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ABSTRACT

In this year devoted to celebrating Luther’s invitation to debate Indulgences in 1517, which led to the establishment of the Lutheran faith, it is timely to reassess the Fastnachtspiele of Hans Sachs, whose reputation varies from unskilled cobbler poet to ‘Verfechter der Reformation’. Previous research devoted to Hans Sachs and satire concentrates on his ability to produce amusing moral tales for the Carnival season, whereas this thesis searches for critical satire of contemporary political, religious and social issues within the chosen Fastnachtspiele. This is achieved by analysing the plays in the context of contemporary events, personalities and circumstances in Nuremberg during a turbulent period in the city’s history, when it faced internal religious conflict, invasion, declining influence as an imperial city and loss of wealth as an early industrial society. The results of the analysis suggest that Sachs’s Fastnachtspiele, which are celebrated for their didactic nature along with his religious Meistergesang and Reformation dialogues, contribute to a corpus of pro-Lutheran works which helped to shape Nuremberg’s Lutheran cultural memories and a cultural identity for its citizens. Scrutiny of Sachs’s personal library also informs us, contrary to his previous reputation, that Sachs was an educated and sophisticated author, who used classical literature and early German works on various subjects — history, politics and religion amongst others — not only as a basis for some of his plots, but also as a source for his desired type of critical satire, in order to write plays intended to reverse the decline he saw in Nuremberg. This thesis concludes that Sachs stopped writing Fastnachtspiele in December 1560 because of his personal quandary about his role as an author and because it had become dangerous to express his views on what he perceived as Nuremberg’s social, moral, political, economic and religious decline.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Dergleich vil poetischer fabel,
Welche samb in einer parabel
Mit verborgen, verblümten worten
Künstlich vermelden an den orten,
Wie gar hochlöblich sey die tugend
Beide bey alter und der jugend,
Dergleich, wie laster sind so schendlich.¹

As the five-hundredth anniversary of Martin Luther’s protest against abuses in the Catholic Church approaches, it is time to revisit the works of Hans Sachs (1494–1576), Nuremberg’s poet, playwright and musician, who is best known for his Meistergesang and his role as a champion of the Lutheran faith through his religious Dialogues written in 1524 and the moral satires found in his Fastnachtspiele. Many scholars have judged Sachs harshly without examining in depth his body of work. As Horst Brunner says: ‘Das heute verbreitetste, populärste, freilich auch gedankenloseste Bild des Dichters Hans Sachs speist sich nicht aus der Kenntnis seines Lebens und seines umfangreichen literarischen Werkes, vielmehr aus der als degoutant empfundenen Vorstellung der Verbindung von Flickschusterei und Dichtkunst’.²

Although little research³ has been undertaken to assess Sachs’s contribution to satire in general, this thesis examines his use of satire as a tool for criticising the changes he perceives as damaging society, commerce, industry and religion in Nuremberg. Sachs’s own words, ‘[M]it verborgen, verblümten worten’, imply his use of subterfuge within the

texts, his employment of metaphor and allegory to hide his real meanings, a strategy that Winfried Theiß acknowledges in Sachs’s poetry containing dream sequences, in his biblical dramas and poetry, his poems referring to battles and conflicts and any work in which he employs personification, place and animal analogies. However, Theiß excludes Fastnachtspiele from his study, saying: ‘Zu den unallegorischen Dichtungen zählen vor allem: die Fastnachtspiele, die Schwänke und Fabeln, die Versification von Psalmen und biblischen Weisheitsbüchern’. Sachs ostensibly uses these Lenten plays to promulgate a simple moral message to his audience but closer examination reveals that the Fastnachtspiele are more sophisticated than Theiß suggests because of Sachs’s frequent use of allegory and metaphor as literary tools to criticise the behaviour and moral failings he sees in Nuremberg.

This chapter aims to provide the context necessary for understanding the different elements discussed in the analysis of six Fastnachtspiele written between 1550 and 1560. The chosen plays are:

*Der unersetlich geitzhunger genandt* (5 September 1551)  
*Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht, das keyser August wolt kauffen* (9 September 1553)  
*Fastnachtspiel, Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen* (1 October 1553)  
*Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent* (28 December 1557)  
*Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen* (13 December 1559)  
*Das gesprech Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni* (30 December 1560)

---

5 Theiß, *Allegorik*, p. 11.
6 KG XIV, pp. 154–69.
7 KG XIV, pp. 276–87.
8 KG XIV, pp. 304–19.
9 KG XXIII, pp. 136–43.
10 KG XXI, pp. 103–15.
The first part of this chapter is devoted to a comprehensive history of Hans Sachs’s life collated from various sources. Additionally, a source generally not exploited by other scholarship is used — his library catalogue as compiled by Sachs himself — to pinpoint the sources of his inspiration as well as to suggest that his knowledge of classical forms of drama and satire was greater than previously perceived. This questions the views of past researchers as set out in the review of Sachs scholarship. Second, in order to understand the nature of Fastnachtspiel as a genre, the tradition of Fastnacht is discussed, which helps the reader understand its celebration in Nuremberg and provides insight into why Sachs uses the Fastnachtspiel as a vehicle for satire. Third, although these high-spirited celebrations are Catholic in origin, this thesis promotes the idea that Sachs, by using a familiar form to establish a corpus of pro-Lutheran works, helped to establish a Lutheran cultural identity for Nuremberg’s residents. This will include a review of the works of Jan Assmann and others on cultural memory and identity-construction and helps to situate Sachs’s use of familiar locations, traditions, foodstuffs, personalities and their workplaces, all of which add realism to the satirical subtext of his plays. Finally, it is necessary to provide a background for the evaluation of the forms and effects of the satire Sachs uses to provoke a response in his audience, whether that provocation is to stimulate laughter, anger or reflective criticism. This necessitates a review of satire, its history and how it was used in German literature of the late medieval period. The understanding of Sachs’s use of satire to provoke a reaction or change is key to understanding Sachs’s work and inevitably leads to the discussion, in the final chapter of this thesis, of Sachs’s decision to stop writing Fastnachtspiele in December 1560.
Hans Sachs

Most facts known about Sachs come from his own pen in the *Summa all meiner gedicht von MDXIII jar an biß in 1567 jar*. He was born on 5 November 1494 in Nuremberg, a vibrant, technologically innovative industrial centre with a highly developed, wealthy and culturally sophisticated merchant class. His birthplace was a house in the Kotgasse, now renamed Brunnengasse 23, not far from the Lorenzkirche. Jörg Sachs, his father, is believed to have come from Zwickau and to have acquired the Nuremberg *Bürgerrecht* in 1490. In this year he married Christine Prunner, the widow of a *Schneidermeister* and mother to Nikolaus, which may explain why Hans Sachs did not become a tailor, his elder brother being the legitimate heir to the tailoring business. Sachs attended a *Lateinschule*, at which he followed a classically based curriculum:

Darinn lert ich puerilia,

Grammatica und musica

Nach ringem brauch derselben zeit. (KG XXI, p. 337, ll. 17–19)

Sachs first encountered the *Meisterlied* song form in 1509, when he made the acquaintance of Lienhard Nunnenbeck (*c*.1509–1527), a weaver, *Meistersinger* and music teacher. Traditionally, to complete an apprenticeship, members of unrestricted trades in Nuremberg left their home city and undertook a journeyman’s *Wanderschaft* which lasted five years, then the apprentice returned to produce a specialist piece of work for the *Meister* examination.

---

12 KG XXI, pp. 337–44.
14 Sachs may have attended the Heilig-Geist-Spital school (Brunner, *Hans Sach*, p. 21).
15 Restricted or ‘gesperrtes Handwerk’ was the term used to describe more technical trades with industrial processes that Nuremberg wanted to keep secret, making a *Wanderschaft* forbidden.
Fig. 2 Statue of Hans Sachs
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Fig. 4 Schuhmacher 1568 Jost Amman
Sachs left Nuremberg in 1511 on one such journey, during which he travelled around South and West Germany:

\begin{flushleft}
Als mein lehrzeit vollendet war,
Thet ich meinem handwerck nach wandern
Von einer statte zu der andern,
Erstlich gen Regenspurg und Braunaw,
Gen Saltzburg, Hall und gen Passaw,
Gen Wels, München und Landshut,
Gen Oeting und Burgkhausen gut,
Gen Würtzburg und Franckfurt, hernach
Gen Coblenz, Cölen und gen Ach;
Arbeit also das handwerck mein
In Bayern, Francken und am Rein. (KG XXI, p. 338, ll. 4–14)
\end{flushleft}

At the same time as gaining knowledge of shoe-making, he perfected his song-writing skills thanks to introductions to Meistersingerschulen in many of the above cities. During this time Sachs produced his first songs, at first love songs, and their musical notation, and then in 1514 his first Meisterlied, Gloria patria: lob und er, composed in Munich.\footnote{Repertorium der Sangsprüche und Meisterlieder des 12. bis 18. Jahrhunderts, ed. by Horst Brunner and Burghart Wachinger, 12 vols (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1986–2009), IX, 5S/25b (Volumes IX–XII are dedicated to Hans Sachs’s work.)}

Sachs returned to Nuremberg in 1516 and widened his repertoire by writing Spruchgedichte (didactic poetry based on religious or folklore tales) and his first two Fastnachtspiele in 1517 and 1518.\footnote{Das hoffgsindt Veneris KG XIV, pp. 3–11. Von der eygenschaft der lieb KG XIV, pp. 12–25.} In 1519 Sachs married Kunigunde Creutzer from Wendelstein, a village south of Nuremberg. Kunigunde’s parents had died before her marriage to Sachs, enabling her to provide a sound financial base for her new family when she sold the family’s farm for 478 gulden.\footnote{Walter L. H. Buchholz, ‘Hans Sachs und seine Nachkommen bis zur Gegenwart’, Blätter für Fränkische Familienkunde, 9 (1965), 350–69 (pp. 352–53).} From his marriage to Kunigunde Sachs had a
source of information about country festivals and traditions, as well as the hardships and the benefits of being a farmer, which he uses to illustrate farming life within his works. The couple produced seven children, all of whom predeceased Kunigunde by 1560, the date of her own death. From the marriage of his eldest daughter Katherina (c. 1520–1556) to Hans Pregel, Sachs had four grandchildren: Hans, Maria, Katherina and Jakob.¹⁹

His parents gave the married couple their house on the Kotgasse, which, with the money brought into the marriage by Kunigunde, allowed Sachs to establish his own business, having been elevated to the status of master craftsman soon after the marriage. From 1520 to 1523, Sachs did not produce any new works. This might have been due to the demands of establishing his business or, indeed, parenthood.²⁰ These years were formative for the Reformation in Nuremberg and it is known that Sachs collected forty works by Martin Luther between 1520 and 1522.²¹ During this time Sachs devoted considerable energy to his efforts to understand Luther’s new ideas and the result of this reflective period was the work Die wittenbergisch nachtigall,²² published in 1523, in which Sachs not only exposes the inequities in the Catholic Church but illustrates his knowledge of Luther’s doctrine:

Darinn zeigt Luther, das wir all
Miterben seind Adams fall
In böser begir und neigung.
Deßhalb kein mensch dem gsetz thut gnung.
Halt wirs schon außwendi im schein,
So ist doch unser hertz unrein
Und zu allen sünden geneiget,

²⁰ Aylett states that two daughters were born before 1523 (Translations of the Carnival Comedies of Hans Sachs (1494–1576), ed. & trans. by Robert Aylett (Lewiston: Mellen, 1994), p. 8).
²² KG VI, pp. 368–86.
This poem could be memorised, read and repeated where ordinary people met, in the home, in the market place, in workshops or in Kneipen. Mary Beare suggests the reason for the success of Sachs’s poem with the population of Nuremberg:

The preface shows that Sachs was clear not only about his aim in introducing the events to the man in the street; he was equally clear about the dire situation of the German people. They were lost sheep, led astray in the Christian community for generations, turned aside as they were from the Holy Gospel and laid under the yoke of the Bishop of Rome.23

Even if the citizens of Nuremberg had not grasped the significance of the Edict of Worms (1521), which outlawed Luther, they would have been aware of the Nuremberg Reichstage in 1522, 1522–23 and 1524 at which suppression of non-Catholic works had been demanded,24 something that would have had a direct effect on trade in Nuremberg, it being a centre for printing.25 Sachs’s own anxiety about publication due to the pronouncements at the Reichstage is clear, as illustrated by the fact that the first versions of Die wittembergisch nachtigall were printed in Bamberg without the name of the printer or the place of publication.26 According to Julius Sahr, the reception of this work resulted in slurs

---

23 Beare, Hans Sachs, p. xvi.
24 The Reichstagsabschied (8 April 1524) demanded that Lutheran works were placed before the Bishops for scrutiny before publication. (Arnd Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik der Reichsstadt Nürnberg: Von der Einführung der Buchdruckerkunst bis zum Ende der Reichsstadtzeit’, Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg, 49 (1959), 66–169 (p. 75)). (Referred to as MVGN henceforth).
26 Beare, Hans Sachs, p. xvi.
against Sachs: ‘Eine Flut von Angriffen regnete auf den “tollen”, den “verfluchten Schuster” hernieder’. Sachs was not discouraged by these insults and in 1524 he published four prose dialogues under his own name, the first printed by Georg Erlinger in Bamberg again: *Disputation zwischen einem Chorherren und Schuchmacher*, *Ein gespräch eins Evangelischen Christen mit einem Lutherischen*, *Ein gespräch von den Scheinwercken der Geystlichen*, *Ein Dialogus des inhalt: Ein argument der Romischen wider das Christlich heuflein den Geytzn betreffend*. In these works protagonists from different levels of society attack the evils of the Catholic Church and discuss various misconceptions of the religious arguments found on both sides. Brunner states that by the time Sachs wrote the second dialogue he had gained such confidence in his ability to set out the doctrinal arguments that he added ‘Hans Sachs. Schuster’ on the title page. The dialogues are lively and based on biblical stories but in a manner that could be understood by the ordinary, less educated man. Their enthusiastic reception was criticised by Luther’s opponents, especially Johann Cochläus (1479–1552), preacher and theologian from Wendelstein, Kunigunde Sachs’s birthplace:

It must have been the ample quotations from the Bible, complete with chapter and verse that caused Cochläus, a notable humanist opponent of Luther, to maintain with some bitterness that even shoemakers and women knew Luther’s New Testament almost by heart and were bold enough to

---

28 KG XXII, pp. 6–33.
29 KG XXII, pp. 69–84.
30 KG XXII, pp. 34–50.
31 KG XXII, pp. 51–68.
dispute not only with monks and priests but also with academic theologians.\textsuperscript{33}

Sachs’s knowledge of the Bible and Luther’s doctrine is illustrated in the analysis of the \textit{Fastnachtspiele}, where he accurately and aptly uses phrases found the Scriptures or Luther’s own works to criticise both religious and secular matters. In the years 1521–25 Sachs rewrote Catholic religious \textit{Lieder} about the Virgin Mary and replaced the lyrics with words emphasising Christ.\textsuperscript{34} Sachs’s interest in the new faith was perceptive as Nuremberg adopted Lutheranism in 1525 after an open public debate and in doing so it prohibited all other confessions within its territories in order to avoid internal dissent. Consequently, when the brothers Sebald and Barthel Beham, who were painters and illustrators, and Georg Pencz, the engraver, were accused of \textit{Schwärmerei} by Andreas Osiander (1498–1552) in 1525, Sachs found himself implicated in their crimes by association. The accusation of \textit{Schwärmerei} was aimed at radical versions of Lutheranism and \textit{Die drei Gottlosen Maler},\textsuperscript{35} as they were known, were suspected and convicted of being influenced by Thomas Müntzer (1489–1525), a contemporary of Martin Luther and a founder of the Anabaptist movement, who became a leader in the \textit{Bauernkrieg} (1524–25). The severity of their punishment — banishment from the city — reflects Nuremberg Council’s fear that its populace would become involved in the Peasants’ War; however, Sachs’s involvement with these three dissidents was disproved.\textsuperscript{36} What Sachs did not foresee was that the enthusiasm for Nuremberg’s adoption of Lutheranism would be tempered by the Council’s fear of the wrath of the Emperor and the possibility of damage to its status as a \textit{Reichsstadt}. Due to these conflicting political pressures, Sachs attracted censorship from the Council in 1527

\textsuperscript{33} Beare, \textit{Hans Sachs}, p. xvii.
\textsuperscript{36} The \textit{Reichsabschied} dated 8 April 1524 had included the censorship of paintings (Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 75).
because of verses he had written to illustrate thirty anti-papal woodcuts by the engraver Hans Guldenmund, called *Ein wunderliche Weyssagung von dem babstumb, wie es yhm bis an das endt der Welt gehen sol in figuren oder gemäl begriffen, gefunden zu Nürnber ym Kartheusercloster und ist sehr alt. Eyn vorred Andreas Osianders mit gutter verstandtlicher aufflegung durch gelerte leut verklert. Welche Hans Sachs yn teutsche reymen gefaßt und darzu gesetzt hat. Ym MDXXV Jar.*  

37 Andreas Osiander, a passionate Lutheran cleric, wrote the introduction and wording for the engravings, which he then asked Sachs to simplify for the less able reader. Despite Nuremberg having chosen to adopt Lutheranism in 1525, Osiander’s texts were considered too inflammatory in their criticism of the Pope, which could have compromised the delicate position in which the Council found itself within Imperial structures. The severity of this accusation is reflected by Nuremberg Council’s request to the Frankfurt Book Fair that any copies of this work found on sale be destroyed at the city’s cost.  

38 This episode in Sachs’s life not only illustrates his devotion to Lutheranism, but also that the Council’s enthusiasm for Lutheranism was tempered by the needs of their relationship with the Emperor.

Despite his censorship in 1527, Sachs began writing a new genre of work, his first tragedy, the *Tragedia von der Lucretia, auß der beschreybung Livii.*  

39 This work illustrates the depth of his knowledge of classical literary forms, which started at the *Lateinschule*, where the study of classical literature formed part of the *Trivium* curriculum followed by those schools. As Sachs was writing these early plays, Humanist scholars were producing classical plays in Latin for an educated audience, whereas Sachs’s dramas, being written in the vernacular, gave a new audience access to Greek and Roman literature.

By 1530 within Germany more towns and cities had defied the Emperor and adopted Lutheranism. Nuremberg became isolated by its reluctance to join Lutheran

---

37 KG XXII, pp. 131–35.
38 Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 85.
39 KG XII, p. 3–39.
alliances which espoused military opposition to the Emperor and by its fear of losing Charles V’s support in its role as a *Reichsstadt*. Sachs was aware of the delicacy of his own situation as a writer since being censored, which may have prompted him to write his poem *Ein Lobspruch der statt Nürnberg* (1530),\(^{40}\) reminding the reader of the many advantages of living in Nuremberg and extolling the virtues of its good governance:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Also ein ersam weyser rat} \\
\text{Selbs ein fleissig auff-sehen hat} \\
\text{Auff seine burger aller stend} \\
\text{Mit ordenlichem regiment,} \\
\text{Guter statut und policey} \\
\text{Güttig on alle tyranny.} 
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{40}\) KG IV, p. 194, l. 39 – p. 195 ll. 1–5

The *Lobspruch* was an attempt at re-establishing Sachs’s reputation and illustrated his loyalty, which, coupled with his awareness of Nuremberg’s dependency on the Emperor’s goodwill, may also explain why some *Fastnachtspiele* written in the 1530s were never published or were published at a later date. This self-censorship can be interpreted as a sign of Sachs’s caution after his brush with the censor in 1527. During the 1540s Sachs sharpened his pens and increased the output of works, using as inspiration for his increasingly acerbic writing the War of Schmalkalden (1546–47) between the Catholic Emperor and the military Protestant alliance in which Nuremberg played no active role, and the war with the Ottoman Empire, which threatened the eastern borders of the Holy Roman Empire for almost two centuries.

As well as being a prolific writer, Sachs became *Spielleiter der Meistersingerbühne* (1551–60) and *Schauspieler* for the production of many plays. Furthermore, in 1555 Sachs became *Merker* of the *Singschule* (1555–61),\(^{41}\) a role which acknowledged his talents both

\(^{40}\) KG IV, pp. 189–99.

as a musician and an exponent of *Meistergesang*. In this role Sachs employed the rules of *Meistergesang* known as the *Tabulatur*, which covered subject matter, metre, rhyme and tune or *Ton* to judge the acceptability of new songs before permission was granted for public performance. This style of singing and composition had developed out of *Minnesang* but rather than being a ‘courtly’ tradition, it was found in an urban setting, mainly in Southern Germany. Nuremberg’s long tradition of *Meistergesang* dated back to the fourteenth century; its practitioners were groups of men, sometimes within their guilds or mixed across different social levels, who sang together, often on a Sunday after morning service.

His musical duties after 1550 did not deter Sachs from his literary endeavours, this being one of his most productive periods for writing new *Fastnachtspiele*. Nor did Karl V’s dominant position, which forced the re-introduction of Catholic practices in the German territories after the Augsburg Interim (1549), prevent Sachs from writing his most critically scathing works about the behaviour of Nuremberg’s ruling patrician class, as they sought to re-introduce these practices to appease the Emperor, a strategy which threatened peace, prosperity and Lutheranism in Nuremberg. He also took inspiration from the catastrophic sieges of Nuremberg (1552–54) by Albrecht Alcibiades von Brandenburg-Kulmbach (1522–1557) and wrote several critical works about this invader. The intensity of the popular hatred of this man is reflected in Hans Sachs’s works; but in 1557 Sachs withdrew his satirical poem *Gesprech von der himelfart margraff Albrechtz, anno 1557*. It is unclear whether this was an act of self-censorship, or one motivated by the intervention
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42 *Clagspruech der stat Nürenberg ob der unpillichen schweren pelegrung margraff Albrechtz anno 1552* (KG XXII, pp. 541–50; 16 June 1552); *Ein gesprech der götter wider der aufrüerischen fuersten margraff Albrecht und ander fuersten und stet Deutschlands* (KG XXIII, pp. 34–45; 27 June 1554). As well as a *Meisterlied* and a *Prosadialoge* *Ein Pasquillus von dem schloss zw Blassenburg* (KG XXIII, pp. 46–51; 16 July 1554).

43 KG XXIII, pp. 113–21.
of the Nuremberg censor. The timing of the publication of this work was inconvenient to the Council, who were in negotiations about reparations with the Margrave’s family. This is discussed later in this study, as are the consequences of the censorship experienced by Sachs’s immediate family on his death.

In March 1560 Kunigunde Sachs died after forty-one years of marriage, an event which Sachs commemorates in a poem dated the same year called Der wunderliche traum von meiner abgeschiden lieben gemahel Könignut Sächsin. In this piece dedicated to his marriage Sachs explains that his sadness is greater due to the death of his seven children, leaving him with no one except the aforementioned grandchildren. In 1561 Sachs married Barbara Endres (Herscher/Harscher), a widow aged twenty-seven years with a ready-made family of six children from a previous marriage; and in the same year he retired from his role as Merker and soon after from his business (1562).

Further works of poetry and song continue to be produced but in diminishing numbers until the end of the 1560s. These works comprise a mixture of secular and religious songs based on the Bible: Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, the Wisdom of Solomon and Saint Paul’s Epistles. The secular works were varied, including some personal writing for friends on special occasions, as well as poems of praise for other towns, such as Frankfurt, Vienna and Lübeck.

Sachs regarded himself as a reasonably well-off craftsman and confirms this in a poem Die Werk Gottes sind alle gut. There is evidence of his property dealings, allowing him on his death on 19 January 1576 to bequeath four houses to his grandchildren, one being on the Spitalgasse, which he had inherited in 1542 and in which he lived until

---

his death, in addition to 740 gulden. There is also archival evidence that he supplemented his income from rents, from lending money and receipts from the sale of single-sheet publications and collections of his works. There is little archival evidence of his work as a Schuhmacher but he had fulfilled his apprenticeship and became a master craftsman. Given that he did not retire from this business until 1562 it must have had a modicum of success.49

In the course of the analysis of the Fastnachtspiele reference will be made to the contents of Sachs’s own library, evidence of which was found in the city archive in Zwickau in 1853. The alphabetical list of books is written in Sachs’s own hand with the following explanation on the unnumbered first page:


The list supplies limited information, there being no purchase date for each book, nor a note of which version or translation Sachs had acquired.51

Even for a wealthy craftsman, Sachs’s collection of books was extensive, containing his own works and a register of all his works, as well as a collection of works by Martin Luther and the latter’s translations of the Old and New Testaments. The library contained Greek and Latin texts about history, geography, politics and religion, all in

49 Horst Brunner relates one anecdote from the details of a court case in Speyer (c. 1553) between Sebald Spengler and his aunt and guardian Juliana Spengler. It appears that the nephew, who was supposedly not in possession of his faculties, had married beneath him according to his relatives, the patrician Tucher family. Sebald Spengler said he had been disadvantaged by the division of his father’s estate. During the court case, his aunt detailed the debts she had settled for her nephew: one item being twenty-seven pairs of shoes, fifteen of which, both boots and Hornschuhen, had been made in Hans Sachs’s workshop. This was not seen as a slight about the quality of Sachs’s shoemaking but an overestimate by Spengler’s aunt of her nephew’s expenses: ‘Sebalds Anwalt führte aus, man habe seinem Mandanten so viele Schuhe berechnet, daß man damit leicht ein Pferd hätte ausstatten können, das jeden Tag ins Feld geführt oder zur Arbeit gebraucht worden wäre’ (Brunner, Hans Sachs, pp. 58–59).


translation, which ties in with Sachs’s own assertions about his lack of skills in Latin and Greek. These texts include books by Ovid, Pliny, Homer and Herodotus, to name but a few. Sachs owned a copy of Plutarch’s *Parallel Lives*, which contains biographies of great leaders such as Alexander the Great. In Herodotus, who also writes about Alexander the Great, Sachs had a different version, which illustrates that he read around his chosen subjects. Furthermore, Sachs also itemizes Plutarch’s *Moralia* (*Von den guten Siten*), which contains a counter-argument to Herodotus’s life of Alexander. The *Moralia* discusses everyday problems and sins, from the mundane issue of how to raise children to religious debates on virtue and how to achieve it. From native German literature, Sachs owned histories written about Augsburg, Denmark, Sweden and Norway as well as Hartman Schedel’s *Weltchronik* (1493) and Sebastian Frank’s *Germaniae Chronicon* (1538). His collection of German folklore covered the stories of *Eulenspiegel*, Sebastian Brant’s *Narrenschiff*, *Schimpf und Ernst* by Johannes Pauli (1522) and what must have been a recent purchase, Georg Wickram’s *Rollwagenbüchlein* (1555). Many of these texts influence the plots of Sachs’s *Fastnachtspiele*. There are also indications that Sachs was interested in science and nature, owning several books on anatomy, herbs, precious stones and animals, in addition to guides to writing rhetoric and methods of accounting and, curiously, two “Schuldpücher”. Also listed are books by Boccaccio, Steinhöwel’s version of Aesop’s Fables, Petrarch and, from the French, the story of Melusina, about which Sachs writes a version. The possession of these books implies that Sachs was a well-informed poet, a finding which counters some of the less flattering attributes ascribed to him by later scholars. As the analysis progresses, Sachs’s library will be referred to in order to indicate the source of his references in his texts or the source for the plot of a play and, sometimes, the source of a genre.

Sachs scholarship to date focuses on several main areas, among them the *Meistergesang*, his contribution to the Reformation, his use of literature by other authors
within his texts, his use of language and his portrayal of different members of society (farmers, women and Jews). Most biographers have used the Summa as a starting point for their information on Sachs. In this text, he informs the reader that he has written over 6,200 separate works, of which 4,286 were Meisterlieder, 1,900 Spruchgedichte and over two hundred were plays, including eighty-five Fastnachtspiele. Horst Brunner has done much to provide factual information about Hans Sachs’s life in his recent publication Hans Sachs: Auf den Spuren der Dichter und Denker durch Franken. Additional archival research by Gerhard Hirschmann\textsuperscript{52} and Walter L. Buchholz\textsuperscript{53} paints a more detailed portrait of Sachs; and both Mary Beare\textsuperscript{54} and Barbara Könneker\textsuperscript{55} provide short biographies and detailed guides to the different genres of his works with genre bibliographies. Rudolf Genée\textsuperscript{56} has presented a comprehensive appraisal of Nuremberg during Sachs’s lifetime as well as looking at the individual genres of Sachs’s work. Furthermore, Brunner has enabled many new researchers to study Sachs’s songs with the publication of the Repertorium der Sangsprüche und Meisterlieder.

We know from the various portraits of Sachs, which Horst Brunner uses to illustrate Sachs’s life story, that he was held in high esteem for his musical output during his lifetime.\textsuperscript{57} In particular the woodcut by Michael Ostendorfer dated 1545 is accompanied by praise for Sachs and compares his works to those of Ovid and Virgil, but the accompanying German rhyme by Johann Betz is significant as it praises the breadth of Sachs’s work, not just his Meistergesang:

\begin{quote}
Dise Abconterfaction/
Zaigt Hanns Sachsen von Nüremberg an
Schuomachern/ der vil schönr gedicht/
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} Hirschmann, ‘Quellen’, pp. 14–54.
\textsuperscript{53} Buchholz, ‘Hans Sachs’.
\textsuperscript{54} Beare, Hans Sachs.
\textsuperscript{55} Könneker, Hans Sachs.
\textsuperscript{56} Genée, Hans Sachs.
\textsuperscript{57} Brunner, Hans Sachs, p. 38.
Vnd weise Sprüch/hat zuogericht/
Nach ahrt der Edlen Poetrey/
In Deudscher sprach/lustig vnd frey/
Auch durch Maister gesang mit fleiß./

In the period between his death and the end of the eighteenth century little scholarship about Sachs exists, until Goethe renewed interest in Sachs in 1776, imitating the use of the Knittelvers in his works, especially in Götz von Berlichingen (1773), and employing the Franconian dialect. However, Goethe’s views about Sachs were based on a romantic idea of Nuremberg in the late Middle Ages. Brunner says of this view:


Richard Wagner (1813–1883) revitalised interest in Hans Sachs and Nuremberg by painting an idealized view of Sachs’s life and acquaintances in his opera Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg (1867). He believed Sachs was unsophisticated but admitted his works had influence as a role model for a political ‘Volksdichter’. Another, perhaps unintended, result of this opera is the downgrading of Sachs’s profession from shoemaker to cobbler by English opera critics since ‘cobbler’ is a word which refers to a shoe-mender rather than a cordwainer or shoemaker and designer. The choice of this word reinforces a level of

---

59 Brunner, Annäherungen, p. 351.
incredulity that an unprofessional man with little education could produce worthwhile literature. This idea and the romantic portrayal by Goethe and Wagner do little to credit Sachs for the quality of his literary output. Jacob Grimm places doubt on the originality of Sachs’s work (1884), saying: ‘Hans Sachs, der alles dichtet und doch nichts erdichtet’, which implies that Sachs’s stories were simply copies of others’ earlier works, but ignores the fact that Sachs’s interest in other authors’ works was not essentially in the story but in their potential as a vehicle to illustrate the moral he wanted to portray in his *Fastnachtspiele*, a sentiment with which Brunner agrees. Hans Rupprich, writing in 1973, downgrades Sachs’s work because of Sachs’s target audience: ‘Er pflegte alle Gattungen in volksbürglicher Form für ein mittleres und kleinbürgerliches Publikum’. Even Sachs’s phenomenal output mentioned in the *Summa* has negatively affected scholars’ perception of the quality of his works. Mary Beare in 1985 says: ‘A major obstacle in the approach to Hans Sachs is the extraordinary number of unimportant works that he wrote’. In the preparations for the five-hundredth anniversary of Hans Sachs’s birth (1993) there were those who did not believe the expense of a celebration was warranted. Horst Brunner quotes Utz Ulrich (FDP), who said ‘Hans Sachs sei “kein großer Dichter” sondern ein “liebenswerter fränkischer Hauspoet”’, which typifies the sentiment of many Germans today. These examples characterise many assessments of Hans Sachs’s works and add to the negative perception that Sachs cannot have produced meaningful literature due to his profession as a shoemaker and his intended audience. Horst Brunner has sought to correct the misinformed opinions of earlier researchers in his work of 2008. This thesis attempts

---


to support his opinion by highlighting Sachs’s use of satire within the dialogues in his *Fastnachtspiele*, which will bring a new perspective to Sachs’s work, suggesting it to be far more complex than previous researchers have recognised.

Other scholars concentrate their efforts on individual genres in his work. In *Hans Sachs and Folk Theatre in the Late Middle Ages* essays about the Reformation dialogues and Sachs’s use of Genesis in his works confirm Sachs’s devotion to Luther and his Bible translations, a devotion which has led to the opinion that *Fastnachtspiele* have a didactic role for their audience. Sachs has also been recognised for his support for the Reformation, not only in his poetry and plays, but also as a pamphleteer in his publication of the four Reformation Dialogues as *Flugschriften*. John Flood arrives at the conclusion in ‘Hans Sachs and Boccaccio’ that Sachs’s use of Boccaccio is not accurate, but he agrees that Sachs uses the stories from the *Decameron* as a vehicle for his own purpose:

Moreover, for him [Sachs] who still stood in the late medieval tradition of didacticism, poetry’s principal role was to teach — hence the ever-present emphasis in his verse on laying down standards of conduct and behaviour for the improvement of ‘the common man’.

Flood contests that Sachs manipulated other sources of literature for didactic purposes; however, this thesis will suggest that Sachs’s use of his sources was far more complex than has hitherto been thought. The article which ‘unlocked’ this supposition is Stephen L. Wailes’s ‘Hans Sachs, John the Baptist, and the Dark Days in Nuremberg ca. 1548’, published in 1999. Wailes suggests that Sachs used the figure of John the Baptist and his gruesome death to represent two of Nuremberg’s prominent clergy (Veit Dietrich and Andreas Osiander) whose opposition to the city Council’s desire to change the Protestant

---

liturgy resulted in their removal from office. Sachs’s use of subterfuge in his texts was necessary, as pointed out by Winfried Theiß in an extremely insightful chapter, ‘Der Bürger und die Politik’, in which he analyses Hans Sachs’s critical poetry, he comes to the conclusion that Sachs was putting himself in danger by opposing the city fathers.\footnote{Winfried Theiß, ‘Der Bürger und die Politik: Zu den zeitkritischen Dichtungen von Hans Sachs’, \textit{Bedingungen und Probleme}, ed. by Brunner and others, pp. 76–104.} The analysis of the \textit{Fastnachtspiele} in this thesis confirms that within the body of Sachs’s work there are, in the decade before he ceases writing, many occasions on which he criticises local, national, secular and religious politics on an increasingly frequent basis, exposing himself to criticism.

Barbara Könneker recognises Sachs’s contribution to the Reformation through his plays and his pamphlets, highlighting his use of satire to help his didactic purposes and his reworking of other authors’ satirical works, for example the Eulenspiegel stories, and his depiction of farmers, all of which conforms to her assessment of his characters as \textit{Grobianesque}.\footnote{Grobian is the fictional patron saint of coarse buffoons (Barbara Könneker, \textit{Satire im 16. Jahrhundert: Epoche – Werke – Wirkung} (Munich: Beck, 1991), p. 124.)} Despite this her work does not address the satire contained within the dialogue of Sachs’s \textit{Fastnachtspiele}, to which the present study is devoted.

Few researchers study in depth Sachs’s dialogue in his \textit{Fastnachtspiele} or question his motivation for writing moral endings. This is the leading question underlying this study: what pricked Sachs’s conscience or provoked his ire to cause him to write a given play? Searching for Sachs’s inspiration or motivation for writing a particular play at a particular time by studying incidents which occurred in his daily life and cross-referencing his words with historical occurrences within Nuremberg or Germany is an approach which has hitherto rarely been adopted by scholars working on Sachs. Ulrich Feuerstein studies all the \textit{Meisterlieder} written before 1546, cataloguing the classical or biblical sources as well as locating them within their contemporary historical framework; however, he falls short...
of looking for references to that historical framework within the songs themselves. This dissertation will attempt to corroborate the opinion that Sachs was writing satirically in his Fastnachtspiele with evidence from recorded historical events pertinent to the time that Sachs wrote each play.

The purpose of this study is to uncover and analyse Sachs’s use of satire within the dialogue of six Fastnachtspiele written during the 1550s and to relate the satirical content of the dialogue to the historical events and personalities of Nuremberg at the time. Previous research has identified Fastnachtspiele as being ‘moral satires’, that is, the play tells a story which makes obvious to the audience that the protagonist’s behaviour is an example of the shortcomings being exposed by the writer. In Sachs’s Fastnachtspiele, he elucidates the moral in his plays before his typical ending: ‘wünscht Hans Sachs’. This research will expose a critical subtext in these plays and illustrate that as the decade progressed Sachs became increasingly critical of the authorities. This criticism may have attracted the city censor’s attention but also provides indications for Sachs’s decision in late 1560 never to write another play of this genre.

Earlier scholars assert that Sachs cleaned up the genre, a statement that will also be refuted: he is just more adept at hiding crudity behind double entendre, using his knowledge of local dialect and craftsman’s vocabulary to hide what was a crude subtext to some of his plays. This research also asserts that Hans Sachs, in his didactic role, attempts to form a new Lutheran cultural identity for his fellow Nuremberg residents, remembering that the city’s religious structures and artefacts had been Catholic before the Reformation and that there was no iconoclastic destruction when the city chose to follow Luther in 1525, meaning that the Catholic vision of God was visible in the form of church decoration and that religious statues on street corners remained. Whether Sachs was successful in his
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71 Feuerstein, Zeitbezug und Zeitkritik.
72 Könneker, Hans Sachs, p. 61.
efforts will form part of the conclusion. The jolly image of Sachs conveyed by the statue in the Hans Sachs Platz will alter as Sachs questions the role of the writer in his last two Fastnachtspiele, something which may give further insight to his decision to stop writing this genre of play. All this points to a more complicated vision of Hans Sachs and his literary output than has previously been allowed and it will be suggested that the previous negative reputation is not deserved in light of the discoveries made in this research.

In order to understand how Hans Sachs used Fastnachtspiele both satirically to criticise people and events and didactically to teach his fellow residents about Lutheran doctrine and the moral advice found in the Bible, an introduction to the celebration of Fastnacht is necessary. Carnival (Karneval, Fasching or Fastnacht) is essentially a Catholic celebration leading up to Lent. It covers the period from Epiphany (6 January) or Dreikönigstag to Shrove Tuesday or Faschingsdienstag and is followed by the fasting period of Lent from Ash Wednesday to Easter Sunday, a time span which follows the biblical story of Jesus fasting for forty days as reported in the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark and Luke. Carnival or the celebration before Lent is discussed in the works of Mikhail Bakhtin\(^{73}\) and Eckehard Catholy,\(^{74}\) who characterise this period of excess before fasting as having a topsy-turvy nature, a term which can be applied to both its festivities and the literary works produced for this celebration. Through the use of exaggeration, whether ridiculous, grotesque, crude or sexually licentious, the upside-down world is typical of this period and questions normal hierarchies, a technique which Sachs deploys in his Fastnachtspiele to convey his social criticism.

Despite the Catholic Church governing both lay and religious activities in the Middle Ages, there is significant doubt as to whether the Catholic Church was the original source for the celebrations of Fastnacht. It is thought that this tradition has its origins


\(^{74}\) Eckehard Catholy, \textit{Das Fastnachtspiel des Spätmittelalters: Gestalt und Funktion}, ed. by Helmut de Boor and Hermann Kunisch, Hermaea Germanistische Forschungen, Neue Folge, 8 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1961).
further back in pagan times, identifying it as a festival to mark the end of winter and the
approaching period of prosperity and fertility, linking it to the Roman Bacchanalian
festivals.\textsuperscript{75} Many other Church festivals similarly coincide with those originating in
farming communities, as when grape-picking coincides with Harvest Festival. Bakhtin
agrees with the hypothesis of a pagan source for \textit{Fastnacht} and claims that being a festival
of the people changed its nature: ‘As opposed to the official feast, one might say that
carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established
order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and
prohibitions’.\textsuperscript{76} This allowed the participants to abandon their normal lives, to become
anonymous by wearing costumes and masks, to behave grotesquely, using obscenities or
being sexual promiscuous, behaviour which during their normal daily lives would have
been deemed unacceptable.

Bakhtin asserts that the suspension of official control allows the source of laughter
to be whatever makes ordinary people laugh: whether their mirth is triggered by obscenity,
physical humour or faecal humour hardly matters. According to Bakhtin the main purpose
for \textit{Fastnacht} celebrations was entertainment and laughter, which is not confined to just the
Lenten period as this purpose applies to other entertainments associated with the Church
calendar, such as the Feast of Fools (1 January) or the Feast of the Ass (14 January).\textsuperscript{77}
\textit{Fastnacht} became associated with the desire to let off steam before fasting began on Ash
Wednesday. Nikolina Zobenica, writing about collective memory, asserts: ‘Die
Fastnachtzeit bot ihnen die letzte Gelegenheit, all das Verbotene noch einmal zu
genießen’;\textsuperscript{78} and Bob Scribner agrees with the idea that the players or participants are

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{75} Kônneker, \textit{Satire}, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{76} Bakhtin, \textit{Rabelais}, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{77} Bakhtin, \textit{Rabelais}, pp. 4–5.
\textsuperscript{78} Nikolina Zobenica, ‘Fastnachtspiele als Medien des kollektiven Gedächtnisses’, \textit{Neophilologus}, 98 (2014),
287–301 (p. 290).
\end{flushright}
letting off steam but attributes this to the containment of discontent.\textsuperscript{79} Furthermore, Scribner suggests that the behaviour allowed in the \textit{Karneval} period was not seen as a breach of the peace: ‘The festive calendar had its high points at which allowance was made for the licence of the youth’.\textsuperscript{80} He concludes that the anarchy allowed during \textit{Fastnacht} is similar to permitted rebellion but is contained within a fixed period of time, the difference being that the rebels, rather than seeking to change the established social order, become the established order but only for a prescribed period.

It is the suspensions of norms, as Bakhtin suggests, which links \textit{Fastnacht} to ‘die verkehrte Welt’ and its inclusion in the traditional \textit{Karneval} events and literature, including \textit{Fastnachtspiele}. The notion of a ‘topsy-turvy’ or ‘upside-down’ world hints at the characteristics of this concept, in which, according to Scribner, ‘the dignified is mocked, the elevated demeaned and order reduced to chaos’.\textsuperscript{81} Both mockery and the demeaning of characters are essential parts of satire and will be discussed later in this chapter. The temporary suspension of the official world had other liberating effects. Bakhtin says:

\begin{quote}
This led to the creation of special forms of marketplace speech and gesture, frank and free, permitting no distance between those who came in contact with each other and liberating the norms of etiquette and decency imposed at other times.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}

Many of these features can be seen in Sachs’s \textit{Fastnachtspiele}, where language is often coarse vernacular or in dialect and the vocabulary is influenced by the level of society which Sachs wishes to portray or by his desire to use a word with a double meaning.

At the same time that Humanist scholars rediscovered classical theatrical genres, often performed in Latin or Greek, early \textit{Fastnachtspiele} were being written in the

\textsuperscript{80} Scribner, \textit{Popular Culture}, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{82} Bakhtin, \textit{Rabelais}, p. 10.
vernacular and displaying many characteristics of carnival humour and ‘die verkehrte Welt’. A factor that contributed to the idea that these plays were based on a folk tradition is the simplicity of their construction. The earliest plays date from the fifteenth century and were mostly one-act Reihenspiele in which the protagonists say their piece but enjoy no dialogue or interaction with other players, the opening and closing of the performance being announced by a Herold or uninvolved player. Sachs used this type of Fastnachtspiel for his pre-Reformation Fastnachtspiele. The type of play mastered by Sachs after the Reformation was the Handlungsspiel, which had a plot, albeit a very basic one. Both forms have been judged a low form of literature, as they contain abusive speech, obscene symbols, toilet humour and fake fighting; however, their value was being compared to that of plays being produced in Humanist circles at the same time. The idea that Fastnachtspiele were not a high-literary genre stems partly from the nature of their audience, who were predominantly from a class of people not known for their ‘literary’ understanding of classical comedy due to their educational attainment levels; and this attitude mirrors the judgement of Sachs’s works by later critics. Nikolina Zobenica believes that the genre of Fastnachtspiel as practised by Sachs does not deserve its place in the history of German literature. Furthermore, she quotes Katelin Hegedüš-Kovačević, who calls the genre a ‘Randzone der Literatur’. 

Early Fastnachtspiele were between one hundred and six hundred lines long and written in short rhyming couplets or Knittelvers, which did not commend them to the Humanists, who sought classically based verse. The rhyming form with eight or nine syllables per line enabled the ‘story’ and dialogue — and hence the final moral message —

85 Zobenica, ‘Fastnachtspiele’, 298.
to be easily remembered by the audience. Fastnachtspiele are part the urban folk tradition and many of their performers came from the lower social classes and guilds.\textsuperscript{87} In Nuremberg the performers came from craft workshops but some plays were produced by patricians’ sons who attended the Heilig-Geist-Spital school.\textsuperscript{88} The early plays were performed on the street, in Wirtshäuser, in workshops and sometimes in market places, without a stage, a feature which allowed the players to mingle with the audience.\textsuperscript{89} This restricted the scope of the performance since, as no scenery was used, any change in the location of the action or the passage of time was difficult to portray and consequently audiences could be involved in both the fights and dances which took place during and at the conclusion of the earliest forms of Fastnachtspiel. Hans Sachs made use of this tradition in his earlier Fastnachtspiele by inviting his audience to return to the festivities after delivering the moral of his play. Moreover, unlike other Fastnacht celebrations, there was little provision for costume, although Catholy suggests that the protagonists may have carried or worn something to help the audience identify their role\textsuperscript{90} or position in society.\textsuperscript{91}

The educational level of the audience depended on the location of the performance. Already mentioned above are performances in the courtyards of inns, but the simplicity of Fastnachtspiele allowed them to be performed on street corners, market places and even in the courtyards of merchants’ houses, where the audience would be significantly better educated than at other locations. Although literacy levels were higher in German cities (c. 30\%) than in the countryside (c. 5\%),\textsuperscript{92} there were still many people who relied on oral sources for their knowledge of the Bible, given that the pre-Reformation Church liturgy

\textsuperscript{87} In Recklinghausen and Frankfurt, the Stadtrat were the performers; in Lübeck performances were led by patricians and in Dortmund the Zünfte provided the actors. Furthermore, according to Werner Lenk, players were not always members of the lay community (Werner Lenk, \textit{Das Nürnberger Fastnachtspiel des 15. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie und zur Interpretation des Fastnachtspiels als Dichtung} (Berlin: Akademie, 1966), p. 10).


\textsuperscript{89} Könneker, \textit{Hans Sachs}, pp. 68–69.

\textsuperscript{90} Catholy, \textit{Fastnachtspiel}, pp. 34–35.

\textsuperscript{91} Catholy, \textit{Fastnachtspiel}, p. 262.

would have been in Latin. Thus, *Fastnachtspiele* being in the vernacular with their memorable rhyming schemes and rhythm rendered them a suitable genre for the education of illiterate or semi-literate people.

Sachs follows a long tradition by writing *Fastnachtspiele* in Nuremberg. His predecessor, Hans Rosenplut (c. 1400–1460) originally a metal worker who became the city’s leading ammunition maker, is known for his entertaining plays based on social conflicts, relationships, physical urges and occasionally on political events in *Reihenspiele*.93 Hans Folz, a barber and blood-letter (c.1435–1513), wrote entertaining but not educational plays. He was Sachs’s immediate example for the art of writing *Fastnachtspiele* in Nuremberg but, according to Zobenica, Folz was more of a satirist, whereas she characterises Sachs as a moralist producing didactic plays.94 This thesis will prove that Sachs encompasses characteristics of both his predecessors by producing plays that are not only didactic but also express political critique woven into them through satirical methods.

Sachs eventually replaces the opening *Einschreier* or *Herold* and the concluding *Ausschreier* or *Herold* with an opening speech and an epilogue usually delivered by one of the protagonists in the play. The moral is contained in the final speech and Sachs is ever present in the plays in his closing words: ‘wünscht Hans Sachs’.95 This way of closing a *Fastnachtspiel* was not innovative: Hans Folz had also closed his plays in this way as it served the purpose of moving the play back into reality.96 In his own words Sachs says that he is writing, ‘Alles zu Gottes ehr unnd anraitzung unnd vermanung’.97
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95 For an example see: *Ein faßnachtspiel mit vier personen: Der rofsdieb zu Fünsing mit dem thollen diebischen bawren*. KG XVII, p. 111, l. 2.
96 Klein, *Bildung und Belehrung*, p. 244, fn. 1.
97 KG t, p. 4 (l. 14).
The idea of satire and parody found in Karneval celebrations had already filtered into literature in the fifteenth century and was not just confined to the mocking of priests and clergy.\textsuperscript{98} Das Narrenschiff, written by Sebastian Brant and published in 1494, is an example of this development, as Brant satirizes the failings of people from different levels of society. Thus, Sachs is not innovative in writing moral satires in which he portrays man’s weaknesses, but his use of the Fastnachtspiel genre as a vehicle allowed him licence to create anarchy that was granted during the Fastnacht period and to write satirical reviews of events and people in Nuremberg.

Nuremberg’s internal city structures enabled this genre of celebration, from the strong sense of community which stemmed from strict observance of social levels to a strong sense of citizenship coupled with religious piety and a long tradition of celebrating Fastnacht. The topsy-turvy nature of Fastnacht allowed the lowly apprentice to play his Meister and vice versa and the costumes and masks worn during the celebrations in Nuremberg allowed grotesque mimicry of the upper classes and encouraged the audience to laugh at their pretentions. Licence to do the forbidden during Fastnachtzeit granted permission to sin and mock, or parody or satirize the established social order. This festival should not be just seen as a celebration for the apprentices: Nuremberg’s other residents took advantage of the freedom accorded to the celebrations to enjoy themselves, thus threatening civic order on a wider scale.\textsuperscript{99}

The genre of Fastnachtspiele had a short literary life from about 1400 to 1600,\textsuperscript{100} but it enjoyed longevity in Nuremberg despite the banns on fasting and many other Catholic traditions which were introduced when the city adopted Lutheranism in 1525. Indeed, Zobenica suggests Fastnachtspiele died out when strict fasting rules were eliminated.\textsuperscript{101} After fasting rules were reintroduced in Nuremberg in 1549 at the time of the Interim, Sachs

\textsuperscript{98} Scribner, \textit{Popular Culture}, p. 87 & p. 89.
\textsuperscript{99} Catholy, \textit{Fastnachtspiel}, p. 262.
\textsuperscript{100} Catholy, \textit{Fastnachtspiel}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{101} Zobenica, ‘Fastnachtspiele’, 1 (Abstract).
increased his production of *Fastnachtspiele* and the genre flourished after Sachs’s death, when Jakob Ayrer (1543–1605) took on the mantle as writer of the city’s Lenten plays. Another important *Fastnacht* tradition in Nuremberg is the *Schembartlauf*, which suffered a different fate. The *Schembartlauf* was established after the *Handwerkeraufstand* (1348–49): after resistance to the rebellion had been quelled, the *Metzgerzunft* was rewarded for its loyalty to the Emperor with the permission to hold an annual dance. Over the course of time this permission was passed to the *Patriziat*, whereby the dance became a masked run through the streets performed by the sons of Nuremberg’s patricians.102

Despite the prohibition of guilds in Nuremberg after the *Handwerkeraufstand*, it was from these craft structures that most of the *Fastnachtspiele* performers were found. The attraction for the players was that young apprentices lived under strict conditions, with every aspect of their lives being controlled by their *Meister*, including the lack of contact with the opposite sex. The resultant tension was relieved by their roles in *Fastnachtspiele* and the riotous behaviour encouraged by the *Schembartlauf*, during which the participants dragged a *Hölle*, a float which depicted a topical theme, through the streets to the *Rathaus*, where it was set alight. The participants could dress up, make obscene jokes and lewd gestures and generally behave badly as a release from their strictly regulated lifestyles103 and it was this licence for unbridled enjoyment that allowed Sachs to include the crude and the rude in his works, whereas under normal circumstances such writing would have been frowned upon.

In contrast to the continuation of the *Fastnachtspiel* performances in Nuremberg, the *Schembartlauf*, regarded as a Catholic tradition, did attract prohibition from 1524 as the city approached its decision to adopt Lutheranism. The Council allowed its re-introduction in 1539, but it was totally banned after this performance, in which the local, radical

102 Zobenica links the *Schembartlauf* tradition to pagan times as the central character during the run is a ‘wild man’ covered in moss (Zobenica, ‘Fastnachtspiele’, 291).
Lutheran preacher, Andreas Osiander, was portrayed on a ship between two devils, which was then burned in front of the Rathaus. It was perceived as a populist reaction to Osiander’s religious stance and as offensive.\footnote{Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 180.}

As early as 1468 there is evidence of criticism in the Ratsbücher and Ratsverlässe relating to the performance of Fastnachtspiele as even at this date plays had to be submitted to the Council before permission was granted for performance. One example is dated 19 January 1496: ‘Den gesellen die mit reimen in einem faßnachtspil geen woollen, ist es vergont, doch das sie nit schempert tragen, noch rott weis laufen’.\footnote{Lenk, Fastnachtspiel, p. 8.} Although this proves that the tradition was flourishing in Nuremberg in the second half of the fifteenth century, all the entries concerning Fastnachtspiele are negative, i.e., the records show the plays being judged or banned due to their offensive content.\footnote{Lenk, Fastnachtspiel, p. 8.} It should be remembered that the working class of Nuremberg had no way of representing themselves within the city’s political structures, despite the presence of eight representatives of the crafts advising the Großer Rat on working practices,\footnote{The Großer Rat comprised thirty-four Ratsherren and eight chosen Meister (Martin Schieber, Geschichte Nürnberg (Munich: Beck, 2007), p. 58).} and that any gathering, whether to perform a play or to sing, was regarded with suspicion by the authorities: Christoph Scheurl, writing in 1516 to Johann Staupitz, describes Nuremberg’s political structure:

Unser ganzes Staatswesen liegt in den Händen der Patrizier, deren Ahnen und Urahnen — das sei festgestellt — auch für uns nützlich waren. Neuzugezogene und Leute aus dem Volk haben keine Macht, noch steht es Leuten aus dem Volk zu zu regieren, weil alle Obrigkeit von Gott ist, und gut zu regieren nur wenigen gewissermaßen erlaubt ist, nähmlich denen, die
This explains why literary works by Sachs, which were performed in the open and available to all, were closely monitored. Control lay with the Council and the city censor; and if a writer crossed the fine line between entertainment and saying something to Nuremberg’s disadvantage or something that might lead to public disorder, the censor acted to prevent the performance or publication of the works in question.

Another research area which will form part of the analysis is the role that Sachs plays in helping to form a Lutheran cultural identity for the city residents. It is worth pausing to consider what is meant by cultural identity. A man like Sachs can be said to have had many cultural identities: he was a citizen of Nuremberg, a shoemaker, a member of a *Meistersinger* group and a congregant of the Lorenzkirche. The shoemakers’ guild had long-established rules and guidelines, as did the *Meistersinger* group, and to become a citizen of Nuremberg or a member of a church would also have entailed fulfilling certain criteria, which makes cultural identity a complicated issue. Jan Assmann’s work *Religion and Cultural Memory* informs us that cultural identity is in part formed by cultural memories. Assmann states that the ‘[p]reservation, retrieval and communication’ used in the transmission of oral histories, folklore and stories in illiterate societies help to establish and maintain cultural memories. These forms of story-telling were practised regularly, with wide participation and often in a poetic form, criteria which are the founding principles of *Fastnachtspiele* and *Meistergesang* and render them suitable as vehicles for cultural memory. Furthermore, Assmann establishes temporal boundaries for memory, subdividing it into communicative memories and cultural memories. Communicative memories tend to be in the immediate past, recollections of events which have taken place
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within four generations or between eighty and one hundred years previously, or even those which constitute hearsay, whereas cultural memories rely on a much longer period of memory.\textsuperscript{110} According to Assmann’s delineation, Nuremberg’s long tradition of \textit{Fastnacht}, \textit{Fastnachtspiele} and \textit{Meistergesang} all have their origins in the distant past, which makes them part of cultural memory. The specific annual performance renders \textit{Fastnacht} and \textit{Fastnachtspiele} part of the communicative memory of the audience. Hence, when writing in the 1550s, Sachs appeals to communicative memories of the Reformation in 1525 or the expulsion of the Jews from Nuremberg in 1499, but he evokes cultural memories when criticising the Catholic Church, which had left its traces in the city in the shape of churches and religious institutions that had been symbols of Catholicism for hundreds of years but were now used by Lutherans for their daily services.

The success of \textit{Fastnachtspiele} with their audience is due to the latter’s ability to relate to the everyday situations portrayed in the plays, typically disobedient wives, stupid farmers, marriage problems and local social problems. Sachs uses these stereotypical ‘identities’ to add meaning to his characters. Assmann describes the purpose of cultural identity:

> It connects the first-person singular to the first-person plural, at one and the same time representing the collective social body and a system of meanings and values through which the individual becomes part of the whole, thereby signalling his identity as a member.\textsuperscript{111}

An example of this is the farmer as a protagonist, who is portrayed as an example of coarseness and stupidity, wearing odd clothing, being subject to basic physical urges and believing in wild superstitions which matched the pagan fertility ideas of \textit{Fastnacht}. He was also identified as an outsider by the city dwellers, underlined by the fact that he lived


\textsuperscript{111} Assmann, \textit{Cultural Memory}, p. 108
‘outside’ the city walls which gave the residents of the city Nuremberg a sense of unity, a unity in which he took no part.\textsuperscript{112} As an object of derision the farmer fulfils the role of the \textit{Narr} in many of Hans Sachs’s \textit{Fastnachtspiele}, a literary convention in Germany since the eleventh century, with the \textit{Narr} being used in many forms, as the butt of jokes, the simpleton or even the wise fool.\textsuperscript{113}

Furthermore, Sachs used negative cultural memories of the Catholic Church to remind his audience of the ‘bad old days’, not only by laughing at some of their practices but also through his demeaning portrayal of Catholic priests within the plays. This tactic stirs the audience to make comparisons with their previous experience of the Catholic Church and the situation prevailing since the adoption of Lutheranism, a comparison which leads to the rejection of one confession and a preference for another. Furthermore, Sachs’s use of Luther’s own words and Bible translations within his works has another purpose: it helps his audience to form a new Lutheran cultural identity by the repetition of biblical passages they may have heard in Church, which were made more accessible by Luther’s translation into the vernacular.

When Sachs wrote the Reformation Dialogues in 1524, which not only reminded his reader of the inequities of the Catholic Church but also contain quotations from Luther’s translation of the New Testament and references to his doctrinal views, Sachs was already contributing to the creation of a Lutheran cultural identity. From the number of reprints of Sachs’s \textit{Dialogues} during the first years before Nuremberg officially adopted Lutheranism, it can be deduced that enthusiasm for the new confession was spreading, but Sachs’s role was especially important for those less able to access the doctrinal arguments circulating amongst the better educated patrician class. Additionally, to make the new faith more acceptable to his audience, Sachs had an advantage: he would not be perceived to be

\textsuperscript{112} Lenk, \textit{Fastnachtspiel}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{113} Baro, \textit{Narr}, p. 10.
lecturing his audience from a superior moral standpoint but was, rather, one of them, a sinner in the eyes of the Lord, a fellow resident and a *Handwerker*. In other words, he shared their cultural identities. In order to communicate his message successfully Sachs used existing social structures in Nuremberg, the traditional *Stände*, craftsmen and the merchant class, and their highly structured sub-divisions, to add more reality to his message. Assmann asserts: ‘The social group that forms a memory community preserves its past mainly through two factors: its peculiarity and its durability’. Nuremberg, like all civic societies in the medieval period, was subject to social divisions, but these became more defined by the formation of the patrician government and craft guild structures from the thirteenth century onwards. For example, the clothing worn by different levels of society as determined by the sumptuary laws and the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) provided visible identifiers as a reminder of social class or cultural identity. This was achieved by restricting the types of material and adornment available to each class, only allowing luxury adornments, such as jewels and fine lace, to be worn by the upper classes. These laws even defined a dress code for Jews, whores and beggars, making their identities clear to the citizens and rendering them easy to satirize within Sachs’s plays.

As well as having their own cultural identity, groups had their own particular set of cultural memories: for instance, craftsmen retained their own books of rules, records of previous masters, methods and costings, which all formed part of their cultural identity as well as their cultural memory as their unity was codified in old texts. Significantly, Sachs had to ensure that his plays appealed not only to the lower levels of society through their cultural memories, but also to the other social classes via their memories and identities. This Sachs did by creating unities and by invoking memories common to both groups within the same play: for example, the use of Franconian dialect, or references to
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local foods, recipes, the Kaiserburg or even the invasions by Albrecht Alcibiades in 1552. The unity of their Nuremberg cultural identity lay in their common experiences or common memories but even annual celebrations such as Fastnacht, Fastnachtspiele and the Schembartlauf involved different levels of society, each with their own rules, thus forming, amongst the residents involved, their own cultural memories. Sachs would not have viewed his strategies in Assmann’s terms, but his writing does demonstrate all the precepts of cultural identity and memory. He was able to appeal to his audience because he was a master at recognising the unities and disunities within his city. He wanted his audience to feel part of a small group or a unified body to enable them to judge their own behaviour and the behaviour of others. His ability to use cultural identities and memories renders Sachs’s didactic role more complex than previously believed: not only did he promote moral behaviour using (usually) the words of the Bible as his guide but, as an opinion-former, he taught his audience how to become Lutheran.

Before the analysis of the chosen Fastnachtspiele commences, it is necessary to decide what type of satire this thesis seeks to illustrate. The focus is not on the ‘moral satire’ found in each play, but more on Sachs’s use of elements of satire within the dialogue of the plays which refer to an actual current theme, person or event important to or affecting Nuremberg. Sachs frequently employs satire to undermine the subject of his criticism by focusing the audience's attention on the hypocrisy of, say, a well-known grasping merchant, who represents the sins of Greed and Avarice pilloried in the ‘moral’ at the end of the play. Alternatively, Sachs uses satire to portray as foolish - and hence criticize - citizens whom he saw as betraying either Lutheranism or Nuremberg itself.

In order to discover this form of satire in the Fastnachtspiele it is necessary to understand the characteristics of satire and their use. Satire is hard to define, as Edgar Johnson says: ‘There would not be much exaggeration in saying that everybody recognizes
satire and that nobody knows what it is’. Both Barbara Könneker and Ulrich Gaier open their books on satire with this quotation and this is no wonder as the defining characteristics of satire are numerous. The *Princeton Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics* defines satire in this way: ‘Satire is both a mode and a genre of verse and prose literature that adopts a critical attitude towards its target with the goal of censuring human folly’. This illustrates that if Sachs’s purpose was didactic, his choice of writing style was apt.

The rediscovery, during the fifteenth century, of the classical practitioners of satire by Humanist scholars had much to do with their interest in ancient texts as exemplars for future theatrical works. Barbara Könneker explains the new interest in the classical writers:

Diese galten schon im Mittelalter als die ‘klassischen’ Vertreter der Gattung, und nachdem die Humanisten die Antike als Vorbild und Orientierungsnorm wiederentdeckt hatten, begann man die Form, zuerst im Lateinischen und dann auch in den Volkssprachen, neu zu beleben.

Nothing remains of the writings of the foremost Greek exponent of satire Menippus (c. 300 BC), whose satirical works are believed to have been imitated by Lucian of Samosata (c. 120 AD), leaving examples of this genre to inspire other authors. Menippus was a cynic and a follower of the philosophy of Diogenes (c. 412 – 323 BC), whose verse satires are cynical, gentle in nature and focus on the failures of man and society, which would have appealed to Sachs. Stefan Trappen believes that Sachs did not have access to these texts, although he acknowledges that Sachs’s work has been proved to have been influenced by Lucian. This view ignores the knowledge that Sachs had gained from the classical

---

118 Könneker, *Satire*, p. 11.
122 Trappen, ‘Das Gesprech’, 322.
123 Trappen, ‘Das Gesprech’, 322–23, fn. 44.
*Trivium* curriculum (Grammar, Rhetoric and Logic) which he had followed and the translations from classical Latin works completed during his school days.\(^{124}\) Another great exponent of satire is the Roman Juvenal (*c.* 100 AD), who wrote sixteen satires criticising corruption in society and politics.\(^{125}\) His works are considered to be different to those of Menippus as he uses a much more abrasive tone. The style of Sachs’s satire is Menippean, but the focus of his criticism falls into the realms of Juvenalian satire as in later years his tone becomes more abrasive.

Humanists promoted the mistaken idea that *satyr* was linked to the Greek mythological figure of the satyr, who appeared in Bacchanalian festivals: ‘Satyrn hießen in der Mythologie die bocksfüßigen Begleiter des Dionysos, von denen man die Satyrspiele herleitete’.\(^{126}\) The Bacchanalian or Dionysian feasts at which the satyr played the role of a fickle, goat-footed wild man were a direct link in the eyes of Humanists to the excesses of *Fastnacht* and notably to the *Schembartlauf* and the central figure of its ‘wild-man’.\(^{127}\) Sebastian Brant’s *Das Narrenschiff* (1494), written first in German rather than Latin,\(^{128}\) was identified as *divina satyra* by the well-known academic and Humanist Abbot Trithemius von Sponheim (1462–1516).\(^{129}\) This work is now seen as an example of Roman verse satire and influences from it are found in Sachs’s works.\(^{130}\) In *Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen* Sachs uses some of Brant’s arguments about the ownership of books and thus mirrors some of Brant’s views from the first chapter of *Das Narrenschiff*, called ‘Der Büchernarr’.

As more recent research has suggested, the word satire derives from the Latin ‘satura’, a mixture or medley, which, when preceded by ‘lanx’ or platter, translates into a
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\(^{126}\) Könneker, *Satire*, p. 25.
\(^{127}\) Zobenica, ‘Fastnachtspiele’, 291.
\(^{128}\) The first Latin version is dated 1497.
\(^{130}\) Könneker, *Satire*, p. 31.
cornucopia of fruits. Barbara Könneker prefers ‘Potpourri’,\textsuperscript{131} which is defined as ‘a mixture of various things that were not originally intended to form a group’ and accords with the problem of identifying satire as a genre. Many of satire’s characteristics can be described as comic effects to achieve laughter. Satire can be witty or, conversely, sarcastic, cynical, sardonic and aggressive, demeaning and hurtful. The gentle variety of satire is described by Barbara Könneker as ‘lachende’, whereas its opposite, which is threatening, aggressive and unpleasant, she calls ‘strafende Satire’,\textsuperscript{132} which would be more akin to Juvenalian satire. The difference in the resultant comedic effect is due to the method used to provoke laughter. This could be through the use of parody, ridicule, irony, sarcasm, mocking, cynicism or hyperbole, the choice depending on how the author sees his satirical subject, his intention (i.e., ‘lachende’ or ‘strafende’ satire) or even for whom he is writing. Satire can be altered by adding crude undertones by means of coarse vocabulary, vulgar or obscene gestures, burlesque or imagery, which affect the tone as well presenting an unflattering image of the subject of the satire.\textsuperscript{133} To increase the comedic effect of satire, as well as to protect the author from the ire of the subject of his satirical writing, the author needs to use subterfuge to coax his audience to laughter. The author is dependent on the audience seeing through the subtleties of his writing and realising who or what the intended subject is. This is when the writer employs allegory and metaphor as disguises for his subject matter. If the audience do not understand the subtleties of the satire then the comic effect will be lost.\textsuperscript{134}

In summary, the comic effect on the audience depends on three determiners: first, how the writer balances the separate components of satire; second, how well he disguises the subject of the satire; and, third, the audience itself. If satire is an aggressive form of writing in which the writer takes on the role of authority or superiority to the person or

\textsuperscript{131} Könneker, Satire, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{132} Könneker, Satire, pp. 19–21.
\textsuperscript{133} Könneker, Satire, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{134} Könneker, Satire, p. 26.
institution about which he is writing, then the writer’s role is to challenge the behaviour of the subject/object of his satire and appeal to the audience’s judgement in order to provoke a response: ‘Der Satiriker versteht sich also stets als Kritiker seiner Zeit, deren negative Erscheinungen er aufzeigt, um sie zu tadeln, zu verurteilen oder auch bloß zu verspotten’. For the audience to understand the satire, they must be able to grasp its meaning, which depends on the writer’s skill in setting the satire within a context they understand. Sachs was able to do this because he wrote for his fellow citizens, using situations they would understand, referring to places they frequented and in which they would have felt comfortable. This may give more credence to the idea that some Fastnachtspiele, specifically Das gesprech Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni (1560), were meant for a different audience. Sachs’s usual intended audience was composed of the general public, whereas this play, set in Athens and based on a classical story about a meeting between Diogenes and Alexander the Great, includes a satirical subtext about the abuse of power. This suggests that Sachs, as a critic of his time, was working to form opinion and by careful selection of the satirical devices available to him directed his criticism to the appropriate audience.

Other than illustrating academic prowess or comedic ability, why did Sachs resort to using this type of satire in the plays which were performed in the streets during Fastnacht? Barbara Könneker assigns three main purposes to sixteenth-century satire: didactic, comedic and polemic. She maintains that one reason satire was popularly produced at this time was the availability of examples of satire to authors from the Humanist translations of the classics, citing the Fastnachtspiel and Schwank, both used by Sachs, as good vehicles for the transmission of satire. Many authors agree that the

135 Könneker, Satire, p. 13.
137 Könneker, Satire, p. 40.
139 Könneker, Satire, p. 43.
purpose of Sachs’s *Fastnachtspiele* was didactic, but his use of *Fastnachtspiele* as a vehicle conforms to the previous assertion that the main purpose of this genre was entertainment and comedy. This thesis will refute the idea that Sachs confined his work as a polemicist to his writing of pamphlets and pasquills,¹⁴⁰ both of which Könneker cites as his vehicles for polemic satire. As has been stated, he was censored for writing simple rhyming couplets for a pamphlet against the Pope written by Andreas Osiander. This study will illustrate that at the end of the 1550s Sachs’s writing was becoming increasingly critical of the establishment in Nuremberg and that Sachs was using the *Fastnachtspiele* as a vehicle for polemics.

It will be illustrated that Sachs’s satire is often buried under many layers of references taken from works found in his library and couched in personifications, allegory and metaphor. This is not a new phenomenon in Sachs’s work as he had used allegory and metaphor in his early pro-Reformation work, *Die wittenbergisch nachtigall*, where he uses animal allegories for the different religious personalities and institutions. Sachs copied a classical tradition found in Aesop’s Fables and imitated by many over the centuries. According to Winfried Theiß: ‘Die berühmteste der Sachsschen Tierallegorien ist “Die wittenbergisch nachtigall”, zuerst als Meistergesang entstanden, dann erweitert zu einem umfangreichen Spruchgedicht’.¹⁴¹ In it the nightingale is allegorically Martin Luther and his new doctrine, the lion is the Pope and the wolves are religious dignitaries.¹⁴²

Sachs was very cautious to avoid the ire of the censor at this sensitive period before the adoption of the Reformation by publishing the work anonymously (initially) and in Bamberg. The *Fastnachtspiele* written in the 1550s have the backdrop of a crisis situation in Nuremberg; and as the city had been Protestant for twenty-five years by the 1550s,
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¹⁴⁰ *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jakob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm* <http://DWB.uni-trier.de/de/> see *pasquill* (Known as *DWB* henceforth and only the headline search word will be used in future footnotes).
Sachs’s works should not have been censored for an anti-Catholic stance, nor should they have been censored for being pro-Lutheran. Ultimately censorship in Nuremberg was wholly dependent on the relationship between the city and the King or Emperor.

This study will illustrate the frequency, structure and content of the satire in the later Fastnachtspiele (1550–60) and by comparing earlier works about the same theme or even with the same title but in a different genre, it will be argued that Sachs used Fastnachtspiele not only as a didactic tool on behalf of Lutheranism, but as a satirical vehicle to criticise his contemporaries, his social superiors, the authorities and those purporting to support either Catholicism or Lutheranism. Sachs was, and remained, a follower of Luther’s doctrine throughout his life, so much so that when describing Sachs it is more prudent to use the epithet ‘Lutheran’ rather than ‘Protestant’. Thus, his criticism of the evolving Protestantism practised in Nuremberg in the 1550s was made apparent through his satire. Additionally, the fact that Sachs’s love of the city’s governance suffered in this period will become apparent as he became more vocal about city politics in old age. As if plagued by doubt in his last few Fastnachtspiele Sachs writes about the duty of the playwright to tell the truth. The satire contained within the two texts Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen and Das gesprech Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni will lead to questions about the role of censorship and self-censorship and the abuse of power, themes which are unquestionably political. An assessment of these last two Fastnachtspiele will also help to answer questions regarding his cessation of writing plays of this genre. Was he suffering from self-doubt or was he being pressured to stop writing satire? The answer can only be guessed but if his last experience of censorship was in 1557, why would the Council deem it necessary to search his property the day after his death in 1576 in a quest for seditious material?143

143 Hirschmann, ‘Quellen’, p. 54.
CHAPTER II

The Golden Period

In order to understand why Hans Sachs felt that Nuremberg was threatened by social, political, economic and religious changes and to understand the context that shaped him and his literary output, it is necessary to describe Nuremberg’s history as a successful city, its Golden Period, and the subsequent changes which occurred during the first half of the sixteenth century, including the Reformation. From this it will become apparent that Nuremberg’s adoption of Lutheranism had consequences for the city’s relationships with its neighbours, with other Protestant territories and within imperial structures. The first section of the chapter (the period before Sachs’s birth) is devoted to a description of the development of Nuremberg from a small settlement to a successful imperial city and of the benefits that this status accorded. An explanation follows of how its favourable position allowed an economy based on trade to develop and how the city’s craftwork shops developed this economy further through the manufacture of completed goods from imported commodities. This allows the reader to understand the extraordinary wealth created by the merchant and patrician classes and to see the potential conflicts which could occur when the government of the city was in the hands of those who created the wealth. This necessitates an explanation of the formation of Nuremberg’s patrician government, which in turn illustrates their control of all aspects of city life. This illustrates to what extent changes within the provision of social care and the Council’s increased control of Church prepared the city for the adoption of Protestantism in 1525.

Focusing, next, on the period after Hans Sachs’s birth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, a history of Nuremberg’s adoption of Lutheranism will be given. This will include the factors leading to the early acceptance of Luther’s ideas in Nuremberg, including the strong tradition of the book trade and printing, of Humanist thought and of the pre-existing bonds between faith and citizenship in the city, which would facilitate the
adoption of the new confession. This discussion will be followed by a consideration of the history of the adoption and consolidation of the Lutheran faith in Nuremberg and the subsequent tension between the religious and political aims of the city during the turbulent period as Charles V attempted to suppress the spread of Protestantism. The second part of the history will document the progression of Lutheranism until the enforcement of the Interim (1549), which was a consequence of Charles V’s triumph after the Schmalkaldic War (1546–47) and allowed him to re-impose elements of the Catholic faith in Protestant territories. At this point our focus turns to the Fastnachtspiele written by Sachs during the 1550s. Additional historical information about events in the 1550s will be necessary and will be provided either before the analysis of each individual play or during such analyses. This will enable an examination of the local causes of the disappointment felt by Sachs which stimulated him to write the satirical Fastnachtspiele analysed in this thesis.

The Development of Nuremberg before the Birth of Hans Sachs

Wenn man aus Unterfranken kommt, und von ferne die Stadt sieht, welche Großartigkeit, welche Schönheit bietet sich da schon dem Blick von außen!
Und im Innern dann, welche Sauberkeit der Straßen, welche Eleganz der Häuser! Was gibt es Herrlichere als die Kirche des hl. Sebaldus, was Prächtigeres als die Kirche des hl. Laurentius, was Stolzeres und Festeres als die Königsburg, was Bewundernswerteres als den Graben und die Stadtmauern?¹

This oft-quoted passage by Cardinal Enea Silvio de Piccolomini (1405–1464), taken from his De ritu, situ, moribus und condicione Teutoniae sive Germania (1457), is a good starting point for a discussion about Nuremberg before Hans Sachs’s birth in 1494. It

describes a city at its best and confirms that Nuremberg was enjoying a ‘Golden Period’ of mercantile and industrial success in the mid-fifteenth century. The city’s early history gives insight into how it achieved this fame.

The name Nuremberg appears in official documents between 1050 and 1180, in which the settlement is referred to as *castrum Noricum*, which indicates the presence of military fortifications. During the reign of Emperor Heinrich III (1017–1056), the *Zoll- und Münzrecht* was moved to Nuremberg from Fürth in 1050. Commercial enterprises received a boost in 1112 when Nuremberg became a *Reichszollstätte*, which allowed income to be raised from the payment of customs duties and, by turning it into a centre for distribution, marked the founding of its merchant trading history. The increase in business necessitated the imposition of a *Schultheiß* to enforce imperial laws and established Nuremberg as a financial centre for the Staufer kings. Furthermore, a *Burggraf* or feudal overlord was appointed in 1113, positive proof that Nuremberg held a position of importance within the territory of King Heinrich V (c.1086–1125). The city gained prestige as a military base for successive kings of the Staufer dynasty, especially Konrad III (r. 1138–1152) in his disputes with the rulers of Bavaria, the Welfs and threats from Saxony. In 1146 there are reports of the persecution of Jews, which marks the beginning of a tortuous relationship with Jewish communities in Nuremberg. The city expanded north of the Pegnitz, where the *Burg* is situated, which was referred to as a royal palace in 1183. Its importance to royalty continued: ‘In der Zeit der späten Salier und der Staufer kam also jeder König nach Nürnberg’. Due to its proximity to the *Reichswald* the city

---

became an attractive place for the court to relax and increasingly the Burg was used as a location for Hoftage and in 1186 for a Reichsversammlung.\(^9\)

When Friedrich II (1194–1250) made Nuremberg a Reichsstadt (1219)\(^{10}\) its importance within the territorial lands of Germany was confirmed. This status helped to shape its relationships with future leaders, as well as giving pride to its citizens. From this point the city began to develop autonomously from the Burggraf, moving towards becoming a self-governing city with a council, magistrates and mayor (1256), using its own seal and coat-of-arms and governing from civic buildings.\(^{11}\) Nuremberg’s advancement continued when Charles IV (1316–1378) issued Die Goldene Bulle (1356) from Nuremberg, which codified the election of the Holy Roman Emperor and established a form of imperial constitution. Significantly, Nuremberg was appointed the location for the first Reichstag after the coronation of each new Holy Roman Emperor, ensuring Nuremberg’s royal patronage as well as establishing the city as a centre for government and law-making. Furthermore, it ensured imperial protection, which was important as the city developed into an independent territory.\(^{12}\)

Nuremberg’s dominance as a trading centre grew accordingly, encouraged by Ludwig von Bayern (1282–1347) and Charles IV, who allowed merchants to negotiate Zollfreiheiten which increased the city’s appeal to foreign merchants and increased its strategic importance. At least twelve trade routes met in Nuremberg, which made the Zollfreiheiten imperative for attracting business to the city, while reduced custom tariffs, negotiated within the German territories and with other European cities, allowed trade to flow quickly and cheaply across Europe.

---

\(^{10}\) Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 37.
\(^{11}\) Schmid, ‘Nuorenberg’, pp. 18–19.
\(^{12}\) Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 81.
Fig. 5 Nuremberg from the Nuremberg Chronicle by Hartman Schedel 1493

Fig. 6 Nuremberg’s city walls and major buildings by William Smith 1594

Fig. 7 Heiltumsweisung 1487 printed by Peter Fischer
The first recorded trade with Venice occurred in 1328, which was important to Nuremberg, giving it access to the Eastern Mediterranean markets which brought goods overland from India and China. The construction of the Fondaco dei Tedeschi on the Grand Canal in Venice in 1228 provided warehousing and living quarters for German merchants, which illustrates that there was already sufficient trade during the thirteenth century to warrant the construction of a trading base. This trade brought tremendous wealth to the city and its patrician families, namely the Tucher, Kress, Imhoff and Pirckheimer. Unfortunately over-reliance on the Mediterranean trade would contribute to the city's economic decline when the emphasis moved from Mediterranean to the western ports of Europe for trade with the Americas.

The availability of raw materials provided by these imports encouraged Nuremberg to become a manufacturing centre. To fuel this economy Nuremberg used the River Pegnitz to power water mills and hammer mills and wood from the surrounding Reichswald was felled for the forges. The proximity to two major navigable rivers, the Main and the Danube, allowed the transport of materials by barge which could be transferred to Nuremberg overland by carts, thus enabling iron ore, copper, lead, gold and silver to be brought to the city and metal-based industries to develop, as well as supplying silver for the mint. The presence of water mills allowed Nuremberg to become a centre for printing when a paper mill, the first north of the Alps, was established by Ulman Stromer (1329–1407) in 1390.

---

14 The discrepancy between the dates of initial construction and the reported first trade is explained by the destruction of the original building in 1380. Other authors of the thirteenth century write about the presence of German merchants and possibly craftsmen confined to do their business in this building (Henry Simonsfeld, Der Fondaco dei Tedeschi in Venedig und die Deutsch-Venetianischen Handelsbeziehungen, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1887), II, pp. 8–9).
By the middle of the thirteenth century, the Pegnitz divided the city into the south, where merchants and craftsman carried out their trades, and the north, where the Burg and court residences were situated. The river was crossed by many bridges and the Sebalduskirche was under construction (finished 1275). There was a recognizable city wall, which was expanded during the fifteenth century to encircle the entire city and the defences were improved by the creation of a moat. These improvements were completed by 1452, something which Konrad Celtis (1459–1508) describes in detail in Die origine, situ, moribus et institutis Norimbergae (1502):

Nuremberg wears about herself a strong girdle of a three-fold wall and trench. The walls are built of masonry blocks dressed on both sides; the native sandstone used for the purpose is exceedingly soft and easy to break, but once it has been exposed to the air it turns as hard as though fired in a kiln. The moat is a good 100 feet wide, and nearly as deep. These immense walls, some eight thousand paces in circumference, were breached during Hans Sachs’s lifetime and their repair cost Nuremberg dear after the devastation caused by the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg (1552–1554).

Trust in Nuremberg was shown in 1424 by the arrival of the Reichskleinodien, the imperial relics and regalia used at the coronation of the Holy Roman Emperors, which, according to Dieter Weiß: ‘Die Reichskleinodien legitimieren die Rechtmäßigkeit der Herrschaft und verkörpern das Reich’. The choice of Nuremberg as a safe, secure location for the Reichskleinodien increased its importance within the Empire.

---

20 The Reichskleinodien are the imperial crown, sceptre, sword, orb and robes inherited from Charlemagne, the founder of the Holy Roman Empire, as well as precious jewels and relics from the early Christian Church, including a piece of Christ’s Cross and a thorn from the Crown of Thorns (Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 108).
As Nuremberg developed, a system of city government became imperative and this section is devoted to an explanation of the structures which enabled Nuremberg to develop into a successful merchant city before Sachs’s birth in 1494. Cardinal Piccolomini’s account describes Nuremberg’s clean streets, which could not have existed without a cleansing routine or efficient waste disposal. This enabled easy movement of people and vehicles, as well as preventing epidemics from occurring within the city walls. This example illustrates how Nuremberg became as successful as it did during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries through its effective governance, with leaders controlling the developing, economically successful trade and industry whilst providing social care for its citizens, a strategy which prevented internal threats to economic success. When Nuremberg attained the status of Freie Reichsstadt in 1219, it became necessary to appoint a council to ensure control and provide protection for its citizens. This became imperative when the Burggraf abused his privileged position as if he were a territorial prince and threatened the autonomy of the city. By 1300 a city council existed, the Großer Rat der Genannten (possibly as many as two hundred members), which wielded power. By 1500 the Council structures comprised the Genannte des Großen Rats (c. two hundred and fifty members), the Kleiner or Innerer Rat (forty-two members, of whom eight were Handwerkssherren and thirty-four from patrician families) and the seven Ältere Herren or the Innerer Geheimer Rat. The number of families considered suitable for inclusion in the Kleiner Rat was increased from twenty-two to forty-two by the Tanzstatut (1521) and many old Nuremberg family names dominate both lists of ‘chosen’ families. According to Walter Bauernfeind, to be a member of the Großer Rat a man had to be married but an

22 Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 43.
25 Examples include the Holzschuher from 1228, the Pfinzing from 1233, the Ebner from 1255 and the Stromer from 1258 (Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 79).
additional criterion was added in 1454, when it was decided that anyone with a Doktor title was ineligible.\textsuperscript{26} Academics were deemed untrustworthy as they wrote in Latin and were reputedly unable to write policy. The importance of a role in the city’s administration was recognized by payment for the more exacting ones: for example, the position of the Losunger, who was in charge of tax receipts, was a full-time paid role.\textsuperscript{27} Less powerful roles received a token salary and members of the different Räte were compensated for each session they attended. All meetings were officially recorded by an appointed Ratsschreiber, whose role enabled continuity but wielded no power and could be undertaken by someone with a university degree.

The Rat was an absolute, self-governing body and the inclusion of eight Handwerkscherren might lead to false assumptions as these men did not represent guild or union membership as guilds were banned after the Handwerkeraufstand of 1349 and their role was advisory. The absence of effective guild participation in Nuremberg will be discussed in the analysis of Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent (1557). This play illustrates both the consequences of the lack of representation of metalworkers as well as the absolute rule of the Rat. The role of the guilds was replaced by the office of the Rugamt, which was composed of five men who effectively controlled industrial and commercial relationships in the city. Four of the five members were also members of the main city Council and their role was to control the fabrication and distribution of products as well as solving internal trade disputes and punishing infringements of local commercial law.\textsuperscript{28} The fifth man was the Pfander, whose role was the control of craft workers’ activities as well the maintenance of standards regarding weight, price and quality of the produced items. Wages, numbers of apprentices in any one workshop, the number of workshops creating the same item and employment laws were all legislated for and closely

\textsuperscript{26} Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 287.
\textsuperscript{27} Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{28} Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 98.
controlled by the office of the Pfander.\textsuperscript{29} Hence, the Council controlled the quality and quantity of goods created, as well as maintaining a disciplined workforce on whom the Ratsmitglieder relied for their own incomes.

Taxes in Nuremberg were relatively simple: excise duty on beer, wine and spirits — or Ungeld\textsuperscript{30} — was collected by a Visierer, who was part of the Pfanderamt. The Losunger kept the books for the Council, reporting expenditure and receipts as well as advising on the value of the currency, but his main role was collector of the wealth tax or Losung. This tax had the potential to be manipulated, being based on an individual’s honest declaration of income.\textsuperscript{31} The Bauernsteuer was the corresponding tax collected from the rural population, which, when coupled with any feudal dues, could be onerous in times of poor harvest or war, as illustrated in Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent. Despite these attempts to control wealth and provide income for social support, it will become evident that different levels of society were profiteering during the difficult times in the 1550s, something satirized by Sachs in the aforementioned Fastnachtspiel.

\section*{Merchants, Banking and Jews}

Nuremberg’s merchants were not known for speculative dealings;\textsuperscript{32} in fact, their prudence and success contrast to the reputation of merchants from Augsburg, where bankruptcies occurred due to risky investments. There are notorious exceptions to this which Sachs makes use of in some of his plays during the 1550s, especially in Der unersetlich geitzhunger (1551). Nuremberg’s importance as a financial centre has been mentioned, which, coupled with the amount of merchant trade, increased the need for banking. This service was performed by the Jews from early in Nuremberg’s development and partially

\textsuperscript{29} Strauss, Nuremberg, pp. 98–105.
\textsuperscript{30} Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{31} Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 91.
explains their presence. Catholics were prevented from lending money with interest, which was believed to be usury and a sin according to the Bible: ‘Wenn du Geld leihst einem aus meinem Volk, der arm ist bei dir, sollst du ihn nicht zu Schaden bringen und keinen Wucher an ihm treiben’ (2 Moses 22:25). This view was re-affirmed by the Third Lateran Council in 1179. Jews were allowed to lend money to non-Jews and were tolerated in Catholic cities throughout Europe as long as they lived in defined areas and worked in restricted roles. The edicts of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) decreed that Jews should be identifiable, forcing men to wear a yellow ring on their clothes and women to attach a blue stripe to their veils. In the late thirteenth century there was unrest in Franconia, known as the Rindtfleisch Massacres (1298), which triggered riots and massacres of Jews in several locations, including Nuremberg. Despite the massacre a Jewish population had returned to Nuremberg by 1349, locating their community in a low-lying, unhealthy corner of what subsequently became the main Market Square. The Council wanted to expand the market place and with the support of Charles IV, who issued a planned expulsion, took matters into their own hands, resulting in the massacre of over six hundred Jews. Another Jewish population re-established itself in the city, but in 1498 it found itself under threat again. This was due to discontent resulting from their high interest on loans and the fact that they were no longer necessary as the patricians had been increasingly involved in finance since the fourteenth century. The Jewish population had grown to approximately

33 Lutheran Bible 1545 <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/Luther-Bibel-1545-LUTH1545/>. Subsequent biblical quotations will all be from this version.  
34 Jews were allowed to work as moneylenders, private tutors, but also in unskilled poorly paid jobs such as horse-dealing in the Christian community or work serving their own religious community. 
35 Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 120. 
36 This unrest was caused by a butcher in Röttingen who caused a riot by saying that the Jews had desecrated the Host. This unrest spread throughout Franconia. See Miri Rubin, ‘Imagining the Jew: The Late Medieval Eucharistic Discourse’, in In and out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany, ed. by R. Po-Chia Hsai and Hartmut Lehmann (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute & Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 177–208 (p. 189). 
37 During this massacre 628 Jews were killed (Karl Bosl, ‘Nürnberg im Interregnum und im ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert’, in Nürnberg, ed. by Pfeiffer, pp. 29–33 (p. 32)). 
38 Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 76. 
two hundred people, making it the third largest one in German towns and cities. The Rat, using the pretext of market expansion, demanded the departure of all Jewish families by 10 March 1499, but ensured no disorderly behaviour from Catholic residents. All evidence of the Jewish quarter was destroyed by the expansion of the market place. Hans Sachs confirms this: ‘Nun frew wir uns, daß disse statt | Keinen Jüden mehr in ihr hatt’. Sachs’s reference here was to the memory of Jewish moneylenders as a metaphor for avarice to highlight the behaviour of many of his fellow citizens rather than intended to denounce the Jewish religion.

In order to end exorbitant rates of interest on loans, Nuremberg merchants established a bank on the model of the Italian bank, the Monte della Pieta, which charged low interest rates and incurred lower losses if the debtor defaulted. This bank served the merchant and patrician classes, which forced workers either to borrow money from their workshop owner, or, if they were a farmer, from their feudal master, or to resort to out-of-town moneylenders. Repayment of the loan interest was achieved by working in lieu of payment, or payment with crops for some farmers, which was to the detriment of the worker, especially if crops failed or wages were suppressed. Hans Sachs believed this to be usurious behaviour and described such loans in Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent.

Care of the poor, sick, orphans and beggars in pre-Reformation times was the responsibility of religious establishments, convents and monasteries within the city, which, in turn, relied on crops from their feudal lands and donations of food for redistribution as

40 Endres, ‘Sozialstruktur’, p. 195.
41 When digging to build an air raid bunker in the Marktplatz during the Second World War, remains of this quarter were found. It is believed it stretched from the northern border of the Heilig-Geist-Spital through the Obstmarkt and as far as Tucherstrasse. There is also evidence of an earlier synagogue on the site of the Frauenkirche, probably destroyed after an earlier pogrom.
42 KG XXI, p. 33, ll. 13–14.
43 Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 198.
44 KG XXIII, pp. 136–43.
Merchant wealth, in the guise of endowments, was another source for Nuremberg’s welfare system: the Heilig-Geist-Spital (1339), endowed by Konrad Groß (1280–1356), who was a wealthy Nuremberg merchant and financier, cared for two hundred ill and destitute people. The wealthy merchant Marquard Mendel founded the Carthusian monastery in 1380 and his brother Konrad established alms houses which cared for elderly craftsmen unable to work, known as the Mendel’sche Zwölfbrüderstiftung, in 1388. The Pfleger of this institution recorded the character and death of its residents in a Totenbuch, which illustrates the care for the elderly and their importance as Handwerker for the city. The example of Catholic care for the poor is portrayed by Sachs in Der ketzermeister mit dem vil kessel-suppen (1553), which will be analysed later in this study and illustrates the system’s potential for abuse in pre-Reformation Nuremberg. To understand the Catholic imperative to care for the poor, the system of indulgences and donations as part of the Catholic cycle of sin and absolution needs to be explained. Sin could be atoned for by the performance of good works, which is based on Matthew 25: 34–46 and covers all aspects of alms-giving: feeding the poor, sheltering strangers, clothing the naked and caring for the sick. In this manner the poor became beneficial to the Catholic doctrine of sin and absolution, giving the rich a doctrinal imperative to give to the poor in an attempt to assure their own salvation. In contrast, hoarding wealth was interpreted as avarice, which encouraged the wealthy to donate their wealth, and discouraged the poor from saving, as this could be interpreted as avaricious. As a consequence, the destitute were encouraged not to work or improve their own situation but to live on alms, based on Matthew 5:3: ‘Selig sind, die da geistlich arm sind; denn das Himmelreich ist ihr’. This resulted in large numbers of itinerant beggars, which increased in times of war, epidemics or migration from the countryside due to the safety net offered by cities like Nuremberg. One such influx

---

45 The alms were not necessarily financial and were more likely to be in the form of food distribution.
46 To read more of the importance of the Mendel family see Anne Simon, The Cult of Saint Katherine in Late-Medieval Nuremberg; Saint and the City (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 205, fn. 7.
occurred when Nuremberg’s own coffers were depleted after an outbreak of the plague, causing the Rat to reassess alms-giving and to introduce one of the first Bettlerordnungen in Germany in 1388, which prevented idle beggars from receiving alms.\textsuperscript{48} As a result of the situation in Nuremberg, a Papal Bull was issued in 1388–89 which stipulated that income from the collection of indulgences in the parishes of St Sebald and St Lorenz could only be spent in those parishes.\textsuperscript{49} To round off this picture of care and provision for the poor, it is timely to mention that in the plague year of 1522, when the city was providing five hundred people with alms, costing 4,000 fl. per annum, the Council introduced an Almosenordnung which challenged the idea of poverty and denied the acceptability of begging. This order categorized the poor into resident poor, travelling poor, deserving and undeserving poor. With one stroke the Council effectively removed layers of population from the receipt of alms and the Rat rendered it a sin to be poor, which opposed the Catholic idea that the poor were a necessity for the absolution of the rich. This move facilitated the introduction of Luther’s ideas on care for the poor in 1525.

By the fourteenth century Nuremberg had gained more control over endowments paid to the religious houses within the city by creating the role of a Kirchenpfleger or Gotteshauspfleger for each institution, who decided how donated money was best spent.\textsuperscript{50} Indeed, in the late fifteenth century the Bishop of Bamberg complained about Nuremberg’s interference in Church matters, saying that it was unprepared to allow: ‘…. uns und unserem stift in geistlichen sachen nit mer unterworfen zu sein’.\textsuperscript{51} Nuremberg, in a bid to control the selection of clergy, bypassed the Bishop and in 1474 received from Pope Sixtus IV (1414–84) permission for the Council to suggest candidates for clerical vacancies in the

\textsuperscript{48} Strauss states that beggars also had to register with a Bettelmeister before being allowed to beg and had to wear an authorised badge (Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 199).
\textsuperscript{49} This control was handed over to the Council by Popes Urban VI, during the Schism, and Boniface IX after the Schism (see Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 155).
\textsuperscript{50} Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 156.
city’s parish churches. This was restricted to appointments which occurred in ‘papal months’, but in 1513 these rights were extended to year-round rights in return for compensating the Bishop of Bamberg with a payment of 1000 Gulden plus an annuity of 100 Gulden for further financial loss. The power of the Bishop of Bamberg had been undermined earlier in 1496 when the Pope raised the role of Pfarrer at the churches St Lorenz and St Sebald to that of a Propst and that of a Rektor for the Frauenkirche, appointments for theologians who had greater status in church matters. Although this occurred after Sachs’s birth, it facilitated the appointment of Lutheran clergy to both parish churches when it became expedient. Within the same Papal Bull came the agreement that the convents in the Nuremberg area should only take the daughters of Nuremberg residents. This was to prevent nuns with inherited family wealth from moving their money from outside Nuremberg’s jurisdiction, by preventing novices from joining religious houses situated outside the control of the See of Bamberg.

Further irritation for the Bishop of Bamberg occurred in 1475 when the Rat demanded the clergy and ecclesiastical houses pay tax in return for protection, the argument being that those in need of protection should contribute to the city coffers, which became law in 1483. Höss says of the situation by the late fifteenth century:

Tatsächlich erstrebte der Rat für Nürnberg die Befreiung vom geistlichen Gericht, die Beseitigung der Sonderrechte des Klerus, die Ämterbesetzung und Einfluß auf die kirchliche Organisation und auf das Abgabewesen, die Kontrolle der monastischen Gemeinschaften und der Stiftung.

By undertaking these changes, the Council, whose intention it was to ensure that wealth created in Nuremberg should be used by, or remain in, Nuremberg, effectively had control

52 Papal months were the odd months, i.e., January, March, May, etc., and the Episcopal months were those belonging to the Bishop of Bamberg and even months (Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 156).
53 Höss, ‘Das religiöse Leben’, p. 139.
56 Höss, ‘Das religiöse Leben’, p. 137.
of many of the religious institutions before the Reformation, something which facilitated the passage to Lutheranism. Although it appears that the Council acted out of greed for monastic monies, it is more probable that their intention was to prevent the Catholic Church, as an external body, from interfering in the city’s business, a process they commenced before the Reformation and which they had achieved by the Reformation.

This snapshot of the history of Nuremberg not only helps to portray the city during its ‘Golden Period’ and its preparedness for the Reformation but also gives insight into the mind-set of its residents and especially Hans Sachs. The wealth of the city, based on the historical merchant trade, the control structures of the Rat, the past treatment of the Jews and the previous dominance of the Catholic Church formed cultural memories as these were events or institutions which had their roots in the distant past and on which many local oral histories would have been based. To an even greater extent, cultural identities had been based on the rigid structures ruling the work of the Handwerker, the wealthy patricians in their role as members of the Rat, as well as where they lived within the town, which in turn depended on the trade followed. Above all, the residents’ pride in their city would have given them the cultural identity of a Nürnberger, all of which Hans Sachs employs to give his audiences a sense of realism and of belonging to a group, which enables them to compare their moral compass with the morals portrayed by the protagonists in the plays analysed.

**Nuremberg after 1494: Territorial Jurisdiction and Population**

The city needed manpower, fuel and nourishment to service the plethora of trades and industries that were developing in Nuremberg and during the fifteenth century events conspired to the advantage of the city. In 1442 Nuremberg’s territorial jurisdiction was composed of 424 villages and hamlets lying within a twenty-five mile radius of wooded
countryside around the city\textsuperscript{57} and by the turn of the century Nuremberg had become one of the largest civic territories in Germany, having expanded through the purchase of rights over forests and villages from the Margrave Friedrich of Brandenburg.\textsuperscript{58} These sales had been forced on the Brandenburg-Ansbach family, who initially had benefited from lands, forestry and hunting rights bought from the Burggraf of Nuremberg but subsequently had had to return to them to Nuremberg’s jurisdiction to service debts or reparations. Nuremberg similarly benefitted from another neighbour’s problems: the Wittelsbachs were weakened by war with Bavaria, losing territory to the east and south-east of Nuremberg as payment of war reparations.\textsuperscript{59} The Hohenzollern lands, known as the \textit{Neue Landschaft}, were under the total control of Nuremberg, but the Council shared jurisdiction with the Margraves of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach in the villages and countryside areas in the \textit{Alte Landschaft}.\textsuperscript{60} These latter acquisitions would lead to disputes, one of which became a partial cause of the \textit{Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg} (1552–54), which resulted in spiralling debt in Nuremberg.

The population of Nuremberg in 1500 is estimated to have been approximately 20,000 people, but accuracy cannot be guaranteed as births and deaths were not always recorded.\textsuperscript{61} This figure differs from Konrad Celtis’s estimation in 1502 of 52,000, which illustrates that the population had more than doubled since a census of 1431, when the Council estimated the available fighting population (men between eighteen and sixty years of age) to be 7,146 men. This figure has been used to calculate an overall population of roughly 22,000. Other estimations, calculated after the threat of aggression by Margrave Albrecht Achilles von Brandenburg (1414–1486) in 1449, suggest a population of 28,000

\textsuperscript{57} Strauss, \textit{Nuremberg}, p. 7 and p. 51.
\textsuperscript{59} At the division of lands after the \textit{Landshuter Erbfolgekrieg} (1504) Nuremberg gained significant lands including the villages of Hersbruck, Lauf and Altdorf (Kusch, \textit{Nürnberg}, pp. 145–47).
\textsuperscript{60} Broadhead, ‘Public Worship’, 280.
to 30,000, if one includes infants. These fluctuating numbers may be partially explained by outbreaks of plague, which occurred in 1462, 1474, 1494, 1505 and 1522. Another estimation conducted in 1526 after the Reformation, which included all the 736 territorial villages and the city in its calculations, determined the total population to be 44,000. Nuremberg in the sixteenth century counted as the second largest city in Germany.

**Trade at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century**

As Nuremberg lay on twelve trade routes, it was connected to all parts of Germany, as well as France, Spain, the Baltic States, Italy and the ports on the Mediterranean. The links with the Baltic States via the Hanseatic League allowed trade with Russia and the Scandinavian provinces, whilst the links to Venice promoted trade with the Eastern Mediterranean, the Silk Road to China and overland trade with Persia and India. To the west Nuremberg maintained close links with the ports in the Low Countries, which brought wool and cloth from London via Antwerp, whereas the trade route to Lyon and its markets supplied by the industries on the Rhone gave Nuremberg access to silks and precious metals. Trade with Sicily, Egypt and Cyprus brought cotton to the city, which provided cloth for its residents. The spice trade, which was extremely profitable, brought ginger, saffron and anise from the Orient. Furs from Russia and Scandinavia were exchanged for finished articles manufactured in Nuremberg made of metal, glass and clay. To this end merchant families set up trading houses in Krakow, Antwerp, Venice and Genoa as well as on the Portuguese and Spanish Atlantic coasts to access the new markets in the Americas. When Vasco da Gama discovered the sea route to the Far East (1497–99), the overland route to the Mediterranean became impractical and, despite efforts to break into the
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62 Sachs was born in a plague year (Strauss, *Nuremberg*, p. 193).
American markets after their discovery by Christopher Columbus (voyage 1492–1502), Nuremberg traders found themselves at a disadvantage due to lack of access to the Atlantic coastal ports. The resultant downturn in income contributed to the poverty in the merchant classes illustrated in Sachs’s play *Der unersetlich geitzhunger* (5 September 1551).\(^{66}\) In contrast, the excellence of a skilled workforce manufacturing top-quality products and the number of workshops attracted many innovators and designers of scientific instruments to Nuremberg: for example, the mathematician and priest Georg Hartman (1489–1564) designed brass astrolabes in 1525 in Nuremberg and Peter Henlein (1485–1542) produced one of the first pocket timepieces in 1510. Other areas of expertise based on metalwork included wire and armaments, for which Nuremberg had a reputation and on which it depended for profitable sales especially during times of war. It was an overproduction of armaments that caused a dispute in Nuremberg, which stimulated Sachs to write *Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent* (28 December 1557).\(^{67}\) In order to furnish the workshops with the raw materials many of the merchants invested in mines in Saxony, Bohemia and Hungary, supplying copper, tin, silver and lead to Nuremberg’s growing industries.\(^{68}\)

**Control, Citizenship and Religion**

The merchants on the Council governed the activities of the city with an iron fist, not only trade, industry and the lives of their citizens, but also the acquired Church income. Strauss quotes Sigismund Meisterlin’s (*c*.1435–1497) appraisal of the motivation of Nuremberg merchants:

‘Three motives’, he thought, ‘led burghers to engage in respectable commerce; first, the desire to provide their sons with experience by sending

\(^{66}\) KG XIV, pp. 154–69.  
\(^{67}\) KG XXIII, pp. 136–43.  
\(^{68}\) Strauss, *Nuremberg*, p. 124.
them into the world; second, to provide adequately for our city (for Nuremberg can raise little on her poor, infertile soil); third, to find steady occupation, for leisure is irksome to our young men’. 69

Control was the watchword of the Nuremberg Rat and this was facilitated by the intertwined nature of citizenship and religion which had developed during the medieval period. That civic obedience and faith were dependent on each other was based on the following thought process: man had faith in the Catholic Church, whose head was the Pope; however, God’s representative in the Holy Roman Empire was the Emperor, thus God was represented by priests as well as those representing the Emperor’s authority in cities, towns and villages. This helps to explain how civic obedience in Nuremberg was achieved by this interdependence, but not totally. The citizens of Nuremberg recognized that good governance had allowed the city to develop into a successful economic and strategic power, reinforcing their civic pride and influencing their behaviour. Despite the enormous emphasis on industry and the Council’s pragmatic decision-making, it might be assumed from the behaviour of the Council that the religious life of the city was swayed by economic factors and not piety. This apparent was not the case:

Johann Cochlaeus hat 1512 in seiner ‘Brevis Germaniae descriptio’ eine knappe Skizze des Frömmigkeitslebens in Nürnberg gegeben, das ein Bild überwiegender Kirchlichkeit bietet. Die Äusserungen der Religiosität waren hier wie anderwärts sehr vielseitig und sind in ihrer Stimmung und Übersteigerung oft kaum mehr zu fassen. 70

Religious piety spread across the different classes in Nuremberg. In 1452 a large crowd assembled to listen to Giovanni da Capestrano (1386–1456) preach for four hours, his words being translated by Nicolaus Eyffler, a Franciscan Monk. Capestrano preached

69 Strauss quotes Sigismund Meisterlin (died c. 1490) who was preacher at the Sebaldskirche in 1478 (Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 126).
about the role of a priest and the acceptance of the vows of poverty. In Nuremberg his subject was the evils of gambling, which resulted in gaming equipment, dice and board games being piled up and burnt in the Market Square.  

Stephan Fridolin (1430–1498), *Lector* and *Prediger* at Nuremberg’s *Klarissenkloster* (1489–98), gave several sermons based on his own text *Schatzbehalter oder Schrein der wahren Reichtümer des Heils und ewiger Seligkeit* (1491). These sermons were intended for lay people to help them interpret God’s Word or the Bible, sentiments echoed later by Martin Luther. At the opposite end of the social scale Dr Johann Pirckheimer (1440–1501), a patrician and father to Willibald and Caritas Pirckheimer, rejected the trappings of wealth in old age and became a *Barfüßermönch*, walking the city streets with no shoes. The religious piety of the wealthiest merchants is reflected by their financial contributions to buildings, altars and other church furnishings. Motivation for this type of sponsorship by the patricians and merchants was also perpetuation of the family name and to this end they have been successful as many of their endowments remain visible in Nuremberg’s churches. Their longevity is a reminder that no iconoclasm took place in Nuremberg during the Reformation, leaving Catholic cultural memories unharmed in what were to become Lutheran churches, which also indicates that the patrician pride was stronger than their religious identity.

**Factors Enabling or Encouraging the Reformation**

Five hundred years after the adoption of Lutheranism in Nuremberg, the question should be asked as to whether favourable conditions, other than the Council’s control of the religious institutions in its jurisdiction, facilitated the acceptance of Lutheranism. There is evidence now that there was a thirst for knowledge long before the Humanist movement
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began, proven by the number of works on diverse subjects produced in the first half of the fifteenth century in Nuremberg. The number of convents and monasteries within the city’s territories enabled the manuscript production of texts. Proof of this lies with the establishment of Nuremberg’s first city library being recorded in 1390.\textsuperscript{74} Gutenberg’s first printing press was set in motion in Mainz in 1455 and soon after Bamberg acquired a press, printing a version of the Gutenberg Bible in 1459–60, but a hiatus in printing in Bamberg in the 1460s allowed Nuremberg to become a centre of printing; the first book known to have been printed in the city dates from 1470.\textsuperscript{75} The educated merchant class in Nuremberg not only had the wealth needed to buy books but also experienced new ideas from their meetings with other traders on their travels to all parts of Europe. Furthermore, educating their sons at foreign universities, mostly Italian, introduced a diversity of ideas and literature to the wealthy elite.

The level of discussion about religious doctrine increased due to the frequent presence of Johann von Staupitz (c. 1460–1524) in Nuremberg. Staupitz was initially Preacher for the Augustinian Order and became their Vicar General in 1517. He had been Martin Luther’s predecessor as a lecturer in Bible Studies at Wittenberg University and subsequently Luther’s mentor and life-long friend. Staupitz was present in Wittenberg during the formative years of Luther’s developing thoughts on reform of the Catholic Church from 1512 to 1517 and in these years before the Reformation he often preached in Nuremberg. Staupitz’s most important Nuremberg sermons were on predestination and the inequities of indulgences in 1516,\textsuperscript{76} which may have piqued Sachs’s interest in the anti-Catholic rhetoric being suggested by these sermons. Staupitz counted amongst his friends in Nuremberg the influential Ratskonsulent Dr Christoph Scheurl (1481–1542), who had been Rektor at Wittenberg University and had returned to Nuremberg to work for the

\textsuperscript{74} Schnelbögl, ‘Buchdrucks’, p. 218.
\textsuperscript{75} Schnelbögl, ‘Buchdrucks’, pp. 218–19.
\textsuperscript{76} Höss, ‘Das religiöse Leben’, p. 145.
Council, as well as the Ratsschreiber Lazarus Spengler (1479–1534). Both Scheurl and Spengler, because of their positions within the governing authority in Nuremberg, were influential, Spengler more so, being always present at Council meetings: due to the frequent rotation of mayors, his position guaranteed continuity of information and thought. Staupitz built up a circle of like-minded, influential friends during his visits, including Hieronymus Ebner, Kaspar Nützel and the Tucher brothers, Andreas and Martin. Staupitz also counted Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530), an important member of the Patriziat and advisor to Emperor Maximilian I and Albrecht Dürer, as a friend. In 1517 Wenzeslaus Linck (1483–1547), the former Prior of the Augustinian Order in Wittenberg and a Wittenberg University professor who eventually became Prediger und Custos (1525) at the Heilig-Geist-Spital in Nuremberg, joined this expanding circle. These men of wealth and influence became known as the Sodalitas Staupitziana and were integral to the dissemination of the emerging ideas of Martin Luther to the patricians of Nuremberg. Sachs may have encountered patrician supporters of Luther during his activities as a Meistersinger or at least heard the latest news about Luther’s current ideas from these meetings. After Martin Luther’s visit to Nuremberg in October 1518 this group became known as the Sodalitas Martiniana.

Other Humanists also met in the city; these were part of the elite patrician society, influenced and informed not only by the Sodalitas Staupitziana but by contacts with Humanists throughout Europe. Willibald Pirckheimer counted amongst his friends Hartman Schedel (1440–1514), doctor and historian, who wrote the Weltchronik (1493) and the poet Konrad Celtis (1459–1508) the author of Norinberga (1495), as well as
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77 Two mayors were chosen from a possible 26 candidates. There was a twenty-eight day rotation so that their own businesses did not suffer (Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 61).
79 Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 160.
corresponding with Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466–1536). The views of these educated groups filtered down to interested parishioners and others via the city’s structures, for example the Singschule, where patricians would have rubbed shoulders with master craftsmen, eventually making the new ideas a discussion point in craft workshops and pubs and enabling the least educated to gain knowledge of the latest theological arguments. Moreover, texts and pamphlets dedicated to Luther’s thoughts were being printed and reprinted on the city’s printing presses, making it hardly surprising that Hans Sachs became so well-informed about Luther and the new faith.

**Martin Luther and the Reformation in Nuremberg**

Whilst Nuremberg’s educated classes were discussing new ideas from different cultures and rediscovering Latin and Greek philosophies and histories, Martin Luther (1483–1546) concentrated on reform of the Catholic Church. Martin Luther’s life and works will not play a part in this study unless they have direct consequences for Nuremberg or Hans Sachs’s works. When Luther posted the Ninety-Five Theses which marked his resistance to the sale of indulgences as a form of penitence for sin, he was an Augustinian monk with a Doctorate in Theology who lectured in Bible Studies at Wittenberg University. Luther had been moved to write his Theses in reaction to the actions of Johann Tetzel (1465–1519) in 1516, who had been asked to increase the sale of indulgences for the rebuilding of St Peter’s Basilica in Rome. Although the stated purpose was the proposed reconstruction, part of the indulgence money was to fund the repayments of a loan made to Cardinal Albrecht von Brandenburg (1490–1545) by the moneylending Fugger family of Augsburg.
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81 Hendrix states that the Theses were being printed in Nuremberg from late 1517 (Scott H. Hendrix, *Martin Luther: Visionary Reformer* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 62).

82 Engelhardt details incidents of indulgence collection and Nuremberg’s reaction to Church information as well as itemizing why the Catholic Church needed reform (Adolf Engelhardt, ‘Die Reformation in Nürnberg’, *MVGN*, 33 (1936), 4–258 (pp. 1–24)).

83 Hendrix, *Luther*, p. 58.
Recent evidence confirms that Martin Luther pinned his *Ninety-Five Theses* written in Latin to the doors of churches in Wittenberg on 31 October 1517. They are thought to have been posted as an invitation to debate the religious imperative of indulgences based on biblical texts. By the end of 1517 copies of the *Theses* had made their way to Nuremberg, where they were translated into German by Caspar Nützel (1471–1529), a member of the previously mentioned *Sodalitas Staupitziana*, and subsequently reprinted as handbills. Circulation of these handbills around Germany was rapid and the simplicity of the writing appealed to well educated Humanists, such as were to be found in Nuremberg. Luther’s arguments were based on the idea that contrition for sins could not be bought: he believed that if the sinner felt contrite, this was part of his punishment and he would be forgiven his sin. Luther also used the *Theses* to attack his brethren for allowing falsehoods to be spread amongst the people. Thesis 89 named the Pope, whose actions Luther could not defend: ‘Wenn der Papst mit dem Ablaß mehr das Heil der Seelen als das Geld sucht, warum hebt er früher gewährte Briefe und Ablässe auf, obwohl sie genau so wirksam sind?’ Luther’s inclusion of the Pope within the *Theses* forced Albrecht von Brandenburg to forward them to Pope Leo X (1475–1521) and attempts to restrain Luther’s activities began in 1518. Tetzel and Konrad Wimpina (1465–1531), a Professor at the University of Frankfurt an der Oder, wrote a refutation of the *Ninety-Five Theses* in January 1518, which was destroyed when it appeared in Wittenberg. This confirmed the strength of support for Luther’s desired reforms as well as the danger in which he had placed himself. Tetzel called Luther a heretic after his initial reading of the *Theses*, but this accusation remained after Pope Leo X had read them. Leo X was not interested in
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84 Hendrix, *Luther*, pp. 60–61.
85 Hendrix, *Luther*, p. 62.
86 *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883), I, p. 237, These 5 & 6. (Known as *LW* henceforth).
87 *LW* I, p. 243, These 89.
88 Hendrix, *Luther*, p. 64.
89 Hendrix, *Luther*, p. 66.
reforming the Church in any way that would disadvantage himself or the upper echelons of the Church, a stance which set the agenda for his pursuit of Luther. Luther’s only visit to Nuremberg took place in late September/early October 1518 en route to Augsburg to debate with Cardinal Cajetan (1469–1534), the Papal Legate, at the Reichstag. Wenzeslaus Linck provided support and joined Luther for the journey, which confirms the extent of the Staupitzian support for Luther’s desired reforms of the Catholic Church and for the emerging theological doctrine as well as demonstrating how fast news was disseminated in Nuremberg. A greater challenge to Luther was the Pope’s proposition that he should recant his writings on indulgences or stand trial for heresy in Rome. Elector Friedrich von Sachsen (1463–1525) was not willing to allow a German priest to stand trial in Rome, so agreed to a debate between Luther and the renowned German theological scholar Johann Eck (1486–1543). Former friends Eck and Luther had been introduced to each other by Christoph Scheurl, but they had fallen out after the publication of the Theses. This debate took place in Leipzig in June 1519 and lasted for two weeks. The outcome was to move the emphasis from indulgences to Luther’s accusations about the Pope’s authority.

In Nuremberg Lazarus Spengler (1479–1534) was moved to write the Schutzred und christliche Antwort eines ehrbaren Liebhabers göttlicher Warheit der Hl. Schrift (1519) in defence of Luther’s new teachings, emphasising the importance of the Word of God. Steven Ozment refers to this, saying: ‘As a layman’s reading of Luther’s message for laymen, it is a revealing commentary on lay perception of the Reformation at its inception’. Furthermore, Spengler’s work emphasised the simplicity and certainty of Luther’s message in comparison to the complex medieval teachings of the Catholic Church. In Rome, the Pope threatened to declare Luther a heretic unless he recanted within sixty
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days. When this did not occur, the Papal Bull *Exsurge Domine* was published on 15 June 1520. This document had direct consequences for two of Nuremberg’s leading Humanists, as will be discussed in the next section. The success of Luther’s *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*\(^95\) (1520) was so great that 4000 copies were sold in the first few days. Meanwhile, the Papal Bull had reached Germany and in Wittenberg it was burnt along with other papal decrees.\(^96\) In light of Luther’s popularity and the threat of insurrection, Charles V summoned Luther to the Diet of Worms in 1521, where his fate was to be determined.

**Cultural Resistance and Censorship**

In Nuremberg, as in other German cities, a printing frenzy in support of Luther had occurred, in part encouraged by Nuremberg’s Humanist patrician families. These publications could be construed as flouting the censorship laws which were upheld by the *Rat*, whose members belonged to the same patrician families.\(^97\) Censorship in early modern times was performed by different agencies: ‘Die Zensurgeschichte der deutschen Reichsstädte bestimmen drei Gewalten: die Kirche, der Kaiser und die Reichsstädte mit ihren Souveränitätsrechten selbst. Für das späte Mittelalter ist bezeichnend, daß der Kaiser dabei zuletzt in Erscheinung tritt’.\(^98\) The Bishop of Bamberg, from whom Nuremberg had been distancing itself for over half a century, would have been perceived as a lesser threat to Nuremberg than the displeasure of the Kaiser, from whom the city received protection. Historically, the arrival of the printing press had presented new problems as mass works which had not been reviewed by either the Church’s representatives or members of the *Rat* could be printed and dispersed quickly. In response Pope Sixtus IV (1414–1484) announced in 1479 that all printers, purchasers and sellers of books containing heresy could
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\(^95\) LW, VI, p. 381.

\(^96\) Hendrix, Luther, p. 98.

\(^97\) Sachs was to experience this censorship during his career as a writer, hence the importance of an understanding of censorship.

\(^98\) Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 69.
be sanctioned by the local priest or deacon. In 1486 this restriction was strengthened by Berthold von Henneberg, Archbishop and Elector of Mainz (1442–1504), who took over the responsibility for book censorship. His edict was quite specific: it decreed that the sale of all translations, especially of the Bible from Greek and Latin into German, could only be undertaken with his permission. This edict was expanded by Pope Alexander VI (1431–1503), who stated that no book could be printed without his permission on pain of excommunication. On 1 June 1501, he added penalties for printers of heretical books, mentioning, in particular, Cologne, Mainz, Trier and Magdeburg. This was then extended to all dioceses and is regarded in Germany as the beginning of book censorship.99

All this placed Nuremberg in a difficult position: as a producer of books and particularly books in translation including the Bible,100 Nuremberg was at odds with Church law. Printing was an important industry for Nuremberg, so it decided to forge ahead and pay little attention to Catholic censorship but in 1502 the Rat decided ‘[a]lle puchdrucker zu besenden und in sagen, das sie hinfüro kainerley gedicht oder derselben gleichen drucken Es sei dann vor dem ratsschreiber presentirt, examinirt, und von einem Rat zugelassen’.101 This is Nuremberg’s first incident of general censorship of written matter, which made it imperative to appoint a city censor, the first being the Abbot of St Egidien, who could call on specialists if his knowledge did not extend to a particular subject. Printing was a relatively new ‘trade’ and few laws governed its activities, but in 1513 printers were forced to swear to abide by Nuremberg’s regulations governing their trade, which effectively forced them to obey the censorship laws.102 The first ‘global’ censorship from the Kaiser came after the Edict of Worms (1521), which not only declared Luther a heretic but banned the printing, publishing and sale of his works as well as

99 Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 70.
100 By 1500 fifteen editions of Anton Koberger’s illustrated Bible (1483) had been printed (Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 71).
102 Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 73.
purchasing them, writing, or painting in support of him.\textsuperscript{103} Examples taken from the Ämterbüchlein at this time include:

1519: ‘Zu sagen, dass sie nichzit fremdes trucken noch reißen’;
1520: ‘Mit einer sträflichen Red, nichts frembds unbesichtig zu trucken’;
1521: ‘Fleißig untersagen, nichts Neues unbesichtigt zu trucken’;
1524: ‘Mit sonderlich warnung, nichzit unbesichtigt zu trucken’;
1525: ‘Sie allesamt mit setzern lassen pflichten und ernstlich Warnung’;
1526: ‘Sollen mitsamt den Setzern pflichten und ernstlich gewarnt werden. Es soll auch keyner kein setzer annehmen, er hab den das pflicht auch thun’.\textsuperscript{104}

Despite these warnings books and pamphlets written by Luther appeared in Nuremberg, some without the name or place of the printer, some with slightly disguised titles. When someone was caught flouting the laws, the punishment did not exactly fit the crime: only a strong telling-off was given to Fritz Peypus for printing \textit{Ein Teuscht Tracktetlein doktor Martin Luthers vom ablaß} (23 August 1518).\textsuperscript{105} This laxity in pursuing miscreants was noticed by Johann Eck, who warned the city printers in 1520 not to disobey the \textit{Exsurge Domine} or print Lutheran works. The \textit{Rat} found themselves at odds with external censors, including King Ferdinand I and the Bishop of Trient (1521), who condemned Nuremberg for the laxity of its supervision of the print trade as books about and by Luther appeared for sale in the city.\textsuperscript{106} The recognition of Nuremberg’s lack of control over its book trade by external authorities may have resulted in the harsher censorship, which Sachs was to experience in 1527.

Other forms of anti-Catholic cultural resistance appeared in Nuremberg: for example, Lazarus Spengler ridiculed corrupt practices of the Catholic Church in

\textsuperscript{103} Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 75.
\textsuperscript{104} Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 78.
\textsuperscript{105} Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 78.
\textsuperscript{106} Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 79.
pamphlets\textsuperscript{107} and Hans Greiffenberger attacked private confessions and wrote seven tracts on the wrongs of the Catholic Church (1524).\textsuperscript{108} The Beham brothers and Georg Pencz produced illustrated anti-clerical tracts long before their expulsion from the city in 1526.\textsuperscript{109} There is also evidence of anti-clerical song sheets and anonymous slander sheets concerning the Church.\textsuperscript{110} An example is an anonymous satire portraying Johann Eck, which was linked to Lazarus Spengler and/or Willibald Pirckheimer and brought these two representatives of Nuremberg into dispute with the Catholic Church, so much so that they were named in the \textit{Exsurge Domine} (1520).\textsuperscript{111} Despite pleas from the Bishop of Bamberg, the Duke of Bavaria and the Nuremberg Council the excommunication was never reversed, which meant that when Spengler represented Nuremberg at the Diet of Worms (1521) he was in as much danger as Luther.\textsuperscript{112} Gerhard Pfeiffer maintains:

\begin{quote}
Von da beginnt die Doppelpoligkeit der Nürnberger Politik: Gerhorsam gegenüber dem Wort Gottes, dessen Offenbarung in Christus durch Luther ein neues Licht erhielt, aber Gehorsam gegenüber dem Kaiser als dem weltlichen Herrn der Reichsstadt, den der Rat 1519 in Spanien durch Christoph Scheurl als humanistischen gebildeten Orator in eindrucksvoller Rede begrüssen ließ.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Arnd Müller’s article cites more examples of heretical writings, which indicate that the \textit{Rat} was unafraid of printing books about the new doctrine or of allowing its educated citizens opportunities to inform themselves about Luther’s works. Pfeiffer’s words betray the hesitancy which pervaded Nuremberg’s decision-making from this point onwards. Due to
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Nuremberg’s connections with the new doctrinal thinking and its printing presses, Hans Sachs had access to all the necessary works to convince himself of the validity of the new faith and added to the debate by writing *Die wittenbergisch nachtigall* (1523).

**The Appointment of Pro-Lutheran Priests**

Nuremberg was influenced by the presence of pro-Lutheran priests in the city. Wenzeslaus Linck (1483–1547) was initially Preacher at the Augustinian Priory in Nuremberg, where he preached sermons on the Beatitudes before his appointment to the Heilig-Geist-Spital in 1525. In 1520, after the death of the Rector of the Lorenzkirche, the *Rat* appointed Hector Pömer, a member of a local patrician family, to the post. He, in turn, appointed Andreas Osiander (1498–1552) as Preacher, who would become a fervent Lutheran supporter but would end by being a thorn in the side of Nuremberg Council until his death. His story, his connections to Hans Sachs and his devotion to Protestantism will be discussed in the analysis of the plays. In the same year as Osiander’s appointment, Martin Luther recommended Dominicus Schleupner (c.1483–1547) as Rector at the Sebalduskirche and Willibald Pirckheimer proposed another Nuremberger, Thomas Venatorius (c.1488–1551), for a preaching position at the Heilig-Geist-Spital. Nuremberg, in this manner, ensured that its priesthood followed the faith chosen by the *Rat*, which may be interpreted as an extension of the Council’s policy to control the Church within its territories but suggests foresight in light of what was to occur in the city in 1525. Knowledge of Luther’s theology, the discussions amongst the leading patrician families in Nuremberg and then the appointment of a pro-Lutheran clergy suggest that the attitude of the *Rat* was strongly positive in favour of Luther. Although there were dissenters to Lutheranism, even within the patrician families, for example: Willibald Pirckheimer, the Humanist and patrician,
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who despite believing in Luther’s early theological arguments about the reformation of the Catholic Church, did not convert to Lutheranism due to certain aspects of the new doctrine.

**Nuremberg Reichstag**

The excommunication of Luther at the Diet of Worms in 1521 coincided with the installation of the *Reichskammergericht* and *Reichsregiment* in Nuremberg and served as a reminder to the Council that they had to be judicious in their actions. By the next Nuremberg *Reichstag* (November 1522), the actions of the *Rat* were clearly in defiance of the Catholic Church and the Emperor, who both demanded the suppression and destruction of Luther’s writings and the arrest of preachers speaking against the Catholic Church.115 The Council’s cleverly worded reply avoided submitting to these demands, by, on the one hand, explaining to the *Reichskammergericht* that they feared popular unrest if these demands were instigated and, on the other, by instructing their Ambassador to Charles V to say that they were not giving way to mob rule.116 The inaction of the *Rat* included a lack of censorship of other materials and allowing anti-Catholic illustrated pamphlets to be read by the populace, the images in which would have been understandable to the illiterate. The attractions of Luther’s message for the Nuremberg *Rat* were the simplicity of its message for the common man; and Luther’s belief that all men were born evil and that only by accepting the Fall of man and God’s authority in His words from the Bible could man hope for salvation, whereas salvation in the Catholic Church depended on the authority invested in the Pope or a priest. Another attraction of Lutheranism for Nuremberg was that the old interdependence of faith and obedience to the Catholic Church would be disturbed by Luther’s emphasis on obedience to God’s Word, which enhanced the Council’s endeavours

115 The Papal Annuncio Francesco Chieregati complained these were being sold openly in Nuremberg’s streets (Gerald Strauss, ‘Protestant Dogma and City Government: The Case of Nuremberg’, *Past and Present*, 36 (1967), 38–58 (p. 41)).
to free itself from the constraints of the Catholic Church. Conversely, Catholic leaders saw
the Lutheran doctrine as a threat to the titular head of the Catholic Church and his
representatives, the Pope, the local priest or even Charles V in his role as the Holy Roman
Emperor.\textsuperscript{117} From a pragmatic stance, the Lutheran faith was appealing to Nuremberg as
it supported the Council’s efforts to free itself from the obligations to and the financial
demands of the Bishop of Bamberg.

A new source of resistance appeared in 1523 when the Augustinian Prior Wolfgang
Volprecht celebrated Evening Mass (1523) using both the Roman and the Lutheran
services. This resulted in disagreements between fellow monks about their role and the
doctrine of the new faith, causing some monks to leave religious seclusion.\textsuperscript{118} By 1524 and
before the next session of the Nuremberg \textit{Reichstag}, new church services prepared by
Osiander and other theologians were introduced in the city’s parish churches. The Bishop
of Bamberg threatened the renegade monks with excommunication,\textsuperscript{119} whilst the \textit{Rat},
despite disagreeing with the new services, refused to take action against them lest it resulted
in public rebellion.\textsuperscript{120} According to Eugen Kusch: ‘Der Rat suchte seine lutherfreundliche
Gesinnung kaum mehr zu verbergen und schon nach kurzer Zeit, vor Ostern 1524, wurde
in Nürnberg die Messe deutsch gelesen und das Abendmahl unter beiderlei Gestalt gereicht,
weil Tausende von Menschen sehnllichst danach verlangten’.\textsuperscript{121} This acceptance of
Lutheranism by Nuremberg Council facilitated Sachs’s attempts to form a new religious
cultural identity for the city.

Nuremberg’s Easter celebrations caught the eye of the Papal legate, Lorenzo
Campeggio, who came to Nuremberg to attend the \textit{Reichstag} in 1524. He observed, in a
letter to the Pope, that he had seen people practising both confessions and eating meat when
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they should be fasting.\textsuperscript{122} No decision concerning Lutheranism resulted from this Reichstag and discussions were postponed until the Speyer Reichstag later that year. The Reichsabschied (18 April 1524) made it clear that the Edict of Worms, banning Luther and his works, should be enforced.\textsuperscript{123} This Reichsabschied also moved the Reichsregiment and the Reichskammergericht to Eßlingen, which facilitated the adoption of Lutheranism in Nuremberg with no imperial scrutiny.

Whilst Nuremberg was on the brink of Reformation, a threat to its own peace occurred when the Bauernkrieg arrived at Forchheim, a small town north of Nuremberg, in 1524.\textsuperscript{124} This resistance movement was initially convened to counter the demands of feudal landlords, who, by increasing rents, tithes and other taxation for their feudal tenants, caused severe poverty in farming communities. These socio-economic complaints attracted the attention of religious reformers because the power of landlords lay in their reliance on Roman law promulgated by the Catholic Church. The principal theologian leading the peasants was Thomas Müntzer (1489–1525), a former follower of Luther, who believed in more radical change than that sought by Luther. The Peasants’ War was concentrated mainly in the southern German states, Austria and Switzerland and the immediate threat to Franconia was quelled by the Bishop of Bamberg in May 1524.\textsuperscript{125} Farmers and peasants in Nuremberg’s territorial lands suffered similar socio-economic hardships,\textsuperscript{126} resulting in the refusal by some tenants to pay their tithes, primarily to the ecclesiastical overlords, or disputing with their feudal masters over forestry, fishing and hunting privileges.\textsuperscript{127} Lower-class workers from the city supported the peasant farmers and joined with them in March
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1525 to demonstrate. Resistance by the authorities to the Bauernkrieg was confusing for the populace, as Nuremberg had adopted Lutheranism on 17 March 1525 and denounced all aspects of Catholicism, including the rights of the monastic orders. Furthermore, Nuremberg’s initial local response to the revolt added to the confusion when they imposed increases in tax on field produce, except for grain. Contradictorily, the Council had allowed pro-rebellion works to be printed in 1525, for example An die Versammlung gemeiner Bauernschaft, written by the Humanist Christoph Schappeler (1472–1551), whilst providing the rebel side with munitions and armour, which prompted Luther to speak out against the city for encouraging rebellion. The Rat, fearful that Handwerker support for the peasant farmers could lead to public disorder, dispatched spies to observe meetings between workers and peasant farmers, specifically to a meeting at the Gaststätte Fasan in the Jakobsviertel, home to lower-status artisans and the poor. This resulted in the arrest of the agitators, an act which caused crowds to assemble who began to complain about city taxes. Fearful of further unrest the Council issued an ordinance for the maintenance of public peace but, in recognition of the farmers’ plight, compromised by reducing taxes and market dues. The innkeeper and an apprentice were executed, whilst another was exiled, which illustrates the iron fist of the Rat despite the concessions they made to prevent civil unrest. According to Pfeiffer, the reductions in taxes for the farmers were instigated on 2 June 1525, which does show some alacrity, especially when the city was in the midst of enacting changes for the Reformation.
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During the *Bauernkrieg* unwelcome guests had sought refuge in the city: Heinrich Pfeiffer (d. May 1525), a former Cistercian monk and supporter of Müntzer was asked to leave Nuremberg after attempting to print rebel tracts there in October 1524. Thomas Müntzer secretly arrived in the city to print some pro-War literature but its discovery and confiscation in November 1524 resulted in his exile. Both events underline the Council’s determination to prevent disturbances occurring whilst the last in a series of *Reichstage* was taking place in the city. According to Vogler, ‘[b]y expelling “the foreigners” from the imperial city and by forbidding the spread of their ideas and writings, the Council succeeded in keeping away radical influences but did not manage to suppress them completely’.\(^{136}\) Meanwhile the *Rat* encouraged Osiander to prepare a translation of the Baptism service using Lutheran theology and allowed the city priests to use the vernacular Mass.\(^{137}\) However, it was within the monastic community that the final blow against the Catholic Church was struck, one which concluded in the adoption of Lutheranism.

In December 1524 the Prior of the Carthusian Monastery in Nuremberg, Blasius Stöckl, a supporter of reforming the Catholic Church, was accused of heresy by his fellow monks, who attempted to replace him. The *Rat*, as protector of the religious community, called for a debate and asked both Lutheran and Catholic representatives to attend, having prepared the essential articles of their faiths in order to present arguments in German about their beliefs.\(^{138}\) The *Rat* encouraged public attendance at these discussions by banning the use of Latin during the debates. The *Religionsgespräch* took place between 3 and 14 March 1525 before four overseers.\(^{139}\) The Lutheran speakers were priests from the main parish churches and the Heilig-Geist-Spital; the Catholics were represented by monks from Catholic religious houses.\(^{140}\) The Lutheran speakers, having spent the previous seven years
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discussing their new theology, were able to explain their articles of faith with ease. The Catholics relied on the formulaic platitudes with which they had suppressed their parishioners, betraying their reluctance to allow the ordinary man access to the Gospels by deeming it their role to inform the congregation of God’s Word. Their complacency and the fear of losing their role as God’s mediators allowed Osiander to close with a pro-Lutheran speech, knowing that the Lutherans had won the day.

The Council moved quickly and decisively to vote to adopt Lutheranism, which it did by a large majority, enabling the appointment of Lutheran priests to all churches and their own choice of confessional priests for the local religious houses. The pro-Catholic religious houses were banned from hearing confession or using the Roman Mass, which allowed Osiander’s Mass, written for the Sebalduskirche, to become the standard service across the city. To suppress religious dissent, Catholics were not to be employed as apprentices or journeymen; traditional Catholic celebrations were scrutinized causing some to be banned, including Easter Passion Plays and the Corpus Christi celebrations. According to Alison Stewart the scrutiny of Catholic festivals had commenced in 1523, which implies that the Rat were already considering these celebrations from a Lutheran standpoint. However, this could have had more to do with improper behaviour than religious propriety: ‘In 1523 and 1524, for example, the elaborate ceremonies of Lent were simplified because of “improper carryings-on which were prevalent” and “more conducive to vexation and frivolity than to piety,” to use the words of the city government’. It is surprising that Fastnachtspiele, which were tied to the Catholic calendar, survived, whereas the secular Schembartlauf was banned for almost fifteen years.
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Dissolution of the monasteries was an integral part of the Reformation and the Augustinian community led the way by offering their lands, buildings and rent payments to the city Council on 22 March 1525.\textsuperscript{145} In return they asked the Council to ensure the care of the remaining brothers until their deaths. Other religious houses quickly followed their lead, with the exception of the \textit{Katharinenkloster} and the \textit{Klarissenkloster}, whose Mother Superior, Caritas Pirckheimer (1467–1532), a great intellect and member of one of Nuremberg’s elite families, refused to give up Catholicism. Melanchthon interceded on behalf of the Poor Clares after unpleasant scenes in the city, with the result that the remaining nuns (those who refused to abandon their faith and their institution) were allowed to follow their faith and remain in the buildings until the last nun died in 1590.\textsuperscript{146} Those leaving religious houses had to become citizens of Nuremberg, with the implication that those who remained should conform to the city’s laws and tax requirements. Monks with concubines were forced to legalize their relationships.\textsuperscript{147} Monies held by the convents and monasteries were transferred into the \textit{Almosenkasten}, which had been set up in pre-Reformation times, allowing the \textit{Almosenamt} to expand its remit and use the funds to good purpose.\textsuperscript{148} In this way Nuremberg suppressed the obstacles which prevented the city from taking control of all religious institutions, their inhabitants, and their incomes:

\begin{quote}
Unter all diesen Gesichtspunkten kann man daher ohne Übertreibung sagen, daß die Durchführung der Reformation nur die Krönung einer schon lange bestehenden Selbständigkeit bedeutete — mit den Ergebnissen völliger Kanzelfreiheit, Einziehung allen geistlichen Gutes bei Übernahme der laufenden Verpflichtungen, wie der Gehälter und Leibrenten, und einer Neugestaltung des Schul- und Fürsorgewesens.\textsuperscript{149}
\end{quote}
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By the end of March 1525 all churches under Nuremberg’s jurisdiction were ordered to introduce the same religious changes as within the city itself.\textsuperscript{150} Thus the Council completed the Reformation in the city and its territories quickly and efficiently, using the law to gain control of all Catholic institutions. Strauss argues that the adoption of the Reformation in Nuremberg was not an extension of the Council’s pre-Reformation attempts at controlling the Church within their jurisdiction, but took place because the characteristics of Lutheranism suited their paternalistic control of the residents, but Ozment says of Strauss’s conclusions:

> What he does believe to have been finally decisive in bringing about that result was the close correspondence between what city officials knew from their own experience about the nature of the political man and what Lutheran preachers were stressing in their theological doctrine of man, namely, that men were fallen, obstinate and absolutely selfish creatures.\textsuperscript{151}

Furthermore, the Lutheran idea that sinners could gain salvation through faith alone was attractive to the \textit{Rat} as it implied certainty, whereas the Catholic ideology of confession and penance caused endless anxiety.\textsuperscript{152} Obviously, that there would be no interference from an external body in matters of faith was also an attractive idea and something which the \textit{Rat} adopted, as will be seen from the outline of their administration of the Lutheran churches in the next section.

**Nuremberg Post-Reformation**

The \textit{Rat} had moved with alacrity once the decision had been taken, which suggests their dedication to Luther’s new doctrine and the seriousness of their intentions. This was a momentous decision: to abandon a faith which had been followed by the majority of Europe
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since the tenth century and within the Germany territories for much longer. By abandoning the Catholicism, they were not only denying the authority of the Pope, but also that of the Holy Roman Emperor, their own secular leader and Head of the Church in the German territories. They were also setting themselves against the supremacy of the Bishop of Bamberg, their immediate religious leader, who had great influence amongst other secular Catholic leaders in Bavaria.

The positivity of the Council’s actions would also have impressed the newly converted, including Hans Sachs and Andreas Osiander. Osiander was a fervent supporter of Luther but his overzealous nature made him enemies from the beginning. Osiander and a leading Nuremberg Ratsherr, Hieronymus Paumgartner (1479–1565), disagreed during a damaging argument about monastic endowments to religious houses originating from before Nuremberg’s Reformation, which relatives or donors wanted returned. Osiander believed they should be returned only: ‘[…] wenn der Stifter das Stiftungsvermögen “frey, gantz und gar” zum Gottesdienst gestiftet’.

Gunter Zimmermann suggests that Paumgartner was, from a confessional point of view, opposed to the Lutheran doctrine but accepted the decision made by his fellow Council members in 1525. This thesis will illustrate that Paumgartner plays an increasing role as advocate of Protestantism in Nuremberg. Paumgartner disagreed with Osiander’s suggestions and sided with Melanchthon’s judgement: ‘Er [Melanchthon] befand prinzipiell, daß das Stiftungsvermögen nicht zu behalten, sondern zurückzuerstatten sei, falls der Stifter noch am Leben sei’. According to Zimmermann, Paumgartner saw faults in both views and by choosing Melanchthon’s opinion, he upset Nuremberg’s clergy and chose the least

advantageous opinion for monetary gain. Paumgartner clashed with Osiander again when the priest Dominicus Schleupner refused to say Mass completely in German. Schleupner and Osiander were both asked by the Rat to produce arguments for re-writing the new Mass. Schleupner was keen to retain the Latin and the use of the chasuble and argued for the use of Latin in Church music. Melanchthon, in an effort to maintain the status quo, agreed with Schleupner and it appears that some elements of the choral service remained in Latin. These early disagreements between Paumgartner and Osiander are important as they form the backdrop to Osiander’s fate in 1548 and help to understand the relationship between Paumgartner and Hans Sachs, not only due to Paumgartner’s role as censor during the 1550s but also as a figure of fun in several of Hans Sachs’s works.

The next step was to develop a firm doctrinal basis on which all the churches and schools in Nuremberg’s territorial jurisdiction could depend. The Rat predicted the reaction of the Bishop of Bamberg, who demanded repossession of the monasteries and their wealth within his see, plus the re-introduction of the Catholic Mass. Due to the growing list of Catholic enemies, Nuremberg needed to create a defensive front and unexpected support came from their arch-enemy and neighbour, the Brandenburg-Ansbach family. Margrave Georg of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach, known as Georg der Fromme (1484–1543), was an ardent Lutheran and the regent-uncle of the then heir of Kulmbach, Albrecht Alcibiades (1522–1557). Nuremberg joined forces with the Margrave to examine all the churches and clergy in their respective territories to ensure the continuity and consistency of the Lutheran doctrine. The visitations commenced in 1529 and included
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the territorial areas,\textsuperscript{160} culminating in the production of a joint \textit{Brandenburg-Nürnberg Kirchenordnung} of 1533, which established the administration of the churches, introduced uniform services, produced rules for the employment and regulation of clerics and ensured that everyone taught the same theology.\textsuperscript{161} Andreas Osiander and Dominicus Schleupner were instructed to write model sermons based on Luther’s Shorter Catechism to help the Lutheran priests write appropriately for Sunday worship.\textsuperscript{162} It is worth noting here that as an outcome of the \textit{Kirchenordnung} of 1533, Nuremberg had retained its right to govern the Church within its own territory rather than referring to a higher Protestant authority, except for theological and doctrinal advice from Luther and later Melanchthon.

At imperial level Nuremberg had represented other southern German reformed towns at the \textit{Reichstag} in Speyer in 1526, hoping to impress upon the \textit{Kaiser} the finality of their decision.\textsuperscript{163} This \textit{Reichstag} was deemed unimportant by Catholic leaders as it had been convened by the imperial cities and due to the poor attendance of Catholic representatives the ambiguous edict from the \textit{Nürnberg Reichstag} (1524) was left in place. A second \textit{Reichstag} at Speyer took place in June 1529 to bring more clarity to the situation. Before reconvening this \textit{Reichstag}, Charles V announced that the wording of the \textit{Reichsabschied} of 1524 had been wilfully misinterpreted by some factions. The \textit{Reichsabschied} had insisted that the terms of the Edict of Worms be enacted ‘sovil ihnen möglicher’ and ‘soweit es möglich ware verstanden’.\textsuperscript{164} The second Speyer \textit{Reichstag} was attended by many prominent Lutheran nobles, notably, Johann von Sachsen (1468–1532), Philipp von Hessen (1504–1567), Georg von Brandenburg-Ansbach and Ernst von Braunschweig-Lüneburg (1497–1546), and at least fourteen reformed imperial cities. For
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this meeting Melanchthon prepared a *Protestation* document in which they denied the authority of a secular body (i.e., Ferdinand as King) over religious matters.\(^{165}\) This document was signed by most attendees but, despite its recommendation by Lazurus Spengler, the Nuremberg Council refused to sign,\(^{166}\) which subsequently caused a loss of respect and leadership role for Nuremberg in Protestant realms.

In 1530 Charles V called for another *Reichstag* to be convened at Augsburg at which he hoped to settle the religious problems now that he was no longer fighting in France and the threat of a Turkish invasion of Bohemia and Hungary had subsided.\(^{167}\) Nuremberg attended, prepared to defend its position, but Charles V, having listened to the arguments from Melanchthon and others, ruled against the Protestants and reaffirmed the Edict of Worms, demanding the return of all Church property as well as the reinstatement of Catholic services. Philipp von Hessen became the Protestant spokesman and urged Protestants to resort to military resistance. At this suggestion Nuremberg distanced itself from the other Protestant delegates and left Augsburg,\(^{168}\) basing their decision on the fear of upsetting relations with the Emperor. At the same *Reichstag* Charles V announced the accession of Ferdinand I as King of the Germans, an unpopular decision as this increased the power of the Hapsburg family. This decision and the reaffirmation of the Edict of Worms encouraged the Lutheran territories to form a union in opposition to the Emperor and Ferdinand I. Lutheran territorial leaders were called to a meeting at Schmalkalden, where the *Schmalkaldischer Bund* came into being in 1531. Nuremberg and Brandenburg-Ansbach decided not to join this league as they perceived the possibility of military resistance. This decision damaged their relationship with the signatories: ‘Landgraf Philipp (Hessen) beurteilte Nürnbergs Haltung dahin, es wolle aus den Erfolgen der
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Nuremberg’s representatives made it clear that although it had chosen the Protestant faith, politically it would not defend its choice against the Emperor. Meanwhile the Kaiser was embroiled in foreign policy because the Turkish threat had been renewed and, being mindful that he need German funds to pursue his policies, he opted to maintain peaceful relations in Germany\(^{170}\) by setting aside the Edict of Worms in the *Nürnberger Anstand* or *Nürnberger Religionsfrieden*, which effectively guaranteed religious freedom.\(^{171}\) Importantly, Nuremberg fell out with the Brandenburg-Kulmbach family at this time, which had consequences for the city in years to come which are reflected in Sachs’s *Fastnachtspiele* of the 1550s. Needing new allies, Nuremberg signed a treaty with the imperial cities of Augsburg and Ulm in 1533 but on the basis that they would not wage war against the Emperor or King.\(^{172}\) The condemnation by Philipp von Hesse damaged Nuremberg’s reputation and although this decision can be interpreted as a pragmatic business decision by the Rat, Nuremberg’s lack of commitment to Lutheran ideology must have been a source of disillusionment for fervent supporters of Luther within Nuremberg. Nuremberg’s attempts to appease the Emperor culminated in an invitation to stay in the city en route to the Regensburg *Reichstag* in 1541, which had been convened to discuss German religious division. This visit highlighted Nuremberg’s religious choice rather than its loyalty to the Emperor. Charles V asked to have Mass celebrated in the Sebalduskirche, a request that was refused as that service had been outlawed in 1525, so Charles V was forced to hear Mass secluded in the *Burgkapelle* rather than in splendour in the centre of Nuremberg.\(^{173}\)

\(^{169}\) Pfeiffer, ‘Sicherung’, p. 162.

\(^{170}\) Pfeiffer, ‘Sicherung’, p. 162.


The ‘iron-fisted control’ of the city meant that the Rat, whose members were heavily invested in the merchant trade and manufacturing economies, determined not only the internal workings of the local Church, but also every aspect of relations with the world outside Nuremberg’s walls, allowing their judgements to be swayed by commercial concerns instead of religious imperatives. This is one of Hans Sachs’s themes in several of the Fastnachtspiele analysed later in this study. He saw that the Council placed economic expediency before faith, thus threatening Lutheranism within the city.

The following Reichstag at Speyer (1544) became significant for Nuremberg, its objective being the demand for finance for the wars against the Turks and the French. On leaving Speyer, Nuremberg’s representative, Hieronymus Paumgartner, now a senior member of the Council and a gifted negotiator, was kidnapped by Albrecht von Rosenberg and held hostage for over a year as revenge for actions taken by the Swabian League in 1520, when Nuremberg had been a member, which had resulted in damages to Albrecht’s inherited property. Since Albrecht had inherited the title he had pursued damages from the Swabian League on the basis that the original crime for which his family had been punished had not been committed by them. This story forms an integral part of Nuremberg’s history and the kidnapping adds further ammunition for Sachs to use for satirical purposes in his writings and will be discussed during the analysis of Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent in Chapter IV.

Before the Regensburg Reichstag took place in 1546, Charles V defeated the French at Guelders (1543) and made peace with the Turks (1545), allowing him to return to Germany triumphant and with his attention keenly focussed on ending the religious problems in the German territories. Whilst his attention had been focussed on foreign
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policy, Protestantism had advanced significantly with large areas of northern Germany and central areas, predominantly in those lands of Philipp von Hesse and Johann Friedrich von Sachsen (1503–1554).

Moritz von Sachsen was a complex leader who introduced the Lutheran faith to his territories but as a career soldier had fought for the Catholic Charles V against both the Turks and the French. His cousin, Johann Friedrich von Sachsen, was Elector and head of the Ernestine division of the family and was recognised, with Philipp von Hesse, as principal secular leaders of the Protestant League of Schmalkalden. Within the League’s constitution was the facility to raise an army, with the proviso that it could only be used when the peace of the German nation was threatened. With the return of Charles V to Germany, the Catholic Electors and Princes called for him to defeat Protestantism in Germany. Moreover, actions by Philipp von Hesse and Johann Friedrich von Sachsen against the Catholic Duke Heinrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel threatened to divide Germany into two by the formation of a large Protestant area from the centre of Germany northwards. Charles V had agreed at Speyer (1544) to reconvene talks about reform of the Catholic Church and religious freedom; however, when the Pope called for a General Council of the Church in 1545, the Protestant territories refused to recognise its powers. This seems to have been a tipping point for the Emperor and before the Reichstag at Regensburg he had secured both troops and funding for war against the Protestants. One of those offering to fight on the Catholic side was Moritz von Sachsen, no doubt persuaded by the chance to reunite the two branches of the Sachsen dynasty as a reward for fighting alongside the Emperor. The Emperor outlawed both Philipp von Hesse and Johann von Sachsen, an act which caused war to break out in summer 1546. The war lasted until 24 April 1547, when the Protestant armies were defeated at the Battle of Mühlberg. Johann
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von Sachsen was captured and condemned to death and Philipp von Hesse capitulated in June 1547, having been persuaded so to do by his son-in-law, Moritz von Sachsen.\textsuperscript{180} It was because of his perceived betrayal of the Protestant cause that Moritz von Sachsen became known as ‘Judas von Meissen’, a sobriquet that Sachs was to mock in \textit{Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht} as will be illustrated in the next chapter.

Nuremberg had declared neutrality in this war and refused to fund the League with official finance, but pointed them towards the city’s wealthy merchants, who lent both the League and the Emperor money and, furthermore, supplied both sides with arms.\textsuperscript{181} Nuremberg was stable during this period, although Bernd Moeller believes the imperial cities’ initial enthusiasm for the Reformation was beginning to wane: ‘They had alienated themselves from the Emperor and the empire, causing a change in self-image, and the sixteenth century saw stirring attempts by imperial cities to reconcile their Protestantism with their fidelity to the empire’.\textsuperscript{182}

Augsburg and Ulm had not adhered to the code of the alliance made with Nuremberg (1533) and, having joined battle against the Emperor, now paid the price. Charles V convened a \textit{Reichstag} in Augsburg (1 September 1547) to celebrate his success and to destroy Protestantism. He surrounded the city with his Spanish troops, led by the Duke of Alba, giving the gathering the name \textit{geharnischten Reichstag} and leaving Augsburg and its neighbours in no doubt of its treacherous behaviour when Charles V replaced their Council, previously composed of guild members and patricians, with a small patrician government.\textsuperscript{183}

Philipp Melanchthon, in his role as leader of the Lutheran Church since the death of Luther in 1546, along with other leading Lutherans and Protestant Electors, including
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Moritz von Sachsen, was unhappy about the terms of the Interim produced by Charles V in June 1548. In an attempt to convince Charles V to produce a more acceptable document Melanchthon and other Protestant theologians met with Catholic theologians and produced a document known as the Leipziger Interim (December 1548). Neither document was acceptable to either the Catholics or the Protestants, causing Melanchthon to be perceived as a Catholic appeaser by other Lutherans. These included Melanchthon’s pupil, the radical Lutheran Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–1575), who could not accept Melanchthon’s involvement concerning the imposition of Catholic fast days, vestments and church decorations, including candles. This disagreement denotes the commencement of internal theological disputes within the Lutheran Church, as will be illustrated in the analysis of the plays.184

The Augsburg Reichstag had devastating effects in Protestant territories, including Nuremberg, despite its declared neutrality. Local effects will be discussed in the analysis of the plays, but the main result of the Interim in July 1549 was the re-imposition of the Catholicism and the re-introduction of many Catholic celebrations in all parts of Charles V’s German dominions. The combination of the enforcement of the Interim under threat of violence, the continued imprisonment of the two main Protestant leaders, the suggested imposition of a Spanish Hapsburg hereditary monarchy and the Reichskammergericht in the hands of Charles V rang alarm bells with both Catholic and Protestant territorial leaders as they saw their powers transferred into the Emperor’s hands. The suggestion of the foundation of a standing army under imperial control and the presence of the forces of the Duke of Alba left both Catholic and Protestant territorial leaders feeling threatened and united against the Emperor.185

185 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, 1, pp. 321–22.
For Nuremberg the imposition of the Catholic practices caused great concern, especially the forced re-introduction of Mass, the Elevation of the Host, Fasting and the Veneration of Saints. According to Gerhard Gruner: ‘In Nürnberg wird deshalb eine neue Kirchenordnung eingeführt. Bestimmte Feiertage werden wieder gehalten, Epistel und Evangelium wieder lateinisch gesungen und die Elevation wird wieder vollzogen’. Nuremberg was forced to comply and Gruner cites the example of the imperial city of Constance, which had refused to sign the Interim and was punished by the removal of its status as an imperial city. The effects of the Interim threatened Nuremberg’s religious autonomy and resulted in divisions of opinion in the city and amongst its priesthood. Moreover, the refusal to accept the terms of the Interim by Andreas Osiander and Veit Dietrich (1506–1549), two of Nuremberg’s leading Lutheran theologians, resulted in the expulsion of Osiander and the dismissal of Dietrich. As their history is vital to the understanding of the first two plays to be analysed, this particular history will be included within that analysis. It is pertinent to say that Osiander particularly would become a thorn in the side of Nuremberg’s Council and, until his death in 1552, equally present a problem for Melanchthon in his role as leader of the Lutheran Church after Luther’s death.

By the end of 1549 Nuremberg found itself in an uncomfortable position, ostensibly Lutheran, but feeling unsure of its relationship with the Emperor and King Ferdinand and threatened by the nearby example of the sanctions that Augsburg suffered for its treachery. It was regarded with suspicion by its natural allies, the Protestants, for its double-dealing during the Schmalkaldic War and despite its early adoption of Lutheranism, the city’s preoccupation with maintaining good relationships with the Emperor dominated its policy-making. Protestantism had lost its religious leader Martin Luther in 1546 and Philipp Melanchthon had already created divisions amongst some Lutherans due to his supposed...
appeasement of the Catholics in the *Leipzig Interim*. For Hans Sachs particularly, the loss of Martin Luther as the figurehead at the helm of Lutheranism would have been disappointing as he had been an early advocate of Luther and had helped disseminate his message amongst Nuremberg’s residents. However, it was the effects of the Augsburg *Interim*, Luther’s death and Melanchthon’s theology which inspired Sachs to write many of his best *Fastnachtspiele* during the 1550s.
CHAPTER III

Decline and Downfall in Plays of the 1550s

In this chapter two plays from the early 1550s will be analysed. The first play by Sachs to be considered here is *Der unersetlich geitzhunger genandt* (5 September 1551), which was written during a ‘Catholic’ phase in Nuremberg’s religious history, that is, after the imposition of the *Interim*. Protestantism itself was in a state of flux as Luther had died in February 1546 and Philipp Melanchthon had become the guardian of Lutheran theology. Protestantism was threatened externally by the Catholics through the *Interim* and internally by squabbles about Lutheran doctrine and Melanchthon’s involvement in writing the decidedly conciliatory *Leipziger Interim*.

The setting of this play portrays a much-changed Nuremberg, in which Sachs illustrates the presence of avarice amongst the city’s merchants. Most commentators pinpoint the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg* (1552–54) as the turning point in Nuremberg’s economic fortunes, but this play illustrates that Nuremberg’s fortunes were already in decline. Gerhard Gruner confirms this: ‘[D]ie Stadt hat Schulden in Höhe 453,000 fl’. This illustrates that Nuremberg was in debt before the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*. This may have been due to the effects of the Schmalkaldic War (1546–47) or Turkish incursions into Bohemia which cut access to Nuremberg’s metal ore mines. Reputation and reliability also play a large part in the portrayal of the protagonists, reflecting a low point in Nuremberg’s own reputation due to the city’s failure to defend the faith it had adopted in 1525, both materially and physically by refusing to join the League of Schmalkalden in 1531. Sachs’s satirical purpose is to document how concentration on finance could harm Nuremberg’s traditional source of income and cause changes in society.

---

1 KG XIV, pp. 154–69.
2 See p. 94.
The second play analysed in this chapter, *Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht, das keyser August wolt kauffen*⁴ (9 September 1553) was written during the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*, but after the two sieges of Nuremberg and after Albrecht Alcibiades had been defeated at Sievershausen on 9 July 1553. From the city’s perspective, it was a time for re-assessment as the sieges had caused significant damage to the city and to the extra-mural territories which supplied Nuremberg with food and other commodities. The effects of this war would be felt long after 1558, when the reparation agreement with Alicibiades’ successors was finalized.

The city Council was wary of offending the Emperor, which is a possible reason for Sachs being refused permission to perform a play called *Vom abt und ainem edelman* (recorded in the *Ratsverlässe* dated 9 January 1551), which is believed to be the play known today as *Der Abt im Wildbad*.⁵ The reason for this censure is not stated but the demands of the *Interim* were the probable cause: ‘Der Rat versuchte durch strenge Zensur, Strafmaßnahmen und Verhandlungen mit den Predigern, in der Stadt Frieden und Ordnung zu halten, mußte noch 1549 polizeilich gegen Pamphlete und Unruhen um das Interim einschreiten’.⁶

Superficially *Der verdorben edelman* is about the extravagant behaviour of a young noble, who, by maintaining his appearance through borrowing and overborrowing, manages to dupe the court about his financial probity. Squandering would have been regarded in Nuremberg as a sin, as excess monies in the hands of the wealthy should have been donated to the *Gemeinnutz* to support the poor, ill and destitute or reinvested in business. In times of crisis, such as during the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*, the poor, unemployed and refugees had to rely on the *Gemeinnutz*, which in turn was dependent on prosperity in the city. Rudolf Endres says: ‘In besonderen Notzeiten aber mußte die Stadt

---

⁴ KG XIV, pp. 276–87.  
⁵ Hirschmann, ‘Quellen’, p. 47.  
⁶ Theiß, ‘Der Bürger’, p. 79.
das praktisch kostenlose sogenannte “Herrenbrot” an gut 13.000 bis 15.000 Arme und Ärmste verteilen’. It will be suggested that Sachs hides within the play subtle references to the local effects of the *Interim* and to the demise of Nuremberg’s two foremost theologians, Andreas Osiander (1498–1552) and Veit Dietrich (1506–1549). The satire is well hidden as Sachs needed to avoid censorship, having just taken on the role of *Spielleiter* and *Schauspieler* and wanting to have as many of his plays performed as possible.

*Der unersetlich geitzhunger*

The play opens with Simplicius, whom Sachs describes as ‘einfeltig’ (p. 154, l. 3), which translates as ‘simple’ and ‘foolish’ on the one hand, or ‘honest’ and ‘upright’ on the other. The use of the name Simplicius is linked to the Greek philosopher Simplicius of Cilicia (490–560 AD), a follower of Plato and a commentator on Aristotle’s works. Simplicius is best known for his commentary on Aristotle’s *De Anima*, a text which was studied as part of Natural Philosophy by students at German universities and Humanists alike. It is not known where Sachs acquired his knowledge of this book, as it is not to be found in his own library. Simplicius, a pagan, had been persecuted by Justinian I (c. 527–65 AD), who banned pagans from public office in 528 AD unless they converted to Christianity, an act which forced Simplicius to leave his home in Eastern Turkey. Simplicius of Cilicia’s exile can be read as an allegory for the treatment of Andreas Osiander in November 1548 after his refusal to accept the terms of the *Interim* in Nuremberg and his subsequent flight from the city.

---

7 Endres, ‘Sozialstruktur’, p. 199.
8 Greek philosophy was translated into Latin and then in the late fifteenth century, the Venetian Aldus Manutius (1449–1515) translated the works of Aristotle (*The Oxford Handbook of Presocratic Philosophy*, ed. by Patricia Curd and Daniel W. Graham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 13).
Fig. 8 Martin Luther by Lucas Cranach 1528

Fig. 9 Moritz von Sachsen

Fig. 10 Albrecht Alcibiades von Brandenburg-Kulmbach
Osiander was a fervent supporter of Luther, having been instrumental in the Reformation process in Nuremberg and written much of the liturgical material used in the city’s church services. He disagreed with the implementation of the *Interim* and, subsequently, was banned from preaching and left Nuremberg. The history of his self-imposed exile will be covered in the analysis of the next play in this chapter, *Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht*.

By the time that this *Fastnachtspiel* was written Osiander had died, but from his new post in Königsberg, where he had settled after leaving Nuremberg, he had written *De Unico Mediatore Iesu Christo et Iustificatione Fidei: Confessio Andreae Osiandri* and *Ein Disputation von der Rechtfertigung des Glaubens* in 1551, in which he opposed Melanchthon’s views. Sachs may invoke the name Simplicius for a more obscure purpose: that of illustrating a longstanding disagreement between Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon about the role of Aristotle’s work in theology, about which Simplicius had written his commentary. Both men had studied Aristotle’s *De Anima* at university before studying theology as it helped to develop logic and reconciled arguments between philosophy and religion. Shortly before the publication of the *Ninety-Five Theses*, Luther had published (4 September 1517) a work criticising Aristotle called *Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam*,

10 saying: ‘The whole of Aristotle […] is to theology as darkness is to light’.

11 Melanchthon disagreed with Luther’s rejection of Aristotle and in 1540 produced his own *Commentarius de Anima*, republishing it throughout Europe until 1560 due to its success. Consequently, by using the name Simplicius, Sachs focuses on the disagreements within Lutheranism, about which Martin Luther had argued with Melanchthon, as well as reminding the audience of Melanchthon’s efforts to reconcile with the Catholic Church at the *Interim* and its consequences for Nuremberg’s two pastors.

---

10 ‘Breviter, totus Aristoteles ad theologiam est tenebrae ad lucem’ (*LW*, i, p. 226, no. 50).
11 Translation provided by Hendrix, *Luther*, p. 69.
To return to the play: in the opening speech Simplicius says that he is looking for a safe place to keep his money, which a debtor has repaid in full (p. 154, ll. 5–10). He uses the word ‘glaubiger’ (l. 8), which means creditor, but his use of ‘bei zwei jahren’ dates the loan to 1549, the date of the Interim, giving it a second and more modern interpretation of ‘believer’. Sachs never refers to Simplicius as a moneylender, which suggests that moneylending was common practice amongst people who were not traditionally moneylenders, just as Sachs himself loaned money. Simplicius then uses the word ‘seltzam’ (l. 10) to indicate the unexpected nature of the repayment, but he never refers to interest or surety taken against this loan. This implies he has loaned money without the expectation of gain and with the possibility of loss. Luther wrote extensively about moneylending in both the Kleiner Sermon von dem Wucher (1519) and the Großer Sermon von dem Wucher (1520) and combined them in the Sermon von Kaufshandlung und Wucher (1524), based on the Biblical quotation: ‘Der geitz ist eine wurtzel alles ubels’ (1 Tim. 6:10). Simplicius’s actions as a moneylender are in accordance with Luther’s advice: ‘Die dritte ist leihen odder borgen, das ich mein gutt ihn gebe und widder neme, so mirs widder bracht wird, und emperen mus, wo man nicht widder bringt’.16

Simplicius is concerned to maintain the value of this repaid loan, asking: ‘Wo ich nun mit dem gelt hin sol, | Das es mir würt behalten wol’ (ll. 13–14). This is a reference to the fluctuating value of money. The greatest wealth, but the greatest threat for inflation, was the discovery in South America of cheaper but purer gold and silver, which debased the value of ‘European’ silver coins, causing rampant inflation. Nuremberg’s merchants had established silver mines in Bohemia and Thuringia and the city minted its own coins,
which made it vulnerable to inflation due to the increasing preference for South American silver. Further problems occurred as there was no standard currency against which locally minted coins could be valued. In 1524 attempts were made to introduce a Reichsguldiner so that parity between gold and large silver coins could be achieved. This caused dissent amongst the various territorial mints, with the Rhineland preferring gold coins, the north and central parts of Germany preferring silver and many mints refusing to withdraw their own coins and replace them with the Reichsguldiner. In 1551 another attempt was made to produce a standard-value coin based on the Austrian Kreutzer. The content of a gold-based coin, the Goldgulden, was determined, but this devalued the Joachimsthaler, the beloved coin of Saxony, which rejected it.

Simplicius’s purpose is to maintain value, not increase it; consequently, he searches for someone with whom he can deposit the money whilst he is on his travels (ll. 15–16). Sachs uses the words ‘Wann so ich auß-gekundschafft wür’. ‘Auß-Kundschaft’ has different interpretations, not only that of being away from a circle of friends, but also that of being in a place where there is no witness. By specifically using this double meaning, Sachs sets the scene for the remainder of the Fastnachtspiel, which sees Simplicius depositing his money with Lux Reichenburger:

Lux Reichenburger, der stadthafft man.

Den selben will ich langen ahn,

Das er mirs bhalt zu trewer handt,

Biß das ich wider kumb zu landt. (p. 154, ll. 19–22)

In Latin lux means not just light but also the quality of that light, implying that Reichenburger’s reputation shines out amongst his fellow citizens, which will prove to be an ironic choice of name. Simplicius describes as Reichenburger as ‘stadthafft’ (l. 19),

18 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 366.
19 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 135. See 1551.
20 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 366.
21 DWB see Kundschaft.
which has several meanings: either constant and firm, which suggests Reichenburger’s commitment to the city, or his nature as a good businessman; or it can mean grand or imposing, which implies that Reichenburger is of a superior class to Simplicius. Another interpretation of ‘stadthaft’ is a town arrest warrant, by the use of which Sachs places doubt about Reichenburger’s financial probity in the audience’s minds. Sachs’s choice of vocabulary presents his audience with a conundrum: a man who is well-known in the city, who deals in money but may have questionable dealings. The name Reichenburger would have been known to the audience as Sachs uses it in the third of his prose dialogues, *Ein Dialogus, des Inhalt ein Argument der Römischen wider das christlich Häuflein den Geiz, auch ander offentlich Last etc. betreffen* (1524). By reusing it, Sachs directs his audience’s memory back to this earlier work and its core subject — avarice.

If Sachs uses ‘stadthaft’ to indicate status, the audience would presume that Reichenburger is synonymous with a wealthy merchant or a patrician, but his opening speech dispels this idea:

All müh und fleiß die sindt vergebens,
Weil sich von mir hat das gelück
Gewendet gar in allem stuck,
Hab das jar vil schaden erlitten. (p. 155, ll.1–4)

Reichenburger has been unable to access his mines and other branches of his business (ll. 5–6), possibly due to the effects of the Schmalkaldic War, adding that he is not making profits from grain sales (p. 155, l. 7). Sachs reports a factually correct meteorological occurrence, namely, a series of mini ice ages which peaked in 1560 and were characterised by shorter growing periods resulting in lower grain yields. The resultant shortage allowed grain merchants to manipulate the price by withholding supplies and subsequently selling

---

22 KG XXII, pp. 51–68.
at great profit, a practice known as *Vorkauf*. According to Tom Scott, grain prices doubled and the increased prices affected everyone who relied on bread for nourishment, confirming that Nuremberg’s residents were experiencing economic hardship before the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*.

Reichenburger states that he is unable to make money from a guardianship (ll. 8–9). The phrase ‘Drob ich wol hab gwermbt mein hendt’ suggests an image of avarice to the audience. Reichenburger is unable to persuade anyone to pay him nine per cent interest on invested money (ll. 10–11), which, as an expectation, is more than Luther’s ideal interest rate for commercial lending of five per cent. If one of Nuremberg’s merchants needed a large investment, he would normally seek help from his fellow merchants, who would expect the payment of interest on the loan, as would any bank or moneylender. Nuremberg had earned a reputation for its financial activities in the fourteenth century, when it established its own banks and lent money to Charles IV to purchase the margraviate of Brandenburg. It still had the reputation as a city where wealthy merchants lent money to high-ranking nobility and churchmen, an example of which occurred during the recent War:

> Während den Schmalkaldenern keine Waffenhilfe und anstatt des erbetenen Darlehens von 200,000 Gulden nur 25,000 Gulden als Geschenk und ein Darlehen von 20,000 Gulden gewährt worden waren, wurde dem Kaiser die dreifache Summe bewilligt und noch dazu die Erlaubnis erteilt, im Nürnbergschen Gebiet eine Anzahl frischer Fähnlein anzuwerben.

In the play, Reichenburger is relying on ‘Glück’ to improve his wealth (p. 155, l. 2 & l. 16), which echoes Simplicius’s opening line (p. 154, l. 5). Martin Luther believed, ‘Glück betört mehr Leute als Unglück’. The idea that luck might improve their situation is contrary to

24 Werner Schultheiß, ‘Charles IV und die Reichsstadt Nürnberg: Streiflichter und Funde zur Territorialpolitik in Ostfranken’, *MGVN*, 52, 42–53 (pp. 44–45).
Nuremberg’s normal reliance on ‘fleiß’, about which there are many local idioms, including ‘Ohne Fleiß, denn Preis’. By repeating ‘Glück’, Sachs reminds his audience of their cultural identity as fleißig as well as of the words of their religious leader.

It is pertinent here to review the information provided by Sachs: Reichenburger conforms to the image of a Nuremberg merchant, with interests in mining and farming, as well as being a guardian to minors. He is involved in finance, both lending and borrowing money with interest. Sachs has also placed doubt in the minds of the audience that Reichenburger’s dealings are not as sound as should be expected of a man in his position through hints at his avaricious nature. Sachs uses Reichenburger as a representative of the merchant class and the change in the focus of their business dealings to finance.

From the subsequent exchange between Reichenburger and his wife the dialogue informs us that she lacks money for household expenditure (p. 155, ll. 26–28). Reichenburger admonishes her to rein in her spending: ‘Mit dem grosn loffl nit richten ahn’ (l. 32). An ‘Anrichter’ is a ladle but Sachs may be alluding to words by Sebastian Franck (1499–1543) in his *Germaniae Chronicon* (1538): ‘[…] stirbt ein fürst und kumpt ein anderer anrichter des glaubens’. Sachs reminds his audience of the death of Luther and the imposition of the *Interim*, making Charles V the ‘anrichter des glaubens’, or Sachs could be assigning this mantle to Melanchthon, as *Fürst* translates also as high priest or instructor.

Returning to the play, Reichenburger suggests house renovations which can only be afforded by dismissing servants (p. 156, ll. 2–6), whereas his wife suggests increasing property rents to cover expenses (l. 9). Sachs portrays a callous couple who would make servants unemployed and homeless to satisfy their pretentions, without any regard for the

---

28 *DWB* see *anrichter*.
29 *DWB* see *Fürst* (10, 11).
increased burden on the *Gemeinnutz*. Subsequently, Sachs makes their selfish behaviour more apparent and petty: Reichenburger complains that the stable boy has stolen an old waistcoat (l. 15), whilst his wife complains that a maid has stolen a vest (l. 17) and sleeping bonnet (l. 18). The wife intends to stop the maid’s wages for these and other infringements (ll. 20–21).

Simplicius asks Reichenburger to keep his money safe whilst he travels to Leon (l. 26) or Lyon, which was a centre for trade, especially in cloth and silk, but also a growing financial centre where Nuremberg merchants set up branches of their main businesses, especially Hans Kleberger and the Tucher and Welser, Ebner and Furtenbach families.

Die wolt ich euch zu trewes handen
Zu bhalten geben, mit grosser bit,
Beger des umb ein sunst auch nit,
Das auff zwey monat ohn gefehr.

(p. 156, ll. 30–33)

Edelgard E. DuBruck calls Simplicius a moneylender, but Sachs does not imply that he is either rich or a merchant, but simply a man abiding by Lutheran rules on moneylending. By using Simplicius to represent an honest lender, Sachs distinguishes him from the pernicious lending of Reichenburger, which forces the audience to compare the actions of the two protagonists.

Reichenburger refuses Simplicius’s money, calling it ‘Fremd gelt’ (p. 157, ll. 3–4), which may be a reference to its undesirability due to fluctuating coin values in German territorial currency markets. However, he is persuaded to take the deposit when Simplicius

---

33 There are many idioms based on ‘Fremd Geld’ but ‘Fremd gelt bricht den schlaaf’ and ‘Fremd gelt ist Bidermans feind’ are amongst the oldest: <http://www.zeno.org/Wander-1867/A/Geld> [accessed: 27 April 2015].
offers Reichenburger’s wife a tip, which illustrates that he is easily persuaded to satisfy his greed (l. 7). Simplicius expects the return of what he has deposited by informing Reichenburger that the sack is sealed (l. 12). This sealed sack will illustrate the Reichenburger’s treachery, nor does it prevent the wife from suggesting uses of the money for their benefit:

Wenn dieser kauffman schaden nem,

Etwan auff der strassen umbkem,

So wer das gelt gleich recht für uns,

Wer ebn ein heyrat-gut unsers suns,

Wenn er etwan ein weyb würt nemen. (p. 157, ll. 23–27)

Reichenburger’s wife becomes the temptress, the biblical Eve who caused the downfall of man, but now her sin is avarice, not curiosity. Normally, dowries (heyrat-gut, l. 26) were paid by to the bridegroom’s family; however, when a commoner or poor noble wanted to marry someone above his station, he had to match her dowry with a Widerlegung and give a Morgengabe. The wife’s words indicate their pretentions to marry their son to someone of a higher class.34

Reichenburger questions what would happen if Simplicius died during the journey (ll. 29–30), but his wife doubts whether anyone knows of Simplicius’s visit (p. 158, ll. 1–2). Reichenburger’s reply suggests he is warming to her suggestions:

Er ist zwar ein einfeltig man,

Freylich gantz ungeniet herkummen,

Weil er keyn handtschrifft hat genommen,

Auff blose wort uns darumb trawt. (p. 158, ll. 4–7)

Reichenburger, from this use of ‘einfeltig’ (l. 4), believes Simplicius is naïve but his wife grasps the idea of a lack of a formal contract and informs her husband that he could deny receiving the deposit (ll. 11–12). Reichenburger continues to have doubts about the consequences: ‘So verlür wir glauben und trawen; | Der gut man würt nit schweigen von mir’ (ll. 16–17). The wife dons her temptress mantle again:

    Ach, ein groß ansehen hat ir,
    So ist er fremb und unbekandt,
    Derhalb sich sein annimbt niemandt,
    Seiner wort glaubet niemandt da;

    Ewr nein gilt viel mehr, denn sein jha. (p. 158, ll. 19–23)

This speech illustrates Sachs’s intention: merchants’ names are held in high regard against accusations by an ordinary man. If Reichenburger represents Nuremberg’s merchants and by association the patrician ruling families, then Sachs is confirming Nuremberg’s reputation as described by Johann Friedrich von Sachsen (1502–1554): ‘Nürnberg ist die “Grundsuppe des Bösen”, die man “im Grund ausrotten und verderben” müsse’. The wife’s speech would have had a varying reception within the audience: merchants might be flattered by the implication of their great reputations, whereas others would see the truth in Sachs’s words, for it was an unequal society dominated and ruled by the wealthy, leaving the ordinary man little chance to complain, a point which becomes apparent in the analysis of Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent (23 December 1557) in Chapter IV.

Sachs allows himself a literary joke when Reichenburg asks: ‘Wo bleib denn unser trew und ehr’ (p. 158, l. 30). His wife replies: ‘Der trew acht wir uns sunst nit fast, | Trew Eckart war nie unser gast’ (ll. 32–33). The reference to Trew Eckart is twofold: Meister Eckhart (1260–1328) was a Dominican Monk and teacher, who was famous for giving his sermons in the vernacular, as did Martin Luther. Eckhart was also accused of heresy but

---

35 Pfeiffer, ‘Anstand’, p. 168. Pfeiffer does not give a source for this quotation.
this occurred shortly before his death.\textsuperscript{36} Georg Wickram (c. 1505–1555), who was leader of the Colmar \textit{Meistersängergesellschaft}, wrote a \textit{Fastnachtspiel} called \textit{Trew Eckart} (1538). Sachs could either be complimenting Wickram on his works or laughing at his fan, who apparently used many of Sachs’s songs.\textsuperscript{37}

The wife continues to work on her husband, saying, ‘Die ehr wechst aber mit dem gut’ (p. 159, l. 1), which contradicts the Bible: ‘Es ist leichter, daß ein Kamel gehe durch ein Nadelöhr, denn daß ein Reicher in das Reich Gottes komme.’\textsuperscript{38} Sachs redirects the audience’s attention back to the fundamentals of their faith, in which earthly possessions earn no reward in heaven. Reichenburger then asks:

\begin{quote}
Mein weib, noch eins muß ich dich fragen:  
Wie würs mit unser seelen sthen? (p. 159, ll. 5–6)
\end{quote}

This illustrates Sachs’s purpose for his choice of the name Simplicius and its origins in Simplicius of Cilicia’s commentary on \textit{De Anima}. Luther believed that there was no separation between soul and body and this informed his views on justification by faith alone and not by the performance of good works.\textsuperscript{39} The wife is undisturbed by the fate of her husband’s soul:

\begin{quote}
Wirt uns gleych wie den andern gehn,  
So finantzten und wucher trieben  
Bey welchen wir sunts ahn das bleiben. (p. 159, ll. 8–10).
\end{quote}

The wife, in her role as temptress, calms Reichenburger’s concerns about his soul, but in doing so condemns his soul to the Catholic Church’s punishment for Christians who

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} <http://www.eckhartsociety.org/eckhart/eckhart-man> [accessed: 21 April 2017].
\item \textsuperscript{37} Carl Drescher, \textit{Studien zu Hans Sachs. Neue Folge} (Marburg: Elwert, 1891), p. 61.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Luke 18:25.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Claire Gantet, ‘Dreams, Standards of Knowledge and Orthodoxy in Germany in the Sixteenth Century’, in \textit{Orthodoxies and Heterodoxies in Early Modern German Culture: Order and Creativity 1550–1570}, ed. by Randolf C. Head and Daniel Christensen, Studies in Central European Histories, 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 69–89 (p. 76).
\end{itemize}
become moneylenders, that is, excommunication.\textsuperscript{40} In this speech she compares Reichenburger’s business activities to those of a \textit{wucherer}, which would immediately forge a link to the cultural memory of the centuries of Jewish moneylending in Nuremberg. One reason given for the expulsion of the Jews in 1498–99 were the exorbitant rates of interest charged on loans, but Rudolf Endres suggests that this move was prompted by the Council’s desire to control finance in Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{41} An audience of \textit{Handwerker} would have known the history of the Jewish moneylenders and their high interest demands, activating a negative image of the Jews. Furthermore, the audience would have known their Bible stories; and the image Sachs creates would have reminded them of the moneylenders in the Temple:

\begin{quote}
Und er fand im Tempel sitzen, die da Ochsen, Schafe und Tauben feil hatten, und die Wechsler. Und er machte eine Geißel aus Stricken und trieb sie alle zum Tempel hinaus samt den Schafen und Ochsen und verschüttete den Wechsler das Geld und stieß die Tische um und sprach zu denen, die die Tauben feil hatten: tragt das von dannen und macht nicht meines Vaters Haus zum Kaufhause! (John 2:14–16)
\end{quote}

If Sachs regarded Nuremberg as a temple to Lutheranism, then moneylending would represent a threat to the teachings of Luther. Sachs may also have interpreted Nuremberg’s increasing involvement in finance as a threat to its merchant trading business. Hence, his concerns about interest rates and moneylending.

When Simplicius returns to reclaim his money, Reichenburger denies all knowledge of the transaction, saying that Simplicius was dreaming (p. 160, l. 5) or mistook Reichenburger for one of his neighbours (l.10). His wife also denies meeting Simplicius (l. 17) and even claims: ‘Ich glaub, ewr vernunfft sey verenckt, | Oder vieleicht habt ir das

\textsuperscript{40} The Council of Vienne (1312) determined that Christians lending money with interest should be excommunicated.

\textsuperscript{41} Endres, ‘Sozialstruktur’, p. 195.
bler?’ (ll. 22–23). ‘Bler’, according to Grimm,\(^42\) means to see double or mistakenly which gives this amusing interlude opportunities for over-acting by the players and provides balance to the play after some thought-provoking issues. Simplicius realises he has been duped and threatens to go to the *burgermeister* (p. 161, l. 4). Reichenburg threatens Simplicius:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Da thu ich eben nichts nach-fragen} \\
\text{Wilt mit schalkstücken du umbgeh'n,} \\
\text{Du magst bald in dem loch auffstehn. (p. 161, ll. 6–8)}
\end{align*}
\]

The reference to ‘loch’ would remind the audience of the miserable cellar room situated under the *Rathaus* which was used as a gaol. Reichenburger celebrates his luck:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Die Schantz ist uns wol halb geraten;} \\
\text{Er ist mir zu schlect in den thaten,} \\
\text{Er heisset wol Simplicius,} \\
\text{Seiner einfelt ich lachen muß. (p. 161, ll. 10–13)}
\end{align*}
\]

Sachs brings the audience back to the ambiguity of the double meaning of ‘einfeltig’, stressing that Reichenburger believes Simplicius to be a simpleton, but the audience recognizes ‘einfeltig’ as naivety because Simplicius has confused Reichenburger’s reputation and position with those of an honest businessman. The impossibility of Simplicius’s position is made clear when he informs his good friend Sapiens (Latin: wise man, philosopher or sage) that he has no written proof of his deposit (p. 162, l. 20). Simplicius explains his choice of banker:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ach, ich hab ja zu weit vertrawt,} \\
\text{Auff sein grosses ansehen bawdt,} \\
\text{Weyl er ist so achtbar und herrlich,} \\
\text{Fürnem, großbrechtig unde ehrlich,}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{42}\) *DWB* see *Blerr*. 
Sachs, by using Lux Reichenburger to embody Nuremberg’s rich merchants, casts doubt on their honesty too. Furthermore, as many merchant families were also Council members, Sachs implies that dishonest behaviour is prevalent amongst the ruling echelons. Sapiens’s reply confirms this:

Der groß schein dich betrogen hat
Und der groß nam. Hest mich rats gfragt,
Wolt dir viel stücklein haben gsagt,
So er den leuten hat gethan
Die nit zimmen eim biederman,
Wiewol es niemandt reden thar.
Der geitz hat in besessen gar.
Niemandt gern mit im zschaffen hat.

There are two particular meanings of the word ‘stücklein’ which could be at play here: first, it was used by Luther to describe a bad deed, ‘das seyn juddische stucklein und tucklein’; and second, ‘stücklein’ translates as ‘schwank’, which could indicate that Sachs here is referring to a particular member of Nuremberg’s elite who has been slighted in a song or poem, a reference which remains obscure. The last two lines (ll. 15–16) imply that Reichenburger’s reputation for avaricious behaviour is widespread within the city. Sapiens suggests a plot to regain Simplicius’s money, using Reichenburger’s reliance on his reputation as bait: ‘List zu überwinden mit list’ (p.164, l. 20). Sachs now introduces a new character, the ‘alt kauffherr’, who deals in jewels, to tempt Reichenburger, who is still considering how to use the remainder of Simplicius’s money:

Wo mir die tausendt gulden bleiben
Wil ich der hendel noch mehr treiben.

43 LW vi, p. 5, l. 7.
Wer nit pratick und gschickligkeyt

Itzt braucht, der bleibt dahinden weit. (p. 164, ll. 26–29)

‘Pratick’ has several meanings — a trick, a device or a ruse — which is an indication of how Reichenburger’s trade is reliant on cunning rather than ‘fleiß’. If Sachs is implying that Reichenburger represents Nuremberg merchants, then this is a damning accusation about the unscrupulous nature of their business dealings. His wife asks whether anything had come of Simplicius’s threat (p. 164, ll. 31–33), to which Reichenburger replies: ‘Ich bin im zu hoch, das er sich | Hie darf auffpaumen wider mich’ (p. 165, ll. 1–2). This again reminds the audience that Reichenburger’s position in society prevents questions about his honesty.

At this point the old merchant arrives with a box of jewels, which Reichenburger’s wife spots, informing her husband when she announces him. On hearing this news Reichenburger says, ‘Er wil leicht etlich kleinet versetzen, | Da wil ich im wol schern und netzen’ (p. 165, ll. 9–10). This has a literal meaning of trapping the old merchant, but ‘netzen’ also means ‘harnen’, that is, to piss on him! Colloquial use of vocabulary is found in many of Sachs’s Fastnachtspiele and his use of double meanings does counter the idea that Sachs cleaned up the genre: he was just better able to disguise filthy language and use it in such a way that his audience understood the implied meaning.

Unusually, Sachs includes a stage instruction before the jeweller’s entrance: ‘Der alt kauffherr kumbt, neigt sich tieff und spricht’ (p. 165, l. 11). By the use of this image Sachs places Reichenburger in a superior position in preparation for his eventual downfall. The elderly trader flatters Reichenburger: ‘Ach standhafft, frummer, erbar herr’ (p. 165, l. 12). The use of ‘erbar’ in this sentence indicates that Reichenburger is a member of the merchant class, but also that he would be able to sit on the Großer Rat. The word

---

45 Simon, Cult of Katherine, p. 277, fn. 112.
‘standhafft’ could be another play on words in which *Stand* indicates Reichenburger’s position in Nuremberg’s society. The ruse involves persuading Reichenburger to accept the deposit of a jewellery box worth 12,000 Gulden (l. 17) into his safe-keeping for three months (l. 22) with the promise of future business (ll. 22–24). Having told Simplicius that he never took foreign money, Reichenburger boasts that he has accepted jewels from foreigners or strangers before (ll. 28–31), which illustrates his avarice as he is tempted by the value of the object rather than origin of its owner.

At this point Simplicius interrupts the transaction, asking for the return of his money; and Reichenburger, fearing an argument would discourage the new customer, willingly complies. The jeweller asks Reichenburger about his charges for the deposit (p. 166, l. 7), to which Reichenburger replies that there is no charge, but the jeweller could give his wife a gift for her industrious behaviour (p. 166, ll. 9–13). Sachs uses another stage direction (l. 20–21) to allow the audience to see the gift. The Kaufmann continues:

Fraw, nembt zu liebung diesen ring,

Schenken werdt ich euch besser ding,

Wenn ich die kleinat wider hol. (p. 166, ll. 22–24)

By tempting the temptress, Sachs illustrates the woman’s obsession with possessions as well as her avarice. She bemoans the loss of Simplicius’s money: ‘Ich wolt, in schlüg der donner nider, | Der ein vogel ist uns entpflogen’ (p. 167, ll. 2–3). This speech gives the final clue to Simplicius’s intended character: he represents Luther. Sachs’s use of ‘vogel’ would have reminded the audience of Luther as the allegorical bird in *Die wittenbergisch nachtigall*, the work which marked Sachs’s own conversion to Lutheranism and his rallying cry to his readers. Furthermore, Luther’s commitment to God occurred after his being

---

46 See page 99.
struck by lightning when he promised that if he were saved he would become a monk.\(^{47}\)

The use of this reference reminds the audience of their commitment to Lutheranism in 1525.

Reichenburger considers deceiving the elderly trader (p. 167, ll. 9–10) and his wife, in her role as temptress, suggests they break the box’s seal (ll. 11–16), revealing the contents to be gravel and straw (ll. 20–21). Reichenburger bemoans his misfortune:

\[
\text{[...]} \quad \text{Ach wie ist es doch jetzt}
\]

\[
\text{Die welt so untrew und verschmitzt,}
\]

\[
\text{Es hat mir auch vor dreyen tagen}
\]

\[
\text{Ein zinstman zwen gulden entragen}
\]

\[
\text{So hat uns auch in jener wochen}
\]

\[
\text{Ein schalk den fischkalter auffprochen}
\]

\[
\text{Und herauf grosser karpffen zwen. (p. 167, ll. 21–27)}
\]

Sachs portrays Reichenburger’s avaricious nature when the latter bemoans having had to pay two Gulden in tax as well as losing two carp from a fish kettle. The city had, and still has, fish ponds where carp, traditionally eaten at Fastnacht, were bred specifically for this purpose. Sachs reminds his audience of their cultural identity by mentioning local delicacies and century-long traditions. As the Interim had re-introduced fasting days, the importance of fish as a symbol of Catholicism becomes significant. The Pope wears the piscatorial ring, the image on which portrays St Peter fishing in the Sea of Galilee, which is symbolic of the disciples’ role: ‘Und Jesus sprach zu ihnen: Folget mir nach; ich will euch zu Menschenfischern machen!’ (Mark 1:17). Thus, by declaring that he had lost two fish, Sachs implies that Nuremberg has lost two disciples, which is another reference to the loss of the theologians Veit Dietrich and Andreas Osiander, which will be explained in the analysis of the next play.

\(^{47}\) Hendrix, *Luther*, p. 33.
Frau Reichenburger realises her ring is not valuable, saying: ‘Auff der glaßhütten
wechst der demut’ (p. 167, l. 33). A ‘glaßhütte’ is the place where glass is made and
‘demut’ has several meanings, including ‘modesty’ and ‘humility’, but it can also mean a
diamond. Nuremberg had a glass-based industry facilitated by the city being founded on
sandy soil. There are many idioms based on ‘demut’ meaning modesty, such as ‘demut
und fleisz haben ihren ehrlichen lohn und lob’⁴⁸, which would link the idea that hard work,
rather than luck or interest, brought monetary reward and praise, in contrast to the view
cherished by Reichenburger. The wife then issues a warning:

Merck wol, landtfarer und kauffleut,
Sindt auch überzogn mit schalks-heudt,
Wir sindt geschicket nit allein. (p. 167, l. 34 – p. 168, ll. 1–2)

This informs the audience that avaricious behaviour and trickery are not just confined to
the merchant sector, as well as confirming Sachs’s fears about the threat to society from
avaricious behaviour.

The play ends with Simplicius deciding to continue his moneylending (p. 168, ll.
12–13), against which Sapiens advises, suggesting that Simplicius evaluate the probity of
those with whom he deals (p. 168, ll. 17–21). Then Sachs, in the guise of Sapiens, closes
the play with a warning about those seeking wealth:

Die unersedtlich, schnödt geitzsucht,
Welche den menschen macht verucht,
Int schantz schlecht seel, leib, trew und her,
Darmit er nur sein reichtumb mehr. (p. 168, ll. 25–28)

Sachs concludes on an uncompromising picture of an avaricious man:

Iedoch er noch mehr haben wil
Und wirt des gutes nicht mehr sat,

⁴⁸ DWB see demut.
Kargt, kratzt, schabt und schindt früh und spät,
Das nur sein reichtumb grosser wachs.

Vor geitz bhüt uns gott, wünscht Hans Sachs. (p. 168, ll. 30–34)

Sachs’s use of the words *geitz* and *wucher*, the imagery used by Reichenburger and the final description of the avaricious man eaten up by greed do not encourage his audience to anti-Semitism but forces them to compare the historical reputation for avarice of Nuremberg’s Jewish moneylenders to that of those merchants or patricians involved in lending in the mid-sixteenth century. Jews were seen as outsiders, even when living within the walls of the city, with the consequence that they were always believed to be traitors or in league with the Devil.\(^49\) Sachs prompts the audience’s cultural memories of Jews and uses this comparison to illustrate how similar the behaviour of the merchants has become. Moreover, Sachs reminds them of Luther’s example of how moneylending should be transacted by Christians through the example of Simplicius, the honourable lender, thereby emphasising their cultural identity as Lutheran.

This *Fastnachtspiel* supports the idea that Sachs wrote satires which forced the audience to make a moral judgement on the behaviour of the protagonists through comparison of the illustrated behaviour in the play with their own experiences. Another of Sachs’s purposes in this play is to highlight the folly of moving from merchant trade into finance and for this purpose he places clues within the text to indicate a local example of the intended victim of his satire. This is likely to have been Bonavenutura Furtenbach, one of Nuremberg’s wealthiest citizens. As described in Reichenburger’s first speech (p. 155, ll. 1–17), many aspects of his life tally with that of Furtenbach. Furtenbach (1498–1564), originally from Feldkirch in the Voralberg, Austria, established his business in Nuremberg in 1522, his ancestors having been merchants with branches of their firm in Venice and Antwerp. He married Helena Dörrer, the widow of Matthäus Ebner, a Nuremberg patrician,

\(^{49}\) Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3rd edn. (Farnham: Ashgate, c. 2009), p. 223.
and through this relationship conducted business in Lyon. Between 1537 and 1544 Furtenbach was heavily involved in silver mining in Alsace which resulted in his involvement in finance. In 1544, in partnership with Hans Ebner, he attempted to form a monopoly of the silver mines in Hungary but failed. As he became richer his activities in finance increased: in 1546 he lent money to the League of Schmalkalden, then lent Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Kulmbach 14,000 florins in return for the administrative offices of Erlangen and Baiersdorf in 1549. Furtenbach’s involvement in finance increased; in 1546 he lent money to the League of Schmalkalden, then lent Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Kulmbach 14,000 florins in return for the administrative offices of Erlangen and Baiersdorf in 1549. Furthermore, his loan to King Ferdinand in 1547 most likely resulted in Furtenbach’s ennoblement in 1548, when he became Herr von Reichenschwand, a name which would have served well for a satirical character in Sachs’s works and adds another dimension to Sachs’s choice of the name Reichenburger!

In addition to his financial activities, he had political ambitions in Nuremberg and in 1523 was made a *Genannter* in the *Großer Rat* but never progressed onto the *Kleiner Rat*. Furtenbach failed in his political ambitions due to his reputation for unscrupulous business methods and his name became synonymous with risky ventures and demands for high interest payments. According to Mark Häberlein: ‘Der Nürnberger Georg Raiger etwa erhob gegen Furtenbach den Vorwurf des “Wuchers” als dieser beim Stadtgericht die Zwangsvollstreckung gegen Raiger beantragte, nachdem ein Darlehen über 13,000 fl. nicht zurückzahlen konnte’. Raiger, a gunmaker, became embroiled in 1551 in a court case against Furtenbach for the non-payment of a loan. When it became obvious that he was not going to advance politically in Nuremberg, Furtenbach gave up his Nuremberg citizenship in 1555 and moved to Augsburg. His son, being of marriageable age, may have been seeking a wife for whom ‘heyrat-gut’ (p. 157, l. 26) would have been necessary but he eventually married the daughter of Hieronymus Sailer in Augsburg in 1555.

52 Häberlein, *Brüder*, p. 228.
Furtenbach is an example of a member of the merchant class who became ennobled, someone who had turned from merchant trading to finance, progress which makes him conform to Sachs’s theme of society being under threat. Mark Häberlein compares his wealth to that of the Fuggers of Augsburg. Although, being a landowner and merchant did not make Furtenbach more successful: ‘Furtenbach nahm damit eine Zwischenstellung zwischen Kaufmannschaft und Adel ein, die ihn der Normenwelt der städtischen Gesellschaft entrückte, ohne daß er im Gegenzug damit rechnen konnte, vom Adel als gesellschaftlich gleichwertig akzeptiert zu werden’.54

Sachs had reason to dislike Furtenbach as the latter had been instrumental in banning Veit Dietrich, one of Nuremberg’s foremost Lutheran theologists, from preaching in Nuremberg during the dispute about the acceptance of the Interim, a story which will be told in detail in the analysis of the next play. During this dispute, Dietrich accused Furtenbach of avarice in a sermon, which compromised his position as a preacher. Hence it is not surprising that Sachs illustrates Furtenbach’s avarice in this Fastnachtspiel. That Sachs dared to make fun of Furtenbach in this way was, of course, dangerous, but Häberlein believes that Furtenbach was disliked within the city. The censor was Friedrich Pistorius (1486–1553), the Abbot of St Egidien Church in the city,55 who would have known Dietrich well in his role as representative of the Lutheran community, which may explain how this play was not censored. The loss of Veit Dietrich was regretted by many and caused Melanchthon to send a letter of praise about his friend and colleague to Hieronymus Paumgartner and Herzog Albrecht von Preussen, suggesting the latter might offer Dietrich refuge at his court, but Dietrich decided to stay in Nuremberg, where he died in 1549.56

For the audience, many of whom would have understood Sachs’s gibes at Furtenbach, this would have been very funny. The mocking of superiors is an essential

54 Häberlein, Brüder, p. 229.
56 Klaus, Dietrich, p. 269.
part of Carnival and in this case the concentration on Furtenbach as the central figure and his denigration through the images provided illustrate that Sachs’s pen was a particularly poisonous instrument. Sachs supplies the audience with enough hints for them immediately to understand who was being mocked satirically. At the same time, he fulfilled his thematic aims to illustrate the threats to society and Lutheranism from avarice prevalent in merchant business and the concentration on finance, which threatened to change merchant business in Nuremberg.

*Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen behr, das keyser August wolt kauffen*\(^{57}\)

Before the analysis of this play commences it is pertinent to introduce new historical information which forms much of the background to this play. After the enforcement of the *Interim*, Charles V had an iron grip on the German territories, which unsettled both sides of the religious divide and forced Protestant and Catholic territories to unite. Furthermore, Charles V’s most feared commander, the Duke of Alba and his Spanish troops, who had been complicit in enforcing the *Interim*, remained on German soil but this presence and the additional threat of the imposition of Charles V’s son, Philip II of Spain, as ruler of the German people caused tension between Charles V and his brother King Ferdinand I. Ferdinand believed his son Maximilian II should be the next King of the Germans.\(^{58}\) Disquiet was felt by both the Pope and the French king, who were fearful that the Emperor’s success might encourage him to increase his territories in Italy and the Netherlands. An alliance of German territorial leaders, Catholic and Protestant, prepared for military action against the Emperor and their strategy involved an invasion of the western German lands by the French. Margrave Albrecht Alcibiades von Brandenburg-Kulmbach negotiated the Treaty of Chambord (1552) with Henri II of France, who agreed

---

\(^{57}\) KG IV, p. 276–87.

\(^{58}\) Whaley, *Germany and the HRE*, I, p. 328.
military support for the alliance in exchange for the imperial cities of Metz, Toul, Verdun
and Cambrai on the success of the action. Moritz von Sachsen moved the alliance’s troops into Hapsburgian lands in southern Germany and
Austria, whilst Charles V took refuge in Innsbruck, whence he subsequently escaped over
the Brenner Pass into Villach, allowing Moritz von Sachsen to negotiate a peace deal, the
Treaty of Passau (1552), with Ferdinand I. Ferdinand, in return, needed the support of the
Electoral and territorial Princes for the succession of his son Maximilian as Emperor of the
Germans. This treaty reversed the religious terms of the Interim and limited imperial
interference in German territories, but this was not confirmed until the Treaty of Augsburg
in 1555.

When negotiations for the Treaty of Passau commenced, Albrecht Alcibiades
rushed north and attacked Bamberg, Würzburg and Nuremberg. His supposed reason for
these attacks was the cities’ declared neutrality and lack of support for the Lutheran cause
during both the Schmalkaldic War and the Fürstenaufstand. Nuremberg had declared
neutrality but cannily sold weaponry to both sides. This had caused Johann Friedrich von
Sachsen’s infamous declaration in 1551, ‘Nürnberg sei die “Grundsuppe des Bösen”, die
man “im Grund ausrotten und verderben” müsse’. Alcibiades used this pretext to attack
Nuremberg, a conflict known as the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg. His real reasons were
financial: the Brandenburg-Kulmbach dynasty was impoverished and had watched
jealously Nuremberg’s economic success and territorial gains. This is confirmed in the
introduction to the letters of his cousin, Moritz von Sachsen: ‘Sein [Alcibiades] Handeln

59 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 330.
60 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 331.
61 Gruner notes: ‘März [1552] Albrecht Alcibiades kauft 150 Zentner Pulver, 1.000 Spieße und 800 Haken in
Nürnberg’ (Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 135).
62 Gruner indicates that twelve merchants in Nuremberg lent the King of France 221,638 livres, which may
have been a contribution to the Protestant cause (Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 135).
läßt den Drang zu einem großen Territorium in Franken erkennen, das er zu Lasten der Bf. von Bamberg und Würzburg und der Reichsstadt Nürnberg gewinnen wollte’. 64 Although Georg der Fromme, Alcibiade’s uncle and regent, had worked with Nuremberg to produce the joint Kirchenordnung 1533, the relationship ended when Alcibiades reached majority and took up his title. His father, Kasimir (1481–1527), had created a mercenary army, which Alcibiades inherited, pursuing every chance to engage in military campaigns for monetary gain, having fought for the French King and Ferdinand I, as well as with the Emperor in the Schmalkaldic War (1546–47). 65 Unfortunately neither Kasimir nor Albrecht was adept at exacting payment for their efforts.

Alcibiades attacked Nuremberg twice: first from March to June 1552, leaving after receiving a ransom payment of 200,000 florins; and again, occupying territory in 1553 (April–June). 66 By June 1553, having inflicted serious damage to Nuremberg, Alcibiades retreated, burning the village of Altdorf and killing many of its inhabitants as he did so. 67 He was defeated at the Battle ofSievershausen on 9 July 1553 by an alliance of troops brought together by the Emperor, who acted after the Reichskammergericht had declared the Markgraf a traitor; 68 and although the battle was not decisive it marks the rout of Alcibiades. Alcibiades’s troops, having been promised rich bounty for their work invading Nuremberg’s lands, destroyed farms, razed buildings and stole crops and animals as recompense for lack of payment by Alcibiades. 69 Damage to the city walls and territorial lands was extensive and the immediate, destructive effects of this war left a lasting legacy of debt in Nuremberg, calculated to be 4.5 million Gulden. Subsequently, this debt

68 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 139.
69 Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 327.
increased on Alcibiades’s death in 1557 when the city was ordered to pay reparations for the destruction by allied troops of the Plassenburg. Sachs, like others in Nuremberg, blamed Alcibiades for the post-war poverty and wrote a satirical portrayal of Alcibiades’ death in Gesprech von der Himmelfahrt marggraff Albrechtz (1557), which he either withdrew himself or was advised not to publish. The suspicion that Sachs retained copies of this work and similar works abusing the memory of Alcibiades lasted until Sachs’s death in 1576 and is one possible cause of the search of his home the day after he died.

In Nuremberg, the religious picture was confusing as the Council tried to balance the need to appease the Emperor, whilst preventing its citizens from rebelling against their authority:

Die Obrigkeit hatte Angst vor dem Willen der Bürgerschaft. Jede Aufhebung von wesentlichen Teilen der evangelischen Kirchenordnung, die der markanteste Ausdruck des neuen Glaubens und des neuen Selbstverständnisses der Bürger und Einwohner Nürnbergs war, barg die Gefahr von Unruhen, Aufruhr und Umsturz in sich.

Nuremberg also had to consider the help it had received from all the allies who had come to the aid of Nuremberg, Bamberg and Würzburg during the war. This alliance also included both Catholic and Protestant territorial princes, including Herzog Heinrich II von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (Catholic) and Moritz von Sachsen (Protestant), rendering decisions on policy-making, whether political or religious, a difficult balancing act. It is pertinent to remember that Nuremberg’s declared neutrality during the Fürstenaufstand (1552) had secretly allowed support: for example ‘An dem durch Hans Kleberger vermittelten Darlehen für den französischen Hof sind 12 Nürnberger Handelsgesellschaften

---

70 The sum of 175,000 fl. in damages was demanded (Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 141).
71 KG xxiii, p. 113–21.
72 Hirschmann, ‘Quellen’, p. 54.
mit insgesamt 221.638 Livres beteiligt’. Gerhard Pfeiffer indicates Nuremberg’s attempts to balance this support diplomatically: ‘Es gewährte den aufständischen Fürsten ein hohes Darlehen und erlaubte ihnen Waffenkäufe, sah aber andererseits von Waffenlieferungen an den Kaiser nicht ab’. This duplicity of behaviour as a ‘so-called’ neutral territory had provided Alcibiades with the reason for his invasion of Nuremberg, Bamberg and Wurzburg. The sieges and resultant hardship, the threat to Nuremberg’s chosen faith and the financial problems which were becoming apparent would present Sachs with plenty of ink for his satirical pen.

Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht, das keyser August wolt kauffen is long in comparison to other Fastnachtspiele, but it is also a play of two halves during which the main protagonist dies. Superficially the play portrays the death of a financially over-extended nobleman and the ultimate sale of his household goods in order to repay his creditors. The extensive use of allegory and metaphor hides a complicated political sub-plot. The main character is Superbus, a name which the late-medieval audience would have linked to Superbia, one of the Seven Deadly Sins. An educated audience might think of Lucius Tarquinius Superbus (535–495 BC), known as Tarquin the Proud, the last King of Rome, who had forcibly taken the throne from Servius Tullius (575–535 BC), earning him a reputation as a despot. He was eventually overthrown, which caused the abolition of the Roman monarchy. Sachs uses this reference to introduce a theme: the dangers of pride. The use of this name also reflects the despotic behaviour of Charles V at the Augsburg Reichstag (1547) when he proposed a standing army and threatened the independence of German territories by the imposition of Philipp II of Spain as King of the Germans and subsequently enforced the Interim. The play opens with Superbus ordering his servants to prepare a banquet for noble guests (p. 275, l. 13): ‘Und sag dems koch, das er ein-kauff |

74 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 135 (1550).
75 Pfeiffer, ‘Anstand’, in Nürnberg, p. 168
Wildtpredt, capaun, rephünr und hasen’ (p. 275, ll. 7–8). He instructs his servants to prepare a room for card and dice games (l. 19), ensuring that there is sufficient wine (p. 277, l. 1) and delicacies for his guests (p. 276, ll. 23–25). These images expressing extravagance would have contrasted to the audience’s recent experiences during the sieges when the city became a place of refuge for Nuremberg’s territorial villagers and farmers, leading to food shortages and rationing within the city walls.\footnote{77 Gruner, *Nürnberg*, p. 138 (1552 März).} Those who remained on their farms were even worse off, as Gerhard Gruner observes: ‘1552 Juni: ‘Man findet auch tote Bauern, welche das Gras noch in den Mäulern haben. Das alles aber gereicht beim Markgrafen und seinen Leuten nur zu einem Gelächter’.\footnote{78 Gruner, *Nürnberg*, p. 137.} Furthermore, Nuremberg had been cut off from its trading routes and external food suppliers. Although the end of the war was imminent, it would take years to recover from the damage to the farming infrastructure: hence the description of this banquet was mouth-watering but imaginary for many. Money squandered on food or other luxuries could lead to jealousy and was frowned upon in Nuremberg as wealth in private hands contradicted Luther’s idea of mutual benefit. Merchants and patricians had historically re-invested surplus money into business, so from their point of view this was equally wasteful. Furthermore, the Bible says: ‘Verlasset euch nicht auf Unrecht und Frevel, haltet euch nicht zu solchem, das eitel ist; fällt euch Reichtum zu, so hänget das Herz nicht daran’ (Psalm 62:10). Additionally, the story of the Prodigal Son is based on a fortune being squandered:

Und er sprach: Ein Mensch hatte zwei Söhne. Und der jüngste unter ihnen sprach zu dem Vater: Gib mir, Vater, das Teil der Güter, das mir gehört. Und er teilte ihnen das Gut. Und nicht lange darnach sammelte der jüngste Sohn alles zusammen und zog ferne über Land; und daselbst brachte er sein Gut um mit Prassen. Da er nun all das Seine verzehrt hatte, ward eine große
Teuerung durch dasselbe ganze Land, und er fing an zu darben. (Luke 15:11–32)

Luther also warned in his *Ninety-Five Theses* against squandering money on indulgences.79

The use of Greek names for the servants in this play poses questions about Sachs’s knowledge of Latin and Greek, which he describes as poor in the *Summa all meiner gedicht*.80 His own library lists many classical texts in translation but he must have had some knowledge of Greek to use Dromo and Gnato, the names of the two servants, as they are apt for the roles within the play. The Greek word Dromas translates as run, sprint or hurry, but the phrase *peri tou pantós DROMON thein* has a metaphorical interpretation, meaning ‘to struggle between’ or ‘fight for to be or not to be’, namely, to struggle for existence, which is, as will be illustrated, the fate of these servants.81 The protagonist Gnato is a parasite, sponger or freeloader in a play by Terence called *Eunuchus*, which is not listed in Sachs’s library. Sachs uses the two servants, Dromo and Gnato, to inform the audience that despite outward appearances, Superbus is in debt. Gnato says:

> Juncker, der koch hat mir gesagt,
> Wie das der fischer gelt hab klagt,
> Ir seid in schuldig 40 ducaten,
> Der kün er lenger nit geraten. (p. 277, ll. 5–8)

To put this into context: one Gulden was worth seventy-two Kreuzer and one Thaler equalled sixty-eight Kreuzer. A craftsman, depending on his trade, earned an average of seven Kreuzer per day, hence forty Gulden or Ducats would have been over one year’s income for a fish bill, luxury unimaginable to an audience of craftsmen. If the ‘fischer’ (l. 6) refers to the authority of the Catholic Church as the Pope wears the *Fischerring*, this may refer to payments demanded by the Bishop of Bamberg after the *Interim* for lost

---

80 *KG* XXI, p. 337–44.
81 Dromo is a thieving servant in Johann Reuchlin’s (1455–1522) play *Henno* (c. 1497).
income from Nuremberg’s dissolved monasteries, whilst the Franciscans demanded the return of the *Barfüßerkloster*. 

Superbus then asks his servant if his armour is ready for a jousting tournament (p. 277, ll. 14–16), which refers to the *Gesellenstechen* that took place in Nuremberg amongst patrician sons and was illustrated by Jost Amman in 1560. By using the word *harnisch* for armour, Sachs reminds the audience of the infamous ‘geharnischter Reichstag’ which took place in Augsburg when Charles V punished that city for supporting the Protestants during the Schmalkaldic War. For Nuremberg the threat of any imposition of external regulation or imperial reprisals had an impact on its subsequent decision-making.

Gnato informs Superbus that the armourer demands his payment: ‘Ich sol im dreyssg ducaten bringen’ (l. 19), which is a reference to Judas’s betrayal of Christ for thirty pieces of silver (Matthew 26:15). Here Sachs reminds the audience of the soubriquet earned by Moritz von Sachsen, *Judas von Meißen*, for betraying his father-in-law, Philipp von Hesse, and Johann Friedrich von Sachsen, leaders of the Protestant cause. Judas’s betrayal and the subsequent payment symbolises the ennoblement which Moritz von Sachsen gained for supporting Charles V. Moritz had been regarded as an enemy of the Protestant cause for allying himself with the Catholic Emperor during the Schmalkaldic War; however, he became its champion in 1552, when he led the Protestants in the *Fürstenaufstand*.

Superbus orders Gnato to inform the armourer that he will receive payment as soon as he has borrowed more money from other sources to help him clear this debt (ll. 21–24). Sachs portrays Superbus as living beyond his means, someone who has over-borrowed and who ignores the consequences of his non-payment of debt for others, a practice condemned by Luther:

---

84 See page 88.
Welcher nu solche finantze treibt odder treiben mus, wie denen geschicht, die mehr auff borg keuffen, denn sie bezalen mugen (als wenn einer kaum zwei hundert gulden vermag und füret einen handel auff funff odder sechs hundert gulden). Wenn nu meine schuldiger nicht zalen, so kann ich auch nicht zalen, so frist der unrad weitter ein, und kompt ein verlust auff de ander, ihe mehr ich diese finantz treibe, bis ich mercke, Es wolle an galgen, ich muss entlauffen odder zum thorm sitzen, So schweige ich stille und gebe meinen Borgern gute wort.  

Superbus now focuses on the arrival of new clothes:

Heut solt auch zu mir auff den morgen
Der alte hoffschneider sein kommen,
Zwey welsche tuch habn außgenummen,
Das er hoffkleider het gmacht,
Das ich nach adelichem bracht
Ewr, meiner knecht, ein ehre het. (ll. 27–32)

The need for ‘hoffkleider’ could be a reference to the ennoblement of Moritz von Sachsen, who received the Electorship of Sachsen at the Augsburg Reichstag (1547), and to the red silk clothes he needed for the ceremony. Dromo replies that the ‘hoffschneider’ complains that the invoice for material procured by the ‘gwandtschneyder’ has not been paid and that that ‘hoffschneider’ will not pay Superbus’s bill (p. 278, ll. 1–6). An explanation of the different tailors is needed here: the importation and sale of luxury cloths such as silks and velvets were the role of a *gwandtschneyder*, whereas a *tucher* sold basic materials. Significantly, Sachs refers to a *gwandtschneyder* in an earlier *Fastnachtspiel* entitled *Ein kürtzweylig fastnacht-spiel von einem bösen weib, hat fünff person* (8 October

85 LW XV, p. 309, ll. 17–24.
During this earlier play, which questions the role of women in the home, the wife shrieks at the apprentice:

Geh hin und ward deiner werckstatt!

Der meister dir geliehen hat,

Das du solt zalen den gwandschneyder. (p. 53, ll. 13–15)

This *Fastnachtspiel* was written after Sachs was criticised by the Council for writing anti-Catholic verses for the work by Andreas Osiander and the lines above appear to reflect the sentiments of the Council when read in conjunction with the Council’s own records in 1527:

Item Han(n)s Sachßen, schuester, ist gesagt, es sey dis tag ein buechlin ausgegangen on wissen und willens eins erbern Raths, welches besser unterwegen gelassen were, an solichem buechlin hab er die Reymen zue den figuren gemacht. Nun sey solichs seynes ampts nit, gepüre ime auch nicht, darumb eines rath ernster befelch, das er seins Handtwerks und schüechmachens warte, sich auch enthalte, eynich buechlin oder Reymen hinzü ausgeen zu lassen, ein erber rath wurd sunst ir notruft gegen ime handeln.  

This record, advising Sachs to concentrate on his craft rather than writing, left him in no doubt of the precariousness of his position; and if Sachs uses the word *Schneider* metaphorically here, it could refer to the work of a censor, whose role it is to cut seditious material. Censorship had been strictly observed in 1527 in order to protect Nuremberg’s relationship with the Emperor; similarly, after the Schmalkaldic War censorship of Protestant texts had increased. Charles V introduced Empire-wide censorship after the *Interim* in order to protect existing Catholic publications and to deter Protestant sects other

---

87 KG v, pp. 47–65.  
88 See page 11.  
89 Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 84.  
90 Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 81.
than Lutheranism. He also demanded stricter rules for authors, printers, booksellers and even purchasers of books. Specifically, the Emperor had complained about a work from Nuremberg dated 1551, *Ains Warnung buchlin, wie man sich für der Papisten groben und Dopischen, unnd der neuen Listigen und Teuschenden Leren hueten soll*, written by Erasmus Sarcerio and printed by Hans Taubman in the Judengasse, around the corner from Hans Sachs’s workshop. Sachs’s earlier experience of censorship informed his perception of how dangerous criticism of either the Catholic Church or the *Interim* could be for himself and others.

That Sachs uses two different types of *Schneider* in the play being analysed here, indicates that differences in their interpretation or role must be significant. In the case of the *gwandtschneider*, Sachs provides clarity:

```
Das der gwandtschneider muß erworgen!
Ich het den gwandtschneideren allen
In Rom all ir tücher zu zallen. (p. 278, ll. 8–10)
```

The reference to Rome is repeated later in the same speech: ‘Viel gwandtschneider sindt noch in Rom’ (l. 13). Sachs could be reminding his audience of the accusations made by Luther about the extravagance of the papal court in *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des Christlichen Standes Besserung* (1520). Sachs links *gewandtschneider* with Rome and in doing so suggests that the criticism or censorship comes from a Catholic source, whether religious or secular. Similarly, references to the *hoffschneider* (p. 278, l. 2) could allude to someone with authority from a noble house or in the King’s or Emperor’s retinue.

Significantly, Sachs did not publish the earlier play, *Von einem bösen weib* (1533), until 8 October 1553, twenty years after its creation and one month after *Der verdorben*
edelman mit dem weichen beht was written. The repetition of specific vocabulary in 1553 to indicate the role and workings of a Schneider suggest that censorship was at the forefront of his mind again. This begs the following question: did something stir Sachs to action which caused him to publish and be damned? The answer is the silencing of two of Nuremberg’s greatest Lutheran preachers, Andreas Osiander (1498–1552) and Veit Dietrich (1506–1549), who had both been integral to the development of Lutheranism in Nuremberg since its adoption and who both disagreed with the adoption of the Interim in 1548. In 1550 Sachs had written about their fate in the Tragedia mit sechs personen Die Enthauptung Johannis, in which he uses the martyrdom of John the Baptist as an allegory for both Osiander’s and Dietrich’s downfall. Stephen L. Wailes explains: ‘Hans Sachs dated his play Die Enthauptung Johannis in January 1550, and the most recent editors suspect it expresses his bitter disappointment at the developments unfavourable to German Lutheranism’. In another work, Das Interim (21 August 1548), which covers the repercussions for Nuremberg due to the imposition of the Interim, Sachs portrays the Pope and the Emperor allegorically as Saturn and Jupiter, but neither work explicitly names either Osiander or Dietrich. Moreover, Sachs realised that these two works were sensitive and could lead to censorship as neither was published in his lifetime. Osiander’s commitment to the Lutheran cause commenced at the start of the Reformation in 1520, when he was appointed to the Augustinian monastery as a teacher of Hebrew. His long service to Lutheranism and Nuremberg rendered his downfall and exile incomprehensible to his supporters. Although Sachs knew Osiander from their collaboration in 1527, it is not known whether Sachs still supported Osiander, especially after the latter’s attack on

94 KG XI, pp. 198–212.
95 Wailes, ‘Hans Sachs’, 399.
96 KG XXII, pp. 439–45.
97 Sachs wrote this play on 21 August shortly after Osiander’s sermon about the Interim on 3 August 1548 (Theiß, ‘Der Bürger’, p. 85).
99 Osiander was a preacher at the Lorenzkirche, where Sachs was a congregant.
Lutheran doctrine from his place of exile, Königsberg. However, from Wailes’s article it becomes apparent that Sachs felt aggrieved by the treatment meted out to Nuremberg’s good servants of Lutheranism.

Osiander was regarded as a zealot by some in the patrician Council and had crossed Hieronymus Baumgartner on several occasions in the past. Osiander had advised joining the League of Schmalkalden in 1531, which was at odds with the desires of Nuremberg’s Council. The high-spirited celebration during Fastnacht, the Schembartlauf, was banned during a review of Catholic celebrations in 1523, when Osiander preached a sermon against this traditional event. This event was organised by the patrician sons and the ban caused upset amongst the upper classes. When the Council allowed its re-instatement in 1539, the Hölle or sledge depicted Osiander standing between a gambling astronomer and priest, causing both Osiander and Luther to complain, which resulted in a total ban of the Schembartlauf. His unpopularity did not prevent Osiander from representing Nuremberg at religious discussions with the imperial authorities during the Hagenau religious talks (1540), which were reconvened in Worms later that year (1540–41). During the second session Osiander argued with the imperial theologian, Nicholas Perrenot de Granvelle (1486–1550), and clashed with fellow Protestant representatives, significantly with Philipp Melanchthon. Reports reached Nuremberg about this debacle which caused the Council to revoke Osiander’s mandate and to order his return to Nuremberg. From this point forward Osiander was replaced at religious meetings by Veit Dietrich.

In 1548 Nuremberg’s Council came under pressure to adopt the Interim; however, it recognised that this would prove to be difficult:
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100 See page 82–83.
101 Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 76.
102 Stewart, Before Bruegel, pp. 45–47.
104 Osiander, Die Reformation, p. 193
Die Mehrheit der Bevölkerung in der fränkischen Metropole lehnte jede Veränderung der seit 1533 geltenden evangelischen Kirchenordnung unerbittlich ab. Jede Maßnahme zur Einführung der interimistischen Kirchenordnung barg infolge der erregten Stimmung in der Bürgerschaft die Gefahr eines politischen Umsturzes in sich.\[^{105}\]

As the Council needed everyone to accept the terms of the *Interim* they reluctantly sought Osiander’s help, as a popular religious leader, to persuade the population of the good intentions contained in the *Interim*. Osiander responded by rejecting the *Interim* and writing detailed objections. At this point the Council asked all priests to moderate their rhetoric, but Osiander, who believed that the Council’s compliance with the *Interim* showed cowardice and a betrayal of the Lutheran faith, would not be silenced and preached a sermon to this effect.\[^{106}\]

Osiander was then asked to submit future sermons to the censor for approval. On 20 June 1548, the Council agreed to accept the terms of the *Interim* without the agreement of Nuremberg’s religious community.\[^{107}\]

Hieronymus Paumgartner, who by 1553 had become the highest religious authority on the Council, believed Council decision-making in the early days of the Reformation had not been restricted by religious politics. Gunter Zimmermann agrees: ‘Mit der Zustimmung zur Botschaft Luthers (nicht in einem konfessionsspezifischen Sinne verstanden) konnten im Rahmen der Nürnberger Politik divergente politische Ziele verfolgt werden’,\[^{108}\] which seems applicable to this later decision. The Council were aware that their unilateral decision lacked support and, in an effort to persuade the local priests, invited Johannes Agricola (1494–1556) and Joachim II von Brandenburg, a Protestant Elector, to the city to explain the *Interim*.\[^{109}\]

\[^{105}\] Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 76–77
\[^{106}\] Osiander, *Reformation*, p. 197.
\[^{107}\] Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 77.
\[^{108}\] Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 64.
\[^{109}\] Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 78.
Naumburg-Zeitz, and Michael Helding, Suffragan Bishop of Mainz, as the authors of the 
*Interim*. Therefore, Agricola was regarded with suspicion by the city’s priests. Gunter 
Zimmermann says: ‘Die Nürnberger Theologen standen dem Mitautor des Interims 
erheblich kritischer gegenüber als die Politiker’.\(^{110}\) Osiander increased his own 
unpopularity by insulting these imperial representatives, which caused a flurry of letters of 
apology to Agricola from Hieronymus Paumgartner. According to Gunther Zimmermann: 
‘Das Bedürfnis nach Harmonie scheint Baumgartner öfters dazu gebracht zu haben, 
Übereinstimmungen und Einhelligkeiten da anzunehmen, wo kein Anlaß für eine solch 
positive Einschätzung vorlag’.\(^{111}\) Osiander preached again against the *Interim* and the 
*Kaiser* on 4 August without submitting his sermon for approval; hence he was banned from 
进一步 attempts to preach in Nuremberg. In an attempt to gain the moral high ground 
Osiander wrote a song of six stanzas entitled *Es ist als Kampf- und Spottlied zu verstehen 
und soll in polemischer Weise vor einem Rückfall in vorreformatorische Zeiten warnen*.\(^{112}\) 
This song was aimed at the three aforementioned drafters of the *Interim* and, fearing 
Nuremberg’s response, Osiander left the city in November 1548. He fled to Königsberg 
under the protection of Herzog Albrecht von Preußen (1490–1568), taking a position at the 
University, from where he made clear his disappointment at Melanchthon’s interpretation 
of the Lutheran faith. Although Sachs and Osiander held similar views about the threat to 
Lutheranism in Nuremberg, it is not known whether Sachs continued to follow Osiander’s 
radical interpretations of Luther’s views. There is a tantalizing fact about Agricola which 
could change the interpretation of this play, namely that his birth name was ‘Schneider’ or 
‘Schnitter’, so Sachs may have singled out Agricola for his authorship of the *Interim*, his 
role in the destruction of Lutheranism and help in silencing Osiander, making him singly 
the *gwanntscheider* or jointly with Michael Helding and Julius Pflug.

\(^{110}\) Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 79. 
\(^{111}\) Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 80. 
\(^{112}\) Wailes, ‘Hans Sachs’, 408–09.
To return to the play, Superbus instructs his servants to lie about his presence when Avarus comes to call, saying: ‘Den wuchrer und den geitzing jüden, | Den nehrwolff unde den gelt-rüden!’ (p. 278, ll. 21–22). The descriptive word ‘nehrwolff’ or ‘nährwolf’ is used by Sachs to mean a ‘geiziger wolf’.\(^\text{113}\) Winfried Theiß indicates that Sachs uses the characteristics of animals as allegories for human behaviour, wolves being indicators of greed or avarice\(^\text{114}\) and in addition an indicator for non-believers or those against Luther.\(^\text{115}\) The word ‘gelt-rüden’ adds emphasis to this meaning, as the use of ‘rüde’ in conjunction with a wolf or dog denotes the male animal and Jews were known as the teufels rüden.\(^\text{116}\) Sachs thus reminds the audience of their cultural memories of Jewish moneylenders and attributes the worse type of avarice to Avarus. Within these two lines Sachs emphasises his purpose: the portrayal of an avaricious man who uses other people’s money for his own gain, which mirrors the behaviour of Reichenburger in the previous play.

Alcibiades, Nuremberg’s attacker, had a reputation for living beyond his means, as had his father Kasimir (1481–1527), who also had a reputation for being mean and miserly.\(^\text{117}\) Kasimir, who was descended from the Hohenzollern dynasty, had inherited Brandenburg-Kulmbach on the death of his father Friedrich V (1460–1536). Friedrich had divided his territory Brandenburg-Kulmbach-Ansbach into two margravates, leaving Kasimir financially distressed as he inherited the poorer portion. Kasimir introduced compulsory military training and established an effective mercenary army,\(^\text{118}\) which Alcibiades inherited, enabling him to take commissions from the royal houses of Europe and thus supplement his income. In the analysis of the previous play it was mentioned that to fund his mercenary army he had raised money by pawning his official positions.\(^\text{119}\) The

\(^{113}\) DWB see nährwolf.

\(^{114}\) Theiß, Allegorik, p. 123.

\(^{115}\) Theiß, Allegorik, p. 132.

\(^{116}\) DWB see rüde (m).

\(^{117}\) Kneitz, Plassenburg, pp. 26–28.

\(^{118}\) Kneitz, Plassenburg, pp. 10–11.

\(^{119}\) See p. 120.
method of financing his army and the extravagant lifestyle demanded by his presence at royal courts is mirrored by Sachs’s portrait of Superbus.

Avarus informs the audience that Superbus has mortgaged his goods and chattels to him (p. 279, ll. 2–3) without ever paying interest on the loan (p. 279, l. 6). He now threatens to shame him: ‘Sol er nit sicher in Rom bleiben | Ich wil in offentlich beschemen’ (p. 279, ll. 10–11). ‘In Rom bleiben’ could be a metaphor for support of the Catholic Emperor or the Pope and hence Sachs mocks the behaviour of Moritz von Sachsen or Alcibiades, who had both supported the Emperor in the Schmalkaldic War. Just as Sachs had used the death of John the Baptist to represent the fate of two people, Veit Dietrich and Andreas Osiander, he appears to be using Superbus to embody characteristics of both Moritz von Sachsen and Alcibiades.

Gnato, the knecht, informs Dromo that he has not been paid:

Ich wolt, ich wer vom junckern zalt,
Ist mir schuldig drey jar dienstlan
Ich habe nur zwen ducaten dran. (p. 279, ll. 21–23)

This was contrary to Luther’s belief that a labourer was worthy of his hire (Luke 10:7). The text illustrates that Superbus has distorted priorities regarding those who work for him. Similarly, this could be criticism of Alcibiades’s behaviour towards his mercenaries, who pillaged as they rampaged through the territorial lands to compensate for the lack of the rewards promised to them by Alcibiades if they invaded Nuremberg. Dromo seems to have had his own suspicions:

Wie unser Juncker heltet hauß
Mit so uberschwencklichen bracht,

---

120 If Avarus represents Furtenbach this is factually true. Alcibiades only partially repaid the mortgages he had taken from Furtenbach, who then pursued Alcibiades’s relatives for this debt after the latter had died (see Häberlein, Bruder, p. 226).
121 LW XV, p. 296, l. 10.
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Hab ich mir heimlich offt gedacht,
Es wer sein in die leng nit tragen. (p. 279, ll. 26–29)

This provides another link to the history of the Brandenburg-Ansbach dynasty: Alcibiades’s grandfather, Friedrich V von Brandenburg-Ansbach (1460–1536), had squandered his fortune and was imprisoned by his sons Georg der Fromme and Kasimir von Brandenburg-Ansbach for thirteen years for impoverishing the rest of the family.123

Although extravagance was frowned upon by Nuremberg’s Council, increasing numbers of its upper classes lived dissolutely. For example, in 1549 Paulus Pfinzing had annual expenses of 2,365 florins, whereas a weaver only earned 100 florins per annum,124 which indicates the difference in the level of hardship experienced by the ordinary citizen in comparison to Nuremberg’s wealthy elite. Gnato describes Superbus’s comportment when he is at court:

Mit kleydung auff aller manier,
Mit ketten, kleinaten und zier,
Mit schlittenfaren und pursieren,
Mit schlemmen, demmen banckatieren.
Mit rennen, stechen und thurnieren

Des weydtwercks ich geschweigen will. (p. 279, ll. 34–36 to p. 280, ll. 1–7)

‘Pursieren’ or purschieren or burschieren means to behave like dissolute young men at leisure, living indulgently with no study.125 ‘Schlemmen’ and ‘demm’ (dämmen) are often used to indicate a life of gluttony and indulgence, a phrase which Martin Luther uses frequently.126 This dissolute life corresponds to Karl-Heinz Blaschke’s judgement of Moritz von Sachsen’s behaviour at the geharnischter Reichstag in Augsburg:

---

123 Kneitz, Plassenb, p. 11.
124 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 134 (1549).
125 DWB see burschieren.
126 For an example see LW X, p. 17, l. 25.
In bezug auf sein Privatleben scheint ihm in jenen Wochen, ähnlich wie auf
den Feldzügen, wieder seine ganze Vollblütigkeit durchgegangen zu sein,
denn ein Zeitgenosse berichtet von Zügellosigkeit, von viel Bekannschaft
mit dem bayrischen Frauenzimmer und einem Haushalten, daß der Teufel
eine recht Freude daran gehabt habe und die ganze Stadt vom Gerede
darüber erfüllt gewesen sei.  

Sachs’s description also echoes the reputation of Albrecht Alcibiades: ‘Er zeigte von klein
auf keine Lust zum Lernen, sondern übte sich früh in Reiten und Streiten, Saufen und
Raufen’.  

This is an example of Sachs using Superbus to embody both Moritz von
Sachsen and Alcibiades.

Dromo now says: ‘Er hat leichter vier roß am barn’ (l. 12). This curious local idiom
is used by Sachs in other plays and is similar in meaning to ‘das ross ist mir in den barn
gesprungen’, or to have suffered economic losses, which describes Alcibiades’ financial
situation. By using a local phrase Sachs uses cultural signposts to direct the audience to
consider their own financial predicament and their experiences during
the sieges. Gnato
then informs the audience that Superbus has been selling and pawning his possessions (p.
281, ll. 7–9).

The use of allegory and metaphor in the first part of the play renders this an
extremely satirical but difficult-to-comprehend Fastnachtspiel. Sachs’s purpose is to
represent the evil of living beyond one’s means, which he does by illustrating the behaviour
of Superbus through his dealings with tradesmen and servants. At the same time he hints
at the behaviour of recognizable people who can be criticised for the same faults, in this
case Alcibiades or Moritz von Sachsen, but who were already culpable, in Sachs’s eyes,
for their support of the Emperor in the Schmalkaldic War and the damage to Lutheranism.

127 Karl-Heinz Blaschke, Moritz von Sachsen: Ein Reformationsfürst der zweiten Generation (Göttingen:
128 Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 323.
129 DWB see ross (5).
Sachs’s clues to their identity facilitate recognition of them and help the audience to compare their existence since the war to that of the nobility or wealthy citizens. The allusions to Osiander and Dietrich through the references to the Schneider have been subtle but that changes at this point in the play, when Sachs alludes to what appears to be a ridiculous story about a bed, a disguised version of an embarrassing actual event in Nuremberg.

During the previous conversation between Dromo and Gnato the audience hears of Superbus’s sudden death (p. 282, ll. 1–5) and are made to reflect on the moral aspect of his actions:

Er hat im selber ubel than,
Mit seinem unörnlichen leben
Hat er zum todt im ursach geben,
Her noch gelebt manch schönen tag. (p. 282, ll. 9–12)

Sachs’s moral is that people should live within their means, ‘[d]enn Geiz ist eine Wurzel alles Übels; das hat etliche gelüstet und sind vom Glauben irregegangen und machen sich selbst viel Schmerzen’ (1 Timothy 6:10). Gnato believes that Superbus’s death can be explained by his conscience:

Die schuldt sein hertz im abgenagen
Der hat er nit künnen vergessen,
Hat das als heimlich in sich gfressen.
Wann ihm hat die zukünftig schandt
Im hertzen thon gar weh und andt,
Die im uber den haß wolt gehn. (p. 282, ll. 16–21)

Sachs has allowed two uneducated and poorly paid servants to reflect on the cause of his death, acknowledging that poverty does not prevent people from recognising the sin of avarice in others. Superbus embodies most of the Mortal Sins as he has committed Avarice,
Gluttony, Pride, Lust and Envy. Sloth can be added as he did no work to achieve his wealth and all these sins can be attributed to both Moritz von Sachsen and Alcibiades.

Superbus’s demise in the middle of the play allows the audience to hear other judgements on his character by new protagonists and accordingly, Sachs moves the action to the court of Keyser Augustus, a reference to the first Roman Emperor Augustus (63 BC – AD14). Theiß points to Sachs’s use of Greek and Roman gods in the role of a judge in situations of dispute, but here his use of Augustus may reflect the recent arguments about imperial succession and the division of the Empire. Augustus has been misled about Superbus’s true financial position due to the latter’s appearance of wealth in court circles. He demands the latest news: ‘Bey der römischen ritterschaft?’ (p. 282, l. 29). Thitus, an advisor, responds. Sachs’s choice of this name is apt as it refers to Titus (39–81AD), son of Vespasian (9–79 AD), who was the first Roman Emperor to inherit the position from his father. A similar familial inheritance had been proposed by Charles V but an alliance known as the Heidelberg League had been established in June 1553 to prevent Philip II’s accession as Emperor in Germany. After the Fürstenaufstand Ferdinand I had gained enough support from the German Princes to demand a Hapsburgian dynastic inheritance. This hereditary title replaced the former electoral system of appointing the King of the Germans, which consequently allowed Ferdinand’s son, Maximilian II, to inherit the title, making Sachs’s allusion both relevant and topical.

Thitus informs Augustus of Superbus’s death, calling him: ‘de[r] Superbus, mit seinem zunamen Lotus’ (p. 282, ll. 34–35). The lotus, according to medieval belief, signified pride or perfection, which accords with Superbus’s name. In Greek mythology a story about lotus flowers occurs in Homer’s Die Irrfahrt Vlyssis, a copy of which Sachs had in his own library. Odysseus’s ship is blown onto islands where the natives eat lotus

---

130 Theiß, Allegorik, p. 113.
131 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 331.
flowers which have a narcotic effect. Observing the effect of the flowers on his men, Odysseus forces them to return to their boat and leave the island. Classical writers interpreted this story as a metaphor for forgetting or being unmindful.\textsuperscript{132} Other commentators read this as a metaphor for the struggle to overcome temptation or meaningless pleasures. Both these interpretations forge links to the theory that Superbus could not face his responsibilities or resist earthly temptation.

In response Augustus calls Superbus ‘ein fein person’ (p. 283, l. 7) and talks of his generosity (ll. 9–10), his musical abilities (l. 13), his choice of entertainments (ll. 14–15), his jousting abilities (ll. 16–19) and his courteousness. The attempts to persuade Augustus that Superbus was not all he seemed mirror the Emperor’s hesitance to declare Alcibiades a traitor, then a few months later to accept him back into the ‘fold’ by not forcing him to pay reparations to Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{133}

Sachs then introduces a new courtier, Fabius, a possible reference to the Greek dictator Fabius Maximus (c.280 BC – 203 BC), known for his military tactics when fighting Hannibal. This could be another reference to Alcibiades’s military reputation as Fabius was known to deprive the enemy of food as part of guerrilla warfare tactics, which had been the effect of Alcibiades’s siege of Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{134} Plutarch wrote about this in \textit{Von den 46 durchlauchtigen Mannen}, also listed in Sachs’s library contents. Fabius replies: ‘Superbus was wol höffelich, | Hat aber ubel ghalten hauß’ (p. 283, ll. 26–27). Sachs uses the old saying: ‘Hoffart und Armut halten übel Haus’, or ‘a proud mind and a beggar’s purse do not go together well’,\textsuperscript{135} an apt description of Superbus’s situation. Augustus has been deceived by Superbus’s outward show of wealth, which would remind the audience that appearances can be deceptive, a similar message to that in the \textit{Der verdorben Edelman}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{132} <http://www.britannica.com/topic/Lotus-Eater> [accessed: 3 June 2016].
\item \textsuperscript{133} Gruner, \textit{Nürnberg}, p. 138 (25.08 1552).
\item \textsuperscript{134}<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Quintus-Fabius-Maximus-Verrucosus> [accessed: 3 June 2016].
\item \textsuperscript{135}<http://www.zitate-online.de:443/sprichwoerter/altvaeterliche/7396/hoffart-und-armut-halten-uebelhaus.html> [accessed: 3 June 2016].
\end{itemize}
Here the warning is about the desire for wealth leading to avarice and squandering. Fabius informs Augustus of Superbus’s financial status:

Er hat in Rom und auß der stadt
Vast als verpfendet was er hat,
Gelt auffgenommen nach der bauß
Und überflüssig geben auß. (p. 284, ll. 2–5)

This description corresponds to reports about Alcibiades, who had mortgaged his official positions to Furtenbach, an act which lost him an income of 14,000 florins. He had borrowed heavily: ‘nach dem bauß’ means copiously or abundantly. The last two lines imply that Superbus impoverished himself, his wife and children, an accusation pertinent to Alcibiades’s grandfather, Friedrich V, who had left the dynasty impoverished through bad advice, squandering, failed investments and an overgenerous support for the military actions of Maximilian I.

Fabius then reports that Superbus’s creditors were about to have him arrested for non-payment of debts (ll. 17–18). Keyser Augustus cannot understand and says: ‘Ach, was hat in denn noht angegangen? | Weyl in armut reit der massen’ (p. 284, ll. 20–21). Having changed his mind, Augustus decries Superbus’s wasteful expenditure, which, if he had lived prudently, could have saved him (p. 284, ll. 22–25). In this exchange Sachs highlights the hardships that the poor in society suffer through no fault of their own, whereas a rich man who has squandered his wealth endangers himself and society, as his wasted money could have supported the poor through donations to the Gemeinnutz. Thitus tells Augustus that Superbus’s pride prevented him from admitting his poverty (p. 284, ll. 27–31), which would have become apparent when his creditors sold his goods and chattels to resolve the debt (ll. 32–35). Augustus decides to buy the bed, saying:

---

Das beht, das kost gleych was es wöl,

Kein gelt das gar nit hinder söl,

Ich muß sein beht haben kurtzumb. (p. 285, ll. 6–8)

The clue to understanding the satire found in the second half of the play is ‘das beht’ so desired by Augustus, which is a reference to the cause of Veit Dietrich’s downfall. Dietrich had already found himself at odds with the Council before this incident. Charles V, who was suffering from gout, visited Nuremberg one month before the Battle of Mühlberg (24 April 1547) under the protection of the Duke of Alba’s troops. Nuremberg felt obliged to present a welcoming front and honoured him by opening one of the main gates for him to process through. Charles V also demanded to hear Mass in St Katherine’s Convent, permission for which the Rat refused but they felt it prudent to accede to his demands for a loan of 100,000 Gulden.138 After the Emperor’s departure several divisions of the Duke of Alba’s troops remained and, having been divided into three groups, they were billeted around Gräfenberg, Hersbruck and the Kirchhof in Altdorf, respectively north, north-east and south-east of the city, almost surrounding it.139 Understandably the city felt pressurized into maintaining a neutral stance with the presence of imperial troops. Veit Dietrich and another priest at St Egidien both preached sermons about the violent behaviour of these troops on 1 May 1547. The Rat demanded that all future sermons be submitted to the censor before Sunday worship.140 Then, in a subsequent sermon delivered on 18 May about the consequences of the potential re-Catholicization of Nuremberg’s churches in accordance with the terms of the Interim, Dietrich predicted that the Catholic Church would demand financial recompense for former Catholic properties. In the congregation was King Ferdinand’s representative Christoph von Gendorf (1497–1563), who believed the King to have been slighted in this sermon.141 Consequently, Gendorf demanded Dietrich’s

138 Kusch, Nürnberg, p. 321.
139 Will, Altdorf, p. 74.
140 Klaus, Dietrich, p. 260.
141 Klaus, Dietrich, pp. 262–63.
immediate removal from his role within the Church, a demand which the Council refused. Dietrich then angered the Council by criticising the Losung, or wealth tax, in a sermon, suggesting that this system was open to abuse by the wealthiest people who could lie about their true income, thereby reducing the amount of tax payable to support the Gemeinnutz.142 Furthermore, he suggested that if loans such as those given to the Emperor and the French King were not repaid, it was the poorest people who filled the hole in the coffers by paying increased taxation, whereas the rich received benefits instead of repayment, such as Furtenbach’s ennoblement.143 In a sermon delivered on 12 June Dietrich then attacked the King’s representative by accusing Gendorf of being party to the gift of a bed for Ferdinand I. According to Gendorf’s complaint, Dietrich had besmirched his reputation: ‘[....] als solt er mit eim schönen peth (Bett) unds sonst vinantzerey (Wucher, Betrug) treiben’.144 There is no record of the purpose of the gift of a bed but it could have been perceived as bribery for some favour, which, in light of Gendorf’s complaint that Dietrich had suggested that avarice and deceit were at play, suggests that there was an expectation of gain. Gendorf’s co-conspirators in the gift of the gilded bed were Hans Ebner and Bonaventura Furtenbach, both of whom owned Bohemian mines and whose rise to fame and wealth through mining and coin-production paralleled that of Furtenbach; similarly, they all had reputations for poor business practices and it is noteworthy that Furtenbach gained his ennoblement around this date.145 This is the bed that is so important to Augustus, who wants it despite its being the property of a wastrel!

Censorship of Dietrich over the affair of a bed seems risible; however, Gendorf was a dangerous man who employed spies in Nuremberg to provide him with information which he then relayed back to the King. Consequently, when Gendorf demanded Dietrich’s arrest

142 Strauss describes how easy it was to cheat the system (Strauss, Nuremberg, pp. 71–74).
143 Klaus, Dietrich, p. 264.
144 Klaus, Dietrich, p. 255.
145 Häberlein, Brüder, p. 227.
and his informant’s name, the Council were obliged to act.\textsuperscript{146} They attempted to placate Gendorf, saying that the accusation of avarice made during the sermon was aimed at the general population and not at Gendorf personally. This did not satisfy Gendorf, who now said that he had bought the bed at the behest of the King. Dietrich, clearly distressed, wrote in a letter to his friend Albrecht von Preußen about the truth of his sermon:

\begin{quote}
Weil ich das Zeugnis meines Gewissens habe, das ich […] meiner Predigt halber nicht unrecht gethan habe, dass in solcher gräulicher Wucherhändel, die Land und Leute in Noth führten, meinem Amte nach gestraft habe, kümmere ich mich um das Folgende lauter nicht.\textsuperscript{147}
\end{quote}

Gendorf was determined to inform the King that Dietrich had besmirched the reputation of the King and Emperor\textsuperscript{148} and, fearful of the consequences, the Council suspended Dietrich from his religious duties on 17 June, blaming the inflammatory speech Dietrich had made about the \textit{Losung} tax.\textsuperscript{149} Thus, when Sachs refers to a \textit{hoffschneider} in the first half of the play (p. 278, ll. 1–6), he probably means Gendorf, who, as the King’s representative, censored or silenced Dietrich.

Augustus still insists that he wants the bed (l. 15) and Fabius describes the Emperor’s existing bed in all its glory (p. 285, ll. 21–25): ‘Auff gulden seuln gemacht von flader’. This may well be a description of the ‘golden bed’ given to Ferdinand I.\textsuperscript{150} When questioned about his motives for wanting the bed, Augustus replies that Superbus’s bed will be better:

\begin{quote}
Weil er darrinen schlaffen thet
Und in stiller ruh darrin lag
Offt biß an den hohen mittag
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{146} Klaus, \textit{Dietrich}, p. 265.
\textsuperscript{147} Klaus, \textit{Dietrich}, p. 265.
\textsuperscript{148} Klaus, \textit{Dietrich}, p. 266.
\textsuperscript{149} Klaus, \textit{Dietrich}, p. 267.
\textsuperscript{150} Klaus, \textit{Dietrich}, p. 265.
In solcher grossen, schweren schuldt. (p. 286, ll. 1–4)

Sleeping in this bed was Superbus’s means of avoiding thinking of his debts and creditors and Sachs uses it as a metaphor for a lack of conscience and sloth in not tackling his debts. If Augustus wants this bed because he, too, wants to avoid thinking about his problems, then Sachs is also assigning Superbus’s sins to him. Consequently, if Sachs uses Augustus to represent Charles V, then he is treading on dangerous ground as Sloth can mean failure to direct one’s thoughts towards God.\textsuperscript{151} Augustus continues by observing, ‘Was unglücks hat der man erduldt’ (p. 286, l. 5). This gives us insight into Augustus’s interpretation of Superbus’s fate. ‘Unglück’ means lack of success, or misfortune and Augustus believes that Superbus was merely unsuccessful in managing his creditors, not an excuse afforded to the poorer debtors in Nuremberg, as will be discussed regarding \textit{Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent} in the next chapter.

Augustus continues:

\begin{quote}
Der schuldiger groß überlauffen,

Und ir uhnwirser, schnod ahnschnauffen,

Ire trowort, mordtgeschrey und waffen! (p. 286, ll. 6–8)
\end{quote}

This image of Superbus’s debtors does not match the image that the audience would recognize as those he owed money to were in the most part tradesman or servants. Line 8 particularly implies a threat of violence which could refer to the behaviour of Alcibiades’s troops or the initial cause of Dietrich’s conflict with the Council, the behaviour of the Duke of Alba’s troops.

Part of the next speech by Fabius (p. 286, ll. 17–22) will have more significance in the analysis of Augustus’s closing speech and will be considered at that point. Fabius closes his speech by reminding the audience of Superbus’s overspending:

\begin{quote}
Hat der nit zu bezalen gwist
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{151} Colossians 3:23: “Alles, was ihr tut, das tut als Herzen von dem Herrn und nicht den Menschen”.
Both Moritz von Sachsen and Albrecht Alcibiades led mercenary armies in pursuit of war, a service for which they received payment. As Alcibiades was in debt to his own mercenaries, ‘Dienstgelt’ may reflect the idea that he had squandered his earnings on luxury before paying his soldiers.

Augustus delivers the Christian moral messages in this play, the first being ‘Hofert geht form verderer her’ (p. 286, l. 35). This is from Proverbs, 16:18 ‘Wer zu Grunde gehen soll, der wird zuvor stolz; und Hochmut kommt vor dem’. He continues saying, ‘Ein eiglicher nach seinem standt’ (p. 287, l. 1), a sentiment taken from the Ephesians 4:1–16, verse one of which says: ‘So ermahne nun euch ich Gefangener in dem HERRN, daß ihr wandelt, wie sich’s gebührt eurer Berufung, mit der ihr berufen seid’. Augustus continues by using a biblically sourced homily: ‘Denn im sein pfluge mag ernern’ (l. 4) (Galatians 6:7), which refers to the way Adam was forced to live after leaving the Garden of Eden.\(^{152}\) Sachs’s use of these biblical quotations reminds the audience of their cultural identity as Christians and of the moral values important to Nuremberg. At the same time he reminds them of their obligation to obey the Word of God as taught by the Bible, which is the basis of Lutheranism.

Not content with biblical sources, Sachs then turns to secular morals found in fables: ‘Dieweil die wölff essen kein zil’ (l. 12). A ‘zil’ is a hedgehog and there are two Greek fables concerning hedgehogs: one is an early Greek fable mentioned by Sebastian Brant and copied from Heinrich Steinhöwel (1412–1482), based on a fable from Themistocles (b. 524 BC) and found in later copies of Aesop; and the other is from a much earlier Greek fable by Archilochus (680–645 BC). The Aesop fable involves a fox, not a wolf, but this

\(^{152}\) 1 Moses 3:23 (In Luther’s Bible 1545 1 Moses is the book of Genesis).
change possibly relates back to Sachs’s use of wolves earlier in the play (p. 278, ll. 21–22). The fox is swept away by strong currents and lies dying in a river plagued by flies. The hedgehog, viewing the scene from dry land, offers to drive away the blood-sucking flies, to which the fox replies that he can stand the ones that are satiated, but if the hedgehog drives them away they will be replaced by others still hungry for his blood.\textsuperscript{153} One source for the moral of this story says, ‘When we throw off rulers or dependents, who have already made the most of us, we do but, for the most part, lay ourselves open to others, who will make us bleed yet more freely’.\textsuperscript{154} This mirrors Nuremberg’s dilemma, since by abandoning the Lutheran faith and accepting the \textit{Interim} it exposed itself to the demands of the Catholic Church: locally, to those of the Bishop of Bamberg and nationally to those of the Papacy and the Emperor. Sachs replaces the fox with a wolf, which has the allegorical meaning of ‘geistlicher Würdenträger’,\textsuperscript{155} so the dying wolf represents those ‘religious dignitaries’ who have accepted the \textit{Interim}. These could be the three authors of the \textit{Interim}, Julius Pflug, Michael Helding and Johann Agricola, Melanchthon. Furthermore, the situation of the dying fox links back to the lines in Fabius’s previous speech:

\begin{quote}
Wie einer, der da sey gelegen  
In dieffem wasser, und verwegen  
Er kün doch nit schwimmen zu landt  
Und les gleych verzagt fuß und handt  
Fallen, und thuet unter-sincken  
Ahn alle wehr, und thut ertrincken. (p. 286, ll. 17–22)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{153} <http://www.aesopfables.com/cgi/aesop1.cgi?2&TheFoxandtheHedgehog> [accessed: 17/06/16].  
\textsuperscript{155} Theiß, \textit{Allegorik}, p. 132.
In this speech Fabius compares Superbus to someone who will not help himself and allows himself to drown. This could be a metaphor for Sachs’s perception that Nuremberg’s lack of political support for Lutheranism could cause its own downfall.

Returning to line 12, the second fable about a fox and hedgehog comes from a fragment of text left by Archilochus. Most interpreters agree that a translation of the original text is: ‘The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing’. This has provoked many philosophical arguments, but one interpretation of this fable relies on a fox which saw a hedgehog roll itself into a ball when it was threatened and decided to adopt this form of protection for himself. Thus, when attacked by a pack of dogs, instead of fleeing, the fox could not decide which strategy to follow and was killed by his own indecision. In the context of Nuremberg, this reflects the wavering position it has taken as it has attempted to balance its support for Lutheranism and maintaining the approval of the Emperor. If the hedgehog represents Lutheranism the importance of the line, ‘Dieweil die wölff essen kein zil’ (p. 287, l. 12), is that the faith can defend itself against attacks from the Catholic Church.

Both fables act as allegories for Nuremberg’s indecision and the dangers of changing religious identity after the Interim has been introduced. This is apparent when considering the historical events surrounding the adoption of the Interim and then its dissolution. Gerhard Gruner states that in 1551: ‘Der Rat sendet einen Bericht über die liturgischen Änderungen an den Kaiser, die aufgrund des Interims durchgeführt wurden’. However, technically the Treaty of Passau (August 1552) reversed the effects of the Interim, a move which would be confirmed in 1555 in the Peace of Augsburg. This caused some change in Nuremberg as on 15 August 1552 Corpus Christi, the Elevation of the Host and the Latin liturgy were abolished again. Gerhard Pfeiffer says that the Council were

---

157 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 135.
hindered in the reintroduction of the 1533 *Kirchenordnung* in early 1553 due to their alliance with the Catholic Bishops (presumably Wurzburg and Bamberg), which they had felt it necessary to make during the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*. However, according to Gruner, the *Kirchenordnung* was reinstated by the local priests without consulting the Council. There is no specific day or month given for this action but the text implies reinstatement but without the Council’s support. The Council’s hesitancy to act may have been Sachs’s motivation for writing this play, inaction which he would have perceived as a threat to Lutheranism.

Various criticisms of the Council emerge in this play: first, the above-mentioned reluctance to revert to the *Kirchenordnung* of 1533 for fear of imperial reprisals. Second, the Council allowed themselves to be influenced by external forces in religious matters, something they intended to prevent when they created the *Kirchenordnung* of 1533. Furthermore, they allowed themselves to be influenced by the various external censors or *Schneider* in internal city matters: the *Gwandtschneider*, that is Pflug, Helding and Agricola in Osiander’s case, or, indeed, Gendorf, the King’s commissioner, as the *Hoffschneider*, in the case of Dietrich. From Sachs’s standpoint as a committed Lutheran, the actions of the various *Schneider* had resulted in the loss of Nuremberg’s two foremost Lutheran theologians, one of whom, Osiander, was Sachs’s own pastor. Later in this thesis illustrations of more discontent about the loss of Osiander in Nuremberg than is reflected in many historical texts will be indicated. It will also be suggested that lack of action by Nuremberg’s Council in religious matters was a contributory factor to Sachs’s decision to stop writing *Fastnachtspiele* in late 1560.

For the less wealthy members of the audience, Sachs’s cleverly contrasts the tradesmen’s experience of Superbus with Augustus’s experience of him as a member of the

**Ritterschaft.** Rather than questioning the honesty of someone due to his position in society, as Sachs had done in *Der verdorben edelman*, here it is the maintenance of that appearance which has led to avarice and squandering.

Throughout the play, subtle references to both Moritz von Sachsen and Albrecht Alcibiades occur in a bid to disambiguate the villain. These strengthen the argument that Sachs held Alcibiades responsible for the effects of the war and the suffering of his neighbours. In fact, Sachs wrote a *Meisterlied, Der Narr und das Kind in der Wiege*,\(^{162}\) in June 1554, which begins ‘Margraff Casimirus ein narren hete’ (no. 906, p. 110, l. 1). In it Sachs insinuates that the father of Margrave Albrecht was the house fool, a possible reference to Friedrich von Brandenburg-Ansbach, who had been imprisoned for squandering the family fortune and was deemed mentally unstable.\(^{163}\) The implication was that Albrecht was a bastard:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Der selbig Fricz von Lambergk his} \\
\text{Der vil freud machen dete.} \\
\text{Den man ins frauen zimer lis;} \\
\text{Die fürstin trib mit ihm vil abentheuer. (p. 110, ll. 2–5)}
\end{align*}
\]

There is no evidence yet of any connection between a Fritz von Lamberg and the Brandenburg-Ansbach family. The phrase “abenteuer treiben” is part of the craftsman’s vocabulary and means relying on luck in business, but it has other meanings, such as dangerous chance or coincidence. Here Sachs implies a sexual relationship.\(^{164}\) The son continues describing how the Fool wakes the child every day by saying:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{“Gott grüsse dich, margrave”,} \\
\text{Gab im den einen kuß, das es thet schmaczen,} \\
\text{Erwecket das kind von dem schlaf. (p. 110, ll. 11–13)}
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{163}\) Kneitz, *Plassenburg*, p. 10.

The ladies of the court notice the Fool’s unusual affection for the child and decide to play a trick on him by one day replacing the baby with a monkey (p. 111, ll. 28–30). When the Fool wakes the child with a kiss, the monkey bites him, which causes him to say: ‘Werfft nur das hurenkind in graben!’ (p. 111, l. 40). This implies that Alcibiades’s mother had questionable morals, but Affen have been used as allegorical figures for fools and Sachs uses affen to indicate sinners, so Sachs accords Alcibiades animalistic characteristics and defines his moral state as that of a sinner. The song ends with the lines, ‘Die weil hernach margraff Albrecht | Im Deutschland nichts gutes anrichten thete’ (p. 112, ll. 50–51). This extremely offensive song leaves little to the imagination about its subject and although Sachs would be censored for his satirical work on the death of Alcibiades in 1557, it appears that in 1553 and 1554 he is given licence to satirize Alcibiades as a recent enemy of Nuremberg.

The satire in this play depends on the audience’s knowledge and relies on them being able to understand all the allusions, which range from obscure Greek fables to well-known Bible stories and Lutheran doctrine. This play could be understood by different audiences with different educational backgrounds. For example, in Nuremberg in 1553 the audience, if they were supporters of Osiander and Dietrich, may have been provoked to ire. Equally the ridiculous story of the desired bed would have provoked laughter, along with the suggestion that Sachs was hinting at Gendorf’s intervention. Sachs’s satirical attacks on Alcibiades would have been enjoyed by those in the audience who had endured the two sieges and witnessed the damage to the city’s infrastructure. The message contained in the play is unequivocal: not only is there squandering and avarice in the city, but the very essence of the populace’s faith is under attack from external religious sources which Sachs perceives as a threat to Nuremberg’s cultural identity as a Lutheran city.

Moreover, Sachs highlights the dangers of avarice as the moral in these two Fastnachtspiele but with different purposes. The first play portrays avarice in a wealthy
merchant in Nuremberg, who is depicted as a *wucherer* using other people’s money and goods. The second play is again set in the upper echelons of society, where a nobleman squanders his own wealth and by doing so puts his creditors’ livelihoods in jeopardy. The evidence of both analyses suggests the wealth gap between rich and poor in sixteenth-century Nuremberg was widening and Sachs implies in both plays that avarice and the squandering of financial resources were prevalent in the wealthiest classes, the merchant traders and patrician families.

Both *Fastnachtspiele* illustrate Sachs’s own fears: his focus on Reichenburger’s financial activities highlights a general decline of interest in trade and manufacturing in Nuremberg’s patrician and merchant classes. This is confirmed by Sachs’s satirical portrayal of Bonaventura Furtenbach as Reichenburger, who, the evidence suggests, was as rich as the Fugger banking family in Augsburg and had made his money from trade initially, but had moved on to finance and was ennobled for his loans to Charles V. Excess money wasted in any manner threatened the *Gemeinnutz* and care for the poor was a Lutheran imperative as it had been during the recent sieges. Sachs maintains the focus on the upper classes in the second *Fastnachtspiel, Der verdorben Edelman*, and suggests that personal debt was considerable at this time. There is little evidence of a solid foundation for expenditure or borrowing, thus squandering borrowed money betrays little regard for either one’s creditors or one’s duty to the *Gemeinnutz*. By focussing his attention on avarice and debt in the upper classes, Sachs allows the lower classes to compare their own positions with those illustrated, which helps to fulfil his didactic purpose and prevent the spread of such behaviour through negative examples.

Sachs lays the blame for the misery suffered by some levels of society squarely at the door of Albrecht Alcibiades, whose attacks on Nuremberg had disrupted the fabric and functioning of society within and outwith Nuremberg’s walls, rendering the poor poorer and in need of help from the community coffers and damaging Nuremberg’s territorial
infrastructure and source of food. The rich, on the other hand, profited from increased arms sales and squandered their money on fripperies, which Sachs interprets as distancing themselves from the principles of Lutheranism. Sachs cleverly uses luxury material artefacts, the jewels in *Der unersetlich geizhunger* and the gilded bed in *Der verdorben Edelman*, for moral censure. In the first play the gemstones are represented by sand and gravel, which indicates Sachs’s message well: worldly possessions have no value, especially so if they are acquired immorally: ‘Das gestohlene Brot schmeckt dem Manne wohl; aber hernach wird ihm der Mund voll Kieselsteine werden’ (Proverbs 20:17). The real treasure is living life as a Christian and with God as a reward in Heaven.

Other factors need to be considered about the causes for this change in piety. The Reformation had taken place twenty-eight years before the second play was written and the first flush of enthusiasm was a distant memory. This, coupled with the additional blow of Luther’s death in 1546, may have contributed to a decline in the civic unity and collective responsibility that had prevailed during the first years of Lutheranism. The threat to Nuremberg’s Lutheran faith is implied by satirical references to the influence of external sources: Pflug, Helding and Agricola in the case of Andreas Osiander and Gendorf in the case of Veit Dietrich.

Behind the play lies the hesitant behaviour of the Nuremberg Council as it tried to balance the reversal of the terms of the *Interim* with the desire to retain the protection of the Emperor. Sachs appears to question the Council’s commitment to Lutheranism, illustrated by his warnings from the use of fables from Archilochus and Aesop, in which the adoption of new strategies leaves the city open to dangers from other confessions, as well as referring to the threat to Nuremberg’s independence, which the city had secured through centuries of negotiation. The use of these two very different fables must also be considered: the Aesop fable would have been well known to a wider audience, whereas Archilochus’s fragment was more likely to be discussed in Humanist circles for its
philosophical implications. This seems to indicate that Sachs was writing this play for two
different audiences: the first message about avarice was intended for a less-educated
audience; while the second message about the threat to Lutheranism and to independence
would have been understood by the educated merchant and patrician classes. Herein lies a
danger for Sachs, as the city’s ruling classes came from this influential group and this work
might have been viewed as encouraging unrest in the lower classes by portraying their
leaders as unprincipled and extravagant. Sachs wraps a political undertone in a moral
message.
CHAPTER IV

Religious Strife and a Strike: Sachs’s Satirical Comment

The analysis of the two plays in this chapter illustrates a continuation of some of the themes found in the last chapter: namely the threat to the Lutheran Church in Nuremberg and the threat to society from avarice. As the Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen (2 October 1553)¹ was written shortly after Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht it is hardly surprising that Sachs was still preoccupied with the effects of the Interim. In this play Sachs turns his attention from the perpetrators of the Interim to the Catholic changes introduced by its terms. By exaggerating practices found in the Catholic Church, Sachs forces his audience to compare the Lutheran faith which they had followed for the past twenty-eight years with their memories of Catholicism. In his illustration of the contentious issues that had caused Martin Luther to demand reform of the Catholic Church in 1517, Sachs creates an amusing play based on the Catholic belief in absolution from sins through penance or payment. Simon Wirdt, an innkeeper, is accused of heresy and is forced to appear before a Ketzermeister, something which will necessitate a short history of Ketzerei. The comedy is based on the understanding of a mathematical calculation based on a biblical quotation which Sachs uses to highlight the fallacy of the cycle of sin and penance. The source of Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen is found in Boccaccio’s Decameron, a copy of which Sachs had in his own library; he had used the same source material for an earlier Meisterlied.

The second play, Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent (23 December 1557),² concentrates on avarice but has a subtext of criticism of the city Council, a thread which Sachs picks up from Der verdorben edelman. In this play Sachs’s criticism falls on those who regulate the quality of goods produced by Nuremberg’s manufacturers, those

¹ KG xiv, pp. 304–09.
² KG xxiii, pp. 136–43.
who control market prices and the leading manufacturers themselves. Inflation appears
ever-present and, as it is coupled with an increased tax burden to help the exchequer repair
Nuremberg’s damaged infrastructure, the citizens have reason to complain. The play takes
place in a judicial setting with the god Jupiter sitting in judgement. As the history of
Nuremberg is significant to this play, specifically the history of a local strike, the second
analysis will open with a historical review of the metal industries in Nuremberg.
Furthermore, the religious history of Nuremberg will also be detailed as it may have
informed some of Sachs’s discontent with Nuremberg’s Council.

**Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen**

The historical scenario for this play is the same as for the previous play. Albrecht
Alcibiades was in retreat after the Battle of Sievershausen (19 July 1553) and in Nuremberg
the religious changes brought in by the *Interim* were slowly reverting to those set out by
the *Nürnberg/Brandenburg Kirchenordnung* (1533). These were still difficult times for
Nuremberg: even though the final costs of the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg* had not been fully
calculated, renovations and repairs had commenced to both buildings and the city walls,
which underwent re-design after the experience of the two sieges and would add to the
city’s increasing burden of debt.

As this play is based on heresy, it is prudent to understand the meaning of the word
*Ketzerei* in sixteenth-century Germany. Before the Reformation *Ketzerei* was heresy, that
is, having religious beliefs which contradicted the established Catholic religious doctrine.
Judgement was undertaken by an Inquisitor, whose role had been in existence since the
twelfth century. The last trial for heresy had occurred in 1474, since when the accusation
of blasphemy had become associated with *Ketzerei*.\(^3\) The word reverted to its former

\(^3\) Bernd Moeller, ‘Religious life in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation’, in *Pre-Reformation Germany*,
meaning when Luther was accused of heresy in 1520, which led to the term ‘Inquisition’ being synonymous with the suppression of Protestantism.\(^4\) The Catholic Church extended the accusation of heresy to include printed matter as a tool for suppression of pro-Lutheran work, which was not new as Pope Gregory XI had censored ‘heretical’ writings in the German language in 1376.\(^5\) The crime of heresy was expanded, after the arrival of the printing press at the University of Cologne, to include printers, purchasers and salesman of heretical works.\(^6\) These restrictions were strengthened in 1496 and again in 1501, when the Pope gave power to the Archbishop and Elector of Mainz to ban heretical translations and printed works, an act which is regarded as the start of censorship of printing within Germany.

After Charles V’s success in the Schmalkaldic War his desire to reintroduce Catholicism resulted in two imperial edicts concerning the repression of reformed confessions in his dominions. The first, dated 13 April 1550, forbade the purchase, reading or possession of the works of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin or their followers as well as the discussion of their doctrines with the threat of death and loss of wealth. The second, dated 29 April 1550, declared that persistent heretics would be burnt alive; men who recanted were to be killed with a sword; and women would be buried alive. These terms also applied to those who harboured heretics.\(^7\) The Emperor was determined to prevent the reformed confessions from spreading from the areas in which they had been permitted by the \textit{Interim} and to forbid the establishment of other reformed faiths within the Empire.

At the same time that Charles V was suppressing Protestantism a revival was beginning in the Catholic Church. The Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola and approved by the Pope in 1540, became synonymous with the Catholic Reformation and the Inquisition. Their first representative in Germany was Father Pierre Favre (1506–1546),

\(^5\) Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 70.
\(^6\) Müller, ‘Zensurpolitik’, 70.
\(^7\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 226.
who moved to Germany in 1540. Attempts were made to reform the Catholic Church, especially after the success of the Schmalkaldic War when Pope Julius III (1550–55) reconvened the Council of Trent (1551). Julius III is regarded as the instigator of the Inquisition, which may have brought the idea of heresy and blasphemy to the forefront of Sachs’s mind and motivated him to write this play.

*Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen* is opened by Herman Pich, whose surname supplies a hint to his character. Pich or pech has many interpretations, including pitch, with which many Christians would have associated Hell and Purgatory. In Dante’s *Inferno*, written in the fourteenth century, the sixth Circle of Hell is intended for heretics, who are entombed in fiery graves, which some have interpreted to be pits of boiling pitch. There are many sayings about pech: for example: ‘Wer mit bech umgeht, der bescheiszt leicht die hend’. Using this idea and with another meaning of pech as to smear or stick something, Sachs’s choice of the name indicates that the character is an instrument for malice. Pich commences the *Fastnachtspiel*, saying:

> Ob ich ein vogel möcht erhaschen,  
> Der mir ein weng füllet mein daschen,  
> Die ist mir zwar schier worden ler. (p. 304, ll. 6–8)

Sachs’s famous allegorical bird is ‘Die wittenbergisch nachtigall’, where the bird represents Martin Luther and his song Luther’s new doctrine, but here Sachs uses it as an allegory for all Lutherans. From the opening of the play Sachs places Pich in opposition to the Lutheran faith and illustrates that Pich is motivated by financial gain. Sachs’s use of ‘erhaschen’ indicates his use of Luther’s Bible translation because the first reported use of

---

10 This phrase is taken from *Ecclesiasticus* by Jesus of Sirach, a copy of which Sachs had in his own library: *Jesus Sirach gereimt durch Sebastian Großen*. Ecclesiasticus 13:1. This is found in most Catholic Bibles and not in Protestant versions.
11 DWB, see pech (3).
this word appears there. Pich encounters his neighbour Simon, whom he calls ‘einfeltig’ (p. 304, l. 9), whereby Sachs presents his audience with the same ambiguity about the double meaning of *einfeltig* which had applied to Simplicius in *Der unersetlich geizhunger*. Pich introduces Simon:

```
Der is reycher an gelt und gut,
Weder an vernunfft, sinn und mut,
Hab in offt bey der nasn umbzogen,
Umb manche örten in betrogen,
Wenn ich hab zecht in sein wirtzhauß. (p. 304, ll. 10–14)
```

By his use of ‘vernunfft’, ‘sinn’ and ‘mut’ Sachs reinforces the idea that Simon is gullible. *Örten* refers to meal times or restaurant bills which Pich has tricked Simon into paying. It also has several meanings in *Handwerker* vocabulary, including locations where gatherings of *Handwerker* meet, such as in *Trinkstuben*, or even the person responsible for visiting *Gesellen* on their journeyman years. This word would have been known by an audience of *Handwerker* and Sachs appeals to their cultural identity as craftsmen using words from their language.

Simon Wirdt’s name suggests several biblical links: first, Simon Peter is one of the Twelve Apostles, a friend to Jesus and known as a pillar of the Church:

```
```

---

13 *DWB* see *erhaschen*
14 *DWB* see *ürte*. 
After Simon Peter denies Christ three times in the Garden of Gethsemane, he searches for the truth, becoming, after his martyrdom, keeper of the keys to Heaven and the first Pope. However, there is also the negative allusion to Simony, or the selling of church offices. By using this name Sachs reminds the audience of Luther’s motivation for the Reformation and the sale of ecclesiastical privileges, such as special masses and indulgences, which Luther saw as infringements of canon law. The name ‘Wirdt’ indicates his profession as a gastgeber or wirt but could also be used to mean worthy or honourable.\footnote{DWB see \textit{wirde} then \textit{würde} (2).} By using words with double meanings, Sachs adds to the ambiguity about the meaning of ‘einfeltig’. Simon invites Pich to taste a new wine:

\begin{verbatim}
O, wie hab ich ietzundt den besten
Gefewerten Elsasser weyn!
Und wenn in trincken solt allein
Gott und auch Johannes der tauffer,
Welcher gewest ist sein vorlauffer,
So weyß ich ye, der weyn wer gut
Und würt erfrewen im den muht. (p. 304, ll. 22–25 – p. 305, ll. 1–4)
\end{verbatim}

This speech holds the key to the accusation of heresy from which Simon will suffer. Simon’s biblical knowledge is illustrated as he understands the relationship between John the Baptist and Christ. Simon invites Pich and his friends to enjoy the sparkling wine (p. 305, ll. 5–7) and Pich greedily asks Simon to include food and entertainment (p. 305, ll. 9–12). After Simon leaves Pich continues:

\begin{verbatim}
Ich hab ein wort von dir vernummen
Das muß mir wol bezaln das gloch;
Ich will dirs wol auffmutzen hoch
Beim inquisitor, dem ketzermeister. (p. 305, ll. 19–22)
\end{verbatim}
Pich claims to have heard Simon say words that can be interpreted as blasphemous; that is the words referring to God and John the Baptist (p. 305, l. 1). However, as ‘aufmutzen’ means to exaggerate or embellish in a negative manner, this accusation may not reflect the truth.\textsuperscript{16} Pich continues:

\begin{quote}
Der ist ein alter münch, ein feister,
Der wirt dich gar wol mores lern.
Ich will den nechsten zu im kern
Ins kloster, im das ahn-sagen. (p. 305, ll. 23–26)
\end{quote}

By his reference to monastic orders, Sachs invokes the audience’s memories of pre-Reformation times, when Catholic clerics had been involved in the city’s daily workings but only a few monks and nuns had remained since the dissolution of the religious houses in the city in 1525.\textsuperscript{17} The monk in question is described as \textit{feister} (l. 23) or corpulent, which conforms to the anti-Catholic images of monks which prevailed at this time. The reference to ‘mores lernen’ (l. 24) concerns rote learning in Humanist schools,\textsuperscript{18} but here Sachs reminds his audience how the Catholic Church frowned upon congregants engaging with the Scriptures, which contrasts to Luther, who encouraged them to do so. Catholic priests were bound to interpret the Bible for the congregants to prevent misunderstanding and heresy, whereas Luther believed the Word of God in the Bible was the most precious aspect of faith and the source of salvation.

Dr Romanus is the name of the \textit{Inquisitor} or \textit{Ketzermeister}, which might have been familiar to the audience as Sachs had used it in his Reformation dialogue \textit{Ein Dialogus des inhalt: ein argument der Romischen wider das Christlich heuflein den Geytzn betreffend}.\textsuperscript{19}

In this early Dialogue Romanus argues with Reichenburger that poor relief was better under the Catholic Church than under Lutheranism, which provides hints to the subject matter of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} \textit{DWB} see \textit{aufmutzen}.
\item \textsuperscript{17} See page 80.
\item \textsuperscript{18} \textit{DWB} see \textit{mores}.
\item \textsuperscript{19} KG XXII, pp. 51–68.
\end{itemize}
this play. This argument was contrary to the perceived wisdom in pre-Reformation Nuremberg as steps had been taken to prevent money raised by the Church being taken out of the city and used for its own benefit. These actions predated the establishment of the *Almosenordnung* (1522), which Nuremberg had adopted even before Luther’s concept of the *Gemeinnutz* was introduced.

From the beginning of Romanus’s introductory speech, Sachs makes it clear that Romanus represents the Catholic Church, ‘Ich bin gesetzt vom stul zu Rom’ (p. 305, l. 31), in order to catch heretics (p. 305, l. 33). He describes his duties:

So hab ich beystlichen gewalt,
Demselben ein straff zu benennen,
 Ihn zu würgen oder verbrennen,
Oder in ein presaun zu schaffen
Odr umb ein summa gelts zu straffen. (p. 306, ll. 2–6)

The vocabulary used in this dialogue lends this speech a threatening tone: ‘würgen’, ‘verbrennen’ and ‘presaun’ being more akin to the description of a torturer’s work than that of a religious man. Sachs portrays how the Catholic Church relied on threats, through visions of Hell and Purgatory, to create good Christians, which the audience would contrast with the merciful Lord they had encountered through Luther’s teachings. Romanus then acknowledges the use of fear:

Darmit ich den gemeinen man
In grosse forcht gesetzet han,
Das mir ein weil durch list und renck
Sehr viel helküchel, gab und schenck
In meinen beutel hat getragen. (p. 306, ll. 7–11)

---


21 See page 56.
This prompts the audience’s memory of the reputation of stereotypical Catholic priests by casting doubts on his moral probity as he pockets the money (l. 11). The reference to *helküchel* (l.10) provides another insight into Romanus’s corrupt behaviour. This word derives from *Höllküchlein*, a cake cooked at the back of the oven where it is dark (*hölle*), which Sachs uses in other texts to mean ‘achieve an unfair advantage’, the cake being a metaphor for bribery. This implies that people have paid Romanus not to denounce them as heretics, but since the Reformation he has suffered a decline in fortune (p. 306, ll. 12–14). Romanus continues:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wiewol ich viel kundtschaffter hab} \\
\text{In dieser stadt auff unde ab,} \\
\text{Wo sie ein mit eim wort ergrieffen,} \\
\text{Das er sich etwas thut vertieffen} \\
\text{An dem heyligen stul zu Rom} \\
\text{Oder gleych an dem gottes-nom,} \\
\text{Das blassens mir den heimlich zu.} (p. 306, ll. 15–21)
\end{align*}
\]

*Kundtschaffter* translates as an acquaintance or a witness, but *Kundtschaffterei* means spying, which confirms Romanus’s use of spies as does line 21. The words ‘An dem heyligen stul zu Rom’ may refer to debts that Nuremberg owed to other members of the alliance who helped Nuremberg during the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*. Moreover, as Veit Dietrich had predicted, Nuremberg found itself in a predicament after the introduction of the *Interim*, when the Bishop of Bamberg demanded recompense for lost income for Catholic convents and monasteries owned in Nuremberg and its territories after the Reformation.24

---

22 *DWB* see *höllküchlein*.
23 *DWB* see *kundtschaffterei*.
In order to force bribery payments in lieu of repentance, Romanus threatens denouncement (ll. 22–27), which confirms his motivation is greed. Pich informs him, ‘Ich hab ein feisten vogel gfangen’ (p. 306, l. 34). Sachs, by repeating the reference to ‘vogel,’ reminds the audience of Luther’s role as ‘Die wittembergisch nachtigall’, but here he implies the ‘vogel’ are Luther’s followers. However, *vogel fangen* has a colloquial meaning of sexual intercourse,\(^{25}\) which again refutes the idea that Sachs cleaned up the genre of *Fastnachtspiele*. Rather, he uses colloquial phrases to add spice to his dialogue and to titillate the audience.

By informing Romanus that Simon is wealthy, Pich underlines that the purpose for reporting the blasphemy is financial gain rather than spiritual purposes. For the remainder of the text Sachs refers to Romanus as ‘Inquisitor’; the reason for this change will be discussed later. Pich recounts his meeting with Simon Wirdt:

*Sagt, wie ein guten weyn het er,*

*Der wer so gut, und glych zu spott,*

*Wenn in sant Johans und selb gott*

*Des selben solten ein viertl trincken,*

*Sie müstens unter den tisch sincken*

*Und truncken werden wie die schwein.* (p. 307, ll. 9–14)

In Simon’s speech (p. 305, l. 1) he referred to St John the Baptist, whereas Pich does not specify to whom he refers: John the Baptist or John the Evangelist, but contained within this speech are reminders of the relevance of St John the Evangelist to the religious calendar, as on his saint’s day (27 December) Communion wine for the following year is consecrated.\(^{26}\) The abhorrent image of God and St John drunk and the embellishment of the story provided by Pich becomes obvious to the audience, as he betrays his friend for

\(^{25}\) *DWB* see *vögeln*.

\(^{26}\) After the Reformation the apostolic saints’ days were retained. St John the Evangelist refers to the Apostle John, therefore this may have been in the Lutheran calendar.
monetary gain. The Inquisitor is encouraged by the wealth of his next victim (p. 307, ll. 18–19). Pich continues to describe Simon’s simplicity:

Doch ist er an den sinnen sein
Gar einfeltig, grob und auch schlecht,
Als ob er sey ein pawren-knecht.
Darumb is er sehr gut zu rupffen. (p. 307, ll. 25–28)

Pich argues that Simon does not deserve his wealth due to his lack of sophistication. Pich’s words, ‘Als ob er sey ein pawren-knecht’ (l. 27), imply that Simon has the same level of intelligence and coarseness as a farmer, which is a stereotypical judgement of peasant farmers, who were regarded as coarse drunkards and uneducated, as will be explained in Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent. The use of this verbal insult contradicts the Ten Commandments:


Romanus uses this very Commandment against Reichenburger in Ein dialogus des inhalt ein argument der Römischen wider das christlich heüflein, den geyz, auch öffentlich laster usw. Petreffend, accusing Lutherans of hypocrisy because they penalise the poor for non-payment of debts.

Both Pich and the Inquisitor use words meaning to pluck feathers, ‘rupffen’ (l. 28) and ‘außzupfen’ (l. 30), and here Sachs uses animal vocabulary to convey the idea of fleecing someone of their money. The continued inclusion of bird imagery illustrates the suppression of Lutherans by Catholics and reinforces the anti-Lutheran behaviour of both

---

27 KG xxii, pp. 51–68.
28 DWB see rupfen 2(c).
Pich and the Inquisitor. In response to the Inquisitor’s question about Wirdt’s address, Pich replies, ‘Er sitzet in der langen gassen’ (p. 307, l. 34). This is a street inside the Maxtor where patrician houses were built, notably the Tucherhaus and Hirschvogelhaus, rendering him in their minds a wealthy goose and worth plucking.

When Simon Wirdt is summoned by the Inquisitor he seeks advice from his ‘Nachtbawr’ Clas:

Es hat ietzundt geschickt nach mir
Der nequamister sein pedeln
Ich sol baldt kummen in sein zeln. (p. 308, ll. 17–19)

Simon’s use of a word derived from Latin, nequamister (l. 18) provides amusement for those in the audience who understand Latin. The Latin nequam means worthless and its grammatical ending renders the translation as ‘most worthless one’. Sachs’s mockery of the Inquisitor helps those who understand the joke remember his point. Its usage also directs Sachs’s audience to another difference between Lutheranism and Catholicism. Luther’s vernacular Bible translation gave more people access to the word of God, whereas the Latin Catholic Bible excluded many congregants and ensured the Catholic priests remained the primary source of theological knowledge. Nachtbawr Clas points to Simon’s error in word use (p. 308, ll. 21–22) but Simon may have intended this play on words, since he replies:

Ich mein halt unsern ketzermeister,

Ein geitzig, grosser munch, ein feister. (p. 308, ll. 24–25)

The rhyme and assonance help to emphasise the characteristics of this monk, whom Simon knows to be greedy and avaricious. Simon continues by saying, ‘Ach weh mir, das sein gott muß walten!’ (p. 309, l. 2). This implies that the Inquisitor’s God is not Simon’s God, causing the audience to compare Luther’s representation of God as a loving, forgiving

---

29 The first Bible in the vernacular was printed by Anton Koberger in 1483, which predates Luther’s Bible.
Father with the Catholic God, who was to be both loved and feared. Simon describes the *ketzermeister* as arrogant (p. 309, l. 4), being a man who punishes his parishioners (l. 5). He continues, ‘Wie streng er sey gewest vor jarn’ (l. 7). Here Sachs refers to the Catholic Church’s former dominance until Lutheranism was established. Sachs uses Romanus, now depersonalized and referred to henceforth as ‘Inquisitor’, to embody the failures ascribed to the pre-Reformation Catholic Church. Sachs evokes the audience’s memories of Catholicism and prompts them to compare those with more recent memories of the Lutheran Church. His motivation may have been the Council’s lukewarm re-introduction of Lutheran practices after the Treaty of Passau in 1552. Gerhard Gruner reports: ‘In Nürnberg wird deshalb eine neue Kirchenordnung eingeführt. Bestimmte Feiertage werden wieder gehalten, Epistel und Evangelium wieder lateinisch gesungen und die Elevation wird wieder vollzogen’. This was reversed in August 1552 after Charles V signed the Peace of Passau, but it is not known to what extent changes occurred in Nuremberg. As reported in the last chapter, the Council were hesitant to reverse the *Interim*’s terms and as Gerhard Gruner notes: ‘[D]ie Geistlichen führen die Kirchenordnung von 1533 ohne Rücksprache mit dem Rat wieder ein’. Hence the Churches acted independently of the Council.

Simon is reluctant to visit the Inquisitor without Clas (p. 309, l. 11), who attempts to dispel Simon’s fears (ll. 17–20). Simon says, ‘Ich bin dem münch gar zu einfeltig; | Er ist mit worten mir zu gweltig’ (p. 309, ll. 23–24), which illustrates how the Inquisitor relies on clever use of language to induce fear and execute his extortion. Clas confirms he will accompany Simon, ‘In das kloster zu den parfotten’ (l. 28). Both Gruner and Pfeiffer confirm that after 1548 the Catholic Franciscan Brotherhood demanded the return of the *Barfüßerkloster*, which was situated between the Lorenzkirche and the River Pegnitz.

---

31 Gruner, *Nürnberg*, p. 138 (15.08.1552).
within the city walls. After the Reformation the Council had agreed that some elderly monks would remain in the cloisters but by mid-1550 most had died, leaving the building as a symbol of resistance to Lutheranism and allowing its central position to remind the populace of the previous power of the Catholic Church. The Council had determined in the *Kirchenordnung* to separate religious administration from that of the city, fearing potential disagreements between the Catholic Church and the desires of the city Council. By informing the audience that the monk was a Franciscan, Sachs renders the physical description of the Inquisitor at odds with him being a *Barfüßer*, who plead poverty and renounce property ownership. Their name derives from their choice to walk barefoot or in basic sandals as a sign of their allegiance to the mendicant order.

The Inquisitor now orders the Verger to make the church look appealing:

```
Custor, geh, zündt die kertzen ahn,
Itzt werdt wir zum tagambt ein-gahn,
Heiß die brüder singen andechtig,
Auff das uns alles volk eintrechtig
Für heylig, frum und geystlich halt,
Darmit uns zutrag jung und alt,
Darmit wir groß feist suppen essen. (p. 310, ll. 7–13)
```

The Inquisitor uses the appearance and atmosphere in the church to manipulate the congregation’s opinion of the Catholic Church, attempting to persuade people to bring alms to the monks for their work in supporting the poor. Sachs, by invoking these memories, emphasises methods used by the Catholic Church to attract donations for its charitable activities. Furthermore, Sachs may be using this scene to mock the compromises made to Catholicism by Melanchthon in the *Leipziger Interim*, which concerned itself with aspects

---

34 Strauss, Nuremberg, pp. 181–82.
of doctrine and specifically vestments, decoration in church, candlelight, in addition to festivals and feast days.\textsuperscript{35}

The Inquisitor’s desires are not prompted by concern for the well-being of the poor, as the monks select the choicest cuts for themselves (l. 17), leaving the poor to eat ‘Krawt, erbes und rubn uneinander’ (l. 19). The Custor continues this:

\begin{quote}
Solch essen thut den betlern wol.

Das braten man auffheben sol,

Dergleichen die grossen stuck visch,

Die tregt man heindt wider zu tisch,

Wenn wir halten colation. \textsuperscript{(p. 310, ll. 26–30)}
\end{quote}

Those donating food are ignorant of the fact that monks feast on the choicest food. However, this has unexpected advantages:

\begin{quote}
Darmit so meindt der gmeine man

Weyl wir den armn solch essen geben,

Wir thundt so schlecht und messig leben

Mit suppen, brey und fastn all tag,

Darmit man uns dest mehr zutrag. \textsuperscript{(p. 310, ll. 31 – p. 311, l. 1)}
\end{quote}

The monks benefit because their parishioners believe they live on the same scraps as the poor, which encourages more donations! When considering Nuremberg’s recent experience, which brought refugees into the city escaping from Alcibiades’s troops, Endres’s remarks are pertinent: ‘Doch selbst die Institutionalisierung der öffentlichen Armenfürsorge und des Almosenwesens seit der Reformation war gegenüber der Masse des Elends gerade in Krisenjahren ziemlich hilflos’.\textsuperscript{36} Feeding these refugees and the residents during the sieges stretched the city’s coffers despite the efforts of the Council, the

\textsuperscript{35} Interim of Zella: \textless http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08077b.htm\textgreater [accessed 9 January 2017].

memory of which would prompt the audience to compare their recent experience with the image of food and greed being played out in this *Fastnachttspiel*. The Lutheran system of poor relief, paid for by the community for the benefit of the *Gemeinnutz*, depended on the biblical imperative, ‘Love they neighbour as thyself’ and it was funded by Nuremberg’s universal wealth tax. According to Luther this should be supplemented by the wealthy, who should donate any excess money, after caring for their own family and household.\(^{37}\) Sachs encourages the audience to judge the fairness of the two systems for themselves by painting a satirical image of the Catholic Church’s care for the needy.

When Simon arrives at the monastery the Inquisitor calls him ‘dölpn’ (p. 311, l. 5), meaning ‘clumsy oaf’ or ‘fool’, and continues:

\[\text{Ich will im einen rappen reissen,} \]
\[\text{Er muß uns unser kuchen speyssen,} \]
\[\text{Weil wir den visch int rewsen bringen. (p. 311, ll. 9–11)}\]

A ‘rappe’ (l. 9) is another word for a raven, but here it is more likely to refer to a small coin as an indication of the desired monetary donation.\(^{38}\) The reference to catching fish is a reference to the role of the Apostles as ‘fishers’ of men. Luther also uses this imagery in the *Ninety-Five Theses* with reference to indulgences: ‘The treasures of the Gospel are nets with which they formerly were wont to fish for men of riches’.\(^{39}\) This change in emphasis between the men and their riches underscores Sachs’s purpose in this play: the Catholic Church is more concerned with the wealth of sinners than saving the souls of those sinners. ‘Rewse’ or, more commonly, *reuse*,\(^{40}\) is a woven conical trap used in river fishing and, as a metaphor, serves to produce an image of landing a good catch, referring to Simon’s wealth.

---

\(^{38}\) *DWB* see *rappe* (4).
\(^{39}\) *LW* I, p. 236, Theses 15 & 16.
\(^{40}\) *DWB* see *reuse*. 
The Inquisitor scolds Simon for his misdeeds by comparing him to the snake which tempted Eve in the garden of Eden, saying:

O du gifftige, mördische atter,
Kan vor der ketzrischn zungen dein
Gott im hymel nit sicher sein
Und auch sant Johannes der tauffer
Wilt auß in machen zwen weinsauffer,
Das sie von dem weyn werden wol
Zwen truncken-boltz und sein stüdvoll. (p. 311, ll. 24–30)

In this speech the Inquisitor refers to St John the Baptist, who, according to the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, lived off locusts and honey, implying that he enjoyed a simple diet and lived off the land, which serves as an example of how monks should live. ‘Trunkbolz’ is a drinking partner and ‘stüdvoll’ is an adjective meaning very drunk; both accusations are inventions of the Inquisitor. By threatening Simon with Hell’s fire (p. 311, l. 33) and condemning him to a life in Purgatory (p. 312, ll. 1–3), Sachs reminds the audience of the Catholic method for dealing with sinful transgressions, whereby the remission of sin could be achieved by payment of indulgences or payment for a Mass, which shortened the sinner’s stay in Purgatory.

Clas, who has accompanied Simon, points out that Simon had used a local oath to illustrate the excellence of the wine (p. 305, ll. 1–4) and as he has done no harm, he should be allowed home (p. 312, ll. 17–23). The Inquisitor accuses Clas of not understanding the situation, saying: “Du weist nicht, was ein ketzer ist” (p. 312, ll. 27). To this Clas replies:

Mein herr, ich habe es langst gewist;
Einer, der junge katzen macht,
Den selben ich für ein ketzer acht. (p. 312, ll. 29–31)
A series of misinterpretations follow, which undermine the authority of the Inquisitor and provide amusement for the audience. Clas misunderstands the Inquisitor’s words, saying, ‘Redt darvon wie ein ley, ein schlechter’ (p. 313, l. 3). In this way Sachs suggests that often the uneducated did not understand Catholic theology. The Inquisitor condemns Clas to excommunication (den schweren ban) (l. 6), which Clas misinterprets, choosing to understand ‘ban’ as Bohne. He replies using a play on words based on peas, ‘So wil ich in die erbes gahn, | Auff das ich nit dürff bonen essen (p. 313, ll. 8–9). Dried peas are still used to make the filling Erbsensuppe which could have been eaten during Fastnacht. The Inquisitor then demands that Clas leaves, which causes this reply:

Mein herr, ich glaub, ir seidt ein narr,
Ir seit ye selb kolbet beschorn,
Und habt den schalk hinter den orn
Und tragt am halß die narren-kappen. (p. 313, ll. 16–19)

The word kolbe has two implications: ‘kolbet beschorn’ is a shaved tonsure, worn by both fools and priests alike, but ‘kolbe’ also denotes a club carried by fools. The phrase, ‘habt den schalk hinter den orn’ (l. 18) is an idiom meaning to have the Devil behind your ears, which is linked to hidden gluttony and a subtle reminder to the audience that the monks are eating well, while the poor eat scraps. Clas mocks the monk’s tonsure by comparing it to the fool’s cap worn by carnival officers (l. 19), on which were either donkey’s ears or a hen’s red comb. Sachs allows Clas to call the Inquisitor a grey donkey, describing the colour of the monk’s habit and confirming that he is a Franciscan (p. 313, ll. 24–25). This exchange ends when the Inquisitor throws Clas out, calling him: ‘Du spey-vogel und ehren-
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41 DBW see laie.
43 DBW see schalk (f).
44 <http://universal_lexikon.deacademic.com/256222/Jemandem_sitzt_der_Schalk_im_Nacken (auch%3A_hinter_den_Ohren)> [accessed: 7 July 2016]. Although this is a modern interpretation, Sachs could have been using the phrase similarly.
dieb’ (p. 313, l. 28). The speivogel is a mocking bird and its metaphorical use indicates someone who enjoys mocking others. This underlines Sachs’s satirical purpose. He has mocked the office of the monk by belittling the vestiges of his authority, his habit, even his haircut. Sachs perverts the stereotypical image of a priest, making the Inquisitor a fool through the use of puns and misinterpretations, whilst turning Clas into a wise fool, which is a role reversal and another construct from the Fastnacht tradition. ‘A wise fool’ refers to the Christian tradition in which those who give up their lives for spiritual purposes, like taking monastic orders, and go to great lengths, or even foolish lengths, to prove their faith, are deemed holy or blessed.

Clas leaves the monastery accusing the monk of theft (p. 314, l. 1) and cursing him with a version of ‘das dich der bock schände’, creating a link to the Devil in the guise of the goat. As goats are often used as a metaphor for lechery, Sachs suggests that the monk has committed another sin. The Inquisitor demands to know who Clas is, but Simon denies knowing Clas, saying he might be stupid, mentally ill or drunk and just someone who had come into the Church with him (p. 314, ll. 15–17). Simon’s denials of knowing Clas echo Simon Peter’s denial of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane. This speech marks the turning point in the play, as Sachs reminds the audience of the true path to Heaven, which is guarded by St Peter and not the Inquisitor. Sachs then illustrates the major difference between Catholicism and Lutheranism during the Inquisitor’s next speech (p. 314, ll. 30–34). Namely, Lutherans believe that God alone grants forgiveness, whereas Catholics believe forgiveness is gained through the intercession of the priest or the Pope, in the form of absolution and indulgences. The priest orders Simon to stay in the monastery and listen to the sermon, informing Simon that he will interrogate him on his understanding of its theme (p. 315, l. 5–7).

---

45 DWB see speivogel.
46 DWB see Bock (6).
47 DWB see Bock (2).
Clas returns and on hearing the threats made by the monk (p. 315, ll. 18–21) informs Simon a payment would guarantee his freedom (p. 315, ll. 24–28). Clas refers to payments for Indulgences, which were believed to reduce time spent in Purgatory and form part of the Catholic notion of celestial accountancy. Johannes Tetzel had said: ‘Sobald das geld im kasten klingt die seele in den himmel springt’. Thus Sachs reduces Simon’s religious duty to the level of a monetary transaction rather than a method to cleanse his soul. Simon, not realising he could pay to lift the ban, says:

Ich hab gemeindt, mich helff am basten
Hart liegen, bitten bettn und fasten. (p. 315, ll. 35–36)

This illustrates that Simon is prepared to perform the traditional acts of penance but will listen to the sermon as demanded (p. 316, ll. 1–3). He continues:

Ich wolts ie warlch von hertzen gern.
Man predigt viel von dem fegfewr.
Ich glaub, es sey kaum so unghewr,
Als das closter mit seiner pein. (p. 316, ll. 8–11)

Simon reflects here that Purgatory would be less frightening than his treatment in the monastery, which illustrates again the difference in the two confessions. The Verger returns and asks the Inquisitor whether Simon has paid yet (l. 22), to which the Inquisitor replies:

Er bit umb gotteswill mit fleyß,
Man sol im diese sünd vergeben,
Zeigt ahn die heylig schrifft darneben,
Hat doch in der zeyt nie gemeldt,
Zu geben weder gut noch gelt. (p. 316, ll. 25–30)

---

48 Luther’s response to this is found in the Ninety-Five Theses, especially in Theses 41–45 (see LW I, p. 241).
Simon has behaved like a good Christian and consequently has not made any payments because he believes that God will forgive him through faith alone. Simon then explains to the Inquisitor that he has concerns about something said in the sermon (p. 317, ll. 5–7):

> Man hat predigt, was wir hie geben,
> Das wirt uns dort in jenem leben
> Alles wol hundertfeltig finden. (p. 317, ll. 17–19)

This is based on Matthew 19:29: ‘Und wer verläßt Häuser oder Brüder oder Schwestern oder Vater oder Mutter oder Weib oder Kinder oder Äcker um meines Namens willen, der wird’s hundertfältig nehmen und das ewige Leben ererben’. The Inquisitor confirms the truth of this but is unable to understand Simon’s concerns (p. 317, ll. 21–24). Simon calculates that if the monks give three cauldrons of soup to the poor daily and, if according to the one-hundred-times rule, this is repeated every day of the year, then they should receive back one thousand and ninety-five cauldrons of soup per year (p. 318, ll. 2–10). Simon explains his concern:

> Ich fürcht warlich, ir werdt darinn
> Sambt den gantzen convendt ertrincken,
> In der suppen zu grunde sincken,
> Vor auß, welcher nit wol kan schwimmen,
> Die weiten kutttn euch nit wol zimmen,
> Welche ir dort auch ahn werdt haben,
> Weil man euch thut darein begraben. (p. 318, ll. 12–18)

The triumph of this mathematical calculation emphasises the ridiculous promises invented by the Catholic Church to coerce good behaviour whilst raising money from indulgences. Furthermore, the reference to a flood would remind the audience that God purged the earth of the sin of mankind in his story of Noah’s Ark. Simon not only ridicules the accountancy on which the Catholics base this practice but also those who believe in it. Sachs’s
exaggeration illustrates to the audience the foolishness of this Catholic concept. That Sachs has allowed the Inquisitor and the audience, to some extent, to believe that Simon was a ‘simple’ man also adds to the comedy, for if a ‘simple’ man can calculate this Catholic method for balancing good deeds on earth and rewards in Heaven, then he, the simple Lutheran, is cleverer than Catholic theologians. On being dismissed home by an angry Inquisitor, Simon continues:

Ich wer vor liebr daheim gewessen,
Het darfür in der bibl gelessen.
Ich mag es auff mein aydt wol jehen,
Das ich nit viel guts hab gesehen
Im closter, denn viel gleyßnerey,
Vil gebets, weng andach darbey,
Darmit ir habt all welt beschiesseen. (p. 318, ll. 31 – p. 319, l. 4).

This judgement points to the essential differences in the two faiths. Simon has noted the hypocrisy he saw in Kloster, which contrasts to his own experience of Lutheranism and the forgiveness accorded to him by his faith. Within the Catholic Church, the authority or interpretation of God’s Word remained the domain of the priest and the example of the Inquisitor and his practices casts doubt on his knowledge and his interpretation of the Bible. Simon, the Lutheran, has read the Bible, which supports his faith and allows him to judge the faults found in Catholicism. If the Inquisitor personifies the evils found within the Catholic priesthood, then Sachs’s purpose is to further blacken their image to emphasise the difference between the two faiths.

The Inquisitor closes the play complaining about the lack of respect for the Church and its institutions, especially the lack of fear (‘fürcht’ (l. 10)) the congregants have of the priesthood and the threat of excommunication (p. 319, ll. 7–10). He says in recognition of the decline in Catholicism’s power over the populace:
Unser betrug ist worden laut,
Derhalb der lay uns nicht mer traudt
Und streinet stets umb in der bibel. (p. 319, ll. 13–15)

He acknowledges this has led the populace to turn against Catholic priests as they now interpret God’s word for themselves. Significantly, the Inquisitor condemns Catholicism when says:

Unser hauß hat ein bösen gibel,
Uns ist gewichen der grundstein
Fürcht nur, es fall ein mal gar ein. (p. 319, ll. 16–18)

Here the biblical metaphor is based on the vocabulary of builders and suggests that Simon embodies Simon Peter as a pillar of the Church. Furthermore, the reference to ‘grundstein’ conforms to Jesus’s words to Peter: ‘Und ich sage dir auch: Du bist Petrus, und auf diesen Felsen will ich bauen meine Gemeinde, und die Pforten der Hölle sollen sie nicht überwältigen’ (Matthew 16:18). The imagery of subsidence illustrates that Sachs’s purpose is to portray how corrupt practices are undermining the Catholic Church. It also defines Simon’s purpose within the play for he is the good disciple, who has based his faith on the pillars of the Church, the Bible and God’s Word. The Inquisitor continues:

Wiewol wir es stets unter-bültzen,
Vorm garn vischen und fürhültzen
Doch ist unser hauß gar vol schwachs
Es senkt sich zum fall, spricht Hans Sachs. (p. 319, ll. 19–22)

If this and lines 16–18 apply to the Catholic Church, Sachs suggests that even if the Catholic Church undertook to change itself, it would fail. However, these lines may indicate that Sachs has changed his focus of attention to the religious situation in Nuremberg. The word

49 ‘Und da sie erkannten die Gnade, die mir gegeben war, Jakobus und Kephas und Johannes, die für Säulen angesehen waren, gaben sie mir und Barnabas die rechte Hand und wurden mit uns eins, daß wir unter die Heiden, sie aber unter die Juden gingen’ (Galatians 2:9) (Kephas meaning ‘stone’ was used as Peter’s name).
‘unter-bültzen’ can be translated as ‘to underpin’ but can also mean to deceive or to go behind someone’s back.\textsuperscript{50} Sachs may be referring to the Nuremberg Council’s actions to introduce Catholic practices without the full agreement of either the Lutheran clergy or the populace after the \textit{Interim}.\textsuperscript{51} To add to the ambiguity of this ending Sachs quotes Luther with the phrase ‘vor dem garn fischen’, which means to make a pointless effort.\textsuperscript{52} He then uses the word ‘fürhültzen’, which translates as ‘to clad something with wood’, but also has a metaphorical meaning, ‘fürhülzen: wann sich einer wil schön machen, ehe er beklagt wirt, sons heiszt es fürbiegen, fürhülzen’.\textsuperscript{53} This implies that Nuremberg’s actions were a defence tactic and had not improved their relationship with the Emperor. Hence, within the last few lines Sachs portrays the situation in Nuremberg, where the Council were driven to appease the Emperor by delaying the re-introduction of Lutheranism and diluting the Lutheran liturgy with parts of the Catholic liturgy. Sachs berates the decision-makers in Nuremberg when he says, ‘Doch ist unser hauß gar vol schwachs, | Es senkt sich zum fall’ (ll. 20–21). This may constitute condemnation of the damage being done to Lutheranism in Nuremberg by the very people who had adopted it so earnestly in 1525. Furthermore, if ‘unser haus’ is a metaphor for Lutheranism, then the last line refers to the internal arguments that had plagued the faith since Melanchthon had become Luther’s successor, in particular the argument with Osiander over Melanchthon’s interpretations of Lutheran theology, which ended on Osiander death in 1552. Support for Osiander in Nuremberg had not diminished and was to prove problematic for the city before Sachs wrote the next play.

Second, another threat to Lutheranism came from Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–1575),

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{DWB}, see unterbolzen.
\textsuperscript{51} Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 249.
\textsuperscript{52} <http://de.slovopedia.com/92/71/397249.html> [accessed: 07 July 2016].
a pupil of Melanchthon, who was pursuing a more radical interpretation of Lutheranism which would continue to be an issue for years to come.

This Fastnachtspiel portrays the inequities of the Catholic Church and Sachs attempts to remind the audience that they still pose a threat. This has become imperative due to the reluctance of the Council to reinstate the Kirchenordnung of 1533. By highlighting and mocking the methods of Catholic priests and monks and portraying the tricks used to force money from sinners, Sachs prompts his audience to compare this with the Lutheran experience. Some members of his audience were too young to remember the city’s Reformation in 1525, so he invokes memories of the city’s former cultural identity as Catholic as well as stimulating actual memory to help his task. Sachs uses references to the Ninety-Five Theses purposely, for this play is based on celestial accountancy and indulgence payments, which motivated Luther’s original stand against the Catholic Church. Sachs saw indulgence payments as a threat to the Gemeinnutz, which he believed to be integral to the Lutheran faith. Theiß’s comments on Sachs’s history plays are relevant here:

[un]d die Forderung, dass der gemeine Nutzen gesichert werden müsse, bilde[t] das Grundgerüst staatspolitischer Normen bei Hans Sachs. Es ist besonders die Sorge um die Erhaltung des gemeinen Nutzens, die die späteren Historienversifikationen mit den aktuellen Situationsanalysen des Reichs in der Zeit zwischen 1531 und 1554 verbindet.54

The Gemeinnutz may have been in the forefront of the audience’s minds as it had been the means for the survival for both refugees and city dwellers during the recent sieges, the memory of which Sachs uses to evoke an emotional response in his audience.

The roles in this play are clear: Simon represents a good disciple, a Lutheran or even Luther, whereas Romanus, depersonalized as the Inquisitor, represents the evils of the Catholic Church. Sachs, by mocking the vestiges of Catholic religious authority, the threats
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54 Theiß, ‘Der Bürger’, p. 93.
and the tricks used to increase their income, including celestial accountancy, conforms to Theiß’s judgement: ‘So unterstellte er [Sachs] der katholischen Geistlichkeit regelmäßi
g “triegerey”, “simony” und beschimpfte sie als “Geltstrick”’. Nachtbawr Clas, despite his
tomfoolery, becomes the wise fool in this play. He is a defender of the new Church: he
understands the games the Catholic monks use and by his use of puns to make them look
foolish, illustrates his lack of fear for their threats. Could Sachs be placing himself in Clas’s
role?

This play is critical of the Council for their lack of courage to rededicate themselves
to Lutheranism, courage which they had shown during the Reformation (1525). Furthermore, in light of the subtext of the last lines of the play, which imply disagreement
amongst Lutherans, Sachs is critical of those interpreting Luther’s theology: Melanchthon,
who was revered in Nuremberg as a great educator and Lutheran; Flacius Illyricus for his
more radical interpretation of Lutheranism; and possibly Osiander as well, who caused
dissent after Luther’s death. Despite this play being one of Sachs’s funniest didactic
Fastnachtspiele, it represents an increasing tendency to apportion blame for the city’s
religious divisions on the Council.

**Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent**

By the time *Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent* (1557) was written, the status of
Lutheranism as the only acceptable Protestant confession had been settled by the Peace of
Augsburg (1555), which was based on the principle of *Cuius regio, eius religio*, which
meant the territorial leader determined his territory’s religious confession. This was not
religious emancipation as the individual believer was not free to follow his chosen faith.
Furthermore, far from the Peace settling religious dissent, further divisions within
Lutheranism became apparent. According to Hans Neidinger: ‘Nach dem Tode Luthers
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55 Theiß, ‘Der Bürger’, p. 91.
brachen im deutschen Protestantismus die Kämpfe zwischen den Philippisten, den Anhängern Melanchthons, und den Gnesiolutheranern aus, deren entschiedenster Vertreter Flacius Illyricus war.\footnote{56 Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 249.}

Illyricus fell out with Melanchthon, believing some of his teacher’s theology to be closer to Catholicism, proven by Melanchthon’s appeasement of Catholicism in the \textit{Leipziger Interim}. Another division in Lutheranism was developing, in which some of the followers of were concerned about the interpretation of the Eucharist and of transubstantiation. These views were similar to those of John Calvin (1509–1564), lending these Lutherans the name \textit{Kryptocalvinisten}. These divisions were to have consequences for Nuremberg, where the religious situation was unclear:

Wenn auch die Stadt nach außen hin auf Grund ihres in der Brandenburgisch-Nürnberger Kirchenordnung von 1533 niedergelegten Bekenntnisses als gut lutherisch gelten möchte, so entsprach die innere Überzeugung eines Teiles der Stadtgeistlichen und des Patriziats durchaus nicht diesem äußern Schein.\footnote{57 Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 249–50.}

Internally, there was further confusion as pastors supporting Osiander still preached his interpretation of Luther’s theology in their parishes. The situation worsened when Melanchthon intervened in the city’s religious matters in 1555.\footnote{58 Throughout 1555 Melanchthon exchanged correspondence about the threat from Nuremberg’s Osiandrists. On 4 February he writes to Hieronymus Besold (preacher at the Heilig-Geist-Spital): ‘Nachdem in [Preußen] eine Berichtigung der Lehre [Osianders] veröffentlicht wurde [...] sollten seine Anhänger ihren Irrtum einsehen’ (\textit{Melanchthons Briefwechsel: Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe}, ed. by Heinz Scheible and others, 12 vols (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1991), VII, (1553–1556), p. 279, Nr. 7403) (Known as \textit{MB} henceforth).}

Leonhard Culmann, a preacher at the Sebalduskirche, had been banned from preaching Osiandrist sermons by the city’s religious authorities in early 1555.\footnote{59 \textit{MB}, VII, p. 322 (7553).} Melanchthon was then invited by Nuremberg’s Council and Kurfürst August von Sachsen to settle the city’s internal religious differences.\footnote{60 \textit{MB}, VII, p. 337 (7568).} Melanchthon, supported by other theologians, came to Nuremberg to instruct
the Osiandrist pastors on doctrine, which resulted in two Osiandrist preachers leaving the city.\textsuperscript{61} Culmann was replaced by Melanchthon’s pupil, Moritz Heling (1522–1595), to ensure conformity in theology at the Sebalduskirche. Although this is not important to this play, it marks the beginnings of a trend which continues to concern Sachs until he writes his last \textit{Fastnachtspiele} in 1560. It also illustrates that internal disagreements existed in Nuremberg before the events described below.

As already suggested the city’s debt after the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg (4.5 million Gulden in 1554\textsuperscript{62}) would take many decades to recover. This included repairs to the city’s infrastructure and the extensive war damage to the farming communities in Nuremberg’s territories. In addition, the war had damaged Nuremberg’s major industry, the metalworking trades,\textsuperscript{63} as hammer mills and watermills outside the city had been destroyed by Alcibiades’s men. In 1339 there had been eighteen mills upstream from the city devoted to grain processing but by 1557 there were at least twenty-one mills dedicated to metal production alone.\textsuperscript{64} Their destruction during the war led indirectly to one of the few recorded strikes of craftsmen in sixteenth-century Nuremberg and feeds directly into this play, so the background to the dispute will be discussed before the analysis of the play.

Tensions amongst the metalworkers grew during the post-war period, resulting in a letter of complaint, \textit{Die Klage der 110 Meister} (2 April 1557),\textsuperscript{65} which was sent to Nuremberg Council by the Meister of the Messerer. The Messerer trades were the largest employer in Nuremberg. Rainer Stahlschmidt reports: ‘Insgesamt dürfte die Zahl der an der Herstellung von Messern und Schwertern beteiligten Handwerkermeister in der Größenordnung von 600 bis 700 liegen’.\textsuperscript{66} Metalwork was integral to Nuremberg’s
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weapons industry, as illustrated by the range of specialisms reported: ‘Sie stellten Messer und Schwerter her, vergaben aber einige Arbeitsabschnitte an die zahlenmäßig kleineren Gruppen der Klingenschmiede und Schleifer sowie gelegentlich an nur vereinzelt auftretende spezialisierte Handwerker wie Schwertfeiger, Schalenschröter, Scheidenmacher, Knauf-, Kreuz-, und Haubenschmiede’.  

In 1537 the weekly production totalled eighty thousand blades but by 1557 this had increased to one hundred thousand and to maintain production levels the Verlagssystem was introduced. This system of employment had been banned in 1348 but was reintroduced as the city developed more industrial processes:


The Verleger supplied the materials for the Stückwerker and then sold the completed item for a sum he determined. If demand fell the Stückwerker suffered, there being no guarantee of work, and as pieceworkers they were paid per item produced. Stückwerker were either Handwerker who had not finished their apprenticeship or who had never made the grade of Meister or those who could not afford their own establishment. To complicate matters there were wealthy Meister with their own workshops who had a secondary level of production as Verleger controlling different workshops of Stückwerker. Endres explains the situation in 1549: ‘Bei den Messeren werden für das Jahr 1549 neben 88
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70 Endres, ‘Zur Lage’, 111.
selbständigen Meistern 110 verlegte Stückwerker erwähnt; zu dieser Zeit soll der reichste Messeremeister allein 20–40 Stückwerker zugleich verlegt haben'.

During the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg twenty-eight mills and twenty-three smithies were destroyed both in and outside the city, which caused a serious loss of power for production. Mills were costly to rebuild and were financed by the wealthy merchants, businessmen or Meister, singularly or in groups, and consequently they restricted production to their dependent Werkstätten or Stückwerker.

In 1557, there was an overproduction of blades, which decreased the price per unit paid to the Stückwerker and this, combined with the problems for smaller workshops and poorer Meister of access to the finished metals they needed for production, resulted in widespread discontent. Additionally, changes were introduced by the Geschworene, which were seen by the poorer Meister as advantageous to the wealthy Verleger or Meister. The poorer Meister united to write the Klage in which they complained about the power and dominance of the richer Verleger and Meister and suggested changes to the rules governing their trade. In other cities this appeal for help would have been handled by the Zünfte but as no guilds had been allowed in Nuremberg since the Handwerkeraufstand (1349), they had to appeal to the Council, which in turn sought clarification and advice from the Rugamt.

On a personal front, Sachs had been appointed Merker of the Meistersinger in 1555, but he had fallen foul of the city censor once again for a work about the death of Albrecht Alcibiades on 8 January 1557. Sachs’s satirical piece about this enemy of Nuremberg is
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76 Geschworene were not patricians, but swore allegiance to the Council and advised the Council on the rules pertaining to each trade, especially the choice of apprentices, the Meisterprüfung etc. (Endres, ‘Zur Lage’, 109).
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called *Gespräch von der Himelfart margraff Albrechts anno 1557* and either the censor would not allow it to be published or Sachs himself withheld its publication. The problem with this satire was its possible publication coinciding with the negotiations with Alcibiades’s descendants for reparations for the destruction of the Plassenburg. These negotiations for compensation did not conclude until 6 October 1558. This work has been cited as the cause of the search of Hans Sachs’s property the day after his death, but what is clear is that Sachs could not afford to upset the new censor, Hieronymus Paumgartner der Ältere.

Paumgartner (1498–1565) had replaced the Abt of the Egidienkloster as censor on the latter’s death in 1554. Paumgartner came from a wealthy patrician family in Nuremberg and was highly educated, having studied with Luther and Philipp Melanchthon at Wittenberg University. He returned to Nuremberg in 1522 and was immediately caught up in the Reformation and helped to establish the Melanchthon Gymnasium, based on Humanist educational principles and Lutheran doctrine, at the behest of the Council, which wanted to bridge the educational gap between the pre-existing city schools and university. It is believed that Dürer’s painting ‘Die Vier Apostel’ (1536) depicts Paumgartner as Mark the Evangelist, illustrating the importance of Paumgartner to the city even at this early stage in his career.

Although personally engaged in Lutheranism, from a political standpoint Paumgartner was reluctant at first for Nuremberg to adopt the new faith, but once the
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79 KG XXIII, p. 113–21.
81 Brunner says, ‘Freilich ließ Sachs den Text nicht drucken – die reichsstädtische Zensur hätte das nicht zugelassen, denn der verstorbenen Markgraf gehörte immerhin zur mächtigen Hohenzollerndynastie’ (Brunner, *Hans Sachs*, p. 43). For this text to have been appropriated on Sachs’s death indicates knowledge of its existence.
decision had been made, he became its champion.\textsuperscript{85} He clashed with Osiander from early in the Reformation and sided with Melanchthon when a judgement was needed.\textsuperscript{86} His power in Nuremberg cannot be overestimated as he held many senior roles during his lifetime. He had been involved in formulating the \textit{Brandenburg/Nürnberg Kirchenordnung} of 1533 and had represented Nuremberg officially on many occasions. In 1553 he became \textit{Oberster Hauptmann}, the third-highest authority within the Nuremberg Council,\textsuperscript{87} his late attainment of this role was due to the presence of his elder brother, Bernhard, on the Council, who took precedence due to his age. His role as city censor was a logical conclusion due to his prior involvement in censorship:

\begin{quote}
Seit 1533 war Paumgartner als erster Kirchenpfleger auch für die Überwachung der Bücherzensur in der Nürnberger Republik verantwortlich, er stützte die restriktive Haltung des Rates gegen die in Nürnberg veröffentlichten Schriften von Täufern und Böhmischen Brüdern – hier konnte ihm auch die offizielle Stellungnahme der Städte Zürich, Bern und St. Gallen gegen die Wiedertaüfer von Nutzen sein, er hatte aber auch die Abwehr gegenüber reformiertem Gedankengut aus dem Südwesten des Reichs und aus den Schweizer Stadtrepubliken nach außen zu vertreten, das er selbst in seinem Haus ausgiebig studierte.\textsuperscript{88}
\end{quote}

There is no evidence of any previous clashes between Sachs and Paumgartner other than the possibility that he had suggested to Sachs that publication of the Albrecht Alcibiades satire would not be prudent. However, given that one of Paumgartner’s roles was the suppression of Anabaptist writings and his accession to the city Council in 1525,\textsuperscript{89} it is probable that he would have known that Sachs had been implicated in the case of the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{85}{Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 64.}
\footnotetext{86}{See page 82.}
\footnotetext{87}{Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 63-64.}
\footnotetext{88}{Jürgensen, \textit{Norica}, p. 144.}
\footnotetext{89}{Zimmermann, ‘Baumgartner und Osiander’, 63.}
\end{footnotes}
“Godless Painters”. Chapter V will reflect on Paumgartner’s role as a satirical subject for Sachs. Conversely, Jürgensen says that Paumgartner displayed no interest in Sachs’s writings and his personal library contained no writings by this local writer.

Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent is a reworking of an earlier Fastnachtspiel and Sachs’s purpose in reusing this text should be examined. In 1535 (21 December) Sachs wrote Ein faßnacht-spiel mit sechs personen und heist die sechs klagenden, in which five representatives of different levels of society (Bauer, Handwerksman, Landtzknecht, Pfaff, Bettelman) ask a Wirt to judge their poverty and help them to rise above it. This earlier play was written during the period when Sachs did not publish works due to his censorship in 1527. The similarities in the two Fastnachtspiele are: a judgement is sought from an external party and the protagonists are representatives of society. Further similarities occur as Sachs reuses entire sections of dialogue from the 1535 play for this Fastnachtspiel dated 1557. The earlier play is based on the sins of Neid and Gier, whereas this play is devoted to Geiz and Wucher. Avarice and the problems experienced by lower-paid workers often appear as themes in Sachs’s works and he had written about the exploitation of Stückwerker in his Dialog wider den geytz und andere öffentliche Laster (1524), saying: ‘Ist das gut Ewangelisch, das die armen also tag und nach uber und uber arbayten und sich doch des hungers mit weyb und kindt kaum erneren mögen?’. Thus, the 1557 Fastnachtspiel is a re-working of a similar play with a subplot about the plight of Stückwerker. Written twenty-three years almost to the day after the Die sechs klagenden, it is opened by Jupiter, who is linked metaphorically to the protection of government. According to Theiß, Sachs uses Jupiter as the dispenser of judgement in
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90 See page 10.
91 Jürgensen, Norica, p. 134.
92 KG IX, pp. 3–11.
93 See page 12.
94 KG XXII, pp. 51–68 (pp. 55–56).
other plays but in other plays Sachs has used Jupiter to represent the Holy Roman Emperor, which may be relevant as at the time this play was written there was a hiatus between the abdication of Charles V (January 1556) and the appointment of Ferdinand as Holy Roman Emperor on 14 March 1558.

Jupiter plays the judge and jury in an adversarial setting, which gives Sachs the opportunity to produce a moral judgement, which serves his didactic purpose. It is not unusual to find classical figures in sixteenth-century dramas, an example being *Schuldramen* written by Humanists, in which classical Greek and Roman histories provided the plot and which were performed in Latin. These were regarded by the well-educated as the theatrical form of choice for children and not suitable for the uneducated. Jupiter clarifies his task:

\begin{quote}
Es schreit das ganz menschlich geschlecht
Zu mir über gewalt und recht
Und über wuecherliche handel,
Wie die sind alles ungluecks drendel.
\end{quote}

(p. 136, ll. 4–7)

As avarice is one of the Seven Deadly Sins and due to the city’s involvement in trade and finance, the audience would have understood the implications of the words ‘wuecherliche handel’, not only from their biblical study but also from Luther’s sermon *Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher* (1524), which he based on commercial transactions. Sachs uses three representatives of society, a merchant, a craftsman and a farmer, for his purposes. The words ‘wuecherliche handel’ would remind people of Veit Dietrich’s sermon of 21 June 1547, in which he accused Christoph von Gendorf of leading people into danger.
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99 *LW xv*, p. 293.
through his avaricious business practices. Jupiter lists the complainants, ‘Unden auf erd aus allen stenten, | Die unterthan sambt den regenten’ (ll. 8–9), meaning the powerless and the powerful. Despite using the words, ‘in den mawren’ (l. 10), he includes those living outside the city walls, ‘die paueren’ (l. ll) and to some extent ‘die unterthan’ (l. 8). This may indicate a new perception of identity prevailing since the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg, when people living in Nuremberg’s territorial lands sought refuge within the city walls during the sieges, making the two separate communities one. One purpose of city walls was to exclude ‘outsiders’, a term subsequently applied to anyone living outside the walls, whether foreigners, non-Christians or farmers. This concept resulted in unflattering stereotypes of the farming community which were exploited in Fastnachtspiele. In the Bible, Adam, who represents mankind, was thrown out of the Garden of Eden due to the Devil’s influence and ordered to till the land, which fostered the idea that farmers were in league with the Devil and added to their reputation as outsiders and as non-believers. Sachs could be using a farmer for all these reasons: as a reminder of Original Sin, as an example of the ‘outsider’, or, conversely, to illustrate the new joint identity.

Jupiter summons the three representatives of society, the Bauer, the Handwerker and the Kaufmann or Bürger, to present their cases in an adversarial situation. Sachs has chosen these three purposely: the Bauer provides the city with food, the Handwerker creates the goods which are sold by the Kaufmann. Their interdependency is obvious. By summoning these representatives of Nuremberg’s class structure, Jupiter puts all Nuremberg’s citizens on trial. The first complainant is the Bauer, which is unusual in Fastnachtspiele, where normally the person of the highest rank, i.e., the Kaufmann, would present his case first. This reversal is, according to Catholy, an example of ‘die verkehrte
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100 Klaus, Dietrich, p. 265.
101 Baro, Der Narr, p. 8.
102 Genesis 3:17.
103 Modern spellings will be used in this work.
This could also be a levelling technique of Hans Sachs, whereby all representatives of society are on trial and are charged with the same crime. The Bauer complains about his hard, physical work (p. 137, ll. 3–5), on which he has many taxes: ‘Mich peinigt rent, zinst, guelt und fron’ (l. 6). ‘Rent’ refers to a yearly contribution he pays the landowner and ‘zins’ is ground rent paid to the territorial landowner, whether secular or religious. ‘Zins’ also has the meaning of interest payments on borrowed money, which may indicate that the Bauer is in debt. ‘Gülte’ is a tax based on income and paid to the landowner in the form of a percentage of crops, whereas ‘fron’ refers to Herrendienst, that is, labour given freely to a landowner by his tenants. In addition to tax payments the Bauer has other burdens: ‘Mues schier ereren idermon: | Adel, pfaff, petler und lanczknecht’ (ll. 7–8). The ‘Adel’ and ‘pfaff’ refer to the peasant farmer’s overlords to whom he owes taxes but the ‘petler’ and ‘lancznecht’ were beggars and mercenary soldiers. ‘Lanczknecht’ would invoke memories of the damage done by Alcibiades’s troops as they stole and pillaged their way through the farming lands surrounding Nuremberg. Furthermore, the Bauer is plagued by scavenging animals:

Wolff, fuechs, marder, kraen und raben

Wils als sein narung von mir haben. (p. 137, ll. 10–11)

Sachs uses animal imagery in many works, notably wolves to symbolize ‘geistliche Würdenträger’ and foxes ‘als Sinnbild der List’, which may indicate that Sachs is satirizing the role that religious and territorial taxes play in causing the poverty of the rural communities. Furthermore, these particular animals are known for other characteristics, such as the cunning fox or the wolf for its greed, which prompt the audience to thoughts of theft and insatiable appetite. The two birds are found in a fable wherein the crow

104 Catholy, Fastnachtspiel, p. 262.
105 Theiß, Allegorik, p. 133.
106 Theiß, Allegorik, p. 135.
107 Theiß, Allegorik, p. 123.
becomes jealous of the raven’s influence over man as a fortune-teller. The crow decides to imitate a raven when people pass by his perch. The people are at first frightened, believing a raven is foretelling a bad omen, but when they notice that it is a crow, they dismiss their fears. The moral of this story is that people who pretend they are something that they are not, just look foolish. How this fable appropriately applies to the Fastnachtspiel will become clearer as the analysis progresses but this fable supports the concepts of jealousy and pretentious behaviour which Sachs portrays in all three levels of society.

The Bauer bemoans his hard life and recalls recent events which would touch the audience through their common experience:

Der krieg mich oft in grund verderbt,
Freund unde feint mir fallen ein,
Dreiben mir his ros, kue und schwein. (p. 137, ll. 17–19)

Sachs lends reality to the Bauer’s situation as it is known that the territorial lands suffered more than the city during the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg. Gruner writes: ‘Ergebnis des Kriegs: 2 Städte, 170 Dörfer, 3 Klöster, 19 Schlösser, 75 Herrensitze, 28 Mühlen, 23 Hammerschmieden und 3,000 Morgen Wald wurden eingeäschert und viele Weiher angegraben’. This indicates the extent of the damage to the countryside, which led to food shortages in both countryside and city. With provisions in short supply, prices rose and this, coupled with pre-existing inflation, resulted in hardship amongst the lowest-earning groups. The reference to the loss of livestock is also factual: not only did the marauding troops steal animals for their own nourishment, but the Council destroyed a ring of forest around the city walls to enable better visibility from the city walls. This destruction included farms, pig and goat stalls situated outside the Frauentor which were

110 See p. 103.
visible to the city dwellers. Sachs’s purpose is to remind his audience how the Bauer has experienced hardship, which became a shared experience for both country and city dwellers. What money the farmer did have, he buried (p. 137, ll. 20–22) to protect it from the troops, which is a reference to the chosen method of saving money by the poorer country folk, who had no access to banks. This farmer can only rebuild his farm by borrowing money from his feudal master, which has resulted in more misery:

Entlehen ich den an dem ent
Gelt, darmit ich wieder auf-paw,
So schirt mir der lehen-herr gnaw. (p. 137, ll. 23–25)

Speculating in the hope of a good harvest is hardly sound business and this is one of Sachs’s points. ‘Schirt’ from scheren means ‘pressured’, or ‘to exploit’, which has consequences for the Bauer: the ‘lehen-herr’ demands grain for his own nourishment whilst the farmer has to eat straw (p. 137, ll. 26–27). That farmers were forced to eat straw is based on fact as it happened during the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg. Gruner reports: ‘Man findet auch tote Bauern, welche das Gras noch in den Mäulern haben’.

Unfortunately, the Bauer has worsened his position by borrowing money:

Hab ich den ain frist uber-gangen
So lest er mich legen gefangen,
Dringt und drueckt mich, wis im ist eben. (p. 137, ll. 28–30)

The Bauer finds himself in a downward spiral of debt as he attempts to rebuild his farm and earn a living, whilst meeting the demands of his overlord for the interest on a loan taken to cover the cost of reconstruction. If he defaults, he is imprisoned, from where he cannot work, and so the cycle of debt increases. The avariciously short-sighted behaviour of the
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111 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 136 (06.05 and 12.05).
112 Sachs portrays this method of protecting money in the Fastnachtspiel Der fahrendt schuler im Paradies (1557) (KG XIV, pp. 72–83), in which a farmer’s wife removes money from a buried pot and gives it to a student who is returning to Paradise, so that he can give money to her deceased first husband.
113 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 137 (03.06).
'lehen-herr’ will worsen his own position as the Bauer’s ability to repay his debt is dependent on his ability to work. Martin Luther said of farmers specifically: ‘Mus doch eyn acker knecht futter und lohn von seyner erbeyt haben. Wer kan umb sonst dienen odder erbeytten? So spricht das Evangelion ‘Eyn erbeytter ist seynes lohns werd’.

Sachs provides the audience with details about a farmer’s life to remind them how recent events have affected society, both inside and outside the walls, causing both groups to unite under the same shared identity. If the audience came to see the Fastnachtspiel believing that the farmer was an outsider, Sachs sought to change their expectations, as explained by Mike Rogers: ‘The audience brings its own expectations to the show, and finds these confirmed, in ingenious and unexpected ways, or perhaps reversed, in ways that are equally unexpected and ingenious’.

By placing the Bauer first in the proceedings Sachs indicates to the audience that the decline in their joint fortunes started from the ground upwards. In the pre-Reformation Dialogues Sachs uses a farmer to be the mouth piece for Lutheranism but there is no direct religious motivation behind this speech. Sachs presents this farmer as lucid and intelligent.

The Handwerker commences his counter-argument:

Ey, pawer, schweig ein weillen still;
Dw clagest ser grosse unpill
Uber die puerger in der stat
Wie sie dich alle in der stat

Peschweren also vil und hoch. (p. 137, ll, 37–40 – p. 138, l. 1)

In his response to the Bauer’s complaints, the Handwerker illustrates the typical city-dweller’s stereotype of a farmer. As the genre of Fastnachtspiel was an urban-based entertainment, the choice of a peasant or farmer as a figure of fun is facilitated by him being

---

114 LW XV, p. 296, ll. 8–10.
115 Mike Rogers, ‘Comedy, Realism and Satire’, p. 20.
116 Gespräch eines Evanglischen Christen mit einem Lutherischen, KG XXII, pp. 69–84.
an ‘outsider’. His dress is different to that of townsfolk, his speech is probably more accented, thus adding to the ‘comic’ aspects of the peasant or farmer and synonymous with the role of a fool.\(^{117}\) The Bauer had apportioned blame for his situation to the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg, an event during which both classes suffered hardships. Sachs proceeds to destroy the concept of this shared experience by allowing the Handwerker to repeat ‘in der stat’ twice, reverting to the pre-existing stereotype of the outsider. The Handwerker believes the validity of the Bauer’s complaints are overstated, using ‘unpill’ (p. 137, l. 37), meaning ‘unreasonable’, and later a double-entendre, ‘Wie dw elagst ungeplewten ars’ (p. 138, l. 3), which is an old Franconian idiom meaning having no grounds to complain.\(^{118}\) This may have evoked laughter in the audience and leads them to move their sympathy from the Bauer to the Handwerker, so that they understand his problems.

The Handwerker accuses the Bauer of living the good life (p. 138, ll. 5–7), which is born out of the idea of Schlaraffenland. This word indicates a type of Paradise where those that strive are penalised and the lazy live comfortably and have more than enough to eat. Similar utopias exist in many European cultures; and examples of this concept are found in Boccaccio’s Decameron\(^ {119}\) and in Sebastian Brant’s Narrenschiff.\(^ {120}\) Hans Sachs wrote about Das Schlaweraffen Land in 1530 and mentions it in other poems.\(^ {121}\) As the Fastnachtspiel unfolds, the accusation that the farmer leads the good life is elaborated by the Handwerker:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Im winter get ir int rochn-stuebn} \\
\text{Da scherczen maid und die rospuebn;} \\
\text{Zu nacht die pawren-knecht erst fenstern,}
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{118}\) DWB see arsch.

\(^{119}\) This story is found on the eighth day in Boccaccio’s Decameron.


\(^{121}\) KG V, pp. 338–41.
‘Rockenstuben’ were initially female gatherings for sewing and spinning during winter evenings by shared lamplight and are a favourite motif for Hans Sachs, who even wrote a *Fastnachtspiel* and a *Meisterlied* about this tradition. It became a metaphor for sexual impropriety when men started visiting these gatherings. Sachs’s *Meisterlied* describes how the gatherings degenerate into an orgy:

Beim ofen stünd ein pawren maide  
Mit plosem ars; da ir zu laide  
Ein pauren knecht grieff zu dem ding,  
Dem gab sie einen pewderling  
In rueck mit ihre flachen hande  
Das er hin dorcklet an ain wande. (ll. 47–53)

Alison Stewart compares Sachs’s description from his poem *Die Rockenstüeben* (1553) to Sebald Beham’s woodcut *Rockenstuben* (1524) (see Fig. 11) because his poem appears to put Beham’s image into words. The Beham image was produced shortly before the Reformation, when it was decided that some festivities could lead to immoral activities. In 1523 and 1524, when the numbers of festivals were reduced, attempts were made to stop *Kermes*, except for the annual Nuremberg *Kermes*. In a similar manner, in 1525 the Council tried to ban *Rockenstuben* in the Nuremberg territorial areas and although the ban was successful in the city, where there was more scrutiny, the country affairs still took place. This gave rise to jealousy on the part of the predominantly male workers in the confines of the city walls.

---

122 KG XIV, pp. 26–34.  
123 *Repertorium der Sangsprüche*, Die rockenstüeben (17 August 1553 ²S/4193a. Rosenton 3 Str.).  
126 Stewart, ‘Distaff and Spindles’, p. 129.  
Fig. 11 Rockenstuben

Fig. 12 Bauer
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Fig. 14 Kauffmann
Returning to the *Fastnachtspiel*, the word ‘fenstern’ (p. 138, l. 11) also refers to sexual impropriety, namely, the custom by which young women would put a lighted candle in their window to announce to their lovers that it was safe for them to enter.\(^{128}\) Again this tradition would have been very appealing for the city apprentices who had little access to female company except during *Fastnacht*. The Handwerker continues:

> In sumer stecket ir die mayen,
> 
> Hat kirchwiech, hochzeit, dencz und rayon,
> 
> Kuegeln, hannen, steigen und lauffen. (p. 138, ll. 13–15)

The Handwerker continues his bucolic imagery of the Bauer’s life with the reference to ‘Maienstecken’, the custom of Maypole dancing with which the villagers celebrate Whitsunday, but other customs exist in which young unmarried men decorate the houses of their desired partners with mayflowers.\(^{129}\) The second line refers to village festivals, ‘rayon’ or ‘reihen’ being a kind of line dance. The reference to ‘kirchweich’ is to another festival which celebrated the consecration of that particular church. This was still practiced in the countryside but, according to Keith Moxey, had been banned in the city.\(^{130}\) Moxey says of Sachs’s descriptions of peasants: ‘Sachs’s verses therefore characterise the peasants as greedy and drunken, gross and uncouth, as well as suggestive and obscene’.\(^{131}\) This applies to the farmers in the *Rockenstuben* described in Sachs’s song, but not the image of the life the Bauer presents to the audience. Moxey’s observations about the cause of the Handwercker’s jealousy are pertinent:

> On the one hand artisans would have taken pride in their status as members of an urban community whose social identity was elaborately defined by the ordinances of the town Council. On the other hand, they may have longed
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\(^{128}\) DWB see *fenstern*.

\(^{129}\) DWB see *maie*.


\(^{131}\) Moxey, *Peasants*, p. 45.
for the less restricted and regimented lives so many of them had forsaken in
favour of earning a better living in the city.\textsuperscript{132}

In the line ‘Ir thuet euch ländisch klaider kauffen’ (p. 138, l. 16), Sachs indicates pretention
on the part of the Bauer, who instead of wearing his coarse pinafore buys London cloth.\textsuperscript{133}
which had been imported into Nuremberg since the fifteenth century. Other literary figures
have confirmed the farmers’ pretentiousness: Hans Rosenplut, Sachs’s predecessor and
writer of \textit{Fastnachtspiele} (c.1400–60), had written:

\begin{quote}
Ich sprich, es ist in dreissig Jorn
Rechter Paurn nit vil geporn.
Das ist wol an irer Hoffart Schein,
Sie wölln all Herren sein.\textsuperscript{134}
\end{quote}

This suggests that farmers had a reputation for pretention in the previous century; however,
this may stem from stereotypical prejudice and the desire to view the farmer as an object
of derision.

The Handwerker lists the Bauer’s methods of moneymaking (138, ll. 18–21), but
accuses him of cheating:

\begin{quote}
Das gilt eüch alles gelcz genueg.
Noch praucht ir unferstant und trüeg,
Seit hertmewlig und unferstanden
Und grob paide mit munde und handen
Ser ungehorsam der obrikeit:
Und dw c lagst doch zu aller zeit! (p. 138, ll. 23–28)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{132} Moxey, \textit{Peasants}, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{133} Luther writes: ‘Dis stuck, höre ich, treyen de Engelländer kauffleute am grobesten und meysten, wenn
sie Englische odder Lündissche tůcher verkeuffen’ (\textit{LW} xv, p. 308, ll. 28–31).
\textsuperscript{134} Günther Franz, \textit{Quellen zur Geschichte des deutschen Bauerstandes im Mittelalter}, Ausgewählte Quellen
‘Unferstant’\textsuperscript{135} can mean incompetent or poor business management, but in conjunction with ‘trüeg’ (l. 24) it suggests purposeful irregularity. ‘Hartmaulig’ is usually used to describe a horse’s hard mouth but when applied to humans it means uncontrollable and stubborn, whereas ‘unferstanden’ has another meaning of ignorance.\textsuperscript{136} The Handwerker describes a stereotypical farmer: unreliable, stubborn and ignorant, with animalistic characteristics which alienate him from the city worker. He accuses the Bauer of being ‘Ser unghorsam der obrikeit’ (l. 27), a similar accusation made by Luther about the farmers’ behaviour during the \textit{Bauernkrieg} contained in his work \textit{Wider die räuberischen und mörderischen Bauern} (1525).\textsuperscript{137} Luther believed the farmers had a Christian duty to obey their feudal overlords. However, the Bauer’s complaints echo the plight of the farmers in 1525, who felt their impoverished conditions were caused, in part, by the demands of their feudal landlords.\textsuperscript{138}

Another reason for Sachs’s use of the accusation of ‘Ungehorsamkeit’ and a further link to the \textit{Bauernkrieg} are found in the wording of the metal workers’ complaint to the Council. When the \textit{Klage} of the 110 \textit{Meister} had been delivered, accusations were made which caused the Council to demand restraint: ‘Auf die polemischen Anschuldigungen beider Seiten ging der Rat gar nicht erst ein, ermahnte allerdings die beiden Anführer der Kläger zum Gehorsam’.\textsuperscript{139} Moreover, in the Council’s reply, known as \textit{Die Gegenbericht der 167 Meister}, it says:

.... uffm handtwergk weiter meuterey und aufwiglung, zanck und zwitracht zu machen, möchten daraus ein grosser unraht enteen, wie sich dan Hannauer in einem wirthshaus hatt hören lassen, er wöll ein klein Paurnkrieg daraus machen, derhalb wir uns teglich besolgen [!] müssen.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{135} \textit{DWB} see \textit{unverstand}.
\textsuperscript{136} Hennig, \textit{Wörterbuch, unverstanden}.
\textsuperscript{137} \textit{LW} XVIII, pp. 357–61.
\textsuperscript{138} Whaley, \textit{Germany and the HRE}, I, pp. 220–223.
\textsuperscript{139} Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 177.
\textsuperscript{140} Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 189.
One of the signatories to the Klage, Hans Hannauer, was believed to be the ringleader by the Council and is named in several places in the Gegenbericht, but the above quotation makes the link to the Bauernkrieg, which suggests that copies of both letters were freely available in Nuremberg or that Sachs had access to a copy.

To return to the play: the Handwerker focuses on his own problems:

Ich pin ain armer hantwercks-man,
Mein hawt mus ich gar hart dran streckn,
Noch wil mein arbeit mir nit kleckn,
Das ich auskum in meinem haus. (p. 138, ll. 30–33)

The Handwerker characterises himself as a basic craftsman or even Stückwerker who had been disadvantaged by the changes brought in by the Geschworene. He complains that his work is not sufficient (‘klecken’, l. 32) to cover his personal needs. He continues: ‘All ding ist spiczig uberaus, Kumbt schier als in die firden hent’ (p. 137, ll. 34–5). ‘Firden hent’ may refer to the number of hands through which the commission of work is passed before it arrives at the workshop, with the implication that each person will take his cut of the profits, consequently reducing the Handwerker’s share.

The Handwerker continues, ‘Vil mues ich fon ehalten leiden’ (p. 138, l. 37). ‘Ehalten’ means ‘Leute, die in einem Vertragsverhältnis stehen’, indicating that he is possibly a Stückwerker or a poor Meister and reliant on the Verleger for work. The Handwerker complains that his neighbours and others hate him (p. 138, l. 38):

Kawflewrt und kunden mir abseczen,
Maide und knecht sie mir verheczen,
Verleger und kauffleut mich puecken,
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141 There appear to be two separate men with surnames Hannauer and Hanauer listed as signatories to the letter. (Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 194).
142 See page 182, fn. 76.
143 DWB, auskommen see 6.
144 DWB: no exact translation available but see viertner, vierdener, firdener.
145 Deutsche Enzyklopädie < http://www.enzyklo.de/Begriff/ehalten> [accessed: 30 June 2016].
Hawszinst und lossung thuet mich druecken. (p. 138, l. 39 – p. 139, l. 3)

The reference to ‘abseczen’ and ‘puecken’ indicates that the Handwerker has received threats from the Verleger. Stahlschmidt describes intimidation meted out by the Verleger: ‘Obwohl die reichen Verleger versucht haben sollen, den Zusammenschluß zu verhindern, und besonders damit gedroht hatten, den Beteiligten keine Arbeit mehr zu geben, hatten sich schließlich 110 Handwerker zur Unterschrift entschlossen’.146 The increased taxes referred in line 3 were to cover the costs of war reparations and often applied to the price of beer and grain, which affected all members of society but especially those with low incomes.147 There is another interpretation: this refers to the consequences for the signatories of the Klage, who were charged for the work carried out by the Rugamt in drawing up the Gegenbericht. They were forced to pay a contribution for the next two years calculated from their income.148 Despite the poverty of their situation, the Gegenbericht brought no changes, except that one of the Geschworene was henceforth to be a Stückwerker.149 This additional tax burden had consequences, as illustrated in the next lines:

Derhalben mein wergzewg und pet

Zu Schnaitach untern Juden stet.

Entnem ich etwan gelt darneben,

Mus ich zwifachen wüecher geben. (p. 139, ll. 4–7)

Martin Schieber writes about craftworkers’ debts: ‘Für arme Handwerker oder kleine Bedienstete der Stadt oder anderer Institutionen bildete die Auszahlung eines Lohnvorschusses durch den Arbeitgeber eine wichtige Möglichkeit zu kurzfristiger Kreditaufnahme’.150 However, if a Handwerker borrowed from the Verleger, as described
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146 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 176.
147 Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 91.
149 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 177.
by Schieber, the consequences were that the craftsmen worked for nothing as their earnings were subsumed by repayments.\textsuperscript{151} Hence, this Handwerker borrows from Jews living in Schnaittach,\textsuperscript{152} a distance of twenty-two kilometres from Nuremberg, where Jews had resettled since being expelled from Nuremberg between 1498 and 1499.\textsuperscript{153} More recently in 1553 moneylenders asked to settle in Furth (approximately twelve kilometres distant) after their expulsion from Bavaria by Herzog Albrecht V.\textsuperscript{154} Nuremberg objected, appealing unsuccessfully to the Bishop of Bamberg for support, as his diocese had borrowed from Jewish moneylenders to pay for their defence against Alcibiades.\textsuperscript{155}

To return to the Handwerker’s plight: having pawned his tools and personal possessions, the craftsman would have had to pay to release them or pay interest for a loan taken against them. The Handwerker, like the Bauer, has put his potential income in jeopardy by borrowing against the tools required to earn his livelihood. He continues: ‘Darmit so wirt ich gar pereit | Gen Straspurg auf die hochzeit’ (p. 139, ll. 8–9). This idiom is based on: ‘Er ist nach Straszburg auf die hochzeit gezogen “sagt man am Oberrhein von einem, der hab und gut mit wohlleben verpraszt hat”’.\textsuperscript{156} Sachs implies that Handwerker prefer to borrow from Jewish moneylenders rather than from the Verleger, suggesting that Jewish moneylenders are less usurious. By invoking cultural memories of Jewish mone

\textsuperscript{151} Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’,182.
\textsuperscript{152} Osiander had written in opposition to Martin Luther’s anti-Jewish rhetoric in 1540 in a work entitled \textit{Ob es war und glaublich sey, daß die Juden der Christen Kinder heymlich erwürgen und ihr Blut gebrauchen}. In this he questioned blaming the Jews for Host desecration. Osiander had studied Hebrew and had corresponded with Schulmeister Wölfflein from Schnaittach (Arnd Müller, \textit{Geschichte der Juden in Nürnberg 1146–1945}, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur der Stadt Nürnberg, 12 (Nürnberg: Stadtbibliothek, 1968), pp. 86–88).
\textsuperscript{153} See page, 53.
\textsuperscript{154} Gruner, \textit{Nürnberg}, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{155} Muller, \textit{Juden}, p. 92.
\textsuperscript{156} DWB, see Straszburg.
to be merciful to those who commit sins. Sachs implies that the Handwerker recognizes his faults and seeks a solution for his sins by asking for God’s help and, in the last two lines of his speech (ll. 14–15), the Handwerker asks Jupiter to punish those he blames for threatening his livelihood.

Throughout this speech, the Handwerker separates his cultural identity from that of the farmer, thus destroying any sense of unity formed by Alcidiades’s sieges. He fails to recognize that their economic situations are similar since both are subject to the demands of their superiors, whether feudal overlord, Meister or Verleger, and both suffered the effects of the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg. The reference to Martin Luther’s hymn reaffirms Nuremberg’s cultural identity as Lutheran, which reminds the audience that, although the religious basis of the country festivals described by the Handwerker is Catholic or indeed pagan, both city and country dwellers are unified in their faith.

The Kaufmann then begins his counter-argument to the Handwerker’s complaints:

   Was dw uber dein unrecht klagst,
   Ist nit so heftig, als dw sagst.
   Deinr hartsel machst dir selber vil:
   Wen dw ligst pey dem wein und spil,
   Den Montag zu dem suntag feyrst,
   Etwan mit voller rot umbleyerst. (p. 139, ll. 19–24)

The Kaufmann’s use of ‘klagst’ reminds the audience immediately of Die Klage der 110 Meister. ‘Voller rot’ translates as full of passion and anger, but in conjunction with ‘Umbleyerst’, which stems from ‘umleire’, meaning being a layabout or good-for-nothing, the Kaufmann implies the craftsmen devote themselves fully to their enjoyment.

157 The hymn was first published in 1524 in Edlich Cristlich lider and is based on Psalm 130, ‘Aus der Tiefe rufe ich, Herr, zu dir’.
158 DWB see rot.
These words reflect the stereotypical image of artisans held by the merchants and manufacturers. Here, Sachs uses his knowledge of the Der Gegenbericht, which states:

‘...so unter inen die furnembsten schreier sindt, am notigsten bedürfen [würde], würd man sie hie und in umbligenden dörfern beim spilen, schlemmen und prassen finden, alda sie mererstheils vom suntag an bis an den freitag und sambstag im luder ligen’.159

The Council accuses the complainants of visiting villages to overindulge themselves, which is similar to the Handwerker’s accusation about the Bauer’s lifestyle. Sachs goes further and underlines the depravity of the Handwerker: ‘Gest umb mit vogeln und mit dauben’ (p. 139, l. 25), and ‘vogeln’ means sexual activity in this instance! The performers, whether apprentices or newly qualified Handwerker, would have probably enjoyed acting out the obscenity in this phrase!

The Kaufmann continues: ‘Und kawft den weibern kostlich schauben’ (p. 139, l. 26). ‘Schaube’ is either a man’s or woman’s over-dress, or a lady’s hat. He implies that the Handwerker’s purpose is to present his wife in a good light, i.e., he is being pretentious in her choice of clothes. Nuremberg’s sumptuary laws were designed specifically to prevent petty jealousies between classes and wasteful spending, which Sachs portrays as a threat to the prevailing model of society as well as threatening economic prosperity. The Kaufmann turns his attention to the Handwerker’s work:

Vil newer gattung ir auf-pringet,
Darmit ir selb ainander dringet,
Und dut auch vil lerjunger leren,
Darmit sichs hauffen-werck thuet meren,
Gebt hin zu neyd auch an einander,
Pis ir verderbet allesander. (p. 139, ll. 27–32)

159 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 186.
Here the Kaufmann criticises the craftsmen’s work practices, accusing them of employing too many apprentices to increase productivity, which reduces the work available to the smaller workshops and causes jealousy. The *Klage* mentions the over-employment of *Stückwerker*, some of whom were not *Bürger*, which was not permitted in the *Meisterwerkstätte* and threatened local livelihoods. This may refer to the arrival of refugees from the Low Countries who were attracted to Nuremberg by the similarity of the commercial industries, which will be discussed in the next chapter. It was the role of the *Rugamt* to control the number of apprentices employed by an individual master, which in 1552 had been increased to three, but these rules did not apply to *Stückwerker*. When the overproduction of blades occurred in 1557 the *Rugamt* demanded a two-year period between the end of the apprenticeship and the *Meister* exam, adversely affecting the number of craftsmen able to establish their own workshops. The *Klage* also suggests a period of six years before a *Meister* can employ new apprentices, which indicates the awareness of the complainants to faults within the system. By allowing the Kaufmann to blame the Handwerker for his own troubles, Sachs mirrors the words of the *Gegenbericht*, in which the *Rugamt* blamed the problems suffered by the *Handwerker* on their behaviour, whilst ignoring the problems with the *Verlagssystem*. Endres confirms the close association of the richer *Verleger* with the upper echelons of society in Nuremberg: ‘Denn reiche Meister und Verleger waren praktisch ausnahmslos identisch mit den Vorstehern im Handwerk’. Furthermore, to the suggestion that the *Geschworene* had disadvantaged the poorer *Meister* the *Gegenbericht* stated: ‘Wir können uns auch nit erinnern, […] das wir ohn wissen eins handtwercks gesetz in die ordnung gebracht [hätten],

160 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 182.
161 Sachs may be referring to an increase in refugees, especially weavers, who fled religious persecution in the Netherlands (Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 225–27).
164 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 183.
165 Endres, ‘Zur Lage’, 118.
die den verlegern zu wollfart und den gemeinen meistern zu nachtheil gelangt [hätten].

Sachs echoes the tone and stereotypical attitudes contained in the *Gegenbericht*, which turned attention from the changes to the *Verlagssystem*, from which the mill-owners had benefitted, to faults in the *Handwerker*.

The next lines in the Kaufmann’s speech indicate that Sachs had access to copies of the *Klage* and *Gegenbericht*:

*Den thuet ir in dye krieg hin-lauffen
Last weib und kinder ob aim hawffen
Siczen in armuet auf und nider.* (p. 139, ll. 33–35)

The first line of the *Gegenbericht* accuses the *Handwerker* of the following mentality: ‘Was ich heut verthue, morgen kan ichs wider gewinnen; ist doch uff wenigst ein guter spital vorhanden; oder aber steet ein her auf, so lauf ich in krig’. This, in conjunction with the following quotation from the *Gegenbericht*: ‘[.....], alda sie mererstheils vom suntag an bis an den freitag und sambstag in luder ligen und weib und kindt daheim in hunger sitzen lassen’, echoes the suggestion in the Kaufmann’s speech (ll. 33–35) that craft workers go off to war leaving their wives and children in need of alms. This may have a factual basis: during the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*, male citizens were obliged to join the *Hauptmannschaften*, for which they had to provide their own armour and weapons and defend their *Viertel* or area in which they lived. Exemptions were given for the sick, beggars, teachers, preachers, *Ratsherren* and *Berufssoldaten*. In times of war and in addition to their normal work, the craft workers were expected to down tools, lose their
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166 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 185.
167 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 189.
168 Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 186.
169 Nuremberg was divided into ten *Viertel*, each district had two *Viertelmeister*, who were responsible for mustering their troops, their arms and the storage of the arms. They were supported in their role by *Gassenhauptmänner*, who oversaw the troops. At the time of the war in 1552 the city counted four divisions, each containing 1300 men. See Johannes Kraus, ‘Das Verteidigungswesen der Reichsstadt Nürnberg in der Frühneuzeit’, *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung*, 70 (2010), 65–85 (pp. 70–71).
income and fight for their city. Within this speech by the Kaufmann, Sachs draws on the experience of the recent past and represents reality as opposed to the suggestions put forward in the Gegenbericht. The Kaufmann continues:

Und wenn ir den kumet herwider,
Must ir den reichn lauffen zu gnaden
Und schweren wuecher auf euch laden,
Und wolt doch lebn den reichen gleich,
Doch werden euer etlich reich. (p. 139, ll. 36–40)

The Kaufmann, who knew that the craftsmen had borrowed from moneylenders, blames their penury on their pretensions to live above their station. Again, Sachs directs his audience to the Handwerker’s desire to improve his status, which is based on borrowing money, and reflects issues found in Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht.

The Kaufmann then turns to his own life and complains about the peripatetic nature of his work:

Ain armer kauffman ymer zu,
Pey tag und nacht an alle rue.
Da peinigt mich den zol und mawt
Und glaitgelt, fuerlon uberlawt. (p. 140, ll. 5–8)

The Kaufmann lists the costs of importing and exporting merchandise: ‘zol’ is customs duty, but ‘mawt’ is a Franconian word for export duty; ‘geleitgeld’ is the cost of protection for travelling on a particular stretch of road and ‘vohrlohn’ are payments which could be bribery or just tolls. However, payments are the least of his problems:

………. Morder und rauber
Raumen mir oft mein wetschger sauber
Und strayffen mir mein geltlich ab,
Was ich for lang gewunen hab. (p. 140, ll. 11–14)
‘Wetschger’ or ‘wätschger’ is a hanging purse,\(^{170}\) sometimes known as a ‘mantelsack’, when it forms part of a coat (see Fig. 13). It also has the meaning, especially in idioms, of someone with a protruding belly and Sachs may have raised a laugh by using this double meaning as an image of merchants. Here Sachs repeats the common complaint of merchants about their dangerous life, which Luther suggested was overstated in his *Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher* (1524), saying: ‘Wenn sie aber solches um der gerechtigkeit willen litten, so weren freilich die kauffleute, heilige Leute’.\(^{171}\) In this sermon Luther also uses an idiom: ‘Grosse diebe hengen die kleinen diebe ...’,\(^{172}\) and: ‘Weyl sie das nicht tun so braucht Gott der Reutter und Reuber und strafft durch sie das unrecht an den Kauffleuten’.\(^{173}\) Nuremberg had its own example of ransom to which Sachs may be alluding, namely the kidnapping of Hieronymus Paumgartner, a senior member of the Council. After the Speyer Reichstag (1544), Paumgartner was kidnapped and held captive for fourteen months, enduring appalling conditions and only being released after a large ransom had been paid. Famously, he wrote a description of his imprisonment, which was widely published.\(^{174}\) This *Fastnachtspiel* was written twelve years after Paumgartner’s kidnapping but since Paumgartner had become the city’s censor in 1554, Sachs may be using the motif of a merchant kidnapping satirically, even more so since Sachs had feared censorship for his satire about the death of Albrecht Alcibiades, written on 6 February 1557.

To return to the analysis: the Kaufmann complains about debts caused by his wife, a trope which stems from the biblical idea that Eve was to blame for man’s downfall and was a common ruse found in *Fastnachtspiele*. As household expenses were usually the wife’s territory, the men in the audience would have felt blamelessness and united in the assumption that the fairer sex were to blame for their indebtedness. By encouraging the

---

\(^{170}\) *DWB*, see *wätschger*.

\(^{171}\) *LW* XV, p. 311 (l. 10).

\(^{172}\) *LW* XV, p. 313 (l. 8).

\(^{173}\) *LW* XV, p. 311 (ll. 26–27).

\(^{174}\) *Eigenhändiger Bericht*, IV, pp. 103–23.
feeling of blamelessness, Sachs sets his audience up for the ultimate fall, when Jupiter’s judgement renders them all equally culpable. He continues:

Der-gleich mir oft vil war verlagen:
Auch stocken etwan gar die hendel,
Und der-gleich solcher ungluecks-drendel.
Kum ich mit der zeit umb das mein
Und rinn als gemachlich ein,
Des zw klagen thw ich mich schemen. (p. 140, ll. 18–23)

The merchant confirms he has suffered a downturn in fortune, his ‘ungluecks-drendel’, and he is ashamed of his poverty, which is further confirmation that Nuremberg was no longer as wealthy as it had been. Sachs counters Luther’s idea that merchants overstate their problems in line 23 when the Kaufmann admits to shame, whereas Luther believed they had no shame. The Kaufmann has also resorted to borrowing:

Wil ich den etwan gelt entnemen,
So saltzt man mir das pfenwert wol:
Per cento ich zehen geben sol. (p. 140, ll. 24–26)

‘Saltzen’ (l.25) implies that the Kaufmann is paying over the odds for his borrowing as it is used in the sense of ‘to spice up something’.¹⁷⁵ This indicates that even the merchants are being charged high rates of interest by bankers and may also serve to remind the audience of Bonaventura Furtenbach, who had a reputation for high interest rates in the early 1550s.¹⁷⁶ Sachs’s purpose may have been satirical because during 1555 Furtenbach renounced his citizenship of Nuremberg and moved to Augsburg, where in 1557 he instigated the bankruptcy of a longstanding merchant company, the Weyers, who owed

¹⁷⁵ DWB see salzen.
¹⁷⁶ See page 116.
money mainly in Augsburg, but also to a few Nuremberg merchants. The Kaufmann continues:

Wirt noch mit schwerer puerd peladen,

So print ain schad den andern schaden. (p. 140, ll. 27–28)

‘Schad’ here means the losses which result from borrowing and lead to misery for someone, either the borrower or a customer of the borrower. The Kaufmann ends with a plea to Jupiter:

O Jupiter, zu helffen mir,

Das ich mit kinden und mit weiben

Mug ain purger und kauffman pleiben. (p. 140, ll. 30–32)

Ultimately, if a merchant went bankrupt, he would face prison and banishment, leading to loss of citizenship, hence his plea to remain a ‘purger’ (l. 32). For him the most important thing is that he remains a merchant and a citizen of Nuremberg. This desire to remain a citizen is a necessity for his trade, but it also suggests the desire for a shared identity with the other merchants of Nuremberg. Sachs portrays a man who acknowledges his faults but wants to prevent loss of reputation and status, which is not the image of the unscrupulous merchants portrayed by Luther in Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher (1524).

The Bauer responds to the Kaufmann’s assessment of his own guilt:

Hor zu, mein purger und kauffmon,

Dw pist oft selber schueeldig dron,

Weil dw oft thouest daheim verwalten

Ein gros uberschwencklich haushalten

Und helst kostlich pancketerey,

Als ob dein disch-küng Artus sey. (p. 140, ll. 34–39)

---

177 Häberlein, Brüder, p. 168 and p. 224.
178 DWB see schade 5 (b).
The reference to the Arthurian legends lends this speech an aura of fabled or imagined wealth and possessions. Sachs uses the comparison to Arthur to emphasise the behaviour of Nuremberg’s wealthy merchants, who organised jousting tournaments and sought ennoblement.\(^{179}\) Hence Sachs indicates that they had pretensions above their station which links back to the fable of the raven and crow (p. 137, ll. 10–11). These aristocratic activities, combined with a university education, caused merchants’ sons to seek prestigious positions within the King or Emperor’s court, rather than return to Nuremberg as merchants or industrialists. Sachs highlights the threat to Nuremberg’s existing society that results from this behaviour. The Bauer continues to itemize the Kaufmann’s other pretentions:

\[
\text{Auch hapt ir lustgercnd herrn-sicz} \\
\text{Aufs kostlichest staffiret icz,} \\
\text{Auch fuert ir gros unnüecz gepew,} \\
\text{Hausrat auf zirlichst guet un new. (p. 140, l. 40 – p. 141, l. 3)}
\]

Records confirm the rebuilding of *Herrensitze* after the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*, when the wealthy residents’ out-of-town residences were destroyed during the two sieges.\(^{180}\)

‘Staffieren’ has many meanings: armour, or the defences of a castle, or a decorated bonnet and a bride’s outfit, or even the furnishings of a room. The Bauer’s intention is to illustrate the sumptuous finish of these houses, calling them pointless buildings.\(^{181}\) He paints a picture of riches to which neither he, nor the craftsman, could ever aspire but of which examples abounded in and around Nuremberg. He even accuses the Kaufmann of dressing in order to impress others with his refinement (p. 141, ll. 5–7) and concludes with the words: ‘Als ob er sey gros, reich und mechtig’ (p. 141, l. 7). This may be another reference to the downfall of Bonaventura Furtenbach in Nuremberg. Furtenbach had failed in his

\(^{179}\) So-called ‘Gesellenstecken’ had been organised in Nuremberg since 1446. The jousts took place on the Hauptmarkt. The tradition ended in 1561 (Kusch, *Nürnberg*, pp. 116–17).

\(^{180}\) Gruner, *Nürnberg*, p. 144, see 1555.

\(^{181}\) Baufeld, *Wörterbuch*, see gebeu.
political ambitions and, by lending money to Alcibiades, had facilitated the two sieges which destroyed the place he depended on for his livelihood. This may have contributed to his unpopularity and been a deciding factor in his renouncing his citizenship. This is also a criticism of the patriciate as their pretentious behaviour contributed to Nuremberg’s decline as they rejected trade for the life of nobility. The Bauer concludes that the Kaufmann is the orchestrator of his own downfall (p. 141, ll. 12–14), as was Furtenbach!

The Handwerker agrees that the Kaufmann is avaricious: ‘Dw pist, der aus geiczigem muet | Uns alle war vertewren thuet’ (p. 141, ll. 16–17). He accuses the Kaufmann of over-charging for his goods, as well as increasing the property rents every year (p. 141, ll. 20–21). In the next two lines the Handwerker recalls Nuremberg’s golden time: ‘Das als vor in der alten welt | War wolfail und umb ringes gelt’ (p. 141, ll. 21–22). Here ‘wolfail’ or ‘wolfeil’ means of good value which implies that commodities were cheaper. The Handwerker continues to link the Kaufmann’s behaviour with that of a ‘wucherer’ (p. 141, l. 23), a term which Sachs uses as an indication of behaviour, not a religious identity.

At the end of the three protagonists’ statements of defence and accusation, the Bauer and the Handwerker unite in their belief that the Kaufmann is the most avaricious. The Handwerker’s accusations are personal as he has direct contact with merchant manufactories, as well as being subject to increased household expenses, whether through goods or rents. However, that both were given precedence to present their case before the Kaufmann indicates Sachs’s desire to portray the miseries of their lives before that of the Kaufmann. This enables the audience to compare the poverty of the Bauer and Handwerker with that of the Kaufmann. That they are all guilty of avarice in some form or another is not questioned, but the audience must judge if the threat to the livelihood of the Kaufmann

---

182 Häberlein, Brüder, p. 226.
183 Baufeld, Wörterbuch, see wolfeil.
is as life-changing or threatening as the miseries and the dangers faced by the poorer social classes. Their chances of improving their lot are questionable, whereas the Kaufmann has already adopted a quasi-noble lifestyle. This image of the lack of power of the lower classes, which turn on the upper class and demand change, mirrors the events of *Der Streit der Messerer*.

Then Jupiter sits in judgement and rules on who is the most avaricious citizen. He believes: ‘So seit ir im gmüt ainerley | Und is gleich ainer wie der ander’ (p. 141, ll. 33–34). They, however, blame each other (p. 141, ll. 35–39) and moneylenders (p. 142, l. 1) for their problems. Jupiter continues: ‘Halt sich euer ider in seim stand’ (p. 142, l. 5). This admonition is based on the Catholic concept that people should accept their status in life as God-given and be content with their lot, a notion derived from the teachings of St Augustine of Hippo, who believed that free will caused evil and that people should remain in the level of society into which they were born, citing Corinthians 7:20: ‘Ein jeglicher bleibe in dem Beruf, darin er berufen ist’.

This is Sachs’s moral message, delivered earlier than usual, and betraying his fear that there is a threat to the society from within. Jupiter advises all three to spend nothing beyond their means, prudence which would render the moneylenders’ role pointless (p. 142, ll. 7–8), a recurrent theme of Luther in *Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher*. Jupiter continues:

Nun merckt, ob ich gleich straffen wöll
Und scheus mit ainem doner-stral
Unter die wuechrer ab zu dal,
Würn die trümer an euch auch springen. (p. 142, ll. 10–13)

Jupiter’s suggestion of a lightning strike as punishment, his usual punishment, would cause all three protagonists to be hit by falling rubble and serves as reminder to the audience of
their experience during the bombardment of Nuremberg during the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg. Jupiter continues his judgement:

\begin{quote}
Den wuechern gleicht ir in vil dingen,
Weil ider suecht sein aigen nuecz,
Seim nechsten zu schaden mit truecz.  
\end{quote}

The accusation of Eigennutz directs the audience towards their faith and the phrase Gemeinnutz vor Eigennutz, which mirrors Luther’s desire that they work for the benefit of each other. Jupiter begins his judgement with the Kaufmann, whom he accuses of selling poor goods, using tricks, lies, deception and being slovenly (popiczen, l. 19). Jupiter also includes ‘uberzelen und uberschmiczen’ (l. 16) in his accusations, echoing one of Luther’s accusations about merchants contained in Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher. Jupiter continues specifically:

\begin{quote}
Dein stueckwerker druecken darneben,
Aufs wolfailst kauffn und dewerst geben,
Die lewt aufseczn mit schwinden sachen
Und darnach panca rotta machen.  
\end{quote}

It is evident now that the Kaufmann has a manufactory (l. 21) with Stückwerker, which creates another link to Der Streit der Messerer. In the following lines Jupiter’s list illustrates the unlawful methods used by merchants to cheat the purchasers of his goods, the middle man and even the end user, whom Luther similarly writes about in Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher. The only evidence of bankruptcy (banca rotta (l. 24)) at this time was that of the Augsburg Weyer family, whose downfall was orchestrated by Furtenbach. By constantly directing his audience’s attention to the worst possible outcome

---

184 DWB, see trumm.
185 According to DWB, popitzon is a word favoured by Sachs.
186 Luther describes a merchant’s trick whereby they make money on the purchase and on the sale of an item, similar to buying forward in today’s financial markets (LW XV, p. 309).
187 LW XV, p. 304.
of merchant greed, Sachs underlines the threat from avarice. To compound this image of avarice Jupiter indicates that such behaviour is no different from that of Jewish moneylenders (p. 142, ll. 25–26). This suggests that Sachs uses the cultural memory and stereotypes of Jewish moneylenders only to illustrate similarly usurious behaviour in Christian protagonists in order to discredit them.

Jupiter then turns his attention to the Handwerker:

Vil hauffen-wercks dw aushin suedelst,
Auf das geringst, stümpelst und wuedelst,
Darmit petreuugst die leut an läugen
Und schwerest in das aus den äügen
Wen man dein arbeit haben sol. (p. 142, ll. 29–33)

Jupiter accuses him of bad workmanship, using local vocabulary. ‘Sudeln’\textsuperscript{188} refers to botched or lazy work and is followed by a list of misdemeanours pertinent to the activities of craftsmen, specifically ‘stümpeln’, meaning to infringe the rules governing one’s trade or craft.\textsuperscript{189} This may refer to an accusation made in Der Gegenbericht, where Hans Hannauer and Erhart Lösel are accused of helping others to cheat when making their Meisterstück.\textsuperscript{190} Jupiter closes his judgement of the Handwerker by saying: ‘Dem wuchrer gleichstw mit den sachen’ (p. 142, l. 36). By this he means that by selling shoddy or illegally produced goods, the craftsmen’s motivation is to create wealth from less work, which damages Nuremberg’s reputation as a centre for high-quality manufacture. Jupiter judges this to be avarice.

He then turns his attention to the Bauer:

Der-gleich, dw pawer, auch vol geicz,
Dw heltzt hin-hinder korn und weicz

\textsuperscript{188} DWB, see sudeln, (3a).
\textsuperscript{189} DWB, see stümpeln, (1).
\textsuperscript{190} Stahlschmidt, ‘Der Streit’, 186.
Jupiter accuses the Bauer of *Vorkauf*, whereby a farmer withholds grain until the price has increased due to inflation or shortages and then sells it at the higher price. This is an accusation from Luther’s sermon *Von Kaufshandlung und Wucher*;\(^{191}\) however, according to Endres, prices for market foods ought to have been regulated by the Council,\(^{192}\) which has not prevented the farmers from making artificial shortages. Jupiter concludes his judgement of the Bauer: ‘Handelst auch wol von dem wuchrer gleich’ (p. 143, l. 2). However, Jupiter has not finished his judgement:

In suma: Wert ir all drey reich,
So triebt ir warlich mit gefer
Das, so iz treibt der wuecherer. (p. 143, ll. 3–5)

Jupiter compares their behaviour to that of the traditional ‘wuecherer’, who were not Christian, thus rendering them all outsiders and enemies of Nuremberg. He offers them advice:

Trag ider mit geduld sein joch,
Weil kainr des andern kan geraten!
Wont ainander pey mit guetaten
Weil ir den maistail schuelding seit
Ider seiner hartseligkeit! (p. 143, ll. 7–11)

Line 7 links to Jupiter’s previous words which encompass this medieval concept, ‘Halt sich euer ider in sein stand, | Wie im gepuert mit mind und hand!’ (p. 142, ll. 5–6). Luther also promulgated this concept in *Der Große Katechismus* (1529): the First Commandment states: ‘[So halte es] jeder in seinem Stand nach Gottes Ordnung, und lasse nur nichts davon

\(^{191}\) *LW* XV, p. 305.
\(^{192}\) Endres, ‘Zur Lage’, 110.
seinen Herrn oder Abgott sein’. This encourages Christians to worship God and not Mammon or material wealth. For Jupiter the greatest cause of misery are moneylenders:

Die grossen wuecherer auch pald straffen;

Wan wuecher-guet das halftelt nicht

Wie man pey allen wuchrern sicht,

Un raicht nit an den dritten stamen. (p. 143, ll. 13–16)

Jupiter includes amongst the ‘wuecherer’ all those who have lent money to the protagonists, directing the audience’s thoughts to the transitory nature of wealth (l. 16). Additionally, he suggests that the rich donate their wealth to the poor, for then they will experience poverty: ‘Druecken prot essen und wasse sawffen’ (l. 20), words which echo the idea of penitential fasting. Jupiter continues: ‘Den wirt erfrewt der arme hauffen’ (l. 21), which will relieve the suffering of the poor. Similarly, Luther suggests: ‘Es ist dem gerechten besser eyn wenig den grosse guter der gottlosen’.\textsuperscript{193} Furthermore, Luther claims: ‘Es will doch sonst keyn schreyben, und leren helffen, bis uns die nott und armut zwinge’.\textsuperscript{194} This confirms that for Luther the eradication of poverty is integral to becoming a good Christian and that everyone should strive to achieve this aim.

Jupiter closes the play in this manner:

Das got auch siczet am gericht,

Der kain ubl lest ungrassaffet nicht.

Das weucher und all geiczikeit

Wert ausgerewt in kurzer zeit,

Dardurch ent nem vil ungemachs,

Das wünschet uns allen Hans Sachs. (p. 143, ll. 22–27)

\textsuperscript{193} LW XV, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{194} LW XV, p. 294.
Jupiter’s last homily is that if the protagonists took his advice, they would be free from the burden caused by all moneylenders and avarice.

Sachs balances the avarice in business and the squandering behaviour of the three protagonists with the jealousy and squandering nature of individual. The protagonists illustrate how envy leads to the sin of avarice, and how envy destroys the fabric of their social classes, with each class showing pretentions to be in a higher class. This is the root of Sachs’s argument as he believes that their avaricious behaviour is destroying the established society in Nuremberg. Sachs, now aged sixty-three, is not being nostalgic for the ‘golden’ past: to believe this would underestimate the message in the play. His intention is to illustrate that the city’s previous success and wealth had depended on social structures which had prevailed for centuries. Furthermore, within Jupiter’s last speech Sachs illustrates how Nuremberg’s reputation for high-quality work is being destroyed by the desire for more money, by cutting corners and producing shoddy work or using short measures and trickery. Consequently, the protagonists’ desire to improve their lot after the hardships of war by borrowing money forces them to rely on underhand methods in order to repay that money. Sachs reminds the audience of their cultural identities and their individual roles, which had contributed to Nuremberg’s reputation for quality merchandise and, as a result, its wealth during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

Throughout this play Sachs seems to be writing with the pen in one hand and Luther’s sermon Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher in the other. By focusing on this sermon, Sachs reminds the audience that they have chosen the Lutheran confession and with it the concept of Gemeinnutz not the Eigennutz displayed by the protagonists in this Fastnachtspiel. Furthermore, by quoting from Luther, Sachs fulfils his didactic purpose as well as building a body of work punctuated by Luther’s own words.

This Fastnachtspiel contains a strong moral message and little overt comedy, other than allowing the actors to use the stereotypical behaviour associated with the characters
to help to identify the protagonists and to ridicule them. There are instances when Sachs satirizes incidents within Nuremberg’s realm: the Paumgartner kidnapping, Furtenbach’s reputation for high interest rates and his departure from Nuremberg and the rebuilding of the local *Herrensitze* are some that are recognised. However, the passage of time and lack of records result in an incomplete picture of the scandals in the city, which Sachs and his audience would have known. Hence, his use of the *Der Streit der Messerer* is quite enlightening for the contemporary reader, giving a completely different understanding of the play. Sachs’s apparent knowledge of both *Die Klage* and *Der Gegenbericht* suggests that it may also have been known by his contemporary audience, if only from local gossip, which adds to the satire.

This play is full of realism, as seen from Sachs’s satirical references, but also from his portrayal of the country festivals, the damage to the farming community, the references to the working practices of the craftsmen and the merchant and the taxes they all suffered. The realism helps the moral message in the play by placing the audience in a seat of judgement on situations they have experienced themselves.

Sachs illustrates a weakness in governance on the part of the Council. He highlights the manipulation of food prices which would normally have been regulated; how Sumptuary laws are thwarted by the lower classes and that the rules governing quality of manufactured goods are being ignored. Sachs focusses on the unfairness of Nuremberg’s working practices; on the one hand the *Rugamt* dictated every aspect of a craftworker’s employment, whilst ignoring the iniquities in the parallel development of the *Verlagssystem*, which disadvantaged of both *Stückwerker* and *Handwerker* alike.

These two *Fastnachtspiele* do have some similarities, but first and foremost they are extremely focused on the moral pronounced at the end. The first play reflects Sachs’s fear that Lutheranism is threatened by Catholicism; the second play, as well as portraying
Sachs’s feared threat to society, illustrates what happens if one abandons the principles of Lutheranism. The two plays are not just focused on their moral conclusion, but on Nuremberg itself and on a citizen’s experience of Nuremberg. Mary Beare believes that the reason Sachs’s plays of the 1550s are so successful is his depiction of life in Nuremberg, which is inherent in this work. Furthermore, the effect of the realism is enhanced by the immediacy of the events being satirized, particularly in the second play and its use of actual words from *Der Gegenbericht*, which Sachs uses to belittle the council’s attempts to produce an adequate and fair response to the *Klage*.

However, what is implied in both *Fastnachtspiele* is criticism of Nuremberg’s ruling bodies. In the first play Sachs illustrates what could happen if the Council allowed the dilution of Lutheranism in Nuremberg. Implicit in this is a criticism of the inability of the Council to make a stand, as they had done in 1525, and to fight for Lutheranism as the only faith permitted in the city’s territorial areas. In 1553 the Council’s reluctance might have been tempered by their unwillingness to make a stand against the Emperor Charles V, whereas in 1557, when the second play was written, those concerns had diminished due to the ratification of the religious peace at Augsburg in 1555. Sachs’s point in the second play is the threat to the Lutheran doctrine of *Gemeinnutz* by avarice, as well as how this sin is threatening the society on which Nuremberg based its wealth. Additionally, there is implied criticism of the Council and its organisational structures, which controlled the city. Endres confirms that during the sixteenth century food costs increased an average of four hundred to six hundred per cent. He also states that the *Stückwerker* lived a hand-to-mouth existence and what was paid on one day was either spent on the same day or had little worth the day after. This contradicts his own description of the efforts to control prices:

---

195 Beare, *Hans Sachs*, p. LXXVI.
196 Endres, ‘Zur Lage’, 121.
So führte der Rat zum ‘gemein Besten’, wie er sagte, eine strenge Lebensmittelaufsicht und Lebensmittelpreiskontrolle durch, die dem gemeinen Mann relativ wohlfeile Lebensmittel garantierte und die Lebenshaltungskosten vergleichswiese niedrig hielt.  

Furthermore, the role assigned to the Rugamt and the Geschworene was to represent the needs of the city’s craftsmen, in exchange for there being no guilds in the city to perform this function. As the rich Meister and Verleger were practically inseparable from those in the Rugamt or the Geschworene, this enabled the Klage to be ignored. Sachs, by his use of the Der Streit der Messerer within the second play, employs satire to criticise the stereotypical portrayals of those who create wealth for the rich manufacturers; and since wealthy merchants and manufacturers were often members of the Rat, he criticises the Council.

These plays mark a turning point for Sachs, who in previous works, notably Ein lobspruch der statt Nürnberg, written on 20 February 1530, had shown himself to be a faithful supporter of the Council. In the Lobspruch he describes the Council as ‘honourable’ (KG iv, p. 194, l. 39), ‘gehorsam und gutwillig’ (p. 195, l. 11):

   Ein fürsichtiger weiser rat,
   Der so fürsichtiglich reagiert
   Und alle ding fein ordiniert. (p. 194, ll. 16–18)

The Council also cared for its citizens and vice versa:

   Also ein rat und die gemein
   Einhelling und einmütig sein
   Und halten da ein ander schutz. (p. 195, ll. 12–14)

---

The purpose for this earlier work may have been to flatter the Council as Sachs needed to atone for his involvement and censorship in 1527.\textsuperscript{198} In these later plays his criticism is in the form of satire, which provokes the audience to question who controls the city and for whom.

\textsuperscript{198} See page 11.
CHAPTER V

Unconcealed Criticism of the City

The two Fastnachtspiele Der doctor mit der grossen nasen (13 December 1559)\(^1\) and Das gesprech Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni (30 December 1560)\(^2\) were written in the period immediately before Hans Sachs ceased to write Fastnachtspiele. Moreover, they are the most satirical and complex. Sachs was sixty-five when writing Der doctor mit der grossen nasen and he had commenced cataloguing his works by compiling folios, the first of which, comprising five separate volumes, was published in 1558.\(^3\) He was still Merker of the Singschule and was performing and directing his own plays. The title of this Fastnachtspiel suggests a ribald play exploiting the late-medieval belief that the size of the nose indicated the size or fecundity of the sexual organs. However, Sachs’s play is not ribald but it contains a blatant satirical subplot mocking two of Nuremberg’s leading patricians, as well as philosophical questions about telling the truth and the best source of knowledge. Furthermore, running through this play is a ‘red thread’, presented to the audience through imagery, which informs them that Sachs is still preoccupied with the religious changes which threaten Lutheranism in Nurembeg.

In contrast, the satire in the second play, Das gesprech Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni, is based on a meeting which took place between Alexander the Great and the cynic Diogenes. Sachs explores the idea of good governance with an exposé of the tyrannical power favoured by Alexander, which Sachs compares to the simple life of the cynic Diogenes. The satirical references will be clarified in light of historical events in the Holy Roman Empire, Germany and Nuremberg itself. The play forces the audience to reflect on how power is wielded in Nuremberg, taking up the theme of Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent. Sachs questions censorship, its purpose and effect on the truth.

---

\(^1\) KG xxI, pp. 103–15.
\(^2\) KG xiii, pp. 580–91.
\(^3\) Hans Sachs, ed. by Michael and Crockett, III, p. 205.
and, continuing the theme from *Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen*, he underlines the importance of the Lutheran Bible as the source of the truth. Sachs closes the play with a section confusingly called a *Prologus*, which will be explained with reference to historical events in Nuremberg, events which may provide an explanation for his decision to stop writing *Fastnachts spiele* after this play is published.

In order to put both plays into their historical context a review of the relevant history is necessary. In Nuremberg the final part of the settlement of the *Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg*, the Treaty of Vienna, had been completed on 6 October 1558. The Kulmbach properties and title had reverted to the new Margrave, Georg Friedrich von Brandenburg-Ansbach (1509–1603), on the death of his uncle, Alcibiades. Nuremberg was forced to pay the largest portion of damages for the destruction of the Plassenburg. The new Emperor, Ferdinand I (r. 4 March 1558–1564), had chosen not to hold his first *Reichstag* in Nuremberg after his coronation in Frankfurt, indicating that Nuremberg had not recovered its former status as a leading imperial city, a fate suffered by all Protestant imperial cities since the *Interim*.

The religious picture in Germany was still in a state of flux, despite the settlement in the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555. Within Protestantism attempts were made to reconcile the differences in opinion about transubstantiation and justification, amongst other issues, at a meeting in Frankfurt (1558). This failed, resulting in deeper divisions, as Flacius Illyricus, who believed he was defending Luther’s theology, formulated a more rigid interpretation of Lutheranism. In Nuremberg the faith practised was still ostensibly Lutheran, which caused friction with Ferdinand I, who, despite being more sympathetic to Lutheranism than Charles V, remained staunchly Catholic. Despite Osiander’s death in 1552, his followers had remained steadfastly supportive of his interpretation of Luther’s

---


doctrine but Melanchthon’s last visit to Nuremberg in 1555 had resulted in the departure of two Osiandrist pastors.\(^6\) However, other religious tensions were appearing in the city:

Wenn auch die Stadt nach außen hin auf Grund ihres in der Brandenburgisch-nürnbergsichen Kirchenordnung von 1533 niedergelegten Bekenntnisses als gut lutherisch gelten möchte, so entsprach die innere Überzeugung eines Teiles der Stadtgeistlichen und des Patriziats durchaus nicht diesem äußeren Schein.\(^7\)

Furthermore, during 1558 there had been complaints about moral standards in Nuremberg’s clergy and amongst their parishioners, particularly in the territorial lands outside the city walls, making it imperative to establish a new commission to assess both the parishioners’ and the pastors’ knowledge of Lutheran doctrine. It was believed that many people could not say the Lord’s Prayer or recite Luther’s Catechism, so pastors, chaplains and schoolmasters were to be examined on their knowledge. Additional complaints existed about the number of people who practised pagan rituals and traditions and did not belong to the faith.\(^8\) Therefore the commission planned another visitation to Nuremberg and its territorial lands, to examine the clergy and parishioners and if necessary replace the *Nürnberg-Brandenburg Kirchenordnung* of 1533.\(^9\) One of the commission leaders was Moritz Heling, Melanchthon’s nominee for a position at the Sebalduskirche.\(^10\)

**Der doctor mit der grossen nasen**

This long, farcical play is based on a Fool who is punished for telling the truth about a large nose and then lying about it to cover his offence, making it pertinent to examine the role of

---

9. See page 84.
10. See page 180.
‘big noses’ in late-medieval literature. Sachs had written several times on the same subject: in 1545 he had composed a Meisterlied entitled Der doctor mit der nasen Vor zeit in Franckreich sassen.11 Both the Meisterlied and the Fastnachtspiel are re-workings of a text taken from Johannes Pauli’s Schimpf und Ernst, published in Strasbourg in 1522, which had at its narrative centre an abbot in France and his Fool.12 Four months before the Fastnachtspiel was written, Sachs had also written a Schwank called Der doctor mit dem grossen nasen (dated 14 August 1559), in which a doctor visits an abbot in Bavaria.13 This implies that Sachs changed the location of the action to suit his own purpose, which in this case was his satirical purpose. Sachs had also written about noses in Der Nasentanz,14 in which he had provided the words for a woodcut by Sebald Beham dated 1534.15 Beham portrays a group of villagers with large noses dancing around a pole from which prizes are hung for the winner with the largest nose. Alison Stewart states that large noses were considered an indication of a woman’s fecundity or the size of a man’s penis. Additionally, she concludes: ‘Text and image draw on the common belief that a man’s intelligence is inversely proportional to the size of his penis’.16 Thus the larger the nose, the larger the penis, the smaller the intellect! The relationship between nose and penis size was not a medieval concept but one established by Ovid.17 In the year that Beham produced his woodcut, Rabelais repeated the same idea in La Vie de Gargantua et de Pantagruel (1534); and Thomas Murner in Logica Memoratiua (1509) had also used a similar idea, using illustrations of a woman with a long nose to indicate faults in her character.18

---

11 Das Repertorium der Sangesprüche, ‘Der doctor mit der nasen Vor zeit in Franckreich sassen’ (14.12.45 2S/1908a in Marner Hofton – 3 Str).
14 KG II, pp. 82–92.
The Fastnachtspiel opens with a ‘Junckherr’ talking to his servant Fritz about the imminent arrival of a guest. The word Junker has many meanings: the youngest son of a nobleman, an unmarried man or possibly the son of a wealthy city dweller involved in commercial enterprise or trade.19 The Junckherr describes the guest:

Der künstlichst mann in teutschen land
Beide mit mund und auch mit hand,
Ist ein doctor der artzeney,
Auch künstlich in der alchimey,
Artlich auff allem seitenspiel,
Auch rund mit schiessen zu dem ziel
Zu dem weidwerck kan er auch wol
Und was ein hofman künnen sol. (p. 103, ll. 6–13)

Sachs details the merits of this visitor: not only is he cultured and knowledgeable, but a pharmacist,20 an alchemist, an archer, a hunter and a musician who plays the saitenspiel, a ten-stringed instrument which is plucked,21 like a zither, of which Luther was a skilled player and for which he wrote music. With this careful description of the Doctor’s talents and characteristics, Sachs may have been suggesting a real person known for his intelligence and abilities who would have been recognized, if only by reputation, by his audience.

The Junckherr instructs his Knecht (Fritz) to ensure his visitor is well treated as he wants to impress the Doctor with their company (p. 104, ll. 1–7. Fritz foresees problems:

Unser narr ist mit worten resch
Und richt offt an gar seltzam wesch;
Wann er stecket vol phantasy,
The word *Narr* was initially used to describe someone who may have been handicapped, either physically or mentally, but later the word became synonymous with the idea of the comedic court fool or jester.\(^\text{22}\) Sachs used *Narr* to mean someone who is ‘einfältig’, as in the case of Simon Wirdt in *Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen*. The word *Narr* can also denote those who relinquish their secular life for religion, as in the case of monks and nuns, earning themselves the epithet of Holy or Blessed Fools.\(^\text{23}\) A Holy Fool has a biblical basis: ‘Wir sind Narren um Christi willen, ihr aber seid klug in Christo; wir schwach, ihr aber seid stark; ihr herrlich, wir aber verachtet’ (I Corinthians 4:10). Sebastian Brant depicts the *Narr* in the *Narrenschiff* (1494) as a metaphor for the moral decline in man and the sins he has committed as part of the burden of life.\(^\text{24}\) Conversely, in works by Thomas Murner, the monk, satirist and author (1475–1537), the *Narr* is characterised by latent wickedness, selfishness and a lack of empathy with his victims,\(^\text{25}\) which is similar to Sachs’s portrayal of Eulenspiegel in other *Fastnachtspiele*. The character of the *Narr* allows Sachs to add layers to the meaning of the play, which will be seen as the analysis progresses.

Returning to the text, ‘wesch’ or *Wäsche* (p. 104, l. 9) has several meanings: not only as a collective noun or the art of cleaning, but also gossip or chat.\(^\text{26}\) Sachs uses it here as gossip to convey the idea of ‘washing one’s dirty linen in public’. ‘Phantasey’ can be interpreted as imagination but here it refers to the opposite of reality, which means that the Fool behaves according to the concept of ‘die verkehrte Welt’ as Sachs directs the audience’s attention to the *Fastnacht* period when normality is suspended. An old idiom: ‘Er platzt offt ungschwungen in brey’, is linked to another saying: ‘mit der Tür ins Haus

\(^{22}\) [DWB](see narr (1) & (3)).

\(^{23}\) [https://www.heiligenlexikon.de/Glossar/Narren_um_Christi_willen.html] [accessed: 23 April 2015].

\(^{24}\) Baro, *Narr*, pp. 10–11.

\(^{25}\) Könneker, *Satire*, p. 79.

\(^{26}\) [DWB](see wäsche (4)).
fallen’. This is interpreted: ‘Wer “mit der Tür ins Haus fällt”, benimmt sich wie ein ungeschickter Tölpel, weil er die rituellen Schritte des Sich-Annäherns an die fremde Sphäre nicht beherrscht und mit seiner ungezügelten Kraft eher einem Eindringling gleicht als einem Gast’. By describing the unbridled speech of the Narr in this manner (l. 21), Sachs hints that the Fool will be used as an instrument for telling uncomfortable or embarrassing truths.

The Fool arrives believing his master is hungry: ‘Hungert dich, so ist dir als mir; Wenn mich dürst, wer mir auch wie dir’ (p. 104, ll. 28–29). Sachs suggests that despite the Fool’s subservient position there is little difference between the Fool and his master as they both are subject to the same physical desires. Sachs could be directing his audience to their knowledge of the Bible: ‘Jesus aber sprach zu ihnen: Ich bin das Brot des Lebens. Wer zu mir kommt, den wird nicht hungern; und wer an mich glaubt, den wird nimmermehr dürsten’ (John 6:35), which renders all men equal in the eyes of God. If so, Sachs presents his audience with a Fool who speaks the word of God, echoing the concept of the Narr as a Holy Fool. The Junckherr calls the Fool, variously, ‘Jäcklein’ or ‘Jäckle’, names used by Luther for a priest, Jakob Schenck (1508–1554), whom Luther found presumptuous in his understanding of the Bible and abilities as a priest. Sachs may be alluding to the forthcoming visitation of all Nuremberg’s pastors and school teachers to test their knowledge of, and abilities to teach, the Bible according to Luther’s doctrine.

The Junckherr informs Jäckle that their visitor is a ‘künstenreicher mann’ (p. 104, l. 33), which Jäckle misinterprets:

Kan er gut feiste suppen machen,

29 LW, Tischreden, IV, p. 68, Nr. 4003.
Jäckle believes the man is a skilled cook rather than an intellectual. Sachs bestows on Jäckle the animalistic instincts of hunger as ‘rachen’ (l. 6) is a vulgar word for mouth,\textsuperscript{30} which creates an image of a glutton. Moreover, the congregation of the Lorenzkirche was, and still is, welcomed every Sunday by a stone carving of the Jaws of Hell, which depicts the Devil dragging sinners into Hell (Fig. 15). The speech continues by naming many local culinary specialities, thereby continuing the theme of animalistic bodily instincts: ‘Rotseck’ or rotsack, often mentioned by Sachs, is a local blood sausage. A ‘semmelbeck’ refers to a baker of fine bread rolls; ‘speckkuchen’, is bread containing bacon and ‘fladen’ is unleavened bread made during Fastnacht (another name for this type of bread is Opferkuchen). Jäckle then turns his attention to wine:

\begin{verbatim}
Oder ist er ein runder keller,  
Tregt auff Reinwein und muscateller  
Und newen wein in grossen flaschen,  
Daß ich köndt meinen goder waschen.  
\end{verbatim}

Sachs’s reference to ‘ein runder keller’ links to wine storage; however, the word also means Kasematte or casemate, a form of military defence. In 1545 Nuremberg’s Kasematten or rounded passages were constructed under the castle to carry water pipes and to ease the movement of soldiers.\textsuperscript{31} These chilly tunnels were used for wine storage; and this may refer to some connected local scandal about which the audience had knowledge. Sachs’s subsequent reference to ‘newen wein in grossen flaschen’ concerns local wine traditions.

\textsuperscript{30}DWB see rachen.  
\textsuperscript{31} <http://www.kaiserburg-nuernberg.de/deutsch/garten/kasematten.htm> [accessed: 30 July 2016].
**Federweißer** or indeed **Federroter** is new wine produced during from the first fermentation and still sold in the Franconian wine area in tall bottles which contrast to the **Bocksbeutel**, a traditional, flat-bellied bottle normally used for Franconian wines. This speech directs the audience to their own cultural heritage through food and wine, a means by which Sachs firmly roots this play in Nuremberg. Sachs seems to imply that Jäckle is more concerned about his bodily needs than his spiritual well-being and by referring to the expected visitor, the Doctor, during this speech, Sachs may also be informing the audience that the visitor has a fondness for wine and is barrel-shaped, which might also explain the large nose!

Sachs may also want to direct his audience’s thoughts, through the ample suggestions about bread and wine in this speech, to transubstantiation and the divisions which had developed since Luther’s death due to the various interpretations of the significance of the bread and the wine during Communion.

Sachs confirms the audience’s suspicions that the **Narr** is greedy from the use of ‘rachen’ (l. 6) and ‘goder’ (l. 14), slang words which refer to the throat and swallowing. Then Jäckle adds, ‘Da wolt ich schlemen, fressn und sauffen, | Daß mir augn müsten überlauffen’ (ll. 15–16). Sachs’s use of animalistic vocabulary underlines the gluttony of the period preceding Ash Wednesday, when these plays would have been performed. Closing his speech, the **Narr** says, ‘So wer mir warlich lieber er, | Als wen er der künstreichst goldschmid wer’ (ll. 17–18). This may refer to Wenzel Jamnitzer (1508–1585), who in 1552 became master of the Nuremberg mint, as well as making gold and silver decorative pieces for Charles V and Ferdinand I.\(^32\) Commemorative medallions produced of Jamnitzer after his death depict him as a large man, which perhaps was Sachs’s purpose in mentioning a man known for his gluttony.

---

\(^{32}\) Strauss, *Nuremberg*, p. 140.
Fig. 15 Nürnberg_Lorenzkirche: Jaws of Hell

Fig. [16a] Fürst der Welt (front)  
Fig. [16b] Fürst der Welt (rear)
When greeting his guest, the Junckherr hopes his guest will stay for a week (p. 106, l. 9), to which the Doctor replies:

Mein junckherr, ich gefordert bin:
Auff morgn muß ich zu Bamberg sein.
Doch hab ich zu euch kehret ein,
Die alten freundschaft zu vernewen,
Doch muß ich wider, bey mein trewen!
In zweyen stunden gwiß auff sein. (p. 106, ll. 11–16)

That the guest needs to be in Bamberg the next day, coupled with the idea that the man is highly intelligent, may remind the audience of the visit of Philipp Melanchthon in 1555, who left Nuremberg to visit the Bishop of Bamberg, whose diocese includes Nuremberg and its territories. By the suggestion of renewing old friendships (l. 14) Sachs may be poking fun at Melanchthon for his reputation of appeasing Catholicism during the *Interim*. As the play progresses Sachs makes further hints to the connection between the Doctor’s journey and that of Melanchthon. Furthermore, as some of Melanchthon’s supporters, known as *Philipisten*, were accused of having doctrinal beliefs similar to Catholicism, Sachs had ample opportunity to poke fun at Melanchthon and his followers, especially in light of Melanchthon’s involvement in removing Osiandrist’s from Nuremberg’s churches.

During the next speech the Junckherr says:

Setzt euch, herr doctor, ir habt gut zeit,
In neun stunden ir nüber reit.
Last uns von newer zeitung sagen,33
Was sich im Teutschland zu hat tragen. (p. 106, ll. 19–22)

---

33 *Warhafftige vnd grüntliche zeytungen* were often one- or more-page broadsheets illustrated graphically to attract the attention of the reader. Their content varied from local or national events to the sensational (Emil Weller, *Die Ersten deutschen Zeitungen, hrsg. mit einer Bibliographie* (1505–1599) (Tübingen, 1872), p. 158) <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11006643_00005.html> [accessed: 21 April 2016].
In the previous two speeches Sachs has included specific time factors: first, when the Doctor says he needs to leave in two hours (l. 16); and, second, when the Junckherr informs the Doctor of the journey time to Bamberg (l. 20). Sachs thus lays a trail of clues to the whereabouts of the Junckherr’s home and, indeed, hints to Melanchthon’s route to Bamberg. The average distance covered in one day by a merchant was between thirty-five and forty kilometres, being dependent on horse, roads and weather (a day being ten hours’ riding). The distance between Nuremberg and Bamberg is c. sixty-five kilometres, indicating that the Junckherr’s home must be situated north of Nuremberg and at least one day’s ride from Bamberg. By providing his audience with clues to the Junckherr’s identity, Sachs gives the play more relevance if his characterisation alludes to a well-known person. This information would have resonated with some of Sachs’s contemporary audience as Hieronymus Paumgartner owned a country property (not a castle but a large house) in Lonnerstadt, which lies forty-four kilometres to the north of Nuremberg on a westerly route to Bamberg.

The Doctor accepts a glass of wine, saying:

Ich glaub, das sey ein welschwein gut,
Welchen man den curs nennen thut. (p. 106, ll. 32–33)

‘Welsch’ often indicates something of Italian or French origin; ‘curs’ can mean Corsican but also has an additional meaning of menstruation, which indicates the wine was red and provides another link to arguments about the interpretation of Communion. By making the Doctor use coarse vocabulary, Sachs subverts his role as an educated, cultivated man and, according to the principles of Fastnacht, mocks his own pretensions. Meanwhile Jäckle prowls around the room, saying:

Wie hast du so ein schönen zincken

---

35 Hörlin, Lonnerstadt, p. 85.
36 DWB see wälsch.
37 DWB see kurs.
The Fool has noticed the Doctor’s large nose: ‘zinken’ means antlers, a protrusion or even a penis, but one so large that it could provide a perch for seven hens. This echoes a proverb:

‘Eine Henne kann mehr auseinanderscharren als sieben Hähne’, which means the work of one woman is better than that of seven men, although here Sachs uses it to conjure up the length of the nose as a roosting place. By emphasising the length of the nose, Sachs hints at the folk belief that long noses indicate long penises and calls into question the Doctor’s intellectual capability by according him a small brain. Additionally, one translation of ‘zinken’ was horns or antlers, and ‘hornen’ can be interpreted: ‘zum Hahnrei machen’, so the Doctor (especially considering the ‘Reihe von Hähnen’ in the proverb) has been cuckolded. By emasculating the Doctor, Sachs subverts the character of the great man and casts doubt on his sexual prowess. Jäckle emphasises the size of this nose, calling the Doctor ‘der nasen-küng’ (l. 7), which refers to the winner of the Nasentanz. He then calls it ‘ein schönes leschhorn’ (l.9), which conveys the idea that the nose is malformed and large, an insult which causes the Fool to be thrown out of the room.

Unusually, Sachs includes stage instructions which ask the Doctor to look embarrassed by the Fool’s words. This suggests that the Fool has told the truth about the Doctor’s alleged reputation! The Junckherr orders the Fool to leave the room and diverts his guest’s attention from the embarrassing incident by discussing his recently rebuilt castle (p. 107, ll. 18–20). Here Sachs directs his audience’s attention to the rebuilding of the

---

39 DWB see zinken B (1).
40 DWB see hornen.
42 See page 225.
43 DWB see löschhorn.
**Herrensitze** in Nuremberg’s territorial lands which had been destroyed by Alcibiades’s troops. Gruner notes that the Baderschloss in Mögelsdorf had been destroyed in 1552 but was rebuilt in 1559. Mögelsdorf lies east of Nuremberg on the Pegnitz, and was an attractive place, boasting several **Herrensitze**. These were owned by Nuremberg’s merchants and leading Council members, who, thanks to their wealth, threatened the traditional social class structure of Nuremberg by assuming the role of nobility. The expense involved in the restoration of these **Herrensitze** may have been judged excessive by Nuremberg’s religious leaders, who disliked open displays of wealth. This desire for country retreats illustrates the change in society occurring in the patrician sector, for in the past they would live close to their warehouses and superfluous money would have been re-invested in their businesses. The Doctor responds that he had heard reports of the Junckherr’s castle whilst he was ‘in dem Welschlant’ (p. 107, l. 23). This gradual revelation of the person being parodied may have caused amusement in the audience, but Sachs may be parodying more than one person as he did with Albrecht Alcibiades and Moritz von Sachsen in *Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht*.

Meanwhile, the Fool ponders his punishment: ‘Mein junckherr sagt, ich solt dem man | Groß zucht und ehr beweisen than’ (p. 107, ll. 27–28). The word ‘zucht’ has many meanings, including reputation, origins, or disciplined and moderate behaviour, but can additionally be used in cultivation or animal husbandry to describe growth, which dehumanizes it and renders it an independent organic growth. The Fool sees the large nose growing on the Doctor’s face as the most visible feature to praise (ll. 29–30). He reflects, ‘Haucht er sich nider, ward schamrot, | Als ob ich in het angelogen’ (p. 108, ll. 1–2). The Fool recognizes the doctor’s embarrassment and continues to describe the nose:

> Sein nasen sey bucklet und högret,

---

45 Endres, ‘Sozialstruktur Nürnbergs’, p. 196.  
46 *DWB* see *zucht*. 
Vol engeling, wümret und knögret? (p. 108, ll. 5–6)

Sachs uses similar vocabulary in *Der Nasentanz*, bestowing animal characteristics on the nose. Both ‘bucklet’ and ‘högret’ describe a bumpy or lumpy nose which is full of maggots and worms (l.6). The audience would recall a similar local image from the fourteenth-century statue in the Sebalduskirche known as the *Fürst der Welt*: the front of the statue illustrates a clothed man but the rear view depicts a man being eaten by worms and maggots (Figs. 17a and b). In this way Sachs subverts the reputation of the Doctor by suggesting he is impotent as his decaying nose indicates a diminished or diseased sexual organ. This may refer again to the idea that the Doctor might have been cuckolded. Jäckle continues:

Er hört leicht die warheit nit gern.
Ich wil die sach mit lügn erklern,
Ob ich wider erlanget huld,

Hab ie sein feindschafft nit verschuldt. (p. 108, ll. 6–9)

The Fool’s response is to lie in order to repair the embarrassment he has caused, believing the Doctor’s vanity will be soothed by flattery. These lines could reveal the dilemma of a playwright who, by telling the truth, caused offence and gained enemies. Could this be an indication of Sachs’s own experience of censorship? The *Ratsverlässe* indicate no recent censorship of his works since 1551, although Sachs did censor his own satire about the death of Alcibiades in 1557. However, as a public commentator Sachs may be illustrating a reluctance to speak openly about religious matters which conflicted with the opinions of the *Rat* for two reasons. First, Melanchthon had effectively suppressed Osiandrism by removing certain pastors from their parishes; second, in light of the approaching visitation the danger was that anyone not following the Council’s preferred theology could be punished.

---

47 See page 94.
Fritz orders the Fool not to speak another word to their guest (p. 108, ll. 11–15). Jäckle replies with a play on words, ‘Beim ars in schlaff’ (l. 18). The use of ‘ars’ could denote Sachs’s playing with the Latin words *ars, artis*, which means art, culture and knowledge. By conflating ‘ars’ and ‘arsch’ he mocks the Doctor’s abilities. Again, Sachs uses vulgar vocabulary and refers to flatulence with this phrase, which refutes the idea that he cleaned up the genre of *Fastnachtspiel* from scatological references.

Jäckle then focuses on the Doctor’s nose, saying, ‘Ein grosse rote küpfren nasen, | Dergleich ich keine hab gesehen?’ (p. 108, ll. 21–22). Candidates for the ‘big nose’ abound in images from this period; indeed, Melanchthon’s nose is remarkable for its size, but here Sachs had someone else in mind.

![Hieronymus Paumgartner (1553) by Joachim Deschler](image)

The suggestion of a copper coloured nose refers most likely to commemorative bronze medal made by Joachim Deschler (*c.*1500–1571), a medal-maker and sculptor, who during the 1550s designed and minted high-relief medals of famous citizens of Nuremberg, including one of Hieronymus Paumgartner (1553), possibly to commemorate his ascension to the position of *Oberster Hauptmann* on the Council. Paumgartner’s face and torso are in a coronal plane, making the bronze nose the most prominent protuberance (Fig. 17).48

---

48 Most references suggest a bronze nose although one silver copy was sold at auction in June 2017. <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=dGEkDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA217&lpg=PA217&dq=%22Joachim+Deschler%22+Paumgartner&source=bl&ots=tB8qp4XIV6&sig=zyjj0EpM496P0RGNmBM8RkJL6qw&hl=e>
By poking fun at Paumgartner’s image and the length of his nose, Sachs mocks a leading patrician and the censor!

The Doctor delivers his opinion of the refurbished building:

Auffs aller-best, bey meiner trew!

Als obs Lucullus het gebawt,

Der Römer, ich habs gern geschawt. (p. 109, ll. 2–4)

Lucius Licinius Lucullus (c. 117–56 BC) was a Roman soldier and statesman known for his cultured entertainments. His reputation was sullied when he returned from war with the Tigranes in 66 BC and was accused of embezzling public funds and waging an illegal war.49 He amassed large amounts of booty from wars and returned to Rome a wealthy man, embarking on building a large villa at Tusculum surrounded by pleasure gardens, mirrored in Nuremberg by the parklands around Herrensitze.50 Plutarch writes about Lucullus in the Parallelbiographien, a copy of which Sachs had in his own library.51 Sachs compares the Junckherr’s extravagance with that of the fabled Roman leader, another reference to the rich squandering their money rather than re-investing it in business or donating their excess wealth to the Gemeinnutz.

The Doctor then asks to see the new library, saying:

Weil durch den truck seit her, ich sag,

Vil guter büchr kamen an tag.

Der habt ir on zweiffel ein teil. (p. 109, ll. 9–11)

Lucullus also built a large library in Tusculum where he housed a collection of books and met and conversed with scholars.52 Lines 9 and 10 reflect Nuremberg’s importance as a

50 Keaveney, Lucullus, p. 145.
51 Parallelbiographien is listed in Sachs’s Bibliography as ‘Plutarchs von den 46 durchlauchtigen Mannen’ (Carlsohn, Bibliothek, unpaginated). Largier believes Sachs used Plutarch’s version (Largier, Diogenes, p. 36).
52 Keaveney, Lucullus, p. 146.
centre of printing, producing all manner of books, including Hans Sachs’s first folio, but increased book production necessitated greater scrutiny by the local censor, which intensified after the *Interim*. Imperial scrutiny occurred in April 1550 when Charles V issued two edicts, the second of which instructed the authorities to use the death penalty for persistent offenders. Ignoring censorship had implications for Nuremberg’s already compromised relationship with the Emperor and for individual writers, printers and readers.

The Junckherr describes the contents of his library:

Ja, was von gutn büchern wird feil
In teutscher sprach, die kauff ich auff;
Hab ir bracht ind die liebrey zu hauff
Daran ir ewren lust werd sehen;
Wann ich mag in der warheit jehen,
Kein grösser frewd hab ich auff erd,
Denn zu lesen die bücher werth,
Da ich teglich erfahr das best,
Das ich vor gar nie hab gewest
Als ein ley und ungelehrter mann. (p. 109, ll. 13–22)

The first line hints at a chapter in Sebastian Brant’s *Narrenschiff* called ‘Von unnützen Bücher’, in which the *Büchernarr* remains a fool despite his possession of books because he has not read them. In Brant’s work the *Büchernarr* compares himself to Ptolomy:

Ich hab viel Bücher gleich wie er
Und lese doch nur wenig drin.

Zerbrechen sollt ich mir den Sinn,

---

54 See page 155.
Und mir mit Lernen machen Last?

Wer viel studiert, wird ein Phantast!

Here, the Junckherr searches for the truth in his books, many of which are written in the vernacular (l. 14). Luther’s Bible translation was in German, so Sachs may refer to his own love of Luther’s version, in which he believed the truth was to be found. This speech may serve as a reference to Sachs’s own library, though modest and it might also be a comment on the intellectual abilities of the Junckherr, who, like Sachs, purchases books in German as they are easier to read in the vernacular.

Throughout the play Sachs directs the audience’s attention to someone of wealth and intelligence with links to a library. These clues point to two eminent citizens of Nuremberg: Hieronymus Paumgartner and Erasmus Ebner (1511–1577): both had their own personal libraries and had organised the relocation of the Ratsbibliothek in 1534.56 The formation of a Ratsbibliothek commenced in 1370 when it included books on law, administration and the management of justice, which were available for consultation by lawyers. Over the course of time it benefitted from bequests from the collections of the city’s elite scholars, including Konrad Kunhofer (1374–1452), Anton Kress (1478–1513) and Sebald Schreyer (1446–1520).57 Donations increased and space in the Rathaus became scarce, which created the need for a new building. The new library was established in 1538 in Nuremberg’s Predigerkloster, the former Dominican monastery, where books from the Council’s bequests and from disestablished monasteries were united, amounting to approximately five thousand books. By 1538 the potential readership had already been widened to include members of the patrician Council, and latterly had allowed professional men and men with a university education access. Matti Stöhr specifically pinpoints the

56 Jürgensen, Norica, I, p. 38.
57 Jürgensen, Norica, I, p. 32.
denial of access to self-taught men who wanted to improve their own education. This is reflected in the last line, when the Junckherr calls himself: ‘ein ley und ungelehrter mann’ (l. 22). This is possibly sarcasm from Sachs, whose own library contents illustrate that even an ‘ungelehrter mann’ can better himself educationally. Was Sachs refused access to the library because he had no university education and been designated ‘ungelehrt’ by the library governors? This would lend the play a different motivation, that of a defence of his abilities as a self-educated writer. Renate Jürgensen, when describing works excluded from Hieronymus Paumgartner’s personal library, says: ‘Gar nicht in das Blickfeld Paumgartners kamen deutschsprachige Werke nicht-gelehrter Nürnberger Autoren aus der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts: [...] auch den Meistergesang hat Paumgartner privatim nicht wahrgenommen, der Schuhmacher Hans Sachs (1494–1576) taucht als Autor nicht auf’. The possibility that Sachs uses both Ebner and Paumgartner, well-known patricians, as models for the Doctor will be illustrated as the play progresses: both men held positions of authority in both Council and Church affairs; had represented Nuremberg in imperial matters during the Reformation; and were involved in the Ratsbibliothek, which renders them ideal for Sachs’s comedic purposes.

Before the Junckherr and his guest leave to examine the contents of the library, Jäckle arrives to flatter the Doctor:

Du groß, grader, baumlanger mann,
Ich bit, wöllest mir zeigen an,
Wo hast dein klein näblein genommen?
Von wannen bist du mit her kommen?

59 Jürgensen, Norica, l. p. 134.
60 Few images of Ebner exist, but the most common one suggests that he also had a large nose! <http://www.tripota.uni-trier.de/single_picture.php?signatur=121_port_0757> [accessed: 17 July 2017].
Sachs’s use of ‘baumlanger’, which could be spelt ‘paumlanger’ as in sixteenth-century Franconian the ‘b’ and ‘p’ were interchangeable, might indicate Paumgartner as the intended target for his mockery or may simply create a comic image of a tall man with a small nose. Jäckle attempts to quench the anger produced by his wonder at the size of the Doctor’s nose by suggesting now that it is insignificant. The reference to stealing the nose from a child (p. 110, l. 1) remains obscure but it could be a local idiom. Furthermore, Alison Stewart indicates that the size of the nose, even the nostrils, determined character, so presumably now that the Doctor has a small nose he has gained a small penis, but a larger intellect!

The Doctor replies angrily that he has been slandered twice by the Fool (p. 110, ll. 2–6) and while Fritz removes the Fool, the Doctor and the Junckherr visit the library:

Komet mit mir in mein liberey,
Da werd ir finden macherley
Bücher, geistlich zu gottes glori,
Philosophey, weltlich histori,
Poetry, fable und gut schwenck. (p. 110, ll. 17–21)

Sachs could be the speaker here, inviting the audience to view his own book collection, which furthers the idea that Sachs is defending his educational status. The Junckherr then promises physically to punish the Fool:

Daß er den narrn bind an ein seul,
Mit runt haw, biß er wain und heul,
Daß im das blut herab muß gahn. (p. 111, l. 1–3)
These words conjure up the *Geißelsäule*, to which Christ was tied during His interrogation before His Crucifixion. A woodcut version of this popular image was executed by Albrecht Dürer, *Christus an der Geißelsäule* (1509) (Fig. 18). The image is based on three possible biblical versions of the events after the Garden of Gethsemane. That found in John 18:21–23 appears relevant:

> Was fragst du mich darum? Frage die darum, die gehört haben, was ich zu ihnen geredet habe; siehe, diese wissen, was ich gesagt habe. Als er aber solches redete, gab der Diener einer, die dabeistanden, Jesu einen Backenstreich und sprach: Sollst du dem Hohenpriester also antworten?

---

---

61 Matthew 26:67 and Mark 14:65.
Jesus antwortete: Habe ich übel geredet, so beweise es, daß es böse sei; habe ich aber recht geredet, was schlägst du mich?

Jäckle’s punishment mirrors that of Christ, supporting the idea that he is a Holy Fool being punished for telling the truth. Here Sachs may refer to the problem of censorship for authors, who despite telling the truth might suffer censorship for their efforts. As they leave the Fool returns and says:

Wenn gleich die warheit sage ich,

So stöst man auß der stuben mich;

Und kom ich den mit lügen-sagen,

So thut man mich mit stecken schlagen. (p. 111, ll. 9–12)

Sachs has come to the crux of the matter: should he tell the truth, or make his point through telling lies? Both actions result in punishment, which reflects Jesus’s statement above. Sachs may be reflecting that when he told the “truth” about Albrecht Alcibiades in the satire about his death, he was prevented from publishing it. As a Christian, Sachs has a religious obligation to tell the truth, which he does in the moral endings to his plays, but because of his advocacy of Luther’s doctrine and his past links to Osiander, Sachs may have felt threatened due to the patrician support for Melanchthon’s interpretation of Lutheran doctrine. Klaus Leder confirms this:

Die Bürgerschaft stand auf Luthers Seite, die Patrizier verehrten Melanchthon, der einflußreiche Ratskonsulent Christoph Hardesheim (1523-1585)\textsuperscript{62} erwies sich als ausgesprochener Calvinist, die drei vordersten

Geistlichen als Melanchthonianer, die beiden Prediger Kaufman als Lutheraner.\textsuperscript{63}

Sachs would have been aware of these different factions and considered them as a threat to society due to the disunity fostered by their presence. Hence, the Fool may embody Sachs’s own crisis of conscience, to which Wolfgang F. Michael and Roger A. Crockett refer.\textsuperscript{64}

Meanwhile Jäckle ponders his Junckherr’s reaction, ‘Wie man sagt kleinen männlein vor zeit: | Der dreck nahend beim hertzen leit’ (p. 111, ll. 15–16). The idiom: ‘kleinen Leuten liegt der Dreck nahe beim Herzen’, means a narrow mind has a broad tongue.\textsuperscript{65} This could be Sachs’s comment on Paumgartner’s role, who, as censor, denies access to new writings, especially if they do not accord with his own views.

Fritz then cautions Jäckle to be silent or he will be punished until his blood runs (p. 111, ll. 25–30), which conjures up the image of the Flagellation of Christ. Jäckle replies:

\begin{quote}
Ich mein, der doctor hab eins sparrn
Im kopff zu weng oder zu vil,
Daß er mich nit vernemen wil. (p. 111, ll. 32–34)
\end{quote}

In this speech Jäckle insults the Doctor’s intelligence: \textit{ein Sparren} is a wooden rafter, another link to a ‘baumlanger Mann’ (p. 109, l. 29), but this idiom implies that the Doctor is not right in the head or has little upstairs.\textsuperscript{66} This agrees with the concept of the big nose, but if applied to Paumgartner, Sachs questions the censor’s intelligence. The Fool believes his own duty is to amend errors:

\begin{quote}
Hör Fridlein, ich glaub nit an dem ort
Sein nasen kom im nit recht her,
Weil darvon nit hört geren er
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{63} Leder, ‘Die religiöse Entwicklung’, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{64} Sachs’s crisis of conscience will be discussed in depth in the final chapter (see Hans Sachs, ed. by Michael and Crockett, III, p. 204).
\textsuperscript{66} DWB see sparren m (2).
The key to understanding the satire here is the double meaning of ‘verholn’, which means ‘to repeat’ but it is also an old form of *verhehlen*, the abduction or hiding of someone.\(^67\) This may refer to Paumgartner’s abduction, which occurred in May 1544 as he returned home from the Speyer *Reichstag*. His kidnapper, Albrecht von Rosenberg (1519–1572), had grievances about the destruction of his family’s Schloss Boxberg by the *Schwäbischer Bund* in 1520. When Albrecht inherited the castle, he demanded compensation for its destruction by the *Bund*, of which Nuremberg was a member. After failing to gain compensation, Rosenberg kidnapped and ransomed Paumgartner to obtain recompense for his losses. During Paumgartner’s captivity he was moved around Franconia for fourteen months, suffering dreadful hardships and finally being released after a ransom had been paid. It is known that after his experience Paumgartner asked to be excused from travelling away from Nuremberg. Consequently, he may have been hesitant to discuss the story, as he had become the subject of much gossip.\(^68\) The idiom ‘An der Nase herumführen’ is applicable to both the story of the kidnap and the coin with Paumgartner’s protruding proboscis: in the first case literally, as Paumgartner had been led in chains around Franconia during his captivity; and in the second metaphorically, if the saying is translated as making a fool of someone.\(^69\)

The Fool still believes the Doctor stole his nose, but this time cites a ‘krämer’, or itinerant peddler, suggesting that he had formed one nose from two (p. 112, ll. 20–23). Sachs refers to wax noses sold by *Wachskrämer*, and possibly to the idiom: ‘das recht hat eine wachsnase’, which means that the truth can be moulded to suit the user, especially in a religious context.\(^70\) In the context of Paumgartner’s account of his captivity, Sachs may be doubting the truth of his description. Furthermore, the patrician Council had allowed

---

\(^{67}\) *DWB* see *verhehlen*.

\(^{68}\) ‘Eigenhändiger Bericht’, ed. by Caselmann, 103–23.

\(^{69}\) *DWB* see *nase* I (5c).

\(^{70}\) *DWB* see *wachsnase* and *wächsen* (4).
themselves to be persuaded by the need for imperial support, by moulding their policies to suit the situations they faced. An example of this would have been the lack of support for the Lutheran cause during the Schmalkaldic War\(^7\) and subsequently, the *Interim*.

The Doctor returns from the library praising its contents:

O junckherr, wie ein thewren schatz
Habt ir von büchern auff dem platz!
Solch meng het ich bey euch nit gsucht.
Gut bücher lesen gibt groß frucht,
Vorauß wo man darnach richt eben
Gedanken, wort, werck und gantz leben.
Denn wird man tugendreich darvon,

Auch lieb und werth bey iederman. (p. 113, ll. 11–18)

These words of flattery reflect Humanist beliefs about the benefits of study and link back to the Junckherr’s speech (p. 109, ll. 13–22), where he speaks of the source of the truth being found in the right sort of books. ‘Theweren schatz’ is a phrase used by Luther for the blood of Christ during Mass as well as the Word of God found in the Bible. This is part of the ‘red thread’ running through this play, where Sachs uses imagery to remind the audience of the Communion celebration. If Sachs’s use of this phrase refers to the Bible, then he implies that reading and obeying the Word of God leads to a virtuous life. He reinforces this idea by saying: ‘Gut bücher lesen gibt groß frucht’ (l. 14), which may be a reference to Matthew 7:17: ‘Also ein jeglicher guter Baum bringt gute Früchte; aber ein fauler Baum bringt arge Früchte’. Applied to the responsibility of the censor, this suggests that a lazy censor, who has not read all the literature, cannot hope to produce a worthy criticism, nor could a reader with limited resources hope to achieve enlightenment on any

\(^7\) See page 85–86.
subject. Significantly Sachs implies that by reading the right books, i.e., the Bible, the result will be social peace and harmony. Jäckle continues:

Herrlein, mich gar nit mehr anficht,\textsuperscript{72}

Du habst ein nasen oder nicht:

Sie sey geleich groß oder klein,

Sols von mir unbekrehet sein. (p. 113, ll. 20–23)

By announcing that the nose is not worthy of comment, Jäckle draws attention to it again, which adds to the comedy. Sachs’s use of ‘unbekrehet’ provides a biblical context to this line,\textsuperscript{73} implying the Fool will not betray the Doctor and in doing this he will suffer the same fate as Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane after the cock had crowed three times. This is the third time the Fool has embarrassed the Doctor for his nose. The biblical ‘cock’ also picks up the idiom about seven hens, reminding the audience again of the Doctor’s potential cuckolding.

The Junckherr orders the Fool to be beaten until he bleeds (p. 113, 25–30),\textsuperscript{74} an image comparable to the Flagellation of Christ on the \textit{Geißelsäule}. The beatings are used repeatedly in this play as a metaphor for punishment for telling the truth. This underlines Sachs’s message: Jäckle is a Holy Fool; and if Sachs places himself in that role he will be punished for whatever he says.

The Fool’s constant references to the Doctor’s nose have irritated the latter (p. 114, ll. 1–3), leaving the Junckherr to calm the situation:

Wie ich euch den sagt im anfang;

Wann ider vogel singt sein gsang.

So thut mein narr reden und kallen

Alle ding, wie sie im einfallen;

\textsuperscript{72}DWB see \textit{anfechten}.

\textsuperscript{73}DWB see \textit{bekrähen}.

\textsuperscript{74}DWB see \textit{schmetszig}.
Auch alles, was er hört und sicht,
Das lest er unbegeckert nicht
On alle shew und hinderhut. (p. 114, ll. 6–12)

The reference to a bird (l.7) directs the audience to Sachs’s *Die wittenbergisch nachtigall* and the Reformation. In other plays, when Sachs mentions ‘vogel’ he uses the word as a metaphor for Lutherans or indeed Luther. Here it confirms that Jäckle, or the ‘heiliger Narr’, speaks the truth with childlike innocence. If Sachs is himself the *Narr* these words suggest the strength of his own advocacy for Lutheranism but also that his writing could be incautious or ‘on scheu und hinderhut’,75 which suggests that he is thoughtless or fearless in his choice of subject matter. The Junckherr continues:

Doch bleibt er gleich der narr wie vor,
Ein gschwätziger fantast und thor
Wann wer er gscheid, so thet ers nit. (p. 114, ll. 14–16)

The word ‘fantast’ means a fool or dreamer,76 who, according to Sachs, would not repeat his mistakes, were he intelligent. This implies that Sachs has not learned from his errors or past censorship. Could Sachs refer here again to the possible censorship he could have incurred in 1557 if he had published his satire on Alcibiades’s death? Censorship may have been in the forefront of his mind as he had published his first folio of work in 1558 and was compiling the second during 1559.77 An alternative meaning of ‘fantast’ is *schwärmer*,78 so Sachs indicates that he is regarded as someone who does not follow Nuremberg’s mainstream faith, which may reveal that Sachs’s preferred doctrinal choice was Osiandrist, rather than the preferred Melanchthon interpretation of Lutheranism. As a *schwärmer*, Sachs could have been accused of heresy according to the prevailing laws, but Nuremberg 75 <https://archive.org/stream/frhneuhochdeut00gt#page/122/mode/2up/search/hinderhut> [accessed: 30 April 2015].
76 *DWB* see fantasst.
tended to disregard the imperial *Ketzerei* edicts, preferring to police heresy themselves.\(^{79}\)

However, in light of the expulsion of the two Osiandrists pastors in 1555,\(^{80}\) Sachs could have attracted more censorship by promulgating Osiander’s doctrine within his works, which may indicate the reason for his self-doubt.

The Junckherr tempts his guest to dinner with the offer of, ‘wildprät, hasen, foglund fisch’ (l. 21), which reminds the audience of Jäckle’s greed at the beginning of the play, but here implies that it is the Doctor and his host who are gluttons. Thus animalistic, uncontrolled desires are now attributed to the two ‘educated’ protagonists, which implies that they, as animals, are unable to reason and reduces them to the level of the Fool. These animals also have allegorical significance and summon the audience’s memories of pre-Reformation times: ‘hasen’ represent the folly of man; ‘vogel’ is often used as an allegory for Luther; and ‘fisch’ are people needing salvation by the fishers of men, the disciples of Christ. Through the use of these allegories Sachs implies that the Junckherr and Doctor may be in need of salvation and his choice of pre-Reformation imagery may remind the audience of Luther’s persecution by the Catholic Church. The implication now is that Luther is threatened by the folly of his own disciples and clerics, who in Sachs’s mind represent a danger to Nuremberg’s adopted faith.

The Doctor orders the Knecht to make ready his horse: ‘Wann es ist warlich hohe zeit, | Daß ich heint noch gen Forcheim reit’ (p. 114, ll. 27–28). The *Wappen* of Forchheim consists of two fish (trout) on a red background which link to the imagery of the fish mentioned previously. Forchheim lies to the north of Nuremberg and was the location of the palace of the Bishop of Bamberg who Melanchthon visited after his stay in Nuremberg in 1555. There is also a route from the town which leads directly to Lonnerstadt, where Paumgartner had his *Herrensitz*. Sachs uses all these satirical hints to link Paumgartner and

---

\(^{79}\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 251.

\(^{80}\) See page 179–180.
Melanchthon in the minds of his audience. Furthermore, both Ebner and Paumgartner had a common link to Bamberg. Erasmus Ebner had travelled to Forchheim on 9 May 1526 in the company of Melanchthon and from there to the Egidienkloster in Nuremberg, where they were met by Hieronymus Paumgartner. This meeting celebrated the opening of the Melanchthon Gymnasium (26 May 1526), which was founded to ensure that the Lutheran doctrine was taught in a Humanist manner.

The Narr is left to close the play:

Hie nem ein beyspiil fraw und mann
Bey mir, wer auch nit schweigen kan,
Sunder beschnattert alle ding,
Obs gleich schand oder schaden bring. (p. 114, ll. 31-34)

The Narr warns the audience of the dangers of unbridled chatter, which can be interpreted as the dangers of being an author like Sachs. He continues:

Es sey auch gleich war oder nicht,
Noch ers auff das spöttlichst außricht,
Darauff hat er am meisten acht,
Wescht für und für gar unbedacht
Wil offt ein sach bessern in fürwar,
Und verderbt sie erst gantz und gar. (p. 115, ll. 1–7)

In this speech Sachs talks about the dangers of writing satire. He uses ‘wescht’ again in its meaning of gossip, but in line 7 he reflects on the damage this can do, damage which may have contributed to his dilemma as a writer and reflect his fear of censorship. He continues: ‘Nemt auch vil auf-neschlein darvon’ (l. 10). Here he makes a pun on neschlein, which can be a small nose, but can also mean a fondness for sweet things. ‘Aufnäschen’ itself

81 MB X, p. 341.
can be used to mean to consume (i.e., finish eating) or to be consumed by something.\textsuperscript{82} Thus Sachs, even in this last speech, still uses the ‘nose’ motif to raise a laugh. Sachs quotes an old saying, ‘Mit schweigen verredt man sich nit (l. 14), which commences his final lines and, when spoken by Jäckle, constitutes Sachs’s reflections on the meaning of the play:

\begin{verbatim}
Het ich auch gschwigen von der nasen,
Se het man mich ungschlagen glassen.
Wil mich nun schweigens nemen an,
Daß ich ungschlagen kom darvon,
Auff daß mir nit ein unglück wachs 
Auß anderm unglück, spricht Hans Sachs. (p. 115, ll. 15–20)
\end{verbatim}

The Fool, realising that his only option is silence, mirrors Sachs’s dilemma as an author. The last two lines confirm that the resultant disquiet about his works may result in official resistance to his writing, presumably from patricians or the censor. This is a possible explanation of his decision to cease writing in late 1560, which will be discussed in depth in Chapter VI. After the censorship of his writing in 1527 Sachs responded by not writing Fastnachtspiele or, more accurately, not publishing any for almost a decade, devoting his energy to writing Meistergesang and different genres of plays. This being so, and, considering the harsh judgement of the city censor in 1527, Sachs’s hesitation to write further works in 1559 makes him a Holy Fool to whom no-one wanted to listen.

This Fastnachtspiel is extremely complex due to the layers of satire within the dialogue and the multiple personalities satirized by Sachs. Why might Sachs have assigned the role of the Doctor to Hieronymus Paumgartner and Erasmus Ebner? Both men were patricians and had been leading members of the Nuremberg Council involved in the decision to adopt Lutheranism. Both men were also instrumental in the formation of the

\textsuperscript{82} See DWB näschlein.
Ratsbibliothek and both men had their own libraries, which allows Sachs to mock them in their role as ‘collectors’ of books in their thirst for knowledge whilst suggesting that they might have not have read the correct books in order to achieve a balanced view. The possibility that Sachs had been denied access to the library adds fuel to the irony of this portrayal. Paumgartner corresponded regularly with Melanchthon and it has already been demonstrated that he was anti-Osiandrist and therefore most probably supported Melanchthon’s interpretation of Lutheran doctrine.

The Doctor’s list of talents itemized at the beginning of the play (p. 103, ll. 6–20) tends to point towards the known abilities of Erasmus Ebner (1511–1577). Ebner had represented Nuremberg, particularly during the negotiations during the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg, in which he made allies of the Bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg in order to defeat Alcibiades. Significantly, he was a chemist, ‘ein doctor der artzeney’ (l. 8) and was in part responsible for the discovery of zinc found in the waste of iron foundries. In 1557 Ebner wrote Warhafftige und grüntliche Zeytungen, to which Sachs probably refers earlier in the play (p.106, ll. 21–22). This was printed in Nuremberg and concerned itself with reports about the relationship between Spain and England during the period of 14 July – 1 October 1557, written during Ebner’s visits to England and Spain, which Sachs refers to as Welschlant (p. 107, ll. 23–24). Biographies of Ebner indicate that he left Nuremberg unexpectedly in 1557, never to return, and died in 1577 in Lower Saxony. There is no recorded reason for his departure, nor any indication of scandal which might have precipitated his move. The references to the rebuilding of a castle are obscure but the Ebner family owned the Baderschloss in Mögelsdorf, which had been destroyed in 1552 during the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg and was rebuilt in 1559. Further credence is added to the suggestion that Ebner was embodied in the character of the Doctor by the existence of

84 Gruner, Nürnberg, p. 142.
another Herrensitzen in Mögelsdorf owned by Erasmus Ebner until 1560, aptly called the Doktorschlösschen or Doktorshof and also destroyed in the same war.85 Whether Sachs had a specific reason for satirizing Ebner is not known; however, it cannot be doubted that Ebner played an integral role in the formation of the Ratsbibliothek, which may have made him a target for Sachs’s satire.

The allusion to Paumgartner as a source for satire is confirmed by the coin but further supported by the geographical location of his manor house in Lonnerstadt, the position of which matches the distances discussed by the Junckherr and the Doctor earlier in the play (p. 106, ll. 11–16). Additionally, with Ebner, Paumgartner was involved in the relocation of the Ratsbibliothek as well as being heavily involved in the adoption of the Reformation and a representative of Nuremberg at religious and imperial meetings. Furthermore, both Ebner and Paumgartner represented another threat to society in Nuremberg: part of the wealthy elite, they illustrated how the wealthy were distancing themselves from traditional city business and by owning Herrensitze.86 From 1554, when he became censor, Paumgartner would have had to judge the suitability for publication or public performance of Sachs’s writing, including his Fastnachtspiele. It cannot be ruled out that Paumgartner had communicated his anger over the contents of Sachs’s writings in another form, either personally or through a mediator. Sachs implicates Paumgartner as the source of two threats in the play: first, in his role as censor, Paumgartner alone determined which books were acceptable and hence controlled the sources of knowledge available to Nuremberg’s citizens, which restricted their search for the truth, as well as being a possible threat to Sachs’s freedom of expression. Second, Paumgartner, due to his position on the Council and as Nuremberg’s leader of the Church, had power to decide

86 Hieronymus Paumgartner’s son, Hieronymus der Junge (1538–1602), became ennobled as ‘von Holstein und Grünsberg’ in 1596.
clerical issues in Nuremberg since he became Melanchthon’s spokesman after Luther’s death, which Sachs may have believed to be contrary to the best interest of all citizens.

Jäckle has a multiplicity of roles, being Sachs or a Holy Fool, and even Luther or Christ at different points in the play, but most significantly, by the choice of this name Sachs signalled at the beginning of the play that its focus is on the various interpretations of Luther’s doctrine.⁸⁷ We have seen from Neidinger’s comment that there was growing support for other reformed confessions in Nuremberg and with the threat of the approaching visitation, Sachs may have been concerned about the possibility of people being judged against criteria which did not represent Luther’s theology. The subtle references to Melanchthon, the journey to Bamberg and to the doctrinal arguments in the ‘red thread’ running through this play illustrate Sachs’s belief that Melanchthon was responsible for the threats to Lutheranism, both nationally and in Nuremberg. Luther’s death marked the beginning of divisions in Lutheranism: the more radical beliefs of Flacius Illyricus and an emerging group of Melanchthon supporters, who believed in Calvin’s theory of predestination.

The red thread which Sachs weaves through the play in his references to red wine or blood from the beatings may allude to the doctrinal arguments on transubstantiation. Luther had devoted much of his life writing and arguing with the Catholics and other Protestant leaders about the significance of the presence of God in the act of Communion. Sachs, who would have known this from his extensive reading, suggests that the Protestants needed to reread the right books, that is, Luther’s teachings on this issue, to achieve better understanding.

The imagery of the Flagellation of Christ indicates that Sachs was concerned about the ‘truth’, as the treatment of Christ, like that of the Fool, illustrated that telling the ‘truth’ is just as dangerous as lying. In religious terms, truth means God’s Word as it is written in

⁸⁷ See page 234.
the Bible, specifically in the Lutheran Bible. This explains Sachs’s references to the possession of books, the quality of books, libraries and the acquisition of knowledge as he questions suitable sources for finding the truth. This being so, his satirical portrayal of the two great statesmen of Nuremberg, the references to libraries and education give an alternative dimension to this *Fastnachtspiel*. Sachs questions where they sought to find the truth and in doing so casts doubt on their ability to decide Nuremberg’s future religious identity.

The dilemma in which the author finds himself is also portrayed by the role of the Fool: should he tell the truth, or lie to achieve his aim of a good story? Sachs portrays the outcome of both strategies, which is that he is punished for his writings through censorship. On a personal level, this play illustrates that a year before writing his last *Fastnachtspiel* Sachs was already considering the viability of future writings. It can only be conjectured that the reaction to the satire on the death of Alcibiades was greater than has been appreciated hitherto since despite Sachs’s self-censorship his property was searched after his death and the play confiscated.88 Sachs, according to this *Fastnachtspiel*, repeated what he heard being said on the street. If ‘the nose’ is the most obvious characteristic of the Doctor for the Fool, and the Fool is the embodiment of Sachs, then ‘the nose’ represents the most obvious truth he was writing about, that is, Alcibiades’s reign of terror and how it affected Nuremberg. By mocking the integrity of Paumgartner and Ebner, two of Nuremberg’s great statesmen, Sachs is in danger of making himself unpopular and, as we see in *Der wüecher und andrer peschwerd petreffent*, the city fathers did not accept criticism lightly.

---

88 Brunner suggests that Sachs circulated copies before publication (Brunner, *Hans Sachs*, p. 43).
Das gespräch Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni.

This play was written on 30 December 1560, a year after the *Der doctor mit den grossen nasen*.\(^{89}\) Between 1550 and 1560 Sachs wrote several plays based on classical Greek characters,\(^{90}\) even writing two almost identical plays about the meeting between Alexander the Great (356–323 BC) and Diogenes of Sinope (c. 412–323 BC) in 1558.\(^{91}\) Evidence of Diogenes is found in other authors’ writings, as no writings exist from Diogenes’s own hand.\(^{92}\) Some of the earliest accounts are by Diogenes Laertius (180–240 AD), who wrote anecdotes about Diogenes of Sinope in his *Bioi*.\(^{93}\) Plutarch’s (45–120 AD) version of Diogenes’s meeting with Alexander the Great features in his *Vitae Parallelae*, of which Sachs had a copy. Renewed interest in Greek and Latin texts by Humanists encouraged interest in Diogenes and his life story, which became a sought-after source for more contemporary writers; works produced at the time included *Diogenes ein lustige unnd kurzwylige History von aller Leer unnd Läben Diogenis Cynici des heydnischen Philosophi*, printed by Rudolph Wyssenbach in Zürich in 1550.\(^{94}\) Hence the Diogenes stories were well known in Humanist circles in Germany and Switzerland and later by a wider readership.

---

\(^{89}\) KG XIII, pp. 580–91.


\(^{91}\) There is some debate about the date of the version identified here, which Sachs himself dated 30 December 1560 (KG XIII, pp. 580–591). The two versions from August 1558 (KG XII, pp. 319–322 and pp. 323–326) are almost identical to each other, the second version being written in more modern language, and are in the form of a *Schwank*. Neither are identical to that written in 1560, although Sachs reuses certain phrases. The version from February 1559 is similar to the 1560 version but only contains a conversation between Diogenes and Alexander. The 1560 version differs, having three protagonists, the addition of the heroldt’s introduction as well as the *Prologus* at the end. This should not be confused with the Beschluß found in other versions as they do not contain the warning found in the 1560 *Prologus*. This being the case and the fact that Sachs dated it himself, the 1560 version will be analysed as his last *Fastnachtspiel*. Edmund Goetze says, ‘Möglich, dass bei der Vorbereitung für den Druck, der Ende 1560 im Gange gewesen sein muss, da Hans Sachsens Vorrede zum dritten Foliobande vom 16. August 1561 datiert, noch Aenderungen vorgenommen worden sind und dass er dann auch das Datum danach verändert hat’ (*Elf Fastnachtspiele aus den Jahren 1552 und 1553 von Hans Sachs*, ed. by Edmund Goetze (Halle/Salle: Niemayer, 1883), p. ix, note 44). The additions listed above give the 1560 version a different relevance.


\(^{94}\) Largier, *Diogenes*, p. ix.
Germany’s new Emperor, Ferdinand I (1503–64), brother to Charles V, had negotiated a German Hapsburg succession in 1558. Since the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, religious peace between the Catholics and Protestants was assured, but only the Lutheran faith was accepted. There was disquiet amongst Catholics about Ferdinand’s son Maximilian II (1527–1576), who had been influenced by Lutheran teaching during his education and became antagonistic to the Catholic beliefs of his father.\(^95\) This made both the Papacy and Philip II anxious about the succession in Germany,\(^96\) where Protestantism had been invigorated by the Peace of Augsburg. Maximilian, on inheriting the crown from his father, would find many powerful supporters amongst the Protestant principalities and imperial cities. Nuremberg was still openly Lutheran, but more subtle divisions in the faith were appearing. This was partially due to the arrival of émigrés from the Netherlands, where the majority of Protestants followed Zwingli (but later Calvin). These refugees formed two groups: first, people fleeing the repression of Protestantism in the Netherlands by Philip II; and, second,\(^97\) craftsmen, who were being sought by Nuremberg to increase the city’s weaving capacity and to remove the city’s dependency on finished cloth from Antwerp and London.\(^98\) This effectively brought another confession into Nuremberg; however, in light of the two edicts issued by Charles V in 1550,\(^99\) which threatened dire consequences for anyone reading, purchasing, or even discussing a “heretical” document, Nuremberg balanced its policy through a: ‘Verbot einer Religionsübung ihres Bekenntnisses und Gebot der äußeren Teilnahme am öffentlichen Gottesdienst der Staatsreligion’.\(^100\) Further insecurities took hold of the Lutheran Church when Melanchthon died in April 1560, leaving a hiatus which encouraged other Protestants to

\(^{95}\) Whaley, \textit{Germany and the HRE}, I, p. 344.
\(^{96}\) Whaley, \textit{Germany and the HRE}, I, p. 344.
\(^{97}\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 226.
\(^{98}\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 229.
\(^{99}\) See page 155.
\(^{100}\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 251.
attempt to take up Luther’s mantle of leader of the Reformed churches.¹⁰¹ These divisions would eventually lead to significant cracks in the agreement arrived at in 1555 and become a significant cause of the Thirty Years’ War in 1618.

This play is based on the legend about a meeting between Alexander the Great and the philosopher known as Diogenes of Sinope or Diogenes the Cynic, who is regarded as one of the founders of cynic philosophy.¹⁰² Cynics base their philosophy on living life in virtue and in harmony with nature, which involves rejecting all worldly wealth, desire for fame and power and living simply. This recalls the demands made of monks when they enter a monastic order. Diogenes took this philosophy to the extreme, living like a pauper and sleeping rough, which was far from the lifestyle to which he had been accustomed as a child. His father had been a banker or coin-minter in Sinope, which is located in modern-day Turkey. Diogenes was exiled when he was accused of falsifying coins or debasing the currency.¹⁰³ It may not be a coincidence that Sachs thought of Diogenes due to monetary developments in Germany. Gruner reports that there was a Münzenordnung in 1559¹⁰⁴ which determined that sixty kreuzer equalled one Gulden. This caused a disagreement between the northern and southern states of Germany, as the north wanted to use groschen rather than kreuzer, which were in widespread use in the southern states, Austria and Switzerland. On an international level Philip II devalued the currency in Spain by declaring bankruptcy in both 1557 and 1560 and France also declared bankruptcy in 1557, both of which affected Nuremberg’s patrician families who had established trading centres in both countries. After the scandal, Diogenes moved to Athens, where he lived frugally, criticising city structures and social values, which he regarded as corrupt. This mirrors Sachs’s

¹⁰¹ Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 340.
¹⁰² Antisthenes (445–365 BC), a pupil of Socrates (c. 470–399 BC), is believed to have been the first cynic and he inspired Diogenes’s philosophy (see Largier, Diogenes, p. 2).
purpose when writing satire in his *Fastnachtspiele*, that is, to highlight moral lapses in his fellow citizens and threats to his beloved Nuremberg.

It is necessary to understand the sort of man Alexander was in order to appreciate this satire. He was the son of Philip II of Macedon (382 – 336 BC) and his wife Olympia, who had dreamt that her womb was struck by a bolt of lightning from the gods, which lent credibility to Alexander’s god-like reputation. His rule and the spread of his Empire fascinated early modern historians and many works about him were translated by the Humanists. Sachs’s own library contained nine books of history by Valerius Maximus in which Sachs found the anecdote about Alexander blocking Diogenes’s light. Similarly, Sachs owned Seneca’s *Von guten Sitten*, which contains the story that Diogenes believed he was more powerful through his philosophical beliefs than Alexander through his political and military might. Alexander, like his father Philip II, was accused of hubris by later historians due to his arrogance and self-belief. Indeed, due to the story of the lightning bolt, Alexander believed that he was invested with the same powers as the gods and therefore immortal. His arrogant style as a leader left him isolated, which is part of the tragedy of his reign. Philip II of Spain also earned a reputation for hubris but for different reasons. Philip believed in the divine right of kings, as was customary, but he also believed that he alone should carry the burden of the work of state and considered his own intellectual powers superior to those of his advisors; hence he declined advice from everyone. This may have been due to his father’s insistence on trusting no-one, but the result was a difficult and deeply suspicious relationship between the monarch and his ministers.105 As Sachs was writing this play, Philip II had already attempted to increase his territorial control in Italy (1555–59) and had threatened the papacy itself (1556–57), so Sachs may have been likening Philip II’s desired territorial expansion to that of Alexander.

A heroldt opens the play, a role traditionally found in older Fastnachtspiele. He delivers a laudatory speech in praise of Alexander (p. 580, ll. 4–20) in which he describes the ruler: ‘Großmechtiger, gualtiger keyser, | Der welt ein sieghafter durch-reyser’ (ll.4–5). This informs the audience about his power and the triumphal nature of his leadership. The audience then hears that Alexander has conquered India and Asia (ll. 6–7). The mention of the Far Eastern lands conquered by Alexander mirrors Nuremberg’s past trading links for exotic spices, a trade that was now threatened by wars between Philip II and the Ottoman Empire, in their fight for domination of the Mediterranean. The Herald alludes to the legend surrounding Alexander’s birth calling him Jupiter’s son (ll. 9–10). In previous plays Sachs has used Jupiter as an allegorical figure for justice, or to represent Charles V. However, as Charles had died in 1558, Sachs could be focusing on either Ferdinand II of Germany or Philip II of Spain.

Sachs sets the scene for the meeting between Alexander and Diogenes, which, according to anecdotal evidence, took place in Corinth. However, here the heroldt says:

\[\text{Nun seyen wir in Grecia,}\]
\[\text{In der mechtig stadt Athena,}\]
\[\text{Welche stadt ist der weisheit stuel.}\] (p. 580, ll. 12–14)

Normally, Sachs uses locations familiar to his Fastnacht audience, but in this case he chooses to set the play in Athens, regarded as a centre of learning and since 450 BC known as the ‘cradle of democracy’. Sachs may have wanted to highlight the interconnectedness of the Holy Roman Empire with the past, as it was believed that the Holy Roman Empire was a continuation of the Roman Empire, which itself was a continuation of the Greek Empire. Sachs hereby emphasises the wisdom of the Greeks and aspects of their pre-Christian philosophy, which resembles the Christian doctrine on how to achieve virtue.

---

106 Theiß, Allegorik, p. 115 and p. 116 respectively.
107 This theory is based on the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dreams in Daniel 2 and 7, wherein the ‘four kingdoms’ were the Roman Empire, the Macedonian Empire, the Babylonian Empire and the Persian Empire. <http://www.biblestudyguide.org/ebooks/comment/calcom24.pdf> [accessed: 27 November 2016].
Humanism had been sparked by the rediscovery of texts from Ancient Rome and Greece by Petrarch (1304–1374) but the leading Humanist known to Sachs’s generation would have been Erasmus (1466–1536), who had both edited the Greek New Testament and translated it Latin (1512). Many Humanist translators of Greek and Roman texts sought a clearer understanding of Christianity through their studies, as had Philipp Melanchthon, who studied philosophy and rhetoric at the University of Heidelberg in 1509 and became a renowned Greek scholar, his theological studies beginning later in 1516.

Biblical quotations lauding meekness (Matthew 5:5) and humility (Matthew 19:24) convey the same sense of virtuousness and humility as found in Diogenes’s cynic philosophy. Similarly, choosing to live in poverty and to reject the trappings of wealth is linked to the life of Jesus and His disciples.108 Luther wrote against cynic philosophy, which he believed was a rebellion against the norms of society.109 The reference to ‘weißheit stuel’ suggests that Sachs intended to focus his audience’s attention on Athens’s reputation as a cultured city. Nuremberg had similarly acquired a reputation as a centre of learning in the early sixteenth century partially due to the number of Humanists living in the city and partially due to its reputation as a centre of printing whence many texts originated. Gerald Strauss calls Nuremberg in the sixteenth century ‘a ‘German Athens’ because of this reputation for intellectual activity.110 The heroldt explains Athens’s reputation:

Da die philosphi ir schuel
Halten, und ist in aller welt
Die höchst und fürtreffligst gemelt,
Auß der all weißheit kumbt gerunnen
In die welt, als auß eim quelbrunnen
Durch ir philosophische lehr.  (p. 580, ll. 15–20)

108 Largier, Diogenes, p. 30.
109 Largier, Diogenes, p. 15.
110 Strauss, Nuremberg, p. 231.
The heraldt’s description of Athenian schools forges similarities between Athens and Nuremberg. Nuremberg had schools long before the Reformation, but the school established by Melanchthon at the Egidienkloster in 1526 was intended to teach a classically Humanist curriculum, albeit in accordance with Lutheran theology.\textsuperscript{111} The teaching staff were some of the best Lutheran academics of the day: Joachim Camerarius (1500–1574) was the first headmaster of the school and Eobanus Hessus (1488–1540) was one of its first teachers. There were fundamental problems with this school from its inception: the name ‘Gymnasium’ was normally applied to universities and this was not a university, but the pupils had to know Latin to attend it.\textsuperscript{112} It experienced financial difficulties from the outset, being initially a free school, but as early as 1527 demands were made to curb the schoolmasters’ living costs. Fees were then introduced, which made the city’s \textit{Trivialschulen}, where the curriculum was based on grammar, logic and rhetoric and which instructed pupils in literacy and numeracy, more attractive as they were free.\textsuperscript{113} Then Nuremberg’s trivial schools began to teach Latin and provided the level of education necessary to attend university. Melanchthon visited the Gymnasium in 1552 in an attempt to improve its flagging numbers by holding a series of public lectures,\textsuperscript{114} but by the time Sachs wrote this \textit{Fastnachtspiel} pupil-retention was at an all-time low and questions were being asked about its viability, whilst others questioned why Nuremberg had no \textit{Hochschule}.\textsuperscript{115} By promoting Nuremberg’s reputation as Athens from the outset in, Sachs informs his audience that the moral dilemma he wishes to expand upon is a current theme in Nuremberg. The comparison of Nuremberg to Athens as a place where philosophers meet is a reference to the number of Humanists who lived in the city and the influence they

\textsuperscript{111} Strauss, \textit{Nuremberg}, p. 236.
\textsuperscript{112} Hugo Steiger, \textit{Das Melanchthongymnasium in Nürnberg (1526-1926). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Humanismus} (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1926), pp. 32–33.
\textsuperscript{113} Steiger, \textit{Melanchthongymnasium}, p. 33.
\textsuperscript{114} Steiger, \textit{Melanchthongymnasium}, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{115} Steiger, \textit{Melanchthongymnasium}, pp. 46–47.
had on it. However, in his role as a satirist, Sachs prepares his audience for the possibility that the forthcoming action does not represent the behaviour of a cultivated city.

Returning to the text: Alexander enters Athens, leaving his soldiers outside the town, and says, ‘Wann weißheit ist ein edler schatz’ (p. 581, l. 1). This phrase was used in *Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen* to describe the truth found in the Bible,\(^{116}\) but here Sachs’s words supports the Humanist view that the study of the classics helps to inform Christianity. At this point in the play the *heroldt* takes on the name Ernholdt, signifying a change in his role and from this point he becomes a protagonist in the play. On reaching the town square, where Alexander and Ernholdt spot Diogenes, Alexander asks:

> Wer ist, der dort sitzt in der putten,
> Gleichsam ein thor in eyner kutten,
> Und leimbt zu-samb gschreiben papir?  (p. 581, ll. 10–12)

‘In der putten’ describes how Diogenes lived in a barrel or large stone jar, which illustrates his simple life without possessions. He is wearing a *kutte*, which can mean either a monk’s habit or a fool’s clothing. This choice of clothing questions whether Diogenes is a Fool or a Holy Fool, which is Sachs’s purpose: as he illustrates in *Der doctor mit der grossen nasen*, the Fool tells the truth. The similarity between Diogenes and a Holy Fool is noted by Niklaus Largier: ‘Dies gilt, weil Diogenes sich immer schon zur Inszenierung bekennt — so nicht für eine naive Natürlichkeit oder für ein philosophisches Konzept von Natürlichkeit, sondern — dem christlichen Narren vergleichbar, […]’.\(^{117}\) Diogenes is described as gluing together pieces of paper, a seemingly pointless activity which is not found in the classical anecdotes about him. If this is interpreted as an attempt to restore something previously destroyed, then it suggests Hans Sachs’s encounters with the censor, who has shredded his work. Then Ernholdt asserts:

---

\(^{116}\) *DWB* see *schatz* (d).

\(^{117}\) Largier, *Diogenes*, p. 6.
Es ist auch ein philosophus
Und der secten ein cinicus,
Welche man ist die hüntisch heissen. (p. 581, ll. 15–17)

Cynic philosophy is associated with dogs as *Kynos* is the genitive of the word ‘dog’ in Greek; however, a dog lives on the streets, eats scraps and behaves without shame, which accords with the idea of being a Holy Fool, although not a Christian, he is a fool for his chosen philosophy.\(^\text{118}\) Ernholdt continues:

> Wann ire wort stechen und beissen,
> Verschonen weder arm noch reich,
> Jung und alt, gilt im als gleich:
> Fürsten, könig und die götter;
> Wann sie sindt aller laster spötter
> Straffens ohn alle heuchlerey. (p. 581, ll. 18–23)

Ernholdt describes the philosopher’s task and prepares Alexander for words delivered without flattery and ignoring his station in life. The words ‘stechen und beissen’ indicate animalistic behaviour, but the use of ‘stechen’ may be a reference to Johann Cochläus’s woodcut of the *Siebenköpfiger Martin Luther* (1529), used to illustrate an anti-Luther work. In it one of Luther’s seven heads is surrounded by wasps or hornets. The label given to this head on the illustration is ‘Schwirmer’ (*Schwärmer*), meaning a fanatic or indeed Anabaptist, which Luther used to indicate someone who did not believe in his interpretation of the Bible.\(^\text{119}\) Again this supports the idea that Diogenes is a Holy Fool, but if Diogenes represents Luther, then Sachs implies that Diogenes attacks those who disregard Luther’s teaching. The word ‘beissen’ links to the ‘dog-like’ behaviour of cynics. Furthermore, this interpretation of ‘beissen’ connects to the role of a satirist, especially a disciple of

---

\(^\text{118}\) Largier, *Diogenes*, p. 1.

\(^\text{119}\) *DWB* see *Schwärmerei* (1).
Juvenalian satire, which is characterised as cynical and cutting. Ernholdt’s words suggest how Luther argued with all manner of clergy, even the Pope’s representatives, imperial envoys and the most powerful Prince Bishops of Germany before the Reformation, which led to his banishment from the Catholic Church. By reminding the audience of the stance that Luther took despite the power ranged against him, Sachs sets up Luther as a model worthy of emulation by illustrating Luther’s courage when faced with adversity.

Replying to Alexander’s enquiry about his name (p. 581, l. 31), Diogenes is obtuse:

So wiß du, das ich bin ein man,

Bin auch ein königlicher hundt. (p. 581, ll. 33–34)

Although this ties into previous speeches about cynics and their ‘dog-like’ shamelessness, the reference to ‘ein königlicher hundt’ could imply loyalty to the crown. Alexander then asks Diogenes why he compares himself to a dog when he has the power to reason like a human being (p. 582, ll. 1–2), to which Diogenes replies: ‘Das ist, das itzt und in die zunkunft | Ich beisse die schendlichen laster’ (p. 582, ll. 5–6). Diogenes describes his purpose as a moral watchdog, a role which Sachs occupies by writing satires about human failings. He continues to compare himself to a dog:

Mein beuln ist der bösen etz-pflaster,

Ich kratz in auff die drüß und beulen,

Ich reuch und spur die laster-feulen,

Leck sie mit meiner scharpffen zungen

Iedoch die alten sambt den jungen

Fliehen mich trewen hund all baidt,

Ziehen nicht mit mir auff das jeidt,

Zu fahen die holdtseling tugendt. (p. 582, ll. 7–14)

---

120 See page 38.
Sachs uses distasteful vocabulary to present the audience with images evocative of plague symptoms. The Catholic Church had promulgated the idea that outward signs of disease were punishment for internal moral failings, and that sin was the catalyst for God’s action in sending a plague. Here Sachs comments on the state of mankind and the need for reform and redemption and he uses this imagery to describe how he envisages his purpose as a writer of *Fastnachtspiele* and moral watchdog. Diogenes continues:

> Derhalb verdirbt die blüennd jugendt,
> Weil sie vol begiert und affeckt
> Erblindt, so lesterlichen steckt,
> Und verachten mich trewen hundt. (p. 582, ll. 15–18)

Diogenes points out that desires and emotions drive the young from virtuous living and if truthful words are disregarded, virtue and faith are under threat. Here, if Diogenes is intended to be Luther, the implication is that Luther’s words hold no sway over the younger generation, their attention being focused on luxuries and social mobility. This could also refer to the attitude of the new generation of Protestant pastors, like Moritz Heling, Melanchthon’s pupil, who has turned away from the accepted Lutheran doctrine and was suspected of crypto-Calvinistic ideas. If, however, ‘verachten’ alludes to the poor credibility of a writer and Diogenes is meant to be Sachs, the latter’s words are falling on deaf ears.

Alexander offers Diogenes a gift to relieve his poverty (p. 582, ll. 22–29) in the belief that Diogenes will be persuaded to write something which reflects Alexander’s fame and glory:

> Wenn er begert tausendt ducaten,
> So will ich imbs frey-willig schencken,

---

123 *DWB* see verachten (2).
Alexander betrays his arrogance by assuming a generous gift would be acceptable to a cynic philosopher who deems possessions and wealth unnecessary for a peaceful existence. Diogenes’s indifference to the presence of Alexander has been noticed by Ernholdt, who points out:

Herr König, der weiß, daß gleich sam ob
Er dein wort nit hab verstanden,
Er hat für sich noch unterhanden,
Leimbt dort zu-samb sein zettel frey
Vol gschrieben seynr philosophie,
Samb er kein acht mehr auff dich hab. (p. 583, ll. 6–11)

Diogenes continues to reconstruct his writings despite Alexander’s efforts to persuade him to extol his (Alexander’s) fame and glory. Diogenes’s act of repairing works containing his philosophy may refer to Sachs’s compilation of his works into folios and preparing them for publication. Many of his earlier unpublished works written during the 1530s were included in the folios completed in 1558 and 1560. These may have been left unpublished purposely if Sachs was fearful of the attention of the censor at their time of writing. If so, the last line (l. 11), implies that Sachs has now decided to publish them, ignoring the threat of censorship.

Alexander then asks Diogenes to demand any gift, to which Diogenes replies:

Lieber geh weck, mach mir kein schatten,
Auff das ich an der sonnen schein
Müg trücknen hie die zettel mein.
Nach deiner gab thu ich nit trachten. (p. 583, ll. 16–19)
The first line agrees with anecdotal evidence from Valerius Maximus of this meeting.\textsuperscript{124} The suggestion of casting a shadow on Diogenes’s work and preventing the glue from drying could be a metaphor for Sachs’s inability to write freely, as the sun dries the ink and fixes his words to the page, as well as drying the glue as he attempts to reconstruct his works. If this refers to censorship, despite there being no evidence of Sachs being publicly censored since Der Abt in Wildbad in 1551\textsuperscript{125}, then the text implies that a threat to the publication of his works still exists. Furthermore, taking into consideration biblical interpretations, if God is the ‘light of the world’ (John 8:12),\textsuperscript{126} blocking the light could be a comment about the threat to Lutheranism in Nuremberg as the factions dispute their choice of doctrine. However, there is also a second biblical reference to God as the sun in Psalm 84:11: ‘Denn Gott der HERR ist Sonne und Schild; der HERR gibt Gnade und Ehre: er wird kein Gutes mangeln lassen den Frommen’. Although this suggests that those who believe in God, receive his protection, cynics believed similarly that those who live in humility will find eternal peace. Sachs uses pre-Christian cynical philosophy to elucidate Christian doctrine. This suggests that Sachs wrote this play for an intellectual audience, not only in his choice of subject matter but also in his illustration of the influence of Humanist scholarship on current theological beliefs.

Alexander, misunderstanding Diogenes’s rejection, informs him it is in his power to make Diogenes rich (p. 583, ll. 21–24) but Diogenes replies that he is already richer than Alexander (l. 26). He continues:

\begin{verbatim}
Das königreich Macedonia,

Welches dir hat verlassen da

Köng Philippus, der vatter dein,

Das kan dir nit genugsam sein
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{124} Largier, Diogenes, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{125} See page 94.
\textsuperscript{126} Although Largier uses the example of the sun being blocked by Alexander, he believes that the sun represents God’s justice rather than eternal peace (see Largier, Diogenes, pp. 46–47).
Diogenes’s reasoning is similar to that of a Fool: that Alexander constantly invades other lands in order to become richer forces the conclusion that he is driven by a desire for power, hence he suffers from spiritual poverty. Sachs contrasts Alexander’s dissatisfaction with Diogenes’s experience as he is materially poor but spiritually rich. Sachs constructs this dialogue around ‘Köng Philippus’, Alexander’s father, who expanded his empire to include the whole of today’s Greece and the western Black Sea lands; however, this description also mirrors the expansionist foreign policy of Philip II of Spain.

Philip II was already married to Mary Tudor of England (1516–1558) when he became Emperor but his plans to include England within his Empire ended when Mary died. On Charles V’s abdication from his roles outside Spain in 1554, Philip inherited Naples and Sicily. These acquisitions encouraged him to increase his Italian conquests, even threatening the Papal lands between 1556 and 1557. After his defeat of the French, the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559) awarded Philip II Piedmont, Savoy, Corsica and the Genoese Republic, lands that Henri de Valois had hoped to wrest from Charles V in the Hapsburg-Valois War (1551–59). Philip II feared Turkish expansion into the western Mediterranean, which had dogged his father’s reign, not only as a territorial leader but also as defender of the Catholic faith. Suleiman the Magnificent had dominated the western Mediterranean until 1558, repeatedly attacking Gibraltar and Cadiz, then Sorrento and Menorca. By the time Sachs wrote this play in 1560, Philip II had suffered a humiliating sea defeat (May 1560) off the Island of Djerba as he attempted to regain Tripoli from

---

Suleiman. The character and politics of Philip II mirror the expansionist activities of Alexander and Spanish foreign policy would have been a topic of conversation amongst many Nuremberg residents from merchants down to craftsmen as they produced goods from Spanish imports. Early foreign trade with Spain had traditionally been conducted through Antwerp by branches of Nuremberg Handelshäuser, but when Christoph Scheurl wrote in 1506 to his uncle Sixt Tucher, Provost of the Lorenzkirche, warning that the discovery of the New World by Christopher Columbus (1451–1506) would reduce the dominance of Venice as a trading port, Nuremberg reacted quickly to counter the effects. Consequently, Nuremberg merchants commissioned ships to undertake dangerous voyages to the Americas, a venture chosen by the Nürnberg and Cromberger families in the first half of the sixteenth century. Then the Tetzel family became involved in copper mining in Cuba, whilst others, the Imhoff, Holzschuher, Stromer and Hirschvogel families, for example, set up branches of their businesses in Lisbon and other ports on the west coast of the Iberian Peninsula. Hence, news of Spanish foreign policy was very important to Nuremberg’s merchant traders.

To return to the play: Alexander justifies his use of power and influence as part of his role as King (p. 584, ll. 2–3), to which Diogenes replies that rulers should act judiciously and honourably. His tone changes when describing Alexander’s rule:

    Du aber thust leut und auch landt
    Ohn ursach und ohn recht bezwingen
    Mit raub, mordt und brandt darzu dringen
    Und puckest die under dein joch.
    Damit du verderbst du aber doch

130 Rodriguez-Salgado, Charles V, pp. 302–05.
131 Bernecker, ‘Nürnberg’, p. 188.
Al sein landtzwinger leut und landt. (p. 584, ll. 7–12)

Sachs’s language characterises Alexander as unscrupulous and may remind his audience of the Duke of Alba’s Spanish troops, whom Nuremberg had experienced first-hand when they had ransacked and burnt the village of Altdorf after the end of the War of Schmalkalden. Sachs could also be referring to Philip II’s violent suppression of Protestantism in the Netherlands, which had caused the flood of emigrés to the German territories and indeed to Nuremberg. Both Philip II and Suleiman the Magnificent represented significant threats to Lutheranism: Philip regarded Protestantism just as he regarded Islam, as a threat to Catholicism. The word ‘landzwinger’ (l. 12) can be applied to both Christian and non-Christian powers. If so and remembering that Sachs uses a single character to represent more than one person in other plays, then Sachs’s words may be read to as referring to the unscrupulous, violent behaviour of both superpowers.

Alexander believes his name will be forever remembered through his conquests (p. 584, ll. 14–17), whilst Diogenes warns him that his reputation will stem from his crimes (l. 19). He continues:

Durch veretrey erlangst sieg
Mit pratick, bösen schelmen-stücken
Thust die unschuldig vertrücken.
Meinst, man gedenck dir das in ehrn? (p. 584, ll. 21–24)

In this case ‘pratick’ is used in the sense of deception and fraud and Sachs’s choice of vocabulary forces the audience to consider the fate of those conquered by Alexander and whether his behaviour can be considered honourable. Applied to Philip II of Spain, this is sharp criticism of his methods and questions his role as protector of Christianity.

---

135 Will, Altdorf, pp. 76–78.
137 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 380.
138 DWB see landzwinger.
139 DWB see practik (f) (3).
Alexander believes that luck has been on his side (p. 584, ll. 26–29), to which Diogenes replies that luck is not durable, a sentiment that Sachs has used before in Der unersetzlich geizhunger genandt.\textsuperscript{140} Diogenes continues:

\begin{quote}
Endtlich wirt es wider dich sein,

Verleurst das frembde und das dein

Und etwan auch den leib darzu. (p. 585, ll. 1–3)
\end{quote}

Diogenes predicts that Alexander’s reliance on luck will be his downfall and cause his death. Some writers have suggested that Alexander died from either poisoning, or fever, or acute alcoholism. He died after his arrival at Babylon, where some histories suggest that he disregarded the warnings of the local deity Belus by entering the city.\textsuperscript{141} His death is described by Plutarch and Justinius, in works found in Sachs’s library and mirrors the principles of hubris in Greek tragedy; that is Alexander’s demise resulted from offending the gods.\textsuperscript{142} Diogenes continues:

\begin{quote}
Weil dich lest nit benügen du,

Begerst noch immer mehr zu gwinner.

Dir wirt das gantz erdhich zu-rinnen,

Ie mehr du hast, ie mehr du gerst. (p. 585, ll. 4–7)
\end{quote}

The use of ‘benügen’ reminds the audience of Sachs’s other Fastnachtspiele, especially Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent, where Jupiter admonishes people to accept their lot in life. Similarly, Sachs, using Diogenes as a mouthpiece, continues with the myth and accuses Alexander of insatiable greed for expansion and the gains it would bring him. Sachs may be alluding to a new development in Nuremberg, when in 1560 the merchants

\textsuperscript{140} See page 101.

\textsuperscript{141} This is to be found in a history of Alexander by Lucius Flavius Arianus (c. 89–106 AD), who is regarded as the best source for Alexander’s campaign history. He wrote The Anabasis of Alexander, a translation of which is to be found at: <https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Anabasis_of_Alexander/Book_VII/Chapter_XVI> [accessed: 10 December 2016].

\textsuperscript{142} LW xviii, pp. 357–61.
established a stock market to be run on similar lines to those in Antwerp and Venice. Trading times were marked by the sounding of a bell hung on the Sebalduskirche, which served as an indication of financial activity in the city. Sachs, who firmly believed in the principle of Gemeinnutz, would have viewed this as a betrayal of Lutheran doctrine to provide for the poor, sick and needy as excess money was being wagered on the possibility of gain in order to make the shareholders, the merchants and patrician class wealthier rather than benefiting the poor.

Diogenes continues accusing Alexander of despotism and tyranny (p. 585, l. 10) and failing in his role, which Diogenes equates to that of a god:

Bist du ein got, so solt du than
Gutes auf erden iederrman,
Schützen und schirmen, helffn und schencken. (p. 585, ll. 11–13)

Sachs’s use of ‘schützen und schirmen’ implies that he wants his audience to understand the role of a temporal leader, echoing Luther’s use of the same words about the concept of care in his sermons on Matthew. Luther believed it to be the duty of those in power, whether they be a king, prince or even a patrician Council, to be strong, fair rulers who protect their people. Sachs directs the audience’s attention to the role of the Rat, whose strong governance had protected the vulnerable throughout the ages, most recently through their administration of the Gemeinnutz, which is referred to in the words ‘helffn und schencken’ (l. 13). Sachs makes clear that he is referring to the threat to the Gemeinnutz posed by diverting funds into share capital. Diogenes points out that he is the richer of the two men (l. 18) and continues:

Wann ich laß mich an dem benügen,

---

145 DWB see schützen (2) and schirmen (2).
146 LW XXXII, p. 390, l. 37.
Was mir gott und natur thut fügen,
Hab mantel, taschen, stab und schw,
Nit mehr ich auch begeren thu. (p. 585, l. 19–22)

This again echoes the sentiments found in *Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent* when Jupiter advises people to be content with their given lot. Here Sachs refers to the idea that one’s lot is prescribed by ‘gott und natur’, which reinforces the Augustinian view, based on 1 Corinthians 7:20: ‘Ein jeglicher bleibe in dem Beruf, darin er berufen ist’. Line 21 describes clothes worn by pilgrims, whose simple life helps them travel to the Kingdom of Heaven, or in Diogenes’s case leads him to a life of virtuousness. In the above-mentioned *Fastnachtspiel*, the protagonists better themselves by means of acquisition, whereas Alexander has no need for material acquisitions, but remains insatiable. This insatiability could be applied to Philip II but, more pertinently, locally to the wealthy classes in Nuremberg who, despite their existing wealth, strive to increase it. Diogenes advises Alexander to change course:

Wo du aber herrschest mit gnaden
In landen deine unterthan,
So blieb gehorsam iederman,
Zu allen dingen gantz gutwillig. (p. 585, ll. 32–35)

Sachs refers to the medieval concept of *Herrschen durch Gnade*, namely that a king only ruled if he had the blessing of God, which then enabled him to act graciously and to render his subjects obedient and content. This was initially a classical concept which was adopted later by the Catholic Church but here Sachs portrays it in a pre-Christian setting. Diogenes points out that a wise ruler who cares for his subjects will in turn receive their respect and obedience. In this way Sachs reminds his audience of the strong government

---

provided by the Nuremberg Council, to whom the citizens have remained loyal for centuries. Specifically, the line ‘Schützen und schirmen, helffen und schenken’ (p. 585, l. 13) can be applied to their leadership as they had safely negotiated the conversion to Lutheranism in 1525 without endangering the populace. Here Sachs’s words imply that this is not the case now, a belief echoed by Klaus Leder.\textsuperscript{148} It was the merchant’s desire to attract experienced weavers to Nuremberg, that encouraged the arrival of Dutch émigrés, who were not allowed to practise Calvinism in public\textsuperscript{149} but that did not prevent private worship.

Alexander believes that if people fear him, he will be able to control them, saying, ‘Darmit halt ichs das volck im zaum’ (p. 586, l. 4).\textsuperscript{150} This coercive behaviour through tyrannical means could reflect Philip II of Spain, or indeed territorial leaders of all beliefs, who attempted to coerce all their citizens into following their chosen religion. However, locally there are other implications of this idea of control. Did Sachs believe that the forthcoming visitation was an attempt to coerce the clergy and parishioners into adopting Melanchthon’s version of Lutheranism? Sachs forces the audience to compare Alexander’s tyrannical government with the past behaviour of the Council and their efforts to rid Nuremberg of Osiander’s influence in 1555 by expelling pastors who supported his views. Continuing with his theme of the dangers of tyrannical rule, Diogenes argues that tyrants have more to fear from rebellion by their subjects than do wise leaders (p. 586, ll. 10–12). He then issues a warning:

\begin{quote}
Derhalben ist dein standt gefehrlich
Entgest ir aller auff-satz schwerlich,
So sie dir heimlich sindt abholdt. (p. 586, ll. 13–15)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{148} Leder, ‘Die religiose Entwicklung’, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{149} Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 251.
\textsuperscript{150} \textit{DWB} see \textit{zaum}. 
'Auff-satz' (l. 14) has many meanings, but Diogenes’s use implies that Alexander’s actions will ruin everything that has previously been written about him. The word ‘aufsatz’ can also be translated as either the gain from shares (share premium) or interest from borrowed money.\(^\text{151}\) If this interpretation is used, Sachs warns the wealthy merchants of Nuremberg that their insatiable greed for financial gain through the introduction of a stock market, will create divisions amongst the citizens.

Other cracks in Nuremberg’s unity appeared in the form of the strike in 1557 and in 1560 the rules defining who was permitted to enter the public houses (\textit{Herrentrinkstuben}) frequented by members of the \textit{Geschlechter} or elite families were tightened. Furthermore, when the new stock market was commissioned only seven members of the \textit{Geschlechter} were allowed to trade, out of sixty-one members of the stock exchange. Gruner says: ‘Die Nürnberger Kauffmannschaft erreicht damit ihre Annerkennung als Berufsstand’.\(^\text{152}\) This indicates that the traditional social classes were being redefined. Hermann Kellenbenz points out that as the ‘first families’ became ennobled and retreated to their \textit{Herrensitze}, more ambitious middle-class families claimed their roles.\(^\text{153}\) This illustrates the changes to society that Sachs feared: knowing that his city’s wealth had been grounded on merchant trade and seeing that the source of wealth was transferring from the long-established merchant families or \textit{Geschlechter} to merchants of a different class constituted a threat to the established social order. Moreover, these newer merchants used a stock exchange, indicating that they would wager in expectation of gain, which in Sachs’s opinion represented a threat to funds available to the \textit{Gemeinnutz}.

In reply Alexander assures Diogenes that he is surrounded by those who will always protect him (p. 586, l. 26) and arrogantly supposes there is no danger. Diogenes’s response is a warning: ‘Trewloß sindt der menschen gemüter. | Man spricht: wer hütet vor dem

\(^{151}\) \textit{DWB} see \textit{aufsatz}.

\(^{152}\) Gruner, \textit{Nürnberg}, p. 142 (1560).

hüter’ (p. 586, ll. 25–26). This last phrase comes from Juvenal’s *Satires VI*, the original phrase being: ‘Quis custodiet Ipsos custodies’. It is normally applied to the behaviour of tyrannical governments. This indicates not only that Sachs understood Juvenal’s meaning but also that he is able to use classical sources pertinently. Here Sachs uses ‘wer hüet vor dem hüter’ as a metaphor for the power of absolute monarchies and its facilitation of tyrannical behaviour as there are no checks on such monarchs’ rule. Sachs might be referring to the characteristics of the rule of Philip II, but possibly also to the behaviour of the Nuremberg *Rat* and more particularly to the role of the censor. Censorship depends on the censor’s interpretation of the writings placed before him and his thoughts on their suitability for the reader. At the end of 1560 Nuremberg’s censor was still Hieronymus Paumgartner, who was a senior Council member and of whom Waldau says:

Rechtschaffenheit und eine ungeheuchelte Gottesfurcht belebten seinen ganzen Wandel: und ein rastloser Eifer, die Ehre Gottes und das Beste der Kirche zu befördern, leuchtete aus allen seinen Handlungen: und alle diese waren ohne Hitze, ohne Eigensinn, sie wurden mit Sanftmuth und Gelassenheit, so wie mit Klugheit ausgeführt, ohne diejenigen zu beleidigen, welche anders als er dachten.\(^\text{154}\)

Waldau’s description implies that Paumgartner was a balanced character who based his judgements on sound reasoning, doctrine and the law. Legally, Paumgartner adhered to the religious peace forged by the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555, which allowed one Protestant faith to exist, that being Lutheranism. Since Melanchthon’s death in April 1560 as no firm figurehead had emerged as a potential new leader, the lack of leadership and the uncertainty about religious determination posed a great threat to Lutheranism, whether from the radical version of Flacius Illyricus or from the presence of Calvinists. Sachs may have believed

---

that Paumgartner’s censorship favoured his own and some of the Council’s religious preferences by adhering to Melanchthon’s interpretation of Luther’s theology.

The following speech commences a section in the play in which Alexander and Diogenes discuss the nature of secular power, comparing it to the power found in moral virtue. Alexander betrays his belief in the use of power to achieve control:

Sag, was du wilt, so thut mich thürsten
Nach gewalt. Bin ich gwaltig und mechtig,
So halt ich mich köstlich und brechtig.

Vor mir buckt landt und leute sich. (p. 586, l. 33 – p. 587, l. 1)

He uses power and image to subdue the people he conquers and continues by comparing his powerful position to that of Diogenes:

Mein Diogene, aber dich
Ehrt niemand, du must dich hie schmiegen,
In deiner putten ellendt liegen,

Veracht in armut immerzu. (p. 587, ll. 2–5)

Alexander humiliates Diogenes who, he believes, lives in a jar to conceal his poverty, rather than making a positive decision to seek poverty as a philosophical choice. In contrast, Diogenes believes that he is the more powerful, saying, ‘Wenn du bist ein knecht meiner knecht’ (l. 9). He explains this in his next speech:

Hab ich alln lüsten urlaub geben:
Alls hoffart, geitz, neidt, haß und zorn,
Unkeusch, füllery und rumorn,
Und all solch unornlich begirt,
Welche mich vor haben regiert,
Die hab ich all getretten unter

Und hersch uber sie selb ietzunder,
Das sie müssen sein meine knecht
Und hab auch vor in allen schlecht
Ein sicherheit und gute rhu. (p. 587, ll. 17–26)

Diogenes, by suppressing all earthly desires (almost a full list of the Seven Deadly Sins is given in lines 18–19) in accordance with his philosophy, has gained control over mortal sins; and since he has overcome them, they have become his ‘knecht’ and he their overlord (l. 23). Diogenes takes his power from the moral virtue he has gained by ridding himself of earthly desires, whereas Alexander’s life is ruled by these desires. As they control him, Alexander becomes ‘ein knecht meiner knecht’ (l. 33). Sachs’s purpose is the comparison of two styles of leadership: the absolute monarchy ruled by the selfish desires of one man; and a selfless ruler, who rules justly for the benefit of his fellow man. Diogenes continues by comparing Alexander’s life to his own:

In unrhu dein leben verzerst,
Wie du denn das teglich erferst.
Ich aber leb in stiller rhu,
Niemandt setzt mir gefehrlich zu,
Hab ein ruig sicher gewissen,
Wirt nicht mit angst und sorgen bissen. (p. 588, ll. 5–10)

In this speech Sachs reiterates the idea of the inner peace gained from following Diogenes’s philosophy, comparing it to the ‘unrhu’ or fear that fills Alexander’s life. This speech illustrates Sachs’s ability to turn the contents of his library into a presentation of his own views, which not only illustrates his understanding of the qualities of a leader but also his intellectual sophistication in being able to write cogently on this subject in an entertaining manner. Listed amongst Sachs’s books is *Xenophontis drey Pücher vom König Cyrus*, which, besides being a description of Cyrus’s failed military expedition, was used as
teaching material for leadership and government. After Cyrus’s death near Babylon, Xenophon, having become leader, had to inspire the demoralized troops to make the return journey to Turkey and Greece. According to Michael A. Flower, the actions of Xenophon have been viewed in the past as either illustrating exemplary leadership or portraying the undisciplined deeds of the mercenary leader of a band of brigands. To add to his body of work on leadership, Sachs had the nine books of Herodotus’s *Histories*, which recorded the history of Croesus, Egypt and the rise and fall of the Persian Empire, highlighting the problems of hubristic rulers, violence and vengeance. Sachs illustrates his insight into and views on leadership throughout this *Fastnachtspiel*, which highlights the extent of his autodidactic endeavours, his intellectual agility and ability to write about this subject and counters the opinion that he was ‘ungelehrt’.

In the last part of this speech, Diogenes reminds the audience of a cynic’s philosophy (p. 588, ll. 11–13) and continues:

In dieser willigen armut,

Darin hat volkumenlich blatz

Auff erdt der aller-höhest schatz

Uber ehr, gewalt und rechtumb. (p. 588, ll. 14–17)

Sachs reminds his audience that Diogenes’s pre-Christian choice of a virtuous life mirrors that of Christ and His disciples and thereby reminds them of the moral values they should follow as Christians. By mentioning ‘schatz’ (l. 16), which he has often used as an allegory for the Bible or God’s Word as written in the Bible, Sachs emphasises the power of God’s love above earthly honours and wealth. Indeed, there is a biblical link between Diogenes, God and ‘schatz’: ‘Wir haben aber solchen Schatz in irdischen Gefäßen, auf daß die überschwengliche Kraft sei Gottes und nicht von uns’ (2 Corinthians 4:7). This renders

---

155 Sachs refers to three books although there were seven. It is not known which three Sachs possessed nor which translation he owned.
Diogenes a mouthpiece for God’s Word. Alexander then asks where he can find the ‘schatz’ (l. 19), believing it to be a material rather than a spiritual treasure. Diogenes replies:

Der schatz ist allein die weißheit,
Welliche mich zu aller zeit
Erlösset auß aller anfechtung
Und mich tröstet in der durchechtung. (p. 588, ll. 21–24)

If Athens represents Nuremberg, then ‘weißheit’ would be found in the churches and ‘der aller-höhest schatz’ would be the Bible, the Word of God, according to Luther’s translation. In this speech Sachs makes clear that good governance is based on God’s Word, which is selfless in contrast to Alexander’s insatiable greed and desire to dominate. Sachs is asking his audience to reflect on government and styles of government they have experienced. ‘Durchechtung’ (l. 24)\textsuperscript{157} can be translated as ‘in bann thun’ or persecution and would have reminded the audience of the early days of Luther’s struggle against the Catholic Church, when he was excommunicated. Alternatively, if Diogenes represents Sachs, as he does earlier in the play, Sachs, who believes in God’s Word as found in the Bible, could be the person suffering from persecution.

At the end of this speech Diogenes rejects Alexander’s renewed offer of a gift and orders, ‘Drumb weich, halt mir nit auff die sun’ (p. 588, l. 27). Diogenes has asked this of Alexander before (p. 583, l. 16) as the latter was preventing his work from drying. Here, Diogenes implies that Alexander prevents his access to the sun. If the sun symbolises God, then Alexander, who represents human desires and sins, blocks or casts a shadow on God’s work and Word. This could be interpreted as political criticism by Sachs, who infers satirically that leaders with the same ambitions and desires as Alexander, like Philip II, are guilty of ignoring God’s Word. If applied to local politics, it suggests that the actions of

\textsuperscript{157} DWB see durchächtien.
the *Rat* threaten access to God’s Word, which may refer to how the council dealt with the supporters of Osiander. Alexander agrees that Diogenes has the most peaceful life, using the phrase ‘geruten leben’ (l. 32) to describe it, which links to Diogenes’s ideas on inner peace.\(^{158}\) He concludes this speech:

Ich danck dir weiser straff und lehr;

Nimb von mir ahn das kleinat mein. (p. 589, ll. 4–5)

Before Diogenes replies, another rare stage instruction occurs: ‘Alexander gibt im ein ketten’ (p. 589, l. 7). ‘Ketten’ translates as a necklace or chain, such as one used to restrict a dog’s movements. This may refer to the dog-like image of cynics but it may also be an metaphor for how Sachs’s ability to write is hampered by the presence of the censor. The use of Diogenes as a metaphor for freedom of speech is not a new concept: Johannes Agricola (1494–1566) had suggested this in his collection of German sayings.\(^ {159}\)

In his rejection speech (p. 589, ll. 8–18), Diogenes lists the basic necessities for his life: bread, olives (l. 10) and water (l. 13), whilst he rejects luxuries, wood, fire (l. 14) and a bedroll (l. 15). All these items have biblical significance in miracle stories: bread from the five loaves and two fishes,\(^ {160}\) the water into wine at the Marriage at Cana\(^ {161}\) and an Old Testament miracle in which Elijah saves a widow from losing her children to servitude by granting her an endless supply of olive oil.\(^ {162}\) These miracles provide the recipients with physical nourishment which symbolizes spiritual nourishment. Diogenes is happy with his lot despite his rejection of physical comforts, through which he has achieved spiritual contentment. Sachs, having grounded this dialogue on biblical imagery, implies that spiritual nourishment is found in the Word of God in the Bible.

---

\(^{158}\) *DWB* see *ruhen*.

\(^{159}\) Agricola produced three volumes of sayings in 1529, 1530 and 1534. The last volume is entitled *Sybenhundert und füffzig teütscher Sprichwörter, verneüwert und gebessert* (see Largier, *Diogenes*, pp. 21–22).

\(^{160}\) John 6:1–14.

\(^{161}\) John 2:1–11.

\(^{162}\) 2 Kings 4:1–7.
Alexander leaves Diogenes, saying, ‘Nun alle götter sindt mit dir’ (p. 589, l. 20). Diogenes replies that Alexander needs the gods on his side as he is in greater danger (ll. 22–23), which suggests that Diogenes foresees the end of Alexander’s life. Ernholdt now re-joins the conversation, reminding Alexander of his warning that Diogenes’s advice could be cutting. Alexander replies, astonishingly, that he wishes he were Diogenes (p. 590, l. 1), which follows the anecdotal story written by Plutarch and others. He continues:

Wievol sein wort sindt scharpff und resch,
Ist er doch sein begirden abgstorben,
Und hat auff erden im erworben
Ein gantz sicher und rüig leben,
Und ist der weißheit gantz ergeben.
Der seinen scharpffen, weissen lehr
Wil ich vergessen nimmer mehr. (p. 590, ll. 2–8)

Alexander acknowledges that the cynic philosopher, by relinquishing all earthly desires and sins, lives a peaceful existence and this admission would have resonance with the audience. Would their leaders, spiritual or temporal, ever admit they had chosen the wrong path? Throughout this play Sachs encourages his audience to make judgements that question the type of leadership they have experienced or desire. Despite this, Alexander does not admit that he will change his own style of government. Within this speech Sachs’s use of the vocabulary of sharpness and cutting (l. 2 and l. 7) acknowledges the characteristics of cynic philosophy; however, the same vocabulary can be used to describe satire and the last two lines actually underscore the purpose of satire in *Fastnachtspiele*: that is, to highlight and explain a moral failing in such a way that it becomes memorable and to promote a change in people’s behaviour. Those that recognised Sachs’s purpose as a satirist would realise how dangerous his demands were.

As Alexander returns to his encampment, he voices his fears:
Das sich im heer kein meuterey
Oder auffrhur durch verreterey
Begeb. Sollichs als zu fürkumen,
So laß uns reitten wiederummen. (p. 590, ll. 15–19)

Alexander has heeded Diogenes’s warnings that those closest to him may betray him; thus allowing himself to be ruled by fear. If this is a warning to the Council, then Sachs implies that there are some within the Council, who are dangerous to the leadership. Diogenes then closes the play in the manner that Sachs normally uses:

Reidt hin, nun seien sicher wir.
Wenn warlich wer vertrawet dir,
Der vertraut eim grimmigen löwen;
Derhalben wirst du gleich und eben,
Wie du anrichst viel ungemachs,

Ein endt nemmen. Das wünscht H. Sachs. (p. 590, ll. 20–25)

The speech’s warning to the audience against trusting ‘eim grimmigen löwen’ could have a double meaning as Luther used this phrase to illustrate how the Devil prowls while seeking out sinners, quoting from 1 Peter 5:8: ‘Euer Widerwärtiger (das ist euer Satan) schleicht umher, wie ein grimmiger Löwe’. Moreover, Luther uses this quotation in a pamphlet written in response to the rise of the Anabaptists, specifically about Thomas Müntzer (1489–1525). Nuremberg had not only banned Müntzer but had outlawed Anabaptism as a confession in its territories in 1525. In the context of this play, the ‘grimmiger Löwe’ could represent the divisions threatening Lutheranism, the presence of Anabaptist and Calvinist émigrés from the Netherlands, supporters of Calvin amongst the clerics and Rat or a resurgent Catholicism led by Philip II. Thus far this play has covered...
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163 LW XVIII, p. 62.
164 See page 78.
166 Whaley, Germany and the HRE, I, p. 340.
the qualities of leadership, how good leadership tends to foster contented citizens and how wise leadership should be based on God’s Word. However, the next section Sachs adds may provide another candidate for the ‘grimmiger Löwe’.

In a complete break from his usual ending, Sachs adds a Prologus to this work where an Epilogue might have been more usual. Sachs’s early Fastnachtspiele had both prologues and epilogues, spoken by a Herold, to introduce the action and to bring the audience back to the present so they could continue their Lenten festivities. Here, Diogenes addresses this speech to ‘ir burger von Athen’. Sachs, after the comparisons he makes between Athens and Nuremberg earlier in the play, intends it as a warning for the people of Nuremberg:

Last euch mein redt zu hertzen gehn,
Alexander Magnus ist hie,
Der mich ermanet ye und ye
An ein leben mit seinen dücken,
Der all herrschaft fert zu verdrücken
Mit list und gwalt, und wie er kan.  (p. 590, ll. 28–33)

Sachs focuses on a specific person when choosing these words and implies that this person’s position affords him powers. There are many candidates: in general terms Sachs could be referring to the Council, or specifically to the censor, Hieronymus Paumgartner, as Sachs began this play with the image of Diogenes attempting to restore his writings. Moreover, as Sachs was compiling the third of his folios (published in 1561) this may have brought memories of past censorship to the forefront of his mind.

The coincidence of an event which occurred eight days before Sachs dated this play may provide a different interpretation of the Prologus. Throughout the history of Nuremberg’s Lutheranism since 1555, it tended to be unclear who had the upper hand in religious matters. As Karl Schornbaum sums up: ‘Der Rat vermied es, in den religiösen
Kämpfen für eine Partei trotz seiner Zuneigung zu den Melanchthonianern, offen Stellung zu nehmen’. Neidinger’s study makes it clear that the divisions were greater in Nuremberg than previously stated. Religious factions acting within the city were several: the Osiandrists, those supporting Melanchthon, those believing in Luther’s original doctrine and refugees supporting Anabaptism or Calvinism. Externally Nuremberg had to appear Lutheran as this was the only acceptable Protestant doctrine given a status by the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555. However, some of those who followed Melanchthon, known as the Philippists, were attracted to John Calvin’s doctrine and became identified as crypto-Calvinists, their most influential speaker in Nuremberg being Moritz Heling: ‘Moritz Heling fand mit seinen Kryptocalvinistischen Ansichten vor allem unter dem Patriziat großen Anklang, während ein großer Teil der übrigen Geistlichen und die Bevölkerung, die an diesen theologischen Streitigkeiten regen Anteil nahm, der streng Lutherischen Richtung anhingen’. On 22 December 1560 Moritz Heling preached openly a sermon at the Sebalduskirche about Calvin’s opinions on transubstantiation, which displeased the Rat. After the Zweiter Markgrafenkrieg they had joined the Landsberg League (1556–99), an alliance of certain Reichsstädte, the Bishoprics of Würzburg and Bamberg and Ferdinand I to ensure their security. Any suggestion of giving ground to a banned faith would have resulted in censure by the League and damage to Nuremberg’s relationship with the Emperor. While Nuremberg did not support Charles V’s heresy laws (1550s), it opposed the open practice of banned confessions in the city. According to Neidinger, the only option available to the Rat was to suppress information about the contents of the sermon. Sachs, as a staunch Lutheran, may have felt that the Council was forsaking its duty by neglecting to punish Heling or, indeed, was angry that the Council seemed to pick and choose which

166 See page 155.
faiths were acceptable, remembering that five years previously, in 1555, the *Rat* had sought Melanchthon’s help to suppress Osiandrism in Nuremberg. The decision not to censure Heling may have been pragmatic and influenced by the Council’s desire to increase wool production, which entailed making allowances for the weavers’ Calvinist beliefs. The history of Heling’s sermon provides the reader with a further motivation for the *Prologus* and the ‘grimmiger Löwe’.

The words: ‘Der all herrschafft gert zu verdrücken | Mit list und gwalt, und wie er kan’ (p. 590, ll. 33–34) assigns power and influence to the Alexander figure which do not equate to Heling’s influence as a parish pastor but add further evidence to the theory that the *Rat* is portrayed as tyrannical. Later Diogenes says: ‘Widerumb in mein putten schmügen | Ob ich möcht sicher vor im liegen’ (p. 590, l. 35–p. 591, l. 1). These words suggest that Diogenes takes shelter from Alexander’s power. If Diogenes represents Sachs, these lines betray his insecurity about his position as a writer or, indeed, his religious position in Nuremberg. If so, this is a major indicator of why Sachs stopped writing *Fastnachtspiele* after completing this one, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Sachs uses a classical pre-Christian myth to illustrate, through the poverty and humility of Diogenes, the correct path to religious serenity or peace by comparing his life to that of the tyrant Alexander the Great. Diogenes, as a representative of the poverty of Christ and His disciples and in his rejection of material possessions and human desires, encapsulates a Christian’s complete subjugation to the Word of God. In the *Fastnachtspiele* analysed in this study so far, Sachs concentrates on how avarice, pride and a reliance on possessions were damaging Nuremberg’s existing societal structures. In this play Alexander represents material desires, power and greed, but rather than illustrate these sins, the conversation between the two men presents the moment of judgement, when the question would be: ‘Have you been a good Christian?’ This in turn begs the audience to choose the better candidate.
Sachs expands the original anecdote of the meeting between Diogenes and Alexander and presents a picture of the powerful Emperor arguing with a lowly philosopher. The philosopher presents cogent arguments against the misuse of power and the power of virtuousness, leaving the Emperor wishing he had the life of a philosopher. A constant theme running through this play is the interplay between the poor and humble (Diogenes) and the proud and wealthy (Alexander), which serves as a metaphor for the battle between the spiritual and material world. Sachs reflects on how power corrupts, as found in I Timothy 6:6–10:

Es ist aber ein großer Gewinn, wer gottselig ist und lässet sich genügen. Denn wir haben nichts in die Welt gebracht; darum offenbar ist, wir werden auch nichts hinausbringen. Wenn wir aber Nahrung und Kleider haben, so lasset uns genügen. Denn die da reich werden wollen, die fallen in Versuchung und Stricke und viel törichte und schädliche Lüste, welche versenken die Menschen ins Verderben und Verdammnis. Denn Geiz ist eine Wurzel alles Übels; das hat etliche gelüstet und sind vom Glauben irregegangen und machen sich selbst viel Schmerzen.

Sachs has disguised within the pre-Christian story considerable ambiguity, which allows this battle to be played out in different arenas: internationally in the desire of Philip II to increase his territories; or locally in the determination of the city’s religious politics; or individually in the work of the censor, Hieronymus Paumgartner. Within these arguments the theme identified is the abuse of power, illustrated by Alexander’s style of governing the people he conquers. Whilst the arguments reflect the tyrannical behaviour of Philip II, locally Nuremberg’s Council can be accused of abuse in apparently promoting the city as Lutheran, but in fact allowing the individual religious preferences of members of the Rat and business pragmatism to undermine this faith and thereby weakening their ability to be strong, just and fair leaders.
Another example of the misuse of power is the work of the censor and his ability to stifle discussion, which Sachs presents through the images of Diogenes trying to repair his works and the shadow cast on his work by Alexander. These imply that the philosopher’s ability to write is being restricted. The final gift of a chain (p. 589, l. 6), which Diogenes throws away, lends another interpretation. If Diogenes represents Sachs, then he refuses to be chained, which could mean that he refuses either to become someone’s mouthpiece, or to curb his writing to suit someone else’s demands. This is compounded by the final words of the Prologus, ‘Ob ich möchte sicher vor im liegen’ (p. 591, l. 1). They imply that Diogenes is fearful of this person. If Diogenes represents Sachs and Alexander the censor, then it is hardly surprising that Sachs stopped writing Fastnachtspiele if he felt his role as a Zeitkritiker and satirist threatened his own safety.

Thematically this play is rendered complex by the layers of satire running through it and the multiplicity of these layers suggests that not all the content would have been understood by all members of the audience. This, then, begs the question of the intended audience. The play is based on classical histories, which may have been more understandable to an educated audience, but Sachs’s portrayal of the characters and the arguments allows it to be understood by people from all educational backgrounds. Diogenes appears as a teller of truths with a biblical fervour, based on his renunciation of sin and desires in order to achieve a peaceful life. The portrayal of Alexander as a tyrant encourages the audience to make the necessary comparisons with examples from their own experience. It is not certain whether the entire audience would have understood Alexander’s behaviour as a metaphor for the Council’s decision-making and behaviour. Similarly, accusations of the misuse of power would have been understood in the context of Alexander and Diogenes, but whether all the audience would have understood any implicit criticism of Philip II is difficult to assess. Members of Nuremberg’s merchant classes would have known about Philip II’s drive to acquire new territories, be that in the
Christian or Islamic world, and, moreover, would have known about his offensives in the Mediterranean, as trade would have been affected by the attacking corsairs of Suleiman the Magnificent. It is noteworthy that Sachs feels able to criticise the Holy Roman Emperor, which reflects Philip’s unpopularity with German Protestants or, indeed, within the German territories as a whole.

It has become apparent, despite scant details in the written histories of this period, that religious divisions within Nuremberg were more intense than previously believed. This renders Sachs’s anxieties about the threat to Lutheranism more relevant. It appears that suppression of Nuremberg’s religious disagreements began long before Moritz Heling’s sermon in December 1560. However, it does explain the addition and tone of the Prologus: Sachs is disappointed and angry with Moritz Heling’s sermon but, more significantly, the words of the Prologus, cloaked as a warning to the public, are critical of the Council for their lack of resistance to the creeping acceptance of Calvinism. Hence, the Prologue turns the play from a warning about the rule of tyrants and admonition to live a virtuous life into a direct criticism of the Nuremberg Council and Paumgartner in his role as a leading Churchman. As a political criticism this play would have been understood by those it was intended to satirize, which is perhaps why Sachs chooses this play to signal his intention to stop writing this genre of works.

The two plays analysed in this chapter are very different, one coming from the German tradition of Schwank and the other from classical Greek literature, but both contain criticism of the establishment, persons as well as government, in addition to expressing significant doubt about the role of a writer. Where they differ immensely is that in Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen the satire is obvious as Sachs litters his text with clues which
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171 Scholars such as those contributing to Gerhard Pfeiffer’s *Nürnberg: Geschichte einer europäischen Stadt* fail to include this episode or point to its importance to the religious history of Nuremberg.
mock two of Nuremberg’s leading citizens, politically and religiously. According to his own words of 16 February 1560, Sachs never satirized individuals:

Daran ich gantz und gar
Rein und unschuldig war,
Weil ich ie kein person
In meim gedicht grief an. (KG vi, p. 20)

The evidence of the protruding nose on Paumgartner’s medallion mocks an individual, allowing the audience to enjoy the satirical portrayal of a well-known personality, but for Sachs this was a dangerous ploy as the censor Paumgartner disliked satirical works. The second of these two plays suggests that censorship was a threat to the expression of an author, which would have been very dangerous for Sachs, for the one man who would have been able to understand the satirical barbs was Paumgartner. No archival evidence exists indicating that Sachs was punished for the attacks contained in either Fastnachtspiel, but it is not inconceivable that Paumgartner made his dissatisfaction known to Sachs through other means. The type of satire in both plays differs: that in Der Doctor is playful, mocking and irreverent, whereas the satire in Sachs’s last Fastnachtspiel is more intellectual, sourced from the books in his library and much more critical; and its focus on cynical philosophy is reflected in the type of satire used. Both plays have one thing in common: their critical tone is blatant in comparison to the other plays analysed in this study and it is this which puts Sachs in a difficult and dangerous position in his role as a writer.

---

172 See page 241.
CHAPTER 6

From Satire to Silence

The aim of this study is to revise the past assessment of Hans Sachs’s work, specifically through the analysis of his Fastnachtspiele, and to encourage renewed discussion about his ability as a writer of satire and his advocacy of Lutheranism. According to Brunner, much damage was done to Sachs’s reputation as a writer during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by commentators who believed his lack of a university education, coupled with his employment as a ‘cobbler’, denied him the ability to write anything of significance.\(^1\) Unfortunately this reputation has persisted amongst some commentators: as recently as 1993, when discussions for the five-hundredth anniversary of his birth were commencing, Utz Ulrich (FDP) said of Sachs that he was not a great poet, a sentiment, according to Brunner, common amongst the German general public.\(^2\) However, it is unfounded. This analysis of his works has illustrated that Sachs was widely read, linguistically versed and more intellectually sophisticated than has been previously assumed. This chapter, then, will look at the contents of Sachs’s library and illustrate how they contributed to his ability to write Fastnachtspiele and it will confirm Sachs’s ability to incorporate theologically based arguments from other faiths. This will be followed by an illustration of the way in which Sachs used his knowledge of Luther and Lutheran doctrine in his Fastnachtspiele to create and maintain a Lutheran cultural identity for the people of Nuremberg and its territorial lands and how he achieved this by writing satirical criticism of human failings which relied on solutions based on Luther’s theology. Then the conclusion will turn its attention to Sachs’s ability to write satire and how he manipulates the elements of satire in the Fastnachtspiele to reflect his criticism of society, as well as illustrating how he appealed to diverse audiences. As evidence of the contents of Sachs’s library was not published until

\(^1\) Brunner, Annäherungen, p. 351.
\(^2\) Brunner, Annäherungen, p. 352.
1853, after the discovery of Sachs’s own manuscript in Zwickau,\(^3\) earlier scholars were unaware of Sachs’s knowledge of classical satire and satirists. Even after this discovery scholars simply failed to recognize its influence on Sachs’ works or that he used the knowledge garnered from these works to write pithy social criticism about events and people in Nuremberg in his role as a Zeitkritiker, which will be the next theme to be discussed. Despite his phenomenal output of Fastnachtspiele in the decade between 1550 and 1560 Sachs decides to write no more plays in this genre after December 1560 and the conclusion to this study is devoted to the possible reasons for this decision.

First, during the analysis of the plays, the list of contents of Sachs’s library, which he compiled on the 28 January 1562, has been used to identify the source of his knowledge on many subjects. The possession of books by approximately sixty-five authors not only indicates Sachs’s financial commitment and devotion to auto-didacticism, but also illustrates the availability of such works in Nuremberg and the extent of the city’s involvement in the printing of Humanist and other literature. The fact that Sachs exploited the availability of new literature is illustrated by his possession of Jörg Wickram’s (c. 1505–1560) Rollwagenbüchlein and of the ‘zwo Garten-Gesellschaft’ books listed in his library contents. Wickram’s book was initially printed in Strasbourg in 1555; and the reference to the Gartengesellschaft indicates Sachs’s possession of a collection of Schwänke by Jakob Frey (d. 1562) which was published initially in 1556. As a source of knowledge, his library provided Sachs with books about scientific studies, botany and health as well as several histories of Germany, Denmark and the Greek and Roman Empires. In addition, his collection contained works about philosophers and philosophy, as well as religious texts, notably Luther’s, which enabled him to compare pre-Christian philosophy with Christian doctrine, knowledge which he displays in his play Das gesprech Alexandri Magni mit dem philosopho Diogeni. However, Sachs’s research on theology and religions is also

\(^3\) Milde, ‘Das Bücherverzeichnis von Hans Sachs’, p. 38.
illustrated by his acquisition of Marcus Antonius Coccius Sabellicus’s (1436–1506) *Exempelbuch von wunderbarlichen Geschichten … der Juden, Christen und Heyden* (1530) and a work by Caspar Huberinus, *Vom Zorn und der Güte Gottes* (1529) as well as books about Catholicism. The inspiration for the stories on which he based his *Fastnachtspiele* is also to be found in his library. He owned Boccaccio’s *Decameron* and folklore tales from Germany, including *Eulenspiegel*; and, of course, biographies of famous Greeks and Romans contained in Plutarch’s *Vitae Parallelae*, as well as *Aesop’s Fables* and many other works. Jakob Grimm asserted in 1841 that Sachs’s works were not original but Brunner agrees that Sachs sometimes bases the plot of his *Fastnachtspiele* on an existing work, using the basic storyline or characters, but then manipulates them to serve his own didactic purpose. Those who believe that Sachs was merely a craftsman with limited education are proven wrong by the evidence of his book collection as well as the use that Sachs made of these works within his plays.

Through his studies, Sachs gained not only knowledge but also a wide variety of linguistic registers, as well as a large vocabulary, which he puts to good use in his writing. This is evident in his ability to write works appealing to, and comprehensible by, different levels of society and is noticeable in many of the plays analysed in this study. In *Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent*, for example, he combines the language of the craftsmen found in the workshops with words from Franconian dialect, whilst still giving the impression of a courtroom setting in which the upper echelons of society would have found resonance through his choice of legal vocabulary. In *Der ketzermeister mit den vil kessel-suppen*, Sachs uses both the language of the street in the exchanges between Simon and Herman Pich and a socially higher register, appropriate for the exchanges between an uncomfortable parishioner and a Catholic priest, to give the impression that Simon is fearful
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5 E.g., *örten* (KG XXIII, p. 304, l. 13).
of the Inquisitor. Sachs also illustrates his knowledge of Latin by creating a pun when Simon calls the *Ketzermeister* "Nequamister" and by using a Latin grammatical construction to raise a laugh, as this word translates as ‘most worthless one’ (KG XIV, p. 308, l. 18).

Sachs also illustrates his genius at word play through his use of double-entendre and words with double meanings. There is a subtle difference here: Sachs’s use of the double-entendre is frequent, and it is employed especially when he wants to produce a comedic effect which allows the audience to believe they are ‘in’ on the joke. By contrast, his use of double meanings proves his knowledge of vocabulary and affords him the means to use subterfuge in his writing. An example of this is found in *Der unersetlich geizhunger* when Simplicius describes Reichenburger as ‘stadthafft’, which has several possible interpretations: constant and reliable, implying that he was a good person with whom to deposit money; but also a town arrest warrant, casting doubt on Reichenburger’s honesty. Sachs wants the second meaning, which is satirical in nature, to be understood by his audience as Reichenburger may allude to Bonaventura Furtenbach, but the more obvious first meaning affords Sachs the ability to deny his satirical intention if challenged by the censor for libel. Equally, this strategy allowed the censor to overlook the possibility of the second meaning if it suited him to do so at the time. Sachs’s satirical intention may explain why he delayed the publication of some plays written during the 1530s after being censored in 1527 for his involvement in Osiander’s work. He then published these plays during the 1550s when their relevance was less important to the censor or the city. The clever use of double-entendres and imagery for the sexual act also disproves the view of those commentators who believe that Sachs cleaned up the *Fastnachtspiel* genre.

Sachs’s penchant for smutty vocabulary, however, should not detract from this study’s assertion that his writing illustrates considerable intellectual sophistication. Sachs
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6 KG XIV, p.154, l. 19.
uses many cultural references within his plays: locations, local foodstuffs, favoured wines and local traditions. Examples include references to farming traditions in *Den wüecher*, which identify his protagonist, the farmer, as an outsider and afford Sachs the opportunity to portray the petty jealousies between those who live within or outside the city walls. In this manner, Sachs adds to the existing antagonism between the levels of society to help with the play’s adversarial tone. This strategy was useful as it allowed the audience to relate to the plays through their own knowledge and language, which flatters their intelligence.

To add more depth and aid comprehension, Sachs often weaves appropriate references into his texts which illustrate his knowledge and understanding of the resources he has in his possession. In *Der verdorben edelman mit dem weichen beht* Sachs alludes to two fables, one from Aesop and the other from Archilochus. Both have slightly different meanings, but Sachs’s purpose is to assist the audience with the interpretation of the *Fastnachtspiel* and its satirical subplot. Furthermore, in *Der unersetlich geitzhunger*, Sachs illustrates his ability to use Luther’s *Sermon von dem Wucher*; and by weaving many of Luther’s thoughts on interest, borrowing and lending into his portrayal of the moneylender Reichenburger in his dealings with Simplicius, he supplements the audience’s knowledge of Luther’s message about avaricious behaviour. Similarly, Sachs’s choice of names for his protagonists, which range from well-known biblical characters to classical and even concocted “speaking” ones (such as Reichenburger), lends an added element, often humorous, to the role in question. Thus, in *Der Ketzermeister* the name Simon, referring to the biblical character Simon Peter, provides an indication that this character knows how to reach the Kingdom of Heaven, whereas Hans Pich, or pitch, receives a blackened reputation from the moment the play opens.

The examples given above illustrate the subtlety of Sachs’s didactic writing. His intellectual sophistication lies in his ability to choose the appropriate example for inclusion
in a play and his use of sometimes very difficult concepts, as in the last play *Alexandri Magni*, where his purpose is to illustrate the characteristics of a just and fair leader by reference to the pre-Christian beliefs of cynic philosophers. Sachs illustrates finesse by presenting a theme in such a way as to encourage the audience to form a judgement about the action taking place on stage. He does this without preaching, a tactic which flatters their intelligence; and by his use of comedy he facilitates the memorisation of the desired moral. The best example is the ending of *Der ketzermeister*, where Simon’s mathematical computation, using the recognized Catholic concept of celestial accountancy, allows the audience to laugh at the absurdity of the one hundred times rule,\(^7\) whilst encouraging them to recognize the potential for abuse in the Catholic care system, which, in turn, although it is never mentioned in the play, reinforces the benefits of the Lutheran *Gemeinnutz*.

Hans Sachs is known for his advocacy of Martin Luther but researchers often limit their studies of Sachs’s support for Luther to *Die wittembergisch nachtigall* and his four *Reformation Dialogues* of 1525,\(^8\) whilst others draw a line between Sachs’s *Dialogues* and his dramas. His use of Martin Luther’s work is just as apparent in the decade in which the plays analysed in this study were written, which confirms that Sachs still believed in the relevance of Luther’s words. The textual analysis has illustrated that Sachs realised Lutheranism was threatened by the reinvigoration of the Catholic Church after the *Interim* of 1549, a concern particularly evident in *Der verdorben Edelman*, written on 9 September 1553, in which he criticises the treatment of Andreas Osiander and Veit Dietrich, Nuremberg’s Lutheran theologians, and in *Der ketzermeister* dated 2 October 1553. This thesis asserts that in his role as a writer and advocate for Lutheranism, Sachs succeeds in creating a Lutheran cultural identity, not least by his use of specific vocabulary constructed

---

\(^7\) This is based on Matthew 19:29 and in return for donations or good works on earth, the giver will receive a hundredfold in Heaven.

\(^8\) An example of this is Broadhead’s work (Broadhead, ‘A Study of the Religious Dialogues of 1524’, pp. 43–62).
by Luther,9 words from the latter’s songs10 and excerpts from his works. Sachs takes over the role of the nightingale from *Die wittembergisch nachtigall* after Luther’s death in 1546 as he reminds his audience of the strength of their conviction as a community when the Council voted to adopt Lutheranism throughout Nuremberg’s territories in 1525.

This is evident in *Der ketzermeister* where Sachs depicts the corrupt behaviour meted out by the Inquisitor in the Franciscan monastery in Nuremberg to remind the audience of the past abuses which had existed in the Catholic’s monastic care of the poor. The action of the play encourages the audience to reflect on the fairness of the Catholic system, as they compare it to their own experience of the Lutheran *Gemeinnutz*. Similarly, in the same play, the example of Simon and his fear of the Inquisitor demands of the audience a judgement on which sort of faith they prefer: a confession which coerces religious obedience through fear, or the less punishing faith they had practised since the Reformation. By encouraging comparisons between aspects of the two faiths, Sachs focuses the minds of the audience on the benefits of the Lutheran Church, but by doing this at a time when the Lutheranism is under threat, Sachs attempts to reinvigorate the city’s flagging Lutheran cultural identity. In other plays, Sachs’s portrayal of a particular sin, like that of avarice in *Der unersetlich geitzhunger*, encourages the audience to seek out Luther’s solution to that sin, which, in simple terms, is never a borrower nor a lender be, hence strengthening their Lutheran cultural identity.

Another strategy to create a Lutheran cultural identity employed by Sachs is the re-use of the names of characters from his *Reformation Dialogues* from 1524. Romanus, *der Ketzermeister* and Reichenburger from *Der unersetlich geitzhunger genandt* are both found in his third Reformation dialogue, *Ein Dialogus, des Inhalt ein Argument der Römischen wider das christlich Häuflein; den Geiz, auch ander offenlich Laster etc. Betreffend*

---

9 See *erhaschen* in *Der ketzermeister* (KG XIV p. 304, l. 6).
10 An example is ‘Aus der Tiefe rufe ich’. (See page 202, fn. 157).
That these characters may have been known to his audience is suggested by the number of times the works were reprinted after their first publication in 1524. In this manner, Sachs evokes memories of the literature he wrote in support of the Reformation but now, at a time when the Lutheran faith was threatened by other forms of Protestantism and by Catholicism, Sachs re-uses the names to remind the audience of the city’s previous, steadfast support for Luther, merging their Nuremberg cultural identity with their Lutheran cultural identity.

Another achievement by Sachs is his production of a body of works which are clearly identifiable as influenced by Lutheran doctrine. Sachs was motivated by Martin Luther from the very early days of his ministry, as proven by the forty pieces of Luther’s writing Sachs possessed before he even wrote the Reformation Dialogues in 1524. Sachs’s library contents suggest that the purchases continued and it is also evident, from Luther’s continued influence on his works, that Sachs’s own faith in Lutheran doctrine never faltered over the course of his life. Hence, Sachs produced works motivated by Lutheranism over the entire course of Luther’s leadership of the Lutheran Church and beyond. Sachs’s other works, across several genres, also contain references to Lutheran theology and can be considered as providing and reviving cultural memories. Many examples of this are found in his religious Meisterlieder. Sachs wrote eight hymns published in 1525 and then reworked many Catholic hymns in the period between 1527 and 1530 in order to produce a Lutheran version. Sachs was still producing hymns into his old age. Works which are written down and repeatedly performed assist the formation of cultural memories according to Assmann. Hence Sachs’s plays, Meisterlieder and poetry, those which contain references to the Lutheran faith and history, form a Lutheran corpus of work and help to form Lutheran cultural memories.

---

11 KG XXII, pp. 51–68.
12 Könneker, Hans Sachs, pp. 7–8.
13 Assmann, Religion and Cultural Memory, pp. 18–19.
Sachs’s creation of a Lutheran cultural identity in his writings is his reaction to the city authorities’ attempts to underplay Lutheranism in their efforts to maintain, or indeed improve, relations with the Emperor or Catholic allies like the Bishop of Bamberg and even the descendants of Albrecht Alcibiades. Previous scholarship on Sachs’s Fastnachtspiele has emphasised their conventional characteristics of jolly but obvious moral tales for simple folk. Although these plays are indeed intended primarily to educate the ‘simple folk’ of Nuremberg, Sachs’s Fastnachtspiele contain satirical comments which elucidate the flaws in city policy, in certain individual members of the Rat and their approach to civic life, thus their appeal and intended audience are much broader.

Those critics who believe that Sachs lacked the education to be an accomplished satirist have only to examine his library contents to discover the depth of his knowledge. He lists Seneca’s Von Guten Sitten (Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium), in which Sachs would have found a fellow commentator on human failings. Seneca was a devotee of Menippean verse satire, whose comments on moral failings are characterized as gentle, or mocking satires often about public bodies rather than individuals, the tone of which conforms to Könneker’s term ‘lachende’ satire.14 Despite there being no works by Juvenal in Sachs’s library, he does quote Juvenal in Alexandri Magni15 and it is not inconceivable that Sachs had borrowed books from his wealthy friend Niclas Praun.16 Juvenalian satire is crueller in intention and conforms to Könneker’s idea of ‘strafende’ satire. Further evidence of Sachs’s knowledge of vernacular satire is his possession of Sebastian Brant’s Das Narrenschiff. From these sources Sachs learned how to use the individual components of satire to his best advantage. He uses parody to mock the Catholic use of singing and candles to encourage larger donations from parishioners in Der ketzermeister. He mocks the pretentiousness of the Junckherr, who shows off his newly acquired library in Der Doctor,

14 See page 39.
15 ‘Wer hütet vor dem hüter’ (KG XIII, p. 586, l. 26).
even using the title of the play to mock the image found on the medal commemorating Hieronymus Paumgartner. He reduces Romanus in *Der ketzermeister* to the level of a fool by allowing Simon to find the weakness in the calculations of celestial accountancy. Sachs allows wise men to become fools and fools to speak the words of wise men in the best tradition of *Fastnacht*; and his satire enhances the didactic qualities of his work.

Indeed, this study has illustrated that when Sachs perceived the threat to Lutheranism to be at its most dangerous, he employed different components to achieve his critical purpose. This confirms Sachs’s knowledge of satire and that he was able to manipulate the elements of satire to arrive at the tone he required for his plays. One of the *Fastnachtspiele* that illustrates this ability is *Der ketzermeister* in which Sachs’s manipulation of the elements of satire, especially parody and exaggeration, renders it the most overtly funny and, consequently, one of the most memorable plays analysed here. However, as the decade progressed, the tone in Sachs’s *Fastnachtspiele* changes as his criticism becomes more strident. This is first seen in *Den wüecher und ander peschwerd petreffent* (1557), in which Sachs uses the actual wording of the *Klage* and its rebuttal, the *Gegenbericht*, in the sub-plot of the play allowing those in the audience with knowledge of the two documents to be ‘in’ on the satirical joke. Sachs’s tone becomes more argumentative in his last two plays as his satires become overtly critical. *Der Doctor mit der grossen nasen* is about body-image, big noses, big penises and the reverse as Sachs’s satirical portraits become more offensive, if not personally damaging, to Ebner and Paumgartner, as the text suggests that one of them may have been cuckolded. Although this provides much needed comedy, this and the victimization of the fool by two well-educated men leave the audience pondering about the wisdom of torturing someone who could not understand why he was punished for telling the truth. Within Sachs’s sub-plot lie satirical hints at theological arguments about transubstantiation, his ‘red thread’, as the religious divisions, including those in the Council, attract his ire. Hence, criticism of
individual institutional failings or the Council as a body increases across the decade, reflected by a change in tone as Sachs chooses more biting forms of criticism, a choice which necessitates the use of sub-plots in which to hide his criticism. Sachs’s reaction of writing personal satirical portrayals makes this play the one in which it becomes obvious that Sachs holds Paumgartner responsible for the increase in religious arguments in his role as arbitrator for Church matters in Nuremberg. In addition, Sachs criticises Paumgartner in both his role as censor, for his ability to limit the availability of literature and as a guardian of Nuremberg’s Ratsbibliothek, using sarcasm as a response to the decision to exclude ‘ungelehrte’ people, that is, those without a university education, which included Sachs.

Sarcasm and cynicism belong to the ‘strafende’ tools of satire, which may explain why Sachs decides to use the alleged meeting between the cynic philosopher Diogenes and Alexander the Great in the final play analysed in this study. If cynicism is the suspicion that someone acts out of self-interest, then Alexander’s greed for territorial expansion accords with this personal failing, which Diogenes exposes throughout the play. Sachs contrasts the greed of Alexander with a depiction of Diogenes, a man who has given up worldly wealth and found spiritual peace. Sachs uses the image of the cynical dog and vocabulary concerned with biting to underline his ‘strafende’ satire. The tone is subtle, intellectual but argumentative and this is deliberate, since Sachs’s true criticism is aimed at the educated Patricians, the wealthy merchants and Geschlechter in Nuremberg, hence his choice of the pertinent characteristics of satire to reflect the status of the subject of his criticism. This is far from the image of Hans Sachs the cobbler writing obvious moral plays for simple folk: rather, it proves Sachs’s masterful knowledge and manipulation of satire to alter the tone of his satire and his use of subterfuge to hide criticism when necessary.
In the last paragraph, it was suggested that Sachs recognized that certain types of satire were more appealing to Nuremberg’s educated elite and this section will unveil Sachs’s ability to write multiple levels of satire in one play, with the object of appealing to different sectors of the audience. As we have seen, some of the satire would have been glaringly obvious to Sachs’s contemporary audience, such as Paumgartner’s large nose and its depiction on the medallion. However, not all his satirical references would have been understood by every member of the audience. This is made obvious in *Der Doctor*, where the unsubtle hints at Paumgartner and Ebner might have been understood by many, whereas the ‘red thread’ of theological arguments about Communion and transubstantiation may have been too subtle for an uneducated audience. The multiple sub-plots in *Der verdorben edelman* are another example. The audience would have recognised the reference to avarice being presented by the dissolute life of the Junker and would have understood Sachs’s moral message about living within one’s means and accepting one’s lot in life. Conversely, the underlying references to the *Interim* and the banning of Osiander and Dietrich, or to the dissolute life of Albrecht Alcibiades and Moritz von Sachsen, may have been more obtuse. The detailed description of the bed in the same play, which probably matched that of the bed ordered by Gendorf as a gift for Ferdinand I, would have raised a laugh with many in the audience, especially if the bed had been the subject of workshop gossip. This is part of Sachs’s genius as the analysis illustrates that he knew how to write entertaining plays which would satisfy an audience with different levels of education, even if some of the satirical references would only have been understood by part of that audience.

Sachs’s ability to make the plays appealing to different social levels needs to be appreciated. *Fastnachtzeit* afforded Sachs the opportunity to depict human failings; and to add to a play’s receptibility, Sachs included in his satires references to individuals or groups of people who he believed had in some way contributed to the threat to Nuremberg or its Lutheran faith. This satirical review had to be relevant to those in the audience,
remembering always that the play had to appeal to every level of society as Sachs’s plays were moveable public performances, although some use of St Martha’s Church as a fixed venue for the performance of plays had commenced. By using actual words from the *Klage* and the *Gegenbericht* in *Den wüecher*, Sachs ensures that the master craftsmen who had signed the document and members of the *Rat* who had sent the rebuttal would have realised that the play had relevance to them as a group. Similarly, some plays contain references which would only have been recognised by a more educated audience, such as those to Lucullus and his library in *Der Doctor*. In this way Sachs attracts the attention of the very group he intends to criticize.

When writing personal criticism Sachs has to be subtle in disguising the subject of his criticism from the censor, which he does in a manner similar to his use of words with double meanings. Sachs uses one protagonist to represent more than one real person in several of the plays analysed in this study, one example being Superbus in *Der verdorben edelman* who portrays elements of both Albrecht Alcibiades and Moritz von Sachsen. The ambiguity of having two or more actual people embodied by one fictional character prevents the potential accusation of libel, which could only have been levied if the satire were to be directed at one named person. According to Trappen, Sachs manages to avoid this pitfall in the case of the *Gesprech von der himelfart margraff Albrechtz* (1557) by never using Alcibiades’s full name.\(^{17}\) This explains why in *Der Doctor*, the protagonist initially represents two people, Paumgartner and Ebner, even though by the end of the play the hints at Paumgartner as the butt of his jokes become more obvious.

Satire is a tool of the *Zeitkritiker* and Sachs has been recognized by Theiß and others as a critic of structures and failings in sixteenth-century Nuremberg but based on the assumption that his criticism is contained in the action of the plays and in their moral endings, rather than in the behaviour of the individuals or civic authorities found in the sub-

\(^{17}\) Trappen, ‘Das Gesprech’, 310.
plots. Theiβ actually states that Sachs does not use allegory and metaphor, both tools of satire, in the genre of *Fastnachtspiel*; however, his opinion is not based on a comprehensive examination of the texts in relationship to events in Nuremberg at the time. This thesis has suggested that a significant amount of Sachs’s social criticism is found within the complex sub-plots of these plays. Although Sachs does occupy himself primarily with the threats to Lutheranism, some of his criticism is aimed at secular authorities, as seen in the case of *Den wüecher*. Of course, any criticism of the Council or its agents attracted their attention and, moreover, the attention of the censor and as illustrated, the role of the censor and censorship also became one of the subjects of Sachs’s satire in the last two *Fastnachtspiele* analysed.

In conclusion, this study has suggested that the work of Hans Sachs deserves better recognition for its literary merit, specifically Sachs’s use of satire in his criticism of the city structures, decisions and people which he perceived to be a threat to Lutheranism. As the decade passed, and specifically in the last *Fastnachtspiel* written in December 1560, the tone of his satire evolved into a ‘strafende’ version, which renders his criticism unsubtle and sharp. The change in the tone of Sachs’s satire reflects the change from his original purpose in writing *Fastnachtspiele*, which was the entertainment and education of his audience, often with a moral to reflect Luther’s theology. Now Sachs is forced to defend his faith from other forms of Protestantism and a re-invigorated Catholicism. Notwithstanding his recognition of this task, Sachs ceases to write *Fastnachtspiele*, a decision which will be investigated in the final section.

**From Satire to Silence**

Although Sachs’s decision to stop writing this genre of plays in 1560 is well documented, very few commentators have looked at the causes, personal and historical, behind his

---

18 See page 2.
decision. There is no evidence of any further censorship that may have deterred Sachs from writing *Fastnachtspiele*, except for his own decision to self-censor his satire about Albrecht Alcibiades. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the genre itself was threatened in Nuremberg as Jakob Ayrer (1544–1605) took up writing *Fastnachtspiele* after Sachs’s death, producing at least twenty-seven plays.\(^{19}\) Admittedly this was a period of change for Sachs, especially after the death of Kunigunde in 1560, Sachs having outlived his children, who had left four surviving grandchildren. At the end of 1560 Sachs was nearly sixty-seven years old, an age at which many might consider slowing down: indeed, he did retire from his public roles as *Spielleiter der Meistersingerbühne* in 1560 and *Merker der Singschule* in 1561.

The compilation and cataloguing of his works had resulted in the publishing of two folios (1558 and 1560) and the preparation of a third was in progress, which was to be published in 1561. According to Wolfgang Michael and Roger Crockett, Sachs’s mood at this time was ‘Resignation’ or a ‘Gemütskrise’. They conclude: ‘Jetzt aber begann der Wurm Zweifel an seiner Seele zu nagen’.\(^{20}\) In his closing poem written for his second folio, Sachs says:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Wann durch deine Geticht} \\
\text{Hast dir selbs zugericht} \\
\text{Doch Heimlich ubermaß} \\
\text{Vil Feindschaft, Neid und haß. (KG IX, pp. 545, ll. 10–14)}
\end{align*}
\]

This is the first indication Sachs gives that his works have brought him enmity and jealousy but he does not expand on the source of these reactions, nor their specific cause. Indeed, if his purpose was entertaining people, then the feelings described in the poem may indicate that he had offended someone, as had the fool in *Der Doctor*. The most logical source of

\(^{19}\) Baro, *Der Narr*, pp. 211–14.

\(^{20}\) *Hans Sachs*, ed. by Michael and Crockett, III, p. 204.
displeasure would have been the censor, but according to the history of Sachs’s previous censorship, as recorded in the *Ratsverlässe*, his first censorship occurred in 1527, when he had penned verses for Osiander. He was also censored for *Der Abt im Wildbad* in 1551 and if, indeed, he did self-censor the *Gesprech von dem himelfahrt Markgraf Albrechtz* in 1557, then the source of the displeasure may not have been the censor. Sachs continues:

Die Welt hört diser zeit
Nicht geren die Warheit,
Wann sie scheuet das Liecht,
Weil ihr Werck sind entwicht,
Derhalb erlangst du mehr

Feindschaft der rhum und Ehr. (KG, ix, pp. 542–46, ll. 110–115)

These words, written on 9 January 1560, reflect the religious situation in Nuremberg from Sachs’s perspective. Sachs frequently uses *Warheit* as a metaphor for the Word of God written in the Gospels, and specifically Luther’s Bible translation, which would have guided Sachs’s thoughts and motivation as a writer. This text informs the reader that people are turning away from the light, which, in *Alexandri Magni*, was interpreted as an allegory for Christ, the Light of the World, or in this case perhaps Luther as the person who translated the Gospels and facilitated the understanding of them by doing so. That people were turning away from Lutheranism may have been accelerated by the divisions in Protestantism and the arrival of weavers from the Low Countries, which resulted in support for Calvinism in Nuremberg, not only from workers, but also from some Council members and clerics. Another possible interpretation is that if Sachs was a supporter of Osiander’s doctrine, which remains unproven, then Sachs, like others in the city, could have been reprimanded for his support for Osiander’s interpretation of Luther’s doctrine and this, subsequently, caused his writing to be unpopular in some quarters.

---

21 See page 94.
There are several other factors that would have affected the popularity of Lutheranism in 1560. Firstly, Nuremberg’s adoption of Lutheranism had taken place in 1525 after the surge of support for Luther’s condemnation of some practices within the Catholic Church. Sachs himself was swept along by this enthusiasm, which is demonstrated by *Die wittembergisch nachtigall* and the *Reformation Dialogues*. In Nuremberg, it suited the Council, which had, over the course of the previous centuries, expended much energy to ensure the independence of the city from the financial burdens of the Catholic Church and its ecclesiastical houses, to adopt a less financially intrusive faith in 1525. This had been swiftly followed by the 1533 *Kirchenordnung*, which had ensured that Nuremberg determined Church policy in its own territories. At that time, the concept of a Protestant ecclesiastical body controlling religious activities in all German Protestant territories did not exist. Hence in the early 1530s Nuremberg’s devotion to Luther was unquestionable and its independence from external influences, other than imperial structures, was complete. However, cracks in the Council’s commitment to Lutheranism soon appeared. The first example of this is Nuremberg’s refusal to join the League of Schmalkalden in 1531 for fear of further upsetting the already tense relationship with the Emperor. From this point onwards Nuremberg’s policy makers attempted to balance their relationship with the Emperor with their commitment to Lutheranism. Pragmatism ruled and Lutheranism lost out as Nuremberg refused to defend its chosen faith in the Schmalkaldic War in 1546–47 and later, when the terms of the *Interim* were imposed. Sachs, as a committed Lutheran, may have interpreted their pragmatic decision to support their industry and commerce as a lack of support for their faith, leaving him disappointed.

Second, the untimely loss of Nuremberg’s two leading Lutheran theologians, Osiander and Dietrich, only shortly after Luther’s death in 1546 contributed to a sense of dislocation from the original Lutheran belief in Nuremberg, a vacuum filled until his death in 1565 by Hieronymus Paumgartner, who was heavily influenced by Melanchthon. In
April 1560 Melanchthon had died, leaving the Lutheran Church without a guiding figure and allowing a second generation of Protestants, like Moritz Heling, to advance their own interpretations of Protestantism. The arguments between Osiander and Melanchthon, which began before the *Kirchenordnung* of 1533 and lasted until Osiander’s death in 1552, and those latterly, between Melanchthon and other Protestant groups after Luther’s death, have been documented in this study, but the enthusiasm for religious debate which existed in 1525 seems to have been lacking in Nuremberg’s younger generations, at least compared to the level that had prevailed at the time Sachs had written *Die wittembergisch nachtigall*. The principle of ‘cuius regio eius religio’, introduced in 1555 in the Treaty of Augsburg, permitted only two confessions, Catholicism and Lutheran Protestantism, but the passage of time since Nuremberg’s choice of Lutheranism in 1525, in conjunction with the presence of other versions of Protestantism being discussed in the city, diluted the attraction of their original choice, a trend which Sachs keenly felt, as illustrated by his words quoted above.

Third, at a time when other versions of Protestantism were gaining ground, there was a simultaneous reinvigoration of the Catholic Church due to the work being done at the Council of Trent since 1545. Nuremberg still had Catholic monastic houses within the city walls where Mass was celebrated in the Catholic manner by the remaining priests and where confessions were heard, albeit in secret. To some, in light of the death of Melanchthon in April 1560, the constancy of the Catholic Church may have seemed more attractive than a divided Protestant Church.

Returning to the date that *Alexandri Magni* was written, 30 December 1560, the coincidence that Moritz Heling’s pro-Calvinist sermon was preached at the Sebaldskirche on 22 December 1560 cannot be ignored. The Sebaldskirche is the church nearest to the *Rathaus* and was known as the *Ratskirche*, underscoring its importance to the members of the Council. Thus, preaching a public sermon about the theology of Calvin to the most influential people in the city could have resulted in some measure of censure from the
Council or Paumgartner in his role as leader of the Church in Nuremberg. Hence, Heling must have been confident that his sermon would be acceptable, probably encouraged by Nuremberg’s decision not to prosecute heresy according to the terms of Charles V’s Imperial Edicts of 1550,\(^22\) and by known supporters of Calvin within the Council. Despite the efforts, according to Neidinger, of the Council to suppress knowledge of the sermon,\(^23\) it would have been impossible to gag an entire congregation. At the very least this would have resulted in gossip within the city of which, no doubt, Sachs would have been aware. This sermon, which explained Calvin’s belief on transubstantiation, and its subsequent lack of censure would have been disappointing to any Lutheran supporter, remembering that Calvinism had been deemed unacceptable in the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555. Sachs would have interpreted the inaction of the city Council as an internal threat to his faith, a stance which is reflected by the severity of Sachs’s critical tone in *Alexandri Magni*.

It is clear from a review of Sachs’s works that he often produced a *Fastnachtspiel* before New Year, which would have allowed time for the censor to review the play and, on acceptance, its rehearsal in preparation for *Fastnacht*. As with many of his plays, Sachs had worked on eight versions of the story of the meeting between Alexander the Great and Diogenes, the last being in 1559.\(^24\) The writing of this *Fastnachtspiel* was probably facilitated by his previous endeavours and was already completed, when Sachs heard about Heling’s sermon. This is confirmed by the presence of his normal ending, ‘Das wünscht H. Sachs’ (KG, XIII, p. 590, l. 25), before the true end of the piece. In the additional twelve lines of the *Prologus* Sachs specifically warns, ‘Alexander Magni ist hie’, suggesting a tyrant is in Nuremberg. Sachs leaves it to the audience to determine the identity of the tyrant. There are several contenders for this role: the city Council due to their lack of wisdom, as good and just rulers, in allowing the promulgation of a banned faith. Their

---

\(^{22}\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 162.

\(^{23}\) Neidinger, ‘Die Entstehung’, 250.

\(^{24}\) Largier, *Diogenes*, p. 35.
action to suppress knowledge of the sermon was presumably to prevent word arriving at the imperial court and, if so, renders Sachs’s satire political criticism, which could have resulted in severe consequences for him. Sachs had an example of the consequences of censorship when the Beham brothers were banished from Nuremberg and lost their citizenship after their conviction for Schwärnerei in 1525.

City censorship was still in the hands of Paumgartner, whom less than a year previously Sachs had mocked in Der Doctor, which adds to the possibility that Alexander Magnus may also embody Paumgartner. Sachs may have already received a warning, whether spoken or written, that his Fastnachtspiele were dangerously close to being censored. Specifically, this is implied in two plays, first in Der Doctor:

Het ich auch gschwigen von der nasen
So het man mich ungschlagen glassen.
Wil mich nun schweigens nemen an,
Daß ich ungschlagen kom darvon. (KG XXI, p. 115, ll. 15–18)

This was written in 1559 and if Sachs is the fool who speaks these words, then he is giving clear notice of his intention to stop writing due to the threat of Paumgartner’s censorship. Furthermore, in the Prologus at the end of Alexandri Magni, again assuming Sachs is Diogenes, he acknowledges the threat he feels after announcing Alexander’s presence in Athens:

Der mich ermanet ye und ye
An ein leben mist seinen dücken,
Der all herrschafft gert zu verdrücken
Mit list und gwalt, wie er kan. (KG XIII p. 590, ll. 30–33)

Most telling are the last lines, in which Diogenes says:

Ich wil mich auch an diesem ort
Widerumb in mein putten schmügen,
This may indicate Sachs’s fear that he needs to retreat as he realises his works are attracting more notice. If he alters what he writes, that is, writes less critically, he loses his freedom as a writer by submitting to censorship. This thesis has indicated that within the last two plays Sachs considered the freedom of a writer and the problems of telling the truth, but for Sachs the truth depended on writing according to his personal religious beliefs. Having done so, he allows his doubt to influence his decision and ceases writing the one genre in which satire, being used in its classical form to criticise and rebuke faults in society, plays a significant role.

Hitherto the argument that Sachs was writing critically has been based on his own words and the analysis contained in this study. However, there is proof that Sachs was considered a subversive writer by the Council. On Sachs’s death in 1576, the Council ordered his house to be searched and three items were removed, including the satire Gesprech von der himelfahrt Albrechtz, written in 1557 and two other pasquills linking Nuremberg’s history to Alcibiades.25 This lends credibility to the theory that his writings had suffered more scrutiny in his lifetime than has been appreciated thus far, especially considering that Sachs died almost twenty years after he penned his satire about Alcibiades’s death. Furthermore, Sachs was eighty-one years old when he died in 1576 and had outlived many of his contemporaries and his bête noire, Paumgartner, by a good ten years, which is an indication that a perceived threat from his writing still existed.

Sachs’s original purpose had been to write Fastnachtspiele for the entertainment and education of his audience, but latterly as an advocate for Lutheranism. The plays discussed in this study point out human failings and help the audience to find the correct solutions to their problems, based on Luther’s doctrine, but in an entertaining and memorable manner. There is no evidence that Sachs’s faith in Luther and his belief in the

latter’s doctrine had faltered over the course of the plays analysed here. This study has documented Sachs’s knowledge of theology: he was not a pastor, but he used the stage as his pulpit and Fastnachtspiele as his sermons. His advocacy changed to defence as the relevance of Lutheranism in Nuremberg diminished and subsequent generations did not listen to the beguiling sound of Sachs’s Nachtigall. His defence of Lutheranism altered the tone of his criticism and, given the political nature of the satire in the final plays, his decision to stop writing is understandable, leaving Nuremberg, as a mark of his ire and disappointment, the deafening sound of his silence.

Fig. 20 Hans Sachs aged 81.
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