The Pennsylvania State University
The Graduate School
College of the Liberal Arts

FROM MORAL REFORM TO CIVIC LUTHERANISM: PROTESTANT IDENTITY IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY LÜBECK

A Dissertation in
History and Religious Studies
by
Jason L. Strandquist

© 2012 Jason L. Strandquist

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2012
The dissertation of Jason L. Strandquist was reviewed and approved* by the following:

R. Po-chia Hsia  
Edwin Earle Sparks Professor of History  
Dissertation Adviser  
Chair of Committee

A. Gregg Roeber  
Professor of Early Modern History and Religious Studies

Daniel C. Beaver  
Associate Professor of History

Charlotte M. Houghton  
Associate Professor of Art History

Michael Kulikowski  
Professor of History and Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies  
Head, Department of History and Program in Religious Studies

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School
ABSTRACT

The following study suggests that social change in seventeenth-century German cities cannot be understood apart from community religious identity. By reconstructing the overlapping crises of the seventeenth century as they occurred in Lübeck, the capital city of the Hanseatic League, I argue that structural crisis alone did not cause permanent changes in the ordering of urban politics and religious life inherited from the late middle ages and Reformation. In fact, the “Little Ice Age” (c. 1570-1630) and Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648) elicited very different responses from the city’s Lutheran pastors and oligarchic magistrates. In contrast to better-studied cities like Augsburg and Frankfurt, dramatic change came to Lübeck only when guildsmen mounted a series of overlapping attacks on elite property and religious non-conformists in the 1660s. These attacks drove the city council to make unprecedented political concessions to the guilds in 1669, and to impose new legal restrictions on other, “unorthodox” religious practices during the ensuing decades. These were more than pragmatic expedients: urban elites also cooperated closely with the clergy in everyday religious life, and became enthusiastic patrons of Lutheran music and art after mid-century. By 1700, new consensus regarding their shared “civic Lutheran” identity enabled magistrates, pastors, and guildsmen to collectively depict their city as stable and prosperous, despite a long-term decline in Lübeck’s international influence.
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“Great things were happening while Hanno played. War broke out, victory was uncertain, and then was decided. Hanno Buddenbrook’s hometown, having shrewdly sided with Prussia, could gaze with some satisfaction on rich Frankfurt, which was now made to pay for its faith in Austria and was no longer a free city.

But in July, shortly before the armistice, a large wholesale house in Frankfurt declared bankruptcy, and at one blow the firm of Johann Buddenbrook lost the round sum of twenty thousand thalers *courant*.”

-Thomas Mann, *Buddenbrooks*
Introduction

“The Queen is Dead”: Lübeck’s Century of Crisis

As magistrates and guild leaders struggled over constitutional reform in the Free and Imperial city of Lübeck, the wealthy patrician Gottschalk Kirchring (1639-1705) concluded his *Compendium of the Chronicles of Lübeck* with a bleak portrayal of the city’s recent history:

“Herewith is this year 1663 departed in the continued smoldering of the ashes of internal unrest in Lübeck and the fire of discord, and because the business and events at Lübeck in subsequent years, into the present time, transpired in such an intricate, nebulous, vexatious, and odious manner, that one considers whether to immerse himself further therein, but rather thereof resolves, to abandon this work at this time, and to relinquish to another the description of the subsequent remarkable years full of disquiet and misfortune.”¹

Kirchring published his *Compendium* in 1678, and though he went on to serve as city council member (Rats herr) and mayor (Bürgermeister), he never extended his digest beyond the onset of Lübeck’s worst internal crisis since the middle ages.² His pessimism was justified: the “internal unrest” he described for 1663 continued to escalate even after the council agreed to cooperative financial management two years later, and was only quelled in late 1668, after the Holy Roman Emperor intervened to restore peace between the guilds and the city council. In the intervening years, the “fire of discord” spread into the city’s religious life. In 1666, mobs of irate guildsmen rioted against the mystical “conventicles” that had recently taken root in Lübeck, which were some of the first such piety movements in Lutheran Germany.³ Though smaller in scale,

---


² Gottschalk (also: Gotthard) Kirchring became a member of the patrician “Society of the Circle” (*Zirkel-Gesellschaft*) in 1669, at the age of thirty. This association assisted his election to the council in 1680, and his appointment at Bürgermeister in 1697; see “Kirchring, Gotthard,” in E. F. Fehling, *Lübeckische Ratslinie von den Anfängen der Stadt bis auf die Gegenwart* (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 1925), p. 131.

the religious unrests complemented the burghers’ constitutional demands, as the guildsmen who demanded restoration of the idealized communal politics of the middle ages also responded violently when their pastors condemned unsanctioned alternatives to the Lutheran church established in the original Reformation. Though the years around 1650 are typically represented as the end of the European “confessional age,” events in Lübeck suggest that public confessional identity remained of vital concern to urban dwellers hard-hit by the “crisis century” of approximately 1570-1670.

Organist Dieterich Buxtehude (1637-1707) came to Lübeck in 1668, by which time the “Queen of the Hansa” had visibly lost the commercial prosperity and internal stability and that had enabled a city-state of about 25,000 souls to dominate Baltic commerce during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The long decline of the Hanseatic League—an urban trading nexus that enforced its international monopoly privileges with its own navy and mercenary armies—had become acute during the “Danish phase” of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). At the Hanseatic Diet (Hansetag) of 1630, the remaining member cities had voted to disband their centuries-old association, citing not only lost monopolies and decreasing tonnages, but especially the Imperial siege of their ally Stralsund in 1628. Luridly reported in news pamphlets and printed broadsheets, this event was embarrassing for all Hanseatics, but especially for the Lübeck city council, who had failed to coordinate an effective relief effort for their beleaguered ally. For most Lübeckers, however, the wartime dissolution of the Hansa was only one factor in a century of malaise that began when the city weathered a military disaster in the

Figure 1: “The Redoubts of Lübeck” (1662). Archiv der Hansestadt Lübeck, Manuscript Collection. (photo: J. Strandquist)
Northern Seven Years’ War (1563-1570), worsened during the subsistence crises of the “Little Ice Age” (c. 1570-1630) and the war decades, and reached a nadir when the Emperor intervened in Lübeck in late 1668.

In light of mayor Kirchring’s description of the climate of the 1660s, it initially seems incongruous that in late 1667, a small coterie of magistrates and merchants – the Kirchenvorsteher or churchwardens of St. Mary’s parish– began to search in earnest for an organist to replace the ailing Franz Tunder (1614-1667), who had attracted attention for his “evening performances in the style of concerts.”

This was no routine matter of parish management, however, and the wardens worked quickly: by April of 1668, they had selected Buxtehude from among numerous candidates, installed him as “organist and Werkmeister” in the main church, and set about preparing for an event intended to mark the reversal of Lübeck’s fortunes after a century of crisis.

As Emperor Leopold I (1658-1705) set about appointing a delegation to Lübeck, the elders of Lübeck’s merchant guilds decided that the coming summer (1668) would be an ideal time to revive the Hanseatic Diet. As the leading patrons of the city’s churches, they resolved that “an organ concert in St. Mary’s” should accompany the opening of the restored Diet, which had now been dormant for nearly four decades.

Though they recruited Buxtehude in time, the Diet planned for 1668 failed to materialize, as so few cities responded to the summons that the Lübeckers decided to postpone the event until the following year. Even by the reduced standards of the seventeenth century, the 1669 Diet was an abject failure: only

---

4 Georg Karstädt, Die »Extraordinairen<< Abendmusiken Dietrich Buxtehudes: Untersuchungen zur Aufführungspraxis in der Marienkirche zu Lübeck (Lübeck: Max Schmidt-Römhild, 1962), p. 13. As his title implies, Karstädt’s revision of Buxtehude scholarship emphasizes the organist’s artistic debt to his predecessor Tunder, stressing the latter’s role as an innovator in organ performances outside the immediate confines of the liturgy; see pp. 11-19.

5 Karstädt, Abendmusiken, p. 13. Karstädt notes that the leaders of the “commercial guilds” intended to “sponsor an organ concert in St. Mary’s” in honor of the Hanseatic envoys, and the decline of Tunder’s health in late 1667 explains the haste with which the parish leaders sought a new organist: an anonymous entry in the church register for the same year recorded that “many applicants are to be heard upon the organ at varying times, both on workdays as well as on Sundays.” “Chronik der Marienkirche” from 1667, quoted in ibid., p. 13: “Merhre Bewerber lasssen sich zu verschiedenen Zeiten sowohl an Sonntagen als auch an Werktagen auf der Orgel hören.”
eight allies sent delegates, and these achieved little of consequence during the subsequent weeks.\textsuperscript{6} For Buxtehude, however, the final \textit{Hansetag} of 1669 marked the beginning of a long and distinguished career: he debuted his first \textit{Abendmusik} compositions in 1673, and the genre gained him many admirers, including Georg Friedrich Handel (1685-1759) and Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750), the latter of whom walked the 400 kilometers from Arnstadt to Lübeck to learn from him in 1705.\textsuperscript{7} Thanks in part to Bach biographer Philip Spitta, Buxtehude now counts as the most famous Lübecker of the seventeenth century, and musicologists refer easily to the second half of the seventeenth century as the “Age of Buxtehude.”\textsuperscript{8} However, despite an outpouring of scholarship between the two-hundred fiftieth anniversary of the organist’s death (1957) and his three hundred and fiftieth birthday (1987), musicologists, biographers, and historians have failed to address the intersection of economic decline and internal crisis with the merchants’ attempts to portray Lübeck as pious and prosperous for the final \textit{Hansetag} of 1669.\textsuperscript{9}

In the following chapters, I argue that Buxtehude should be understood as the apex of a community response to Lübeck’s experience of decline from an international power to a provincial city –though still a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} Philippe Dollinger, \textit{The German Hansa} (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964), p. 368. In addition to the official rump Hansa of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen, only Rostock, Danzig, Brunswick, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, and Cologne answered the call to a \textit{Hansetag} in Lübeck in 1669.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Kerala J. Snyder, \textit{Dieterich Buxtehude, Organist in Lübeck} (New York: Schirmer Books, 1987), pp. 103-105.
\end{itemize}
sizeable and prosperous one—in the course of the early modern centuries. Buxtehude was recruited to Lübeck in the aftermath of wrenching changes in the political and economic order of Europe, all of which threatened to relegate Lübeck to the status of an also-ran among the cities and principalities of the Baltic sphere. Forced to experiment broadly with political, economic, and religious responses to warfare, poverty, and the spreading popularity of “foreign religions” – the German and French Reformed churches, post-Tridentine Catholicism, and non-conformists sects inspired by mystic “spiritualists” and the writings of Johann Arndt-- the urban estates collaborated in creating a renewed image for their city as a prosperous, orderly, and godly community in the wake of the Hanseatic League’s seventeenth-century collapse. The intertwined “civic” and “orthodox-Lutheran” identity they constructed would show princes, other city councils, and foreign merchants that the “Queen of the Hansa” had emerged from its trials with a renewed commitment to the two urban traditions that had structured urban life during its medieval golden age. The first of these was the city’s medieval constitutional tradition, which formed the guiding example for the new constitutional settlement (Bürgerrezeß) that finally curbed internal unrest after 1669. The second revolved around community religious life, specifically the evangelical confessional identity enshrined in the Kirchenordnung written by Luther’s confessor Johannes Bugenhagen (1485-1558) in 1531. Though seventeenth-century Lübeckers could not reverse the structural changes responsible for Lübeck’s long-term decline, they did succeed in restoring orderly civil politics and a modicum of prosperity after 1670, ushering the city into a far more stable period that lasted until Napoleon’s armies occupied the former Hanseatic capital in 1806.

< *Lübeck and Urban Germany, 16th and 17th centuries* >

Several decades of fresh research on the social impact of the Lutheran Reformation have now made clear that we cannot endorse a narrative purporting to reconstruct a homogenous confessional development in the regions that adopted the *Confessio Augustana* after 1530. We now know that the practice of
constructing religious confessions—summarized by Robert Kolb as “the use of church and religion by the governing authorities for purposes of social discipline”—varied considerably across Europe. Likewise, we accept a priori that differences in size, political constitution, and economic orientation imparted a different tenor to this process in princely territories of Germany (both large electorates like Brandenburg and Electoral Saxony as well as small principalities like Lippe and Saxe-Gotha) than was the case in the Imperial cities. Yet, the urban centers of the northern Empire remain under-studied in comparison to the south German cities emphasized by Bernd Moeller, leading many to assume that the confessional process in Strasbourg and Augsburg set the paradigm for the spread of Luther’s teaching in the “slow-moving areas” of the northwestern Empire. In reality, the project of remaking society according to Protestant dictates produced many variations on the original model of urban reform. This becomes particularly obvious in the divergent trajectories traced by Protestant cities in the later seventeenth century, following the overlapping crises of the Little Ice Age and the Thirty Years’ War. For example, the proto-Pietist initiatives that achieved a foothold in coastal Rostock never gained traction in Lübeck, where initial ambivalence to the movement on the part of clerics and magistrates alike shifted to hostility during the constitutional crisis of the 1660s. Though both cities remained officially “Lutheran” into the modern era, the reforming cast of Evangelical practice Jonathan Strom has reconstructed for seventeenth-century Rostock grew in juxtaposition to the ornate, material Lutheranism of Lübeck.

In contrast to other regional capitals, Lübeck’s experience of the Thirty Years’ War offers no glaring caesura with what came before. In his studies of wartime Augsburg, Bernd Roeck has stressed the transformative effect of the conflict on both the urban landscape and its population. Here, the plagues and sieges that reduced the population from over 40,000 in 1618 to a wartime low of about 16,500 were

sufficiently traumatic that they also profoundly destabilized the “world pictures” (Weltbilder) inherited by the generations that lived through the war. ¹³ While Lübeckers also confronted mass death during the war—a particularly severe plague carried off a quarter of the city’s population in 1525-6—a combination of favorable geography and the shrewd financial diplomacy of the city council spared the city from the siege warfare suffered by Stralsund, the compounded traumas that engulfed Augsburg, or the near-total destruction that made Protestant Magdeburg, razed by Imperial troops on 20 May 1631, a byword for unprecedented wartime horrors. Broadsheets, news pamphlets, and the firsthand accounts of refugees like pastor Jonas Nicolai, who fled Magdeburg for Lübeck in 1631, ensured that many Lübeckers were intimately aware that such fates could be their own. The wartime writings of pastors and educated laity alike attest that Lübeckers shared the fears of urban counterparts harder-hit by the war. Yet this psychological trauma in no way equaled the physical sufferings of citizens elsewhere; ultimately, the war’s most dramatic legacy for Lübeck was a protracted financial crisis, rather than a population catastrophe. In 1618, the city was already hard-pressed by Hanseatic decline and subsistence crisis, and the massive loans raised by the wartime council inflicted debt and heavy taxation on the postwar generations. This dubious inheritance moved the guilds to rebel in the early 1660s, and the ensuing struggle produced significant constitutional reforms that ushered Lübeck into a much more stable era after 1670. Thus, while Lübeckers of the war generation unquestionably suffered more than their forebears, their worst fears never transpired. In the former Hanseatic capital, the war proved to be less a break with the past than a catalyst for change, as religious and temporal authorities cooperated to address the hardships and physical threats that seemed to surround them on all sides.

The case of Lübeck also contradicts the trajectory followed by nearby Hamburg in the seventeenth century. Daniel Korth has identified Hamburg as one of few Imperial cities that profited from the war, despite the community’s repeated brushes with blockade and marauding troops, and the commercial gains and new

population Hamburg accumulated in consequence of the conflict may account for a crucial divergence in community religious life that would further distinguish these two Lutheran mercantile cities in the post-war era.\textsuperscript{14} While Lübeck’s burgher elite placed new emphasis on highly public forms of high-church Lutheran piety in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Mary Lindemann has shown that their counterparts in Hamburg embraced pietist-inspired educational models in the same period, a time when the population of Hamburg was doubling.\textsuperscript{15} A portion of this population growth can probably be attributed to the Hamburg city council’s willingness to absorb some of the Reformed refugees that streamed eastward from France after Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes; meanwhile, the dukes of Holstein tolerated a variety of non-conformist communities in the neighboring district of Altona from the war years onward. Letters preserved by the \textit{Franckesche Stiftung} in Halle suggest that by the eighteenth century, a few preeminent Lübeckers also recognized the disciplinary allure of internalized reform, but in their institutional capacities, the rulers of August Hermann Francke’s home city imposed new restrictions of Calvinist worship and settlement from the 1670s, and remained markedly suspicious of the model for Christian life envisioned by early advocates of Pietism. Instead, Lübeckers weathered the transition to a provincial city of the northwestern Empire by embracing and defending the confessional identity they had inherited from the last years of their medieval “Golden Age.”

A new consensus about what it meant to be a Lutheran city of the northern Holy Roman Empire after the Peace of Westphalia manifested itself in social loci ranging from Buxtehude’s instruments to the strict policies the council adopted toward Reformed immigration in the wake of the Revocation of the Edict of

\textsuperscript{14} Daniel Korth, \textit{Die Auswirkung des Dreißigjährigen Krieges auf die Hansestadt Lübeck} (München: Grin Verlag, 2007). Because he affirms that Hamburg grew in size and influence as a result of the war, but rejects similar conclusions for Lübeck, Korth urges circumspection regarding the notion of a shared “Hanseatic” legacy of the Thirty Years War.

\textsuperscript{15} Mary Lindemann, \textit{Patriots and Paupers: Hamburg, 1712-1830} (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). Lindemann’s portrait of eighteenth-century Hamburg as a “German Amsterdam” underscores the contrasts in both size and demographic compositions that distinguish the city from contemporary Lübeck, which experienced no comparable population growth.
Nantes. These developments owed much the changing relationship between the city’s spiritual and worldly authorities, who forged a newly cooperative relationship conditioned by the political and religious demands of the urban laity. Though the city council combated new hardships with diplomacy and legislation even before the Thirty Years’ War, the war and its aftermath drove Lübeckers of varying ranks to embrace Lutheran church life as a means of restoring the community cohesion badly damaged by the overlapping crisis of the seventeenth century. To the wider world, the “civic Lutheranism” that shaped the council’s policy toward immigration and religious plurality, suffused the symbolic acts of public life, and re-made Lübeck’s church interiors into Baroque showpieces demonstrated that Lübeck retained some of her traditional influence over Hamburg, Rostock, and other allies-turned-competitors in the northern Empire.

< Crisis and Urban Oligarchy >

Constitutional disorder—peasant insurrections, urban rebellions, and internecine conflict between kings and aristocrats—has long served historians as a hallmark of early-modern crisis. The exact parameters of the “General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century” conceptualized by Eric Hobsbawn and Hugh Trevor-Roper in the 1950s have now been the subject of a half-century of debate, but both advocates and revisionists continue to emphasize “state breakdowns” as an essential barometer for what Geoffrey Parker labeled the “global crisis of the seventeenth century” in a 2008 forum of the American Historical Review.⁶ Lübeck’s own experience of internal unrest is congruent with these definitions, and underscores the causal links Parker and others have detected between cyclical harvest failures and famines—engendered by prolonged climate cooling in the “Little Ice Age,” a period marked by heavier snowfall, the advance of glaciers, and shorter

growing seasons—and widespread, violent dissatisfaction with the political *status quo*. However, the prolonged and cyclical nature of constitutional confrontations between magistrates and guildsmen in Lübeck suggests that we broaden our view of urban turmoil started “from below,” and go beyond merely seeking analogues to the “Fettmilch Uprising” in Frankfurt and Worms between 1612 and 1616. This episode owes much of its centuries-long notoriety to the anti-Semitic motivations of Vincent Fettmilch and his followers, but Christopher Friedrichs has shown that there is more to the story.\(^\text{17}\) The same is true for the lesser-known disorders that plagued Lübeck in 1598-1605, and again in 1663-1669. While religious difference fueled constitutional breakdowns in both cities, the disturbances that targeted religious non-conformists in Lübeck, where there were very few Jews, typically paled in comparison to the enmity burghers harbored toward their own rulers.

In the autumn of 1599, *Bürgermeister* Heinrich Brokes (1567-1623) summarized the impact of economic decline and subsistence hardship on citizen-magistrate relations in Lübeck. “Many of the *Ratsherren,*” the mayor confided to his diary, “and particular the foremost, were greatly hated among the citizens, because they considered more how they might attend to their own dignity and advantage, than that they might earnestly promote commerce and exchange.”\(^\text{18}\) The frequent rumblings of discontent Brokes recorded thereafter—regarding new tax levies in 1609, or the council’s treaty with the Netherlands in 1613—suggest that these views remained widespread among Lübeckers in general, many of whom enjoyed no representation in urban politics. Whether a male citizen’s dependents—wives, children, apprentices, and servants—or non-guild laborers, migrants and refugees, orphans, and members of the growing class of urban

\(^{17}\) Christopher R. Friedrichs, “Politics or Pogrom? The Fettmilch Uprising in German and Jewish History,” *Central European History* 19 (1986), 186-228, p. 188: “[T]he Fettmilch Uprising is one of the most oft-recounted episodes in German urban history of the seventeenth century—and one of them most frequently cited occurrences in German-Jewish history of that era.”

poor, these “other” urban-dwellers counted, in Friedrichs’s phrase, “wards of the political community.”

Though they had no claims to influence in urban politics, early-modern urban corporations generally “recognized a moral obligation to help these often defenseless individuals.” However, “arbitrary rule” by self-interested oligarchs flouted this responsibility, and was particularly offensive to the poor and disenfranchised residents who made up between eighty-five and ninety percent of Lübeck’s early-modern population. While guild members were aggrieved by undue competition from the new cottage industries proliferating on patrician estates outside the city, all urban dwellers were hard-pressed by the heavy taxes that accompanied Lübeck’s ill-fated military expeditions in northern seas around 1600, and worsened in the Thirty Years War. Great events like these added plagues, runaway inflation, and spiritual malaise to the existing hardships of the Little Ice Age period, and exacerbated the mixture of envy and enmity regular people felt toward their social betters. For most of Lübeck’s residents, riots and unrest were the only means of confronting the elite “abuses” that seemed to proliferate during the Little Ice Age and Thirty Years’ War, and thus of taking an active role in improving their own circumstances. While the volatile nature of seventeenth-century urban life is now generally recognized as a response to crisis, trends in Lübeck suggest that the threat of disorder “from below” also played a vital role in persuading pastors and magistrates to cooperate in the face of deepening crisis.

When the “fire of discord” engulfed Lübeck in 1663, political power was enshrined in a city council or Rat of only 18 members. Together with a death and infirmity, the recent political exile of several Ratsherren or “lords of the council” had reduced this body from its seventeenth-century average of between twenty-two and twenty-four members. All the members were men, and the majority were also rentiers, or landlords of economically productive estates, who enjoyed a status equivalent to the “quasi-aristocratic patriciate”


20 Ibid, p. 5.
Friedrichs identifies as a key target of the citizen unrest in Frankfurt.\textsuperscript{21} Like their counterparts in Frankfurt, Lübeck’s city council members jealously guarded their right to political self-perpetuation, and the oligarchic character of their rule was underscored by the limited extent of citizenship rights in the Hanseatic capital. In 1664, the council’s formal constituency was restricted to the three thousand or so male citizens – those who could lay claim to the “full rights of citizens” or Vollbürgerrechte—enfranchised in the city’s merchant and craft guilds, collectively known as the “burgher corporations.”\textsuperscript{22} In chronicler Kirchner’s time, these comprised seventy-six different organizations, ranging from honorable trades like blacksmithing and paper-making, at the lesser end of the social spectrum, to the grand trading companies like the “Stockholm Traders” (Stockholmfahrer) and “Company of Mariners” (Schiffergesellschaft). Guided by consultation among the guild elders, enfranchised artisans were the driving force behind the constitutional unrests that imprinted seventeenth-century Lübeck. A closer look at the cycle of violent protest and protracted negotiation that structured constitutional unrest in Lübeck reveals that these events were not “revolutionary” in the modern sense; rather, merchants and guild elders sought reforms that would dismantle the patrician oligarchy governing Lübeck by including more merchant- and guild elders on the council itself, and by restoring the guilds’ former right to have a voice in major government matters like tax and warfare.\textsuperscript{23} None of these ideas counted as innovative in the seventeenth century – a guild uprising of 1405 had invoked similar constitutional arguments—but the deteriorating circumstances of life had a corresponding effect on the urban political climate by about 1600. The seemingly interminable disorders of subsequent decades—which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Friedrichs, “Fettmilch Uprising,” p. 190: “The city council was an all-powerful and self-perpetuating body of 43 members, most of them rentiers drawn from the quasi-aristocratic patriciate.”
  \item \textsuperscript{22} In 1664, the enfranchised body politic in Lübeck consisted of approximately 370 merchant-guild members and 2,700 artisans and craftsmen. Jürgen Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft in Lübeck, 1598-1669: Die verfassungsrechtlichen Auseinandersetzungen im 17. Jahrhundert und ihre sozialen Hintergründe} (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 1961), pp. 38-39.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, pp. 170-173. Asch argued that neither the “Reiser Unrests” of 1598-1605, nor the violent clashes that produced the new Bürgerrezeß in 1669, should be viewed as “revolutions” in the modern sense, because their participants deliberately eschewed dramatic visions for re-making society.
\end{itemize}
were internal and external, political and religious in character—played the decisive role in shaping the public confessional response that re-made Lübeck from erstwhile “Queen of the Hansa” to the cultural capital of the “Age of Buxtehude.”

< Moral Reform and Civic Lutheranism: Chapters >

Each the following chapters reconstructs a particular aspect—thematic or chronological—of the urban community’s encounter with the new pressures placed on Lübeckers by long-term economic decline and seventeenth-century crisis. The first of these compares the pastors’ conception of themselves as “shepherds of souls” with the realities of urban clerical leadership in a crisis century. In contrast to princely territories like Saxe-Gotha, where Duke Ernst (“The Pious”; 1601-1675) pursued Luther’s vision for the visible reform of daily life “from above,” the Lübeck clergy’s pursuit of this foremost duty of evangelical Obrigkeit caused protracted debate over the duty of the magistracy to the church and the “pure Evangelical faith.” Most disagreements occurred when the pastors perceived abuses in church government and Lutheran ceremonial life—the election of pastors and the discharge of funeral ceremonies in particular—and when they perceived their lay patrons to be lax in defending the community against moral turpitude and heterodox contagion. While debates became heated when hunger, warfare, and natural portents exacerbated the uneasy state of civic politics in Lübeck, the war years also witnessed the growth of new cooperation between pastors and magistrates, even as the need to combat disorder drove the city council to more carefully delineate the duties and privileges of the pastoral office.

My second chapter reconstructs the various responses Hanseatic decline and the “Little Ice Age” elicited from magistrates, citizens, and members of the urban ministry. The dissemination of the Formula of Concord (1577-1580) marked the beginning of an “Age of Orthodoxy” in Lutheran Germany, but theological consensus offered little practical help to princes and city leaders seeking to reform their subjects into godly
Irene Dingel has emphasized the rapid maturation of Orthodox doctrine as a result of the “culture of controversy” following Luther’s death, but her focus on the sixteenth century omits the local debates that endured – and in some cases, accelerated – after the Evangelical estates adopted the Book of Concord. In Lübeck, the decades between official Concordia and the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618 were imprinted by a series of scandals and disciplinary problems originating in the urban ministry, as reform-minded clergy clashed with their lords on the council over the twin issues of sponsoring moral reform and combating heterodoxy. This decades-long debate reached its nadir when pastor Antonius Burchardi publicly denounced the council for concluding a commercial treaty with the (Calvinist) Netherlands in 1613, causing a public scandal that threatened to incite riots among the citizenry. While Burchardi was banished for sedition in 1614, continued agitation by his allies persuaded the council to make new concessions to “orthodox” church leadership in the 1620s.

To the Protestant clerics of the Holy Roman Empire, a thorough-going moral reform became increasingly pressing as the war spread northward in the 1620s, meaning that the dogmatism and dire prognostications of pre-war clerics now became a standard trope of homilies and polemical works (Streitschriften). My third chapter reconstructs community responses to the Thirty Years’ War: while pastors predicted that God’s “rod and bloody sword” would soon befall Lübeck, magistrates devoted their greatest energies to the city’s defenses, spending enormous sums on fortifications and “contributions” required to defend their political autonomy from the competing claims of Scandinavian kings and the Holy Roman Emperor. Though their priorities differed according to their estate, real wartime threats - disease, crowds of refugees, marauding troops, and bankruptcy—forced wartime leaders to unprecedented cooperative and
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24 On the periodization of Lutheran theological Orthodoxy, see Kolb, Ecclesiastical Culture, p. 2.

25 Irene Dingel, “The Culture of Conflict in the Controversies Leading to the Formula of Concord (1548-1580),” in Kolb, Ecclesiastical Culture, pp. 15-64, here pp. 15-18. This essay concerns the role of dispute and negotiation among political and theological elites in shaping the “Wittenberg Reformation” into a coherent doctrinal form by 1580; Dingel addresses the question of local reception of the Konkordienformel only obliquely.
disciplinary measures. While the city council rejected the more radical reforms championed by wartime Superintendent Nicolaus Hunnius (1623-1643), magistrates gave sanction to the ministry’s new offensive against the mystical sects that proliferated in Schleswig-Holstein during the war years. As censorship and consistory proceedings targeted threats to community cohesion, pastors and magistrates also worked to enhance it, by placing new emphasis on participatory expressions of the city’s Lutheran identity.

Social and political historians typically portray the years around 1650 as the end of the European “confessional age,” but protracted internal crisis meant that Lübeck defied this trend. The artisans who attacked patrician-owned cottage industry in 1665 laid siege to the council in the town hall the following year. In the meantime, violence spilled over into religious life, as irate guildsmen rioted against the pious “conventicles” that had taken root in the midst of these disorders. By reforming city council membership and granting new powers of financial oversight to the guilds, the Bürgerrezeß of 1669 was intended to reform city politics on the model of the medieval corporate model, and thus to permanently thwart oligarchic rule by the city’s landed patricians. Chapter four reconstructs the financial insolvency, tax burden, and subsistence crisis that fueled repeated citizen unrests between 1650 and 1670, and suggests close links between the guild’s demands for constitutional reform and their aggressive attacks on mystical alternatives to Lübeck’s inherited religious traditions.

My fifth chapter argues that pastors, magistrates, and ordinary Lübeckers agreed that it was vitally important to uphold the institutional integrity of the Lutheran church after decades of overlapping challenges to their city’s survival. Articulating their collective allegiance to high-church or low-church models of Lutheran practice became a pressing concern as rulers, merchants, and craftsmen attempted to re-orient the city’s economic life toward the Atlantic economy, which promised not only new shipping markets in France and Catholic Spain, but also threatened to attract an influx of Reformed craftsman from the Low Countries and Huguenot refugees from France. With the clergy’s urging, a generation of magistrates opted for a strict
interpretation of the religious permissions of the Peace of Westphalia, which informed the new restrictions the council placed on Calvinist worship and citizenship after 1670, and conditioned the urban community’s first encounters, in the 1680s, with Pietists influenced by Philip Jakob Spener (the “father of Pietism,” 1635-1705). The hard line pastors and magistrates adopted when August Hermann Francke (1663-1727) sought a pastors’ post in Lübeck affirmed the city’s dedication to home-grown Orthodoxy. Whereas religious plurality and pious assemblies offered economic growth and internal renewal, respectively, the “civic Lutheranism” of the late seventeenth century offered a potent means of articulating a unified and stable corporate identity in a sphere accessible to urban dwellers at all ranks of society.

The “Lutheran Baroque” style that dominated artistic life in Lübeck by the time of Bach’s pilgrimage to Lübeck in 1705 was a material-culture response to the economic challenges and political tensions of the preceding decades. My final chapter reconstructs the decades of lavish patronage that re-made Lübeck’s church interiors in a recognizably orthodox and high-church Lutheran idiom by the end of the seventeenth century. Lübeck’s social and mercantile hierarchies had been reflected in the furnishings of the city’s churches since before the Reformation, but decades of crisis provided the impetus for a new largesse that, in visual and aural terms, evoked the princely churches of Electoral Saxony and the Scandinavian kingdoms. Lutheran liturgical life formed a symbolic point of cooperation between clergy and secular authorities, and the space these ceremonies occupied was furnished and maintained through lay patronage, managed by the Kirchenvorsteher or churchwardens. By the time Buxtehude died in 1707, hundreds of bequests articulated a
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26 On the “Northern Baroque” style after the Thirty Years’ War, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Court, Cloister, and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe (1450-1800) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 256 ff. A late-century upswell of renovations and additions – most conspicuously in the Marienkirche – melded with a long history of corporate patronage; the ornately carved stalls (Gestühle) commissioned by councilmen and elders of merchant Kompanien dated from the sixteenth century, and in some cases predated the Reformation; see Max Hasse, Die Marienkirche zu Lübeck (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1983), pp. 121-124. Prewar images of the church interior suggest that much of the original seating remained in situ until the allied bombing of Lübeck in 1942.

27 For an in-depth discussion of this form of Lutheran confessional culture, see Tanya Kevorkian, Baroque Piety: Religion, Society, and Music in Leipzig, 1650-1750 (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007).
message of authority, political cohesion, and prosperity that proclaimed Lübeck’s continued vitality in the face of far-reaching changes in the political and economic ordering of the Baltic region.

< Auslagerung and Luftangriff: Sources >

My attempt to integrate economic decline, church history, and material culture into a narrative of “civic Lutheranism” began as a solution to the challenges of the archival sources for Lübeck. Here, the protracted dislocation (Auslagerung) of a large quantity of archival documents that followed the Soviet advance of 1944-45 has exacerbated the usual challenges imposed by the passing of more than three centuries. Though Lübeck’s archivists and librarians have worked tirelessly to catalog and restore the collections returned from the former GDR after 1990, we encounter significant gaps left in the book and manuscript collections of the Stadtbibliothek Lübeck, as well as in the chronological records of major institutions like the Geistliches Ministerium, or urban ministry. For instance, available Konsistorium protocols reveal that Lübeck’s authorities exercised particular energies against adultery, in the best Lutheran tradition, but we lack the corresponding case files that enabled Anja Johann to depict post-Reformation social disciplining in Frankfurt as a process that depended on the collaboration of citizens.28 Thus, many records that have yielded great insights for other Lutheran territories – consistory records foremost among them – are inconclusive here. During eighteen months of research as a Fulbright fellow and guest of the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, I resolved to search more broadly to remedy these challenges. For this reason, printed sources – many available only in the collections of the HAB – and pre-war scholarship based on now-vanished sources play a crucial role in shaping my arguments.

The situation is equally daunting when we seek to re-interpret Lutheran material culture in Lübeck, particularly the sacred space of the urban church. Though not as absolute as the destruction visited on the
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Dresden Altstadt in February 1945, the “Palm Sunday air attack” (Luftangriff) of 28-29 March 1942 reduced much of Lübeck’s Marienkirche and Petrikirche to ruins, and inflicted major damage on two of the city’s three remaining parish churches.29 Incendiary bombing destroyed not only paper records, wooden pewage, pulpits and choir lofts, but also reduced Baroque altars and cenotaphs fashioned from stone and marble to their base materials. Given this bleak outlook, the work of pre-war historians of art and visual culture becomes particularly valuable, as do more recent works on burgher testaments and civic material culture in general. For example, Bonnie B. Lee’s recent study of community patronage in early-modern Lübeck offers broader conclusions based on the relatively well-preserved St. Jacob’s church, and the collection of pre-war photographs assembled by Max Hasse in his 1983 visual study of the Marienkirche offer an invaluable base of evidence from which to re-imagine the grandeur of Lübeck’s churches prior to the 1942 bombing.30 While these works help us to

29 Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 2; cf. Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 8. Hasse optimistically notes that “the fire of 1942 made it possible to examine the building history upon the naked walls of the church,” but his study of St. Mary’s places the extent of the destruction in sharp relief; for example, Ritter’s cenotaph perished alongside all the other epitaphs adorning the central nave of the Marienkirche, with corresponding damage to the organ works and other liturgical furnishings; see pp. 214-215. Bonnie Lee’s work on Lutheran material culture in Lübeck confirms that of the five Gothic churches located on the Altstadtinsel, only St. Jacob’s or the Jakobikirche escaped extensive damage from British bombers; see Bonnie B. Lee, “Communal Transformations of Church Space in Lutheran Lübeck,” in German History 26 (2008), 149-167.

recover some of the voices of seventeenth-century patrons, however, we have few documents that reveal how contemporaries not directly involved in patronage or church management perceived the interplay of liturgical artworks and church music in Lübeck. The only comfort is found in two analogous works from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, both of which can best be described as early modern guidebooks to the city, and which both offer detailed descriptions of the church interiors as they appeared at the end of the seventeenth century. Read comparatively, Johann Krüger’s *The Blessed and Ornamented City of Lübeck* (1697), and Jacob von Melle’s *Thorough Report on the Free and Imperial City of Lübeck* (1787) constitute one of few surviving links to the material culture that marked out Lübeck as a showpiece of Lutheran material culture for two centuries following the Lutheran “Age of Orthodoxy.”

Although pastors and temporal rulers often disagreed about the priorities of their Lutheran confessional identity during the seventeenth century, both groups ascribed communal religiosity a vital role in urban social life for at least two centuries after the Reformation. The fact that pastors and elites merged their antagonistic viewpoints into a mutually-reinforcing compromise on the question of what it meant to be a Lutheran city of the Holy Roman Empire has important implications for scholarship on urban society and confessionalization in early-modern Europe. First, my findings regarding clerical and civic forms of confessional Lutheranism offer one means of refuting the false dichotomy of “secularization” and “sacral corporatism” that persists concerning long-term social change in early-modern Germany. My arguments complement the work of scholars who reject the notion that seventeenth-century crisis inevitably produced “modernizing” tendencies in political and religious life, and instead insist upon the lasting importance of

---

religious life as a vital locus of discourse and negotiation over the ordering of society. Second, and perhaps more importantly, the remarkable endurance of inherited religious and political understandings in Lübeck gives us cause to revisit our assumptions about the phenomenon of “confessionalization” in general. If analogues to Lübeck’s experience can be found, we will be forced to consider anew the extent to which seventeenth-century confessional life was less an outside impetus enacted upon local societies through social disciplining, than it was a means of coping with contemporary challenges to authority and the inherited order of old-regime Europe. The development of confessions, it follows, was the fusion of new, widely-held convictions with social structures that had deep roots in the pre-reformation centuries. We might conclude that the unique importance of confession-building and related processes for understanding “early modern” society lies in their ability to allow cities and territories to engineer a modicum of stability in a period during which nearly all inherited structures of community life had been thrown into flux.

---

32 Most recently Tanya Kevorkian’s study of Leipzig; see Baroque Piety, pp. 3-7, for a useful summary of this trend in the literature contributing to the social history of religion.
Chapter One

“The Shepherds of Souls”: Lutheran Pastors in a Crisis Century

In a 1643 sermon commemorating the death of Superintendent Nicolaus Hunnius, senior pastor Michael Siricius (1588-1648) depicted the life of an evangelical pastor as laden with hardship. The *Christian Sermon of the Three-Part Shepherd, as Shepherd of Fields, of the World, and of Souls* is remarkable for the author’s complex exegesis of Christ’s metaphor of “the Good Shepherd,” which Siricius used to demarcate the clergy as the office with the closest affinity to God himself, and stress the pastor’s authority vis-à-vis the “third use of the law.” He first identified the laity as “field-shepherds...each with his task,” and the magistrates as “world-shepherds,” charged with defending the Christian “flock” from “wolves” in various forms, i.e., from dangers both physical and spiritual.³³ Luther’s teachings had established that the pastor’s calling was no more inherently sacred than an artisan’s trade or magistrate’s office, but Siricius’s gloss of John 10:14 – containing Christ’s dictum “I know my sheep, and they know me”-- suggested that pastoral obligations were especially subtle and various. “A good shepherd,” he stressed, “as the soul-shepherds should be, must also know the father, and upon this recognition not a little is laid.”³⁴ Pastors were to use three practices to discern and communicate the will of God to parishioners, namely “meditation” (*meditatio*), “preaching and prayer” (*oratio*), and enduring “trial” or “temptation” (*tentatio*), all in the image of Christ himself. Regarding the latter, Siricius urged his colleagues to uphold Christ’s unequivocal example of a shepherd’s “lay[ing] down his life for his sheep”: they were not to shy away from the plagues, violence, and heightened suffering that accompanied the Thirty Years’ War.³⁵ “Much preaching makes the body weary,”

---


the fifty-four-year-old Siricius concluded knowingly, but the strain of tireless devotion to the gospel was but one of the many hardships that revealed the Lutheran clergy to be the true successors of Christ.\(^36\)

In pioneering studies of the early-modern Protestant clergy, C. Scott Dixon and Luise Schorn-Schütte argued that Protestant clerics shared a “unique sense of self-awareness” regarding their role “as a shepherd or a sentinel” vis-à-vis the other early-modern estates; i.e. the worldly authorities and the laity.\(^37\) In Lübeck, this self-perception became the seed for numerous conflicts between clergy and lay rulers after the city adopted the Lutheran Formula of Concord in 1580, a period which coincided with the onset of the “Little Ice Age” (c. 1570-1630), and a sharp decline in Hanseatic influence in the Baltic. Disputes – over the election of pastors, over their shared duty to enforce moral discipline and combat heterodoxy, and over the proper response to both human and natural events – caused both pastors and magistrates to draw upon ambiguities in the Lübeck \textit{Kirchenordnung} to support their respective claims to authority. Church historians seeking the roots of social modernity in early-modern cities have interpreted these tensions as a clash between the ossified and intolerant “orthodoxy” of the clergy and the new


“secularizing” tendencies Max Weber detected in the Protestant-mercantile urban milieu. While matters of church government were often decided along dialectical lines, the story of the seventeenth-century clergy cannot be viewed merely as a power struggle between a dogmatic pastorate and a pragmatic burgher magistracy who successfully “domesticated” their clergy in the centuries that followed the magistrate-led Reformations of the 1520s and 1530s. To do so ignores the ongoing collaboration by members of both institutions in church government and public religious life, and a new impetus to enforce right belief and suppress religious heterodoxy. In Lübeck, all of these gained momentum as the Thirty Years’ War brought new threats to public order. These included internal unrest, financial insolvency, and a dramatic increase in the number of sectarian groups offering unsanctioned alternatives to the doctrines taught in Lübeck’s five parish churches. Though seventeenth-century pastors could not conceive of church and state apart from one another, they also rejected theocracy on Calvin’s model: the pastors who protested the council’s heavy-handed approach to church government understood and accepted their client status vis-à-vis the council; in fact, they made free and frequent recourse to the magistrates when their livelihood was endangered by new hardships. For their part, the elites who staffed both the Rat (council) and the Kirchenverwaltung (church government) relied on pastors to buttress their authority in the tense urban climate that accompanied a crisis century.

I. ‘Much Preaching Makes the Body Weary’: The Clergy and their Office

Siricius’s eulogy for Hunnius appeared in print shortly after Hunnius’s funeral on 16 April, 1643. This pamphlet embodies the most essential tools --preaching and the printed word— that pastors employed when carrying out their duties to advise, comfort and instruct the laity in right belief and godly living. Luther


39 Because the manuscript collections for Lübeck contain only a few complete sermons, the print record is essential to our knowledge of the pastor’s foremost occupational duty, and their practice of publishing select sermons for sale
identified the preaching of Scripture as a conduit of divine grace, and the resulting emphasis on preaching in seventeenth-century Lutheranism, together with the relatively small number of Lutheran pastors in Lübeck, ensured that *Prediger* and *Hauptpastoren* preached a daunting number of sermons in the course of a career. At any given time there were approximately twenty-five full-time clergy distributed among the city’s five churches and two chapels, and these were responsible for an (overwhelmingly Lutheran) urban population of up to twenty-five thousand souls. In addition to administering sacraments (e.g. baptism) and rites (confirmation, hearing confession, anointing the sick), a typical week’s preaching included the morning or evening sermons on Sunday and a mid-week sermon, but might also require the commemoration of a saint’s day, and a further homily at a wedding or funeral. On major anniversaries, commemorative preaching added to this workload -- an outpouring of sermons commemorated the centennials of the Ninety-Five Theses (1617), the Augsburg Confession (1630), the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1655) and the Lutheran Formula of Concord (1680) – while the city council declared frequent public ceremonials in the course of the seventeenth century. These included not only the scripted *Buß- and Bettage*, or “Days of Penitence and Prayer” that the *Ratsherren* decreed in response to the new trials of the Thirty Years’ War, but also sermons to celebrate various milestones in this conflict. Some fourteen years before his *Sermon of the Three-Part Shepherd*, for example, Siricius had been appointed to preach a cycle of sermons celebrating the successful conclusion of the Peace of Lübeck in May 1629, which he titled *On the Justice and Mercy of God* and dedicated to the Danish dignitaries representing King Christian IV (r. 1588-1648). Given this demand for

enables us to recover vital elements of the self-image and sense of duty motivating pastors. Homilies composed for public holidays like the Peace of Lübeck, or in response to dramatic events of wartime were understandably deemed to be the most marketable, and are thus over-represented in the surviving sermons for Lübeck, for which we have no larger-scale collections. However, we gain a sense of how they preached on more mundane occasions from the increasing popularity of printed *Leichenpredigten* or funerary sermons in the seventeenth century, and from the senior pastors’ practice of publishing their *Catechismus-Predigten* (catechism lectures), and other sermon cycles.
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preaching—and the fact that lay patrons of the church frowned upon a pastor’s recycling the same sermons—the approximately three dozen sermons preserved for Lübeck represent only a tiny proportion of the total preaching output of the Lübeck pastors in the seventeenth century.

In a lecture published in 1865, the Anglican Archbishop Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-1886) frowned upon the polemical fervor that distinguished early-modern pastors from their latter-day counterparts. Specifically, he warned that “the Lutheran and Reformed clergy at the close of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century do not always present themselves to us in a very attractive point of view: they were contentious, word-warriors, over-prompt to discern a heretic, in their theological disputes with one another or with Romanists frightfully abusive, [and] not a little given to domineer over consciences.”41 These traits made church leaders like Nicolaus Hunnius famous, but spiritual combat was only part of the clergy’s professional life. In contrast to the Archbishop, Michael Siricius’s “shepherd of souls” stressed a holistic view of the pastor’s office in society, even as it reprised familiar Lutheran teachings regarding every Christian’s obligations to diligence in his calling and obedience to authority. Though he was eulogizing a famous polemicist, Siricius chose the pastor’s duty to visit the sick as a shining example of clerical self-sacrifice, a theme that recalled the plagues that afflicted Lübeck in 1620s and 1630s: “there must the teacher (Lehrer) take a foothold, risking life and limb, going into poisonous houses, that he so does, as though standing among the dead and the living.”42 Certainly, being a “shepherd of souls” in a century of crises meant that members of the urban ministry fought their own war against sin and false belief, but spiritual combat, though highly visible in the sources, was not their only approach to overseeing moral life, advising their magistrates, and instructing parishioners on the true meaning of the ongoing Thirty Years’ War.


Despite their predilection for admonishment, pastors also sought to communicate Christ’s love by offering their congregations solace (Trost) and affirming instruction (Erbauung). Even when confronting the real physical and spiritual threats of wartime, Lübeck’s pastors never eschewed their vocational duty to instruct their parishioners in the fundamentals of the faith. To do so would have violated Luther’s own exhortation, in the preface to his Large Catechism of 1529, that they should “treat the Catechism constantly” in their preaching, and not eschew catechetical instruction in order to devote themselves to supposed “higher matters,” nor allow it to lapse due to “laziness.”

Superintendent Georg Stampelius (1561-1622), for instance, stressed that “catechism and the instruction of children” was a core duty of the urban pastorate in a cycle of sermons delivered to commemorate his entry into office in 1613. Stampelius felt that catechism instruction had lapsed during the twelve years Lübeck had gone without a Superintendent, and stressed a return to form; young people in particular were to be “orally instructed on all parts of Christianity, what they believe, hope, and how they ought to live,” and were to be “questioned and examined” before being admitted to the sacrament of communion. Because Stampelius took pains to refute the Reformed and post-
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43 Martin Luther, “A Christian, Profitable, and Necessary Preface,” in Luther, The Large Catechism. Trans F. Bente and W.H.T. Dau (Fairford, UK : Echo Press, 2007), p. 3: “We have no slight reasons for treating the Catechism so constantly [in sermons] and for both desiring and beseeching others to teach it, since we see to our sorrow that many pastors and preachers are very negligent in this, and slight both their officers and this teaching; some from great and high art (giving their mind, as they imagine, to much higher matters), but others from sheer laziness and care for their paunches...”

44 Georg Stampelius, Achte Catechismus Predigten: Darinninen die Haupstück unsers Catechismi und Christlicher Religion / nach der Richtschnur Göttliches Wortes (Lübeck: Samuel Jauchen, 1615), pp. i-ii. HAB 919.125 TH. Although this collection did not appear in print until 1615, Pouchenius’s dedication dates the sermons to “the beginning of this my office, in September 1613. His sermons remained true to form, as the new Superintendent following four hundred and sixty pages of sermons delve at length into divine law (das Gesetz Gottes), beginning with the ten commandments, the articles of the of the Lutheran confession, and the sacraments, both “in general,” and individually.

45 Stampelius, Achte Catechismus Predigten, p. 2: “da sie von allen Stücken des Christenthumbs / was sie glauben / hoffen / und wie sie leben solten / mündlich unterrichtet / und auch hinwiederumb verhöret und examiniret... ohne welches sie auch in der ersten Kirchen in derselben Gemeine nicht auffgenommen / noch zum Sacramenten gestattet würden.”
Tridentine Catholic catechisms in detail, we can assume that he was also reacting to the dramatic advances of Calvinism and post-Tridentine Catholicism when he emphasized the centrality of basic doctrine to Christian living; the same sermons described catechetical learning as “a certain badge and hallmark, through which to distinguish from the pagans and unbelievers.” In the years to come, pastors redoubled their edificatory efforts when faced with the violence, material hardship, and the proliferation of mystical religious sects caused by the Thirty Years’ War. For the seventeenth century in general, the proliferation of Erbauungsschriften or “edificatory writings” was closely tied to the challenges the city encountered as a result of climate change, economic decline, and a real growth of religious heterodoxy in Protestant Germany.

From the rank of Superintendent to junior chaplain, pastors invoked their Pflicht, or duties of office, when instructing parishioners on Christian living. The Lübeck-born pastor Jacob Stolterfoht (1600-1668) was effusive on this point in 1638, when he published The Perilous Voyage of St. Paul, a massive tome reproducing ten sermons on the Apostle’s fraught journey from Caesarea to Rome to Acts 27. “As I therefore consider myself duty-bound (Pflicht-schuldig) to pray unfailing for [my lords] and this whole beloved community” he wrote by way of dedication in 1638, “and to teach them the good and right path, and together with Paul, not to give the Gospel of God alone … but also to willingly impart to them my very life.” Like colleague Michael Siricius, whose “shepherd of souls” he foreshadowed, Stolterfoht did not present the dangers of his own time as appreciably different from the kind of trials that beset the apostle; by the same token, the seafaring essential to Paul’s ministry was equally vital to sustaining life in an early-modern mercantile center. “Sea voyages serve men both for conveyance and for the necessities of life – that is, trade, defense, and military necessity,” he declared, citing the Christian victory over the Turks at Lepanto (1571) as

---


an example of the latter. Yet sea travel was fraught with peril, particularly in times of war. As senior pastor in the home church of Lübeck’s merchant companies, Stolterfoht not only recognized the dangers of the seafaring life, but deliberately invoked them when urging his congregation toward a more Christian way of life.

Stolterfoth’s target audience was not the common mariner, but the rich merchant-guild leaders who were the primary patrons of St. Mary’s church. He duly acknowledged the dangers of sea travel, noting, “in the sea there are to be found great rocks, and hard cliffs of stone; when a ship butts powerfully thereupon, everything must go to pieces.” The same waters were infested with pirates, as they had been in Paul’s time. “Upon the sea are Seeräuber, who practice, as the poet says, vivitur ex rapto, they live from robbery,” the pastor continued, noting that “of the same pirates there is no lack in the present day, rather are more than too many to be found,” in reference to the Lübeck sailors enslaved by Muslim corsairs.

Having established his authority on the subject, Siricius made a telling distinction between the aforementioned dangers that afflict Christians “at sea,” and a different but equally dangerous set encountered “on land.”

---

48 Stolterfoht, Gefährliche Schiffarth St. Pauli, p.25: “Dienen dann endlich die Schifffarthen den menschen zu ihrer Leibes Notturfft und Uberführung...also, Handel, Verteidigung, militärische Notdurft...zum Beispiel, was für eine gewaltige Schlacht im Jahr Christi 1571. den. 7. Octob. die Christen / unter dem general Johan de Austria, zu Schiff mit den Türcken gehalten.”

49 Cf. chapter two, below. In addition to the formal disbandment of the Hanseatic League in 1630, sailors and merchant elders alike were hard-pressed by Swedish dominance in the Baltic (which required expensive “contributions” to the Swedish war effort) and Muslim piracy in mid-Atlantic; a few years earlier, Superintendent Nicolaus Hunnius had collaborated with the city council to establish a civic “slave’s fund” (Sklavenkasse) in an attempt to repatriate some of the 84 Lübeckers seized by Muslim corsairs between 1615 and 1629; cf. Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks: Christentum und Bürgertum in neun Jahrhunderten (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 1981), p. 307.

50 Stolterfoht, Die Gefährliche Schiffarth, p. 34: “bald finden sich da im Meer grosse Felsen / und harte Steinklippen / wann deran die Schiff emit Gewalt stoßen, muss alles zerspringen.”

51 Stolterfoht, Die Gefährliche Schiffarth, p. 35: “Balden finden sich da auff dem Meer die Seeräuber, die das practiciren, was der Poët sagt: vivitur ex rapto, se leben von dem Raub / und nehren sich mit Schaden... an derogleichigen Seeräuber es auff den heutigen Tag auch nicht mangelt / sonder warden deren leider mehr dann zu viel gefunden.” Cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses, I, 144-145: “vivitur ex rapto, non hospes ab hospite tutus / no socer a geneso; fratrum quoque gratia rara est.” On Lübeck’s seventeenth-century losses to piracy, cf. note 49.
“Here must one foremost look well thereto, that he not take to ship and to sea in any way out of impertinence (Vorwitz) ... he must not use seafaring (or much more, misuse it), for grandeur, luxuriance, and opulence.”

Seafaring could easily be corrupted from its God-given status as a noble profession, when those who practiced it pursued their own exultation, instead of following the teaching of Christ and the apostle.

“One uses seafaring in a right and seemly manner,” the pastor urged, “when one pursues the same to the glory of God, and uses it for the need and benefit of one’s neighbor.”

Here, he walked a fine line, as it required considerable delicacy to balance between the obligation to honor one’s lords and patrons, while also admonishing them for a well-known taste in material ostentation and outward display. Accordingly, Stolterfoht was careful to honor the profession upon which Lübeck depended as blessed by God, while offering an unmistakable critique of the city’s merchant elite that extended to the clothes they wore to church, and the richly-carved pews they occupied during his sermons.

Instruction and exhortation also permeated the pastors’ campaign against the mystical conclaves that proliferated in seventeenth-century Germany. During the Thirty Years’ War, the growing influence of non-sanctioned teachings in Lübeck perplexed clergy and magistrates alike: in early 1632, following a series of disputes with non-conformist teachers, Superintendent Hunnius requested and received the city council’s permission to revive the Ministerium Tripolitanum, a regional consistory established during the “Hamburg Convent” against Anabaptism in 1535, and staffed jointly by pastors from Lübeck, Hamburg, and Lüneburg.

---

52 Ibid., p. 26: “Hie muss man zu foderst wol zuscheuwen / daß man sich nicht etwa auß Fürwitz zu Schiffe und auff die See begeben ... so muß man die Schiffarth nicht gebrauchen (oder vielmehr missbrauchen) / zur Pracht, Hoffart, und Oppigkeit.”

53 Ibid., p. 28: “Recht und gebührlich aber gebrauchet man der Schiffarth / wann man dieselbige zufoderst zu Gotts Ehren: und des Nebstest gebührliche Notturfft und besten anwendet.”

The latter-day “Convent of Mölln” was named for a nearby cathedral town, where the heads of these ministries met on 26-29 March 1632. Dedicated explicitly to the task of “keeping safe this church,” the delegates agreed to attack the new mysticism on its own ground, for which purpose Hunnius agreed to craft a vernacular “handbook” of catechism texts, songs, and prayers for private devotion, thus providing an Orthodox Lutheran alternative to the mystical teachings of “spiritualists,” “enthusiasts,” and “fanatics.” The resulting Lower-Saxon Handbook (Dat Neddersassische Handtboek) appeared the following year (1633), and soon gained a wide readership in Lutheran Germany. The deliberately vernacular form and content of this work distinguishes it from Hunnius’s polemical and theological writings, recalling instead the devotionals and prayer manuals printed in Lübeck at the end of the sixteenth century. That causal link between the Convent of Mölln and Hunnius’s handbook confirms that the books pastors wrote to comfort and instruct a lay audience cannot be understood as *sui generis*; rather, these were part of a community response to hardships that involved pastors, magistrates, and lay urban-dwellers of all ranks.

*< The Pastor’s War: The Clergy as Guardians >*

Hunnius’s *Handbook* was one maneuver in a sustained spiritual combat between Orthodox Lutheran pastors and the spiritual alternatives that proliferated in the northwestern Empire after about 1600. Pastors increased their output of printed sermons and edificatory texts in response to the war’s ravages, and a corresponding increase in polemical *Streitschriften* suggests that wartime experiences were equally important for the maturation of the clergy’s role as “sentinels,” who guarded the urban community against

---


55 The phrase “keeping safe this church” appears in an untitled letter by Nicolaus Hunnius to the Hamburg and Lüneburg consistories, from February or early March of 1633; *AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV*, fol. 476.

infiltration by mystical sects or competing confessions. Pastors and magistrates never the abandoned the disciplinary goals of Luther’s reformation—effect a visible reform of daily life through education and moral discipline—but lack of consistory and visitation records forces us to look elsewhere when reconstructing Lübeck’s encounter with the mysticism and apocalypticism of the war decades. As the “Convent of Mölln” suggests, the success of the pastors’ struggle against unsanctioned alternatives to Lübeck’s Lutheran church depended heavily on their success in gaining the disciplinary support of the city’s magistrates. Though Lübeck’s struggle with heterodoxy fell far short of Hunnius’s grand vision, it marked a sea change from the discord that plagued church life in the pre-war decades.

Lübeck’s pastors had long warned against the dangers of Jesuits, Tridentine Catholicism in general, and Anabaptists in particular, but it was their vigilance regarding the growth of the Reformed tradition—and an attendant enthusiasm for uncovering “secret” or “crypto-Calvinist” sympathies among their co-religionists—that caused the most trouble after 1600. Lübeck’s magistrates facilitated a decline in the discipline and cohesion of the city’s ministry when they neglected to appoint a new Superintendent following the death of Superintendent Andreas Pouchenius (1526-1600) in October 1600. In 1601, a year after he was elected to St. Peter’s parish, Prediger Caspar Holste described himself as “persecuted, bedeviled, oppressed, vilified, and slandered” at the hands of colleagues who suspected him of Calvinist sympathies. The magistrates eventually intervened on Holste’s behalf, but dissatisfaction persisted among members of the

57 The pastors frequently lumped these together under the derogatory label of fremde Religionen, or “foreign faiths,” but their theological treatises distinguish between the legal sanction granted Catholicism and Calvinism (in the 1555 Peace of Augsburg and the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, respectively), and “enthusiast errors” of sectarians; cf. Nicolaus Hunnius, Consultatio, Oder Wolmeinendes Bedencken: Ob und wie die Evangelische Lutherische Kirchen die jetztschwebende Religionstreitigkeiten entweder friedlich beylegen (Lübeck: Embs, 1632), HAB S: 274 Helmst. 8.

58 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri [A 80], “Caspar Holste bittet abermal, ihn vor den Beleidigungen des Ministeriums zu schützen, und sendet eine Verantwortung gegen die ihm gewunschten Vorwürfe”: „Was mir aber nu eine geraumer Zeit, hierbeÿ für Schimpff ... und Hertzeleid zugefugt, wie ich druber verfolget, gequelet, verachtet, unterdrückt, geschmehent und gelesten worden, kann ich itzt von ort zu rede, ohn sonderliche schmertzen vnd hertzbeschweren in specie nicht erzechen.” Despite the discrimination that marred his first decade in Lübeck, Holste served as Prediger in Lübeck for a total thirty-four years, relinquishing his post only when “the afflictions of age” drove him into retirement in 1635, three years before his death; cf. AHL Pastorenkartei, “Holste, Caspar.”
ministry, eventually causing a protracted scandal in the winter of 1613-14, when junior pastor Antonius Burchardi publicly condemned a treaty the council had recently concluded with the Calvinist Netherlands. “It is a great sin,” Burchardi argued in one of several sermons disparaging the council’s new Bündniß, “whenever one binds oneself to and intermingles with people of foreign and false religion, and seeks help or assistance among them,” and the support he received from his colleagues revealed that the senior pastors agreed with his sense of duty, if not his methods. Because new Superintendent Georg Stampelius defended the treaty, the Burchardi affair soon divided the ministry from within, and spilled over into a vitriolic public debate. By Christmas of 1613, Burchardi’s sermonizing had incited rumblings of popular unrest against the council, and though the Ratsherren successfully prosecuted him for sedition and exiled him from the city in 1614, Lübeck’s pastors remained bitterly divided until Stampelius died in 1622.

After the nadir of 1613-22, the cohesion of Lübeck’s ministry improved rapidly when Hunnius, a Wittenberg professor and well-known dogmatician, was recruited by the city council in 1623. Under his firm leadership, pastors of the war generation sustained Burchardi’s conviction when it came to combating “foreign faiths” and “false belief,” but refrained from publicly questioning the council’s God-given authority. As Superintendent, Hunnius had ambitious plans for Lübeck and Lutheran Germany in general, and his

---


62 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 593 ff. Cf. Horst Weimann, “Lübecker Geistliche im 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert: Ihre Ärgernisse mit Rat und Bürgern,” in Jahrbuch des St.-Marien Bauvereins 8 (1974/75), 102-109; p. 105. Burchardi’s allies in the ministry (particularly Sebastian Schwan) continued to persecute Stampelius for his role as the council’s apologist until he died in 1622, and used the slightest pretexts to criticize and hinder their Superintendent. In mid-1614, for example, pastor Hinrich Menne “pilloried” the new Superintendent for being an opportunist, “who behaved in a disloyal manner toward his clerical brethren,” thus preparing the ground for subsequent incidents of harassment that ranged from the obvious dislike shown by the pastors for Stampelius’s sermons and lectures, to their repeated allegations that he was, in fact, a clandestine Calvinist. Stampelius’s personal troubles were exacerbated by his chronic inability to effectively discipline subordinates: in 1619, Prediger Sebastian Schwan voluntarily resigned from the staff of St. Mary’s parish, declaring that it “had become inhospitable to him” after repeated clashes with the Superintendent.
antidote to the divisions he inherited was a sweeping commitment to the work of spiritual defense. “When a city is placed in severe danger from warfare,” the Superintendent declared in a weighty polemical work entitled *A Thorough Report on the New Prophets*, “everyone strives with great diligence to counteract the enemy and secure the advantage.”

Published in 1634, the *Report* was the second element of a three-part attack agreed upon at the Convent of Mölln: in addition to the vernacular *Handbook*, Hunnius undertook to refute the movement’s leaders in print, while the parish clergies of the three cities were instructed to utilize “every suitable opportunity” to educate parishioners concerning the “Enthusiast” danger. For the pastors from Lübeck, this was an enlargement on an existing strategy, as they had been wary of the “New Prophets” since Advent of 1631, when it was discovered that a Dutch bookseller was vending copies of a book written by mystical leader Paul Felgenhauer (1593-1677) in Lübeck’s central market. On 17 February, 1632, Hunnius had written to the council with a visceral description of the danger embodied in this book. Because Felgenhauer urged an individualized understanding of Scripture “according to spiritual, allegorical meaning,” and rejected the authority of the institutional church, his book necessarily contained myriad “false teachings” concerning core Lutheran doctrines. “From this it is clear,” the Superintendent concluded, “that should this book be brought among the people, it [would] engender conflict and strife, disorder, and the evil that follows thereupon in our community.” Though some on the council were skeptical, Hunnius eventually convinced a majority that the danger was genuine. By the time the council banned the trade in “fanatical” books in

---

63 Nicolaus Hunnius, *Hunnius, Ausführlicher Bericht von Der Newen Propheten / (die sich Erleuchtete / Gottesgelehrte / und Theosophos nennen) Religion / Lehr und Glauben / damit der Satan die Kirche Gottes auffs neue zu verunruhigen sich unterstehet* (Lübeck, 1634), p. i. HAB 463.5 Th.

64 Hunnius, quoted in Hauschild, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 302. The phrase “keeping safe this church” appears in an untitled letter Hunnius sent to the Hamburg and Lüneburg consistories in early 1633, proposing the meeting at Mölln; see AHL *Geistliches Ministerium IV*, fol. 476 ff.


67 *ibid*, fol. 523.
January of 1633, however, a new influx of texts written by Felgenhauer’s ally Christoph Andreas Raselius (1590-1660) had arrived in the city from Hamburg.⁶⁸

Hunnius’s protracted dispute with Raselius -- which endured until the Superintendent died in 1643, aged fifty-eight—confirms that Hunnius saw a “partnership of council and ministry” as the crucial prerequisite to a pious and prosperous urban society.⁶⁹ The Thorough Report offered six hundred pages of theological proofs refuting Raselius, Felgenhauer, and their followers, but the Superintendent devoted his foreword to urging Lübeckers of all ranks to resist the rising tide of religious non-conformism. He envisioned no less than a communal effort against both sin and false belief, and took care to dismiss half-measures by anyone: “should not all orders and ranks, where such an evil bestirs itself, do nothing else but join together, helping to control and to dampen, as must occur by an outbreak of fire, and not desist before the evil is remedied, and all is returned to a peaceful prosperity?”⁷⁰ The council had “shown great diligence and paternal ministration” in censoring heretical books and prosecuting Lübeckers affiliated with the New Prophets, but there was still much to be done if peace and prosperity were ever to return to Lübeck. Accordingly, Hunnius implored “that our beloved and honored authorities will desire to graciously continue on in the same oversight and precaution, in order that the devil might not sow the enthusiast weed among us.”⁷¹

By stressing the obligations between clergy and magistrates — “we bind ourselves to yourselves, as Christian and most honored authorities (Obrigkeiten)”-- Hunnius’s exercise of clerical guardianship

---


⁶⁹ Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 309: “Hunnius’ Ordnungsmodell zielte auf eine Partnerschaft von Staat und Kirche, d.h. von Rat und Ministerium.”

⁷⁰ Hunnis, Ausführliche Bericht, p. vi: “solten nicht alle Orden und Stände / wo sich ein solches Ubel regen wil / nicht anders als zusammen treten / stewren und dempffen helfen / als bey einer Fewersbrunst geschehen muß; und nicht ehe ablassen / biß dem Ubel remediret, alles aber zu einem ruhigen Wolstand gebracht werde?”

⁷¹ Ibid., pp. xiii: “Unsern lieben / hochgeehrten Oberkeiten aber sagen wir insonderheit / für die bißhero bezeugte väterliche fürsorge ... gebührenden hochleissigen Danck / Instendig bittende / sie wollen mit derselben Auffsicht unnd Vorsorge großgünstig continuiren / daß der Teuffel diß Enthusiastische Unkraut unter uns nicht außstreewe ... dessen wir uns zu ihenen / als Christlichen und hochlöblichen Oberkeiten / unzweiffelig versehen thun.”
demanded that the whole urban hierarchy embrace spiritual defenses as a necessary antidote to wartime hardships.

While Hunnius achieved moderate successes during his lifetime, his long-term influence on church government in Lübeck marks his tenure of office (1623-43) as a transformative period. When he died in 1643, the council perpetuated his legacy by recruiting a former student, Superintendent Meno Hanneken (1595-1671), whose ministry built upon Hunnius’s precedent for convincing magistrates to join the fight against religious non-conformism. Their successes owed something to Hanneken’s greater capacity for diplomacy -- he made earnest, if unsuccessful attempts to mediate the escalating dispute between the guilds and city council in 1663-64 -- but when combating heterodoxy or advising the council, Hanneken took care to present himself as Hunnius’s disciple. This self-fashioning became most conspicuous toward the end of the Superintendent’s life, when the city council began to circulate a printed broadsheet – known as the ‘Notifikation’ of 1670— that invited textile artisans and cloth merchants from France and the Netherlands to take advantage of favorable market conditions in Lübeck. Facing an influx from a famously Reformed sector of the Atlantic economy, Hanneken’s reply directly appropriated a treatise that Hunnius had dedicated to Swedish king Gustavus Adolphus in 1632, in order to demonstrate that confessional pluralism, though not explicitly forbidden by Scripture, would imperil not only the Lutheran confessional tradition, but also the

---

72 AHL “Hannekeniana,” manuscript of 27. October 1644, quoted in Horst Weimann, “Zwei Superintendenten: Lübecker Volks- und Sittenspiegel 1640-1700,” in Jahrbuch des St.-Marien-Bauvereins 2 (1955), 33-49; p. 48. The mediatory position Hanneken assumed in his meetings with both parties is reflected in a well-intentioned essay he wrote in October 1664: “right and wrong are determined by each conscience,” the Superintendent opined, but “we are all members of one body.” He subsequently expressed frustration that his mediatory efforts failed, chiding both parties in his 1664 missive that “the negotiations of an honorable ministry have not been able to ease the matter.”

salvation of souls, public order, and the basic integrity of the Christian family.\textsuperscript{74} “It should be of greatest concern to authorities, that the divine service be conducted purely and correctly,” Hunnius and Hanneken reminded the magistrates of their respective generations, “meanwhile, an authority that permits all religions will liable for all of the souls that are misled through such freedom.”\textsuperscript{75} While Hanneken adopted a less apocalyptic tone than Hunnius—economic innovation and not war would be responsible for the new contagion—he and his pastors still hoped to circumvent the new religious settlement of the Peace of Westphalia, which gave the German Reformed churches equal legal status with Catholics and Lutherans. At a time when confessional pluralism began to replace orthodox interpretations in many Lutheran cities, their efforts to lionize Hunnius would be rewarded with an outpouring of popular support for Lübeck’s inherited confessional identity.

As Lübeck sought to rebuild its community traditions following a decade of internal turmoil, the burgher elite perpetuated the city’s orthodox Lutheran tradition by continuing to recruit Wittenberg-educated pastors—men as like Hunnius as possible—to fill the office of Superintendent. Although less prolific in theology and polemic, the ministries led by Samuel Pomarius (1675-1683) and August Pfeiffer (1689-1699) continued to gain ground in the inherited struggle against threats to the city’s Lutheran church; shortly after Hanneken’s death in 1671, for instance, a council majority voted to permanently prohibit the city’s Calvinist congregation from holding “formal worship” on pain of imprisonment, and formally banned adherents of the

\textsuperscript{74} Meno Hanneken, \textit{Theologisches Bedencken / Ob der Käyserlichen Freyen Reichs-Stadt Lübeck zurahten / Daß sie zu Berforderung des Commercii und zeitlicher Nahrung / fremder jedoch im Römischen Reich zugelassener Religions-Verwandten in die Stadt annehme} (Lübeck: Wessel, 1671). The Superintendent argued that although legal pluralism was not explicitly forbidden in biblical law, it was by nature inimical to the well-being of the Lutheran confession, the preservation of which was the foremost duty of \textit{Obrigkeit}; cf. pp. vi-vii: “Dieweil Gott / der dißfallß die oberste Regierung hat / der gleichen (Freystellung allerley \textit{Religionen}) nichts der Oberkeit zuthun weder gebotten noch freygelassen / die doch als Gottes Reichs Amptleute und Diener sich allein nach ihres Herren Befehl und Orndung richten müssen.”

\textsuperscript{75} Hanneken, \textit{Theologisches Bedencken}, pp. vii: “Dieweil diß der Oberkeit Sorge zu grösten Theil sein soll / daß der Gottesdienst rein und richtig gehalten werde ... Dieweil eine Oberkeit welche alle \textit{Religiones} frey lässet / an allen den Seelen schuldig wird / welche durch solche Freyheit verführt werden.”
Reformed confession from acquiring citizenship, or serving as godparents to citizen children. The next generation of pastors would continue to inveigh against the errors of Reformed doctrine, but Superintendent Pfeiffer found a more immediate threat in the growth of Lübeck’s first Pietist community, founded by Johann Wilhelm Petersen (1649-1727) in 1675. The pastors’ efforts to reconcile this group to the institutional church ultimately convinced the council to expel the group’s leader in 1692, and embroiled Hanneken successor August Pfeiffer in a heated pamphlet exchange with “father of Pietism” Philip Jakob Spener (1635-1705) in 1693. While church historians have stressed that Hanneken and his successors never rivaled the fame or prestige achieved by Hunnius, their efforts garnered far more approval from councilmen and church wardens who were more concerned with faithfulness to their city’s church traditions that with theological innovation. While the ministry’s achievements in combating heterodoxy always fell short of the sweeping measures envisioned by the Superintendents, the clerical cohorts of the mid-seventeenth century successfully persuaded their magistrates that the pastors had a valuable role to play in combating the religious pluralism that could lead to internal divisions.

< Zeitzeichen: The Pastors as Seers >

76 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 329.

77 Pfeiffer’s critique of Spener appeared as a foreword to his Klugheit der Gerechten: Darinnen in acht Catechismus-Predigten, denen Eltern gezeigt wird, wie sie ihre Kinder nach den wahren Gründen des Christenthums aufferziehen sollen (Lübeck, 1693); HAB Alv.: T 235. His criticism was sufficiently incisive to earn a public rebuttal from the “Father of Pietism” himself in 1694. Spener’s answering tract named “D. August Pfeiffer, Church Superintendent at Lübeck,” as one several Orthodox leaders “who has taken it upon himself to refute my Explanation”; see especially his preface “To the Christian Reader,” in D. Philip Jacob Spener’s gründliche Beantwortung dessen / was Herr D. Augustus Pfeiffer Superint. Zu Lübeck / in der vorrede seiner so genanten Klugheit der Gerechten ... der hoffnung künftiger besserer zeiten entgegen zu setzen / sich unterstanden (Frankfurt, 1684), pp. 1-5. HAB Xb 4802.

78 Wolf-Dieter Hauschild concludes that although Hanneken demonstrated greater skill in his political engagements with the council, he “lagged far behind his predecessor in scholarly importance”; Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 311.

79 While Burchardi argued that the city council should restrict Lübeck’s trade and diplomacy to avowedly Lutheran princes and cities, Hunnius urged Protestant princes embroiled in the Thirty Years’ War to seek victory by sustained “religious disputation” with their doctrinal rivals in Rome and Geneva. To carry this out, Hunnius advised the princes, the Lutherans urgently needed “a single College, or assembly of learned theologians,” who would dedicate themselves to the cause of Lutheran apologetics, “avoiding all other kinds of duties”; Hunnius, Consultatio, Oder Wolmeinendes Bedencken, p. 503.
The perception of contemporary hardships as divine retribution for sin was an interpretation eminently available to the generation of pastors who confronted the Thirty Years’ War. In a 1627 sermon entitled sermon Beneficial Advice: What One Should and Must Do In These Troubled Times, pastor Gerhard Winter urged his congregation that they could still be spared the ‘road and bloody sword’ of warfare, but only if they would “meet God with a penitential heart,” desist from immoral living (he included an impressive catalog of sins), and consistently “venerate and honor the pastors” and office of ministry (Predigamt). These and like interpretations approximate what Wolfgang Behringer has termed the “sin economies” typical of the early-modern worldview, according to which observers of the “Little Ice Age” interpreted contemporary hardship as God’s punishment for immoral living. Lübeck’s magistrates agreed that the new hardships of their times had religious significance – in 1619, Bürgermeister Heinrich Brokes confided to his diary that many of the Ratsherren believed that “the Bohemian war had been caused by the Jesuits and Papists without cause” — and the measures they adopted in response to various portents were specifically designed to enhance community cohesion in times of general malaise.

At the pastors’ urging, the wartime council demonstrated a new enthusiasm for public religious ceremonies that sanctioned the clergy’s self-ascribed role as prognosticators or seers, charged to transmit God’s intentions as revealed in both human action and in the created world. In September 1631, for example, the council approved the ministry’s recommendation “that we should thank God following the Battle of Leipzig,” an event that marked the first decisive Protestant victory of the Thirty Years’ War. The council

---


decreed a civic holiday, and approved a prayer of thanksgiving, drafted by the ministry and read out in all the city’s churches. “Lord, how shall we repay you all your blessings?” the pastors asked, answering with affirmation of the Christian duty to worship: “we praise your Name with a song, honor you highly with [our] thanks, and sing a hymn of praise with heartfelt joy.”

The council and ministry held comparable events in honor of the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the new constitutional settlement of 1669, and the centennial of the city’s adoption of the Lutheran Formula of Concord (1680), but in the seventeenth century at large, such celebrations were rather less common than the “Days of Penance and Prayer” (Buß- and Bettage) through which the council engaged with the various threats hard times posed to internal order. More somber in both definition and practice, these events allowed pastors to emphasize their adherence to Gnesio-Lutheran tradition, while also stressing a Lutheran subject’s debt of obedience to divinely-ordained authority (i.e. the magistrates and city council). Unsurprisingly, the council tended to decree these “high-celebratory” and “publicly exercised” ceremonies in times of internal tension, and in response to unsettling portents.

“Anno 1663 in the month of November,” mayor Gottschalk Kirchring recorded in his Compendium of the Chronicles of Lübeck, “a general, solemn Day of Penitence, Prayer and Fasting was celebrated in Lübeck and in the whole Lübeck domains,” and it is suggestive that the council revived this tradition in a year marked by famine and popular protests.

Gaps in the ministry records preclude a full chronological reconstruction, but we know that the council decreed Buß- und Bettage in 1673, 1675, 1676, 1677, and 1678, and it is likewise clear

---

83 AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 219-219a, “Das Ministerий bittet, daß man nach der Leiptziger Schlacht Gottdenken möge” (1631). Today, this Swedish and Saxon victory over the forces of Tilly and the Catholic League in early September 1631 is more commonly known as the Battle of Breitenfeld (or First Battle of Breitenfeld).

84 AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 220-221a, “Formula der Dancksagung der Victorie cum consensus Senatus” (1631): “Herr, wie sollen wir dir vergelten alle woltaten, die da uns thust? deinen Nahmen wollen wir loben mit einem Lied, dich hoch ehren mit Danck, und aus herzlicher Freude einen lobgesang singen.”


86 Kirchring and Müller, Compendium Chronicae Lubecensis, p. 332.
that the impetus for such events frequently came from the pastors, whose enthusiasm for such rituals can be explained, at least in part, by the collaborative opportunities they offered.  

The city’s reaction to the frequent comets of the 1670s and 80s suggests that such events helped to solidify a cooperative relationship between pastors and magistrates. As Bernd Roeck has shown for Augsburg, the other-worldly nature of comets made them highly vexing to seventeenth-century urban dwellers. In Lübeck, pastors and magistrates worked to offset popular fears by stressing the God-given authority of their respective offices; for example, new Superintendent Samuel Pomarius dedicated his inaugural sermon to interpreting the comet of April-May 1675, which allowed him to remind his distinguished audience that Lutheran Predigamt had its origins in the “prophets, wise men, and scribes” of Israel, and remained the sole authority “through which the body of Christ might be edified.” When the council decreed a special Day of Penitence in response to the “Great Comet” of 1680, moreover, Pomarius and his pastors made sure that the official script of this Bußtag reprised the Superintendent’s earlier claims to authority in matters of prognostication. Together with Protestant holidays and the new restrictions on “foreign religions,” Days of Penitence helped clergy and magistrates to articulate a new and mutually-


88 **Roeck, Als wollt die Welt schier brechen**, pp. 173-178, on the reaction of Augsburgers to the appearance of a major comet in 1618. Roeck concludes that comets were typically interpreted as a sign for the “punishing rod of God, that would soon be visited upon the Empire”; ibid., p. 177. Writing in the 1670s, chronicler and Lübeck mayor Gottschalk Kirchring noted matter-of-factly that this comet “denoted the beginning of the thirty-year German war”; see below, p. 123 and note 331.


90 “D. Pomarius, Samuel,” in **AHL Leichenpredigten** L XIII 2362.16, excerpted in **AHL Pastorenkartei**, “D. Pomarius (Baumgarten), Samuel.” The “Great Comet” of 1680 is also known as “Newton’s Comet” (C/1680 V1).
beneficial consensus regarding the authority of the urban ministry. From the middle years of the Thirty Years’ War, therefore, the Lübeck clergy could rely upon a basic level of support from their magistrates in their battle against religious non-conformism, buttressed by the council’s symbolic approval for their interpretations of the wider world. Accordingly, though pastors of the post-war generations remained devoted to the orthodoxy of Wittenberg, they showed far less enthusiasm for the kind of open confrontation that had plagued the city’s church life in the first decades of the century. From war years onward, regular civic ceremonies of penance or thanksgiving not only included a strong measure of orthodox Lutheran content, but also gave the council’s sanction to the clergy’s role as seers, or the authoritative interpreters of the wider world.

II. “That I will hold true and be obedient to the honorable council of this city”: Clergy and Magistrates in the Seventeenth Century

On 5 July 1611, the Lübeck city council demanded that a number of the junior pastors serving the city’s parishes formally declare their loyalty to their adopted city. “On the Friday following the Visitation of Mary,” pastor Sebastian Schwan recounted in a subsequent letter of complaint, “were summoned in the name of the honorable council of Lübeck four pastors, Michael Trost, Jacobus Boye, Adamus Helms, and Albertus Raimarus, whereupon it was desired of them, that they should perform an oath of citizenship.” It was not unknown that a junior pastor or Prediger should become a citizen after joining the urban ministry -- citizenship rolls show that several émigré pastors had done so in the preceding two decades—but Schwan

---

and his colleagues found the council’s demand highly irregular. This impression deepened the following week, when the council singled out the young Albert Reimars, the new chaplain of the city’s medieval Burgkapelle or Castle Chapel. On 9 July in St. Mary’s church, the council’s messengers warned Reimars that the plans for his upcoming wedding would be disrupted if he failed to submit to the council’s request; according to Schwan, Reimars was advised that “he should submit his citizen’s oath, otherwise the cook and musicians would not be permitted him at his wedding, but rather be prohibited.” Trost, Boye, Helms, and Schwan soon received similar warnings: “the other pastors were told, that if they did not furnish the oath of citizens, something else would be undertaken with regard to them.” The pastors duly attempted to resist what they saw as the council’s encroachment on the privileges of the clerical estate, but gained little support for their cause at home or abroad; when Schwan wrote to the theological faculty at Helmstedt “concerning the citizenship oath imposed upon him,” the professors responded with the unequivocal opinion that “the dictum of the Apostle Paul, ‘let every soul be subject unto the higher powers,’ applies to the pastors as well as all other men.” After stalling for nearly two years, Schwan capitulated on 25 November 1613, swearing alongside two of his clerical colleagues “that I will hold true and be obedient to the honorable council of this city.”

---

92 Ibid. fol. 1: “And if they might have reasons why they could not acquiesce to such an innovation,” Schwan continued, “the [Ratsherren] had little desire to involve themselves or to assist; rather were [the pastors] pressed, that they ought only to declare themselves, with yes or no, what they wished to do.”

93 Ibid., fol. 1.

94 Ibid., fol. 1-2.

95 SbL Handschriften 2°693, 9: “Schreiben der Theol. Fakultät zu Helmstadt an M. Sebastian Schwan, Prediger zu Lübeck an S. Marien wegen es ihm aufgebürdeten Bürgereides 1612 , 12 Jan.” In their letter, the Helmstedt professors cited the Apostle in Latin (“omnis anima potestatibus supereminentibus subdata sint”); the above rendering of Romans 13:1 is the King James Version.

1611 echoes the frustration pastors often experienced when attempting to carry out the reform of daily life envisioned by Luther and his allies.

Amid growing tensions between guilds and the city council over famine and public debt, pastor Lucas Stein (1616-1671) wrote a polite but firm letter to Bürgermeister Gottschalk von Wickede (1596-1667), in which he took the patrician to task “because of his sinful epithet ‘by God’.”\(^97\) To Stein, the mayor’s habit of using this phrase was clearly blasphemous, and the pastor duly admonished his lord in keeping with his duty to discipline. “Your honor also certainly knows, without my reminder,” he wrote, “that the Lord our God strictly prohibits and condemns to punishment not only all false, but also all mis-applied oaths, [in] Matth. 5: 34-37.”\(^98\) Though Stein had no doubts regarding his pastoral obligation, he feared provoking one of Lübeck’s most powerful men, and was careful to cloak his warning in the appropriate honorific language, and to stress his pure motives: “because I did not wish, that your honor should judge for himself unknowingly, out of anger, have I humbly taken it upon myself to remind you, out of Christian feeling.”\(^99\) Mayor Wickede’s response is unknown, but it clear that Stein employed this same strategy with other members of the social elite. One analogous letter reveals Stein’s attempt to correct the son of a Hamburg mayor, who allegedly “used the names of heathenish gods in song,” e.g. “Leda, Neptuni, Apollinis etc.”\(^100\) Stein was adamant that invoking pagan deities in this manner invited condemnation, but also allowed that the sin could be


\[^98\textit{Ibid.} fol. 1: “Auch wißen E. M. ohn m. erinnerung gar wohl, wie d. H. unser Gott, n. nur alle falsche so auch alle unwohle-wendige jurament Ernst verboth. U. der straff gedammet, seh. Matth. 5. 34. 37.”}\]


\[^100\textit{SbL Handschriften 2°693, no. 25, fol. 1: Lucas Stein, “Erinnerungs-Schreiben an das Hanburgischen Bürgermeisters N. Schlebuschen Sohn wegen des Gebrauchs Heÿdnischen Götten-Nahmen in carminibus.”}.\]
unintentional, and stressed that he was motivated to reprimand the young man “out of worthy love and out of the same [love] of our Christian teachings.”

Pastor Stein’s attempts to combat the blasphemous habits of urban elites encapsulates an tension found in many of the archival sources concerned with urban church life in the seventeenth century. In their letters and memoranda, pastors like Sebastian Schwan and Lucas Stein seem to be walking a fine line between the clergy’s avowed duty to discipline and advise the laity, on one hand, and their socially subordinate status to their elite parishioners, on the other. The potential for conflict between a pastor’s duties and his client status vis-à-vis the magistrates dated to Luther himself, whose vision of the evangelical pastor dispelled the “sacral notion of office” that marked out the Roman clergy, and emphasized the evangelical pastor’s duty to advise both his prince and his parishioners regarding the manifestations of God’s will in the world.

In Lübeck, where the work of building recognizably “Lutheran” disciplinary institutions proceeded slowly, this inherited tension ensured that the debate over the boundaries of the clerical office was long-lived, as the pastors’ attempts to discharge their admonitory duties occasionally conflicted with their duty to obey the council as loyal subjects. Pastors affirmed this unequal power relationship as God-given in their letters and memoranda, but their demonstrated potential to rally the citizenry, as well as the practical utility of their office in combating threats to public order, seems to have discouraged the magistrates from pursuing the kind of overt legal and institutional domination of the clergy favored by many territorial princes. In Lübeck, the process of making a “civic” clergy had much more to do with finding a workable consensus between the fervor displayed by pastors like Lucas Stein, and the political exigencies that occupied patrician elites like Gottschalk von Wickede.

---


102 Dixon and Schorn-Schütte (eds.), *Protestant Clergy*, pp. 4-5.
While pastors occasionally clashed with their magistrates regarding the parameters of lay and clerical authority, they shared their magistrates’ strong sense of obligation to the urban community. Though Antonius Burchardi was exiled in 1614, and Sebastian Schwan departed Lübeck to become a rural Superintendent in Ottendorf in 1619, these are rare cases; after about 1620, the vast majority Lübeck pastors served out their careers in the city’s churches with a minimum of conflict with mayors or city council members. Their smaller institutional struggles are nonetheless highly useful for reconstructing the key stages of the clerical life-cycle, and understanding how crisis impacted the material and professional circumstances in which pastors lived, taught, and admonished. From the early years of the Thirty Years’ War, the need to confront new financial hardships and religious non-conformism in Lübeck reminded both pastors and magistrates that civic patronage was integral to effective pastoral care, and thus to maintaining the trust of the citizens they governed. It is thus no coincidence that the outward symbols of affinity between burgher elite and magistrates proliferated in a century when that trust was most frequently imperiled.

< Becoming a Pastor: The Predigerwahl >

Apart from a few dramatic cases like Burchardi’s, the professional life-cycle of a Lutheran pastor in Lübeck changed little in the century following the Lutheran formula of Concord. The churches continued to be administered by small groups of Kirchenvorsteher or lay churchwardens, who were typically city council members and/or Bürgermeister, supplemented by wealthy merchants. These men bore the primary responsibility for selecting candidates for the ministry, and approving them following a successful trial sermon or Probepredigt. The election of Hermann Lipstorf (1565-1610), a born Lübecker who had studied at Rostock and Wittenberg before becoming rector of the “Electoral School” at Berlin in 1590, ran as nearly to clockwork as was possible. Lipstorf’s name had been short-listed by the four wardens of St. Peter’s church
following the transfer of his predecessor Georg Scherenhagen to St. Mary’s church in 1595. At the end of that year, the jurist and city syndic Dr. Hermann Warmboeke wrote to the noted theologian and Rostock university rector David Chytraeus (1531-1600) to make enquiries about the candidate, whom the professor described as eminently suitable in a letter of recommendation dated 1 February, 1596. This encouraged the St. Peter’s churchwardens to call Lipstorf to the office of Prediger in Lübeck in a letter dated 14 August; meanwhile, they moved to corroborate Chytraeus’s opinion by contacting the rector’s colleague Jakob Coler (1537-1612), Superintendent in Güstrow, and the Berlin city council. Both were approbatory in letters docketed by the Kirchenvorsteher on 13 September; in addition to conduct and doctrinal reliability, Coler noted that “he is moreover quite a man quite learned in languages, especially Latin and Greek, and in the methods of science.” In the meantime, Lipstorf had responded to the summons with alacrity, sending a letter from Rostock on 22 August. “I will therefore, by God’s safe-conduct,” he wrote, present myself before you at Lübeck within a few days, before I depart again for Berlin, so that all things pertaining to this Christian matter, and any others, might be arranged, according to God’s will.” Lipstorf’s trial sermon has not

---

103 The subsequent correspondence identifies the four Kirchenvorsteher of St. Peter’s parish as Arnold Bonnus, Georg (Jürgen) Gruwel, Lucas Steffen, and Hermann Oldenhaue. Bonnus and Gruwel were members of the city council.

104 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 79: “Zeugnis über Herm. Lipstorp.” Chytraeus’s letter is counter-signed by Jacob Coler, which probably explains why the council consulted him further concerning Lipstorf’s election.

105 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 79: “Die Vorsteher der Petri Kirche erkündigen sich bei Jacob Coler nach Herml Lipstorf 1596.”


survived, but it must have been well-received, as he formally joined the city’s ministry by signing the Lübeck Book of Concord on 19 November.\textsuperscript{108}

The archival record of Lipstorf’s election contains no suggestion that the churchwardens who brought him to Lübeck consulted formally with the Geistliches Ministerium when making their choice, and subsequent events suggest that the clergy resented this exclusion.\textsuperscript{109} Three years later, the pastors, led by deputy Superintendent Gerhard Schröder, objected to the election of Caspar Holste (1554-1638) on the grounds that he was a secret Reformed sympathizer, or “crypto-Calvinist.”\textsuperscript{110} Because Holste’s letters of recommendation—one of them from Professor Chytraeus—were in order, the pastors had to focus on alleged past errors in order to prove their accusations.\textsuperscript{111} Their formal “remonstrance” to the council seized upon a funeral sermon from 1597, in honor of the late provost of the Ratzeburg cathedral chapter, in which Holste had allegedly “set out, in public print, that Christ remains of secondary nature to God, which is Arianistic and against the Word of God”; the candidate was therefore “a wolf, who cloaked himself with sheep’s clothing” with the intent of spreading doctrinal error in the Lübeck churches.\textsuperscript{112} Tellingly, however, the ministry’s complaint also contended that the Kirchenvorsteher had circumvented the traditions governing the Predigerwahl by


\textsuperscript{109} Officially, this body consisted of the Superintendent and five parish Hauptpastoren, but was frequently employed in correspondence between council and clergy to denote the parish clergy en masse.

\textsuperscript{110} Holste delivered his candidacy sermon in Lübeck Marienkirche on the sixteenth of September, 1599; AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80, “Der Pastor und die andern Vorsteher der Petri Kirche laden Caspar Holste ein, ein Probepredigt zu halten.”


\textsuperscript{112} AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80, “Die Pastoren gegen der Wahl Caspar Holste”: “so ehr ihn offfnen druck außgehen laßen, dar zuthun, daß ehr darinnen gesetzt q. christy sedeat at de xtram patris secundum naturm triuinam, welche den arrianischte undt wider Godeß wordt sey, darzu ehr dan testimonia auß heillige Schrifft allegeter.”
selecting Holste without clerical consent, and expressed particular resentment concerning “how collectively and unanimously they allowed themselves to consider and decide” the matter of Holste’s candidacy. In response, the council issued a writ affirming Holste’s “legitimate and orderly calling” to the urban ministry in early September of 1600; he was formally inducted to the pastorate the following month. Though Holste would complain repeatedly of persecution by his colleagues, he overcame this sufficiently to remain in office until for over three decades, until “the complaints of age” forced him into retirement in 1635. While the pastors made a dramatic and prolonged show of opposing Holste’s election based on alleged Reformed sympathies, what they actually sought was a more symbiotic working relationship with the burgher elite who managed the urban church.

Pastors of later generations left a trail of documents attesting to their continued efforts to forge a closer partnership with the burgher elite in matters of church government. A memorandum from 1648 recounts a particularly bold attempt by Superintendent Meno Hanneken’s ministry to claim closer involvement in core functions like the Predigerwahl. Writing in the name of the churchwardens of St. Peter’s parish, mayor Otto Brokes offers insight into a dispute that arose concerning the election of a successor for pastor Bernhard Wörger, who had succeeded Holste as parish pastor in 1635. “Hereupon was this debate

---


115  Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 566. Many of the pastors continued to regard Holste’s election as “illegitimate” („electionem pro illegitima“, literally, a „bastardized“ election). The ministry issued a further protest along these lines four days after Holste was introduced to office; cf. AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80, “Das Ministerium bittet den Rath, die Wahl Caspar Holste nicht zuzulassen.” Starck notes that Holste continued to be ostracized in the years thereafter, as his colleagues “wished neither to accept him as a member, nor to admit him to the sittings of the colloquium.”
brought to the council on the 26th of February,” Brokes recorded, “and after much disputation this decree was issued, that the Bürgermeister shall have the power to nominate a person to the vote and the patrons shall consult amicably with the Superintendent and pastors thereupon, that that person may be brought inter eligendes, into consideration.”117 Despite the council’s new willingness to consult with the ministry regarding the suitability of various candidates, however, “their clerical masters were not satisfied with this decree, rather was the entire ministry called together in the house of the Superintendent, and complained thereabout.”118 Brokes relates that they duly composed a “supplication, with copious appendices” protesting the council’s resolution on the grounds that it contravened “the church order and long usage hereto, over 140 years long.” Specifically, Hanneken argued that, “because the Senate had taken on the jus episcopale, the church order had not been observed according to the Peace of Passau,” to which Lübeck had subscribed a decade previously.119 Despite the agility the pastors displayed by invoking Imperial law, their attempt to expand their role in clerical election at the end of the Thirty Years’ War yielded as little practical benefit as had their predecessors’ attempts to discredit Holste. In fact, it seems the parish council now moved with deliberate swiftness when choosing “one of the four or five persons” the pastors had approved for eligibility to the ministry; though we know little of pastor George Drevenstede’s background, his signature in the Lübeck Book of Concord reveals that he entered office in St. Peter’s parish on 29 April, only two months after

116 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 566


118 Ibid., fol. 3: “Mit diesem Decreto sein die Geistliche Herren nicht friedlich gewesen, anders das gantze Ministerium sein in das H. Superintendenten Hause zusammen gefodert gewesen und sich darüber beschweret.”

the pastors moved to obstruct the selection process.\textsuperscript{120}

Superintendents Pouchenius and Hunnius both lobbied the council for a permanent revision of the city’s original Lutheran church order, on the grounds that a new \textit{Kirchenordnung} would clarify the relationship between the city’s spiritual and temporal leaders in matters of church management and discipline. The fate of Hanneken’s supplication of 1648 foreshadowed his continued lack of success in promoting such initiatives; in fact, his initiative in the sphere of church management well have prompted the uncommonly clear stand the council took on church matters around the time of his death in 1671.\textsuperscript{121} In keeping with its title, the “Council’s Directive in Church Matters” contains few ambiguities, apart from implying, in the opening lines, that “issue of a complete church-order” would be forthcoming; in fact, a thorough revision of Bugenhagen’s \textit{Kirchenordnung} was not accomplished until well into the eighteenth century. “Before one can come to a thorough revision,” the \textit{Ratsherren} declared, the “honorable and worthy council of this city, as Christian authority” would undertake to “obviate and abrogate the improprieties that have, up to this point, crept in on all sides.”\textsuperscript{122} In the points that followed, the council reprimanded the pastors for a number of acquired habits,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Ibid.}, fol. 1: “Also hatt der H. Pastor angezeiget die Personen, die sich beÿ Ihr angegebenen 7. oder 8. Personen, davon er 4. oder 5. \textit{inter eligendas} kommen laßen.” Though Brokes does not confirm which pastor spoke for the ministry, his use of the term “der H. Pastor” suggests that the role was assumed by Adam Helms, who served both as head pastor of St. Peter’s parish and as deputy Superintendent to Meno Hanneken. By contrast, Hanneken is always designated “H. Superintendent” in this text. \textit{cf.} Annie Petersen, “Konkordienbuch,” p. 37b: “\textit{M. Georgius Drevenstede} Lubec. Verbi divini in aede D. Pet: Minister hanc Confessionem toto corde approbo subscribebam A[n]n[io] 1648, 29 Apr.”

\textsuperscript{121} AHL \textit{Handschriften}, 819.d: “Verfügung des Raths in kirchlichen Angelegenheiten.” Only a single copy of this decree is preserved, with few contextual documents, but both its timing and contents are significant. According to the archival \textit{Findbuch} (AHL 8.1. Handschriften), this document was issued “soon after 1670”), a period that coincides with a vacancy in the office of Superintendent, following Hanneken’s death on 17. February 1671. His successor Samual Pomarius formally joined the ministry on 6 May 1675. The council, moreover, had been formally re-constituted by the new \textit{Bürgerrezeß} of 1669, following nearly a decade of internal discord, and the new consensus this marked between magistrates and burgher corporations gave the council a firm constitutional footing from which to re-assert its authority in church life.

\end{flushleft}
including their tendency to over-use familiar passages of Scripture when preaching—"over two, three, or at most four sermons must not be delivered from a single chapter"—their preference for administering communion to one another in private, and their alleged willingness to hear confessions in private homes, rather than in church.\(^\text{123}\) The latter rites, the council admonished, were to be observed in the church only, and their remonstrances served to underscore what both sides already know; namely, that the pastors were dependent upon the magistrates, and that their status as both subjects and clients obliged them to act as obedient servants of the urban \textit{Obrigkeit}.

The timing of the 1671 “Directive” is highly suggestive, and not merely because it appeared shortly after the death of a strong-willed church Superintendent. The new constitutional settlement of 1669 had given the Emperor’s sanction to far-reaching reforms in civic finance and in the social structure of the council, but the new, less oligarchic magistracy remained untested, and thus found it necessary to address conspicuous deviations from the city’s church tradition. In particular, their instructions regarding clerical election sought to remove any and all conceptual space for dissent: “thus should the chaplains, the Superintendents and pastors... not concern themselves excessively with the selection and election of servants of the church... far less should they presume, secretly or publicly, to solicit or obstruct these matters or to direct them according to their own prejudice and affect.”\(^\text{124}\) In case any pastor or Superintendent found this vague, the council also demanded that members of the ministry “show to the authorities all due obedience

\(^{123}\) \textit{Ibid.}, fol. 4, § 6: “So sollen auch die Ministr\textit{i} sich selbst nicht \textit{communiciren}, sondern in einer Kirchen wie in der anern, neben andern Leuten...” ; \textit{cf.} fol. 5, § 7: “Die Beichtstuele sollen in der Kirchen und nicht daheim zu Hauße gehalten...” ; \textit{cf.} fol. 1, § 1: “So were eß auch in solcher großen Volkcreichen Gemeine sehr nothing und nutzig, daß die Textus der Wochen Predigten so abgetheilet wurden...und musten über 2. 3. oder zum höchsten 4 Predigten von einem Capittell nicht gehalten werden.”

\(^{124}\) \textit{Ibid.}, fol. 6, § 9: “So sollen sich auch die Capellan wie das H. Superintendenten und Pastorn Ampt nicht weniger, und sich umb die \textit{Electiones} und Wahl der Kirchen-diener, wie auch Consistorial Sachen nicht bekummern, vielweniger sich untersehen heimlich oder öffentlich diese Sachen ... zu \textit{Sollicitiren}, zu verhindern, oder nach Ihren \textit{affecten} und Vorteil zu dirigiren.”
and reverence,” and “abandon all suspicions and grudges conceived without good reason.”

By admonishing the clergy to act in a better-disciplined and more obedient manner than had been the case during a decade of urban unrest, the new council sought to re-affirm longstanding community traditions in the Lutheran church, as the Bürgerrezeß had done in urban constitutional politics.

< Yearly Bread: Pastoral Income >

By excluding the clergy from the process of clerical election, the city council reminded their pastors that while the identity of their office might be mandated by scripture, they owed their livelihoods to the magistrates and wealthy merchants who staffed the church councils. This impression becomes increasingly clear when we consider the source of that livelihood. We have only a partial image of clerical salaries for seventeenth-century Lübeck, due in part to our lack of consistent accounts for the period, but also owing to the nature of the clergy’s income. Luise Schorn-Schütte has concluded that “fluctuations in income were the rule” for pastors of all confessions, as payment of parish pastors depended heavy on local economic cycles, the prosperity of parishioners, “and demographic developments, since payments for clerical services rose and fell with the population.”

Even more problematically, at least a portion of the pastor’s expected annual income seems to have been “in kind,” i.e. in terms of commodities and foodstuffs. These supplemented the salaries, honoraria, and testamentary gifts – in Lübeck Marks, schillings, and Imperial Reichstaler -- they received from the council, parish management, and their parishioners.

A manuscript index of “gifts to the clergy” attributed to historian Jakob von Melle (1659-1743) reveals that clergy were fully salaried by the time the extant copy was created. For the unnamed nineteenth-century copyist, the “pious bequests … with which our predecessors gifted their pastors, particularly at New-Year’s

---

125 Ibid., fol. 7, § 12: “Der Obrigkeit soll man allen billigen gehorsamb und Reverentz zeigen, und sie ohn allen Grundt gefaßete Suspiciones und Wiederwillen fahren laßen…”

126 Luise Schorn-Schütte, “The New Clergies,” in Hsia (ed.), Reform and Expansion, 444-464; p. 458: Schorn-Schütte concludes that “a standardized system of remuneration based on education and experience scarcely existed before the end o the eighteenth century.”
time, and also at Easter and at Michaelmas” were a curiosity from a bygone age. At New Year, in addition to numerous gifts of coin, the pastors received from parishioners over two dozen gifts of foodstuffs, including “one cockerel rooster” from two different sources, “one roast of beef,” “one salmon,” fourteen “tongues of oxen”, a goose, varying amounts of meal and wheat, and two Stäbchen (i.e. “rods” or “measures”) of wine. The gifts at Easter were less grand and numerous, but centered around Fladen or dough-cakes, though “sugar cakes” and “egg-breads” are also represented, along with “half a salmon,” “one keg of wine vinegar,” and a handful of “ducats” and “florins.” Finally, Michaelmas in late September yielded a long list of gifts of food, particularly preserved fish in wholes or halves (Bölting) and hams (Schincken), with a smattering of poultry and grains; these were numerous enough that if shared out equally, each of the city’s pastors would have received at least two such gifts. Moreover, they would have enjoyed an annual portion of beef at the latter holiday; there was “after Michaelis 1650, as in all years, a grand ox,” accompanied by a collection of money, by which a “not insignificant sum” was furnished for the maintenance of the pastors. We lack analogues for the detailed catalog of 1650, but the unnamed scribe suggests that this year was not exceptional in terms of lay largesse, but should “serve as an example” of seventeenth-century practice. The manner in which these gifts paralleled the liturgical calendar suggests that at various times, the pastors relied upon the laity for


128 Ibid., s.v. “Auf Ostern 1650 verehret ihm...”

129 Ibid., s.v. “Auf Michaelis 1650 verehret ihm...”

130 Ibid.: “Noch würde ihm nach Michaelis 1650 gleich wie sonst alle Jahr ein ansehnlichen Ochsen, und noch dazu wurden Nebenst des dazu gesammleten Geldes eine nicht geringe Summe verehret.”

131 Ibid. The copyist suggests that 1650 “may serve an an example, of what a certain pastor of this locale has recorded.” The reference to “a certain pastor” evokes von Melle, and the catalog notes for this manuscript date the copy to the nineteenth century, which is consistent with the script itself. The entries themselves run only to 1700, that is, to the earlier years of von Melle’s long career in Lübeck.
supplements to their daily bread, as well as for their monetary income.  

Monetary gifts to the pastors appear as a typical feature of citizen’s testaments in the seventeenth century. These could benefit any combination of the city’s clerics—beneficiaries of testamentary giving range from a single favored confessor to the entire staff of the ministry—and were not made solely of piety, or gratitude for pastoral care, but also for spiritual services not yet rendered. Bürgermeister Heinrich Wedemhof’s bequest of 1588 underscores the impact that elite largesse had on a pastor’s annual income. Wedemhof was “in his time, likely the richest man in Lübeck,” a status reflected in aggregate testamentary bequests totaling more than 200,000 Reichstaler.  

When he died in 1589, every one of the city’s pastors benefitted, but with differences that reflected the clerical hierarchy and the deceased’s loyalty to his home parish of St. Mary’s. The magistrate “bequeathed in his testament 6 Rtl. to the Herrn Superintendent, and 4 Rtl. to every pastor (Prediger) of St. Mary’s.” As a wealthy magistrate, Wedemhof naturally counted St. Mary’s as his home church, but he did not neglect the other pastors; his testament earmarked a further “3 Rtl. each, to all other Prediger in Lübeck.” Melle’s record omits Wedemhof’s motives, but other parishioners attached clear conditions to their gifts, and August-Wilhelm Eßmann has emphasized that numerous seventeenth-century testators employed their testamentary gifts to urge diligence in pastoral care. Guild butcher Heinrich Barchän made over twelve Lübeck marks to his “confessor and minister” with the request that the man “pray and preach more diligently,” while the wheelwright Henning Parchin was more ambitious, dedicating two silver thaler to each of the city’s pastors and ministers, in the expressed home that they might “more

132 Ibid. s.v. “Michaelis 1650.”


diligently and faithfully teach the word of God.” Finally, some well-to-do citizens gave gifts to the pastors out of posthumous self-interest, as did a certain Mathias von der Wÿde in his testament of 1627. Wÿde “bequeathed to the pastors of St. Jacob’s church one thousand Lübeck marks, to have a diligent oversight over his grave in front of the choir, that the same not be opened, sold, or otherwise dispossessed.” While such overtly conditional bequests are less common, they refer most directly to the patron-client relationship that determined a considerable portion of a pastor’s annual income.

Lübeck’s seventeenth-century clergy invoked the new hardships of their times to buttress their claims to a unique status vis-à-vis both council and lay citizenry. Gaps in the city’s Geistliches Ministerium archive preclude a complete reconstruction of their attempts to acquire new financial concessions from the council, but it is clear that by the early years of the Thirty Years’ War, the pastors were not above pleading poverty. In 1620, for instance, the “Superintendent, Senior, Pastors and members of the ministry of the divine word” wrote to the council in order to request a general increase in their salaries. Their missive of 3 November stressed that “the current supplication” was motivated strictly by necessity, or in their words, “because of still further troubles and importunities, because thereto out now long-increasing affliction, such [a request] breaks free from us, and forces us to the same against our will.” These formalities were meant to prepare the council to agree to a dramatic re-evaluation of the pastors’ pay rate, which had fallen victim to inflation. “In particular we find painfully after the six or seven years hereto,” the pastors continued, “that the Reichstaler was worth two Lübeck Marcks...[it] is in the time considered [i.e. the present] worth five.” An

---


inflation rate of 250% ensured that “our stipend not from year to year, rather from month to month, and also from day to day is reduced and made lesser.”\textsuperscript{138} The clergy declined to name a figure when requesting the council’s intercession against their impending poverty, suggesting instead that their magistrates “shall consider the honorable household of the preachers, and…. open the fount of generosity toward us… so that we may not suffer want.”\textsuperscript{139} Whatever rhetorical license they took in framing their request, it reflected the financial reality at the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War. Because they cast the pastors in the role of supplicants, clerical efforts to improve their own material circumstances by appealing to civic patronage offer an important counterpoint to the traditional rights they claimed in other areas of church government.

In a memorandum to the ministry on 6 December, 1620, the council declared “that each and every \textit{Pastor and Prediger}” belonging to the urban church “shall have his salary improved with one hundred marks yearly.”\textsuperscript{140} The council explained that they acted “out of good affection and diligent care for the honorable ministry,” but also stressed that their largesse conferred fresh obligation upon its recipients.\textsuperscript{141} “Against which the honored council assures itself” their resolution continued, “that the honorable Ministry will acknowledge this, good-willingly and not merely as is proper … that the divine service and their own office are esteemed, led, and maintained singularly and solely for the glory of God, for fruitful teaching, and for holy edification of

\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Ibid.}, fol. 100a: “insonderheit sein dann unsern sechs oder sieben Jahren hero schmertzlich vergefunden, in dem uns unser der Zeit, als der Reichsthaller zweer Marck Lbeckisch gegolten, verordnetet \textit{Stipendi}, zwaar am Lubecksichen Marcken so in gedachter fünf, so unser von Jahren zu Jahren, sondern von Monaten zu Monaten, auch von Tage zur Tage abgenommen, unnd geringer worden.”

\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Ibid}, fol 105: “Das sie auf der \textit{Predicanten} Ehrliches Haußhalten achtunge Haben, und… sie werde more & \textit{exemplo majorum}, \textit{die fonts liberalitatis} gegenn uns alhier tunn, und uns von der Kirchen, deren wir dienen… also versorgen laßen, das wir nicht noth leiden.”


\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Ibid.}, fol. 102: “Darnach aber damit eines Erbarn Rath guete affection und Sorgfaltigkeit zu einem Ehrw: \textit{Ministerium} desto mehr zu verfueren [i.e. verfahren].”
the Christian community.”

They stressed this point further by admonishing the pastors regarding four specific issues that had been the subject of conflict or scandal in the previous forty years. An injunction “that the younger pastors, along with the others, approach and address the Herr Superintendent with more obedience, observance, and respect,” may be read as a comment upon the lasting rift in the ministry caused by the dismissal of Antonius Burchardi in 1613. The next point critiqued the clergy’s polemical fervor by demanding that “the personnel of the ministry, old and young alike,” dedicate their disciplinary efforts “wholly to godliness and edification, without various private affections, without vituperation, and without remonstrating against other churches and estates.”

In making this demand, the lords of the council referred explicitly to a formal reprimand the council had issued against libelous preaching in 1588, and “which [the council] hierwith desires to have renewed.” Though Ratsherren were also beleaguered by the city’s growing financial crisis, they demonstrated considerable dexterity in using the financial obligations of church management to assert their authority in an ongoing debate over the parameters of clerical authority.

< Posthumous Patronage: Retirement, Death, and Commemoration >

In 1661, on the third Sunday in Lent, senior pastor Gerhard Winter (1589-1661) died while performing his duties in St. Jacob’s church. His obituary sermon, written by his colleagues, noted that the pastor had intended to preach that Sunday; instead he “he passed gently away in his confessional

---

142 Ibid., fol. 102: “Dahin gen versichet sich Ein Erbar Rath, Ein Ehrw: Ministerium werde solche seine guthwilligkeit nicht alleine gebuerlich erkennen, sondern auch sampt und sonders bestes Fleißes ... dahin erachten, das den Gottes dienst und ihr Amt für allen dingen, auch einzig und allein zu Gottes ehren, fruchtbarlichem unterricht, und heilsamen erbauung der Christlichen gemeine angesehen, geführet und getrieben werde.”

143 Ibid., fol. 102a: “Fürs Andere, Das die jungen Prediger, nebenst den andern, dem Herren Superintendenti... mit mehrere Gehorsamb, observantz und respect... sollen fürcommen und begegen”; and fol. 103: “...daß das solches geschehe nach: und auß Gottes Wortts und befehlig, und Christlichen vermandunge, alles zur Gottseligkeit und erbauung, ohne einige privat affecten, schmähung, auch anderen Kirchen und Stände beschwerunge.”

144 Ibid., fol. 103: “In waß er auch Ein Erbar Rath dieses Puncks halber Anno 1588 dem Ehrwürdigen Ministerio einen schriftlichen bescheidt zustellen laßen, dem er hiermit will renoviret haben.”
(Beichtstuhl), just as he was preparing to ascend the pulpit (Canzel). Winter’s mode of departure may seem dramatic, but it was not terribly unusual for seventeenth-century clergy, who remained in office until they died, or until “weakness” or “frailty” (Schwachheit) rendered them physically or mentally unable to fulfill their duties. In March 1645, head pastor Jonas Nicolai suffered a stroke in midst of a catechism sermon in the city’s cathedral (Dom), while in 1685, Hinrich Engenhagen, who had replaced Winter as head pastor of St. Jacob’s church, died from a sudden episode --heart failure or stroke-- while taking part in a funeral procession through the city streets. Winter had reached the very respectable age of seventy-one, and Engenhagen seventy, but their colleagues often died younger; Superintendent Hunnius, born only four years before his colleague Winter, had taken ill and died in April 1643, at the age of fifty-seven. Junior pastor George Scherenhagen, of St. Mary’s parish, counts among the youngest of Lübeck’s deceased pastors, having succumbed to plague on 3 September 1603, “in the forty-fourth year of his age,” and in his thirteenth year of service to the church. The likelihood of an early death was not lost on pastor Winter, who had been promoted from Prediger to Hauptpastor in the first decade of the Thirty Years’ War, and had publicly interpreted the conflict as the “rod and bloody sword” of God’s wrath in 1627. He purchased a gravesite inside St. Jacob’s church in 1636, where he was buried on 27 March, 1661.

While all of Lübeck’s pastors confronted poverty, warfare, and plague during the first half of the seventeenth century, few suffered worse trials than head pastor Jonas Nicolai, who came to Lübeck after


147 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 742 ff. Starck offers an extensive obituary, but reveals little of the causes of Hunnius’s untimely death.


149 Melle, Gründliche Nachricht, p. 203.
fleeing the plunder and razing of Magdeburg by Imperial armies on 20 May, 1631. Nicolai’s last will and testament piously credited God for the refuge and new livelihood he found in Lübeck, but it is clear that he suffered poverty prior to his death in November, 1646. Four months after his stroke in the pulpit, he petitioned the “patrons of the Cathedral Church” for the formal “substitution” that would relieve him of his pastoral duties.150 Such requests were common in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though they varied greatly in tone. When seeking a pension for the aged deputy Superintendent Joachim Dobbin in 1612, the pastors reminded the Ratsherren that the material circumstances of a pastor’s life were essential to his authority; therefore, “the fathers of the church (Kirchenväter) should give attention to the honorable institution of the pastor’s household, that they not allow it to lapse into poverty, whether such transpires from injury, or from sickness.”151 In 1645, Nicolai was ill and acting alone, and his request “concerning a substitution [and] financial support” thus tried rather harder to evoke his patrons’ empathy: “how I shall now content the apothecary,” the ailing pastor wrote in July, “I do not know.”152 Nicolai’s story rings true, as his testament—one of the few clerical wills preserved from this time—avers that “my goods were reduced after the burning and destruction of Magdeburg,” and discloses his childlessness. Likewise, his aggregate bequests disposed of far less money and property than do those made by other pastors of similar rank.153 Faced with


151 AHL Geistliches Ministerium II, “Supplicatio Ministerÿ ad senatum, wegen Verordnung eines substituten M. Dobino, fol. 160-166; 161-161a: “Die Kirchenväter sollen acht haben, auff daß ehrliche Haußhalt der Praedicanten, daß sie ihnen keine Not laßen leiden, wens sonders hat aus Schade, oder Krankheit vorfielen.” This missive is dated 13 January 1612, and cites a long list of former colleagues who had been pensioned off by the parish lords, but they failed to convince the council, who rejected the request in an extensive reply issued the following month; cf. “Decretum Senatus auf vorgehende supplication,” in ibid., fol. 167-175. Cf. Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 584, on the same outcome.


growing debts, he had few options apart from appeal to his parish churchwardens, who eventually approved his requests. In June of 1646, five months before Nicolai died, acting Superintendent Adam Helms was empowered to engage two young pastors to take over "the two sermons of M. Jonas Nicolai, pastor of the cathedral, from this day on, until the coming advent season of the present year." Following Nicolai’s death in November, the same patrons elected one of the substitutes --Joachim Wendt from Rostock, who subsequently married Helms’s daughter—to the post of junior Prediger in the Lübeck cathedral.155

The crucial stages of the pastoral life cycle became loci for debate in times of crisis, but on the whole, magistrates demonstrated more concern for the well-being and status of their pastors than their institutional disputes suggest. Individual members of the social and political elite continued to favor the clergy in their wills – in his testament of 1631, city council “agent” Paul Storck earmarked a Reichstaler each for Superintendent Hunnius and his “spiritual father” Michael Siricius, alongside “two hundred Lübeck Marks for the clergymen displaced by the war”—and they did the same collectively in commemoration of deceased pastors.156 Though fewer citizens made legacies of pious nature as the Thirty Years’ War faded into memory—by 1700, the frequency of such gifts in burgher testaments had fallen to one-half of what they were before the Thirty Years’ War – those who could afford it gave more to the churches; the aggregate annual sum earmarked for church improvements, as well as pastors, chaplains and theological students, increased


155 On Wendt’s career in Lübeck, see AHL Leichenpredigten, L XIII 3389.10, “Wendt, Joachim.”

consistently during the same period, peaking at just under 500 Lübeck marks per annum by 1700.\textsuperscript{157}

Meanwhile, a new wave of elite patronage focused on death memorials – both lay \textit{Gedächtnistafeln} and clerical portraiture—helped to create a conspicuous public face for Lutheranism in the city’s churches.

In Lübeck, the tradition of erecting visual memorials to influential citizens and church leaders dated to the late middle ages, but the Little Ice Age and Thirty Years’ War created a conspicuous vogue for the practice in the later seventeenth century. The monuments commissioned by well-to-do citizen reflect the popularity of \textit{memento mori} images and printed funerary sermons (\textit{Leichenpredigten}) that imprinted seventeenth-century Germany at large. In both chronological and stylistic terms, this fashion for commemoration can be identified as a “Baroque” phenomenon that joined civic belonging and Lutheran confessional identity to a heightened consciousness of death. Many of the church gravestones indexed by Johannes Warncke in the early twentieth century date from this period, suggesting that the practice of re-selling graves, previously common after about a half-century of burial, was gradually being discontinued by 1700.\textsuperscript{158} In the preceding centuries, however, gravesites were transferrable in the same manner as church pews, and pastors often purchased their own; Gerhard Winter, for example, acquired his in the midst of the Thirty Years’ War, and his younger colleague Johannes Stolterfoht (1600-1668) did the same. His testamentary instructions, written in 1665, refer explicitly to “my grave in the penitent’s chapel of St. Mary’s,” and in fact, his family owned several sites in this vicinity.\textsuperscript{159} Magdeburg survivor Jonas Nicolai presents a contrast; while his testament notes formulaically that “my pale corpse shall be interred in the earth, whence it came,” it mentions no prepared gravesite. Rather, the pastor wrote “I desire that [my body] might be buried according to Lübeck custom in

\textsuperscript{157} Eßmann, \textit{Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz}, pp. 125-127.

\textsuperscript{158} Johannes Warncke, “Grabsteine der Lübecker Kirchen,” AHL Hs. 1030.

the parish church of the Cathedral (Dom).”\textsuperscript{160} It was clearly typical for pastors to be buried in the churches, but for Nicolai, the illness and penury of his last years were such that he could not purchase his own grave, but would continue to rely on the largesse of his secular patrons even in death.\textsuperscript{161}

No record of Nicolai’s gravesite survives, but even if the parish council refused his last request, they did not neglect to commemorate his service to the church. Today, Lübeck’s church interiors are faint shadows of their early-modern splendor; the “Palm Sunday” bombing raid of 28-29 March 1942 reduced much of Lübeck’s Marienkirche and Petrikirche to ruins, and inflicted major damage on two of the city’s three remaining churches.\textsuperscript{162} It is nonetheless possible to reconstruct an outline the clergy’s posthumous presence there, thanks to the descriptions found in Johann Krüger’s The Blessed and Ornamented City of Lübeck (1697) and Jacob von Melle’s Thorough Report on the Free and Imperial City of Lübeck (1787).\textsuperscript{163} A few surviving artifacts confirm that seventeenth-century pastors were conspicuously present in church decor, thanks to the widespread practice of memorializing parish pastors in full-length portraits displayed in their home


\textsuperscript{161}AHL Testamente, “Johannes Stolterfoht” and “Jonas Nicolai.” Nicolai Nicolai’s illness caused the poverty that drove him to appeal to the parish council in 1645, and his relative penury becomes evident when we compare his testament to those left by his colleagues. Whereas Stolterfoht’s pro forma bequest for public works amounted to ten Lübeck marks, Nicolai gave only one and one-half to the same cause, a ratio corroborated by their testamentary bequests for poor relief. Nicolai gave one-and-one half Lübeck marks to the city’s Armenhaus, while Stolterfoth earmarked ten for the same cause.

\textsuperscript{162}Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 2; Hasse, Marienkirche zu Lübeck, p. 8. Hasse optimistically notes that “the fire of 1942 made it possible to examine the building history upon the naked walls of the church,” but his study of St. Mary’s places the extent of the destruction in sharp relief; for example, all the epitaphs adorning the central nave of the Marienkirche perished in the bombing and fire, with corresponding damage to the organ works and other liturgical furnishings; see pp. 214-215. Bonnie Lee’s study of Lutheran material culture in Lübeck confirms that of the five Gothic churches located on the Altstadtinsel, only St. Jacob’s or the Jakobikirche escaped extensive damage from English bombs; cf. Lee, “Communal Transformations.”

\textsuperscript{163}Johann Gerhard Krüger, Beglückte und Geschmückte Stadt Lübeck; Jacob von Melle, Gründliche Nachricht von der kaiserl. Freyen und des H. R. Reichs Stadt Lübeck.
churches.\textsuperscript{164} Because pastor Nicolai could not afford to purchase his own grave, or even pay his apothecary, it is highly unlikely that he commissioned the portrait that adored the Lübeck Cathedral during the subsequent centuries.

In his \textit{City of Lübeck}, published in 1697, Krüger located “the \textit{epitaph} of Jonas Nicolai, pastor who died \textit{Anno} 1646” “behind the pulpit” in the main nave of the cathedral.\textsuperscript{165} Krüger’s use of the medieval-Latin \textit{epitaphium} is vague, as he uses the same word to describe the ornate cenotaphs or \textit{Gedächtnistafeln} commissioned by preeminent burghers.\textsuperscript{166} However, further comparison suggests that Nicolai was commemorated in the same medium as Pastor Daniel Lipstorf (c. 1600-1679), who died in 1679 following “forty-two years as pastor” in the city, and whose memorial Krüger describes as “a portrait in living size,” located adjacent to Nicolai’s epitaph. Because Krüger’s next comment centers on a crest found “between the two portraits (\textit{Bildnisse}) previously mentioned,” we can assume that Nicolai’s memorial was also a formal portrait, rather than a carven or sculpted tablet of the kind popular among the burgher elite.\textsuperscript{167} Jacob von Melle confirms this in his description of the Cathedral, but his context suggests that Nicolai’s likeness was relocated sometime after 1697: “to the side,” von Melle noted in his description of one of the church’s chapels: “hanges the portrait (\textit{Bildnis}) of M. Jonas Nicolai, pastor of this church, and beneath the same is found a confessional seat (\textit{Beichtstuhl}).”\textsuperscript{168} This pairing of a pastor’s image with liturgical furnishings was no accident,


\textsuperscript{166} The vogue for elaborate cenotaphs among the burgher elite far outstripped clerical portraiture in number, expense, and variety; cf. chapter six, below.


\textsuperscript{168} This chapel was built by the patrician Warendorf family centuries before the Reformation, and in Jacob von Melle’s time (1659-1743) still contained the disused remnants of their private altar; see Melle, \textit{Gründliche Nachricht}, p. 235:
as von Melle locates another confessional in the central nave, among “the first northern pillars” near the choir, above which “the portrait of pastor Joachim Wend [sic] in life-size” could be seen. Melle, Gründliche Nachricht, p. 238: “Der erste nördliche Pfeiler, vom Chore an zu rechnen, trägt... westwärts des pastoris Joachim Wend Bildniß in Lebensgröße.” Although “Beichtstuhl” (literally “confession chair”) is commonly translated as “confessional,” pre-war photographs suggest that this was a simple, unenclosed seat, and not the enclosed booth implied by the latter term.


Magistrates like Ritter saved their grandest largesse for themselves and their families, but the artworks they commissioned for their pastors and confessors in the seventeenth century paralleled their increased concern for preserving their own memories. In keeping with the clerical hierarchy, the Superintendents were the first to receive portraits; the guidebooks reveal that Superintendent Andreas Pouchenius (d. 1600) was memorialized in this way, as were Martin Luther and Hermann Bonnus (1504-1548),
the founding leader of the evangelical church in Lübeck. St. Jacob’s *Hauptpastor* Johann Stein, who died in 1637, was among the first of *Hauptpastoren* to receive this kind of visual commemoration. Portraits of senior parish pastors like Stein would account for the majority of the paintings erected in the city’s parish churches during the subsequent decades – St. Mary’s church acquired portraits of Michael Siricius (d. 1648), Jacob Stolterfoth (d. 1668), and Albert Balemann (d. 1672) in a single generation—though Melle reveals that after about 1650, junior *Prediger* like Jacob Lippen, a native Lübecker who died in 1674 at only thirty-six years of age, were also commemorated in this way. Today, few of these portraits survive, but extant examples reveal why both Krüger and Melle so readily included basic biographical data for the clerics mentioned in their guidebooks.

In the seventeenth century, and particularly during the career of famed organist Dietrich Buxtehude (1668-1705), Lübeck’s magistrates, patrician families, and guild elders re-made the city’s sacral spaces in a recognizably civic and Baroque idiom. Their gifts of altars, pulpits, organs, and elaborate cenotaphs articulated lasting dedication to the city and its Lutheran traditions, while a less costly, but equally coherent current of their patronage commemorated the pastors who devoted their lives to preaching and pastoral care. The restored

---


174 Krüger, *Beglückte und Geschmückte Stadt Lübeck*, p. 101. An example of a junior pastor commemorated this way was Jacob Lippen, a native Lübecker who died in 1674 at only thirty-six years of age; cf. Melle, *Gründliche Nachricht*, p. 239.

175 Cf. chapter six, below.
portrait of deputy Superintendent Johannes Reich (1617-1688), a thirty-nine-year veteran of St. Aegidien’s parish, serves as a template for the genre of clerical portraiture described by the early-modern guidebook authors. Reich’s portrait is full-length, and bears a Latin legend outlining his career in Lübeck; he was “called to the ministry here” in 1648, “made pastor” [i.e. Hauptpastor] in 1662, and was declared Senior or deputy Superintendent in 1685, until he “died peacefully in Christ” on 8 May, 1688. Though formulaic in both style and content, the clergy’s memorials were distinct from other characteristic forms of seventeenth-century lay largesse, which focused on carved cenotaphs, organs, and church furnishings ranging from new candelabra to ornate altars and pulpits. Both the composition history and reception of clerical portraiture require further research; for instance, this conspicuous difference in medium may have served to symbolically affirmed the unique role of the pastor’s office and ministry in the urban community, or to remind later generations of pastors of their duties toward the magistrates and wealthy citizens who governed the church, or both at the same time. However, even a cursory examination offers intriguing conclusions. Because the indigent Nicolai and the youthful Lippen were commemorated in the same medium and style as their Superintendents, the proliferation of portraits in the midst of crisis served to articulate the status shared by all members of the urban clergy, regardless of rank, and thus their obligations to the magistrates and urban corporation. At the same time, however, publicly commemorating the clergy in the churches served to enhance their status vis-à-vis the vast majority of burgher parishioners, who could neither afford nor had access to a physical memorial

---

in the sacred space of the church. Like the pastors’ salaries, therefore, clerical portraits reflected the
consensus, gradually forged between clerical and worldly authorities in response to crisis, regarding the vital
importance of maintaining and defending the city’s inherited religious traditions.

< Nihil dederunt: Conclusions >

When Sebastian Schwan gave in to council’s demands regarding the oath of citizenship in late 1613,
he could take comfort in the fact that as a pastor, he would receive an honorary exemption from paying the
Bürgergeld, or the fee that accompanied the swearing of the burgher oath. Later generations enjoyed the
same privilege: citizenship rolls reveal that pastors were consistently exempted from paying this fee, and
these cases received special mention in the Bürgerannahmebücher preserved in the city archives. Entries
range from “nihil dederunt” (“he paid nothing”), a frequent notation of the early seventeenth century, to
“gratis” (“without payment” or “freely”) in the post-war decades, with a simple zero or dash the most
common by 1700. 177 While a one-time benefit, this exemption grew in value in the course of the century, as
the council’s need for money drove them to raise the price of Bürgergeld contributions by a factor greater
than inflation demanded. New pastors remained immune, however, even though they were subjected to the
new taxes and increased workload that became their lot in a time of overlapping crises. Though not exclusive
to the clergy—the rectors and teachers of the city’s schools were also exempted—the pastor’s sustained
privilege vis-à-vis the citizenship fee reflects the importance of public acts of collaboration, both in ad hoc
acts of policy as well as ceremonial life, in papering over the rifts that divided the Lübeck’s pastors and
magistrates in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

New disciplinary initiatives, public ceremonies of penitence and celebration, and the proliferation of
pastors’ portraits attest that clergy and magistrates in Lübeck enjoyed a far more symbiotic relationship by
the time the city celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of the Formula of Concord than they had when

177 Archiv der Hansestadt Lübeck, Cameraria 1337 and 1338 / Bürgerannahme-Buch 1591-1633, and 1633-1801.
the council adopted the *Konkordienwerk* in 1580. As war and economic hardship exacerbated the city’s economic decline in the 1620s and 1630s, magistrates who had expressed skepticism about moral reform offered unprecedented support for the pastors’ self-appointed war against heterodoxy. The decades of the Little Ice Age witnessed the worst disputes over the limits of clerical and magisterial authority, but cases of insubordination were noticeably curbed by the coeval arrival of Nicolaus Hunnius and the Thirty Years’ War in Lübeck. As the war threatened both physical destruction and financial collapse, the council recognized that an organized and disciplined ministry was crucial to preserving internal order, and offered them a divinely-sanctioned means of articulating their own authority in dangerous times. They perpetuated their support in the latter half of the century by placing firm new restrictions on the city’s Calvinists, and by suppressing conventiclers and early Pietists. While pastors expressed occasional dissatisfaction over the lack of consultation in church government until at least the 1670s, the realities of the clerical livelihood bespeak a far more symbiotic relationship with the council than was often expressed in their formal remonstrances. As the “fathers of the church” began to collaborate with their “shepherds of souls,” the clergy acquiesced more willingly their obligations to honor and obey their secular authorities, though they demanded that magistrates act decisively in matters pertaining to the dignity of pastoral office. Thus, though pastors and magistrates continued to debate the demarcation between spiritual and secular authority in specific matters of church government, the new cohesion they forged in the Thirty Years’ War suggests that in Lübeck, a workable consensus over confessional identity — i.e. what it meant to be a avowedly Lutheran city of the northern Empire— was a product of a protracted encounter between clerical orthodoxy and civic tradition forced upon magistrates and pastors by the new material hardships and spiritual dangers of the seventeenth century.
Chapter Two

“In Times of General Need”: Lübeck in the Little Ice Age, 1575-1620

By about 1600, daily life was more difficult for many urban dwellers than had been the case a generation previously. In Lübeck, a new sense of hardship can be traced to 1575, when the printer Asswerus Kröger (d. 1594) produced the first of a series of devotional works, entitled *A New Christian Prayer-book, Augmented with Additional Consolatory Prayers*. While most of the contents concerned familiar acts of everyday piety, the new “consolatory prayers” advertised in the book’s title addressed contemporary threats to life, livelihood, and the ordering of society. Of these, the “Prayer to be said in Times of General Need” is the most expansive, requesting that “all our sins be graciously forgiven,” and that God might “grant a peaceful, Christian and blessed ordering (Regiment) in these cities and lands, and graciously preserve our authorities (Obrigkeit) ... in these dangerous times.” “A Prayer in Time of Pestilence” was more specific, requesting Christ’s intercession against the frequent epidemics that befell commercial entrepots like Lübeck from the fourteenth century onward. Finally, the “Prayer on account of the afflictions of the Christian Churches, because of the Antichrist and the Turks” admonished Christians to pray diligently for the preservation of the “true Christian Church,” and of the Holy Roman Empire itself, in the face of the Ottoman onslaught in the south-east. The unknown compilers did not neglect a believer’s duty to gratitude –the

---


179 Entries like “A Prayer upon retiring to bed,” “A Prayer for the First Sunday of Advent,” and “A Prayer before the Sermon,” address “everyday” events in home and church life; see *Bedebok*, pp. iii, ff., pp. xx, ff., and cclxx, f.


181 “Ein Gebedt in der tydt der Pestilentzie,” in *Bedebok*, pp. ccxlviii – ccli. This prayer suggests that curbing pestilence required a general improvement of morals, and thus instructs the reader to request divine mercy in “preserving [us] from the dreadful contagion of sin.”

manual includes several prayers of thanksgiving (Danksagungen)—but on the whole, the New Prayer-Book suggests that by 1575, dearth, fear, and the increased likelihood of suffering played a greater role in shaping the outlook of most Lübeckers than did the perceptible richness of God’s blessings.

I. Crisis in Print: Hanseatic Decline and the Little Ice Age

In the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Lutheran pastors in the Holy Roman Empire produced a corpus of writings advising magistrates and the urban Mittelstand how they ought to respond to the Little Ice Age (c. 1570-1630) and Thirty Years War (1618-1648).183 Hartmut Lehmann has shown that such works dwelt upon the Not, Angst und Pein (“want, fear and suffering”) endemic to both eras, and Lutheran Lübeck was no exception to the wider trend.184 The 1575 Prayer Book must have found an eager audience, as the printer Kröger produced a similar book the following year, and in 1594, reprinted a new devotional handbook by a Dresden preacher named Peter Glaser, entitled A New Book of Teachings, Comfort, Confession, and Prayer.185 Though the print record for this period is incomplete, the new popularity of Lutheran devotional works by 1600 suggests that many urban dwellers embraced Lutheran piety as an antidote to hunger, plague, and “general need” in a time when life had grown perceptibly more difficult.

__________________

183 Hartmut Lehmann, “Lutheranism in the Seventeenth Century,” in R. Po-Chia Hsia (ed.), Reform and Expansion, 1500-1660 (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 56-72; p. 71: “the lasting legacy of seventeenth-century Lutheranism may therefore not be, if all aspects are considered, blind obedience towards worldly power and a tendency towards authoritarian forms of government. By contrast, the lasting legacy of seventeenth-century German Lutherans can be found, and cherished, in the edifying tracts that they wrote, in their hymns, their prayers, and their poems.” On the chronology of Lutheran Orthodoxy, see Kolb (ed.), Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, p. 11.

184 While the majority of the vernacular prayers in the 1575 “Bedebok” concerned familiar acts of everyday piety, the new “consolatory prayers” advertised in the book’s title addressed contemporary threats to life, livelihood, and the ordering of society; of these, the “Prayer to be said in Times of General Need” is the most expansive, requesting that “all our sins be graciously forgiven,” and that God might “grant a peaceful, Christian and blessed ordering (Regiment) in these cities and lands, and graciously preserve our authorities (Obrigkeit) ... in these dangerous times.” “Ein Gebedt in gemener Nodt tho sprekende,” in Bedebok; pp. ccxlii – ccxlvi.

Works like the *New Prayer Book* bear witness to the overlapping crises that shaped the mental world of Lübeckers between the mid-1570s and the spread of religious warfare from Bohemia to the Empire in the early 1620s. The broader corpus of printed sources for the period 1580-1620 suggests that it was not merely the printer Kröger’s intended clientele (educated Lutheran burghers of the middling and uppers social ranks) who perceived that they were living in a period of general crisis by the end of the seventeenth century; even the illiterate would have absorbed a sense of urgency through the oral circulation of news, in liturgical life, and through the popular media of song.\(^{186}\) The fears devotional works sought to allay were, by and large, justified: geography and economic orientation ensured that the mercantile cities that depended on the Baltic Sea economy for their livelihood fared worse from the growth of the Atlantic economy than did urban centers like Hamburg, Bremen, and the port cities of the Netherlands, all of which had direct access to this sphere via the North Sea. For Lübeck in particular, the waning of the Hanseatic League exacerbated the general subsistence hardship caused by the second period of the “Little Ice Age,” a period of prolonged climate cooling marked by shorter growing seasons and the advance of glaciers.\(^{187}\) Meanwhile, Lübeck’s unsuccessful involvement in the Livland War (1558-1583), the Seven Years’ War of the North (1563-1570) and in the succession conflict that sparked Polish-Swedish War (1600-1629) attested to the city’s loss of influence on the international stage.\(^{188}\) All too cognizant of the causal relationship between hunger, warfare, and epidemic disease, Lübeckers also feared *Pest* or plague, outbreaks of which bookended this period,

\(^{186}\) On the audience for devotional works like the *Bedebok*, see Lehmann, “Lutheranism in the seventeenth century,” p. 61.


\(^{188}\) The “Northern Wars” that accompanied Swedish expansion in the Baltic sphere comprised 15 separate conflicts between 1550 and 1700. Lübeck was militarily involved in the Livland War (1558-1583), the Seven Years’ War of the North (1563-1570) and briefly in the succession conflict leading to the Polish-Swedish War (1600-1629). See Robert I. Frost, *The Northern Wars: War, State and Society in Northeastern Europe, 1558-1721* (London, New York: Longman, 2000), pp. 11-16.
occurring in 1564-65 and 1625-26, with lesser plagues occurring more frequently.\textsuperscript{189} Those who turned to their inherited religious traditions for solace confronted new rifts in the city’s Lutheran church. As pastors sparred repeatedly with magistrates over the moral improvements needed to restore God’s blessing to the beleaguered city, the ongoing success of the “second Reformation” in Protestant Europe fueled a series of scandals, brought on by the Lutheran clergy’s aggressive stance toward the German Reformed tradition. Both trends reached their nadir in the two decades after 1600, as structural crisis fueled constitutional unrest and religious turmoil in the beleaguered Hanseatic capital.

< The Hansa in Decline >

Lübeck’s medieval status as “Queen of the Hansa” meant that the city’s livelihood suffered in particular measure from the declining influence of the medieval trading association known as the Hanseatic League. Philippe Dollinger’s classic study of the Hanse’s politics and commerce leaves no doubt that this entity was considerably weakened by the changing political landscape of Northern Europe after 1475, and suggests that a series of expedient reforms – most importantly, the institution of new chief diplomat or “Hanseatic Syndic” based in Lübeck – permitted the League a brief “renewal” during its long autumn in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.\textsuperscript{190} Intermittent periods of recovery, however, were not unilaterally beneficial, and instead tended to benefit the Hanseatic centers that enjoyed direct access to the

\textsuperscript{189} Kirchring and Müller reported an additional “pestilence” in 1603 in their \textit{Compendium Chronicae Lubeicensis}, p. 286. Johann Rudolph Becker, an eighteenth-century “Licentiat and Cämmerery-Secretaire in Lübeck” confirmed this outbreak in his \textit{Umständliche Geschichte II}, p. 292, in which he calculates that a “contagious epidemic... claimed more than 2500 persons in the city in a half-year.”

\textsuperscript{190} Philippe Dollinger, \textit{German Hansa}, pp. 312-329. Key indicators of Hanseatic weakness after 1475 included the “collapse of the two main pillars of the Hanseatic system, the Kontore at Novogrod and Bruges.” Adding to the encroachments of princes on the eastern and western frontiers of the Hanseatic network, the Hanseatic cities encountered new challenges from non-allied merchant towns on the North Sea coast. Other instabilities occurred – in Lübeck and in the Hansa cities at large – as a result of the ambitions of the Fuggers of Augsburg, who sought to a share of the Baltic trade from 1490; meanwhile, the Reformation in Lübeck and elsewhere undermined the cohesion the merchant companies and urban communities in general; see pp. 320-323. On the “renewal and eclipse” of the Hansa between 1550 and 1669 (the latter the date of the final Hansetag), p. 330. On the contributions of the first Hanseatic Syndics (Heinrich Sudermann of Cologne, 1556-1591, and Johann Doman, 1605-1618) to the renewed diplomatic cohesion and vitality of the League after 1550, see pp. 334-335.
North Sea; especially Hamburg, Bremen, and Cologne, via the Rhine. Import figures for the long-running Lübeck-Stockholm-Danzig trade are particularly telling regarding Lübeck’s fortunes, as they reveal significant decline in import tonnage for key bulk commodities (butter, copper, pig- and high-grade iron) between the 1570s and the 1620s. While Lübeck’s population remained relatively stable – Imperial tax rolls placed the population at approximately 25,000 in 1502-1503, and at almost exactly the same around 1600-- the same decades witnessed rapid growth in Bremen and Hamburg; the latter had 40,000 inhabitants by 1618, which exploded to over 100,000 by the middle of the following century.191

Though this period was one of economic flux for the Hanseatic League, one key affliction remained constant and insoluble, namely the aggrandizing policies of northern European monarchs, who targeted the traditional monopolies of the Hanseatics as fields in which to extend their own economic influence. The steady dismantling of Hanseatic privileges is illustrated with particular clarity in a decree issued by Elizabeth I of England in 1598, in which the crown forbade Hanseatic merchants to “use any maner [sic] of trafficke or merchandise or to make any contractes ... in the house commonly called the [London] Steelyard or in any other place elsewhere.”192 As the League’s fading “Queen,” such policies were particularly detrimental to Lübeck’s commercial interests, and the city council was hard-pressed to defend ancient trading rights against the royal merchantmen that plied the northern seas in increasing numbers during the sixteenth century.

Frustration was already palpable in a pamphlet from 1564, in which Lübeck’s rulers appealed to the “natural

191 Dollinger offers a variety of tonnage statistics corroborating this impression in the appendices to German Hansa, pp. 430-440; see particular table 49, “Exports from Stockholm to Lübeck and Danzig,” pp. 437-438. On population, see M. Hoffmann, “Lübeck’s Bevölkerungszahl in früherer Zeit,” in MVLGA 13 (1917), 77-92; p. 89.

192 Elizabeth I, “Closure of the London Steelyard (1598)”, Calendar of State Papers (Domestic) 1598-1601 (1869), no. 14, pp. 5-6; in Dollinger, German Hansa, pp. 397-398. This decree states explicitly that further prohibitions on Hanseatic commerce were undertaking as reciprocity for like treatment of English merchants in the Empire: “we have thought it agreeable to our honour ... to command all such as here within our realme, appertaining to the said Hansetowns, ... and especially all such as haue any residence in our citie of London ...to forbear to use any maner of trafficke or merchandise or to make any contractes to command all such as here within our realme, appertaining to the said Hansetowns, ... and especially all such as haue any residence in our citie of London, either in the house commonly called the Steelyard or in any other place elsewhere, to forbear to use any maner of trafficke or merchandise or to make any contractes , and likewise to depart out of our dominions in like sort, as our subjects are commanded to depart out of the Empire.”
law” of self-defense to justify their intervention in Seven Years’ War of the North (1563-1570); meanwhile, in 1609, the Lübeck Ratsherren dispatched a terse memorandum to their counterparts in Hamburg, in which they betrayed their fears that Lübeck would become a “mediocre posting-house and forwarding agency,” inhabited not by powerful merchants, but by “boatmen, agents, and innkeepers.”\textsuperscript{193} Princes of the Empire stopped short of open warfare with the Hansa, but some adopted legal strategies antagonistic to the Hansa’s traditional monopolies. The same year they rebuked Hamburg, the council published a tract entitled the \textit{Short and Necessary Reply by the United German Hansa-Cities}, in which they defended their League against “two princes of the Empire” who had allegedly condemned the Hanseatic Diets as “conventicles” of conspiracy and sedition.\textsuperscript{194} Dollinger concludes that by the time of the last \textit{Hansetag} in 1669, Lübeck and her erstwhile allies “represented only themselves” in the altered political and economic landscape of Europe after the Peace of Westphalia.\textsuperscript{195}

\textsuperscript{193} Quoted in Dollinger, \textit{The German Hansa}, p. 361. The political tract of 1564 appeared under the title \textit{Eines Erbarn Radts der Keyserlichen Freien Reichs Stadt Lübeck warhaffte und bestendige ursachen / warumb Sie / als unumbgenglich / darzu genotdreget / in jtzwerdenden defensions Krige wider die Kunigl. W. zu Schweden sich begeben müssen / Auch nodtturfftige wolergründte ableinung aller deren beschuldigung / so Ihnen derhalb von Hochgedachter Künigl. W. oder sunst ihren Widerigen zugemessen werden} (Lübeck, 1564); pp. i-ii: “We and this good city of Lübeck have been forced to utilize the defense and resistance permitted by nature and all laws...”

\textsuperscript{194} The title of \textit{A Short and Necessary Reply by the United German Hansa-Cities, with a Protestation Against Several Recent Writings, in Which the Ancient Hanseatic League is Accosted and Slandered as a Prohibited Union, Faction, and Conspiracy [Der Vereinigten Teutschen HanseStäatt Kurtze Notwendige Verantwortung / sambt anehengter Protestation wider Etliche newlich pargirte schriffte / darinn der uhralt Hansisch Bund / vor eine verbottene liga, faction und conspiration &c. ubel angezogen und außgeruffen wird} (Lübeck, Samuel Jauchen, 1609) illustrates the generally defensive tone of the Hansa’s declarations by this point. The Hansa’s princely antagonists remained unnamed; they are identified only as “two princes of the Empire” who “allowed themselves to be moved, in public prints of 12. September and 14. October this past year 1608, bitterly and unfairly to accost this our society and convention ... as though, without need and fair cause, would presume to devote ourselves to leagues and conspiracies ... to generally worrisome and dangerous insurrection, rebellion and disruption”; see p. ii. This description of princely aggression against Hanseatic privileges had numerous analogues during the period in question, some of them literal rather than rhetorical; cf. a report on the siege of Narva by Muscovite and Swedish forces in 1590; \textit{Newe Zeitung, Was sich in diesem 1590. Jar. Zwischen den Moscoviter und Schweden, in Belagerung der Stadt Narva, alle Tage gedenkwürdiges zugetragen} (Lübeck: Johannes Balhorn, 1590).

\textsuperscript{195} Dollinger, \textit{German Hansa}, p. 369. The Hanseatic League first voted for dissolution in the midst of Thirty Years’ War, whereupon Lübeck, Hamburg and Bremen concluded an alliance that made them the legal heirs of the Hansa. Major diplomatic efforts in Muscovy and Iberia in the final decade of the sixteenth and first decade of the seventeenth produced new trade connections that lasted throughout the seventeenth century; however, these did not offset the
The economic impact of Hanseatic decline on the average Lübecker is difficult to assess, but by the turn of the century, guildsmen and merchants en masse were sufficiently aggrieved that they rebelled against the oligarchic council. A series of threatening mass assemblies by the guilds – known as the Reiser’chen Unruhen after the young jurist Dr. Heinrich Reiser (1566-1629) – forced the magistrates into a long-running process of negotiation with “burghers’ committees” (Bürgerausschüße) that lasted until the threat of Imperial intervention drove the council to make a series of compromises between 1603 and 1605.

Specifically, the council promised the guild elders that they would exercise improved oversight and discipline over itinerant lesser craftsman, and protect Lübeck’s craft guilds—particularly the brewers and drapers—by preventing undue competition from foreign goods. There was nothing innovative about these changes, and Jürgen Asch has argued that the reform (Rezeß) formally enacted on 14 June 1605 reveals less about the challenges facing Lübeck than do the separate compromises achieved “on issues of greater importance” between 1599 and 1601, when the craftsmen and merchants were particularly exercised about lax enforcement of the oath of citizenship (Bürgereid) vis-à-vis competitors from abroad, the ineffective management of poor relief, and the “Turkish tax” (Türkensteuer), an additional tax on property occasioned significant losses Lübeck experienced vis-à-vis English, Danish, and Swedish competition; cf. Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, pp. 436-440.

Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, pp. 440-443. Dr. Heinrich Reiser (1566-1629) was the original leader of the fifty-man “citizens’ committee” appointed to present popular grievances to the council. The Bürgerausschuß was made up of representatives of the city’s trading companies (e.g. die Rigafahrer, Novgorodfahrer, Stockholmfahrer et al.) and larger craft guilds (Zünfte and Ämter). The disturbances of this period ranged from assemblies in public places to organized marches on the Rathaus.

The Rezeß of June 1605 of “restricted itself to numerous smaller complaints” submitted by the leading guildsmen of the citizen’s committee; this resolution offers insight into the role of the guilds in regulating daily life. According to Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 92-93: “The Rat committed itself [in the 1605 Rezeß] to discipline the indolence of the masons, carpenters, and other craftsmen. Additionally we find prescriptions for a better supervision for the trade in linens and draperies, for the sale of Flemish herring on the open herring market, against selling during the Sunday sermon … concerning the length of apprenticeship for merchant apprentices, etc. Further, the Rezeß contained regulations for maintaining the the Trave river and the city’s passageways … and for the improvement of annual musters and armed exercises [of the city militia].”
by the Emperor’s wars against the Ottomans. Asch concludes that these weightier revisions provided no basis for long-term “constitutional renewal,” which explains why the guilds mounted a second, far more violent revolt as the city confronted bankruptcy and famine after the Thirty Years’ War. Prior to the war, however, these expedient compromises allowed the Ratsherren to continue to pursue an oligarchic model of government in the midst of a multifold crisis.

Widespread and growing dissatisfaction with the oligarchic rule of Ratsherren and Bürgermeister moved Lübecker to protest in 1599. In his journal, early Bürgerausschuß leader (and later Bürgermeister) Heinrich Brokes (1567-1623) described the “great disturbance among the citizenry” that took place that autumn, “and nearly came to public insurrection” as citizens demanded redress of their grievances in a series of popular assemblies and marches on the Rathaus. The immediate cause was the city council’s recent, ill-advised intervention in Swedish politics, but this built upon a foundation of popular antipathy toward the self-serving politics of the council: “Many of the Ratsherren,” Brokes continued, “and particular the foremost, were greatly hated among the citizens, because they considered more how they might attend to their own dignity and advantage, than that they might earnestly promote commerce and exchange.” By early 1599, this dislike had found a new, more specific basis. Late in the previous year, the council had concluded an alliance with King Sigismund of Sweden and Poland, which permitted the city council to seize ships and goods belonging to Sigismund’s rival (and uncle) Duke Karl von Södermanland. Karl soon defeated Sigismund,

---

198 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 92.

199 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 93: “Der Rezeß enthält keinerlei Bestimmungen, die Verfassungsneuerungen brachten ... Die Reiserchen Unruhen bedeuten also keine Etappe auf dem Wege zur Modernisierung der Verfassung.”

200 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 93: “Das seit Jahrhunderten bestehende Verhältnis zwischen Rat und Bürgerschaft blieb unverändert. Die Rechtsstellung der Bürger war durch die Einigung über die Bürgereidsformel gesichert worden [...] Der Rat verspach in dem Rezeß, den Bürgern ‘mit guter und väterlicher affection’ zugetan zu bleiben; die Bürger gelobten dafür Gehorsam.”


however, and began a retaliatory campaign against Lübeck’s shipping in the summer of 1599. The resulting loss of ships and goods caused particular outrage among the merchants, because it disclosed that the council had intervened in the Swedish succession on their own initiative, without even the pretense of consulting the guilds.  

Such high-handed behavior was typical for patrician councils in seventeenth-century Germany: in Frankfurt-am-Main, for example, the “Fettmilch Uprising” of 1612-1616 was fuelled not only by popular anti-Semitism, but also by the hatred many craftsmen felt toward the “arbitrary rule” of the oligarchic city council. Brokes’s diary reveals that a similar politics defined political life in Lübeck, where the patrician sense of entitlement hindered negotiations between the council and guilds in the years around 1600. In one incident, a single vote was delayed for two full days “before the council could unify itself” on a minor point of procedure; he also conveys his own sense of affront when two of the Ratsherren to whom he was to present the citizen’s grievances refused to dine at his home. After peace was restored, the council elected the well-born and well-educated Brokes into their own ranks, and accounts of his extensive diplomatic journeys come to dominate his diary. Nonetheless, his description of the events of 1599-1601 provide a rare insight into  

---

203 Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, p. 181: “The citizenry was particularly embittered concerning this, that the council had, without their consent, honored the request of the King Sigismund of Sweden and Poland to seize the Swedes present in Lübeck, and their ships and goods, which indeed other, neighboring cities had not wished to do.” Cf. Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, pp. 440-441. Karl von Södermanland (later Karl IX of Sweden) exploited the tense atmosphere in Lübeck by addressing his demands for restitution to both the council and the citizenry; his missives of 1598 posed “the cunning question, whether the arrest of his ships had been carried out with the knowledge and consent of the citizenry”; he also successful solicited “a threatening letter” addressed to Lübeck from his military allies in Lower Saxony (the Niedersächsischer Kreis).

204 Friedrichs, “Fettmilch Uprising,” p. 188.

205 Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, p. 183. The diarist notes that his entertaining costs on the latter occasion (which took place “prior to Easter” in 1601) ran to 300 Lübeck Marks, or approximately 100 Reichstaler.

the mechanisms by which generalized burgher discontent transformed into popular unrest, and confirms that widespread dissatisfaction colored Lübeckers’ perceptions of their magistrates in the seventeenth century.

<Climate Deterioration and Famine: The ‘Little Ice Age’>

In early modern cities, public unrest became more likely as the material circumstances of life worsened, and Lübeck’s guildsmen stressed this connection when they complained of “declining sustenance and advancing dearth” in 1599.207 The perception that life had grown steadily harder in the late sixteenth century also afflicted members of the clerical estate: in his studies of suicide in Protestant Europe, David Lederer has argued that the worldview of Lutheran reformers and theologians became more pessimistic as a result of the “catastrophic famine” that struck Germany around 1570.208 The New Prayer Book suggests that a similarly negative outlook began to inform popular piety, while Patrice Veit has reconstructed the long-lasting impact of subsistence crisis in re-shaping the Lutheran liturgy by means of the new, bleaker tone in the hymnody of the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.209 Finally, the growing body on scholarship on the social history of climate change suggests causal links between widespread famine after about 1570 and the coeval growths in witch-hunting, suicide, and a general climate of “melancholy,” “fear,” and “despair” afflicting the Protestant laity of northern Europe.210 “Almost everybody,” Hartmut Lehmann has concluded,

207 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 58: “Daß die Nahrung zurückginge und Teurung einreiße, sei nicht allein in Lübeck so, sondern auch in den Nachbarstädtchen, ‘ja in der ganzen weiten weldt ein gemeine Clage undt seuffzen.’” The Rat bristled particularly at the fact that the citizens compared their situation unfavorably to that of their neighbors in Hamburg; Asch relates that they dismissed the allegations that they were worse off than their Hanseatic neighbors as “fast odio unndt zumahle impertinenter.”

208 David Lederer, “Verzweiflung im Alten Reich: Selbstdmord während der « Kleinen Eiszeit »” in Behringer et al. (eds.), Kulturelle Konsequenzen der “Kleinen Eiszeit,” 255-280, pp. 268-269. Lederer suggests that the famine of 1570 forms a “caesura” dividing contemporary Lutheran leaders from the first generation of protestant reformers (Luther included), who tended to emphasize the positive aspects of the evangelical faith vis-à-vis their Catholic opponents. “In the following generation, the mood became increasingly pessimistic – not from inherently theological grounds, but rather due to a generally foreboding contemporary understanding of the world, that was created first and foremost by deteriorated environmental conditions.”


210 Lederer offers a concise summary of this historiography in “Verzweiflung im Alten Reich,” pp. 255-257.
“had to struggle for survival” as a consequence of longer winters, wetter summers, and the inflated cost of foodstuffs caused by failed harvests.\(^{211}\)

In 1578, a pamphlet by Nicolaus Selneccer suggested that “pestilence, sickness, poverty, wars and rumour of war, inflation and like things” were God’s “multifold signs, warnings, and punishments” for human sinfulness, and portents of the apocalypse to come.\(^{212}\) Works like this were often re-published in Lübeck, where they attracted an educated and well-to-do audience; Selneccer served as the Lutheran church Superintendent for Leipzig, and his *Christian Prayer for the Current State of Calamity* was based on detailed scriptural exegesis. By the end of the century, however, his core themes of sin and judgment were familiar to a much broader segment of the urban population, thanks to a proliferation of news pamphlets informing Lübeckers of extraordinary happenings abroad. The *True and Dreadful Account of a Peasant, Who Hanged Himself Together With His Wife and Children Because of Famine*, for example, offers grisly account of the potentially catastrophic social and psychological consequences of famine.\(^{213}\) While the key events can be

\(^{211}\) The majority of sources for Lübeck use the term “Noth” or “Hungersnoth” to denote famine; “Theurung,” meanwhile, refers both to scarcity born of a general increase in the cost of living, and monetary inflation in the technical sense of dramatically raised prices.

\(^{212}\) “O dear Lord, we see the signs of your anger in the heavens, and we remember also the multiform signs, warnings and punishments already appeared, that is pestilence, sickness, poverty, wars and rumours of wars, inflation and like things, with which you afflict and discipline us, and our neighbors, brothers and sisters.” Nicolaus Selneccerus, *Ein Christlich Gebet in jetzigem elenden zustand / darin Gott uns seine fewrige Rute / und seinen gerechten Zorn am Himmel zeigt / und uns mit allerley drawungen und züchtigungen heimsuchet / zuthun / und sich damit für Gott demütiglich anzugeben / und umb Gnad zu bitten.* (Leipzig: Jakob Berwaldts, 1578), p i. On the probable familiarity of Lübeckers with Selneccerus, cf. the unattributed *Gemein Christlich Gebet zu beschwerlichen Zeiten vnd gemeiner Gefahr zusprechen* (Lübeck: Jauchen, 1619), which bears conspicuous similarities to Selneccerus’s text of 1578; also Selneccerus, *Calvinus Redivius / Das ist: Zwingli / Caluini / Beze &c. Eigentlich Meinung von etlichen fûrmernen streitigen Religions-Artickeln unnd Sprûchen der H. Schrifft / mit ihren eigenen Worten* (Lübeck: Kröger, 1590). On his hymnody, see Patrice Veit, “Gerechter Gott, wo will es hin / mit diesen kalten Zeiten?” *Witterung, Not und Frömmigkeit im evangelischen Kirchen lied,* in Behringer et al. (eds.), *Kulturelle Konsequenzen der “Kleinen Eiszeit,”* 283-310; p. 284.

\(^{213}\) *Erschrecklich / Warhaftige Zeitung / von einem Bawren / welcher seinen Juncker umb Korn zu leihen gebeten / das er ihm thet versagen / Und der Bawr darüber in verzweiflung gefallen /wegen hungers-nott sich selbst samt seinem Weib und Kinder erhent / auch wie hernacher der Edelamm versunken / Allen frommen Christen zur warnung in gesangweise gestellt* (Lübeck: Johan Balhorn, 1581), pp. i-v. In this folkloric account, Gurgen Schultze, a peasant living “near Danzig in Prussia” hangs his children, his wife, and finally himself, after his lord (a certain Heinrich Rechenberg) denied his request “to borrow or to buy grain” in April 1580. However, the nobleman receives his just reward by being swallowed by earth
gleaned from the title, the Lübeck printing included an additional song appealing to Christ for mercy in times of dearth, a common feature in other, contemporary pamphlets reporting the “pitiable condition, suffering, famine and war” affecting coastal regions of the Empire. By the turn of the century, moreover, pamphleteers began to adopt an overtly apocalyptic tone, as did the author of the True and Alarming Account of the Wonders, Seen and Heard in the Land of Holstein, In the city of Altenburg, Seven Miles Distant from Lübeck, which recounts “a great rainbow” serving as a portent for the “great and terrifying thunderstorms,” “unnatural” hail, and tremors of the earth that reportedly occurred in the region on 1 March 1599. “God the Lord,” he begins, “gives us in these last, calamitous, afflicted, unhappy times, many alarming, uncommon signs and wonders, which according to Christ’s own prophecies are to occur shortly before the Last Days.” Regardless of medium, theme, and intended audience, contemporary prints insisted that sinful living, divine judgment, and this-worldly affliction were not only connected, but were the only viable explanations for the widespread suffering of the times.

< “To look like death from Lübeck”: Interpreting Disease >

Plague –known as Pestilenz, Seuche, and Pest– was a “constant companion” in early-modern mercantile centers, but it occupied a special place in the imagination of early-modern Lübeckers. The

---


215 Cf. the anonymous *Warhafftige Newe Zeitung Von dem jetzigen kleglichen zustande / jammer / Hungers noth und Krieg in Lifflandt / dadurch viel tausent Menschen ihr Leben erbarmlicher weise enden / und dahin sterben müssen.* (1602). The “New Spiritual Song of the Twelve Hours” appended to this news account offered twelve distinct prayers, because “every person should let no hour go past without considering God’s grace.”

sardonic Danish saying “to look like Death from Lübeck” (at ligne Døden fra Lübeck)\textsuperscript{218} bears witness to the international fame of the “Dance of Death” mural in Lübeck’s Marienkirche (1463), a work that became well-known by means of an extensive “Totentanz-literature” produced in northern Germany and Denmark between 1480 and 1750.\textsuperscript{219} Like many examples of the genre, Lübeck’s mural had its origins in the epidemics that ravaged Europe the late Middle Ages: plague outbreaks proved particularly destructive in the mercantile entrepots of the Mediterranean and the Baltic, and it has been suggested that the pandemic of 1347-1352 killed up to ninety percent of the population in the Hanseatic capital.\textsuperscript{220} The fifteenth century witnessed six “plague years” of varying intensity, while the sixteenth experienced four such outbreaks, the last in 1564-65.\textsuperscript{221} As the climate deteriorated after 1570, Lübeck was accustomed to brace itself for a plague once every fifteen to twenty-five years, and it is no wonder that contemporary observers expected, as Superintendent Andreas Pouchenius predicted in 1577, “the heavy rod of damnable pestilence” to descend on them at any time.\textsuperscript{222}


\textsuperscript{218} The phrase remains current; for example, \textit{Døden fra Lübeck} (“Death from Lübeck”) is the title of a recent collection of poems by Henrik Nordbrandt (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2002).

\textsuperscript{219} Brigitte Schultze, “Zur dänischen Totentanzüberlieferung,” in Hartmut Freytag and Steffen Blessin et al., \textit{Der Totentanz der Marienkirche in Lübeck und der Nikolaikirche in Reval} (Tallinn) (Köln; Weimar: Böhlau, 1993); 365-369. See especially pp. 366-368 on the literary tradition of the \textit{Dødedans} and its edificatory intent. The first texts date from the late fifteenth century, while the re-painting of the Lübeck \textit{Totentanz} in 1701 prompted a new wave of publications in both German and Danish.

\textsuperscript{220} The original Lübeck \textit{Totentanz} is attributed to Bernt Notke (1435-1509), who also executed a similar mural in the Nikolaikirche in Tallin (Estonia); Schultze, “Totentanzüberlieferung,” in Freytag und Blessin et al., \textit{Totentanz}, pp. 365-366. Estimates of plague mortality in medieval and early-modern Lübeck vary considerably. Ninety percent is Dirk Proske’s estimate for Lübeck’s general populace; he notes that twenty-five percent of all urban householders (\textit{Hausbesitzer}), and thirty-five percent of \textit{Ratsherren} died in the pandemic of the late 1340s and early 1350s; see Risiken, p. 141. Erich Hoffmann, however, suggests that the actual net population loss was much lower in the fourteenth century, due to the speed with which Lübeck regained its burgher population after epidemics; see Graßmann (ed.), \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 310.

\textsuperscript{221} Lübeck experienced epidemic disease, though of course in varying degrees of intensity, in 1406, 1420, 1433, 1451, 1464, 1483-84, 1537, 1548-1550, 1564-65, 1625 and 1639, according to Proske, \textit{Risiken}, p. 142.
In early 1577, pastors and educated laymen alike were particularly apprehensive about plague, and with good reason: a severe pestilence had recently ravaged numerous cities in northern Italy, whence trade routes could easily convey the disease into the Empire.\textsuperscript{223} This was precisely the scenario that prompted Lübeck-born physician Heinrich Dobbin to compile \textit{A Useful Regimen and Short Instruction Concerning the Pestilence}, a medical handbook offering detailed advice on how one might “preserve oneself” during what he dubbed “the current time of pestilence and deadly need.”\textsuperscript{224} Dobbin possessed an extensive knowledge of Galenic medicine, but he was careful to note, by way of introduction, that the pestilence would spread only according to the will of God.\textsuperscript{225} The same year, Superintendent Pouchenius developed this theme further in a pamphlet expounding upon a plague-year sermon attributed to St. Cyprian of Carthage (c. 200-258), which included an itemized list of sins likely to bring God’s wrath upon the city.\textsuperscript{226} In contrast to Dobbin’s remedies, Pouchenius composed the \textit{Sermon of Caecil Cyprian} in hope of curbing an epidemic of immoral living, rather


\textsuperscript{223} In mercantile Venice, for example, the plague of 1576-77 was severe enough that it dealt a lasting blow to the population growth of the preceding decades; significant population losses also occurred in other northern Italian cities. See Julius Beloch, \textit{Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens Bd. 3: Die Bevölkerung der Republik Venedig, des Hertzogtums Mailand, Piedmonts, etc.} (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1937), 1-22. On contemporary knowledge of this event on the part of Lübeckers, see n. 46, below.

\textsuperscript{224} Heinrich Dobbin, \textit{Ein nützlich Regiment und kurze Instruction / von der Pestilentz / wie sich ein jeder mensch in solcher schwachen zeit praeseruiren / hüten und vorwarten / und wie man denen sole helffen / so mit Pestilentzens gift uberfallen sind. Mit möglichen Fleiß / zu dienst und Ehren der löblichen Steter Lübeck und Lunaeburg} (Lübeck: Johan Balhorn, 1577). Dobbin expressed a sense of civic duty; he dedicated the \textit{Regiment} to his “fatherland, parents and dearest friends” in Lübeck, as well as to his adopted home city of Lüneburg. His dedication discusses a recent period of famine and flood afflicting Italy, “in den Venedischen und Ligurischen Grentzen” and “die Stadt Verona,” upon which followed a pestilence that spared only a remnant of the population; see p. x-xi: “eine jemerliche Pestilentz ist erfolget / die das Volck so heuffig hingerissen / das aus einer sehr grossen menge / wenig überblieben sind.”

\textsuperscript{225} Dobbin, \textit{Kurtze Instruction von der Pestilentz}, pp. i-ii. The author predicted that plague symptoms would increase “not only here, but in the surrounding areas, “as long as the Almighty God does not abate it, and dampen the poison through his grace.” “Nachfolgendes Regiment / der itzig Pestilentzischen zeit und sterblichen not / (die sich vielleicht ins folgende Jar verzehen / und nicht hie alleine / Sondern auch in den umliegenden örtern / Stedern und Felcken kreffliglich erheben wirt / so es der Allmechtiger Gott nicht abwendet / und den Gifft durch seine Gnade dempffet)...”

than the spread of disease. Because no epidemic had yet occurred in the city, he argued, general repentance from sin would awaken God’s mercy, and forestall the worst of the punishment to come. As it happened, no epidemic befell Lübeck in the late 1570s, but Pouchenius and his successors remained unshaken in their conviction that these crises were God’s retribution for the chronic sinful behavior of the community, and that true and lasting reform of life was the only solution. When plague did return in the early years of the Thirty Years’ War, killing some 7,000 residents in between the summer 1525 and early months of 1626, Pastor Bernhardus Blume observed that “whosoever does not see from this, that the Angel of God goes about [this city] and strikes, he is blind.”

< “Foreign Religions”: Anabaptists and Calvinists >

In the decades prior to the Thirty Years’ War, Lutheran cities of the Northern Empire perceived “foreign faiths” (fremde Religionen) as a growing threat to structures and traditions already weakened by internal unrest, warfare, famine and disease. In the coastal cities, the disorderly potential of “heretical” sectarian movements was well known from “Radical Reformation” of the 1520s and 30s. Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, Rostock, Stralsund and Lüneburg issued a joint prohibition banning “desecrators of the sacrament, Anabaptists, and blasphemers” in 1535, the same year a coalition of German princes crushed the theocratic Anabaptist kingdom founded by Jan Matthys and Jan van Leiden in Münster. Lübeckers were particularly

227 This is particularly evident in the “Prayer in Time of Pestilence” appended to Pouchenius’ *Sermon Caecilii Cypriani*, 52-59; here p. 46-47: “Neben dem in warer hertzlicher ernster rew und bekerung / umb verzeihung solcher unser voriger Missethat im waren Glauben umb Christi willen Gott anfallen und stehen / das er uns unserer Missethat und ubertrettung nach seiner grossen Barhertzigkeit vergeben wollen ... sein Antlitz aber uns leuchten lassen / ... / Ja er wirt sich wieder zu uns keren / und seinen Knechten gnedig sein...”

228 M. Bernhardus Blume, “Bericht von der Pest zu Lübeck 1625,” in *Lübeckische Blätter* 35 (1893); 411-412: “Die Pest hat nicht zugleich den gantzen coetum dieser Stadt angriffen, ob man gleich eines durchs ander gangen ist, sondern Sie ist erst in St. Jacobs Kirchspiel, darnach zu St. Marien, dan gen St. Peter ... und also ... nachen Thum kommen: Wer daraus nicht sieht, das Gottes Engel herumbangen und geschlagen, der ist blind.” On the circumstances and death rates in the plague of 1625-26, see the editor’s introduction Blume’s “Bericht,” *ibid.*, p. 411.

229 In the broadsheet mandate *Der Erbaren Fry / Rykes / unde Seestede Lübeck / Bremen / Hamborch / Rostock / Stralsund Lüneburg Christlick / und Ernstlick Mandat wedder de Sacramentschender / Wedderdöper / unde Gades Lesterer / Anno XXXV. In öffenlyken Druck uthgegahn* (Hamburg: Hans Mosen, 1616), the councils of these Hansa cities
sensitive to the social implications of Anabaptism because of the city’s own radical past: between 1533 and 1535, Bürgermeister Jürgen Wullenwever had presided over a “cleansing” of the magistracy that drove many members of “old council” into exile, and re-wrote the constitution to increase the direct participation of the guilds. Lübeck’s subsequent defeat in a Hanseatic war with Denmark not only signaled the end of the League’s dominance in the Baltic, but also undermined Wullenwever’s regime; he resigned as mayor and left the city in November 1535, but was soon arrested by Duke Heinrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, accused of Anabaptist sedition, and eventually executed on 29. September 1537. The decline of Lübeck’s Hanseatic fortunes remained linked to the city’s experiment with “radical” evangelicalism in the 1530s, and it is no surprise that pastors and magistrates feared the growth religious of non-conformism that accompanied the various crises of the seventeenth century. By the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War, the perceived threat of heterodox contagion had grown to the point that the city councils collaborated on a revised edition of the 1535 Mandate, in which they acknowledged their “sworn duty” to oppose the spread of “enthusiast” sects. “That the evil teaching flourishes secretly among the common people (Volk),” stated the new declaration of 1616, “is to be feared most highly.”

New religious threats were part of a general crisis shaping the grim outlook of urban dwellers by the end of the sixteenth century. Whether clerical or lay, contemporary observers generally agreed that they were suffering more than had their forebears, and acknowledged that famine, epidemics, and related hardships occurred by God’s permission. However, comparing the concrete responses of clerical and lay described their collective apprehension by noting, “we clearly and conspicuously see and find that such heresy and false teaching increases in many principalities, lands, and cities.” On the Anabaptist Kingdom of Münster, see R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535-1618* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

---


232 *Christlick und Ernstlick Mandat*: “Deweyle wy öuerst öpentlick sehen unde bevinden / dat sülcke Kettereeye / unde valsche Lere in veele Fürstendomen / Landen / unde steden auerhandt nemen / Ock dorch de bösen Lerere hemelick under dat Volck gesprengen / ys am högesten tho befürchten.”
authors reveals that important differences of emphasis co-existed within this shared worldview. Educated laymen like the physician Dobbin and Bürgermeister Brokes did not dispute that the new hardship was a punishment for sin – the former affirmed it plainly in his book on plague remedies – but their responses to hardship also concentrated on this-worldly solutions to new hardships. The oligarchic structure of power in Lübeck permitted the council to pursue its vision for politics and religious in Lübeck, even after formal subscription to the Lutheran Formula of Concord announced the city’s formal allegiance to the “orthodox” Gnesio-Lutheran evangelical tradition in 1580. The council’s monopoly on church government led to frequent conflicts with their pastors, who viewed moral disciplining as a core responsibility of civic Obrigkeit, and a new priority “in times of general need.” By the time war broke out in 1618, the clerical backlash against oligarchy had driven a rift in urban church life that paralleled the disordered state of Lübeck’s constitutional politics in 1600.

II. From Concord to Conflict: Struggles over Reform, 1580-1620

On the first day of November, 1617, a twenty-seven-year-old Michael Siricius delivered the first of three sermons celebrating the one-hundredth anniversary of Luther’s Reformation:

“I am reminded at the outset of this sermon, that the Lutheran churches here and there in Germany and in other places, are holding a special festival of thanksgiving, because God, now 100 years hence, sent his angel with the everlasting gospel to his afflicted churches.”

A Lutheran’s debt of gratitude - “for the blessings and benefits that God bestows upon the churches,” and the faithfulness with which “God the Lord protects and preserves his church” – was the unifying theme of the three “Jubilee Sermons” (Jubelpredigten) Siricius delivered in November of 1617, but his exegesis on

persecution and thanksgiving cloaked the true, disordered state of confessional life in Lübeck on the eve of
the Thirty Years’ War. In fact, confessional cohesion had recently reached its lowest ebb since
Wullenwever’s time, owing to a public dispute over the city council’s commercial treaty (Bündniß) with the
ruling estates of the Netherlands. Lesser scandals marred church life before and after the treaty, and all had
origins in the ministry’s attempts to effect the “reform of daily life” advocated by radical reformers and
evangelicals alike. Encouraged by Superintendent Andreas Pouchenius, who led the ministry from 1575 until
his death in 1600, two generations of pastors confronted a council that seemed to them to be far more
concerned with political and economic gain than with fulfilling the promise of the Lutheran Formula of
Concord.

< Moral Reform and the Formula of Concord >

As Superintendent in Lübeck, Andreas Pouchenius embodied the fervor for uniformity of teaching
and moral policing that characterized the “early Orthodoxy” that followed dissemination of the Lutheran
Formula of Concord between 1577 and 1580. Also known as the Konkordienwerk, and often compiled into a

234 Siricius admitted at the beginning of his sermons that Lutherans found themselves surrounded – “dearly beloved,
those of you who wish to open your eyes, and look to the right, upon the papists … we gaze, on the other side, upon the
Calvinists” – but countered such fears by stating the obvious errors of both confessions, and assuring his listeners and
readers that God would continue to protect his latter-day chosen people in the one true Lutheran church; see Drey
Jubel-Predigten, p. 3 ff.: “Dann ihr meine geliebten / so ihr die Augen auffthun wollet / unnnd sehet zur rechten / auff die
Papisten / so findet ihr anstatt der Rechten Gottes des Herrn ... ein hauffen Decreta und traditiones, mit welchen sie
vergeblich Gott dienen / dieweil sie nicht den Menschen Gebott seyn. Sehen wir dan zur andern seiten die Calvinisten
an / so finden sich die Vernunft Regulen / die sie sich unterstehen mit Gottes Wort zustutzen ... Aber da haber wir
dagegen des Wordt Gottes / so schärffer ist dan kein zweischneidig schwert / Hebr. 4.” The pastor’s persistent emphasis
on “reminding” listeners of God’s blessings suggests that, given contemporary hardships, many ordinary Lutherans felt
little enthusiasm for commemorating the Reformation in 1617; this impression is corroborated by the extensive
commentary in his Jubilee sermons concerning the persecution, tyranny, and heresy afflicting Christians since Roman
times.

The first of the Jubilee sermons enumerated divine “benefits and blessings” for which Lübeckers should give thanks;
the second extolled protection and preservation of the Lutheran church: “Als erstlich die Beneficia und Wolthaben die
Gott der Kirchen erzeigenent / II. Wie dann Gott der Herr seine Kirchen schützet und erhalten.” The third and final sermon
of the cycle addressed Christian gratitude specifically, i.e. “the thanks we are indebted to show to God for the same”;
Drey JubelPredigten, p. 8. Siricius’s dedication to the printed version of these sermons - dated “18. February, which was
the day of Concord (on which, 72 years ago, D. Martin Luther departed blessedly in the Lord) Anno Christi 1618” –
reiterates his desire to heighten general awareness God’s beneficence in freeing Protestant Germany from papal
“tyranny”; see p. 10.
local *Book of Concord*, this was a formal confession of the faith designed to resolve the protracted disputes among Lutherans that followed the reformer’s death in 1546. Completed in 1577, the *Formula gave* Lutherans a standard version of evangelical doctrine that could rival Calvin’s *Institutes* and the canons of the Council of Trent, but this offered little practical help to parish pastors in seeing through the unfinished business of Luther’s reformation; though what a Lutheran believed was clearly established in the twelve articles of the “Bergic Book,” actually implementing the “third use of the law” (Article VI) and defending Lutheran congregations against “heresies and sects” (Article XII) was necessarily left up to individual princes and city councils. Some of these interpreted the *Formula* as an opportunity for further reform, and recruited senior Lutheran churchmen to oversee church visitations, moral discipline in the consistory courts, and to re-draft the original evangelical church orders of the 1520s and 1530s. Andreas Pouchenius was one such reformer, and his enthusiasm for policing belief and morals found expression in the extensive church visitations (*Kirchenvisitationen*) he conducted at the request of Duke Franz II of Saxony-Lauenberg (1547-1619), and in his comprehensive revision of that territory’s church order (*Kirchenordnung*). He sought the same kind of symbiotic relationship with temporal authority during his twenty-five years as church Superintendent in Lübeck, but the *Ratsherren* who confronted a growing crisis in those years manifested far less support for new church orders, visitations, and consistorial discipline. By the time Pouchenius died in 1600, the Lübeck magistrates had rejected the former measure, abandoned the second, and set clear restrictions on the pastor’s influence vis-à-vis the consistory. Other scholars have interpreted this attitude toward confessionalization as early evidence for a “secular” urban politics, but this fails to account for the

---

235 Robert Kolb identifies the period of “early Orthodoxy,” as “the thirty to fifty years” following the 1577 Formula of Concord, see Kolb (ed.), *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture*, p. 11.

matrix of instabilities that shaped the urban community in the Little Ice Age. The imprint of economic decline and popular unrest on this period suggests that the magistrates’ lack of enthusiasm for church discipline after 1580 had little to do with the onset of modernity, and much more to do with the disorderly potential of the clergy’s fervor for reform.

Following Pouchenius’s election to the office of Superintendent in 1575, the clergy made several promising gains in the work of *Kirchen- and Sittenzucht*. The first new ordinance the pastors solicited from the council was a decree “protecting the sanctity of the Sabbath,” which prohibited certain disruptive activities during the Sunday service – e.g. the hawking of meats and patronizing public houses – though it stopped short of the full-day prohibitions on commerce and conviviality originally requested by the ministry. 237 Similar measures followed, targeting non-attendance at the Sunday sermon and “the few who shunned attending communion,” as well as public drunkenness on the Sabbath. 238 The Superintendent’s personal appeals to the council netted new resolutions against sexual sin in September 1580, the first designed to prevent marriages deemed incestuous, and the second to target sundry “indecent practices,” including the maintenance of public brothels (*Hurhäuser*), and the mixing of the sexes in the city’s bathhouses (*Badstuben*). 239 A new decree against heterodoxy accompanied these measures, in which the council ordered Lübeck’s district administrators (*Quartierherren*) to “ferret out and report,” “Calvinists, Anabaptists, and others, who secretly mislead the people.” 240 By the time the council adopted the *Formula of Concord*, however, Pouchenius and his pastors had already expressed frustration with the lax commitment to enforcement shown by their magistrates. As early as 1578, the ministry petitioned the *Ratsherrnen* for additional action against all of the behaviors targeted in the decrees of 1575, during which process


238 *Ibid*.


Pouchenius vented his frustration by comparing the state of moral life in Lübeck to the mythical “stables of Augeus” (Augiasstall), purged by the fifth labor of Hercules. A few years later, the chaplain Johann Stricker followed suit by publishing a satirical play lampooning gluttony (Schlemmerei) and sexual immorality (Unzucht) among members of the upper tiers of society. This critique highlights what the pastors knew well, namely, that laws and mandates meant little without regular church visitations, and the council’s dedicated support for the moral court of the Konsistorium.

The paucity of magisterial support for these institutions explains the vigor with which Pouchenius and his pastors sought to exercise the Strafamt, or clerical office of discipline. In his multi-volume Church History of the Free and Imperial City of Lübeck, Caspar Heinrich Starck (1681-1750) recorded numerous incidents in which a pastor’s attempts to discipline parishioners led to conflict with members of the urban elite. The case of Adelheid Ludinghusen (the widow of Lübeck Bürgermeister Anton Ludinghusen) exemplifies the divisive potential of the clergy’s everyday efforts to enforce the moral resolutions passed by the council. In early 1576, Ludinghusen’s confessor Gerhard Schröder, head pastor of St. Peter’s parish, advised her that her planned second union - to a male relative of her deceased husband – was, in fact, “illegal” due to her affinity (by marriage) to her betrothed. The matter became generally known within both ministry and the council when it was addressed in a February meeting of the consistory, whereupon Lundinghusen’s new confessor, Prediger Theodor Vastmer, refused to admit her to confession.

---

242 Entitled De düdesche Schlömer; see Johannes Bolte, De Düdesche Schlämer: ein niederdeutsches Drama von Johannes Stricker (1584) (Leipzig: Soltau, 1889).
243 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 279.
244 Caspar Heinrich Starck’s Lutherano-Evangelica, das ist, der Kayserlichen / Freyen / und des Heil. Römischen Reichs Hanse- und Handel-Stadt Lübeck Kirchen-Historie (Hamburg: Felgener, 1724) is the leading printed source on Lübeck’s church for the period from the Reformation to the death of Superintendent Hanneken in 1671.
now consulted a Lübeck jurist—a certain Joachim Gregory von Brietzen—who eventually secured a favorable opinion on the engagement from the Lutheran consistory in Rostock. By August 1577, the lawyer had “effected an intercession for her in the Lübeck consistory concerning the granting of her marriage trust,” but the resentment she harbored toward the pastors soon exacerbated matters. On 21 February of the following year, the widow was turned away from attending a baptism in St. Peter’s church, “because she had, in the presence of the other godparents, uttered vain and immodest words of vituperation and blasphemy,” directing some toward her former confessor Schröder, but reserving the “most dreadful misuses” for Superintendent Pouchenius, whom she disparaged as “a vagabond,” a “tight-neck” (Geitzhalß), who placed “his own advantage” above the needs of parishioners, and “a busybody, who mixed in the affairs of others.” Pouchenius immediately sought legal redress for libel, and the resulting negotiations lasted well into the summer, and required mediation by three Bürgermeister, three members of the council, and four pastors to achieve resolution.

The disturbance caused by pastoral discipline escalated in the 1580s, when a protracted dispute between Pouchenius and city Schulrektor Pancratius Crüger (1546-1614) revealed that the Superintendent was willing to challenge the inherited limits of clerical authority. This ended with the rector’s dismissal in

---

246 Theodor Vastmer (also rendered “Bastmer”) served as Prediger in the parish of St. Peter from 1568-1598; s.v. “Vastmer, Theodor” in the Pastorenkartei for Lübeck (PKL) assembled by Roland Gross in the 1970s.


248 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, pp. 346-347. Pastor Michael Rhau’s manner was “polite” (freundtlich), but good manners seem to have had little impression on Lundingshusen: “da sie den in Gegenwart der andern Gevattern eitel unbeschindene Schmäh- und Läster-Worte ausgestossen / und gleichwie auf ihren vorigen Beichtvater / Pastor Schröder / also auch allermiest auf den Superintendenten sich schrecklich unnütze gemacht / wann sie ihn ... für einen Landläuffer / der / da er nirgend bleiben können / hieher gekommen / für einen Geitzhalß / der nicht der Kirchen bestes / noch der Leute Seligkeit / sondern seinen eigenen Vortheil suchete / für einen unruhigen Menschen / der sich in frembde Händel mengete[...]”.

1588, but the original disagreement concerned the curriculum for the Katharineum, or city Latin school.²⁵⁰ Pouchenius had served as Schulrektor in Helmstedt and Braunschweig, where he distinguished himself as a stanch advocate of the Scripture-based pedagogy of Philipp Melancthon. Crüger, for his part, proved himself a virulent anti-Melancthonian soon after he assumed office in 1581. According to Starck in the History, Crüger dismissed the reformer’s pedagogical system as “crude,” criticized Melanchthon “innumerable times in the presence of the pupils,” and attempted to introduce a new curriculum based on the dialectical methods of Huguenot humanist Peter Ramus (1515-1572).²⁵¹ As church Superintendent and “overseer” for school matters, Pouchenius moved rapidly to discipline this affront to the city’s orthodox tradition. After a series of private admonitions effected no change in Crüger’s conduct, Pouchenius denounced the headmaster’s innovations from his pulpit in the Marienkirche.²⁵² Crüger reacted badly, and his continuing intransigence made him a target for general critique by the pastors, particularly after he disdained Hauptpastor Michael Rhau’s attempts to mediate in 1586.²⁵³ Several city council members now intervened on Crüger’s request, but this appeal produced an unforeseen backlash when the council appointed a mediatory commission and solicited opinions on the case from several university faculties, which proved to

²⁵⁰ Pouchenius had been instrumental in recruiting Crüger to the top position at the St. Katharine’s Latin school in 1580, but his opinion of the new headmaster soured quickly; Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 281.


²⁵² Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 282. The Superintendent’s public censure also stressed Crüger’s alleged “neglect of catechism instruction,” which Pouchenius condemned as a root of “Unkirchlichkeit,” or “churchlessness.”

²⁵³ Starck, Kirchen-Historie pp. 381-382; cf. Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 282.Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 282. In his formal complaint to the council, Crüger argued that “personal attacks” by clergymen [i.e. denunciations by name from the pulpit or in other contexts] exceeded the bounds of clerical discipline; this echoed Adelheid Ludinghusen’s complaints from the later 1570s. When Hauptpastor Michael Rhau attempted to mediate the between the parties in mid-1586, Crüger’s refusal to cooperate prompted the pastor to denounce him as a “notorious trouble-maker” and openly criticize the “poor state of the schools”; meanwhile, pastor Rhau used his status as Crüger’s confessor to deny him absolution, and thus bar him receiving communion.
be so unfavorable that the council decided to remove Crüger from the post of Schulrektor on 29 October, 1588.\textsuperscript{254}

The Pouchenius-Crüger dispute appeared at first to be a victory for Orthodox Lutheran teaching in the city, but the incident actually seems to have affirmed many council members in their cautious attitude toward the ministry’s disciplinary zeal. The confluence of heightened structural pressures with Pouchenius’s fervor for discipline encouraged magistrates to take a defensive stance vis-à-vis the ministry as early as 1582. “So outrageously does one speak in the pulpit,” the council had complained in a general reprimand to the pastors, “it is as though Lübeck were one great whorehouse, and neighbor upon neighbor were adulterers.”\textsuperscript{255} In 1588, the council balanced its dismissal of Crüger with a new decree restricting the Strafamt, which demanded that the pastors confine their pulpit denunciations to “public and notorious” sins like blasphemy, heresy, murder, and “demonstrated cases of adultery.”\textsuperscript{256} Meanwhile, allegations for all other moral infractions were to be reserved for meetings of the consistory court (Konsistorium), where they would be decided by city’s four Bürgermeister. In view of Heinrich Brokes’s testimony on burgher-patrician enmity by 1599, the council probably moved to circumscribe pastoral discipline out of fear of disorder: Brokes’s diary entries for 1613-14 report that the scandal over the council’s treaty with the Netherlands scandal caused widespread murmurs of uprising among “common people” who mistrusted the council. Although a quarter-century elapsed between Crüger’s dismissal and the council’s decision to exile a pastor for sedition in 1614, both events began with pulpit denunciations by pastors committed to the work of reform.


\textsuperscript{255} “So wird dabei auf der cantzel ... so greulich davon geredet, als wenn Lubeck ein gross hurhauss und nachbar bei nachbar ehbrecher weren,” quoted in Hauchild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 281. The reprimand issued by the council in 1582 targeted the new penchant for innovation that characterized the clergy under Pouchenius’s leadership; this occurred both in liturgical matters (e.g. the clergy had abruptly discontinued use of the paten in the Lord’s Supper, and begun silencing the organ during baptism, among others items), as well as in their new-found fervor for moral discipline; see p. 280-282.

\textsuperscript{256} Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 282.
The same fears moved Lübeck’s magistrates to eschew the key disciplinary innovations central to Protestant confession-building elsewhere. Beginning in 1580, they refused ministry requests for revisions to the original Lübeck church order of 1531, despite urging from the Superintendent, and seem to have withheld support for church visitations in the various parishes (urban and rural) subject to Lübeck’s summus episcopus, or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Later generations of clerics made use of the church order Pouchenius had written for Saxony-Lauenberg in 1585, but were unable to overcome their magistrates’ lack of enthusiasm for the visitation tradition; the only significant visitation protocols preserved for the four decades after 1580 are for Bergedorf, a district located on the Elbe river, about sixty kilometers southwest of Lübeck, which the council ruled jointly with Hamburg. When viewed alongside the lax enforcement of moral legislation that so exercised the clergy, Lübeck’s church politics for this period seem to have been characterized by ad hoc responses to church management in general, and to the reform of belief and behavior in particular. Wolf-Dieter Hauschild has explained this as a fundamental difference in the mindset, and thus the priorities, of the clerical and secular estates; specifically, he suggested that the magistrates restricted clerical discipline by 1600 because they feared an “ominous intervention by the clergy into the sphere of worldly authority,” and concluded that the council rejected “a rigorous piety of the type promoted by the ministry,” because they found this incongruent with urban-mercantile society and their own oligarchic claims to power. In view of the new hardships of the Little Ice Age, however, it is equally likely that city council members foresaw that an outpouring of denunciations in the weekly sermons would fuel the

---


258 The records of the Bergedorf visitations (1583-1594) are the only ones of this type preserved in the records of the AHL, *Geistliches Ministerium, Tom. II, 1550-1624*. Ernst Deecke confirmed the infrequency of church visitations in Lübeck during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; see “Die früheren Verhältnisse des hiesigen Ministerii im Überblick,” in *Neue Lübeckische Blätter* 4 (1838), 209-212, 219-223, 227-230, 237-238; here p. 211.

resentment ordinary Lübeckers already harbored toward their magistrates and patricians. The same fears justified an extraordinary innovation at the start of the seventeenth century: when Pouchenius died in October of 1600, the office of Superintendent in Lübeck languished for over a decade, until the council installed Georg Stampelius (1561-1613) in June of 1613.

< *The Second Reformation and “Crypto-Calvinism”* >

Mystics and non-conformist teachers proliferated in the northwestern Germany during the Little Ice Age and Thirty Years War, but around 1600, Lutheran polemicists still devoted their greatest efforts to the twin threat of Calvinism and post-Tridentine Catholicism. In 1608, an anonymous tract entitled *True-hearted Warning to All Christian Princes* decried the counter-reformation efforts of “the Society of Jesus in Munich and Ingolstadt,” and spoke of a general Catholic conspiracy against Protestant Germany, but in general, the polemical corpus for this period suggest that northern cities viewed the rapid gains of the “second Reformation” as the greater threat. Reformed innovations in Bremen and Berlin, and at princely courts in Nassau-Dillenburg and nearby Holstein-Gottorf demanded that Lutherans possess the knowledge needed to recognize and oppose what became known as “crypto-Calvinism”; i.e. Reformed sympathies held by rulers and pastors who still outwardly conformed to Lutheranism. In Lübeck, the printing workshops of Asswerus Kröger and Johannes Balhorn filled this demand with a series of anti-Calvinist prints for both learned and popular audiences.

---

260 Ibid, p. 279: “The council feared ... [that] an extensively pursued clerical policing of morals, which always traced tangents into new areas of life, could, at length, lead to an ominous intervention by the clergy into the worldly regiment of authority.” M. Funk makes a similar argument in his short monograph on modern Kirchenpolitik in Lübeck; Cf. Funk, *Kirche und Staat*, pp. 15-16.

261 Catholic (particularly Jesuit) conspiracy against the Empire is a recurrent theme in Protestant pamphlets like Trewherzige Warnung / An alle Christliche Potentaten und Obrigkeiten / Jeder das Colloquium des Bapsts Pauli / Philippi Königes in Hispanien / Und Erzherzogs Ferdinandi / Wie man Teutschland überziehen und bezwingen möge / von der Societät Jesu zu München und Ingolstadt vorfertigt / und an Tag gegeben. (1608). HAB H: S 320c. 4° Helmst.

popular audiences. Kröger’s edition of the 1590 pamphlet *Calvin Second-Hand*, by the Leipzig professor and church Superintendent Nicolaus Selneccer (1530-1592), refuted Reformed understandings of the sacrament, baptism, and predestination through detailed critique of Zwingli, Calvin, and Theodore Beza, and was meant to appeal to the former readership. As though heeding Selneccer’s warning that “the Zwinglian and Calvinist error is much more grave and nefarious that one commonly allows,” other writers simplified this dense polemic into verses and songs with popular appeal. The pamphlet *Two Songs against the Calvinists* (1592) offered ironical instructions on how one might adopt Calvinist practice, advising in the opening couplets: “First, if you wish to be Calvinist / follow my sound advice / Worry not / that people demean you / and also care little for Baptism / Do not rely on it for solace / so are you truly converted.” Subsequent stanzas accuse the Reformed tradition of similar disregard for the Lord’s Supper (*Abendmahl*), and lampooned Beza’s predestination doctrines through a sardonic reminder that “you do not know / whether you are elect / thus you must live in doubt.” A “Prayer against the Calvinists” accompanied these verses, which the anonymous author notes were meant to be sung according to tunes borrowed from existing songs.

Lübeck’s pastors shared the vigilance advocated by these Streitschriften, and their vocal opposition to perceived manifestations of crypto-Calvinism embroiled the ministry in several public and highly divisive scandals between 1600 and the beginning of the Thirty Years’ War. The first of these was the hotly contested election of junior pastor Caspar Holste (1554-1638), whom the Bürgermeister and Kirchenvorsteher selected...

---


264 Selneceer, *Calvinus Redivivus*, p. iii: “...das der Zwinglische und Calvinische Irrthumb viel gröber und schedlicher seye / dann man gemeiniglich fürgibt... und beydes Obrigkeiten und Unterthanen gern überreden wolte.”


266 “Ein Christlich Gebet / wider die Calvinisten,” in *Zwei Lieder wider die Calvinisten* (Lübeck: Balhorn, 1592), pp. 6-7. The subtitle stipulates that this was meant to be sung or recited to the tune of “O Herre Gott / dein Göttlich Wort.”
for a vacant post in St. Peter’s parish in late summer of 1599. Though the city council approved Holste’s election, this appointment excited fervent protests by the ministry and subjected the pastor to years of discriminatory treatment; in a 1601 letter to the Lübeck council, Holste described himself as “persecuted, bedeviled, oppressed, vilified, and slandered” at the hands of his new colleagues. From the available sources, is difficult to reconcile Holste’s career in Ziethen, a rural environ of Ratzeburg located about thirty kilometers due south of Lübeck, with the allegations of doctrinal error, corruption of character, and Reformed sympathies that threatened to overturn his election in 1599. In fact, the letters of recommendation solicited by the churchwardens of St. Peter’s give the opposite impression of Holste’s character and discharge of office in Ziethen, and the questionable nature of the ministry’s opposition suggests that Holste’s election became bound up in the longer debate over the practice of clerical election, and the clergy’s role therein. While Holste was probably not a secret Calvinist, his involvement in not one but two scandals after 1600 bore witness to the new disorderly potential of the urban ministry after 1600.

268 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80; “Caspar Holste bittet abermal, ihn vor den Beleidigungen des Ministeriums zu schützen, und sendet eine Verantwortung gegen die ihm gewunschten Vorwürfe”: „Was mir aber neu eine geraumer Zeit, hierbei für Schimpff ... und Hertzeleid zugefugt, wie ich druber verfolget, gequelet, verachtet, unterdrückt, geschmehent und gelester worden, kann ich itzt von ort zu rede, ohn sonderliche schmertzen vnd hertzbeschwerung in specie nicht erzehlen."
269 The recommendations Holste solicited from Rostock and Ratzeburg depicted him as a dedicated pastor and a promising candidate for the ministry. Nicolaus Petraeus, Superintendent in Ratzeburg, “gladly supplied” a recommendation “because, he being known to me for almost two years, in which time I conversed often and at length with him concerning important matters relating to our churchly office, and neither his teaching, nor his life... impressed me as objectionable”; AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80; Nicolaus Petraeus, “Zeugniß des Superintendents in Ratzeburg Nicolaus Petraeus” 7. August 1599. Not only was Holste doctrinally correct and morally upright, his discharge of office in Ziethen was exemplary, “because he in constant in the pure teaching, which [is] founded in the writings of the prophets and Apostles, and is a fervent enemy of all conflicting, erroneous opinions,” and because he was diligent in his pastoral duties; see ibid.: “the fundaments of his sermons he takes from the same ... seriously preaches and exhorts the pure teaching of God’s Word, consoles in a friendly manner, and staunchly disciplines, without erroneous causes of character [i.e. motivations].” The Rostock professor David Chytraeus (1531-1600) issued a similar assessment of Holste, deeming him gifted with “temperance, solemnity, truth and justice,” and a man who exercised his God-given virtues in both his clerical duties and his daily life; he was similarly gifted in his understanding of doctrine: he not only “grasped the correct positions on all points of Christian teaching,” but was also, apparently, a highly effective homilist: “I have it from those who have heard him preach that he has a singular skill and mellifluence about him, that moves ... the hearts
On 10 September 1599, the management of St. Peter’s parish (consisting of Bürgermeister Alexander von Lüneburg and three other laymen) invited Holste to deliver a trial sermon in the Lübeck Marienkirche. This took place on the sixteenth of September, and does not seem to have been controversial at first. Two months later, however, the ministry formally objected to Holste’s candidacy, on two grounds. According to the complaint written by head pastor Gerhard Schröder, Holste’s trial sermon contravened the Lutheran sola Scriptura tradition by relying excessively on “other, private writings, conflicting with or inharmonious with God’s word.” Holste’s sermon is no longer extant, and though we know that it was based upon Acts 20, verses 17-21, it is difficult to speculate as to which elements might have given offense; it is possible that the pastors simply found themselves insulted by the candidate’s brash invocation of St. Paul’s farewell address to the elders of the early church at Ephesus. It is equally likely, however, that the pastors had decided to oppose Holste’s election regardless of the quality or content of his sermon, as the ministry also accused the churchwardens of deviating from the traditional form of the Predigerwahl. Schröder’s letter lamented “how collectively and unanimously the Kirchenvorsteher allowed themselves to consider and decide” upon Holste, without securing the consent of the ministry. Having seized upon perceived doctrinal irregularities as a
pretext from which to forestall Holste election, the pastors now set about assembling a body of evidence that would overturn his candidacy.

With Schröder’s leadership, the ministry issued a formal “remonstrance” in late winter of 1600, in which they argued that Holste posed a spiritual danger to the urban community because he was a secret Reformed sympathizer, or crypto-Calvinist. This document mustered evidence of false teaching from Holste’s past sermons in the hope of discrediting him as “a wolf, who cloaked himself with sheep’s clothing” with the intent of spreading doctrinal error in the city’s churches. In particular, the pastors seized upon a funeral sermon Holste had published in late 1597, in honor of the provost of the Ratzeburg cathedral chapter, and claimed that this work “set out, in public print, that Christ remains of secondary nature to God, which is Arianistic and against the Word of God.” The ministry also claimed that Holste’s conniving, “wolfish” nature was well-known among his colleagues in the Ratzeburg district, and cited the additional testimony of a certain Doctor Tohlmer, who alleged that “the pastor of Ziethen was an evil adder.”

Because of his alleged dedication to Calvinist errors, the ministry concluded, pursuing Holste’s election would

---

273 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80; “Die Pastoren remonstrieren gegen der Wahl Caspar Holste.” This document constitutes the ministry’s most detailed argument against Holste’s election, and was probably composed in February or March of 1600, several months after the initial protests.

274 Ibid.: “Here too [i.e. in the town of Ziethen] there are burghers who are said to have heard from the mouth of the pastor at Schlagsdorf, that he spoke these words of the pastor of Ziethen [i.e. Holste], [that] the pastor of Ziethen is a wolf, who has cloaked himself with sheep’s clothing.”

275 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 843. The former provost was a certain Ludolph Schacken, and the text in question was titled Leich-Predigt auff Ludolph Schacken / Thum Probsten zu Ratzeburg; it appeared in print in 1597; The clergy’s complaint appears in AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80; “Die Pastoren remonstrieren gegen der Wahl Caspar Holste”: “so ehr ihn offnen druck außgehen laßen, dar zuthun, daß ehr darinnen gesetzt q. christy sedeat at de xtram patris secundum naturm triuinam, welche den arrianischte undt wider Godeß wordt sỹ, darzu ehr dan testimonia auß heillige Schrifft algeret.”

276 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80; “Die Pastoren remonstrieren gegen der Wahl Caspar Holste.” This testimony gives the impression of hearsay, which is hardly lessened by the testimony of Doctor Tohlmer, who may have been connected to the household of Lübeck Bürgermeister Gotthold von Höveln; as the ministry reported: “Doctor Tohlmer, who can be heard [i.e. consulted] concerning this, is also to have spoken these words concerning him, [that] the pastor of Ziethen was an evil adder.”
contaminate the whole city with false doctrines: “Were such ministers to be accepted,” Schröder wrote, “circuitousness (Weitläuffigkeit) would be introduced into this church on every hand.”

Despite their preoccupation with unrest among the guilds, the council moved to resolve this dispute after Schröder openly accused Holste of Calvinist sympathies at a meeting convened by the council on 6 July. The council investigated by soliciting theological opinions from the pastors and theology professors in Rostock, who found the case against Holste wanting, and even defended the theology of Christ found in his sermon for Schacken. Ministry opposition failed in early September of 1600, when the council issued a formal declaration affirming Holste’s “legitimate and orderly calling” to the pastorate of St. Peter’s in Lübeck. He was inducted as a junior pastor or Prediger the following month. However, this document could not protect Holste from the deep-seated hostility of the ministry, who “wished neither to accept him as a member, nor to admit him to sittings of the colloquium,” and Holste’s career remained at an impasse until 1607, when Rostock Superintendent Lucas Bacmeister (1538-1608) persuaded Lübeck mayor Jakob Börding

---

277 ibid.: “Wehr solchs dir forige Exempel ußgewiset habenn, daß auch Prediger, die ihre gaben wider auß undt woll gehabt, angenommen, darnach aber allrhandt wedtlofficheit in diße kirche eingefuret hette.”

278 Holste’s plight aroused the sympathy of the Rostock professors: in addition to refuting the charges leveled by the ministry, they also issued him with a written “testimony of Orthodoxy” [testimonium orthodoxiae] to protect him from future allegations of heterodoxy. Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 565: „da man Holstenio aus einer dem voerstobenen Probste zu Ratzeburg / Ludolph Schacken gehaltenen Predigt den Arianismum, und Calvinismum zulegen wollen / und er ihnen dieselbe zur censur überreicht / sie ihm ein testimoiium orthodoxiae wider solche beygemessene Irrthümer so ferne ertheilet.“


280 AHL Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri, A 80; “Der Rath zu Lübeck beruft Caspar Holste,” 12. September 1600: „So wollen wir demnach Eurer Ehrwürden hiermitt in Nahmen Gottes des Almechtigen legitime und ordenlicherweise vociret und beruffen habenn, grundlich begerendt.“ Holste swore the oath of ministry (Predigereid) and signed Lübeck’s Book of Concord the following month, returning briefly to Ziethen to deliver a farewell sermon on 7 October, 1600 (his signature in the city’s Book of Concord reads only “Anno 1600,” and does not include the date he formally joined the Lübeck ministry.
to engineer a formal act of reconciliation between Holste and his fellow pastors.\textsuperscript{281} However, Holste’s colleagues continued to suspect him of heterodoxy sympathies in subsequent years, prompting the pastor to re-fashion himself as an aggressive anti-Calvinist after 1610.\textsuperscript{282}

Holste’s appeals to the council offer insight into the ill-treatment he suffered following his contested election. In 1601, for example, Holste complained of repeated harassment by a fellow \textit{Prediger} from St. Aegidien’s parish, reporting:

“...that Lambert Nordanus, not merely twice previously, but also lately, namely the 28\textsuperscript{th} October in public exchange, on a open street, approaching [me] with aggressiveness and bitterness of mind, with protesting and troubling words, challenged my possession of office, hither and thither for two whole passageways.”\textsuperscript{283}

Such incidents not only interfered with Holste’s discharge of office, but also tarnished his personal reputation, and thus his authority vis-à-vis parishioners. After years of such treatment, he finally resolved to counter the “persecution and untruthful accusation, as has been inflicted upon me from the highest to the lowest in the ministry” by aligning himself unmistakably with the Orthodox theologians of Wittenberg.\textsuperscript{284}

\textsuperscript{281} Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, p. 566. Many of the pastors continued to regard Holste’s election as “illegitimate,” (\textit{electionem pro illegitima}); literally, a „bastardized” election, issuing a further protest along these lines four days after Holste was introduced to office; \textit{cf.} AHL \textit{Religionsgemeinschaften, St. Petri}, A 80; “Das Ministerium bittet den Rath, die Wahl Caspar Holste nicht zuzulassen,” 16. September, 1600. As Rostock Superintendent, the elder Lucas Bacmeister had overseen Holste’s ordination in 1595, and his intervention successfully brought the belligerents in the Holste affair to negotiation in July of 1607; see Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, p. 566. On Holste’s formal reconciliation with his colleagues in 1607, \textit{cf.} Sartori, „Caspar Holste,” p. 351-352.

\textsuperscript{282} Mediated by Börding, talks between Holste and ministry in summer of 1607 produced an official “formula of reconciliation,” in which Holste promised to henceforth conduct himself “peacefully and without dispute, as befitting a true brother.” In return, the ministry officially recognized their colleague’s status as a “brother and member of the ministry,” upon which Holste symbolically shook hands with the head pastors, as well as his fellow ministers [\textit{Prediger}]; Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, pp. 566-567. August Satori confirms that the pastors continued to view Holste with suspicion after the formal reconciliation of 1607; \textit{cf.} “Caspar Holste,” pp. 353-54.

\textsuperscript{283} Mediated by Börding, talks between Holste and ministry in summer of 1607 produced an official “formula of reconciliation,” in which Holste promised to henceforth conduct himself “peacefully and without dispute, as befitting a true brother.” In return, the ministry officially recognized their colleague’s status as a “brother and member of the ministry,” upon which Holste symbolically shook hands with the head pastors, as well as his fellow ministers [\textit{Prediger}]; Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, pp. 566-567. August Satori confirms that the pastors continued to view Holste with suspicion after the formal reconciliation of 1607; \textit{cf.} “Caspar Holste,” pp. 353-54.

\textsuperscript{284} Mediated by Börding, talks between Holste and ministry in summer of 1607 produced an official “formula of reconciliation,” in which Holste promised to henceforth conduct himself “peacefully and without dispute, as befitting a true brother.” In return, the ministry officially recognized their colleague’s status as a “brother and member of the ministry,” upon which Holste symbolically shook hands with the head pastors, as well as his fellow ministers [\textit{Prediger}]; Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, pp. 566-567. August Satori confirms that the pastors continued to view Holste with suspicion after the formal reconciliation of 1607; \textit{cf.} “Caspar Holste,” pp. 353-54.

\textsuperscript{281} Mediated by Börding, talks between Holste and ministry in summer of 1607 produced an official “formula of reconciliation,” in which Holste promised to henceforth conduct himself “peacefully and without dispute, as befitting a true brother.” In return, the ministry officially recognized their colleague’s status as a “brother and member of the ministry,” upon which Holste symbolically shook hands with the head pastors, as well as his fellow ministers [\textit{Prediger}]; Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, pp. 566-567. August Satori confirms that the pastors continued to view Holste with suspicion after the formal reconciliation of 1607; \textit{cf.} “Caspar Holste,” pp. 353-54.
1610, he began work on a German translation of the *Compendium locorum Theologicorum* by the theologian and polemicist Leonhard Hutter (1563-1616), to which he appended a foreword expressing his wish “that my own insignificant person might hereby be liberated and released, from the unfounded suspicion of erroneous opinions and teachings.” ²⁸⁵ His polemical turn would have unanticipated consequences, as his second polemical effort, an anti-Calvinist tract entitled *Sixteen Highly Important and Necessary Questions, Correct to Expound in These Times*, drew him into conflict with Johann of Holstein-Gottorf, a Holstein duke who also held the office of Bishop of Lübeck.²⁸⁶

Holste wrote the *Sixteen Questions* in imitation of another book by Leonhard Hutter, in which the latter condemned the innovations in liturgy, sacramental life, and church government promoted by Reformed jurist and statesman Johann von Münster (1560-1632) in various princely courts of the northwestern Empire.²⁸⁷ Holste’s digest of this work targeted “political pretexts, mandates, and orders through which doors and windows are opened to Calvinism and other heretical opinions”: he warned readers to beware of crypto-Calvinist innovation in the Eucharist, urged Lutheran pastors to combat “Calvinists, verfolgung, [und] vnwarhaftige besichtigung ... so mir von dem Obersten bis zum Untersten im Ministerio nu fast d. ganzer Jahr zugetrieben, nicht weiter dulden, noch leiden kann.”


²⁸⁶ Cf. Feddersen, „Kryptocalvinismus,” pp. 344-345. Johann Adolf was a close friend of the Calvinist Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Kassel, who influenced the innovations in liturgy and statecraft the Duke adopted in his territories after 1600. The Lübeck Hochstift no longer exercised episcopal authority over the city’s churches in 1613; the bishop’s authority over the city was dissolved in the early Reformation, and Johann Adolf had to rely on the Lübeck city council to discipline Holste in 1613-14; cf. *Jahresbericht für Deutsche Geschichte* (1927), S. 388.

Anabaptists, Schwenkfelders, Jesuits and Papists” through diligent exercise of the Strafamt, and condemned the German Reformed tradition as an illegal sect under the 1555 Peace of Augsburg. While Holste never mentioned Duke Johann by name, the prince condemned Holste to the Lübeck city council as a “corrupter of princely honor” (Ehrenschänder) in early 1613, and demanded his written retraction and formal apology. Holste subsequently described himself as “hard pressed” by the combined displeasure of the prince and council, but he initially refused to admit that his polemical zeal had exceeded the proper bounds of his office. In one of numerous explanatory letters, Holste expressed contrition for the offense he caused, but insisted on the rectitude and necessity of his efforts to combat heterodoxy: “[I] will, through truth, capably and in the capacity of my office, faithfully warn my assigned flock against the Calvinist poisoning of souls [Seelengift].” This fueled Johann Adolf’s resolve to humble the pastor, and he continued to demand letters of apology into 1614. He finally let the matter rest late the same year, after Holste begged the intercession of one Peter Juchert, a member of the ducal consistory, who agreed to request the duke’s mercy on account of the pastor’s wife and five young children.

---

288 See for example question eight, one of several arguing for strict application of the clerical Strafamt; Holste, Sechzehen Hochwichtige Fragen, § 8: “Obs weder Gottes Wort / und praxin Apostolicam / auch wider die Brüderliche liebe / das ein Christeiferiger Mundbote unsers Erzbischoffs Jesu Christi / die Calvinisten / Widerteuffer / Schwenckfeldisten / Jesuiter und Papisten etc. mündlich schrifftlich / privatim & publice ... postulat, taxiere, und bey Namen auf der Cantzel nenne?”

289 Starck describes Holste as „harte bedroht“ in 1614; for a summary of his conflict with Duke Johann, see Kirchen-Historie, p. 586. The prince-bishop was particularly angered that Holste’s preface to his translation of Hutter’s Compendium Theologicorum condemned a letter of patent he had issued in April 1609, prohibiting the clergy in his lands from “excessive” exercises of clerical discipline, namely “chastising, judging, and condemning” the perceived shortcoming of temporal government from the pulpit; cf. Satori, “Caspar Holste,” pp. 353-354.


The success of Holste’s self-fashioning campaign is difficult to gauge. Many pastors continued to disavow knowledge of the *Sixteen Questions* when questioned by a deputation of *Ratsherren* in early 1614, but in both cases Holste’s colleagues complained only of his “excessive” zeal and inflammatory style; they did not accuse him of false doctrine, condemn the tenets of his writings, or attack his character as they had done in years past. Moreover, several colleagues even took Holste’s side when the council examined him in the consistory on 22 March, suggesting that at least a coterie within the ministry approved of his antagonistic stance toward the reforms of Duke Johann.²⁹² By 1613, therefore, Holste enjoyed more support than he had in the years prior to his *Compendium*, but with the notable exception of new Superintendent Georg Stampelius, who criticized him for “suspicion, temerity, and impertinence” in publishing the *Sixteenth Questions* without the consent of his superiors in the ministry.²⁹³ By this time, however, the scandal caused by Holste’s polemic had been thoroughly eclipsed by a fellow pastor’s public confrontation with the Superintendent and *Ratsherren*.

*<The Bündnis of 1613 and the Burchardi-Stampelius Debate>*

The discomfiture caused by Holste’s publications was overshadowed by a general uproar that occurred after the Lübeck city council signed a commercial and defensive alliance with the Estates of Holland in May 1613. Within a month, the junior pastor Antonius Burchardi (1580-1626) had publicly denounced this accord in a series of sermons begun in late June.²⁹⁴ The earliest of these, a two-part cycle entitled *Sermons of*
Penance and Warning ... Concerning the Newly-Made Alliance of Our City With Persons of Calvinist Religion, attacked the liaison on the grounds that it would subject the city to infiltration by members of the Dutch Reformed confession, in the guise of improved commerce and mutual defense. Burchardi’s position proved popular in the ministry, and his status as de facto leader of a “party” of pastors opposed to the treaty embroiled him in a vituperative debate with newly-appointed Superintendent Georg Stampelius (1613-1622), a man known for his irenicist attitude towards Catholics and Calvinists who soon found himself charged with the formidable task of neutralizing Burchardi’s attack on the council’s foreign policy.295 The protracted dispute between pastor and Superintendent threatened popular unrest at the end of 1613, and concluded with Burchardi being dismissed from his post and exiled from Lübeck.

Burchardi’s Warning Sermons articulated a causal relationship between the sinful behavior of God’s chosen nation and the afflictions of divine punishment, a familiar device that recalled the explanations for plague, famine, and disaster current since the 1570s. “It is a great Sin, through which God will be severely angered,” Burchardi warned from his pulpit in the Marienkirche, “whenever one binds oneself to and intermingles with people of foreign and false Religion, and seeks help or assistance among them.”296 In contrast to the apocalypticism of popular prints, Burchardi drew his proofs mainly from the Old Testament history of the Israelite nation, focusing on the sufferings that ensued when the tribes violated their covenant with Yahweh.297 In Egypt, following the death of Joseph, “the Egyptians became their killers and executioners

---

295 “Stampeel, Georg,” in AHL Pastorenkartei. Stampelius, born in Salzwedel and a professor of “oriental” (“morgenländischen”) languages at the University in Frankfurt, was at this time a newcomer to Lübeck, having been elected to the office of Hauptpastor in St. Peter’s parish in 1611.


297 Burchardi’s relied upon Old-Testament accounts of the original Israelite nation, as illustrated by his copious use of scriptural proofs from Mosaic law (Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy) and from the books of history and prophets, especially Joshua, Jeremiah, Nahum, Ezekiel, Kings and Chronicles.
... because they were drawn into the Egyptian idolatry”; similarly, “seeking community” (Gemeinschaft) with the Canaanites of Moab led many Hebrews to take up worship of the Phoenician deity Baal, for which God’s wrath “burned against Israel, as fire in straw.”298 Because an alliance with the Netherlands brought Lübeck into a comparable Gemeinschaft with “Calvinists,” the council had placed all Lübeckers in danger of the same punishments He meted out against the Hebrews.

For Martin Luther, tyranny on the part of temporal authorities was one of very few circumstances in which god-fearing subjects could be justified in rebelling against their magistrates. Because Burchardi portrayed the council’s new alliance as a glaring miscarriage of the responsibilities of Obrigkeit, or secular authority, his sermons had a political dimension that made his brand of anti-Reformed polemic far more volatile than Holste’s combative digests. The fourth “proof” of the Warning Sermon contains the most concise summary of Burchardi’s arguments condemning alliance with non-Lutherans: “It is well to note,” he writes “from the histories of the whole Bible, that no single authority [Obrigkeit] of God’s people, nor the people [Volk] thereof, having inclined themselves to godless and unbelieving succor and community, has ever gone unpunished.”299 These sermons suggested that the new treaty was one such act, which justified the pastor in questioning the council’s claims concerning the divinely-ordained nature of their authority. “No single godly prince or authority,” Burchardi opined, “who had God’s favor and did rightly, ever intermingled himself and his people with the unbelievers through political community ... nor sought or requested the same

---

298 Burchardi, “Warnungs-Predigt,” p. 677. Burchardi stressed that this came about because the Hebrews willingly sought sanctuary in Egypt after the death of Joseph (notably, he refers to the legal condition of “Stadtdrecht”): „Die fingen an in Egiptenland, da Joseph gestorben war, und begehrten Stadtrecht bei den Egiptern, vnd wurden mit Freuden angenommen ... Darüber gerieten sie in der Egipter Abgotterei, und gedacht der Herr alle seinen Zorn über sie gehen zu lassen noch in Egiptenlande Ezeh. 20 v. 8 und wurden die Egipter ihre Hecker vnd Mörder.“ On the Israel’s encounter with the Moabites, ibid., p. 678: „Den Brott und Wasser von den Moabitern zu kauffen war ihnen vergonnet Deut 2:6. aber hinter Mosis Rucken suchten sie auch mehr Gemeinschaft mit ihnen, liessen sich auch aufhalten in ihren Heusern, und machten Freundschaft, daß sie auch zu Gast geladen wurden. Da brant es schon, da das Fewr in Stro war...“ As punishment, Moses ordered the leader members of each Hebrew tribes executed, “because they gave themselves to Baal”; see Num. 25: 3-5.

in time of need." When the council dismissed Burchardi from office in 1614, they justified their decision by referring to various defamatory comparisons – to “Sodom and Gomorrah, the godless Ahab [and] Jezebel, and other persecutors and scorners of God”– that peppered Burchardi’s sermons and writings on the treaty.

Mayor Brokes recorded that matters came to a head on December 18, 1618, when “the youngest minister of the church of Our Lady” (i.e. the Marienkirche), “inveighed fiercely on this Bündnis and condemned it as a godless and damned work, for which the Lord God would punish this city with the fires of hell ... he inveighed equally severely upon the Superintendent, who defended such a confederation, and also desired to hold other pastors back from their office of discipline (Strafamt).” Since November, Burchardi sermons had targeted Superintendent Stampelius personally, until the latter responded in kind with a sermon entitled Against the Undermost Chaplain of St. Mary’s and His Impudent and Unauthorized Denunciation, Falsely Titled a Sermon of Penitence. Burchardi counter-attacked with a message entitled Why Do You Ally with Scoffers and Hold Your Peace, That the Godless Devour the Pious?, and set about dedicating his weekly “sermons of penitence” (Buß-predigten) to attacking both Stampelius and the treaty he

---


302 Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, p. 277: “Der jüngste Capellan (M. Burchard), so kaum ein halbes Jahr im Amte war, so weit verleiten, daß er am 18. December auf einem Sonnabend Nachmittag sehr heftig auf dieses Bündniß inveirht und es für ein gottlos verdammt Werk schalt, so den Sünden der ersten Welt gleich ware, und würde Gott der Herr darum diese Stadt mit dem höllischen Feuer strafen; inveirhte gleicergestalt heftig auf den Supintendenten, der solche Conföderation defendiren, auch andere Prediger von ihrem Strafamte abhalten wollte.”

defended. Stampelius returned fire in his weekly catechism sermons, but these failed to dampen Burchardi’s fervor, or to deprive Burchardi of support among the pastors. The magistrates finally intervened after Stampelius accused Burchardi of fomenting sedition among the laity in a sermon delivered in the Advent weeks of 1613; they were particularly concerned by Stampelius’s report that Burchardi’s sermons reflected “the crude errors of Karlstadt, Müntzer, and the Anabaptists” by deliberately advocating disorder among the citizenry. Diary entries by Brokes reveal that the council feared that this turmoil would ignite simmering resentment over recent increases in taxes, and Starck, the eighteenth-century historian, confirms that “the council could no longer peer through their fingers” at the threat of unrest by Christmas of 1613.

The threat of internal unrest demanded that the council publicly refute the allegations contained in the Warning Sermon, and their response appeared in February of 1614, in the form of a theological digest compiled by Stampelius and published under the title Various Treatments by Distinguished Theologians, That the Entire Churches of the Papists and Calvinists Are Not To Be Wholly Condemned, Rather That We Might Have Friendship and Community With the Same, As Baptized Christians, in Civic Life and Vicissitude.

Burchardi, however, interpreted the Various Treatments as an invitation to continue the debate in print, and

---

304 Weimann, “Lübecker Geistlichen,” p. 106. Burchardi’s rebuttal is no longer extant, but Weimann records its title as Warum stehest Du denn zu den Verächtern und schweigest, daß der Gottlose verschlinget den, der frömmrer denn er ist?

305 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 600. In the weeks before Christmas anti-Calvinist agitation proliferated among the burghers until the council, in Starck’s memorable phrase, “could no longer peer through their fingers” (“da der Rath unmöglich länger durch die Finger sehen können”) at this issue and its seditious potential.

Andreas Karlstadt, an early contemporary of Luther’s, became a proponent of the “radical Reformation” by the 1620s. Thomas Müntzer was one of the chief architects of the Peasant’s War; see Peter Blickle, The Revolution of 1525 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1981). On the rise and fall of the Anabaptist kingdom of Münster and its theocratic leaders Jan Matthys and Jan van Leiden, see R. Po-Chia Hsia, “Münster and the Anabaptists,” in Hsia (ed.), The German People and the Reformation (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), pp. 51-69.


307 Stampelius’s Unterschiedliche Bedencken / Etzlicher fürnehmer Theologen / das die gantze Kirchen der Papisten und Calvinisten / allermassen nicht zu verdammen / sondern das man mit denselben als getauften Christen / in eußerlichen Bürgerlichen Leben und Wandel wol könne umbgehgen / Freundt und Gemeinschaft haben (Lübeck: Jausch, 1614) comprises a digest of theological opinions from Luther and his successors. This tract was composed by Stampelius with the oversight of a deputation of four Ratsherren and the city’s four Bürgermeister; cf. Weimann, “Lübecker Geistliche,” pp. 107-108.
forged ahead by drafting a thirty-two point refutation of Stampelius’s arguments, which he published under the title *Brief Refutation of the Various Treatments by Distinguished Theologians*. Although this tract was printed anonymously, the council had few doubts about the identity of the author: Burchardi dedicated the *Refutation* to his “dear Lords and fellow citizens,” urging them that a timely repeal of the Dutch alliance could still save the city from “misery that fills many other Lutheran cities” as a consequence of their dealings with “Calvinists, Anabaptists, Arians, Jews [and] Papists.”\(^{308}\) This stubborn dismissal of the council’s explanation would be Burchardi’s final submission to the debate, and its intransigence probably helped to seal his fate prior to the hearings that took place in May of 1614.\(^{309}\)

The council’s efforts to quell the Burchardi-Stampelius debate revealed that most of Lübeck’s pastors were deeply opposed to the notion of “friendship and community” with members of the Reformed confession. In consistory proceedings, several members of the ministry disapproved of Burchardi’s confrontational stance toward the council— they testified that they had “urged him not to sharpen his quill thus”\(^{310}\) – but Burchardi enjoyed outspoken support from senior pastors Johann Stolterfoth and Heinrich Minne, and junior pastors Sebastian Schwann and Johann Embs.\(^{311}\) Menne, Burchardi’s “leading ally” according to council, articulated his sympathy for his colleague’s cause on 21 December 1613, when he


\(^{310}\) Starck, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 590. The rest of the pastors were also called to account during the proceedings of 12 May 1614, during which many admitted conferring with Burchardi on his *Kurtzer Gegenbericht*. Several pastors claimed that they “had advised Burchardi not to sharpen his quill thus,” that is, that they sought to dissuade him from publishing the inflammatory pamphlet (“die da frey gestunden / sie hatten es gelesen / und Burchardo gerathen / die Feder nicht also zu schärffen / in realibus wäre nichts zu tadeln”).

\(^{311}\) Weimann, “Geistliche,” p. 108. In a letter to the law faculty at Rostock, the council identified Menne as Burchardi’s leading ally (*Hauptmitstreiter*) in his year-long campaign against the Dutch alliance. Menne’s support of Burchardi did not inhibit him becoming *Senior* of the Lübeck ministry shortly after this affair was settled in 1614, a post that he held until his death in 1621.
informed the magistrates that “he could not know whether it was right that the treaty permitted itinerants of a foreign faith to live here, because this was against the Christian mandates of the forefathers.”

Because of the support Burchardi enjoyed, the May session of the consistory concluded by forbidding the clergy en masse from further dispute or public commentary on the matter.

The magistrates had first considered dismissing Burchardi the previous December, and they now sought to secure the legal and theological opinions that would support a case against him. The law professors at the university in Rostock agreed that Burchardi was culpable; the jurists confirmed that he had “elevated himself to leader of a civic party,” which had produced “egregious excesses” by promoting unrest among the citizens. However, the Giessen theological faculty opined that the Superintendent himself was partly to blame for his inability to discipline the pastors under his charge, noting that despite Burchardi’s hubris, his theological opinions were correct in the essential points. In the Abschiedsbrief issued on 19 August 1614, the Ratsherren chose the harder line, depriving Burchardi of the office of Prediger, and instructing him to “transfer his domicile elsewhere” by St. Michael’s Day of the following year. Expelling a pastor was an extraordinary act, but the council stressed that Burchardi’s seditious behavior demanded firm

---

312 "Thus," Brokes commented in response to Menne’s testimony, “he knows very well indeed.” Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, p. 278: “Der Pastor zu St. Egidien behauptete, er könnte nicht wissen, ob es recht ware, daß in der Conföderation den fremden Religionsverwandten allhier zu wohnen wäre vergönnet worden; denn solches wäre wider die christlichen mandata der Vorfahren.’ Er konnte es also doch wissen.”


314 Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, p. 278.

315 Quoted in Weimann,“Lübecker Geistlichen” p. 108.


317 About thirteen months from the date of Burchardi’s dismissal, as St. Michael’s day typically fell on 23./24 September. For the original phrasing from the Abschiedsbrief, see above, note 301.
measures: in their words, he had “given cause and occasion to general confusion, unrest, and insurrection in this city and community.”

Burchardi secured new employment as a parish pastor in Kiel in 1616, and continued to serve the city’s church until his death in 1628. In the meantime, the Lübeck ministry remained bitterly divided until Stampelius died in the early years of the Thirty Years’ War. Tensions between the Superintendent and other pastors probably dated to Stampelius’s appointment as Hauptpastor in 1611, but it was his unflagging loyalty to the council and treaty that guaranteed the lasting animosity of his fellow pastors after 1613. In mid-1614, Hinrich Menne “pilloried” the new Superintendent for being an opportunist, “who behaved in a disloyal manner toward his clerical brethren,” thus preparing the ground for subsequent incidents of harassment that ranged from the obvious dislike shown by the pastors for Stampelius’s sermons and lectures, to their repeated allegations that he was, in fact, a clandestine Calvinist. Stampelius’s personal troubles were exacerbated by his chronic inability to effectively discipline subordinates: in 1619, Prediger Sebastian Schwan voluntarily resigned from the staff of St. Mary’s parish, declaring that it “had become

318 On the text of the Abschiedsbrief, see above, note 303.

319 “Burchardi, Antonius,” in AHL Pastorenkartei. Burchardi’s son Matthias (b. 1619) succeeded him in the Kiel ministry, as pastor in St. Nicolai’s parish.

320 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, pp. 288-289. Several reasons contributed to Stampelius’s early unpopularity; first, he was never intended become Superintendent; his election to the office of Hauptpastor in 1611 had been facilitated by Bürgermeister Hinrich Brokes, whom Stampelius had befriend while at University in Tübingen, and he only became a candidate for Superintendent (again, at Brokes’s urging) when the council’s first choice, Dr. Christoph Butelius, died unexpectedly in December 1611, prior to entering office in Lübeck. “Stampeel, Georg” in AHL Pastorenkartei. Second, Holste’s ironic tendencies clashed sharply with the staunch anti-Calvinism that characterized the ministry since Pouchenius’ day; worse, this trait seems to have helped persuade the council to choose him over the other candidate for the Superintendency in 1613, Hauptpastor Johann Stolterfoth.

321 Quoted in Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 290. Regarding the animosity toward the Superintendent’s public engagements, Starck concluded succinctly that „not all in the ministry desired to be instructed by Stampelius.” In the latter case, he records an incident occurring after Burchardi’s dismissal, in which Marienkirche ministers Sebastian Schwan and Johann Embs declared that “the door had been opened to the Calvinist Wolf” when the council decided to appoint Stampelius. Other pastors cited the Superintendents erroneous expositions “of the person and office of Christ” as proof of Reformed sympathies; see Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 593.
inhospitable to him” after repeated clashes with the Superintendent. In December of the same year, St. Mary’s Prediger Michael Siricius (1588-1648) invoked the duties of clerical discipline against his own Superintendent when he denounced as “papist” a Christmas song that Stampelius had chosen for the children’s choir. Pastors angered by Burchardi’s exile were willing to publicly challenge Stampelius on the slightest pretexts after 1614, which ensured that institutional cohesion in Lübeck’s church reached its lowest ebb as religious warfare began in Bohemia.

Guild remonstrances and penitential sermons suggest that during the Little Ice Age, both pastors and laymen were quick to become outraged at perceived miscarriages of temporal authority in Lübeck. Pouchenius and his pastors clashed repeatedly with the magistrates in the 1580s and 1590s, but in 1600, the debate over moral discipline gave way to new clashes over the city’s relationship to the Reformed tradition. In 1599, Caspar Holste’s contested election ushered in a decade of scandals in urban church life that reached a nadir in the Burchardi-Stampelius dispute of 1613-14, which divided the ministry for nearly a decade thereafter. Both of these events relied on the antipathy to oligarchy widespread among lay burghers by 1600, but while guild artisans protested the economic disadvantages foisted upon them by their magistrates’ ineffectual responses to the decline of the Hansa, their pastors resented the council’s sluggish responses to the reforming mandates of the orthodox Lutheran confessional tradition. Economic decline and subsistence hardships fueled the constitutional unrests that plagued the city at the turn of the century, and the perennial

---

322 Sebastian Schwan, a colleague of Burchardi’s who served St. Mary’s parish from 1605 until quit the Lübeck ministry shortly after the Reformation centennial, securing a more prestigious post in Ottendorf after a series of “sharp clashes with Georg Stampelius”; Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 593. Cf. “Lübecker Geistlichen,” p. 105; Weimann explains Schwan’s departure by stating that his position in Lübeck had “become inhospitable to him” by 1619.

323 Siricius condemned the song “Joseph, Dear Joseph of Mine” on the grounds that it was not derived from the “approved Psalm-book.” His remarks to this effect during his sermons seem to have convinced numerous citizens that the songs had “papist” overtures, due to a preceived excessive focus on the sainted parents of Christ; see Stampelius’s complaints to this effect in “Von dem Weihenachtwiegen-Liedt Joseph Lieber Joseph Mein,” wieder M. Michaelis Siricii öffentliche auf der Cantzell ausgegossene calumnien Bericht undt verantwortung George Stamellii Superintendentis.” Siricius’s rebuttal bears the title “Rechtmessige und abgezwungene Defensions Schrift gegen Georg Stampelii Superintendentis / Von dem Wehenachtwiegienliedt Joseph, lieber Joseph mein.” Both are preserved in the manuscript collections of the Lübeck Stadtbibliothek (SBL), Ms. 52 and 53, respectively. Here, Stampelius, SBL Ms. 52; “Weihenachtwiegien-Liedt,” fol. 2-3.
nature of burgher enmity in the following decades made the non-conformism of pastors much more
dangerous than it might have been in times of plenty. Holste’s newfound convictions against the Reformed
tradition invited unwanted attention from princes following a string of political and military setbacks suffered
by the council, while fear of anti-Calvinist rioting drove the council to take a hard line against Burchardi 1613.
As Lübeck confronted its own decline after 1600, fractures in community religious life demonstrated far
greater potential to incite crisis, and this did not go unnoticed by pastors who saw right belief and moral
living as the only lasting antidote for the dramatic decline in their city’s fortunes.

Previous scholarship on Lübeck’s “confessional age” has neglected the role of structural crisis in
shaping community responses to the mandates of Lutheran orthodoxy after 1580. In general, historians
seeking evidence of modernity in the seventeenth century have tended to portray conflicts between
magistrates and clergy as an ill-fated struggle by established clergies to overcome the nascent absolutism of
princes, or the proto-mercantilist pragmatism of urban magistrates; tellingly, the authoritative work on
Lübeck’s church history interprets the conflict over the Dutch alliance as a “caesura, heralding the modern,
secularizing state” on the eve of the Thirty Years’ War.324 However, the “secularization” thesis ignores the
role of more immediate hardships in shaping the different stances magistrates and pastors adopted toward
the disciplinary mandates of Lutheran orthodoxy. Both parties feared hunger, plague, and spiritual division,
but the capacity of the city council to effectively respond to crisis was repeatedly checked by the fragile state
of their magisterial power when confronted by an impoverished, mistrustful, and volatile citizenry. Against
this social backdrop, a protracted debate over the parameters of religious and secular authority in Lübeck
confirm that material security and spiritual well-being remained inextricable in the minds of pastors,
magistrates, and ordinary Lübeckers when they found themselves hard-pressed by the confluence of climate

324 See Wolf-Dieter Hauschild’s interpretation in Kirchengeschichte, pp. 290-291, in which he describes the outcome of
the Burchardi-Stampelius dispute as a clear victory for the nascent “modern, secularized state”: “Die grundsätzliche
Bedeutung des ganzen Streits liegt darin, daß der Staat einen nicht unberechtigten Eingriff der Kirche ... zugunsten eine
religiös neutralen Politik abgewehrt hatte. [...] Der neuzeitliche säkularisierte Staat kündigte sich an; Lübeck als Corpus
Christianum war eine Fiktion, die nur in wenigen Bereichen der Realität entsprach.”
cooling and the waning of the Hanseatic League. Their core interpretations of crisis changed little in subsequent decades, but new hardships would produce a dramatically different encounter between the pastors and magistrates who confronted the Thirty Years’ War.
Chapter Three
“The Rod and Bloody Sword”: Lübeck in the Thirty Years’ War, 1620-1650

In his *Compendium of the Chronicles of Lübeck*, published in 1678, Lübeck Bürgermeister Gottschalk Kirchring noted matter-of-factly that the “great and terrible burning Comet” that appeared over Europe at the end of 1618 “denoted the beginning of the thirty-year German war.” Three decades had elapsed since the war’s end, but Kirchring’s digest did not address the Thirty Years’ War as a discrete event shaping Lübeck’s experience between 1618 and the final promulgation of the Peace of Westphalia in 1650, as have the historians of subsequent centuries. In the *Compendium*, protagonists like Tilly and Wallenstein, Christian IV of Denmark, and Gustavus Adolphus appear alongside reports on the vicissitudes of Lübeck’s commerce, the successes and failures of her diplomacy, and the perpetual ebb and flow in the ranks of the city council caused by the election and death of its members. Only in Lübeck’s worst wartime period – the approximate decade between the Danish invasion of 1625 and the city’s subscription to the Peace of Prague in 1635 – does Kirchring’s editorship suggest that news of the war was as important as events occurring within the immediate vicinity of the city’s walls. His perspective confirms a trend found in other contemporary accounts: events like the siege of Stralsund (1628) and the destruction of Magdeburg (1631) gave Lübeckers ample cause to fear for their own lives and livelihoods, as well as the future of their church,


327 The variety of the *Compendium’s* entries is well illustrated by the authors’ inclusion of the extensive new *Polizeiordnung* issued by the council in 1619, the giant hog (valued at 20 Reichstaler) that changed hands in a game of chance in 1620, or the plagues that killed thousands of residents in 1625 and 1639. Kirchring and Müller, *Compendium Lubecensis*, pp. 295, 297, and 299-304, respectively.
but the absence of true catastrophe in Lübeck meant that the war created no lasting caesura with the pre-
war structure of life in the city.

Like their pastors, Lübeck’s patrician rulers perceived the war in overtly confessional terms: 

_Bürgermeister_ Brokes recorded the council’s judgment “the Bohemian war had been caused by the Jesuits 
and Papists without cause” in January 1619.\(^{328}\) Still, they devoted their greatest energies and resources to 
earthly safeguards designed to defend their traditional political autonomy from the competing claims of 
Scandinavian kings, German princes, and the Holy Roman Emperor.\(^{329}\) For wartime Superintendent Nicolaus 
Hunnius (1585-1643), however, the proper antidote for the war was not new fortifications and defensive 
alliances, but a new “partnership of council and ministry” that would re-make Lübeck into an “evangelical 
Corpus Christianum.”\(^{330}\) Pastor Gerhard Winter even went so far as to declare publicly that “human means 
were worthless” to forestall God’s judgment in October, 1627.\(^{331}\) Despite two decades of urging from the 
ministry, the magistrates remained wary of the clergy’s disciplinary zeal and its potential to incite conflict and 
disorder, never granting Hunnius’s requests for dramatic reforms of church government and social discipline. 
However, because the city’s rulers also articulated a confessional response to the ravages of war, the case of 
Lübeck demands that we look beyond received interpretations of the Thirty Years’ War as an agent of 
“secularization” and “de-confessionalization” in local societies after 1650. In the long run, the overlapping 
crises that accompanied the Thirty Years’ War in Lübeck promoted rapprochement between the estates in

\(^{328}\) Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 2, p. 428. This entry dates to January 1619, as describes the council’s response to a 
request by Emperor Matthias for financial support in his war against the Bohemian estates.

\(^{329}\) The first of these was their controversial alliance with the Dutch mercantile cities in 1613; subsequent efforts 
included joining the _Niedersächsisches Kreis_ or Lower Saxon Circle, a major renovation and expansion of the city’s 
defenses, and repeated financial contributions to the Swedish and Imperial coffers intended to prevent occupation or 
quartering by foreign armies.

\(^{330}\) Hauschild, _Kirchengeschichte Lübecks_, p. 309, on Hunnius’s vision of this partnership as an essential prerequisite to 
making the urban community a truly “Christian body.”

\(^{331}\) Gerhard Winter, _Heilsamer Rath_, p. 18.
church matters, and enabled a generation of pastors and magistrates to re-build the cohesion lost in the bitter clashes of the pre-war decades.

I. Lübeck a War Zone: Neutrality and Community Impact

The mercantile cities of the Baltic coast appear infrequently in the literature on the Thirty Years’ War. Scholars of this conflict have tended to assume that these urban centers experienced the war similarly, and that their experience was of secondary importance vis-à-vis events to the south. The accompanying tendency to neglect Lübeck’s war in favor of other northern coastal cities has an even longer history; Hamburg historian Gottfried Schultze (1611-1665), for example, hardly mentioned Lübeck in the four hundred pages his Historical Chronicle devoted to wartime events. In the historiography of the past fifty years, Lübeck is best known as a city of refuge for deposed princes, and as the host of the peace negotiations that sealed early Imperial victories in the 1629 Peace of Lübeck; however, we find no evidence of a clerical outcry against the arrival of the Reformed “Winter King” Ferdinand V, or the presence of the Emperor’s emissaries in early 1629. In view of the city council’s adopted role as granter of refuge and mediator, it may be unsurprising that scholars have tended to assume that most of the coastal cities experienced the war as fortunate observers, a trend Geoffrey Parker summarized when he concluded that “the German north-west experienced almost no population loss, while the war zones of Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and Württemberg lost over half their inhabitants.” Fortunately, local research offers a counterpoint: Daniel

---

332 The siege of Stralsund and the rapid growth of Hamburg in consequence of the war are two of the most commonly discussed phenomena for the northern urban centers; cf. Parker, The Thirty Years’ War (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 211 ff.

333 Gottfried Schultze (1611-1655) was a resident of Hamburg who wrote a world history entitled Historische Chronica, Oder Kurtze Beschreibung der dankwürdigsten Geschichte von Anfang der Welt biß auf die ietzige Zeit (Lübeck: Schernwebel, 1646); HAB A: 598.5 Hist. The main reference to Lübeck found in the Chronica addresses the city role in hosting the peace negotiations of 1628-29. Despite Lübeck’s exclusion from the narrative, the book proved so popular that Schwernwebel and others Lübeck printers produced ten editions between 1646 and 1663.

334 As was the case in Schultze’s Historische Chronica; cf. note 333.
Korth has recently questioned Lübeck, Hamburg, and other erstwhile Hansa cities can be considered “beneficiaries” of the conflict, and of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia. Because he affirms that Hamburg grew in size and influence as a result of the war, but rejects similar conclusions for Lübeck, Korth urges us to differentiate more critically regarding the war’s impact on less overtly afflicted regions of the Empire.

Newer inquiries into the social and cultural ramifications of this conflict demand that we revise Parker’s assumption that the northwestern Empire was not properly a “war zone.” Based on numerous studies of local experience during the war, Hans Medick and Beninga von Krusenstjern have concluded that contemporaries typically experienced the war as a series of “fluctuations between the everyday and the catastrophic,” which varied by location and date. They and other scholars of wartime daily life also point out that news of geographically distant events (e.g. the Imperial destruction of Protestant Magdeburg on 20 May 1631) influenced a community’s perceptions of more localized events. That Lübeckers knew of the major disasters that befell their co-religionists is certain; they not only contributed money to the Lutheran congregations displaced by fighting elsewhere, but they also took in refugees like pastor Jonas Nicolai (Hauptpastor of the Cathedral parish, 1632-1646), whose last will and testament praised the “gracious and merciful God” for restoring his livelihood after the “burning and destruction of Magdeburg.”

---

335 Parker, Thirty Years’ War, p. 211.
336 Daniel Korth, Die Auswirkung des Dreißigjährigen Krieges auf die Hansestadt Lübeck (München: Grin Verlag, 2007), p. 18; cf. Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, pp. 453-454. Hamburg experienced rapid and sustained commercial growth as a result of the war, thanks to location on the Elbe and access to North Sea. By contrast, Lübeck did not experience an aggregate growth in commercial traffic or population comparable to the post-war experience of her neighbor on the Elbe.
real catastrophe of the kind that befell Magdeburg and Augsburg, or caused severe depopulation in the village networks of Hessen and Westphalia, never came to Lübeck. However, it is equally clear that the conflict made life harder for Lübeckers of all social ranks from the mid-1520s, and that the expectations of pastors, patricians, and ordinary citizens vacillated between the mundane and the potentially catastrophic.

< The Siege of Stralsund and the Dissolution of the Hansa >

The first phase of the Thirty Years’ War demonstrated that Lübeck and her fellow mercantile cities could no longer muster the military strength or diplomatic influence to challenge Imperial and Scandinavian belligerents. When Imperial commander Hans Georg von Arnim laid siege to the city of Stralsund in May of 1628, the assault confirmed the worst fears of the coastal cities of the northern Empire. The news pamphlet True Description of the Siege of the Trading city of Stralsund, published in Lübeck later that year, recounted Arnim’s unprovoked advance on the city on 13 May, the subsequent intervention of the Scandinavian monarchies on the city’s behalf, as well Lübeck’s contribution of money (3,488 Reichstaler) and diplomatic resources to the general Hanseatic effort to relieve Stralsund. The latter effort failed: Arnim only retired after a coalition of Swedish and Danish troops repulsed his forces on 27-29 June. The 1629 Peace of Lübeck promised a renewed accord between the Emperor, the Danish King, and the princes of the Northern Empire, but this did little to ameliorate the collective despair of the Hanseatics, who voted to disband their centuries-old League at the Hanseatic Diet in Lübeck the following year.

On the massive losses the war inflicted on village populations in Hesse, see John Theibault, German Villages in Crisis: Rural Life in Hesse-Kassel and the Thirty Years’ War, 1580-1720 (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities press, 1995), pp. 165-192.

Wahrhaftige Beschreibung von der Belagerung der löblichen Kauff-See- und Handelstadt Strallsund, was sich von Anfang biß zum Ende begeben und zugetragen hat (Lübeck: Valentin Schmalhertz, 1628). The purportedly eyewitness author of the True Description notes that not all Lübeckers acted in support of their ally: as the Hanseatic ambassadors negotiated with Arnim, “Herman Thorinöhlen, a merchant of Lübeck” made an opportunistic decision to deliver a barge-load of “powder, muskets, salt” and other provisions to Imperial forces; ibid., pp. 4-5. The 1628 Hanseatic Diet had already convened in Lübeck when the assault on Stralsund began, and quickly sent a deputation to intercede on their ally’s behalf; Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 371.
alliance passed control over the league’s foreign holdings to a rump coalition founded by Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen. This alliance promised that the three “heirs of the Hanseatic League” would provide for their own mutual defense, but events at Stralsund foreshadowed the minimal commitment this remnant mustered to the military conflict of the subsequent decades.

< The Problem of ‘Hanseatic Neutrality’ >

In 1628, the Imperial commander and propagandist Johann von Aldringen (1588-1634) warned Lübeck and her Hanseatic partners that their policy of military neutrality and political isolation placed them at increased risk of the fate that befell their allies and co-religionists in Stralsund. “It commonly occurs,” he wrote in a tract entitled the True-Hearted Warning to the Hanseatic Cities, “that some, while remaining neutral by such great outrages and wars, for the love of worthy peace ... are however, embroiled in war against their will.” This likelihood was even greater, Aldringen claimed, in view of fresh Imperial conquests in the Palatinate, Mecklenburg, and other Protestant territories that followed the Danish defeat at Lutter in

342 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, pp. 387-388.  
343 Opinions differs as to whether 1630 was the penultimate Hansetag (so Dollinger), or actually the “final” Diet (so Becker). Attempts to revive the League after the war garnered only a paltry nine towns (Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen, as well as Rostock, Danzig, Brunswick, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, and Cologne) at the Diet of 1669; cf. Dollinger, German Hansa, p. 368.  
344 Aldringen’s keen observations of the siege and his pragmatic political vision – particularly as his condemnation of Wallenstein, Spanish “Papists,” and Christian IV of Denmark as the true enemies of Germany, and his attempt in general to portray the Emperor as the defender of Germany and the Religious Peace of Augsburg – distinguish the Warning from much other wartime confessional propaganda directed at the German cities. Aldringen also wrote accounts of the battles of Mantua (1630), Aschaffenburg (1631), and the Bavarian campaign against the Swedish army (1632); he was killed at the Battle of Regensburg on 22 July 1634; see “Aldringen, Johann von,” in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie 1 (1875), 327-329.  
345 See Aldringen, Hansischer Wecker / Das ist: Treuhertzige Warnung / an die Erbare Hanse Städte / so den 16. Julij Jetzlauffenden 1628 Jahrs in Lübeck beyssammen sein werden (Grüningen: Sachs, 1628). See the author’s dedication “An den Christlichen Leser,” p. i: wie es gemeiniglich daher gehet das diejenigen / so bey grossen Einpörungen und Kriegen sich neutral halten / den werthen Frieden Lieben / demselben nachjagen / und ihn gerne behielten / dennoch wieder ihren willen / in Krieg geflochten werden / und sonderlich dieses ofters alsdan geschicht / wa die eine Parthey vermeinet / sie habe victoriam albereits in Händen / dazu dieselbige etwa einen alten groll wieder die Neutralisten (welches alhier ist / die Lutherischen Ketzer außurottten) treget.” The Hanseatic Warning was published anonymously in 1628, and as the title implies, was intended to influence the upcoming Hansetag (Hanseatic Diet) by exonerating Ferdinand from guilt in the (then ongoing) Imperial siege of Stralsund.
1626. Because Imperial forces now “supposed that they had victory in their hands” commanders like Wallenstein and Tilly were not only determined “to exterminate the Lutheran heresy,” but also “carried the ill-will against the neutrals,” who had refused to support the Emperor’s cause. The only hope for the other Hansa cities, he concluded, was to acquiesce to the commercial and naval treaty proposed by Ferdinand II the previous year, which would ensure the Emperor’s favor and protection. For their part, the Hansa’s leaders remained unmoved by Imperial threats and patriotic overtures alike. When the penultimate Hanseatic Diet rejected the Emperor's proposal in late 1628, Aldringen castigated Lübeck and her allies in another anonymous tract, in which he blamed the Hanseatic cities for the deprivations of the past five years, inferring that their lack of good faith had opened Germany to “perdition” the hands of foreign kings.

Aldringen wrote to persuade Lübeck’s council to support the Imperial cause, and his treatises contained a perceptive assessment of the city’s tenuous political situation by the time of the Peace of Lübeck. In particular, the Hanseatic Warning-Bell underscored the difficulty of maintaining political and military neutrality during the first phase of the conflict; after 1618, Imperial cities could no longer rely on

\[ \text{346 Aldringen drew a careful distinction between the Imperial commanders who ran amok, “marauding and tyrannizing in the Reich,” in defiance of the Emperor, and the wishes of Ferdinand himself; Hansischer Wecker, p. i. In particular, Aldringen accused Wallenstein, and subordinates like Arnim, of “illegally marauding and tyrannizing in the Reich,” in “disobedience” to the emperor’s wishes; cf. § 6: “Das General Wallenstein / Kays. Mayest. Ungehorsamb / wiederrechtlich im Reiche grassire und Tyrannisire, weßhalben er auch als Turbator pacis publicae ipso facto in des H. Reichts acht / und deßwegen von männiglich zuverfolgen sey.”} \]

\[ \text{347 Ferdinand II, Holy Roman Emperor, Copia Syncerirten Proposition, So Käyserl: Mayest: durch dero Abgesandte er Löblichen Stadt Lübeck/ und mit Confoederierten HanseStädten / wegen der Spanischen / Indiansichen / und anderen nützbarlichen Schiffsahrts Vereinigung / gnedigst proponiern und vortragen lassen / Im Jahr 1627; pp. 1-2. HAB A: 61.6 Pol. By suggesting an exclusive “conjuncture and correspondence” between Habsburg Spain and the Hanseatic cities, the aptly-titled Proposition of early 1627-28 promised that the latter would enjoy exclusive rights to the commerce wrested back from the “strictly prohibited monopolies” by which “foreign Potentates” - i.e. the Dutch and English – “obstructed your free trade and navigation” between the Baltic region and the Iberian peninsula.} \]

\[ \text{348 Aldringen’s Do You Wish to See the Emperor? Suggested that Lübeck and Hamburg had only themselves to blame for the blockades and naval attacks suffered at the hands of Imperial forces in 1627 and 1628, because they had declined the Emperor’s requests to provision and supply Imperial forces; see Wilt du den Kayser sehen? So siehe hinten in diesen Brief (Mühlhausen, 1629), p. 4: “Zum Exempel gestetzt. Ew. Kayserl. Mayest wolle entweder Lübeck (welche je zu erst an den Raigen soll) oder Hamburg dero Gestalt eröffnet haben [i.e. to the maintenance and support of Imperial forces; see ibid p. 3]. Wie kann das ohne Belagerung / deren geringestes membrum die Bloquirung ist / abgehen? Woher nehmen wir Brodt? Wodurch wollen wir die Soldatesca bei gutem Willen erhalten? “ The subsequent discussion extends this critique to the Imperial estates in general, whom the author portrayed as criminally disobedient to the Emperor.} \]
defensive alliances, the mandates of the Imperial constitution, or their shared confessional identity to
prevent neighboring princes and potentates from exploiting the wartime atmosphere in order to further their
own ambitions. A minor but costly incident from the year 1620 reveals that confessional identity meant little
at the local level, as armed conflict with a neighboring Lutheran prince forced Lübeck and her allies into
defensive position vis-à-vis territorial powers long before the war spread to the northern Empire. On 23
February of that year, cavalry and infantry belonging to Duke Christian of Braunschweig-Lüneburg crossed
the Elbe to attack a series of settlements located in the Amt (district) of Bergedorf on the Elbe, plundering
the customs-house (Zollhaus) in a dawn raid that quickly escalated to “house to house despoiling” of the
nearby villages.349 Because Lübeck shared in the jurisdiction over the district (rule over the “four lands” of the
Bergedorf Amt alternated between Hamburg and Lübeck every six years), the city appeared as co-
complainant in the ensuing suit against Christian in the Imperial Chamber Court. The suit brought by the two
cities cited injuries of fifty thousand Reichstaler to the toll station at Zollenspieker and the surrounding
villages, topped by tens of thousands more in damages to the “private merchants” waylaid and robbed by
the Duke’s soldiers.350 This incident – particularly as reported by the Lübeck and Hamburg councils in a tract
called the True Report of the Conflict of Lüneburg, Lübeck, and Hamburg-- illustrates the political and military
vulnerability city councilors had already experienced when the Danes invaded the region five years later.351

---

349 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, pp. 343-344. Lüneburg’s forces were commanded by his brother Georg, whose
soldiers first plundered the villages of Altengamme and Neuengamme on the banks of the Elbe, and then proceeded
inland to the larger settlements of Curslack and Kirchwerder. Soldiers extracted money, specie and valuables from the
populace with beatings and “weapons set at the breasts of the neighbors”; and subsequently stole the agricultural
implements, along with horses and other livestock. Becker notes that “neither the churches nor the parsonages were
spared,” and Becker recounts that the Duke’s soldiers robbed the pastor (Prediger) of Neungamme “with a pistol set at
his breast.

350 Wahrhafftige newe Zeitung in Streitsachen / wegen der Stadt Lüneburg / Lübeck / vnnd Hamburg /etc. (Hamburg:
1620); HAB H: T 911 4° Helmst. (4). A handwritten addendum to the printed complaint suggests that the councils
originally assessed the cost of damage, plunder, and lost commerce at an astronomical 443,159 Taler, but this hardly
seems feasible. Eighteenth-century historian Johann Becker estimated the damages at 50,000 Reichstaler; on this and
the subsequent case in the Reichskammergericht, see Umständliche Geschichte, pp. 346-347.

351 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, pp. 340-342. This was not properly a “wartime” conflict; as the Elbe formed the
boundary between Hamburg’s environs and the lands belonging to the Dukes of Lüneburg, the latter’s attack on
The threat to Lübeck and her neighbors escalated dramatically in 1625, when Christian IV of Denmark (r. 1588-1648) entered the war on behalf of the Lower Saxon Circle and the beleaguered Protestant estates of the Empire.\(^{352}\) His intervention ultimately proved indecisive, but the “Danish intermezzo” of 1625-1629 introduced the northern cities to the demands of monarchical politics and the destructive potential of mercenary armies.\(^{353}\) In late spring of 1625, Heinrich Mohr, Amtmann or bailiff of the district of Ritzerau, wrote to the Lübeck city council seeking restitution for the damages suffered by the villages as a result of a recent occupation by Danish forces:

“From Easter to Pentecost in this year 1625, the cavalry of his royal majesty have had their quarters among the subjects in the district of Ritzerow, so that these same have not been able to carry out their usual work... Damages to the same at least 500 Reichstaler.”\(^{354}\)

At the time of Mohr’s letter, the Danish forces had drawn off south to seek battle with Tilly and Wallenstein, but the presence of the soldiers had prevented the peasantry from tilling their fields and sowing their wheat and flax crops, causing widespread dissatisfaction in the communities under Mohr’s charge. Not only field

---

Bergedorf in 1620 constituted a violent new essay in a dispute over jurisdiction on the river that dated to a treaty of the early fifteenth century.

\(^{352}\) Parker, *Thirty Years’ War*, p. 75-76. Christian’s intervention was justified by his status as Duke of Holstein; he was thus the ruler of a Protestant territory of the Empire. He was elected Kreisoberst of the Lower Saxon Circle (Niedersächsisches Kreis) in April 1625. He crossed the Elbe with 20,000 troops in June of that year. Parker has suggested that Christian was motivated by equal parts “confessional conviction and personal ambition,” but his decision to assume the role of “Defender of the Protestant Faith” did nothing to ameliorate the enmity that already existed between himself and the Hanseatic cities, Lübeck in particular. Beginning in 1603, Christian took steps to overturn Danish reliance on Hanseatic shipping; in particular, he steadily dismantled Hanseatic privileges in his kingdoms of Denmark and Norway, replacing these with trade agreements between the crown and individual cities. Tensions escalated considerably in October 1614, when when Christian issued a letter expressing his intention to exclude Lübeck’s merchants from any and all commerce in his dominions. According to the diary of Lübeck mayor Heinrich Brokes, Christian next sent agents to “set fire to all the ships at Lübeck, Herrenwick, and Travemünde,” but this plot was discovered when Lübeck’s militia apprehended ringleader Michael Dyne. Brokes notes that the council took this threat seriously, conducting house-to-house searches for conspirators in likely areas of the city; see Brokes, *Tagebuch*, in ZVLGA 1, p. 285; cf. Graßmann, *Lübeckische Geschichte*, pp. 446-447.

\(^{353}\) Parker, *Thirty Years’ War*, pp. 121-170. Parker dubbed the period 1618-1629 as “the indecisive war,” identifying the second period between the Gustavus Adolph’s intervention in 1630 and the major Imperial defeat at the Second Battle of Breitenfeld (1642) as the conflict’s decisive era.

\(^{354}\) Heinrich Morr, quoted in Horst Weimann, *Der 30jährige Krieg im lübschen Raum zwischen Elbe und Fehmarn* (Großbetrieb Lübecker Nachrichten, 1959), p. 11.
hands, but also the brewers and millers complained bitterly as the Amtmann toured the villages in order to present as clear as possible a picture to his superiors on the city council.355

Compared to settlements in Swabia or Westphalia, Lübeck’s first contact with the belligerents of the Thirty Years’ War was remarkably peaceful, but this changed when troops under the Protestant Ernst von Mansfeld (1580-1626) swarmed into the region late in the year 1626. Mansfeld’s troops were mercenaries, and their commanders rejected the letter of protection (salva guardia) that Christian IV had issued to spare Lübeck and its environs from quartering and extraction.356 As soon as they established their winter quarters among the rural environs of Ritzerau, Mölln, and Behlendorf, Mansfeld’s soldiers commenced to strip the villages of provisions and plunder the households, liquidating their loot via traders and middlemen from abroad, particularly Hamburg.357 When the Lübeck council refused to provision the Mansfelders in late December, their situation quickly became untenable: several detachments of soldiers attempted to relocate closer to Lübeck, where they clashed with the city militia, led by city captain (Stadtoberst) Hans Heinrich von Wendelstein.358 Wendelstein’s counterattack allegedly killed or captured some 200 Mansfelders and put others to flight, some of whom “drowned pitiably” while attempting to escape across the Trave river. However, the quartering only ended when Mansfeld mustered his forces in late February and marched south, where he proceeded to lose four thousand men (one-third of his army) in battle with Wallenstein at Dessau in April.359 In the meantime, Mohr had calculated the cost of this second occupation (in which Ritzerau alone lost three horses, seventy-eight sheep and goats, fourteen hogs, ninety-three geese and ducks, and all the

355 Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, p. 12.

356 Ibid. The Mansfelders’ defiance of the king’s edict, and accompanying “claims to sovereignty” made by the Lübeck council, is illustrated by their decision to lodge a contingent of soldiers in the Bergfried retreat in Ritzerau, normally reserved for the exclusive use of the Lübeck Ratscherren. They took similar liberties in the neighboring districts of Mölln and Behlendorf.

357 Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, pp. 11-12.

358 Ibid., p. 13.

359 Peter von Kobbe, Geschichte und Landesbeschreibung des Herzogtums Lauenburg, Band 3 (Altona, 1836), pp. 5-6.
communal grain stores) at 3,171 Reichstaler, bringing wartime damages for the district to 3,681 Taler, an exorbitant sum that the district officer equated to the price of “460 young cows.”\textsuperscript{360}

Troops returned to Lübeck’s environs in 1626, late in 1627, and finally in 1643, as the Swedish general Lennart Torstensson (1603-1651) occupied the region in order to forestall a second invasion by Christian of Denmark, who had allied himself with Emperor Ferdinand III (r. 1637-1657) in an attempt to offset Swedish dominance in the Baltic.\textsuperscript{361} Though we lack analogues to Heinrich Mohr’s detailed records for Ritzea in 1625-26, there is no doubt that such visits exacted a similarly high cost in goods and property from Lübeck’s rural dependencies, at great cost to the city. Eighteenth-century historian Johann Becker recorded that the winter quartering by elements of Tilly and Wallenstein’s armies were particularly cruel, noting that the endless infantry and cavalry traffic “reduced the subjects to beggary” in the winter of 1626-1627.\textsuperscript{362} Similar hardships befell the rural districts of Hamburg, Bremen, and other coastal cities as the disordered Danish forces retreated northward following their disastrous encounter with Tilly’s army at Lutter in August 1626. City governments were incapable of making good the losses in coin, and Lübeck’s financial position grew increasingly dire after the events of 1620-1626 prompted the council to strengthen the city’s defenses by expanding the defensive walls, gates, and batteries, hiring new garrisons, and pouring money into fortifying the port at Travemünde and rural districts hard-hit by troop quartering.\textsuperscript{363} These measures proved a success, if only because they were never fully put to the test; Lübeck was never besieged by a main land force as were Stralsund and Wismar.\textsuperscript{364} The council’s success in forestalling siege and occupation can be

\textsuperscript{360} Mohr, quoted in Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{361} Parker, Thirty Years’ War, p. 174.

\textsuperscript{362} Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 363.


\textsuperscript{364} Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 448.
attributed to a second, even more costly strategy concocted by the wartime council, namely, the payment of massive financial contributions required to spare Lübeck from the well-publicized horrors of siege warfare.\textsuperscript{365}

By the time Christian IV sued for peace — concluded at Lübeck on 22 May 1629 — Lübeck’s \textit{Ratsherren} had resolved to maintain their claims to “Hanseatic neutrality” at any price.

\textit{< Costly Defenses: Fortifications-Werk and Wartime ‘Contributions’ >}

In late February 1622, Lübeckers “spoke very evilly” amongst themselves about the city council’s decision to raze St. Gertrude’s to make way for the “new wall and trench” being built to strengthen Lübeck’s \textit{Burgtor}, or northern gate.\textsuperscript{366} Writing a century later, Starck recorded that the \textit{Ratsherren} justified the demolition as a necessary step in “the beginning of the new fortification works” (\textit{Fortifications-Wercke}); they maintained this conviction when ordering pastors Hermann Wolf, Jacob Boye, and Johann Stein to desist from condemning the demolition from their pulpits.\textsuperscript{367} The 1620s witnessed a dramatic leap forward in the council’s efforts to renovate and expand the city’s existing defenses, begun nearly thirty years before when master builder Johann Pasqualini warned the magistrates that existing walls were “no longer sufficient” to defend the city in 1595.\textsuperscript{368} The arrival of the defeated “Winter King” Friedrich V in 1621 seemed to galvanize

\textsuperscript{365} Brady, \textit{German Histories}, p. 388-389. The \textit{Warhafftige Beschreibung}, broadsheet account of the siege of Stralsund published in Lübeck, included a lurid woodcut illustrating the besieged city. After the “Magdeburger Hochzeit” of 20 May 1631, this event became “the most sensationalized event of the Thirty Years War,” and a discursive standard for urban siege warfare.


\textsuperscript{367} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{368} Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, pp. 356-357 and 428-429. Pasqualini was master builder to the Duke of Jülich, and his remarks of 1595 (paraphrased by Graßmann in \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 461) indicate that Lübeck’s existing walls and redoubts were no longer sufficient sixteenth-century innovations in siege warfare, particularly cannon technology. The beginning of the fortification works was part of an upswell in new building in Lübeck from the late sixteenth century; the council manifested a new enthusiasm for construction — both defensive and monumental—
the council: work on the walls had been hampered by shortages of money and labor, but the Ratsherren now threw financial caution to winds. 369 Traditionally, Lübeck had relied upon able-bodied citizens to perform the physical labor of construction, but the spread of warfare into the Empire compelled the council to engage full-time workers in 1621. 370 Wage labor proved much more efficient than the medieval labor drafts, but it also caused construction costs to skyrocket: the council’s disbursements for wages jumped from 8,754 Lübeck Marks in 1620 to 19,250 the following year (an increase of approximately 220 percent), later reaching a peak of approximately 91,129 Marks annually for the decade 1630-1640, before declining to an approximate annual average of 62,556 Marks during the final eight years of the war. 371

The astronomical cost of Lübeck’s new defenses required that the council impose new taxes, which proved so unpopular that the Ratsherren were driven to new compromises with the citizenry in the late 1620s. In Lübeck as in other cities, high taxes were a perennial complaint among citizens in the pre-war decades: at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Lübeckers were subject to two direct forms of taxation (the large and small property taxes, or Schoß and Vorschoß) and four indirect taxes (the Zoll or customs duty, beginning in 1570, when they commissioned a new façade for the Rathaus in the Hollandish style. Other commission expanded the city’s westward gate (the Holstentor) in 1585, established a dedicated armory near the Rathaus (1594), later supplemented by a Kriegsstube constructed in the town hall itself.

369 Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, pp. 8-10.

370 Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 461. The indefatigable Heinrich Brokes, who co-founded the civic authority for fortifications (Wallbehörde) in 1601, described the labor difficulties and resistance to new taxes that hampered the fortifications work before 1620; for his entries to this effect from 1605 and 1613, see Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, pp. 287-289, and pp. 256-261. Under Brokes’s leadership (he was appointed Wallherr, leader of the Wallbehörde, in 1603) a series of Dutch engineers slowly expanded walls the lined the perimeter of the canals surrounding the city, and began work on a series of new bastions drafted by Dutch fortification expert Johann von Ryswyck. The threat of aggression by Christian IV of Denmark assisted this process, as Lübeck commissioned the Dutch engineer Johan von Valkenborg to revise the plans drafted by his compatriot Ryswyck in 1604.

371 Wilhelm Brehmer, “Beiträge zu einer Baugeschichte Lübecks,” in ZVLGA 7 (1898), 341-498; pp. 415-431. Brehmer identified over two kilometers of new and renovated walls, ten new bastions and towers, and corresponding expansions to the city’s four main gates between 1620 and the early 1640s. Council protocols reveal that the city had spent an astronomical 1,641,300 Lübeck Marks (the equivalent of approximately 547,100 Reichstaler) on construction wages alone by the war’s end; According to Brehmer, the single most expensive year of the war vis-à-vis labor costs was 1639, for which the Ratsprotokolle reveal expenditures totaling 142,533 Lübeck Marks, or approximately 47,511 Reichstaler.
the excise, the mill tax and the “tenth penny”), and the citizens’ representatives had complained loudly about the high tax burden during the constitutional unrests of 1599. In 1609, however, a twenty-year, “supplementary” percentage tax (Zulage) on goods entering and departing the city (in the amount of ¼ and ½ percent their value, respectively) heralded a new era of extractive efforts by the council, which built upon other initiatives such as an increased Bürgergeld, the mandatory contribution required from all new citizens. A new burial tax (Grabengeld), new excises on wine, brandy, and tobacco, and an increase in the mill tax, or Mehlsteuer, followed in subsequent years. As protests from the citizenry mounted, magistrates like mayor Brokes refused to compromise by suspending the fortification work. Instead, they established a civic “defense fund” (Defensionskasse) in 1626, to be managed by a commission of six Ratsherren and twelve representatives of the burgher corporations. Though a victory for the Bürgerschaft in matters of civic finance


373 AHL Cameraria 1338 / Bürgerannahme-Buch 1633-1808. The citizenship rolls (Bürgerannahme-Bücher) for this period reveal a gradual increase in receipts of the Bürgergeld between the end of the sixteenth century and 1620s; though fewer people swore the citizen’s oath during the war years, they paid a significantly higher average contribution: 389 new citizens swore the Bürgereid in 1593-1594, and 486 in 1594-1595, at a rate of approximately 2 Lübeck Marks (Ml.) each; this yielded respective incomes of 779 and 960 Ml. for each year (The slight disparity in the accounts for 1594-1595 can be explained by the fact that a few new citizens -- e.g. recently-appointed clergymen-- were exempted from the citizen’s tax). Just over a decade later, the average contribution rate had risen to approximately 10 Ml. per new citizen. The year 1607 records 328 new citizens, with a combined contribution of approximately 3400 Ml.; 353 new citizens contributed 3,770 Ml. the following year (1608-1609). The number of people becoming citizens fell by fifty percent or more for most years of the 1620s and 1630s, but the citizenship retained its elevated price; in 1627-1628, 117 new Lübeckers contributed approximately 4,808 Ml. to the city’s coffers, while in 1628-1629, 119 new citizens paid in 4,266 Ml. For 1593-1595, see AHL Cameraria 1337/ Bürgerannahme-Buch 1591-1633, fol. 85-122, for 1607-1609; ibid., fol. 384-406; on 1627-1629, ibid., fol. 741-750.

374 Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 448. The last of these was particularly unpopular because it increased the price of bread, as bakers passed the tax on to their customers. On the period between 1601 and the 1620s as a period of “reorientation” of civic finances, see Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 445. “Defensive” expenditures were defined as those matters not only to the urban fortifications proper, but also to fortifications, protective dikes, and transportation waterways throughout the city’s environs; fortifying the outpost of Travemünde on the Baltic, for example, cost an additional 163,956 marks in the year 1627; Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 358.

375 Contemporary accounts leave little doubt that these innovations caused great resentment among ordinary Lübeckers (not least because they ensured that an increased cost of living imprinted the entire life-cycle citizens and residents), and their grumbling assumed an unpleasant tone as the council revealed its plans for defense building in the early 1620s; see Brokes, “Tagebuch,” in ZVLGA 1, pp. 256-257. Tensions over the fortifications and taxes were fueled by the newly aggressive stance adopted by Christian IV of Denmark toward Lübeck in the mid-1620s; cf. Kirchring and Müller, Compendium Chronicae, p. 293-294.
the charter of 1626 required the council to present its accounts to the citizen leaders on an annual basis—
the fund provided no solution to the city’s insatiable need for revenue: three years later, the commission
determined to renew the Zulage for an additional twenty years, “because of the extraordinary expenditures
necessitated by war.” Had these expenditures not increased exponentially after the 1629 Peace of Lübeck,
this moderate solution might have successfully quelled the public outrage at the war’s cost to citizen
livelihoods. Instead, these concessions to increased cooperation merely delayed the popular backlash against
wartime financial impositions.

Fortification works exacted a high price from ordinary Lübeckers, but they were not the sole cause of
the chronic financial distress that plagued Lübeck after the Peace of Westphalia. Thomas A. Brady has
described the “contributions” through which belligerents supplied their armies in the field as a refinement of
the field-expedient threats by which the rank and file obtained food and provisions from villagers. “From
ransom and extortion it was but a short step to the full-fledged ‘contributions system’,” he explains, clarifying
that “a contribution was a regular tax levied by the army on all communities within a certain radius of its
encampments.” As Johann von Aldringen insinuated in his pamphlets from the late 1620s, the neutral and
wealthy Hanseatic cities made inviting targets for any commander prepared to answer non-payment with
violence. Because the Danish king failed to establish any systematic means of financing his German
adventures, Lübeck first encountered the full-fledged contributions system in the years after the Peace of
Lübeck. Gustav Adolph was more astute: in November 1631, fifteen months after the Swedes landed in

---

376 Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 96. Because it obligated the council to report its annual receipts and expenditures for
review by a delegation of the citizenry, the *Defensionskasse* marked an innovation concerning citizen participation in
city finance that elaborated significantly on the administrative concessions the council had made to quell the
Reiser’chen unrest in 1601.

377 Brady, *German Histories*, p. 383.

378 Becker, *Umständliche Geschichte*, p. 360-361. Much has been made of Christian IV’s fiscal unpreparedness when he
invaded the Reich in 1625, and though the king forcibly displaced the prince-bishop of Lübeck in order to acquire Duke
Johann Friedrich’s lands for his own son, he never established a functional system of extraction over the lands he
occupied before the Peace of Lübeck concluded his German adventures in May 1629. See *ibid.*, p. 381 on Danish
Pomerania, financial minister Johann Adler Salvius attended the assembly of the Lower Saxon Circle in order to conclude Sweden’s formal alliance with Lübeck, Hamburg, Bremen, Lüneburg, and the other cities and territories of the northern coast.\textsuperscript{379} The following February, he made the first of series of appearances before the Lübeck council, in which he promised the city “free commerce at sea and on land,” as well as freedom from quartering and conscription, in exchange for a contribution of 36,000 Reichstaler (Rthl.) to the Swedish war effort. The council met the Swedish terms in order to preserve its commercial lifeblood, paying Salvius 20,000 Rthl. in coin and paying the balance within the agreed-upon six months. Such apparent solvency, however, quickly began to work against the city: Salvius returned in August, “proffering the same wares,” for which he received an additional 24,000 Rthl.\textsuperscript{380} Demands continued as the Swedes swept south during the 1630s; the Lübeckers was forced to renew their neutrality and trading privileges in 1634 and again in 1635, in the familiar amount of 36,000 Rthl. each time.\textsuperscript{381} However dear, this bought neutrality spared the citizens quartering and military recruitment, but outlying environs like Behlendorf and Ritzerau were not so fortunate: the movement of Swedish forces through the region in 1636, and again in 1643, reprised the Danish and Imperial occupations of the mid-1620s by wreaking havoc on the peasantry.\textsuperscript{382} The last requisitions came when the Swedes demanded “satisfaction monies” from the seven circles Imperial circles occupation of the prince-bishops lands. Geoffrey Parker agreed that Christian’s intervention in the German war in the spring of 1625 was “rash” (“early in 1625 he entered the war ... without having secured binding promises of political and financial support from anyone”), he suggests that the Christian’s war quickly drained the Danish treasure because “the king’s extraordinary freedom of financial operation left the way open for extensive activity beyond the range of constitutional control”; not because his strategy was itself ‘childish’ or ‘foolhardy,’ as it has been depicted by Danish historians; see Parker, Thirty Years’ War, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{379} Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{380} Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, p. 39.

\textsuperscript{381} Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 97; cf. Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 449.

\textsuperscript{382} Weimann makes this comparison in 30jähriger Krieg, p. 441; cf. Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, pp. 415 and 422-423.
(Kreise) they occupied by the time of Peace of Osnabrück; of the 5,000,000 Rthl. the crown demanded from the German estates, 42,720 fell to Lübeck.\textsuperscript{383}

Political neutrality made the northern cities equally attractive to Imperial exchequer. The city paid its first significant war taxes (24,660 Lübeck Marks, or 12,220 Reichstaler), to the Emperor in 1634, but Ferdinand III began demanding regular remittances when the city joined other Imperial Estates in subscribing to the Peace of Prague in late 1635.\textsuperscript{384} Because no Imperial army occupied the northwest after the Swedish invasion of 1630, it is difficult to assess the extent to which Lübeck acquiesced to Ferdinand III’s repeated demands for revenue after Prague. By 1642, however, the Emperor had successfully re-asserted his extractive authority vis-à-vis many Imperial cities via the Duke of Aversberg, an Imperial Aulic councilor who now demanded that the Estates of the northern Empire remit the so-called Römermonate, an incidental tax used by Charles V (1519-1556) to fund his wars against the Ottoman Empire. In return, Aversberg offered familiar guarantees protecting Lübeck’s trade in the Reich, and exempting the city from “quartering of troops and other hardships.”\textsuperscript{385} On balance, Imperial contributions compared favorably to those demanded by the Swedes; Lübeck paid 12,000 Rthl. in 1642, and Syndic David Gloxin (1597-1671) was able to negotiate a reduced tax burden for Lübeck (60 months of contributions, instead of the 120 levied elsewhere) that demanded payments totaling 19,200 Rthl. during the 1630s and early 1640s.\textsuperscript{386}

\textsuperscript{383} Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{384} Brady, \textit{German Histories}, p. 376. Brady identifies Prague as the latter of two “turning points” in the Thirty Years’ War. Though the 1635 Peace has typically been described as a “partial peace” in view of the ongoing conflict, it marks the point when Emperor and princes (both Catholic and Protestant) agreed to restore the Imperial constitution, lately endangered by princely rebellion against Ferdinand II’s Edict of Restitution, and by a string of Swedish victories in the heart of the Empire.

\textsuperscript{385} Becker, \textit{Umständliche Geschichte}, pp. 418-419.

\textsuperscript{386} On the contributions of 1642, see Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, p. 97. On the Römermonate levies of the 1630s, see Becker, \textit{Umständliche Geschichte}, pp. 417-419.
Preserving “Hanseatic neutrality” was an expensive proposition that could not isolate coastal urban centers from the hardships of war. Contributions, fortification works, plundering of rural villages, and lost commerce impoverished Lübeck from the war’s second decade, and the monumental debt amassed during the 1630s and 1640s meant that the Peace of Westphalia offered city dwellers no respite from their onerous tax burden after the last of the Swedish troops finally departed the region.\footnote{Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 457: “Trotz aller Bemühungen konnten die Zinszahlungen an die Gläubiger nur bis 1680 geleistet und die Schulden nur wenig getilgt werden.” The author notes that Lübeck’s financial problems were exacerbated by the long-term decline in her commerce by the mid-seventeenth century, and therefore could not be ameliorated “through a change of the administration alone.”} Instead, things grew worse: in the years immediately following the war, the city council was scarcely able to afford to pay the interest accruing on wartime loans, let alone repay the principle sums owed to a variety of creditors.\footnote{A detachment of the Swedish troops remained to enforce the city’s payment of 42,720 Reichstaler in “satisfaction monies” (\textit{Satisfactionsgelder}) assessed by the Swedish crown after the Peace of Osnabrück in 1648; the city paid the sum (largely by means of loans) by late 1640; see Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 450.} By 1665, when the council erected a general civic fisc in response to violence and agitation among the citizenry, the coalition of burghers and councilors appointed to staff the city’s new financial organ assessed the city’s debt at 5,251,416 Lübeck Marks, or 1,750,472 Reichstaler.\footnote{Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 457: “Trotz aller Bemühungen konnten die Zinszahlungen an die Gläubiger nur bis 1680 geleistet und die Schulden nur wenig getilgt werden.” The author notes that Lübeck’s financial problems were exacerbated by the long-term decline in her commerce by the mid-seventeenth century, and therefore could not be ameliorated “through a change of the administration alone.”} The average Lübecker’s experience of the war as a financial disaster may have been overshadowed by plague, violence, inflation, refugee traffic, and other hardships, but massive civic debt would be the defining legacy for the post-war generation.

\textit{< Death and Taxes: Urban Life in the Thirty Years’ War >}

Lübeck’s political isolation did not translate into physical isolation of the urban population from the outside world. Neutral and well-fortified, Lübeck became a refuge for defeated princes as early as 1621. Elector Friedrich V was joined by Johann Friedrich, Bishop of Lübeck in 1626, and Dukes Adolph Friedrich and Hans Albrecht of Mecklenburg in 1627.\footnote{Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 457.} Displaced princes and other dignitaries served as conspicuous
reminders of the defeats suffered by the Protestant cause, especially after Christian IV chose the city to host the peace talks that produced the Peace of Lübeck on 22 May, 1629.\footnote{Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, pp. 8-9, on Friedrich V’s sojourn in Lübeck. When Christian IV ordered his soldiers to seize the lands belonging to Johann Friedrich, Bishop of Lübeck, in the spring of 1626, the prince-bishop fled to the nearby Hanseatic capital, where he spent the following years attempting to persuade the Ratsherren to help him regain his bishopric at Eutin, which was occupied first by Danish troops, and then by the Swedes; Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 360-361; cf. Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, p. 15-16. Likewise, when Ferdinand II gave the duchies of Mecklenburg to Wallenstein as spoils of war in 1627, Dukes Adolph Friedrich and Hans Albrecht went first to Magdeburg and then to Lübeck, where they remained in exile until the Imperial commander was assassinated in 1630; Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 372.} Swedish and Imperial delegations subsequently lodged in the city during their periodic visits to demand contributions, where they proved to be “expensive guests”; between 1631 and 1634, Salvius and his Swedish entourage amassed bills in Lübeck’s best inns totaling 825 Rthl. which they left to be paid by the city council.\footnote{Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 448. Between 12 and 22 May, Imperial and Danish representatives negotiated the terms of peace in the summer garden belonging to wealthy patrician Michael Festor, just outside the city’s Burgtor (northern gate).}

A travel account written by two Dominican friars who visited Lübeck and her Baltic port of Travemünde in July 1622 calls our attention to the diverse human traffic that traversed the city in wartime. Nicolaus Janssenius and Jacob de Brouwer were Belgians, and they naturally concealed their monastic dress in Protestant Germany, but the detailed description they submitted to Rome (which dwelt on Lübeck government, its churches, and a “particular predisposition to piety” Janssenius observed among the townspeople) suggests that travelers enjoyed easy entrance and egress.\footnote{Jon Peter Wieselgren, “Itinerarium Danicum: Lübeck im Reisebreicht zweier Dominikaner von 1622,” in ZVLGA 42 (1962); 115-117; p. 115. Janssenius and de Brouwer sailed from Antwerp in June 1622, spent 22 – 26 July in Lübeck (and two further days in Travemünde, due to stormy weather) before sailing on to Copenhagen at the month’s end. The intent of their journey was to gather preliminary information for a Catholic mission to northern Germany and Scandinavia. In his report to Rome, Janssenius commented upon the city’s beautiful appearance, and noted that “the people of Lübeck have a particular predisposition to piety.”} Trade by land and sea remained Lübeck’s economic lifeblood, and the council was loath to interrupt the flow of commerce even during the most dangerous years of the war: the city remained accessible except in extraordinary circumstances like the
Danish blockade of Travemünde in 1627, or when land forces appeared in the city’s immediate vicinity, as occurred in 1625, 1626, 1627, 1631-32, and 1643.\(^{394}\)

While economically vital, this circumstance also ensured that refugees crowded into Lübeck after 1625, their numbers composed of displaced villagers and townsmen as well as itinerant groups of Mennonites, spiritualists, and other religious non-conformists.\(^{395}\) During the Danish blockade of 1627, coastal settlements like Heiligenhafen (situated due north of Lübeck on the Holstein coast) were oppressed by Danish quartering to the point that residents “could no longer cultivate their fields,” and instead fled eighty kilometers westward to seek refuge in Kiel, or seventy-five kilometers south to Lübeck.\(^{396}\) Though skilled or educated refugees might acquire citizenship in Lübeck (as did Magdeburg pastor Jonas Nicolai) it is impossible to assess how many people from Holstein, Mecklenburg, and other cities and coastal villages passed through Lübeck during the war years. However, enough remained to swell the urban population to approximately 31,000, an increase of nearly 25% over pre-war figures.\(^{397}\) While wartime population growth proved an economic boon to neighboring Hamburg, this was not the case for Lübeck. Sources suggest that these numbers were sufficient to overwhelm the city’s poor-relief institutions, and to pique existing fears

---

\(^{394}\) Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 96. The months-long blockade was only lifted when Lübeck’s diplomats reassured the Danish crown that they would preserve their “strict neutrality” vis-à-vis Imperial forces.

\(^{395}\) A large contingent of Mennonites fled to Lübeck from nearby Bad Oldesloe after Croatian troops under Imperial command occupied the town and its vicinity in September 1627, whose impoverished state and unorthodox beliefs aroused the concerns of pastors and magistrates alike; see Weimann, *30jähriger Krieg*, p. 41. Bad Oldesloe is located approximately thirty kilometers south-west of Lübeck. The town’s location midway between Hamburg and Lübeck made it a natural choice for encampment; Imperial forces remained there from 1627 to 1629. Oldesloe lacked the defenses that spared neighboring cities; belligerents demanded not only accommodation and high contributions, but also destroyed the fields and plundered what remained after the town government and many residents fled in 1627; the town’s slow recovery was again thrown back when the Swedes (under marshal Lennart Torstenson) looted the city (under threat of arson or *Brandschatzen*) in 1643.

\(^{396}\) Weimann, *30jähriger Krieg*, p. 24. Heilighafen is located on the mainland coast of Holstein, opposite the Baltic island of Fehmarn. Weimann notes that 150 households in Heilighafen were allegedly forced to bear aggregate costs of approximately 24,000 Reichstaler in contributions, quartering, and damages in 1627 alone.

\(^{397}\) Graßmann, *Lübeckische Geschichte*, p. 463. Graßmann notes that the city’s population grew from approximately 25,000 in the pre-war years to an average of approximately 31,100 during the period 1642-1661, an increase of almost 24.4%; in consequence, magistrates and patricians advocated stricter differentiation as a countermeasure for the city’s swollen population during the post-war decades. See *ibid*, p. 463-466.
about the growth of heterodoxy and non-conformism in the region. Tellingly, Lübeck’s seventeenth-century growth proved temporary, as the population gains of the war years ebbed rapidly as internal unrest returned to Lübeck in the 1660s.398

Despite the council’s commitment to neutrality, Lübeckers shared the fears common to urban populations elsewhere during the war. Propaganda (e.g. Aldringen’s *Hanseatic Alarm-Bell*) and news pamphlets (e.g. the *True Account of Siege of Stralsund*) reminded Lübeckers that the fate of other cities could easily be their own, and the new military presence and the heightened violence that imprinted urban life during the war years fueled their fears. Wartime disorders also imprinted the business of everyday life: refugees (including the city’s own peasantry) ensured that the depravations of invasion, quartering, and plunder were common knowledge, while the regular requests for aid from Lutheran communities elsewhere recounted an endless litany of burned churches, looted homes, and destitute parishioners.399 Beginning in the 1620s, citizen militia companies (whose numbers grew to 26 units during the war years) kept the watch both by day and by night; after the Danes invaded, the council hired additional companies of mercenaries to buttress the forces commanded by the city’s captain (*Stadtoberst*).400 Wartime musters successfully defended the city from marauding soldiers on several occasions, but they brought new traumas and demands to citizen families: urban mobilization meant that citizens not only engaged foreign soldiers in combat, but also practiced drill and marksmanship at regular intervals; the duties of militia service also diverted burghers from their daily work to man the city’s fortifications and keep the watch.401 Commercial

398 Graßmann, *Lübeckische Geschichte*, p. 463. In the period 1662-1681, average population totaled approximately 27,000, declining to 23,000 between 1682 and 1700.

399 As demonstrated by various documents collected in the register of the Lübeck *Geistliches Ministerium*; see especially *AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV*, the volume for the years 1628-1642.


401 Weimann, *30jähriger Krieg*, p. 15. Men up to age sixty were eligible for militia service, and during the war, the council assumed many of the expenses of equipping the militia (building on innovations of the 1590s), thus significantly broadening the range of men able to serve.
travelers were robbed, beaten, and often killed on the land routes outside the city, either by bands of soldiers or by the highwaymen who proliferated during wartime; one noteworthy perpetrator was a certain Cuno von Hoffmann, the stepson of a minor nobleman, who was captured and executed by order of the city council on 1 May 1632, after a year of robbing travelers in Lübeck’s vicinity. Dueling was another, uniquely violent phenomenon that caused particular consternation when Lübeck Commandant Hartwig Asche Schack was killed in a bloody single combat with Holstein nobleman Otto Blume (who also died from his wounds) on 3 June 1645. The following week, Hauptpastor Michael Siricius condemned the manner of Schack’s death in a vitriolic sermon against social violence, in which he warned that “killers, duelists … and inhuman acts of murder” invited “punishment and ill-fortune upon this whole city and land.”

Lübeckers’ perennial fear of the plague turned out to be wholly justified during the war decades, as the community lost thousands of residents in major epidemics in 1625 and again in 1639, with smaller outbreaks dotting the intervening years in nearby communities like Oldesloe and Travemünde. In Lübeck, this chronological incidence was much higher than had so far been the case for the Little Ice Age. After the major outbreak of 1564-65, Lübeck suffered only a single epidemic in three generations, which claimed approximately 2,500 residents in 1603. The outbreak of 1625 killed nearly three times as many: chronicler

402 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 412-413; cf. Weimann, 30jähriger Krieg, p. 17. Frequent plunderings by highwaymen suggest that commercial traffic to and from the vicinity was a rich target. Weimann notes that following the occupation of Oldesloe in 1627, the routes around the town became impossible to traverse safely, as “bands of dispersed soldiers… showed no consideration for the lives of travelers.”


404 Michael Siricus, Warnings-Predigt / Darinnen / wie durch eine Göttliche Kette und Donnerstrael / alle Todtschläger, Duellanten, und Balger von ihren unmenschlichen Mordthaten abgezogen und abgeschrecket werden (Lübeck: Schmalhertz, 1645), p. 43. The other pastors shared Siricus’s aversion, and the ministry’s attempts to deny the captain an honorable burial ensured that his body remained “above ground” for three months after his death. Only six pastors conceded to attend elaborate public ceremonies that accompanied the funeral ceremonies of 3 September; see Becker, Umständliche Geschichte, p. 425.

405 Hartmut Lehmann and Christian Pfister both date the beginning of this cycle of cooler temperatures and poor harvests to the early 1570s, and trace its duration until about 1630; cf. Lehmann, “Lutheranism,” p. 61, and Pfister, “Weeping in the Snow,” pp. 85-86.
Gottschalk Kirchring recorded that “this Pest claimed more than 7,000 people inside Lübeck, however through God’s merciful protection ... none from the council, likewise none among the clergy, and also none of the servants of the large Latin-school died.” This did not mean, however, that the plague was confined to poorer quarters of the city; in fact, pastor Bernhard Blume (1614-1631) found the 1625 outbreak uniquely unsettling. First, it seemed to be unusually tenacious: “In the year 1625, at the time of the pestilence,” he wrote, “many citizens fled the city of Lübeck in the hope of safety from this contagion; however a portion of them died without, and a portion were brought back in again, ill.” Unusual timing and an uncommonly long duration added to Blume’s unease, as the illness took hold in late winter and lasted over half a year, spreading slowly from one parish to the next, before ending “ex abrupto, unhoped-for” in October. Perhaps most unsettling, the plague defied conventional methods of treatment: “The plague afflicted many people ... who had very good care, and died,” while “those laid out on straw, even in the passages, barely receiving ministration, recovered.” To Blume, the death of physician Heinrich Kampfbeke (which spurred


408 Bernhardus Blume, “Bericht von der Pest zu Lübeck 1625,” in Lübeckische Blätter 35 (1893), 411-412: Blume lists ten prominent deaths among those who sought to flee the plague, including a wealthy merchant who died in Magdeburg, and the wife of city council member Heinrich Köhler (1576-1641), who took ill and died while sequestered at the family’s country residence.


other medical practitioners to flee Lübeck) proved the futility of Galenic treatments, while the subsequent
death of the council’s apothecary (Ratsapotheker) signaled that “human recourses were exhausted” in the
attempt to control the disease. “Whosoever does not see from this, that the Angel of God goes about [this
city] and strikes,” the pastor concluded, “he is blind.”

Troop movements and refugee traffic ensured that epidemics were commonplace in many areas of
Germany during the Thirty Years’ War, but the long-term demographic stability of cities like Lübeck has
tended to obscure the traumatic effect of mass deaths in these less-affected regions of the Empire. From the
events he witnessed, Blume concluded that “plague is not a natural contagion, but a deadly punishment of
God, which no one has the power to escape.” Clearly, supernatural explanations for deadly disease
remained current, even as cities developed more advanced strategies to reduce the risk of contagion.

Although population losses were rapidly made good by refugee traffic and immigration, the fear and disorder
caused by these events proved highly troubling for magistrates, pastors, and regular Lübeckers alike, all of
whom witnessed mass death firsthand, and who lamented with pastor Blume their inability to comprehend
the “great and many works of God.” In view of Lübeck’s wartime experiences, pastor Gerhard Winter’s
identification of “pestilence and dearth” (Pestilenz und Theuerung) as the definitive hardships of a sinful age
was more than a formulaic invocation, but reflected the everyday realities of life by the end of the 1620s.

\[411\] Ibid., p. 411: “5. auch starb der Apoteker mit einem Gesellen und also war menschliche Zuflucht gar aus.”

\[412\] Ibid., p. 412: “Pestis non est natural contagium sed morbus supplicij divini, quod nemo potest efugere.”

\[413\] Despite attempts to promote a more salubrious atmosphere (like the sanitary measures demanded by the council
issued in preparation for the peace congress of early 1629) the war years saw a return to more frequent plagues in
Lübeck, her environs, and in the vicinity. Among numerous local outbreaks of disease, a plague recurred in Travemünde
in 1629, and returned to Lübeck proper a decade later. The city’s second wartime epidemic was probably less severe
than that of 1625; Kirchring’s chronicles relate only the following: “Anno 1639 ist zu Lübeck und den benachbarten
Orten abermahl eine ziemliche Pest gewesen”; Compendium Chronicae Lubecensis, p. 304.

\[414\] Blume,”Bericht von der Pest, in LBl. 35, p. 412: “[Herr Gott], wie sind Deine werck so groß und viel?” On population
310, on the medieval precedent for population regeneration after plague outbreaks.
“War’s greatest terror,” Thomas A. Brady writes of 1618-1648, “came in irresistible forms: wild inflation of prices, terrible plagues, famine and starvation, and the devastation of whole regions by armies who lived ‘off the land.’” Lübeck’s experience of such deprivations suggests that the coastal cities should not be counted among the few “favored regions” who escaped the ravages of this conflict. However, coastal urban dwellers were unique in that they experienced the hardships that accompanied the Thirty Years’ War most consistently in the course of their daily lives; with the exception of the besieged Stralsund, the Hanseatics escaped the outright catastrophes visited upon cities like Magdeburg, Leipzig, and Augsburg. Lübeckers were aware of their relative good fortune – refugee traffic and popular prints kept them informed of the sieges, fires, and plundering impacting other urban centers—but they lived in constant fear of these fates, which were repeatedly predicted by their pastors, or promised by Imperial polemicists. The runaway debt occasioned by marauding armies, fortifications, and exorbitant ‘contributions’ left its most tangible imprint on the city’s administrative structures and institutions, but accounts of occupation, refugee traffic, violence, and epidemic disease reveal that the war directly impacted the everyday lives of Lübeckers from the early 1620s until the last of the foreign troops departed the region in 1650.


416 Brady, German Histories, p. 392.

417 Brady, German Histories, p. 392: “Such experiences, except in some favored regions, were those of the common people during the Thirty Years War.”

418 News of the siege of Stralsund was particularly traumatic for Lübeck and the coastal cities, and was widely reported in pamphlets like the Warhafftige beschreibung of 1628 and Newe einkommende Avisen, Von dem Erbärmlichen und unuberwindlichen Brandschaden, so in der weitberühmetet Stadt Breßlaw in der Schlesien (1628), which included a report “from Lübeck” on the progress of the siege at Stralsund, in addition to recounting the burning of Breslau, as mentioned in the title.
II. “The Rod and Bloody Sword”: Magistrates and Ministry in the Thirty Years’ War

In a series of essays exploring the war’s impact on seventeenth-century Lutheran thought, Thomas Kaufmann expanded Medick and Krusenstjern’s thesis on wartime culture to include the religious sphere. His contention that theologians, pastors, and laypeople lived and worshipped “between normality and chaos” encourages us to seek a more nuanced view of the war’s impact on “everyday” religious life, and its legacy for Protestant community identity. This interpretive paradigm is especially useful for Lübeck, where magistrates and pastors alike perceived the war as a dire threat to their city’s survival (already imperiled by a general crisis after 1580), but concocted different strategies with which to counter these fresh threats to their community’s survival. Because magistrates, clerics, and common townsfolk shared the same basic worldview, their responses to the war were more subtle and complex than a simple distinction between the “spiritual” worldview of pastors and a pragmatic or “secularized” set of responses on the part of magistrates. By the time the Danish army overran Schleswig-Holstein, Lübeckers were constantly being reminded that they lived in a war zone by the tax burden occasioned by new fortifications and defenses, by brushes with marauding troops, by refugee traffic, and not least, in the apocalyptic sermons delivered by their pastors.

< War Sermons, Polemic, and Public Morals >

In October 1627, on the fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, Lutheran pastor Gerhard Winter (1589-1661) warned his parishioners that the conflict raging in the Holy Roman Empire would soon befall Lübeck. See Thomas Kaufmann’s introductory discussion in Dreißigjähriger Krieg und Westfälischer Friede: Kirchengeschichtliche Studien zur lutherischen Konfessionskultur (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

On the shared Weltbild that structured urban dwellers’ responses to the Thirty Years’ War, see Bernd Roeck, Als wolt die Welt schier brechen: Eine Stadt im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1991), pp. 11-66.

Gerhard Winter was born in Lübeck on 10 November 1589; he began his career as school rector in Kiel, prior to elected Prediger in Lübeck’s St. Mary’s parish in 1619. He advanced rapidly, becoming Haußtpastor of St. Jacob’s parish.
His sermon *Beneficial Advice: What One Should and Must Do In These Troubled Times*, offered up the poverty, destruction, and disease of wartime as proof of God’s anger, and a warning of imminent punishment.\footnote{Gerhard Winter, *Heilsamer Rath*, p. 5: “So und furs 4. Ist auch Theurung und Pestilentz nunmehr ein gemein Werck in der Welt geworden, wie dan auch furs 5. Das Elende und die Trübsal der Christenheit klar und am Tage ist.”} The only lasting solution was for all believers to reform their sinful ways – if God’s wrath were pacified by general penitence, the coming judgment might still be avoided:

“Therefore dear Christians, because we desire to be children of God, and because we have so acted through our sins, that God the Lord now, out of righteous judgment, has taken the rod and the bloody sword in hand, and begun to smite this locality with them, so let us, as behooves pious children, submit to the rod with true penitence, so that He will have no further need of blows and punishment.”\footnote{Winter, *Heilsamer Rath*, p. 18.}

According to many Lutheran pastors, the coming of the Thirty Years’ War was best explained by a general spiritual crisis afflicting Germany, a sentiment Winter wholeheartedly shared: “[it] is most lamentable,” he stated in the same sermon, “that one perpetually adds to the tally of sins, and does not trouble himself in the least with better living.”\footnote{Winter, *Heilsamer Rath*, p. 9. “[U]nd das noch am allermeisten zubeklagen … daß man immerdar auffs Kerbeholz sündiget, und sich umb die besserung des Lebens im geringsten nicht bekümmert.”} For Winter and his colleagues, it followed that all of Lübeck’s recent misfortunes – the plague of 1625-26, the Danish blockade in the summer of 1627, high food prices and exorbitant taxes-- were direct consequences of this type of moral decay.\footnote{On the blockade of 1627, see Theodore Hach, “Nachrichten zur Geschichte Lübecks im 30-jahr. Kriege, besonders im Jahr 1627,” in *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Lübeckische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* (VMLGA) 7 (1895/96), 122-125; p. 123-124.} Only a general commitment to “true penitence” and lasting piety could save the city from an imminent visitation of “the rod and bloody sword” of the Thirty Years’ War.

Apocalypticism, judgment, and divine punishment became standard tropes of homilies and polemical writings as war came to northern Germany. Lübeck’s pastors now avoided the barbed political commentary in 1626, and later acquiring the rank *Senior*, or deputy Superintendent, in 1653. He “died peacefully” (if suddenly) in his confessional (*Beichtstuhl*) on Sunday, 17 March, 1661.

---

\footnote{\textsuperscript{422} Gerhard Winter, *Heilsamer Rath*, p. 5: “So und furs 4. Ist auch Theurung und Pestilentz nunmehr ein gemein Werck in der Welt geworden, wie dan auch furs 5. Das Elende und die Trübsal der Christenheit klar und am Tage ist.”}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{423} Winter, *Heilsamer Rath*, p. 18.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{424} Winter, *Heilsamer Rath*, p. 9. “[U]nd das noch am allermeisten zubeklagen … daß man immerdar auffs Kerbeholz sündiget, und sich umb die besserung des Lebens im geringsten nicht bekümmert.”}

that had scandalized the city in 1613-14, but they agreed that contemporary events were best understood as the fulfillment of prophecies Christ had made “concerning the last days of the world” in Matthew 24.\textsuperscript{426}

Accordingly, they remained critical of the council’s response to the conflict. “Wars and rumors of wars,” the appearance of “false Chris
ts and false prophets,” real “pestilence and dearth,” and the apparent “triumph of unrighteousness” in the world all underlay confrontational sermons like the \textit{Beneficial Advice}, in which Winter concluded that human efforts alone were worthless to counteract the present crisis.\textsuperscript{427} Expensive new fortification works and clever diplomacy could offer no lasting protection without dramatic improvements in morality and a “return” to piety by Lübeckers \textit{en masse}; in his sermon of 1627, for example, Winter urged townsfolk to “meet God with a penitential heart,” to desist from committing an impressive catalog of sins, and to “venerate and honor the pastors and \textit{Predigamt}.”\textsuperscript{428} The results usually fell short of their expectations, but Winter and his colleagues never ceased to insist that spiritual defenses were vital to Lübeck’s wartime survival.

The trope of war as punishment for human wickedness dominated the clergy’s “war sermons,” or pulpit commentary on the events of wartime. In a cycle of homilies celebrating the conclusion of the Peace of Lübeck in May 1929, \textit{Hauptpastor} Michael Siricius affirmed Winter’s certainty as to the divine origins of war


\textsuperscript{427} Winter, \textit{Heilsamer Rath}, pp. 2-6. Winter first offers an exegesis of Christ’s prophecy in Matthew 24, and then confirms the presence of each of these phenomena in the present day; for example regarding the first two of the afflictions noted (p. 5): “Also und fürs 2. Darff man nicht viel fragen / ob man zu dieser Zeit höre Krieg und Geschrey von Kreigen … So und fürs 4. Ist auch Thewrung und Pestilentz numehr ein gemein Werck in der Welt geworden.”

and peace. As part of a two-day celebration decreed by the city council, Siricius’s *On the Justice and Mercy of God* attracted a distinguished audience made up of royal ambassadors and local Imperial knights, supplemented by refugee princes and the patrician families of Lübeck. On 23 May, Siricius addressed the symbiosis of human sin and divine justice that had sparked the bloodshed and destruction of the past decade; the following day, he expounded upon God’s mercies in restoring order to the Empire. The printed version of these sermons fills more than thirty pages, but the pastor was also capable of more lapidary expression: “This judgment, particularly war and bloodshed,” he instructed, “God had allowed to spread over many kingdoms and principalities, and finally also sent to this region, for the reason, without any doubt, that he wishes to discipline and better us, that we might no longer be contaminated by the godless world.” In keeping with Luther’s teaching on justification, Siricius stressed that the new Peace was as an act of divine mercy, irrespective of human effort: “meanwhile the high God, though is his anger, considered his grace, and made the beginning of peace at this place; thus we have honorable cause to consider his judgment, and to think him from the heart for his great grace.” The celebratory tone of May 1629 collapsed with Gustav

---

429 Michael Siricius (b. 1588) served as *Prediger* from 1614-1625, and as *Hauptpastor* from 1625-1648, both in the Marienkirche. He was a staunch supporter of Hunnius’s reform attempts, and survived in the Lübeck ministry by his son Gerhard Siricius (1659-1677 *Prediger* in St. Aegedien). His namesake Michael Siricius (1628-1685) became professor of theology in Gießen, and served as court preacher in Güstrow. “Siricius, Michael,” in AHL *Pastorenkartei*; cf. “Siricius, Michael (1628-1685),” in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie (ADB) 34 (1892), p. 417.

430 Becker, *Umständliche Geschichte*, p. 380, on Siricius’s sermons as central events of the public thanksgiving ceremonies (*Danksagung*) held by the council in late May of 1623.

431 Michael Siricius, *Justitiae et Misericordiae Dei Temperamentum. Zwo Christliche Predigten Vom Krieg und Frieden / Für den Hochansehnlichen Königlichen Herrn Abgesandten / nach beschlossenen und publicirten Friede auff dero Begehren zu Lübeck gehalten* (Lübeck: Valentin Schmalhertz, 1629). HAB A: 270.1 Theol. Both sermons rely on detailed exegesis of the Old Testament prophets and books of history, complemented by the Gospels and Pauline Epistles of the New; as might be expected, the first sermon (on divine justice) contains more examples of the former, while the second (on God’s mercy) dwells on the new-testament exegesis. Together, these sermons filled over thirty printed pages.

Adolph’s invasion of the Empire the following year, but Siricius’s core interpretation of the war remained intact, even as his sermons assumed a bleaker tone. Both the *Christian Sermon on the Horrors of Destruction* (1644) and the *Warning Sermon* condemning dueling and other forms of internecine violence (1645) recalled Winter’s “rod and bloody sword” by advocating repentance and moral renewal as the only reliable antidotes to invasion by Torstensson’s armies.  

In addition to bringing destruction and disease, the war altered the religious landscape of the northwestern Empire: the Imperial advance of the 1620s, the determined neutrality of city councils, and the inexorable flow of refugees these produced brought Lübeckers into direct confrontation with non-Lutherans of unprecedented quantity and variety of belief, whose confessional composition ranged from the itinerant Dominicans of 1622 to a community of Mennonites displaced from Oldesloe in 1627. Jesuit missionaries passed through Lübeck in 1629, which helps to explain the ministry’s renewed commitment to anti-Catholic polemic around this time, and their brief tenure supplemented a tiny population of Catholic priests and confessors maintained by local noble families (to the perennial chagrin of the city’s Lutheran clergy). Protestants in general were concerned about a Jesuit conspiracy involving the war plans of the Catholic kings, and the wave of anti-Jesuit literature that accompanied the Edict of Restitution fueled these fears. In 1629,

---


435 Cf. Graßmann, *Lübeckische Geschichte*, p. 467, on Jesuit missionaries. The few residents of Lübeck who remained devoted to the Catholic faith were usually *Domherrn*, i.e. members of the Cathedral Chapter (*Domkapitel*) The study “Zur Geschichte der katholischen Gemeinde in Lübeck,” in *Katholisches Kirchenblatt für die Nordischen Missionen* 34 (1894), 157-158, 165-166, 173-175, 189-190, 197-199 placed their number at six, according to a source from January 1624; see pp. 157-158: “Am 1 Januar 1624 waren am Dom zu Lübeck noch 6 katholische Kanoniker, nämlich Rabanus Heistermann, Ludowikus Spalle, Aegidius Rocha, Jodukus Delbrügge, Theodorus Korff, Henrikus Holthusen....anno 1624 prima Januarii und lange hernach ein katholischer Priester Nahmens Martinus Stricerius den katholischen Gottesdienst auf denen ... bennanten Höfen und Häusern so woll im Jahr 1624 den 1. Januarii, alß auch lange hernach alhier verrichtet ...”
for example, the anonymous author of a pamphlet entitled *A Letter of the Roman Imperial Majesty’s Confessor to a Prominent Jesuit near Hildesheim* alleged a German-Jesuit conspiracy against the Protestant estates of the Empire, insisting that the Imperials had special designs on the German coastal cities (See-städte), especially Lübeck and Hamburg.\(^{436}\) Despite the mistrust of “Jesuits and papists” the council had expressed in 1619, the *Ratsherren* appeal to have been unwilling to risk a confrontation with Catholic princes and commanders over such small numbers of priests. Likewise, they tolerated the Reformed merchants and engineers essential who played a vital role in building Lübeck’s fortification and facilitating trade during the war years, and thus declined to support any confessional policy that would empower pastors to go beyond the use of Strafamt, printed polemic, and sermons encouraging vigilance against Catholic or Reformed incursion.\(^{437}\) By contrast, their response to the appearance of non-conformist teachers and new mystical sects in wartime Lübeck was far more energetic, and became an important precedent for a new postwar politics concerning “foreign religions” in general.

---

\(^{436}\) Anon., *In Teutsch übersetztes Schreiben / Der Römischen Keyserlichen Mayestet Beichtvaters / an einen vornehmen Jesuiter gen Hildesheimb* (1629), or *Letter of the Roman Imperial Majesty’s Confessor to a Prominent Jesuit near Hildesheim, Translated into German*; HAB N 335.3 Theol. This pamphlet purported to be a missive intercepted from the Imperial confessor to a leading German Jesuit, and claimed to reveal to the reader of “all papist designs against the German state, the Crowns of Sweden, Denmark, and England; also a part of the States-General of Holland.” The author called special attention to the threat facing German coastal cities (“See-städte”), particularly Lübeck and Hamburg, whose strategic location made them the key to imperial designs against the northern Empire and the Scandinavian kingdoms; see p. 7: “Dann wan wir Hamburg und Lübeck / nebenst den übrigen Städten / erst unterm Joch und mit mächtigen Guarnisonen belegt haben / können die übrigen Reichs Städte mit einander nur duch blosse blocquirung nach allem wunsch herbeig gebracht werden.”

Friedrich II’s new offensive against Protestantism after the Battle of White Mountain sparked a wave of anti-Catholic polemic in Lutheran Germany during the 1620s and 1630s. In Lübeck, the clergy produced a rich crop of works designed to warn both their own parishioners and communities elsewhere of the dangers of heterodox contagion. Nicolaus Hunnius came to embody the city’s rebuttal to the Catholic threat after he assumed the office of Superintendent in 1623. Though preoccupied by plague and a dispute with the spiritualist Johannes Bannier, Hunnius found time in 1625-26 to edit and publish three sermons by the Bohemian theologian Helwig Garth (1579-1619), who had spoken out from his pulpit in Prague against Catholic liturgical innovations, specifically “against the Jesuit horror... of communion in one form.” He took his own stand in pamphlets of 1629 and 1631: the Necessary Repudiation of Two Severe Accusations, Made by the Jesuits Against the Churches of the Augsburg Confession used scriptural exegesis to counter Catholic claims that Lutherans “defame and do injury” to the Imperial constitution, the Emperor, and the Religious Peace of Augsburg “when they call the pope the Antichrist.” A subsequent, similarly charged treatise entitled Thorough Proof That The Roman

---

438 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 804. Stark described Hunnius as first and foremost a polemicist: “Hunnius ist Verfasser zahlreicher Schriften: 1) gegen das papsttum 2) gegen den Calvinismus, 3) gegen den Socianismus 4) gegen die Fanatiker [Schwärmer].” Starck adds that the Superintendent was also a writer “concerning the Christian teaching and Christian life.” Hunnius anti-Jesuit sentiment was somewhat less fantastical, though his decision to publish Helwig Garth’s Offenbarlicher Beweiß should be counted part of his effort (in Starck’s phrase) “to repel the Jesuit attempts to re-Catholicize Lübeck”; ibid., p. 742. This refers to the Jesuit missionaries who passed through Lübeck during the war years.

Church Is Not The True Christian Church condemned the enforced restoration of Catholic rites in occupied regions of the Empire as a “a clear and unmistakable sign of false teaching and ensnarement,” and as a harbinger of “the last days of the world.” The Necessary Repudiation was published anonymously in Leipzig, but Hunnius took steps to ensure that fearful Lübeckers need not wait for reassurance by instructing Bernhard Blume to produce a similar anti-Catholic treatise for local publication in 1629. Because wartime events inspired polemic in the same way they informed the “warning sermons” of Winter and Siricius, it is plausible to speak of a distinct “wartime discourse” produced by the Lübeck clergy as part of their broader corpus of sermons and edificatory literature.

Pamphlets like Blume’s Short Report on the Alleged Sanctity of the Roman–Catholic Church offer remarkably consistent examples of theological dogmatics, designed to educate the laity about the irreconcilable differences separating the “true teaching” of Lutheranism from the “errors” of the Catholic and Reformed churches. The theological proofs and scriptural glosses such works relied upon quickly become predictable, but these texts reveal that the clergy’s vision for preserving and strengthening the Lutheran creed stretched well beyond the dictates of moral discipline. Hunnius illustrated this with particular clarity in a 1632 treatise entitled A Well-Intentioned Consideration of Whether the Lutheran Church Might Reconcile


442 Bernhardus Blume, who served as Prediger of the Cathedral parish from 1614 to 1626 before becoming Hauptpastor of the same in 1626, acknowledged that Hunnius motivated him to write Sanctitas Ecclesiae Roman-Catholicae: Das ist: Kurtzer und gründlicher Bericht: Von Der Berühmbten Heiligkeit der Römisich-Catholischen Kirchen (Lübeck: Schmalhertz, 1629), HAB 1243.2 Th., p. v-vi: “Wenn aber unser Herr Superintendens der Wolehrwürdige und Hochgelarte Herr Nicolaus Hunnius, der H. Schrifft Doctor, welchen ich von Ehren wegen nenne / mir diß Thema zu tractiren approbiret, als lasse ichs hiemit dem lieben gotte zu Ehren / und allen Christen zu Dienste ans Tageliecht kommen ...”
Itself to the Current Religious Disputes, which he dedicated to the Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus. In thirty-three heavily annotated chapters, Hunnius rejected the notion that Lutherans could make any religious compromise with Catholics, Calvinists, or non-conformist sects, advocating instead that the Lutheran estates pursue victory through tireless theological dispute, which he labeled “the actual, correct means of bringing the truth to light, and ending religious conflict.” To secure this objective, the Superintendent proposed that Lutheran kings and princes sponsor a general institute for theological argumentation, which he described as “a single College, or assembly of learned theologians, to whom alone the business of religious dispute would be charged, avoiding all other kinds of duties”; pointedly, he added that necessary monies could be raised by the princes in a single year, if they would simply cut back on the excesses of court life.

Given that Lutheran rulers were preoccupied with martial interests, it is unsurprising that this idea failed to take root in Protestant territories, though the Lutheran Duke Ernst of Gotha would make an unsuccessful attempt to found “Hunnius’s College” (Collegium Hunnianum) after 1670.

These sermons and writings bespeak a new cohesion at the highest ranks of the ministry, which contrasted sharply with the scandals and disputes that divided Superintendent Georg Stampelius from his pastors in the first years of the war. During the Burchardi-Stampelius debate, the majority of the Lübeck clergy already believed that their city must eschew any compromise with Calvinists and Catholics, but the pastors’ “wartime discourse” signaled an important development in the institutional and thematic capacities

---

443 Nicolaus Hunnius, Consultatio, Oder Wolmeinendes Bedencken: Ob und wie die Evangelische Lutherische Kirchen die jetztschwebende Religionstreitigkeiten entweder friedlich beylegen / oder durch Christliche udn bequeme Mittel fortstellen und endigen mögen (Lübeck: Valentiin Schmalhertz, 1632). In addition to the King of Sweden, Hunnius dedicated the Consultatio to another leading Protestant prince, Elector Johann Georg I of Saxony (1585-1656).

444 Hunnius, Consultatio, p. 486: “Solches disputiren ist das eigentliche rechte Mittel / die Warheit an Tag zu bringen / und den Religionstreit zutreiben.”


446 As Hunnius’s vision became known in the post-war decades; cf. Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 303.
of their struggle against heterodoxy. Hunnius’s polemical tracts dwelt at length on the pastor’s duty to battle heterodoxy, and his example infused Lübeck’s ministry with a new polemical agenda: the most outspoken and prolific polemicists of the war years were not impetuous junior Prediger like Holste and Burchardi, but the Superintendent and Hauptpastoren of the city’s five parishes. Though Gerhard Winter and Michael Siricius consciously yoked the fears and hardships of wartime to the moral reform agenda they had inherited from the previous generation, they were motivated by genuine new threats to the religious cohesion of their city, and to German Protestantism at large.\textsuperscript{447}

\textless Corpus Christianum: Hunnius and the Lübeck church order >

Hunnius viewed a “partnership of council and ministry” as the essential precondition for his goal of transforming Lübeck into an “evangelical Corpus Christianum.”\textsuperscript{448} Beginning in 1626, he sought to persuade the city’s rulers to commit anew to the work of moral disciplining by composing a treatise on the Strafaamt, and he took up the subject again in 1630, when he submitted an outline for a revised church order to the council.\textsuperscript{449} The Ratsherren deflected these efforts by refusing to enter into a debate on the subject, but the pastors overcame this when they seized upon perceived abuses of the Lutheran funerary rite in the early 1630s. The clergy had bitterly protested the “honorable” burial of an Imperial envoy (a Catholic named Johannes Lange) in the region in 1628, and their indignation grew when the council honored two Dutch engineers with full civic burial ceremonies in return for their contributions to Lübeck’s fortification works.\textsuperscript{450}

\textsuperscript{447} On the proliferation of millenarian teachings in Lutheran areas, see Lehmann, “Lutheranism,” pp. 67-68.

\textsuperscript{448} Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 309: “Hunnius’ Ordnungsmodell zielte auf eine Partnerschaft von Staat und Kirche, d.h. von Rat und Ministerum, ohne eine Trennung beider Bereiche auch nur zu erwägen. Gegen das absolutistische Staatskrichtum setzte er das Ideal des evangelischen Corpus Christianum, doch er mußte damit zwangsläufig an der andersgearteten Realität scheitern.”

\textsuperscript{449} Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 305. Hunnius’s treaty on the Strafaamt was published under the title Ministerii Ecclesiastici zu Lübeck Bedencken / Auff Drey Fragen / das Straffamt betreffend (Lübeck: Schmalhertz, 1626).

\textsuperscript{450} These included the ringing of the city’s bells and a chorale by the students of the Latin school, in addition to a public procession. The ministry’s complaint against “Johannes Lange, a devotee of the papist religion” is found in AHL
After the second burial in 1633, Hunnius drafted a letter of protest in which he claimed ultimate authority in liturgical matters for the clergy, an argument the council parried with a legal treatise claiming “sovereignty in all church matters,” on the grounds that the dismantling of the Roman church in Lübeck had transferred the authority of the bishop (Bischofsrecht) to the temporal authority (Obrigkeit). This constitutional legacy, chief diplomat Otto Tanck concluded, empowered the council alone to adjudicate all questions of church government, and to command the Lutheran clergy as its clients. The Superintendent countered this with his own assessment of Luther’s “doctrine of the three estates,” which insisted that the clergy (Klerus) and lay community (Gemeinde) share in the discharge of both jus episcopale and jurisdictio ecclesiastica. “One Estate,” he concluded from the canonical texts of the Lutheran tradition, “shall not simultaneously command both spiritual and temporal powers.” Though buttressed by legal opinions from various Lutheran institutions and university faculties in Saxony – the Electoral consistory at Leipzig, for example, affirmed that “the ministry is in no way to be excluded from the administration of the episcopal right” -- this effort came to naught. Like “Hunnius’s College,” the manifesto of 1634 reveals that while the Superintendent had grand

---


452 Hauschild offers a useful summary of Tanck’s argument in Kirchengeschichte, p. 308. The council’s core argument stated that “Die alten Rechte des Lübecker Bischofs und Domkapitels seinen in vollem Umfang ... auf den Rat übergegangen, der somit zu einer juristischen Doppelperson, Obrigkeit und Landesbischof, geworden sei. Aus dieser Kirchenhoheit leitete der Rat den Anspruch ab, über alle kirchl. Fragen souverän entscheiden und über die Geistlichen als seine Beamten verfügen zu können.”


ambitions for re-making society in a recognizably Lutheran model, clerical agitation was not enough to produce sweeping changes in the inherited ordering of church and state in Lübeck.

< Social Welfare and Scholarship >

The magistrates frustrated clerical ambitions by their dogged adherence to Bugenhagen’s original church order, but they cooperated readily in smaller initiatives that promoted internal order and complemented Lübeck’s innovative tradition in the sphere of poor relief.455 The first of these, known as the “widow’s chest” (Witwenkasse) sought to offset the new financial hardships impacting pastors and their families by creating a permanent institution for dispensing financial support to the wives and children of deceased pastors.456 Hunnius created this fund in 1624 by combining an array of citizen bequests to the ministry with a program of annual contributions by the pastors themselves; this was begun at the request of a handful of concerned pastors, but the widow’s chest grew rapidly when the rest of the parish clergy subscribed to the system the following year.457 A few years later, the city council established a Sklavenkasse or “slave’s chest” at the united request of the ministry, in order to repatriate sailors captured by North African pirates during voyages to the Iberian peninsula; this fund united the clergy’s desire to combat the tendency of captured sailors to convert to Islam with a pre-existing initiative by the merchant guilds to


456 A series of appeals by the ministry to the council requesting improved compensation and protesting the abrogation of clerical financial privileges (e.g. tax exemption) attest to the impact of inflation and extractive measures on pastors’ material well-being after 1600. Two illustrative examples from the years immediately prior to the first incarnation of the Witwenkasse (which initially concerned only the clergy of St. Mary’s parish, and the Prediger of St. Johann Cloister or Johanniskloster) are found in the ministry records from 1620 and 1623. The first of these was a success, as the clergy received a moderate pay rise in response to their requests for “improvement of salary in 1620; see AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 99-100 and 105-106, “Ansuchen Ministerÿ, umb Besserung der Besoldung.” Ibid., fol. 102-103 for “Decretum Senatus darauff,” specifying “Einhundert Marck Verbesserung” of clerical salaries in 1620. Three years later, the ministry petitioned the council “that they might be freed from civic taxes” without success; see AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 108 f., “Supplicatio Ministerÿ, daß der Prediger, Schulerer, und Custodum-Wieberr von civiliby oneribus mögen befreyet sein.” Cf. ibid., fol. 111, for the council’s reply.

457 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 306.
repatriate some of the 84 Lübeckers seized by Muslim corsairs between 1615 and 1629. In the final case—a stipend for theological study known as the Schabbelstiftung after the founder Hinrich Schabbel, a Hamburg merchant and the brother of Lübeck syndic Hieronymus Schabbel—the Superintendent designed a scholarship dedicated to assisting students pursuing the doctorate in theology at leading Lutheran universities.

Hunnius designed the Stiftung to ensure that recipients “first excel in theology … second, that they would usefully teach, disputing adversaries and false teachers from a firm standpoint, [and] also, that they would edify Christendom in general through beneficial writings.” Schabbel’s endowment was rich enough to support four students at a time --the young August Hermann Francke was a preeminent recipient-- and by his close involvement therein, Hunnius won a small victory for the perpetuation of Orthodox theology. This institution also bore lasting witness to the Superintendent’s fervor for moral discipline, as the terms of this scholarship systemically forbade the temptations likely to befall its recipients while at university, namely idleness, gambling, immoderation, frequenting pubs and wine-shops, dueling, and dancing. Like the Kasse for pastor’s families, this scholarship fund remained in operation until the early twentieth century, due in no small part to the cooperation of the city council and the lay elite, who not only facilitated the creation of both institutions, but also played a leading role in financing both through charitable and testamentary giving. Though Hunnius found his grander visions for Lübeck repeatedly frustrated, his career was punctuated by successful initiatives to support social welfare on a Lutheran model.

< Religious Non-Conformism: the “New Prophets” >


459 Quoted in Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 307: ‘Vnnd sol alles zu diesem scopo gerichtet sein, das sie mit Gotlicher verleyhung einmal in Theologia excelliren, andreire mit nutzen lehren, den wiedersachern vnnn falschen Lehrern mit guttem grunde vnnn bestande widerstehen, auch durch nutzliche schrifften die gemeine Christenheit erbauwen konnen.’

460 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 307.

461 Quoted in Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 307. Hunnius’s instructions demanded that stipend-holders refrain from ‘des Mußiggangs, Spielens, Gastereyen, öffentliche Bier vnd Weinheuser, Fechtboden, Tantz Plätze etc.’.
As the Swedes stormed the Empire’s Catholic heartland following the Protestant victory at Breitenfeld, Hunnius and his pastors re-directed their polemical energies to confront the new Protestant sects proliferating in the German northwest.\(^{462}\) In 1616, the city council had renewed its original decree banning “desecrators of the sacrament, Anabaptists, and blasphemers” from Lübeck, but enforcing this mandate made for a difficult and time-consuming proposition which only gained momentum under the leadership of Nicolaus Hunnius.\(^{463}\) While the ministry habitually applied the language of fanaticism and/or heresy to any group whose beliefs conflicted with orthodox Lutheran doctrine, their magistrates came to distinguish sharply between the members of other mainstream confessions, and the mystics, spiritualists, and religious syncretists who proliferated in response to the material hardships and state breakdowns of the war years.\(^{464}\) The progress of Lübeck’s campaign against wartime non-conformism is best encapsulated in the decade-long encounter with a spiritualist group led by Paul Felgenhauer (1593-1677), and Christoph Andreas Raselius (1590-1660), whose followers were known as the “New Prophets” due to their anti-clericalism, apocalypticism, and chiliastic leanings.

The known potential of spiritualist sects to incite disorder persuaded Lübeck magistrates to sanction the clergy’s struggle against the growth of religious non-conformism. “When a city is placed in severe danger from warfare,” the Superintendent wrote in his *Thorough Report on the New Prophets*, published in 1634,

---

\(^{462}\) Breitenfeld was fought on September 17, 1631 in Saxony. The victory won by Gustav Adolphus’s forces and their Saxon allies – they destroyed two-thirds of the Imperial army commanded by Count Tilly-- constituted the first major Protestant victory in a conflict already more than a decade old, and for this reason, as well as the string of successes it initiated (to the cost of Catholic lands bordering the Main river), has been dubbed “the first of the Thirty Years War’s three decisive battles” by Thomas A. Brady; see *German Histories*, p. 393.

\(^{463}\) Der Erbaren Fry / Rykes / unde Seestede Lübeck / Bremen / Hamborch / Rostock / Stralsund und Lüneburg Christlick / und Ernstlick Mandat wedder de Sacramentschender / Wedderöper / unde Gades Lesterer / Anno XXXV. In öffenlyken Druck uthgegahn (Hamburg: Hans Mosen, 1616) (unpaginated): “Deweyle wy öuerst öpentlick sehen unde bevinden / dat sülcke Kettereye / unde valsche Lere in veele Fürstendomen / Landen / unde steden auerhandt nemen / Ock dorch de bösen Lerere hemelick under dat Volck gesprengt / ÿs am högesten tho befürchten ... Darümme hebbe wy uth schuldiger pflicht / so veele minscllick ys / mit Gödtlike vörsichtichkeit in unsern steden sülcken grüwlicken Erdoem vorkamn / unnde mit düssem Mandate vorhinderen willen.”

“everyone strives with great diligence to counteract the enemy and secure the advantage.”

In contrast to the council’s strategy of fortified isolation, Hunnius engaged the spiritual enemy head-on, by leading disciplinary campaigns against the heterodox teachers that appeared in Lübeck during the war’s first decade. In 1623-24, for example, Hunnius and the ministry targeted the Hamburg-born theosophist Joachim Morsius (1593-1642), as well as the wandering mystic and rigorous ascetic Johann Bannier, and persuaded the council to expel both men from Lübeck. A few years later, they encountered a greater challenge from the Neue Propheten, who subscribed to the “radical anti-church individualism” espoused by Bohemian pastor’s son Paul Felgenhauer. Despite continued success in securing magisterial cooperation, a decade-long confrontation with Raselius and his followers revealed that this generation of Superintendents and pastors were unable to fully suppress movements that privileged individual piety and spiritual “illumination” over the institutionalized religiosity of the Lutheran Orthodoxy.

---


466 Richard Hoche, “Morsius, Joachim,” in *ADB 22* (1885), 327-328, and Susanna Åkermann, *Rose Cross over the Baltic: The Spread of Crosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1998), pp. 128-129; cf. Hauschild, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 299. Though born in Hamburg, Morsius had a pronounced wanderlust; Hoche records that he became director of the Rostock city libraries in 1615, giving up the post the following year, in which he resided in Stettin, Hamburg, and Leyden; the following year (1617) he travelled through the Netherlands, Denmark, and the German region of Pomerania; while he spent much of 1619 in England. This pattern continued for much of his life, prior to his “sudden” death in Gottorp (Holstein) in 1642. Bannier’s troubles in Lübeck began when he attempted to publish his "rigorist" views on piety and abstinence in Lübeck, upon which printer Valentin Schmalhertz turned his manuscript over to Superintendent Hunnius. After his exile from Lübeck, Bannier travelled to Sweden, where he declared at the court of Kristina of Holstein (the mother of King Gustav Adolph) that he was free of the sins of the flesh, and was eventually tried for heresy and executed. Bannier was influenced by August Wiegel and Johann Arndt, and had been accused of Rosicrucianism during his first visit to Sweden in the early 1622, after the publication of his tract *Spiegels oder Abriss des Greuels der Verwüstung*, which eventually led to his being examined by High Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna (1583-1654).

467 Hauschild, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 300; cf. Julius August Wagenmann, “Felgenhauer, Paul,” in *ADB 8* (1878), 278-279. Felgenhauer was “earmarked for the pastor’s office” from an early age, but refused to enter the Lutheran clerical office following his studies at Wittenberg.

468 Hunnius, *Ausführlicher Bericht*, p. iv-v: “Über welche alle eine newe Sect der Enthusiasten / Chiliasten / und (als sie sich zunennen pflegen) der Illuminatoren oder Erleuchteten / new Propheten und Aposteln...” Hunnius condemned the
these incomplete successes when composing his dedication to the city council. He was careful to praise the magistrates—whom he addressed as “our beloved and honored authorities”—for the support his ministry had enjoyed to date, but also urged Lübeck’s rulers to make a greater, lasting commitment to disciplining belief on the Orthodox model. Like Winter and Siricius, Hunnius stressed that such discipline was not only vital to salvation, but essential to the Lübeck’s wartime survival.469

The perceived danger of the New Prophets owed much to capacity of the movement’s teachers to produce and circulate printed texts articulating their chiliastic and anti-clerical vision for society. Felgenhauer began his polemical career in 1620 from Prague, where he published a pamphlet entitled *A Mirror for Our Times*, condemning the “corruption” he found to be rife “among most of these called the clergy and the learned.”470 Displaced by the Emperor’s persecution of Czech Protestants, Felgenhauer eventually settled in Amsterdam, whence his *Secret of the Temple of God* (1631) spread rapidly into the northwestern Empire; at least one Dutch bookseller was vending the work to citizens in Lübeck’s central market by Advent of that year.471 Hunnius offered a concise and visceral description of the danger embodied by this book in a letter to the Lübeck city council, dated 17 February, 1632. Because Felgenhauer urged an individualized understanding of Scripture “according to spiritual, allegorical meaning,” his book necessarily contained myriad “false teachings” concerning core doctrines and Lutheran traditions such as justification, Christ’s

---


470 Wagenmann, “Felgenhauer, Paul,” in *ADB 8* (1878), 278-279. The full title of Felgenhauer’s *Mirror* reveals his antipathy toward the established Protestant clergies: Felgenhauer, *Seculum Temporis Zeit Spiegel: Darinnen neben Vemahnung aller Welt wird vor Augen gestellet, was für eine Zeit jetzt sey unter allerley Ständen, besonders unter den meisten Geistich genante und Gelerten* (Prague, 1620).

human nature, prophecy, and the authority of the pastor’s office.\textsuperscript{472} Worse, Hunnius argued, the spiritualist mode of perception dismissed all forms of God-given authority, instead teaching “that every person has in himself the knowledge of all things, and should learn all things of himself.”\textsuperscript{473} “From this it is clear,” the missive concluded, “that should this book be brought among the people, it [would] engender conflict and strife, disorder, and the evil that follows thereupon in our community.”\textsuperscript{474} Despite Hunnius’s urgent tone, however, the council waited nearly a year to acquiesce to this request, only banning the trade in “fanatical” books in January of 1633, on the grounds that such works were contemptuous to “the divinely-established authority (Obrigkeit) and the worthy office of ministry (Predigamt).”\textsuperscript{475} In the meantime, however, a new influx of texts written by Felgenhauer’s ally Raselius had arrived in Lübeck from Hamburg.\textsuperscript{476} While Felgenhauer’s works came from Amsterdam, books like The Horn of Repentance and The Golden Key of David to the House of God had been produced nearby, for a growing community of local followers. Raselius and his


\textsuperscript{473} Ibid., fol. 523-24: “Zum andern: Wann das Geheimnuß des Tempels einen Mensch so weit gebracht, daß er alle die Art, Mittel und Wege, dadurch Gott uns lehren will, fahren lasset, so brings es Ihn dar zu …also lehre es: 1.) Das ein jeder Mensch aller Dinge Erkenntnuß in ihm selben habe, und alles in ihm selbst lernen solle.”

\textsuperscript{474} Ibid., fol. 523: “Darauf ofenbar, diß Büchlein sey unter die Leute gebracht, streit und Zanck, Zerrüttung, und darauf folgende Ubel, in unser Gemein Zustifften…”


\textsuperscript{476} Krause, “Raselius,” in ADB 27, pp. 319-320. Thematically similar to the former’s Secret of the Temple, Raselius’s The Golden Key of David to the House of God purported to be scriptural guide to “recognition of the secrets of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,” while the new edition of his work The Horn of Repentance echoed the apocalypticism and anti-authoritarian sentiments of Felgenhauer’s Mirror; this was published as Trewhertzig Buß Posaune, Angeblasen über eine sehr denckwüdige zur Zeit Kaysers Ludowice Bavari Anno 1322 geschehene Propeceyung vom jetzt- und zünktfigen Zustand des Teutschlands (without a printer’s name) in 1632. The original title of The Golden Key is: Der guldene Schlüssel Davis / zum Hause Gottes und Erkanndnuß dessen Geheimnußen / vom Vater / Sohn und heiligen Geist (1632). Like most of Raselius’s works, the Golden Key was published without a printer’s mark or a place name, but the provenance of many of his works has been reconstructed by his nineteenth-century biographers.
disciples moved the magistrates to action because he represented a threat that could not be quelled by censorship alone.\textsuperscript{477}

Hunnius’s \textit{Report on the New Prophets} represents the apex of a collaborative effort led by the Lübeck pastors to reconcile the followers of Felgenhauer and Raselius to the institutional church. In early 1632, Hunnius requested the council’s permission to revive the \textit{Ministerium Tripolitanum}, a regional consistory staffed by the ministry leaders of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Lüneburg.\textsuperscript{478} The council granted this request simultaneously with a ban on Raselius and Felgenhauer’s books, and the Lübeck pastors summoned their colleagues to a convention in the cathedral town of Mölln (located thirty kilometers to the south on the Stecknitz canal) in February of 1633. The Convent of Mölln took place on 26-29 March, according to an itinerary drafted by the Lübeck ministry, and the surviving minutes reveal that the eight senior pastors in attendance concerned themselves primarily with the problem of “keeping safe this church” against the enthusiast threat, to which end they forged on a three-part defensive strategy.\textsuperscript{479} The legacy of their third resolution is the most revealing: the Convent of Mölln resolved to deploy the office of discipline (\textit{Strafamt}) against those suspected of spiritualist inclinations, both in their own communities and through public debate with the movement’s leaders. In Lübeck, the ministry would achieve a public victory against Raselius’s adherents, but this effort also disclosed the practical limitations of the pastors’ campaign against wartime spiritualists.

Armed with the council’s approval, the pastors moved to discipline alleged adherents of spiritualist heresy. At Mölln, the \textit{Ministerium Tripolitanum} had named three Lübeck citizens – Johann Wessel, Johann

\textsuperscript{477} In addition to their entreaties to their \textit{Ratsherren}, the Lübeck ministry penned similar censorship requests to the Lutheran community and city council of Amsterdam in early 1632, hoping to stem the flow of Enthusiasts prints at its source; “Ein Schrieben auff Amsterdam, daß daß Büchlein von d. Morgenröte [der Weisheit] nicht mochte gedrucket und publiciret [werden].” AHL \textit{Geistliches Ministerium IV}, fol. 524 f.


\textsuperscript{479} The phrase used by Hunnius and the ministry in their letter to the Hamburg and Lüneburg consistories, from February or early March of 1633; AHL \textit{Geistliches Ministerium IV}, fol. 476 ff. “Verzeichniss etlicher Puncten, davon in dem Conventum Molensi wird zu andern sein.” Cf. Starck, \textit{Kirchen-Historie}, p. 787. On the origins of the \textit{Ministerium Tripolitanum} and its resolutions in at the Convent of Mölln, see pp.32-33 and note 54.
Tanckmar, and Leonhard Elver-- among the suspected “New Prophets” it subsequently reported to the councils of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Lüneburg. It is difficult to know from the available sources whether these men were denounced by their fellow parishioners (as was often the case in the proceedings of urban consistories) or by the clergy, but ministry records confirm that the pastors from Lübeck already suspected Tanckmar by the time of the Convent of Mölln. The ministry’s dragnet also revealed that the itinerant mystic Joachim Morsius (1593-1644) had returned to Lübeck – he had been expelled by the council in 1624—and a search of his lodgings uncovered an alleged “magical book” and the manuscript for a “mystical” text. The investigation of Johann Wessel (which added Lübecker Heinrich Ottendorf and his wife to the roster of suspects) likewise alleged a “shameful book” (Schandbuch) and “various conversations with coarse fanatics,” attested to by a “respected woman” of Wessel’s acquaintance. The ministry dealt with these errors in three separate proceedings between 1633 and 1635, and each case began with questioning by the parish pastors, who reported their findings to the Superintendent and Hauptpastoren. Morsius, who was both well-to-do and accustomed to an itinerant lifestyle, voluntarily departed Lübeck when the ministry confronted him in 1633, but this option was less desirable to citizens like Tanckmar, Wessel, and Ottendorf, who were


482 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 299.

483 AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 533-534, 536-537, “Der 3 Prediger zum Thum fragen an Johannes Wessel, darauff er antworten soll, aber nicht richtig geantwortet hat”; fol 537. This entry include the testimony of an acquaintance of Johannes Wessel who claimed to have warned him about his interaction with the spiritualists, with the words “...er hatte sich sehr verdächtig gemacht, ds. Er mit den groben Fanatis [sic] so vielfaltig conversirt; er hatte allen bösen schein auch...” On Wessel’s knowledge of at least one “Schandbuch,” see Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 535, “Nicolaus Hunnio schreibt Johann Wesel und Ottendorff betreffend.” On the involvement of Henrich Ottendorff’s wife, Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 570 f., “Gesprech H. D. Hunny mit Hinrich Ottendorf und seiner fraw, daß sie ... falsche Lehre bleiben mögen.”
examined in sessions of the consistory. Following an examination by the four members of the council, all three men admitted their errors and signed written confessions, Tanckmar and Wessel in 1633, and Ottendorf in 1635. However, the Lübeck spiritualists proved prone to recidivism: Johann Wessel was re-examined by the ministry in 1635, on the grounds that he continued to seek the “society of the fanatics,” and the pastors continued to suspect Ottendorf even after he recanted his errors in writing in May 1635.

Heinrich Ottendorf’s encounter with the Lübeck consistory is particularly illustrative of the means by which pastors and magistrates prosecuted religious non-conformism in wartime Lübeck. Though not included in the original list of suspected New Prophets compiled by the tripartite Ministerium, Ottendorf became the target of a clerical inquiry between January and May of 1635, probably as a result of Johann Wessel’s second brush with the ministry. Ottendorf caused “far greater troubles” than the other accused spiritualists, not least because his “enthusiast errors” included distributing suspect literature; specifically, he was accused of circulating a text called *A Child’s Conversation with His Mother*, written by the Holstein “enthusiast” Anna Ovena Hoyer (1584-1648) and considered an “inflammatory pamphlet” by the Lübeck pastors. Hunnius

---

484 On Morsius’s voluntary departure from the city, see Hauschild, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 302; on his marriage to a wealthy woman and his travels, see Hoche, “Morsius,” in *ADB* 22, pp. 327-328.


486 Starck, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 806-807, on the second examination of Wessel by pastors Alber Reimars, Daniel Lipstorp, and Jonas Nicolai. The contents of Hinrich Ottendorf’s complaint to the council (dated 18 February 1638) make clear that this act of discipline concerned his previous connections to the New Prophets, a circumstance Ottendorf bitterly protested, describing himself as an “always obedient citizen”; *AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV*, fol. 556-558, “Hinrich Ottendorff beklaget sich fürm Rath, daß er zum Thum von der Tauff [prohibiret] worden.”

487 His confession in the consistorium is found in *AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV*, fol. 539, “Ottendorff depreciret im Consistorio, nach gesetzer formul.” The basics of Ottendorf’s case can be reconstructed from the ministry’s internal reports on him, e.g. *ibid.*, fol. 540 f., “Relatio gramini mit Hinrich Ottendorff gehalten,” and fol. 535 f. “Nicolaus Hunnio schreibt Johann Wesel und Ottendorff betreffend.”

488 Starck, *Kirchen-Historie*, p. 807. Starck writes that Henrich Ottendorf’s attempt to circulate the *Gespräch eines Kindes mit seiner Mutter* meant that he “not only had committed himself to spread among the people ... a known inflammatory pamphlet,” but also contributed an appendix containing a “previously printed prayer” -- or incantation; the word he uses is *carminis* -- “in all of which he had no other intention, than to despise the public office of ministry (Predig-Ambt).” Anna Ovena Hoyer was the daughter of Johann Oven, an anstronomer from Koldenbüttel in Schleswig, and is primarily
examined Ottendorf and his wife personally on 23 January 1633, remanding his report to the city consistory. 489 Chaired by Dr. Otto Tanck, provost of the Cathedral Chapter, this body questioned Ottendorf on 24 February on thirty different points ranging from Hoyer’s pamphlet --where it was printed, where he had obtained copies, what had motivated him to append a prayer of his own thereto-- to Ottendorf’s domestic devotional practices, and whether his children “were likewise seduced with this new teaching.” 490 The six pastors and four magistrates concluded by ordering husband and wife to desist “from further resistance and disobedience to the ministry.” 491

The clergy already resented Ottendorf’s challenge to their authority, and they now asked the council’s permission to make Ottendorf’s formal reconciliation a public event, “proportionate to the public scandal” he had caused with his pamphlets. 492 The council refused this request on various grounds, none of them satisfactory to the pastors. For instance, the council’s reply contended that “the public act of deprecation was an unaccustomed act,” that would “see in [i.e. usher in] new, unaccustomed misdeeds” or innovations; they also cited the likelihood that Ottendorf would react badly to these proceedings, turning

---

489 AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 570 f.; “Gesprech H.D. Hunný mit Hinrich Ottendorff und seiner frauw” (23 January, 1635).

490 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 810-811. Starck notes that the matter might have rested here, had not Ottendorf prolonged the proceedings by requesting his own copy of the ministry’s thirty points, instead of simply admitting his error: “... und folglich diesen Streit hießt sollen gelöschen seyn lassen / war es ihm so gar nicht gelegen, daß [Ottendorf] auch umb copiam der extrahirten Puncten bate / welche ihm auch so ferne / daß er ohne Zuziehung seiner cornuten sich darauf declariren möchte / eingewilliget wurde.”

491 Starck, Kirchen-Historie, p. 810. In addition to Tanck, the consistory meeting of 24. February was staffed by council syndic Dr. Benedict Winkler, and Ratherren Henrich Remmerß and Dieterich Brömse. The ministry leadership comprised Hunnius and the five Hauptpastoren: Michael Siricius of St. Mary’s parish, Adam Helms of St. Peter’s, Gerhard Winter of St. Jacob’s, Jonas Nicolai of the Cathedral Parish (Dom), and Johann Reich of St. Aegidien’s.

492 AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV, fol. 544 f.: “Erklerung des Ministerý, wie die Deprecatio Offendorpy möge abgefaßet werden.” Hunnius and the pastors argued that Ottendorf’s “deprecation” should take place in loco publico as retribution for the injuring he had done to the office of ministry; this would make his errors and disobedience “as clear as the sunlight” (sonnenklar) to the community.
observers against the urban authorities through the “unmistakable symptoms of his unrepentance.” Clearly, the council saw such an event as a potential threat to public order, and they maintained this conviction as Hunnius and the pastors continued to agitate for a public _deprecatio_ during the subsequent months. To their disappointment, this affair was concluded quietly in the consistory on the first day of May, when Ottendorf signed a formal confession set down by council notary Friedrich Pöpping, in which he recanted the “errors” set down in Hoyer’s work, pledged his devotion to the “pure confession,” and swore his obedience to the assembled pastors and _Ratsherren_. He, too, would be suspected of backsliding; the pastors of the Cathedral parish barred Ottendorf anew from communion in 1638. There is no evidence, however, that Ottendorf or his fellows were ever re-tried by the consistory.

The city’s religious defenses remained porous in spite of innovations in discipline. Christoph Raselius visited Lübeck and Hamburg in person in 1641, and afterward attempted reconciliation with Hunnius and the _Ministerium Tripolitanum_ in a correspondence that lasted from the second half of 1641 until February 1643. Unlike Felgenhauer, who rejected even the building of formal church structures or attending services therein, Raselius believed that reconciliation with the institutional church was desirable, if the Lutheran clergy would only dedicate themselves to promoting Christian living as firmly as they did to Orthodox doctrine.

Moreover, he agreed heartily with Hunnius, Gerhard Winter, and Michael Siricius regarding the deplorable

---

493 _AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV_, fol. 543: “Daß Hinrich Ottendorp solle _publice deprecire_, siehet E.E. Rath nicht für Gutt an,” in which the council ordered that these proceedings take place “privatim,” that is, in the closed session of the consistory.

494 Starck, _Kirchen-Historie_, p. 811, on the “numerous negotiations” between council and ministry concerning the form of Ottendorf’s reconciliation.

495 _AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV_, fol. 539 f., “Ottendorff depreciret im Consistorio, nach gesetzer formul.”

496 Hauschild, _Kirchengeschichte_, p. 302.

497 _Ibid._

498 Felgenhauer’s contention “that one should build no churches, nor enter them to hear God’s word” was among the errors identified in the Lübeck ministry’s report on Felgenhauer’s _Secrets of the Temple_ in 1632; _AHL Geistliches Ministerium IV_, fol. 512 ff., “Wiederlegung der Püncten, die im Neu-Prophetischen Buchlein d. Geheimniß des Tempels begriffen.”
state of morals in the Hanseatic cities.\textsuperscript{499} In his first letter to Hunnius, he described “a desert of Christianity in the cities as well as in the countryside... I had to hear and see so much of fornication, drunkenness, ostentation, gambling, cursing, slander, fighting, murder, theft, falsehood, etc., that it nearly pained my eyes and ears, [and] my heart.”\textsuperscript{500} Beyond this, major disagreements obtained: Raselius’s letters avowed that the Lutheran clerical estate had neglected the true work of reform: “the ministers have dispensed with the doctrine of godliness, preaching only half of the knowledge of Christ, teaching only the faith. The Christian life was forgotten after the death of Doctor Luther, so that Johan Arndt [sic] had to be the first to again teach the same.”\textsuperscript{501} Like many would-be reformers, Raselius felt that Lübeck’s clergy were more interested in defending theological consensus than fostering true holiness, but the pastors reacted badly to being blamed for an alleged moral crisis among their parishioners.\textsuperscript{502} Hunnius especially resented this devaluation of the clergy’s disciplinary work in favor of Arndtian mysticism, and in response, he proposed strict terms for Raselius’s “revocation” and formal reconciliation, as he had done in Ottendorf’s case.\textsuperscript{503} Raselius rejected these as “defamatory” in February of 1643, and retaliated by castigating \textit{Ministerium Tripolitanum} in the

\textsuperscript{499} Hunnius acknowledged that Raselius’s treatise \textit{How True Christendom May Be Instituted} was correct in doctrine, and his core disciplinary prescription — i.e., denying the Sacrament to all unrepentant sinners — recalled Hunnius’s own treatise on the \textit{Strafamt}, published in 1626. See Krause, “Raselius,” \textit{ADB} 27, p. 321. \textit{Cf.} Hunnius, \textit{Ministerii Ecclesiastici zu Lübeck Bedencken / Auff Drey Fragen / das Straffampt betreffend} (Lübeck: Valentin Schmalherz, Frantz Tunder, 1626).


\textsuperscript{502} A paraphrase of Raselius’s statement in a letter of 1642, in which he observed that “in den Lutherischen Kirchen sey nichts als disputiren und streiten über den Religions-Artickeln; die Gottseligkeit aber werde wenig getrieben.” Quoted in Krause, “Raselius,” \textit{ADB} 27, p. 320.

\textsuperscript{503} Arndt’s \textit{Four Books of True Christianity} (1610) made him one of the most widely-read devotional authors of the seventeenth century; \textit{cf.} Lehmann, “Lutheranism,” p. 62.
preface to his new edition of his *Horn of Repentance*, published in Amsterdam later that year.\footnote{Starck, *Kirchen-Historie*, pp. 879-881. Raselius rejected three drafts of a recovations-formel authored by Adam Helms (*Hauptpastor* of St. Peter’s parish and deputy Superintendent) between mid-1642 and his final contact with the Lübeck ministry in February 1643.} Hunnius’s death on 12 April of the same year cut this exchange short, and Raselius never re-entered the Orthodox communion in a Hanseatic city.

*Conclusion: Cohesion and Transition in the Thirty Years’ War*

Between 1620 and 1650, Lübeck’s magistrates offered unprecedented support for clerical initiatives that helped to offset a matrix of new threats to internal order. However, they continued to believe that physical defense, diplomatic security, and sustained commerce offered their city the best chance of surviving the Thirty Years’ War. The initiatives they chose to endorse reveal that magistrates made a distinction between the constitutional legitimacy of the Catholic and Reformed confessions, on one hand, and sectarian outcasts, on the other, even before the Peace of Westphalia re-defined confessional politics in the Empire to include the Reformed tradition. The shared campaign against religious non-conformism should be interpreted as the most successful chapter of a new, cooperative effort to counteract the material hardship and confessional competition that challenged the spiritual hegemony of Lübeck’s established church during the Thirty Years’ War. Hunnius and his pastors enjoyed no such support in their campaign to halt the spread of the Reformed tradition or Jesuit missions, but their efforts to counteract their confessional rivals in print and pulpit bespeak a cohesive and productive clerical institution, dedicated to a vision of Lutheran Orthodoxy that was even more ambitious than the one advocated by Andreas Pouchenius in 1580. Despite a stasis in the inherited task of improving morals among the citizenry, the wartime ministry would exercise a defining legacy for their city’s confrontation with renewed internal unrest and violent religious division in the post-war decades.

Church historians interested in Orthodoxy, Pietism, and their interplay with social modernity have tended to emphasize cases in which the Lutheran clergy successfully effected a new institutional symbiosis...
with their temporal rulers by first half of the seventeenth century, and have sought parallels between the non-conformism of the war years and the proto-Pietists movements that challenged the established church with increasing vigor after the Peace of Westphalia. For Lübeck, Wolf-Dieter Hauschild dubs the period 1618-1648 as “a typical transitional period,” in which “the attempted integration of civic and Christian existences aspired to in the Reformation increasingly dissipated” when confronted “with the beginnings of modern emancipation.”505 By applying Bürgermeister Kirchring’s perspective to the social and religious impact of the war, we have seen that the reality was not nearly so simple; the growth of religious non-conformism, for example, drew its primary inspiration from the pious desires of Lutheran clerics like Jakob Böhme, Johann Arndt, and Raselius, whose books promoted an internalized, individual religiosity that had at least as many links to late-medieval mysticism as it did to the spiritual “emancipation” advocated by the mature Pietism of Philip Jakob Spener and August Hermann Francke.506 The council’s innovations in finance and civic politics traced a similar trajectory between tradition and necessary innovation. Wartime taxation and the Defensionskasse, for example, were emergency measures understood by all parties in the terms of Lübeck’s medieval constitutional tradition; whenever they had the choice --as they did after the dissolution of the Hansa, or in the case of Hinrich Ottendorf’s formal reconciliation-- the magistrates resisted innovations that might foster instability in the urban community, just as they had done at the time of the Lutheran Formula of Concord. Hauschild’s perspective is undeniably useful for the longer durée with which he is concerned, but for the seventeenth century, the true “transitional” impact of Lübeck’s war became evident in the new sense of common purpose the conflict engendered between the city’s spiritual and temporal authorities.

---

505 See Hauschild’s summary in Kirchengeschichte, p. 310

Chapter Four

“The Fire of Discord”: Constitutional and Religious Turmoil, 1650-1670

During the Easter season of 1665, hundreds of guildsmen—brewers, smiths, bakers, cobblers, and others—attacked rural estates belonging to Lübeck’s patrician families. Notary Johann Schaube, who assessed the damage at the behest of one patrician landowner, described the destruction the citizens caused on Maundy Thursday: “They smashed the brewing pans, tubs and barrels. Where they found stores of malt and beer, they spilled it out, or hauled it away with them. They destroyed the looms, carrying off the finished cloth, and threw open all cellars, cabinets and cupboards on the farmsteads as well as in the houses, and demolished all the craft equipment the encountered. Indeed, they did not spare one of the houses and buildings.”507 The burghers decamped for Good Friday, but returned en masse on the Sunday after Easter (31 March), whereupon “that which had remained whole” on the “above-named estates and villages ... was now completely smashed into pieces.”508 A final round of attacks occurred when citizens “visited” the more southerly environs of Krumesse, Kronsforde, Kastorf, und Rondeshagen,509 “in a comparable fashion, where they inflicted the same mischief in the destruction of brew-works, shattering of looms and other craft equipment, and by carrying off or destroying that which, according to their opinion, was made by ill-trained


508 Schaube, “Notariats-Instrumenten,” in Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 35: “Kurz nach Ostern den 31. März widerholten die Brauer und Handwerdker diesen Ausfall nach vorhin genannten Gütern und Dörfern zum zweytemal, und was vorhin noch ganz geblieben war, ward nun völlig in Stücken geschlagen.”

509 Krumesse, Kronsforde, Kastorf and Rondeshagen are roughly contiguous settlements, all located approx. 5-12 km south-southwest of the Lübeck Stadtinsel.
hands.” By destroying private breweries and workshops on patrician estates, Lübeck’s guildsmen sought to eliminate the competition they faced from privately-owned cottage industries in the city’s rural environs, where many of Lübeck’s magistrates employed non-guild “bunglers” (Böhnhasen and Pfuscher) to manufacture beer, cloth, and other goods at a lower cost than the urban craft guilds.

Assaults on patrician residences showed that the guildsmen’s true enemies were the elite landowners who exploited ordinary citizens – the core representatives of the urban Mittelstand – for their own gain. The household staff of wealthy Dietrich von Brömbsen – landlord of Little Steinrade, approximately five kilometers due west of the Lübeck Holstentor—testified that the intruders targeted household furnishings, slashing and stabbing portraits of the master of the house with particular alacrity. At Little Steinrade, two household maids told the notary Schaube that “a number of fellows spoke thusly, up there we cut the nose off of that rogue”; the same men boasted “we have likely done more than a thousand Reichstaler damage, [but] he has enough money to have it restored.” Given that Brömbsen was in Vienna when the attacks took place, seeking Imperial mandates with which to suppress burgher agitation against the Lübeck city council, it is likely that the irate craftsman singled out his property for special treatment when their frustrations finally boiled over in the spring of 1665. Together with his wealth and privilege, Brömbsen’s


open opposition to compromise with citizen leaders marked him as an enemy of the “common good” (*gemeiner Nutz*) that dissatisfied citizens invoked in their frequent protests after 1650.

In oligarchic Lübeck, collective demonstration was the only reliable mechanism regular citizens had for demanding political reform. The scripted violence the merchants and guildsmen unleashed during the Easter season of 1665 constituted a potent reminder to magistrates that the city’s rulers were responsible for the collective well-being of their social and economic inferiors.\(^{512}\) The war and its aftermath had made life harder for many Lübeckers, and the internal unrest that began in 1663 continued to escalate even after the council agreed to cooperative financial management with the guilds in early 1665. Violent insurrection began with the Easter riots, and was only quelled in 1668, when the Holy Roman Emperor intervened directly in the struggle dividing Lübeck’s wealthiest citizens from the members of the merchant and craft guilds. By this time, the violence had spilled over into religious life: in the late summer of 1666, mobs of irate guildsmen rioted against pious gatherings or “conventicles” that had grown up in Lübeck under the leaderships of Thomas Tanto and Jacob Taube. This violent defense of the accustomed forms of Lutheran church life complemented the burghers’ constitutional demands, through which they sought to restore a vision of urban life that dated to the medieval “golden age” of the Hanseatic League. This process was neither revolutionary nor secularizing in intent: as they negotiated the new constitutional settlement of 1669—known as the *Bürgerrezeß* or “citizens’ recess”—magistrates, merchants, and guildsmen alike agreed that preserving the institutional integrity of the city’s Lutheran church was still vitally important after decades of overlapping challenges to the city’s political autonomy and traditional livelihood. As Lübeck confronted its worst internal crisis in centuries, ordinary guildsmen used violent protest to reach a compromise with magistrates and pastors about the new identity they would forge as a Lutheran mercantile community and Imperial City after the Peace of Westphalia.

\(^{512}\) Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 145 ff., on the “medieval conception that held good law to be old and old law to be good,” and its currency in the written arguments of both council and citizen opposition in the 1660.
I. Patrician Privilege vs. Burgher Tradition

“In the year 1652,” mayor Kirchring recorded, “there occurred in Lübeck a dangerous uprising of the red-beer brewers (Rotbrauer) against the landed lords (Herrn Landbegüterte), and to a certain measure against the council (Raht) and various guilds (Zünfften).” Unfortunately, Kirchring offered few details of the “revolt” or “uproar” staged by the Rotbrauer concentrated in the southwestern quarter of the city, focusing instead on the “clever foresight” by which the magistrates forestalled the further spread of insurrection in the city.

Lübeck had managed to avoid Imperial involvement in its affairs during the two most serious disturbances of the early seventeenth century—the Reiser’chen unrests of 1599-1605, and the Burchardi-Stampelius debate in 1613-14—but this changed after the Rotbrauer submitted their case to the Imperial Aulic Council (Reichshofrat), seeking redress of their complaints about unsanctioned “brewing and malting [by] the citizens in the city,” and undue competition from patrician estates in Lübeck's environs. Paucity of


514 Ibid., cf. Johann Rudolph Becker, Umständliche Geschichte II, p. 449-450. On the physical disposition of the brewer’s guild houses and workshops, see Wolfgang Frontzek, “Brauhäser, Brauwesen,” in Antjekathrin Graßmann (ed.), Lübeck-Lexicon (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 2006), pp. 54-55. The council’s stratagems included the arrest and imprisonment of the guild’s publican, and a steep fine of 250 Reichstaler levied on the guild’s four elders; Becker’s account implies that the imprisonment of the Rotbrauer publican was a means by which the council extracted security from the guild: “Der Wirth in dem Rothbrauer Zunfthause aber, ob er gleich Bürgschaft zu stellen sich erboten hatte, ward zur gefänglichen Haft gezogen.” Though Kirchring reports that the “Rohtbrauer zu Lübeck sich empört” in 1678, Becker offered a more moderate depiction of this incident when he wrote in 1784 that “dieses Misvergnügen der Brauerzunft brach 1652 in einen ordentlichen Auffstand aus, den die Rothbrauer wider die Landbegütherten, auch in gewissermaaße gegen den Rath ... erregten.”

515 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte II, p. 450.

516 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte II, pp. 450-41. The brewers’ official letter of complaint also detailed lesser grievances regarding the regulation and taxing of the Lübeck Brauwesen by the city council: “Die wider den Magistrat eigentlich geführte Klagen betreffend, wie viel Tonnen auf einem Brau zu brauen, und zu veraccisen, auch wegen des Brillenbieres, und der auf die Ueberfahrer gesetzten Strafen; so solte es [according to the decision of the Imperial court] es bey dem was der Magistrat verordnet und verfüget hätte, auch insonderheit bey der Acciseordnung, sein Verbleiben haben, und die Rothbraruerzunft sich darnach zu verhalten schuldig sein.”
more detailed sources— and the abortive nature of the uprising in general— are likely reasons why this incident has attracted almost no scholarly attention. Yet, important parallels to the more dramatic events of the 1660s suggest that the brewers’ uprising set a strong precedent for the guilds’ dramatic use of violence in 1665, and for the repeated overtures that guildsmen, patricians, and the city council would make to the Imperial Court during the 1660s.\footnote{517}

The brewers’ complaints about new economic inequalities would be taken up by guildsmen en masse during the unreists of the 1660s. In their missive to the Imperial court, the Rotbrauer elders bitterly protested the fact that private malting and brewing operations had been allowed to multiply on patrician estates— tellingly, some of these installations would be destroyed by the irate craftsmen who invaded Dietrich von Brömbsen’s parlor in 1665.\footnote{518} The burgher remonstrances of the 1660s also echoed the brewers’ “displeasure” with the council’s practice of encouraging foreign imports (in this case, lower-priced brews}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{517} Graßmann (ed.), \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, pp. 471-472; and Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, pp. 94-98. Despite the continuing involvement of brewing guilds in the events of Lübeck’s second major constitutional disturbance of the century, and an analogous Imperial intervention in 1664-1665, this incident barely appears in the major contemporary works on the city’s political and economic history. Johann Becker’s history of the event elaborates little upon Kirchring’s chronicle, repeating his predecessor nearly verbatim at various points; cf. Becker, \textit{Umständliche Geschichte II}, pp. 449-450. On the decline in demand for red-beer that caused production to plummet during the Thirty Years’ War, (exacerbated by increased consumption of coffee and tea, as well as “foreign beers” and private brewing), see Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 471-472.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{518} Becker, \textit{Umständliche Geschichte II}, p. 449. The brewers’ grievances illuminates the distressed state of the city’s domestic economy at the end of the Thirty Years’ War, as craftsmen fought a losing battle against “foreign goods” arriving from points abroad as well as from Lübeck’s immediate vicinity. Though the red-brewer’s loss in market share was extraordinary among the city’s guilds – their saleable output fell from 107,532 tons produced in 1624 to a mere 76,971 tons recorded for 1650, a loss of over twenty-eight percent– the council’s favorable attitude toward taxable imports (and, increasingly, toward non-guild immigrant labor) also dealt a heavy blow to the traditional livelihoods of weavers, carpenters, and glass-makers during the middle decades of the seventeenth century. The increasingly “elastic” policy the council pursued toward raw materials and craftsmen from abroad peaked in the so-called “Notifikation” of 1670, a printed broadsheet by which the council actively solicited imports raw materials and workers from Holland and northern France, as well as various duchies of the north-eastern Empire; see Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 473. Graßmann interprets the Notifikation as a “high-point... of the constitutional stagnation of the craft organizations” that imprinted the later seventeenth century, particularly as mercantile interests gained a constitutional upper hand after the 1669 \textit{Bürgerrezeß}. This trend underscores the plight of brewers and other craft guilds in the 1650s and 1660s, which would not be fully ameliorated by the constitutional innovations of the 1660s.}
from abroad) in order to boost revenues from the wartime excise tax; as was frequently the case in other cities, heavy taxation proved to be a trigger for burgher unrests in Lübeck, particularly when combined with subsistence crisis, as would occur in 1661-1662. In order to successfully demand economic reforms from the council, however, the burgher corporations would have to overcome the enmity toward “other corporations” that marked the brewers’ appeal to the Emperor; in 1652, their grievances targeted especially the upstart white-brewers’ guild (Weißbrauerzunft) producing newer-style pale beers, and also condemned the merchant guilds who chose commercial profits over solidarity with their craft brethren. Despite the persistence of such fraternal feuds—the Rotbrauer-Weiβbrauer rivalry nearly ruined the latter guild prior to a compromise in 1666—most guildsmen decided that patricians posed a greater threat to their livelihood than did the merchants or their fellow craftsmen. When the Rotbrauer joined forces with the Schonenfahrer and other merchant guilds against the council in 1663, what began as a dispute over cheaper imported beer escalated into a bitter conflict over the proper interpretation of Lübeck’s constitutional inheritance.

Emperor Ferdinand appointed a commission (consisting of Aulic Council members or Reichshofräte Johann Kaltschmied and Wilhelm Bidenbach, as well as secretary Johann Rüßen) to assess the brewer's claims, but “the matter transpired very differently than the Rotbrauer had imagined” when the commission issued its decision in August 1654. Three parties were represented: the Rotbrauer by their own members Jürgen Eggers and Heinrich Emmerman, the city council by their Syndic David Gloxin (1597-1671) and Ratsherr Johann Pöpping (1608-1657), and the landed patricians by the aforementioned Dietrich von Brömbsen (d. 1671). The brewers' hopes were dashed when the Aulic councilors confirmed the authority

519 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 56-77. The brewers' complaint at the loss of traditional protection against competition mirrored core grievances submitted during the Reiser'sche Unrest of 1599-1605.


521 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte II, p. 450.

of the Lübeck city council over the guilds and domestic economy, referring questions of illicit private brewing and the taxation of malting and brewing “back to the council as the ordained and direct authority (Obrigkeit).” Eggers and Emmerman were likewise aggrieved by the court’s decision to “dismiss as undecided that which concerned malting, brewing, and transfer by the patricians upon their estates lying outside the earthworks” ringing the city. Their defeat was made complete by additional punishment recommended in the Imperial decision: Eggers was sentenced to fourteen days imprisonment in Vienna, and another six weeks arrest, along with Emmerman, “upon their home-coming.” Writing in the 1670s, Kirchring offered no explanation for the harsh treatment of the brewers' envoys, but his eighteenth-century counterpart Johann Becker noted that von Brömbsen played the critical role in persuading the Imperial council to dismiss the rural brewing question, and to mete out exemplary punishments to the guild representatives. The “brewers' rebellion” thus ended with their envoys returning home in disgrace, setting a precedent for patrician recourse to Imperial authority that would galvanize the Lübeck guildsmen to violent protest a

_became Bürgermeister (1666, until his death in 1671)) and von Brömbsen (who became Ratsherr in 1659, and took a position firmly opposing Gloxin's during the 1660 unrests, securing his status as one of the most hated men in Lübeck), see Fehling (ed.), Lübeckische Ratslinie, pp. 125, 128-129, and 126-127, respectively._

523 Becker's paraphrase of the “kaiserlichen Reichshofraths-Bescheide” of 17 August 1654 is found in Umständliche Geschichte II, pp. 450-451: “Dabey wurden die angebrachten Klagen wegen des Brauens und Mülzens der Bürger in der Stadt, an den Rath als die ordentliche und unmittelbare Obrigkeit zurückgewiesen. Was aber das Mülzen, Brauen und Schenken der Landbegütherten auf ihren außerhalb der Landwehre gelegenen Güthern betraf, so ward dieser Punkt noch zur Zeit unentschieden ausgesetzt. Die wieder den Magistrat eigentlich geführte Klagen betreffend, wie viel Tonnen auf einem Brau zu brauen, und zu veraccisen, auch wegen des Brillenbieres ... so solte es bey dem was der Magistrat verordnet und verfüget hatte, auch insonderheit bey der Acciseordnung, sein Verbleiben haben....”

524 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte II, p. 451: “Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach hat vorhingenannter Dietrich von Brömbsen, welcher als Bevollmächtigter der Landbegütherten sich persönlich vor dieser Commißion stellete, by seiner Anwesenheit zu Wien, das Gesuch der Landbegütherten um die Bestätigung ihrer uralten Kaufbriefe, am kaiserlichen Hofe wo nicht selbst angebracht, doch nach allen Kräften zu unterstützen und zu befördern getrachtet.” Becker notes that the Ratsherren dismissed a further six-month prohibition from brewing activities levied against the probable authors of the brewers' complaint, Jochen Lockewitz und Peter Magnussen.
decade later. By the time Brömbsen returned from a second visit to the Imperial court in 1664, his devotion to elite interests at the cost of communal well-being had made him one of the most hated men in Lübeck. 525

< From Competition to Coalition: The Growth of a Burgher Opposition, 1661-1665 >

On 11 December 1661, Bürgermeister Gottschalk von Wickede—an estate owner and a twenty-year veteran of the city council—announced to the leaders of the burgher corporations that Lübeck’s finances were in “an evil condition.” 526 He did not exaggerate: by the beginning of the second decade after the Thirty Years’ War, the council had raised so many loans (in addition to the massive public debts accrued during the war for contributions and new fortifications) that it was no longer able to afford the interest payments due to its creditors, much less pay back the principle of debts totaling approximately 1,750,000 Reichstaler. 527 With von Wickede as spokesman, the council now sought the citizenry’s compliance with a series of new extractive measures that included raising the mill tax (Mühlensteuer), increasing the accise on malt (Malzakzise) levied upon the brewers and vinegar distillers, and placing a new consumption tax on “meat and other foodstuffs.” 528 The “general distress of the Lübeck treasury” to which the council appealed did not surprise Lübeckers who remembered

525 Together with his fellow envoy, mayor Gotthard von Höveln. Beginning in the autumn of 1665, the citizen’s representatives demanded the dismissal of both men from the council “with ever-increasing energy”; Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 127.


527 Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 455. By 1665, Lübeck’s public debt amounted to 5,251,416 Lübeck Marks, or 1,750,472 Reichstaler, the majority of it loans raised to overhaul Lübeck’s fortifications, and to satisfy Swedish and Imperial demands for “contributions” during the 1630s and 1640; cf. pp. 137-139.

528 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 99-100 on the new taxes and levies proposed by the council in 1661; cf. Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 455.
the lean years of the Thirty Years' War, but the council's latest fund-raising strategy collapsed almost immediately, not least because of its poor timing in the midst of a severe subsistence crisis. “[T]he citizenry accepted this proposition very evilly,” Kirchring recorded of von Wickede's public appearance on 11 December, “and the ground was hereby laid for a general unrest in Lübeck.”

The following spring, renewed subsistence crisis wedded the plight of ordinary Lübeckers to the long-standing political ambitions of the city's merchants: “Anno 1662 in the time of dearth, it came to a general uprising (Auffstaendt) of the common man, because of the troubles of the citizenry, who now desired to have and know a general civic fisc (Stadt-Cassam).” Conspicuous poverty galvanized burghers to action that spring: Kirchring's chronicle relates a “such a famine in this land ... that it cannot be described; the grain profiteers (Korn-Wucherer) drove the bushel [price] of grain to six Lübeck marks.” Two miserable harvests underlay this explosion in the price of grain, in consequence of the “wet, weak winters” in 1660-61 and 1661-62, “in which it tended to be so warm as otherwise in autumn or in spring,” with the result that “all winter seedings in the fields of all Holstein and Mecklenburg were ruined.” Fearing unrest, the council intervened to ameliorate the price increase, but attempts to provide subsidized grain effected only a slightly less exorbitant price of five marks per bushel, and did little to appease the mounting animosity of hungry citizens; for Lübeck's poor, the threat of starvation remained acute until a normal harvest could be reaped in the

529 Kirchring and Müller, Compendium Chronicae, p. 328: “die Bürgerschaft hat dies Proposition übel auffgenommen / und ist hiemit zu einer allgemeinen Unruhe in Lübeck allermahl der Grundt gelgetworden.”

530 Ibid., p. 330: “Anno 1662 in der theuren Zeite ließ es sich in Lübeck wegen Schwierigkeit der Bürgerschaft / welche einen allgemeine Stadt Cassam nunmehro haben und wissen wolten / zu einen allgemeinen Auffstande des gemeinen Mannes gefährlich gnug an...”

531 Kirchring, Compendium Chronicae, p. 328-329 and 330-331. This chronicle records the inflation of grain prices in several entries for 1661 and 1662. The hard winters of 1661 and 1662 were naturally not exclusive to Lübeck and her vicinity – public order suffered in Hamburg for similar reasons in 1662-63 –but Kirchring portrayed Lübeck as particularly afflicted; not only had the city lost a large grain reserve to “a dreadful fire” in 1661, but Kirchring complained that while Hamburg's council resolved her problems expeditiously in 1663, disunity in Lübeck “grew more dangerous from day to day.”
autumn of 1662. When Lübeckers took to the streets following a second hungry winter, some patricians finally opted to share their wealth in order to forestall a food riot: “Herr Bürgermeister Gottschalck von Wickenden [sic], however, having still a store of grain from his lands (Güter), sold to the poor in the time of need a number of loads of rye at three marks the bushel, by means of which the common man was somewhat appeased.”

Kirchring’s quick action staved off open unrest until the Easter riots of 1665, but by this time, merchant companies like the Schonenfahrer and Bergenfahrer had successfully rallied popular discontent for their campaign against two overlapping oligarchies: the council itself, on one hand, and the patrician society represented by von Brömbsen and von Wicke, on the other.

The council’s attempt to increase taxes in the midst of a famine provided Lübeck’s seven merchant guilds with the opportunity to demand the civic fisc (allgemeine Kasse or Stadtkasse) they had desired since the war years. In a formal complaint dated 8 January 1662, the merchant elders rejected the council’s demands as excessively “onerous” in “mal-nourished” times, and countered by requesting that the council create a communal chest “into which all incomes of this city shall flow, also, conversely, from which the expenditures shall be taken.” Such an organ would permanently establish burgher oversight in civic finance – “decree to the loyal and diligent citizens the administration in acceptis et expensis” – as had lately occurred

---


533 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, pp. 27-28. The seven “kommerzierenden Zünfte” whose elders collectively engaged the council from 1662 until early 1665 included the long-distance trading companies of Schonenfahrer, Novgorodfahrer, Bergenfahrer, Rigafahrer, and Stockholmfahrer, as well as the Krämerkompagnie (shopkeepers) and Gewandschneider (drapers; also Wandschneider).

534 Letter of the Kaufleutekollegien to the council (8 January 1662), quoted in Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 100: “Daher schlugen [die Brüder der Kollegien] dem Rat vor, eine allgemeine Kasse, 'in welche alle Einnahme dießer Stadt fliessen, hingegen auch die Aufgaben genommen werden solten, derogestalt zu verorden, das getreuen und fleißigen Burgern in acceptis et expensis die Administration' übergeben werden möchte.”
in both Hamburg and Stralsund, with a positive impact on civic income and public debt. The merchants argued that this innovation conformed to longstanding Imperial precedent, in which the emperor habitually delegated financial management to the estates, “without injury to the dignity of the Imperial majesty.” However, a majority of Ratsherren doubted that a similar arrangement would obtain in Lübeck, and their initial response to the merchant guilds bore an unmistakably autocratic tone; in Jürgen Asch's paraphrase, the council “never considered” acquiescing to the elders' wishes, and instead contented themselves with raising the existing malt-excise (Malzakzise) levied on the red-brewer's guild, on the grounds that such acts were exempt from approval by the citizen's corporations. The merchants responded with a second formal admonition reminding the Ratsherren that this initiative neglected the vital role of consultation to Lübeck's constitutional tradition; specifically, their protest of 29 April, 1662 objected that the council did not command the “absolute power” (absoluta potestate) needed to empower them to decree new “collections” of this type. By late spring of 1662, therefore, council and merchant guilds had arrived at a familiar impasse that drove the latter to seek broader support among the citizenry, particularly the enfranchised artisans. Their success in papering over old tensions with the craft guilds produced a dramatic reaction from the patrician Ratsherren, who in early 1664 actively courted Imperial intervention in response to the growing cohesion of the burgher opposition.

535 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 100, on the analogous innovations in fellow Hanseatic cities Hamburg and Stralsund. On the merchants' letter of 8 January 1662, see note 539.

536 According to Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 100: “Schließlich wiesen sie auf die Verhältnisse im Reich hin, wo der Kaiser ohner Verletzung der kaiserlichen Hoheit den Reichsständen die Verwaltung der bewilligten Steuern übertragen habe.”

537 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 101.


539 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 101; cf. Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 455-56. The Lübeck Rotbrauer added a new dimension to the dispute between merchants and council when they symbolically allied themselves to the burgher
After patrician intransigence foiled their attempts to capitalize on the symbolic victory of May 1662, the merchant guilds sought legal representation in the person of city Low-Court barrister Johannes Conrad, whom the guild elders retained in April 1663 to “consult, advocate [for] and administer ... their collective rights and privileges.” In the following months, Conrad codified the nascent opposition’s demands into an extensive statement of grievances, submitted to the council on 3 July. True to the terms of Conrad’s contract, this document not only reprised the merchants’ demands for the creation of “a general fisc for the bettering of civic finances,” and decried the council’s refusal to rule “according to consultation” (pro consultativo), but also appended seventeen “Rüttelungen” (Beschwerdepunkte or “points of remonstrance”) that elaborated significantly on these familiar grievances. The July remonstrance implied opposition at the end of April. The guild’s profitability had continued to decline precipitously since the their ill-fated appeal to Ferdinand III the previous decade -- production had fallen a further eleven percent since 1650, a net loss of over thirty-six percent from highs of the 1620s, with little corresponding reduction in guild membership-- and the council’s new tax appears to have galvanized the guild elders, who protested by ceasing beer production altogether in early May; see Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 101. Ultimately, the prospect of compounding the city’s ongoing food crisis with a “beer shortage in the warmer months of the year” appeared to have provided a more effective motivation than the merchant’s appeals to urban tradition, as the council repealed the increased excise on 30 May. Despite their economic difficulties, the brewers still ranked among the most populous and prestigious of the city’s craft guilds, and their demonstrated solidarity with the merchant’s demands represented a tangible “worsening of the council’s position” beginning in the summer of 1662; Though a few guilds resisted the trend to burger solidarity --the Weißbrauer remained nominally loyal to the council until guild leaders negotiated a merger with their erstwhile rivals the Rotbrauer in 1666-- the opposition party counted ten prominent guilds among its members by the late winter of 1665. On the members of the burgher coalition, see Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, pp. 34-35. On the loyalties of the “white-beer brewers” (Weißbrauer), and their amalgamation with the Rotbrauer in the wake of the Kassarezeß, cf. ibid., pp. 41-42, and Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 103.

540 “Gotthard von Höveln,” in Fehling, Lübeckische Ratslinie, pp. 122-123. Höveln (1601-1671; Ratsherr from 1640-1665 and Bürgermeister 1654-1665) quickly emerged as the leading antagonist of the burgher opposition, beginning in 1662; he was “exemplary of the staunchly conservative aristocrat, strongly opposed to every development” of the early constitutional crisis of the 1660s.


542 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 29 f., and Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 102.

543 Quoted in Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 102.
that the merchant elite had amalgamated their demands with members of the craft corporations, and this relationship became explicit as the dispute over financial reform escalated in the second half of 1663, prompting the beleaguered council to seek a prominent ally in the person of Emperor Leopold I.544

Conrad’s remonstrance elucidated five habits by which the urban oligarchy deviated from Lübeck’s medieval constitutional tradition, and which negatively impacted every group of their subjects, including merchants, craftsmen, and the urban and rural poor. The burghers’ first complaint targeted the rampant nepotism that preferred the sons of patrician families for public office, “in contrast to which few merchants are brought onto the council,” ensuring that the ruling body was “thoroughly populated by brothers-in-law, cousins, and other close relatives” of patrician Ratsherren.545 Other points of complaint addressed specific issues of financial accountability, particularly regarding tolls, taxes, and other incomes.546 For example, the

544 On the negotiations prompted by the burghers’ general complaint of 1663, see Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, pp. 26-28; cf. Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 103-104. The July remonstrance suggested that the merchant elite had amalgamated their demands with those of lower-ranking Lübeckers, but this relationship became explicit as the dispute over financial reform escalated in the second half of 1663. During the famine years of 1661 and 1662, the council had invoked the Lutheran doctrine of obedience to worldly authority whenever they wished to avoid negotiation with various burgher corporations, but this obfuscatory tactic failed in the wake of Conrad’s remonstrance. The merchant elders responded aggressively to the council’s counter-complaint “that the citizens had dispensed themselves from their debt of obedience, aspired, conversely, to co-governance of the Regiment, and even exerted themselves to introduce an altered civic constitution”; see ibid, p. 104. On 5 February 1664, they demanded (in additional to the new community fisc) that each of the nearly forty council-run “offices” (Ämter) responsible for law, commerce, and public finance in Lübeck accept a “citizen assessor” who would monitor the receipts and disbursements of the council, and report to the assembled burgher corporations. The council resolved that strong countermeasures were now required, and resolved on 5 February to seek support from the new Emperor Leopold I (1640-1705); they issued instructions to Dietrich von Brömbsen when numerous guilds refused to pay the Monatsgelder (the regular tax for maintenance of Lübeck’s garrison) the following month.


546 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 29. The latter category included the fines from the city’s courts of appeal: “Von den bey der Wette und dem Marstall eingekommenen Strafgeldern werde keine Rechnung abgelegt.” Elsewhere, the merchants suggest that such slapdash bookkeeping was common in the council’s accounts: “Die Stadt werde ohne
merchants’ complaint that “the decreed contributions, as well as the tenth penny and detraction fees, are not punctually assessed, nor thoroughly from everyone without consideration of the person,” implied that those with elite connections were frequently exempted from civic extractions, which seems especially likely in light of the fact that “the servants of the council manning the gates and customs-house turn a blind eye to the patricians and their friends regarding the importing of wares subject to toll and excise.” A third appeal targeted prejudicial treatment of Lübeck's mercantile fraternity, lamenting that “commerce is not accommodated, nor the merchant's order maintained against hawkers and hucksters,” in a clear reference to lax regulation of itinerant and non-affiliated merchants plying their trade in the city; this was exacerbated by the fact that the aforementioned exemptions “burdened” the merchant corporations with a disproportionate ratio of public expenses. The craft guilds felt themselves similarly ill-used by patrician competition, and Conrad reprised the complaints of the early 1650s in his fourth argument: “no excises are required upon the beer that the patricians brew outside the city, rather the common good [Nutz] of the city is subordinated to the advantage of these private persons”; worse, the patricians had also established “craftsmen of various types upon these estates, to the injury of the guilds.” This contempt for communal well-being fueled the concluding complaints against land enclosures that exploited urban and rural poor alike: “the commons are

Notth in Schulden gesetzt, und von dem aufgenommenen Gelde, wohin es verwandt worden, keine Rechnung abgelegt”; ibid. p. 31.


appropriated by private individuals, and considerable damage is inflicted upon the same by the construction of walls and ditches, through tillage, by gardens and other means,” while wooded areas adjacent were subjected to similar treatment, for hunting and other “needless” pursuits.\(^{550}\)

A reprimand by Ferdinand III’s Aulic Council had successfully pacified red-brewer’s rebellion of 1652, and the council’s patrician inner circle expected a similar outcome when the affiliated guilds refused, in early March of 1664, to pay the *Monatsgelder* that funded the city's mercenary garrison.\(^{551}\) Encouraged by patrician *Bürgermeister* Gotthard von Höveln and his relatives on the council, the *Ratsherren* dispatched Dietrich von Brömbsen to Regensburg in March with the express intention of facilitating “a strong mandate of Imperial discipline” (*kaiserliches Poenal-Mandat*) against the rebellious citizenry, which the latter secured on 2 May.\(^{552}\) This mandate met with growing resistance in the summer of 1664: as more and more Lübeckers boycotted tax payments (including the Imperial military levies known as the *Türkensteuer* and *Römermonate*), the guild elders commissioned an extensive legal defense from Johannes Conrad, in which he justified their demands according to the “age-old usage” (*uhrales Herkommen*) of the urban commune, in which the burgher corporations had been empowered “to vote and to submit emendations in lofty and


\(^{551}\) Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 104. The *Monatsgelder* were the primary source of the payroll for the city’s garrison, which were “seven months in arrears” at the beginning of March 1664, and for that reason the source of considerable “dissatisfaction” among the soldiers, and thus of intense concern to the council.

\(^{552}\) The Imperial *Paritorium* (also dubbed *Mandatum poenale*) ordered the guilds “to demonstrate to the assembled council members [*Rathspersonen*] all respect and obedience, desist from insults to the same in word or deed, and also and not less to remit the delinquent *Römermonate, Türkensteuer*, and levy for the city garrison”; in Becker, *Umständliche Geschichte III*, p. 33. Leopold’s decree also condemned the guildsmen’s coalition against the council as unlawful, order the disbandment of such “prohibited conventicles,” assembled “under the pretext of deliberating and concluding an an emendation or improvement” of the city constitution.
incidental affairs,” on behalf of the entire citizenry.\textsuperscript{553} This event represented the full coalescence of burgher opposition to the oligarchic Ratsherren, as the latter’s attempt to bring the guilds to heel actually galvanized various disobedient guilds into a coherent anti-council, anti-patrician party led by the city's mercantile elite. Moreover, the Imperial gambit inadvertently wagered the honor of the Emperor’s office on the likelihood that the guilds \textit{en masse} could be cowed like the brewers had been a decade previously; if Lübeckers openly defied the Emperor’s demands for a formal showing of obedience, von Brömbsen advised the council, the Emperor would send an Imperial commission to adjudicate the matter, causing “great expense and inconvenience” to Lübeck’s magistrates and taxpayers.\textsuperscript{554}

Von Brömbsen’s continued efforts became a liability for the council when Leopold demanded the formal submission of the guilds for the second time on 31 October. This galvanized the Ratsherren to action: on 16 December, they ordered von Brömbsen “to stand down” from further agitation at court in Vienna, and retreated from their strategic intransigence vis-a-vis the guild opposition by agreeing to discuss terms for the restructuring of civic finances.\textsuperscript{555} For their part, the merchants and craft guilds sought to forestall Leopold’s disciplinary intervention by symbolically swearing “all fitting respect and due obedience” to the council in a formal letter of reconciliation, which their own representatives carried to Vienna in February of 1665.\textsuperscript{556} When the council appealed for a two-month suspension of proceedings at the Imperial court in early March 1665, it appeared that satisfactory compromise had been found to nearly four years of dispute and ill-will

\textsuperscript{553} \textit{in rebus arduis et noviter incidentibus decreta zu machen und Emendationes zu verfügen}, quoted in Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{554} Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, p. 116.

\textsuperscript{555} The council’s letter to von Brömbsen at Vienna advised him ‘in Ruhe zu stehen,’ quoted in Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{556} Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, pp. 107-108. The \textit{Partitionsschrift} remitted by the guilds in February 1665 promised ‘allen gebührenden Respect und schuldigen gehorsamb” to the council, along with payment of Imperial taxes and city militia levy, both of which were conspicuously in arrears. However, the burghers corporations refused to remit back taxes until after the Kassarezeß was introduced in late July.
between council and citizenry. However, a series of violent attacks on patrician estates destroyed this facade of reconciliation the following Easter, after which the renewed threat of Imperial intervention—a task Leopold delegated to the Elector of Brandenburg in May of 1665—would prove instrumental in bringing both parties to settlement.

The fear that “Great Elector” Friedrich Wilhelm I (r. 1640-1688) would use his Imperial authority to further his own advantage in the region persuaded Ratsherren and guildsmen to uphold the promises of the previous winter in a manner neither had originally intended. The conciliatory preamble of the Kassarezeß stressed its traditional qualities: “Insofar as the city of Lübeck, including mayors and council, adheres unwaveringly to the statutes and rights, privileges, concords, and aforementioned usage [Herkommen], can the same, now as before, esteem the common fisc [Cassa] as being exclusively to the promotion of the common good and for the best of this city.” The council’s concession to direct citizen collaboration occupied pride of place among more than two dozen statutes regulating the income and disbursements made by the various financial offices [Ämter] administered by the Ratsherren: “in the first place, this decreed Cassa is established and administered under the continued direction and authority of the council, with the approval and consent of the citizenry.” The two council members assigned to manage each major income stream (e.g. the treasury [Cämmerey], the council cellars [Weinkeller], property and consumption taxes [Schoß and Accise], and court incomes [Strafgelder]) would henceforth partner with four citizen delegates.

---

557 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 108.

558 See Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 109-126. Leopold delegated leadership of the Imperial Commission to Friedrich Wilhelm I in a letter of 9 May 1665, and the Great Elector informed Lübeck of this in a missive of 28 May. When council and guild representatives concluded the Kassarezeß in mid-July, they immediately dispatched messages notifying the Emperor and the elector; see Jürgen Asch’s reconstruction of this correspondance in Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 116, notes 41 and 46. 26 July 1665 is the effective date stated in the preamble to the Kassarezeß, reproduced in Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 8.


(Kassabürger), chosen from the dozen guilds that approved the Rezeß.\textsuperscript{561} This settlement innovated by superimposing a general fisc upon the existing Ämter, but both parties emphasized the traditional nature of these measures, and thus their own conformity with Lübeck’s medieval constitutional tradition. This decidedly non-revolutionary compromise proved a successful means of structuring city finance, as the statutes of 1665 remained in use until Napoleon Bonaparte annexed Lübeck (along with Hamburg and Bremen) to his continental Empire in December of 1810.\textsuperscript{562} Because it omitted the broader sources of popular dissatisfaction, however, the Kassarezeß can be best understood as an expedient compromise undertaken by citizens and council fearful of a powerful prince. It did little to ameliorate the far-reaching social grievances expressed in Conrad’s remonstrance of 1663, and financial concessions alone could not restore the political legitimacy the patricians had lost in the eyes of their subjects since the Thirty Years’ War.

\textit{< Guild Violence and Patrician Exodus, 1665-1669 >}

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Johann Rudolph Becker attributed the 1665 Easter riots to the social and economic rift that divided Lübeck’s wealthiest citizens from the merchants and artisans who made up the urban Mittelstand. “To the burghers,” he reflected, “malting and brewing activities for open sale, and the maintenance of craftsmen upon the landed estates [Landgüter] of the patricians were first and foremost a thorn in their eye. Thereby were the corporations or craftsmen, who had originally brought this to the council, particularly alienated.”\textsuperscript{563} We have seen that Lübeck’s craftsmen felt both their political and

\textsuperscript{561} The Kasserezeß was officially amalgamated into the Bürgerrezeß of 1669, making it difficult to ascertain which, if any, of the thirteen corporations that subscribed to the latter failed to subscribe to the 1665 settlement; see “Bürger-Rezeß” in Becker, \textit{Umständliche Geschichte III}, Appendix I, 1-31, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{562} Alexander I. Grab, \textit{Napoleon and the Transformation of Europe} (London: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2003), p. 94-95. This was both a strategic and extractive decision; in addition to direct taxation of the wealthy Hanseatic cities, the flow of British goods through these ports (Hamburg in particular) constituted a major weak point in the French “Continental Blockade.”

\textsuperscript{563} Becker, \textit{Umständliche Geschichte III}, p. 34: “Hauptsächlich war den Bürgern das Mülzen und Brauwerk zum feilen Kauf, und die Hegung der Handwerker auf den Landgütern der Patrizier ein Dorn im Auge. Insbesondere wurden die Ämter oder Handwerker, welche es anfänglich mit dem Rath gehalten hatten, dadurch aussätzig.”
material well-being had declined since the Thirty Years’ War. Though largely fruitless, attempts by guild leaders to re-assert the right of citizen consultation had required the burghers to form a coherent opposition party and to enlist legal counsel during the early 1660s. This does much to explain the cohesive, almost scripted nature of the uprising that commenced in the city on 21 March of 1665. On this particular Maundy Thursday, crowds of citizens “besieged” the Rathaus and the city’s main gates, bringing traffic to a standstill and halting commerce in the adjacent central market.\textsuperscript{564} Meanwhile, “a great number of people assembled themselves on the old rampart before the Holstein Gate...that together comprised six to seven hundred men.” Armed with “muskets, daggers, axes, hatchets, scythes, pikes, and more of the like,” the rebellious burghers fanned out in groups heading west and north-west—”some to Moisling, others to Niendorf, others to Steinrade, to Stockelstorf, to Morie, and other estates situated in the city's vicinity”—where they attacked patrician property “with the greatest violence.”\textsuperscript{565} This violence targeted both the physical tools of patrician exploitation and the material symbols of patrician privilege, but it is equally important to note the occupational identity of the rioters. Becker’s account stresses that members of the craft guilds formed the core of the raiding parties: Lübeck’s brewers furnished the largest contingent with sixty-eight armed men, while the smiths’, bakers’, cobblers’, and tailors’ guilds mustered forty-eight men each, reinforced by several hundred men “from the small corporations” (kleinen Ämter) and other common trades.\textsuperscript{566} Though the merchant elders who commanded the burgher opposition probably planned the assault on that ravaged the


property of the privileged few like Dietrich von Brömbsen, the “fire of discord” was ignited by the very citizens who suffered most at the hands of unchecked patrician privilege.

When news of his losses reached Dietrich von Brömbsen in Vienna, he found himself torn between the personal desire for retribution and the council’s goal of forestalling Imperial intervention in Lübeck; consequently, he sought to “to depict events in Lübeck and on the neighboring estates in the blackest color possible,” intimating to various members of the Aulic Council that a full-scale rebellion against the city council was imminent.\(^{567}\) This last effort against the citizenry would prove to be Brömbsen’s undoing: by actively encouraging the Imperial court to intervene against Lübeck’s burghers, he not only laid the groundwork for a rapid compromise between council and burgher corporations in the subsequent months, but confirmed his own status as the man most hated by ordinary Lübeckers. Within a few months of the Kassarezeß, the burgher opposition added constitutional siege warfare to their physical assault on patrician wealth, demanding the immediate dismissal of Brömbsen (and his ally Gotthard von Höveln) from their positions in the city government. The Kassarezeß had revealed that even a patrician-dominated council could be forced to terms, and the violence of 1665 constituted their opening demand for dramatic changes in the magistrates’ accustomed attitude toward ordinary citizens.

Dietrich von Brömbsen brought his litigious tendencies full circle during his final months in Vienna: by the time he returned to Lübeck in the summer of 1665, he had not only secured a disciplinary mandate against Lübeck’s artisans on his own initiative, but had also convinced Leopold to deputize him to the Imperial Aulic Council, charged with reporting on matters in Lübeck.\(^{568}\) This proved to be the final straw: the brewers and artisans filed their first suit against him with the city Obergericht—an organ composed of sixteen

---

\(^{567}\) Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 115. The Lübeck Ratsherren appear to have anticipated von Brömbsen’s latest recourse to Imperial authority, as they resisted his repeated requests for the documentation needed to lodge a formal complaint with the Emperor.

members of the council— in April 1665, but this failed to gain traction until merchant companies added their voice on 26 September, protesting that Brömbesen’s assumed status as Imperial Advocat precluded him from further discharge of office in Lübeck.\(^{569}\) Faced with repeated incursions by the craftsmen onto their estates in early September and early October—council member Heinrich Kerkring (1610-1693) recorded that these took on an ugly tone “because [the guildsmen] were of the mind to enter houses and knock in heads”\(^{570}\)— Brömbesen resolved to “establish his free and noble hereditary possession and villages outside of the Lübeck territory and defenses” by transferring his allegiance from the Lübeck council to another sovereign lord.\(^{571}\)

At Höveln’s urging, Hans und Heinrich von Brömbsen turned to the Duke of Holstein, better known as Frederick III of Denmark (r. 1648-1670), who demanded that the Lübeck city council acknowledge his “shelter, defense, and special protection,” over the family estates at Steinrade and Stockelsdorf in a missive dated 22 October 1666; by this time, their elder brother Dietrich had departed under the guise of a three-month furlough from office.\(^{572}\) Led by Heinrich Kirchring (great-grandfather of chronicler Gottschalk), the remaining Ratsherren now moved against the remaining members of the clan. First, they sought to undercut the economic viability of Steinrade and Stockelsdorf by banning the resident peasants from selling their wares in the city. With no outlet for their produce— the city council dismissed one appeal by suggesting that the peasants “could deliver their wares to their new lord in Copenhagen”\(^{573}\) — the villages rebelled by refusing

\(^{569}\) Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, pp. 127-128.


\(^{571}\) Quoted in Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 124.


\(^{573}\) Jürgen Asch’s paraphrase of a more extensive exchange between the village leaders of Steinrad and Stockelsdorf and the Lübeck council; *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 125.
to render labor tribute owed to their patricians *qua* landlords. There can be little doubt that the council had intended this, as it gave them occasion to re-take the environs by force. When Frederick sent five armed agents to pacify the peasantry in mid-July 1667, Lübeck’s remaining councilmen responded by dispatching sixty soldiers to the contested estates, where they erected wooden barricades upon the rural thoroughfares. Admirably bold, this gambit nonetheless failed, as Frederick deployed approximately 500 men from his ducal seat at Glückstadt, who routed the Lübeck troops on 10 August, capturing many as they attempted to flee.

When their military attempts failed, the council resorted to Brömbsen’s signature tactic by dispatching an envoy to file suit against the Brömbsens and Denmark-Holstein at the Imperial court in late August. The failure of this appeal had deep-reaching consequences: when the Aulic Council upheld patrician rights to dispose of their lands as they saw fit— an unsurprising resolution considering recent precedent and the Brömbsen’s connections in Vienna— it gave sanction to five other members of the landed elite, who transferred their allegiance from the Lübeck council to the Danish crown in the wake of the 1669 *Bürgerrezeß*, confident that the Emperor would respect their mercantile rights. One of these was Gotthard von Höveln, a longtime patron of Dietrich von Brömbsen’s whose conduct after 1665 highlights the patrician commitment to maintaining personal privilege at the cost of general prosperity and constitutional tradition.

To merchants and guildsmen alike, *Bürgermeister* von Höveln was the most dangerously autocratic member of the urban elite after Dietrich von Brömbsen. A twenty-five year veteran of the council, Höveln had not only advocated in favor of his younger colleague’s efforts to deploy Imperial power against the

---


576 Becker, *Umständliche Geschichte III*, p. 65; cf. Asch, *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, p. 126. Specifically, Andreas-Albrecht von Brömbsen (lord of Niendorf), Johann Kerkring (Dunkelsdorf), Heinrich Lüneburg (Eckhorst), Thomas Wetken (Trenthorst) and Gotthard von Höveln sought confirmation of their mercantile privileges from the Danish-ducal court, as had the Brömbsens for Steinkrafe and Stockelsdorf in 1667. Their *Kaufbriefe* or letters of patent were confirmed by the newly-confirmed Christian IV, as Frederick III had died on 9 February 1670.
burghers in 1654 and 1664, but also, in his capacity as treasury secretary, repeatedly obstructed the process of negotiations during the tense summer of 1665. The craftsmen had demonstrated their contempt in their “visitations” of Höveln’s lands at Moisling – a particularly productive estate that boasted over ninety different weaving installations-- but it was von Höveln’s intransigence vis-a-vis the civic fisc that caused his fellow Ratsherren to begin to view him as a liability.\textsuperscript{577} When the burgher corporations filed suit against him with the Obergericht in early 1666, Höveln put up stouter resistance than his protégé, nearly reaching a compromise with council and citizens after the Aulic Council’s verdict of late 1666 upheld the patrician right to dispose of their estates as they pleased. Repeatedly delayed by the renewed protests of the burgher corporations and Höveln's own devices in 1667 and 1668, these proceedings collapsed when Höveln refused to concede to any civic oversight over brewing and weaving on his Moisling estate. He finally abdicated the office of Bürgermeister in May 1669, whereupon he placed Moisling under the “protective lordship” (Schutzherrschaft) of the Danish crown and moved to Glückstadt, on the Elbe, to assume the post of vice chancellor at the Frederick’s ducal court.\textsuperscript{578}

When they removed Steinrade, Stockelsdorf, and Moisling from Lübeck's jurisdiction, the city’s wealthiest patricians demonstrated conclusively that their aristocratic privileges were of greater concern

\textsuperscript{577} This began when Höveln, together with Brömbsen and his relatives, protested the eighth article of the Rezeß on the grounds it gave tacit approval the guildsmen's recent conduct; Specifically, the offending clause in this article “On the Bettering of Civic Incomes,” subjected the estates to the civic tax assessment, specifically to the “Schoß, Zoll, Wein- und Bier-Accise, wie auch die Zulage [und] Salvo Reversu...sonsten auch die gravamina abethan, und die deswegen bereits erkannte und schon ergangene execution in und außerhalb der Landwehr forthin unwegerlich allemal gebührlich gestattet und auferfolget werden.” “Kassarezeß,” in Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, Appendix 1, p. 20. Only two days after the formal acceptance of the Kassarezeß, Höveln, together with most of the male Brömbsens (Andreas-Albrecht, Heinrich, and Hans, in addition to Dietrich) argued that the settlement would “make legal not only the previous but also future visitations and acts of violence” upon patrician estates by members of the burgher corporations. Asch concluded that this fear was justified, considering the long-standing conflict over uneven tax assessment of patrician holding; Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{578} “Gotthard von Hoeveln,” in Fehling (ed.), Lübeckische Ratslinie, p. 122-123. Writing after the First World War, Fehling described Höveln as “typical of the strongly conservative aristocrat, staunchly opposed to every innovation” during upheavals of 1663-1669.
than the city’s constitutional traditions, or the material well-being of ordinary burghers. The expulsion of Brömbsen and Höveln from the council ended the first of two conspicuous crises in magisterial authority faced by the city council following the various tax boycotts, protests, and written remonstrances of the preceding years. The dissolution of the patrician party among the Ratsherren paved the way for lasting compromise facilitated by former city Syndic Dr. David Gloxin, a highly accomplished diplomat who in 1666 was elected to the council post recently vacated by Brömbsen.\footnote{David Gloxin, Dr. jur.,” in Fehling (ed.), Lübeckische Ratslinie, pp. 128-129.} Following three years of renewed hostility, Lübeck’s second, more lasting compromise finally found a middle way between the burgher demands for full enfranchisement and the watchful eye of the Holy Roman Emperor.

< ‘According to ancient usage’: the Bürgerrezeß of 1669 >

Together with the death of Bürgermeister Hermann von Dorne in the early summer of 1665, the burgher lawsuit against von Höveln gave guild leaders occasion, in the summer of 1666, to demand that jurists and guildsmen be preferred for these vacancies over patricians and the relatives of existing council members. In a supplication to the council from early July, the merchant elders explained that burgher corporation leaders would serve the collective good more ably than could patricians; in their words, they requested that a guild brother “learned, experienced, and also well-tested in Imperial and civic matters ... might be elected, through whom the Christian and political integrity of those things which work to glory of God and the best of this city might be encouraged and refreshed, and against which all self-interest [Eigennutz] be uprooted and extirpated.”\footnote{Ratsprotokoll of 18 July 1666, quoted in Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 132. The guilds requested “das ein Grundgelehrtes, erfahreneres, auch in Reichs- .... und Stadtsachen schon feliciter probirtes, salutem publicam einzig und allein liebendes subjectum erwählt werden möge, durch dessen christliche und politische Integrität diejenigen, welchen Gottes Ehre und dieser Stadt Beste zu Herzen gehe, unterstützt und angefrischt, hingegen aller Eigennutz ... außgereutet und exstirpiret werde.”} The council sought to forestall debate by electing the jurist David Gloxin (their longtime Hanseatic syndic) to fill the vacant mayor’s office on 20 July 1666, but even several
such consolatory appointments failed to temper the guild leaders’ desire to permanently undercut patrician oligarchy.\footnote{Asch, \textit{Rat und Bürgerschaft}, pp. 131-133. The guild elders reprised their demand for increased merchant representation in the leading civic offices following the death of \textit{Bürgermeister} Gottschalk von Wickede in January 1667, choosing wealthy merchant-company member Matthäus Rodde as new mayor. Rodde, however, was already a longtime member of the council when appointed Bürgermeister, and like Gloxin, he offered a minimal threat of political radicalism. Consequently, his appointment failed to satisfy the burgher corporations’ core demands for reduced affinity among civic office-holders.} Beginning with the \textit{Citizens’ Points of Remonstrance and Reminder}, submitted on 11 July 1667, the burgher opposition now demanded a reform of council elections (\textit{Ratswahl}) that would dismantle the “council of brothers-in-law” (\textit{Schwieger-Rath}) that had long obtained “to the great damage of this city and the mercantile fraternity.”\footnote{“Gemeiner Bürger Beschwer- und Erinnerungs-Puncten der Zunftten der Schonefahrer und Consortt. In der Stadt Lübeck, so den 11. Juli 1667 vermittelt einer \textit{Supplication} dem Herrn Syndico Doct. Bawern umb zu Rahte zubringen,” in \textit{Catalogus Argumentorum, Junctis documentis verificatoriis} (Lübeck: Gottfried Jäger, 1668), 125-127, p. 126: “Daß der eine Zeit hero zu grossem Schaden dieser Stadt und der Kauffmanschaft \textit{sovirte} Schwieger –Rath/ nachdem derselbe sowol unserm StadtRechte/ welches Vater und Sohn / auch dannenhero Schwieger-Vater und Schwieger-Sohn/ welche Vaters und Sohnes Stellevertreten / zu gleich nicht zulässet.”} To repair the damage patrician self-interest inevitably caused “in those republics dedicated to commerce,” guild elders suggested that the council be re-populated with men more like themselves. “It is therefore highly necessary” the \textit{Remonstrance} opined, “to enact a statute, that all such citizens, who live from rents alone, either dedicate themselves to mercantile pursuits, or study something honorable and sober, or make themselves reputed and useful in matters of war, or otherwise must be unsuitable to the council chair.”\footnote{“Gemeiner Bürger Beschwer- und Erinnerungs-Puncten,” in \textit{Catalogus Argumentorum}, p. 126-127: “Und weil in denen \textit{Rebispublicis}, welche auff das \textit{Commercium} gewidmet / eine sehr \textit{profitable} beobachtung diese gewesen ist ... So wird / der Zunftten unvorgreifflichen meinen nach / hochnöthig seyn / \textit{ad prima principia} zu recurrire; Solchem zu folge auch / ein Statutum darin abzufassen /daß alle solche Bürger / welche anjetzo bloß und allein von denen Zinsen leben / entweden der Kauffmannschaft sich beflissigen / oder was redliches und gründliches \textit{studiren} / oder in Krieges-Sachen sich berühmt und brauchbahr machen / oder aber des Raths-Stuehls unfähig seyn müssen.”}

The renewal of hostilities between guilds and council had its roots in two dissatisfactions inherited from the dispute that produced the \textit{Kassarezeß}. The first concerned the power of the new \textit{Kassabürger} (citizen appointees to the civic fisc) to approve incomes and expenditures in lofty civic matters, especially...
“peace, war and alliance.” The second reflected intense dissatisfaction among craftsmen, especially the brewers, over the council’s practice of regulating craft production by civic ordinance. When the council attempted to undercut the burgher position six weeks after the Remonstrance, they succeeded only in exploding the rough consensus achieved in the course of the 1665 settlement. In the third week of August, 1666, a faction of the council ordered the clandestine arrest of the guilds’ legal consultant Johannes Conrad, driving the jurist to seek refuge in St. Johann’s cloister, where he hastily assembled legal proof that the house and its abbess were exempt from the city council’s direct jurisdiction, “on the basis ancient privileges” that pre-dated the Reformation. However tenuous this claim seems, ten burgher corporations protested this aggression by placing the Rathaus under siege on the morning of 22 August, thereby rendering the point moot. According to Heinrich Kerkring, over 1000 members of commercial and craft guilds filled the High Street (Breite Straße) before the Rathaus, the adjacent central market, and the neighboring churchyard of St. Mary’s parish, reinforced by an company of the citizen militia deployed in full military array. The council’s heavy-handed attempt to forestall the escalation of burgher grievances now failed signally, as this incident not only “made clear to the council the uncomfortable position in which it found itself,” but also required them to abandon proceedings against Conrad. Worse, this choreographed threat of violence suggested that magisterial authority in Lübeck had now reached a state of open crisis.

584 In this case, the quantities of beer that the red-brewers could licitly distribute; see Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 134-135 and 137-138 on these and similar dissatisfactions.

585 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 136.

586 Diary of Heinrich Kirchring, quoted in Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 136. Heinrich (1610-1693) was an elder relative of the above-quoted chronicler Gottschalk Kirchring (1639-1705). His diary relates that as individual council members filed between the ranks to their entrance, they encountered taunts reminding them that the citizens had successfully deposed much of the council in Jürgen Wullenwever’s time, others threatening to lock the gates and beat the muster drums, and the repeated demand to know “with whom each man stands, whether he be on the side of the council or the side of the burghers.”

587 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 136.
After the council’s abortive persecution of Conrad, the distrust corporation leaders felt for their magistrates moved them to demand the right to approve or deny the council’s actions in spheres ranging from declaring war to managing poor relief. In his 1961 study of the Bürgerrezeß, Jürgen Asch reconstructed the respective arguments and grievances of council and burgher opposition in detail, identifying the ensuing debate over “the superior rights” [jura superioritatis] as the primary roadblock to compromise and reconciliation during the second half of the 1660s. After the council rejected their arguments claiming expansive privileges for the Kassabürger, the united corporations took the offensive in another remonstrance of July 1667, in which they demanding restoration of the medieval precept of rule by “mixed regiment,” according to which “the burghers are not excluded from the adjudication of the superior rights, but rather hold the same in common with the most honorable council.” Specifically, the medieval tradition of communal rule required the council to consult the burger corporations in all the essential jura of civic Obrigkeit, including the right to levy taxes, to declare war, to conduct diplomacy and forge alliances, to create laws, and all other “high and lofty matters” impacting the urban community. In so doing, the merchants and artisans sought redress for their manifold grievances by demanding permanent re-entry into a sphere of civic life from which they had gradually been excluded over two centuries. In the spring of

---

588 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 149. The guild elders who led the burgher opposition claimed to represent all incorporated burghers, and the official missives they delivered to the council in 1667 specifically excluded wage laborers and non-guildsmen. The representation granted to the body of common Lübecker in the final Bürgerrezeß of January 1669 consisted of fourteen signatory merchant and craft guilds.

589 See Asch’s comparative analysis of the conflicting constitutional theories marshaled by citizens and council in the two major internal upheavals of the seventeenth century, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 139-154, and 155-160, respectively.

590 “Erklärung der Zünfte wegen der Verlehnungen vom 23. Okt 1666,” in Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 135: ‘die cives von denn Juribus Superioritatis und deren effecten nicht abgesonderd seyn, sondern diesselbe mit E. E. Rahte gemein haben.” This guilds had first invoked Lübeck’s “mixed constitution” in a missive to the council dated in July 1663, in which they defined the city’s traditional political order as an “aristocratico-democratice mixta Respublica”; ibid., p. 149.

591 Asch, Rat und Bügerschaft, p. 148-149.

592 From 1667 until the conclusion of the Bürgerrezeß in January 1669, the legal clash between council and burgher opposition centered around conflicting interpretations of “distribution of the rights of authority,” a broad sharing of
1668, the guilds engaged city notary Andreas Senf to assist Conrad in distilling their demands into the *Refutation and Explanation to the Honorable Council*, a printed pamphlet that merged their arguments for council reform with the perceived injuries done by the council to commerce and manufacture.

Despite the urging of sympathetic magistrates like Gloxin and Rodde, the majority of the *Ratsherren* rejected any such compromise.593 Their various rebuttals to the burgher demands of 1666 and 1667 were revised into a pamphlet released to counter the burghers’ *Refutation*. The resulting *Scriptum Apologeticum*, or *Necessary Defense of an Honorable Council* was compiled by the council’s syndic Dr. Bernhard Diederich Brauer, whose efforts upheld the tradition of intransigence to which the *Ratsherren* had clung since the red-brewers’ uprising of 1652.594 As was common in early-modern constitutional disputes, these parties marshaled virtually irreconcilable interpretations of the specific privileges promised to magistrates and subjects by medieval *Herkommen*, a rift encapsulated in *Necessary Defense* with the statement “that an honorable council alone exercises the *jura Superioritatis*, without the assistance of the guilds and citizenry, and is entitled to propagate or rescind ordinances in *Regiment, Polizey* and other civic matters, or to amend

which constituted the foundation principle of communal politics for the guildsmen, but what the patriciate’s dedication to “an ‘aristocratic form of governance’ sanctioned by the Emperor himself” could not accommodate. Asch offers a detailed examination of both cases in *Rat und Bürgerschaft*, pp. 139-160. In their arguments, magistrates and guildsmen interpreted past moments of constitutional innovation very differently; key among these were the settlements that followed a major uprising against the council in 1415-16, and the disastrous tenure of office of radical Bürgermeister Jürgen Wullen in the early 1530s, which precipitated the magistrate’s effort to gain control of and “domesticate” the forces of evangelical reform. Both incidents witnessed the partial expulsion of the council from the city, followed by a series of countermeasures designed to stabilize the authority of the *Ratsherren* vis-a-vis the guilds.

593 On Gloxin’s sympathy for burgher demands, see “Gloxin, David, Dr. jur., in Fehling (ed.), *Lübeckische Ratslinie*, pp. 128-129.

594 *Scriptum Apologeticum oder Nohtwendige Ehren-Rettung wider die von Friedhäsigen Consiliarisis unter dem nahmen der Zünfte der Schonefahrer & Consort. Ohnlängst in Druck gegebenen also genanten gegen-Bericht*, in *Catalogus Argumentorum* (Lübeck: Jäger, 1668). Author Bernhard Diedrich Brauer was born in Dortmund and attained his law doctorate in Heidelberg; he was elected *Bürgermeister*, which also elevated him to office on the city council, in 1669. “Bernhard Diedrich Brauer, Dr. jur.,” in Fehling (ed.), *Lübeckische Ratslinie*, p.129.
them for the public prosperity, apart from a few exceptional cases.” The council justified the oligarchic realities of the city’s politics on the basis on two elements derived from Martin Luther’s thought. The first of these was the Lutheran model of the godly household: Brauer’s Defense rejected the burgher’s argument that “the council shall have received its office from the hands of the citizenry,” arguing that the city’s constitutional tradition better approximated a patriarchal relationship in which citizenry owed their magistrates the same “respect, loyalty and love” a child owed his natural father. Second, the council condemned the burgher’s uprisings as a sinful violation of Luther’s doctrine of obedience to secular Obrigkeit, an argument Brauer embellished by invoking the Paul’s warning against rebellion in Romans 13, in which the apostle cautioned that “whosoever resists authority resists God’s ordinance, [and] those who resist will bring judgment upon themselves.” Placed alongside the burghers’ Refutation and Explanation, the rebuff of burgher demands implicit in the Necessary Defense marks the full polarization of council and burgher parties in a dispute that had its roots in the brewer’s uprising of 1652.

By the summer of 1668, Lübeck’s constitutional crisis still seemed far from resolution. However, Emperor Leopold and his councilors could scarcely have ignored the sequence of conflicting appeals sent by patricians, burgher corporations, and the council during the previous five years, all of which suggested that law and order had deteriorated sharply in the city since Brömbsen’s visit to Vienna in 1664-1665. The exiled patrician Bürgermeister Gotthard von Höveln confirmed these suspicions in a letter of 12 April 1668, in which

595 Nohtwendige Ehren-Rettung (upaginated), p. i: “Daß E. Hochw. Raht allein / ohn zuthun der Zünffte und Bürger / die jura Superioritatis exercire, und Ordnungen in Regiments- Policey- und andern Stadt-anliegenden Sachen / ausserhalb etzlicher wenig höhstangelegener Fälle / zu machen / zu vermehren / und zu vermindern / oder pro salute publica, zu verendern befugt sey.” Despite dramatic differences of interpretation, the argument submitted by council and burghers in 1668-69 remained fundamentally conservative in the sense that both parties justified their arguments on the basis of “rightful usage,” i.e. an idealized understanding of urban constitutional law inherited from Lübeck’s medieval golden age; Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 149-150.

596 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 158-160.

597 Quoted in the council’s Scriptum Apologeticum, p. i: “Wer sich wider die Obrigkeit setzet / der widerstrebet Gottes Ordnung; die aber widerstreben / werden über sich ein Urtheil empfahen.”
he “depicted the condition of the city in the darkest colors,” and informed the Imperial court that prolonged disruptions of unity, peace and commerce now threatened “the downfall of the city.” Leopold became convinced when the Ratsherren sent their own envoy to formally request the Emperor’s support against the attempted “overreaches” of the merchants and craftsmen, and he assigned a formidable commission consisting of “Great Elector” Friedrich Wilhelm of Brandenburg and the new Duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, Ferdinand Albrecht I (1636-1687), to investigate the state of affairs in Lübeck. Through subdelegates Otto von Grote (privy councilor to the Elector) and Joachim Friedrich Söhlen (legal advisor at Ferdinand Albrecht's court) the commission worked to restore stability in accordance with the emperor’s orders, but also to secure their own interests by forestalling the encroachment of the Danish crown on a major Imperial city and lynchpin of the Baltic economy. The council received Grote, Söhlen, and their entourages into Lübeck with a “celebratory” reception on 23 October 1668, but became perplexed when the commission upheld many burgher demands over the council’s oligarchic claims during the two months of negotiation that followed. Ultimately, the compromise that guilds and council formally enacted on 9 January 1669 owed much to the “uncommonly great costs” of hosting the Imperial commission in the style


599 The council’s most urgent request for Imperial intervention came just under a month after Höveln’s letter and was dated 5. May 1668; see Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 161 note 1.

600 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 75-76; cf. Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 102.

601 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 161-162. With the arrival of the Imperial commission, “der Rat glaubte aufatmen zu können und hoffte, daß die Kommission den Übergriffen der Bürgerschaft entsprechend den Wünschen des Kaisers ein Ende bereiten und ihm seine alte Selbständigkeit wiedergeben würde. Die Kommissare ergriffen jedoch offen für die Bürger Partei.” This foiled the expectations the council, not least because it represented a distinct shift from Leopold’s own consistent support for patrician party and council in various incidents since the 1654 red-brewer’s uprising.
demanded by their rank. “Because of this” Becker concluded, “the burghers wished as eagerly as the council, that the end of these conflicts ... might be effected through an agreeable accord.”

The six points of the Bürgerreße represent the conclusion of a middle way between the dramatic concessions demanded by the burghers after 1665, and the autocratic intransigence of patricians like Brömbsen and Höveln that had so exercised the citizenry since the war’s end. Because it mandated that “learned men, [i.e.] jurists, merchants, and guildsmen” be elected to a majority of magisterial offices, and forbade fathers and sons, brothers, or brothers-in-law from holding council office concurrently, the Bürgerreße undercut the ability of the landowning elite to sustain the patrician oligarchy that Lübeck’s senatorial classes had assembled since the Reformation. However, Imperial commissioners also sought to restore hierarchical stability by preserving key privileges for the council alone; crucially, the first point of the Reßèß denied the guilds their demand to have an active vote in the Ratswahl, reserving the election of new council members exclusively for the existing Ratsherren. For the same reason, the commission sought to ensure that the council retained magisterial power in the core functions of government, or what the settlement described as “private matters,” including the exercise of civic law, warfare and “matters of Polizey” pertaining to the public order. Meanwhile, the resolution concerning diplomacy – one of the leading powers of civic government claimed by both sides in their debate over the “superior rights”--

602 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 76: “So viel ist gewiß, daß diese kaiserliche Commission für die Stadt mit ungemein großen Kosten, welches sich indessen nicht ändern ließ, verknüpfet war. Und daher wünschte die Bürgerschaft eben so sehnlich als der Rath, daß das Ende dieser Streitigkeiten bald herannahen, und dieselbe dirch eine annehmliche Vereinbarung möchten gehoben werden.”


604 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, pp. 76-77.

605 Bürger-Reßeß § 1, pp. 4-11.

606 Bürger-Reßeß § 2, pp. 11-13; cf. Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, pp. 77-78.
encapsulates both the conservative spirit of compromise as well as the clear limits the new accord placed on
the autonomy of the council. The third point of the Bürgerrezeß stipulated that the “appointment and
confirmation of Imperial and Circle affairs” (Reichs- und Creißsachen) was to be reserved for the Ratsherren,
up to the point that “something with particular bearing upon the commerce of the city of Lübeck might
occasion at Imperial and Circle Diets,” in which case the council was to solicit the “opinion and consent of the
commercial guilds” when making its decision. Apart from this formal acknowledgment of the consultation
tradition, however, the burgher’s most significant gains occurred in the sphere of fiscal management, as the
1669 agreement confirmed the Kassarezeß in all its points, clarifying that major civic disbursements would be
decided by a fisc consisting of twelve senators working in concert with twenty-four Kassabürger,
representing all the burgher corporations. Because of the leading role the commercial guilds exercised in
appointing these candidates, as well as the permanent enfranchisement of merchants in the council ranks
and mayoral offices, the constitutional revisions of 1669 represent a particular victory for the trading-
company elders and affiliated members of the Lübeck mercantile elite.

The consensus forged by burghers and magistrates in 1665 concerning the threat posed by certain
aristocratic landowners did not predispose the council to anything more than token compromise when the
merchant and craft guilds began to demand dramatic new enfranchisement in city government. The success
of the Kassarezeß had whetted the appetites of the merchants and craftsmen, who now set out to prove,
through a series of legal opinions compiled by Johannes Conrad, that the Ratsherren were only the
administrators of authority, who governed on behalf of, and in consultation with, the true proprietors of
divinely-ordained Obrigkeit. Within a year of the Kassarezeß, guild elders had escalated burgher demands

---

607 Bürger-Receß § 3, pp. 13-14.

608 Bürger-Receß § 5, pp. 15-28. This segment reproduces the original Kassarezeß of 1665. Cf. Becker, Umständliche
Geschichte III, pp. 80-82.

609 Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 155.
for permanent mechanisms of consultation by demanding direct influence upon the nomination and election of new magistrates. The council’s real power to govern affairs in the city approached its nadir when the guilds mustered in military array and laid siege to their own Ratsherren in 1666, after which the burghers’ sustained demands for massive political concessions finally drove city rulers to request the intervention of the Holy Roman Emperor in late 1668. Citizen violence, and the carefully maintained threat thereof, was a driving force behind Lübeck’s most dramatic constitutional reform of the early modern centuries, but exploiting its potential to bring the council to negotiation also forced both magistrates and citizen corporations to openly acknowledge their collective subservience to Imperial authority. When confronted with Imperial intervention in late 1668, guildsmen and magistrates saw a common enemy in the shape of runaway civic expense, coupled with the prospect of sustained infringement by the Emperor and powerful princes on their time-honored constitutional autonomy.

The Bürgerrezeß of 1669 was not a “revolutionary” settlement, insofar as it affirmed Lübeck’s existing constitution and a tradition of rule by “consultation” dating to the year 1201. Still, the innovations enshrined therein ushered Lübeck into a markedly more stable era of constitutional politics that lasted until the city was occupied by Napoleon’s forces at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Analyzing the various responses to the crisis of legitimacy suffered by Lübeck’s political and economic elite after the Thirty Years’ War gives no cause to question Asch’s conclusions as to the fundamentally conservative, even “traditional” nature of the reforms enacted between 1665-1669, but it does prompt us to question the social mechanisms that stabilized the revised social order, despite the recurrence of war and material hardship, and the permanent decline of the Hanseatic League. Though the new settlements ameliorated the worst of the constitutional abuses that had grown up after the Reformation, this legislation provided no panacea for the problems confronting the urban community twenty years after Westphalia. After 1670, the re-constituted council crafted new policies designed to buttress domestic industry while also enhancing their competitive role in the Atlantic market; however, this spawned fresh tensions among the urban estates, which ranged from
disagreements among merchant leaders over the continued viability of Hanseatic trade, to the danger posed by the deviant religious beliefs of immigrant craftsmen. In this environment, community religious life proved to be a rare site of consensus among magistrates, guildsmen, and pastors, all of whom were enmeshed in the tense nexus of debate over tradition and innovation in constitutional, mercantile, and religious matters. Because Ratsherren and guildsmen alike had demonstrated their loyalty to the core tenets of Orthodox Lutheranism even before Imperial intervention forced magistrates and council to compromise in 1669, public religious life emerged as a natural site for restoring community cohesion after a century of crisis and discord.

II. Polemic and Popular Violence: Calvinists, Sectarians, and Early Conventicles

Dr. Meno Hanneken’s long tenure as Superintendent (1646-1671) marked the beginning of sea change in the city council’s policy toward church leadership. In 1613, junior pastor Antonius Burchardi had scandalized Lübeck’s magistrates when he condemned their commercial treaty with the Netherlands as a glaring miscarriage of worldly authority. This unprecedented act of clerical insubordination had not only stirred popular discontent and led to Burchardi’s dismissal in 1614, but also prompted a lasting feud between moderate Superintendent Georg Stampelius (1613-1622) and the rest of Lübeck’s pastors, who opposed political union with a Calvinist polity. These lasting enmities marked the worst of a series of disorders in the city’s church life that convinced Lübeck’s magistrates—who now faced multifold new challenges caused by the Thirty Years’ War-- that the advantages of strong church leadership outweighed the liabilities of a Lutheran clergy committed to improving public morals through church discipline. When Stampelius died in 1622, the council reversed their strategy entirely, and filled the vacancy with the conspicuously Orthodox theologian Nicolaus Hunnius, whose dogmatic reputation contrasted sharply with Stampelius’s irenicism. Hunnius successfully re-made Lübeck’s ministry into a coherent and disciplined institution that tirelessly lobbied the council to increase its commitment to dramatic outward manifestations of the Lutheran
confessional identity. By deliberately choosing Hanneken, a man as similar to Hunnius as was possible in the mid-1640s, Lübeck’s magistrates declared themselves willing to absorb regular admonishments from the pastors, in exchange for the clerical discipline essential to preserving internal peace and promoting cohesion within an urban community hard-pressed by the new material and spiritual challenges of the war years. As the self-styled successor to Lübeck’s greatest early-modern Superintendent, Hanneken’s career marked the beginning of a coherent Kirchenpolitik that had been conspicuously lacking in Lübeck during the previous four decades.

< From Hunnius to Hanneken, 1643-1646 >

Meno Hanneken did not assume leadership of Lübeck’s church until 18 October 1646, nearly two years after his recruitment began.  

610 Hunnius had probably recommended his junior colleague to the Lübeck council before his death in 1643 — the two had been on amiable terms during Hunnius’s last year in Wittenberg — and the council began to actively recruit Hanneken in early 1645.  

Hanneken came from Blaxen, on the coast north of Bremen, and had studied under Hunnius at Wittenberg; their personal affinity was such that Hanneken had enjoyed the mealtime hospitality of the soon-to-be Lübeck Superintendent in 1622-23.  

612 After further study in Leipzig and Tübingen, Hanneken achieved the doctorate in theology at Marburg, where he subsequently assumed the professorship in moral philosophy at the behest of the Landgrave Ludwig. Ludwig’s son Georg of Hesse would prove a possessive patron: by the time the city council invited Hanneken to Lübeck, Georg had already denied him permission to leave his post for other prestigious

---


leadership posts, most notably the office of General Superintendent in Frankfurt and Oldenburg. This precedent explains Hanneken’s apparent reluctance to broach the subject; though the preserved correspondence is not exhaustive, Hanneken seems to have first informed his patron of his desire to go to Lübeck during the Christmas season of 1645.

Convincing the Landgrave to release him required the would-be Superintendent to adopt an innovative strategy. As expected, George took a dim view of Hanneken’s proposed move, discouraging him from accepting the “Lübeck Vocation” in a letter of early March of 1646. With the avenue of polite request closed, Hanneken sought outside support, writing to head pastor (and acting Superintendent) Adam Helms on the thirty-first of March to request the intercession of the Lübeck city council. Helms and the council collaborated efficiently, issuing Hanneken the desired letter in duplicate on 23 April; in the meantime, Hanneken had sent another letter of appeal (10 April) explaining to Georg his heartfelt desire to join the ministry in Lübeck. However, this collective appeal also failed to garner the desired response, and by early June, Hanneken had become sufficiently concerned that he wrote to Lübeck’s mayors to re-assure them that he intended to accept the post. The following month witnessed further correspondence between the city council and their would-be Superintendent, which produced a bolder (and ultimately successful) tactical resolution: on 1 August, on the advice of the Lübeck council, Hanneken drafted a letter to his patron’s wife,


618 AHL Nachlässe, “Hanneken”: “M. Hanneken an den Bürgermeister, etc. der Stadt Lübeck 3. Juni 1646.”
the duchess Amelia Elisabeth, in which he requested her intercession with the Landgrave on his behalf.\textsuperscript{619}

Exactly what arguments the duchess employed are omitted from her reply of 17 August, but she proved to be Hanneken’s most effective advocate, as Hanneken now received a letter of safe passage (\textit{Passbrief}), dated 18 August 1646, “that he might come to Lübeck in the greatest security.”\textsuperscript{620} Hanneken lost no time moving his residence to Lübeck, where he officially joining the urban ministry by signing the Lübeck \textit{Konkordienbuch} on 19 October.\textsuperscript{621} Between his inaugural sermon and his death in early 1671, he led the city’s church for twenty-four years.

Church historians have stressed that Nicolaus Hunnius far outclassed any of his successors as a theologian and scholar, but his legacy for religious life in Lübeck owed much to Hanneken’s deliberate efforts to perpetuate his style of church leadership.\textsuperscript{622} With the collusion of the city’s head pastors (\textit{Hauptpastoren}), Hanneken drew on Hunnius’s example of tireless polemical agitation to urge magistrates to embrace the confessional intolerance of the previous generation in a postwar landscape they deemed far too conciliatory toward Catholics, Calvinists, and heterodox sectarians alike. In contrast to his predecessor, however, Hanneken’s efforts proved most successful when they appealed to the fears of Lübeck’s citizens, rather than to the magisterial concerns of the city council. The reform-minded mystic Christian Hoburg (1607-75), whose anti-clericalism strongly recalled Christoph Raselius, garnered only minimal attention in 1650s Lübeck, but the conventicle riots of the mid-1660s revealed that citizens (and especially guildsmen) feared spiritual contagion from within. While Hanneken maintained Hunnius’s hard line toward Tridentine Catholicism and

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{note2} “Dieser unser offene Passbrief,” 18. August 1646, in AHL Nachlässe, “Hanneken.” The duchess’s reply “Frauw Amelia Elisabeth... Ahn. Dr. Hannekenium zur Marpurkg,” is dated the previous day, or “17. Augusti Anno 1646.”
\end{thebibliography}
non-conformism in general, his own orthodox legacy is found in the marked intolerance Lübeckers of various ranks demonstrated toward the first pious gatherings in the 1660s, and Calvinist immigration after 1670. The cooperation Hanneken secured from magistrates and citizens against the latter groups suggests close links between internal crisis and the shifting perceptions of the religious threat facing postwar Lübeck.

<Interpreting Westphalia: Heterodoxy and Calvinism after 1650>

In the months prior to his death in February 1671, the seventy-five-year-old Hanneken made a final attempt to persuade his magistrates to take an unbending stance against non-Lutheran influences in Lübeck. “It is not answerable by conscience,” he wrote in a pamphlet entitled Theological Consideration of Whether It Is Advisable for the Free and Imperial City of Lübeck to Accept Adherents of a Foreign Religion, “that we accept and defend strangers to the Augsburg Confession, and other religious exercises antagonistic to our church of the Augsburg Confession ... because that would earn us such repute, as though we reject the religious fervor of our Christian forebears, and held the difference of religion to be unimportant, as though it had occurred, that the papist religion had remained in full sway in this city.”

The main target of the 1671 Theological Consideration was a potential influx of Calvinist craftsmen (especially weavers, spinners, dyers, and cloth merchants) that pastors saw as a likely outcome of the council’s decision, in 1670, to issue an international declaration inviting French and Dutch textile workers to take advantage of the favorable market

---

conditions in Lübeck.\textsuperscript{624} Crucially, however, Hanneken’s blanket condemnation of “strangers to the Augsburg confession” reflects not only his own dogmatic fervor for preservation of Lübeck’s traditional Lutheran identity, but also points to the commitment the pastors shared to perpetuating the legacy of Lübeck’s most distinguished Superintendent.

The urban clergy’s success against heterodox belief had taken a major leap forward in the 1630s, when the pastors convinced their magistrates to prosecute Lübeck’s “New Prophets” on the grounds that these wayward citizens would foment insurrection on the Anabaptist model. While combating religious non-conformism had always been a leading concern of the city’s pastors, it remained of secondary interest to temporal rulers preoccupied with the war’s multifold threat to physical security and economic survival. After the war, magistrates remained judicious in prosecuting cases of spiritualist error: when the mystic Hoburg revived the wartime spiritualist critique of the institutional church by republishing his \textit{Mirror of the Abuses In Today’s Office of Ministry} in 1653, he excited comparatively little attention from pastors or magistrates, despite the fact that he singled out the Lübeck ministry for anti-clerical attack.\textsuperscript{625} Though a known “enthusiast” leader, Hoburg differed conspicuously from Christoph Raselius in that he lacked any known

\textsuperscript{624} The ‘Notifikation’ was a broadsheet dated 30 July 1670, and distributed in various provinces of northern France and the Dutch Republic; Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, pp. 472-473. Its proper title was \textit{Bürgermeister und Raht der Käyserlichen und des Heil. Reichs Freyen-Stadt Lübeck / geben allen und jeden / besonders des Commercii und der Manufacturen Liebhabern / hiemit zu wissen [...]; reproduced in facsimile in Graßmann, \textit{Lübeckische Geschichte}, p. 472.

\textsuperscript{625} Elias Praetorius, \textit{Apologia Praetoriana. Das ist: Spiegels derer Mißbräuche beyhm heutigen Predig-ampt / Gründliche Vertheidigung: wider die Luthehrische Prediger in Lübeck / Hamburg und Lüneburg [...] Ihnen / Zur nottürfftigen Überweisung ihrer Verführung / Hecheley und Falschheit / auch zu besserer Prüffung / und da es beliebet zur redlichen Beantwortung / sein deutsch vorgehalten (1653), pp. i-ii: “I truly believe,” Hoburg declared in the \textit{Mirror}, “that among one thousand teachers of the present time, barely a handful will be found who serve worthily in such matters.” Originally published in 1644, Hoburg re-published the \textit{Mirror} under the alias “Elias Praetorius,” and with a revised title that explicitly targeted the “Triple Ministry” that had prosecuted Raselius and the “New Prophets.” By taking a stand “against the Lutheran pastors in Lübeck, Hamburg and Lüneburg” in 1653, this tract perpetuated the Prophets’ core critique of Lutheran Orthodoxy by deriding the clergy as “today’s Pharisees,” who privileged ceremony and polemic over the spiritual demands of righteousness. Hoburg himself had been expelled from multiple pastoral offices in the 1630s and 1640s; he lived out his later years in the non-conformist haven of Altona, where he served as preacher to the Mennonite community; cf. Winfried Zeller, “Hoburg, Christian” in \textit{Neue Deutsche Biographie (NDB)} 9, (1752), pp. 282f.
followers in Lübeck; he therefore failed to offer an analogous threat. Accordingly, there is no evidence that the city council moved to censor him as they had done when they banned Raselius’s book *The Secret of the Temple of God* from Lübeck, and prosecuted citizens sympathetic to his teachings. In contrast to both wartime spiritualists and later proto-Pietists, Hoburg’s considerable corpus of late writings (several of which continued to be re-published after his death in 1675) excited little attention in post-war Lübeck; instead of Hanneken or his head pastors, a colleague from Hamburg wrote the definitive refutation of Hoburg’s *Mirror*, published in 1656. The fact that Hanneken and his pastors expended far greater energies refuting post-Tridentine Catholicism, Calvinism, and the “conventicles” suggests that in contrast to the nearby town of Oldesloe (home of a sizeable community of Mennonites and other sectarians) or the Hamburg environ of Altona, the anti-clerical movements that proliferated in the region during the Thirty Years’ War had failed to find a lasting footing in Lübeck.

In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia had extended the *cuius regio, eius religio* mandate of the Religious Peace of Augsburg to include the Reformed confession. In Lübeck, however, Lutheran pastors continued to

---

626 On Christoph Raselius and the “New Prophets,” and their critique of the institutional Lutheran church from 1630 onward, see chapter three.

627 Johann Müller (1598-1672) was an accomplished polemicist whose works targeted mystics and non-conformists; his tract refuting Christian Hoburg was entitled *Prüfung des Geistes Eliae Praetorii, das ist Gründliche Wiederlegung der Weigianischen / Schwenckfeldischen / Wiedertäufferischen / Enthusiastischen / Neuprophetischen Schwermereyen und gefährlichen Irrthümer* (Hamburg: lezer, 1656). “Elias Praetorius” was one of Hoburg’s several aliases. Hanneken’s successor Samuel Pomarius (1675-83) condemned Hoburg’s *Postilla Evangeliorum Mystica* (1663) and *Praxis Arndiana* (1642, 1662) in a later pamphlet condemning the “fanaticism” of the Rosicrucian Aegidius Guttman (d. c. 1619). Pomarius’s *Abgenöthigte Lehr- und Schutz-Schrift / wider den Gutmanischen offenbahrungs-Patron* (Hamburg: Völcker, 1677) was part of a broader corpus of texts written by Lutheran theologians refuting later mystical interpretations of Johann Arndt’s (1555-1621) works (particularly his *Von Wahren Christentum* of 1605-1610). Like many of his forebears and contemporaries, Pomarius’s treatises of 1677 distinguished Arndt sharply from the less palatable mysticism of many of his followers; in this case, Aegidius Guttman’s “fanatical book” *On the Revelation of God’s Majesty* (1619) had been reprinted in Amsterdam in 1675.

urge their magistrates to adopt an antagonistic stance toward Calvinists in a manner that remained virtually unchanged from the previous generation. Like Hunnius, Superintendent Hanneken specialized in anti-Catholic writings during his early career, later modifying his polemical targets in response to local opponents; while at Marburg, for example, he had contributed a treatise to the growing “Antibecani” corpus, in which various Lutheran theologians engaged the sacramental, soteriological, and polemical works of prolific Belgian Jesuit Martin Becanus (1563-1624). Hanneken’s contribution was entitled *Examination of the Manualis Catholici by the Jesuit Martin Becani*, in which he rejected the post-Tridentine emphasis on the efficacy of works, with similar treatment of other venerable Lutheran-Catholic disputes. Though Hanneken was less prolific than Hunnius, works of this type symbolized his connection to Wittenberg orthodoxy in general, and to the polemical work of his institutional forebears, specifically. Hanneken’s efforts to perpetuate this struggle as Superintendent testified to his loyalty to the city’s confessional tradition and to Hunnius himself, whom he echoed by arguing, in the 1663 treatise *Irenicum Catholico-Evangelicum, or General, Correct Christian Religious Peace*, that “adherents of the Augsburg Confession” could not hope to maintain “good, uninjured conscience” if they exercised latitudinarian attitudes toward the Roman Church. This language remained constant during the half-century after the Peace of Westphalia, even as the clergy’s opponents changed. After 1650, the Lübeck ministry directed its fiercest polemic toward the newly-enfranchised

---

629 Martin Becanus was among the “most significant and prolific theologians in Germany in his time,” and had the distinction of serving as confessor to Emperor Ferdinand II during the Thirty Years War (1620-23); see Wilhelm Kratz SJ, “Becanus (Schellekens), Martin,” in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1 (1953), p. 686. Works like his *Manualis Catholici* continued to be cited as examples of post-Tridentine theology into the nineteenth century; cf. Georg Benedikt Winer, *Comparative Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs der verschieden christlichen Kirchenparteien*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1866), pp. 97, 129, and 151.

Calvinist confession, rather than the Catholic-Jesuit threat that had preoccupied pastors and magistrates during the war years.

Hanneken’s attempt to fashion himself as disciple and successor to Nicolaus Hunnius appears with particular clarity in the *Theological Consideration*, which he wrote in opposition to the city council’s ‘*Notifikation*’ of 1670. Merchants of Reformed faith had resided peacefully in Lübeck since the council’s commercial alliance with the Estates of Holland in May 1613, but the community grew very slowly during the subsequent half-century; by 1670, the number of adherents to the Reformed tradition in Lübeck – traders, their families, and household servants—probably did not exceed thirty souls. In 1670, however, the pastors feared that this population would grow as a result of the council’s attempts stimulate the city’s textile trade, and such growth would require the council to codify the informal legal toleration that governed Calvinist worship in postwar Lübeck. To forestall an influx of textile artisans and merchants from a famously Reformed sector of the Atlantic economy, Hanneken directly appropriated Hunnius’s *Whether the Lutheran Church Might Reconcile Itself to the Current Religious Disputes* as an authoritative source for his digest of arguments “why the exercise of sundry religions should not be permitted.” Specifically, this work

---

631 Graßmann, *Lübeckische Geschichte*, p. 466-7. Reliable population figures are elusive before the last decades of the seventeenth century. A very small number of Calvinists lived in Lübeck from 1613, but the combined impact of the *Notifikation* of 1670 and the influx of French Huguenots into the Empire after 1685 had far impact in Lübeck that it did elsewhere, which can be explained in part by the new restrictions the council placed on Calvinist immigration and worship in the 1670s and 1690s. Graßmann places the Calvinist population at 40-50 people in 1692-3.

632 Cf. Graßmann, *Lübeckische Geschichte*, p. 466. Like the Catholic confessors retained by a few members of the Cathedral Chapter, the city’s tiny Calvinist congregation had no *Kirchenordnung* or formal charter, which meant members were neither permitted to hold “open” (i.e. public) services, nor were they allowed a permanent house of worship. Since 1666, they had conducted their worship outside the city wall, in a *Gartenhaus* belonging to one of the city council members.

633 Hanneken, *Theologisches Bedenken*, p. vi. In both content and argumentation, this work follows Hunnius’s own essay on the question of a general peace among the confessions, cf. Nicolaus Hunnius, *Consultatio, Oder Wolmeinendes Bedencken: Ob und wie die Evangelische Lutherische Kirchen die jetztschwebende Religionstreitigkeiten entweder friedlich beylegen / oder durch Christliche und bequeme Mittel fortstellen und endigen mögen* (Lübeck: Valentiin Schmalhertz, 1632). Hanneken’s pamphlet devoted a dozen pages to establishing the fundamental disagreement of Hunnius and Martin Luther with Zwingli, Calvin and Martin Bucer; his text then turns to a dialogue in seven points in
reproduced four of Hunnius’s proofs in order to warn the council that a move toward confessional pluralism would imperil not only the Lutheran confessional tradition as it had developed in Lübeck, but also the salvation of souls in general: “it should be of greatest concern to the authority, that the divine service be conducted purely and correctly,” Hunnius and Hanneken reminded the magistrates, “meanwhile, an authority that permits all religions will liable for all of the souls, that are misled through such freedom.”

The Consideration also warned that confessional plurality would endanger public order, and compromise the integrity of the Christian family; according to Hunnius, “such dispensation to various religions also precipitates much evil in the worldly order,” for which reason “neither a magistracy nor the father of a family is empowered to grant freedom of this kind.” Hanneken’s arguments implied that the urban clergy still hoped to circumvent the new religious settlement entirely, and it is unsurprising that he failed to convince the council to rescind the “Notifikation,” or to expel the city’s nascent Calvinist population. As a statement of the postwar clergy’s unbending loyalty to Hunnius and Lutheran Orthodoxy, however, the Theological Consideration fulfilled its goals admiringly, and gave a subsequent generation of pastors a clear point of reference from which to confront an analogous threat posed by Louis XIV’s revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Hanneken had died by the time the city council finally codified its relationship to Reformed tradition, but the

which he refutes a variety of contemporary arguments for the toleration of Calvinist worship in Lutheran communities; cf. pp. vi-vii.

634 Hanneken argued that although legal pluralism was not explicitly forbidden in biblical law, it was by nature inimical to the well-being of the Lutheran confession, the preservation of which was the foremost duty of Obrigkeit: “Though God has not instructed the temporal authorities (Oberkeit), neither commanded nor enabled [them] concerning free exercise of varying religions, they must act in accordance with the command and order of their Lord alone, as officials and servants of Gods’ Holy Kingdom”; Theologisches Bedencken, pp. vi-vii: “Dieweil Gott / der dißfalß die oberste Regierung hat / der gleichen (Freystellung allerley Religionen) nichts der Oberkeit zuthun weder gebotten noch freygelassen / die doch als Gottes Reichs Amptleute und Diener sich allein nach ihres Herren Befehl und Orndung richten müssen.” On the second point of warning, cf. p. vii: “Dieweil diß der Oberkeit Sorge zu grösten Theil sein soll / daß der Gottesdienst rein und richtig gehalten werde ... Dieweil eine Oberkeit welche alle Religiones frey lässet / an allen den Seelen schuldig wird / welche durch solche Freyheit verführet werden.”

635 Hanneken, Theologisches Bedencken, pp. vii: “Dieweil solche Freystellung allerley Religionen auch im Weltlichen Regiment viel böses verursachet. ... Dieweil in Weltlichen Sachen / weder einer Oberkeit noch Haßvater verantwortlich ist / dergleichen Freyheit zugestatten.”
magistrates who survived him would vindicate his efforts by imposing new restrictions on Reformed worship and immigration in Lübeck.

< *The Conventicle Riots: Lutheranism as Community Religious Tradition* >

Spiritualist alternatives to the institutional church took new and more ominous form in Lübeck when Thomas Tanto and Jacob Taube—both Lutheran pastors and devotees of Johann Arndt’s “Christendom of personal edification”--founded Lübeck’s first lay “conventicles” in the early 1660s. The growth of these pious assemblies, in which like-minded followers gathered privately to pray, study scripture, and later to partake of communion, quickly incurred the ire of the urban ministry, whose preaching against them incited citizens to violent action in 1666. Jonathan Strom’s study of the Lübeck conventicles argues that we cannot label these gatherings as the beginning of “Pietism” in Lübeck, because of important differences in intent and practice between this early movement, and the recognizably Spenerian group Johann Wilhelm Petersen founded in the city in 1675. However, hostile Lutheran pastors tended to downplay such distinctions, and chose instead to attack both the conventiclers and the Pietists using weapons and strategies honed in the spiritual combat of the Thirty Years’ War. Clerical denunciations of the Lübeck conventicles—some of the first such assemblies in the Holy Roman Empire—culminated in Hanneken’s painstaking refutation of the

---

636 These devotional gatherings, which met in various private homes in the city and its environs, were some of the earliest in the Holy Roman Empire; see Jonathan Strom, “Early Conventicles in Lübeck,” in *Pietismus und Neuzeit* 27 (2001), 19-52. For Johann Arndt’s influence on the Lübeck conventicle founders, see Hauchild, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 318.

movement, printed under the title *A Christian Challenge to the New Fanaticism* in 1669. This work also contains numerous analogies to Hunnius’s written attacks on heterodoxy (particular his 1634 work *Thorough Report on the New Prophets*), but written polemic proved less important in the struggle against Tanto, Taube, and their followers than it had for the wartime ministry. By the time the *Challenge* appeared in print, in fact, the conventicle movement had already begun to ebb significantly, thanks to the galvanizing effect of the clergy’s preaching.

Thomas Tanto was the son of a Lübeck merchant, and had spent several years studying theology in Rostock and Jena prior to his return to his home city in 1662, where he became a candidate for the ministry. His candidacy faltered, however, when he began holding household devotional meetings with other piously-inclined Lübeckers, which the group later explained “were limited to using God’s word to awaken repentance in each other and to strengthen themselves in faith and Christian practice.” Though seemingly innocuous compared to outspoken critics like Hoburg, the private and extra-church nature of these gatherings immediately aroused the suspicious of pastors and citizens alike, who seem initially to have perceived these gatherings as a manifestation of “Quakerism.” It is difficult to gauge the number of followers Tanto enjoyed for his early efforts, but the magistrates were not disposed to take risks in a time when ordinary Lübeckers were already restive because of famine. When the *Ratsherren* learned of the conventicle meetings in the winter of 1662-1663, they appointed their syndic David Gloxin to convene a disciplinary meeting with Tanto on 15 February, 1663. Following this rebuke, Tanto left the city and went to Zwolle in the Netherlands, where a group of piously-inclined pastors had congregated around the mystically-included dissident pastor

---


Friedrich Breckling (1629-1711). The council’s precautionary action against Tanto temporarily disbanded Lübeck’s first conventicle movement, and though Tanto returned to his hometown approximately one year later, in early 1664, he encountered no further trouble until Jacob Taube, another member of the Zwolle circle, came to Lübeck in June of 1666 and encouraged him to re-convene the conventicles.

Unlike Tanto, Taube actively courted confrontation with members of the urban ministry, inciting a series of conflicts with the ministry that led him to rebuke the pastors as “worse than Pharisees” in a missive of 10 July, 1666. Shortly after, he departed the city under threat of expulsion, as Tanto had done, but returned at the beginning of September, whereupon Superintendent Hanneken took a clear public stance against him in a sermon delivered on 10 September. From the Marienkirche pulpit, Hanneken “exhorted ... the authorities not to tolerate false teachers and infiltrators,” and urged them to defend “the pious and holy pastors” against such defamation. This preaching produced a dramatic effect among groups of citizens already mobilized by constitutional disputes: groups of craftsmen now formed “unruly mobs” to seek out Taube and his followers. On 29 September he was physically dragged out of the house of Catharina Calpin, where a meeting was presumably underway, but managed to escape unharmed. He was not so lucky during a second incident that occurred about a week later, when a group of irate guildsmen sought him out in the Lübeck environs of Schwartau, this time administering a serious physical beating. Despite his injuries, Taube

641 Peter Meinhold, “Breckling, Friedrich,” in Neue Deutsche Biographie 2 (1955), p. 566. A university-trained Lutheran pastor, Friedrich Breckling’s “radical understanding of the need for reform of the Lutheran church” was influenced, among others, by the writings of Christian Hoburg. He was dismissed from office in Flensburg after a dispute with Stephan Klotz, General Superintendent to the Danish crown, after which he fled to Amsterdam before settling in Zwolle after 1660. He was dismissed from this office in 1668, both for the disruption caused by his criticism of Lutheran church and clergy, and also for the scandal precipitated by his marriage to a “mentally disturbed” young woman. He spent the remainder of his life in Amsterdam (1672-1690) and The Hague (1690-1711).


643 In Strom’s phrasing; “Conventicles in Lübeck,” Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, p. 23.

received no sympathy from the Lübeck ministry, and departed the city under threat of further attacks on 11 October 1666.\textsuperscript{645}

Superintendent Hanneken had demonstrated notable solidarity with the guild position during the early phase of Lübeck’s constitutional unrests, which does much to explain the unprecedented community response to the ministry’s campaign against Jacob Taube. As Lübeck’s church leader, Hanneken’s concern for the expedient restoration of peace and order drove him to attempt to moderate the growing dispute between guilds and the patrician Ratscherren after 1663, and the position he assumed in his meetings with both parties is reflected in a well-intentioned essay he wrote in October 1664: “right and wrong are determined by each conscience,” the Superintendent opined, but “we are all members of one body.”\textsuperscript{646} Neither party was likely to dispute this, but Hanneken’s further admonitions betray a sympathy for the kind of appeal that characterized the burgher party’s various remonstrances to the council: “all residents (Einwohner) of this dear city,” he continued, “whether they be high or lowly, should and must consider what serves the city, and subordinate their private interests thereto.”\textsuperscript{647} Hanneken’s moderation and political caution (compared to the apocalyptic tendencies of the wartime clergy) are likewise reflected in his appeal to Lübeck’s medieval political tradition, suggesting that “laws by which this city has profited for so many hundreds of years should not be altered without exceptional need,” a stance that closely paralleled his conservative interpretation of the Peace of Westphalia.\textsuperscript{648} Meanwhile, his recommendation that both sides appoint representatives to negotiate cooperative financial management --including the collusion of a group of burghers “in whom you collectively have full trust” in civic disbursements—suggest that the

\textsuperscript{645} Strom reconstructs these attacks in detail in “Conventicles in Lübeck,” Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, pp. 23-24.


\textsuperscript{647} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{648} \textit{Ibid}. Hanneken also sided with the majority of Lübeckers and council members who preffered not to involve the Emperor in 1663-1665, noting of Brömbsen’s efforts in Vienna “such is no means of loosing the city from its debts.”
Superintendent was thoroughly appraised of the specific points of negotiation that would produce the *Kassarezeß* of 1665. Though Hanneken expressed frustration that his mediatory efforts failed — he chided both that “the negotiations of an honorable ministry have not been able to ease the matter” — the conventicle riots affirmed that enfranchised Lübeckers understood and valued their Superintendent’s support for their interpretation of urban constitutional tradition.

Though his stay in Lübeck lasted only three months, Taube had planted a nonconformist seed that his allies would continue to tend in devotional meetings and polemical writings. Following the conventicle riots, authorities (including the Superintendent) returned their attention to the more pressing constitutional business at hand, with little mention of the conventicles during late 1666 and 1667. Clearly, however, founder Tanto did not remain idle during this time, as Hanneken’s personal records for early 1668 point to a clear resurgence in conventicle activities; on 30 January, the Superintendent commented upon the irksome sacramental practices common to these gatherings, recording that “not only men but rather also female persons dispense the Holy Supper to one another on all days, as often as they assemble.” Perhaps because of the escalating dispute between magistrates and guilds, Hanneken chose a cautious approach in early 1668, instructing the pastors to proceed against the mostly-female groups by means disciplinary admonition; according to Strom, this milder option was also preferable because “the clergy did not consider Tanto as dangerous as Taube.” The response such measures garnered suggests the pastors underestimated the strength of these gatherings, as conventiclers responded to clerical admonishment with a vocal critique of

649 *Ibid.* Hanneken’s manuscript offered eight suggestions for compromise, most of which were closely reflected in the finished *Kassarezeß* of the following summer.

650 *Ibid.*: “...und da die Unterhandlung eines Ehrwürdigen Ministerii die Scahe nicht hat heben können.”


the city’s institutional church, precipitating a polemical battle that quickly motivated the city council—newly reconstituted by the signing of the Bürgerrezeß—to decisive measures against Tanto and his devotees.

Tanto launched a new phase of dispute over the conventicles when he submitted a written defense of his group’s practices to the ministry in early 1668, which he subsequently published under the title Public Confession of Several Persons in Lübeck Who Hold Communion Amongst Themselves in the Purity of the Apostolic Faith.653 Instead of waiting for a reply—Hanneken would refute this work “almost paragraph by paragraph” in the Christian Inquiry of 1669—he quickly supplemented this work by printing an array of essays by himself and by Taube.654 Since the 1530s, pastors had tended to indulge in hyperbole when warning their magistrates about the dangers posed by Anabaptists, mystics, and anyone else they deemed “fanatical”, but Hanneken may have deliberately downplayed the popularity of Lübeck’s conventicle movement when he described them as “a few small gatherings of persons, men and women” in the introduction of the Christian Inquiry.655 For their part, secular authorities may have exaggerated the number of Lübeckers devoted to these devotional practices: following the appearance of Tanto’s Public Confession in July 1668, the Lübeck council learned from one of its members (unnamed in the minutes) that at least one thousand urban dwellers were afflicted with the “poison of the Quakers.”656 With this revelation, the

653 Ibid., p. 28. Tanto’s Offentliche Bekänntniss Etlicher Persohnen in Lübeck und aller der denigen Die in reinigkeit des Apostolischen glaubens […] das H. Abendmahl auff die Vollmacht Christi / der gegenwärtig ist mit einander halten (1668) appeared without printer’s name or location, but Superintenden Hanneken suspected it was printed either by a member of the sizeable non-conformist community in Altona near Hamburg, or “probably even in Holland.”

654 Strom, “Conventicles in Lübeck,” in Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, p. 28. The Superintendent speculated that these works came to Lübeck from either Altona (home to a sizeable non-conformist community, and a known source for anti-clerical literature), or directly from the Netherlands; his refutation was the Christliche Prob der neuen Schwermery, da etliche Manns- und Weibs-Personen eigene kleine Zusammenkunffte hatte: darinn nicht allein unberuffene Männer, sondern auch Weiber das H. Abendmahl austeilen (Lübeck: Wetstein, 1669).

655 For both this description and Hanneken’s titular denunciation of Taube, see ibid., “nebst Entdeckung der Lügen und Lästerungen so Jac. Taube von Isselburg in seiner Relation ausgegossen.”

656 Minutes of the Lübeck city council (Senatsprotokolle), 28 July 1668, quoted in Strom, “Conventicles in Lübeck,” Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, p. 27.
initiative shifted to the realm of secular authority, as the magistrates moved to suppress a movement that threatened not only to spread false belief, but to exacerbate the burgher opposition’s threat to public order and established structures of authority in Lübeck.

Lübeck’s council took action against the conventicles on 28 July, 1668. After demanding that Tanto submit an immediate written retraction of his teachings—a standard practice in cases of perceived defamation—they issued magistrates and militiamen with a standing order “to break up any further conventicle meetings inside or outside the city.” They also made their support for the established ministry explicit by adopting a zero-tolerance policy toward defamation: in the first week of August, two female conventicle members—one of them Taube’s erstwhile hostess Catharina Calpin—were jailed for publicly mocking one of the city’s parish pastors as a “Pharisee” and “scribe,” thereby implying that the clergy were more concerned with the letter of the law than with the well-being of the Christian community. Tanto himself now followed the same course as Taube, departing Lübeck for Hamburg shortly after Calpin was arrested, where he was joined by some of his followers in the years prior to his death in 1673. For their part, the re-constituted council upheld the precedent of 1668 by prosecuting followers of Tanto who refused to desist from their gatherings: seven conventiclers were arrested in a household raid in 1669, following the conclusion of the Bürgerrezeß in January. We can conclude that the threat level the pastors perceived ebbed rapidly after the brief polemical battle of 1668 and the suppression of 1669; though a devoted remnant persevered under the guidance of de facto new leader Klaus Lampe, this group disbanded of its own accord when Lampe and his family converted to Catholicism in 1675. Their battle won, Hanneken and the pastors

657 Strom, “Conventicles in Lübeck,” in Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, p. 29

658 The two women derided various pastors in public as “Ihr Phariseer, ihr Schriftgelehrten,” in the last days of July or the first days of August, 1668; quoted in Strom, “Conventicles in Lübeck,” in Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, p. 27, n. 46.

659 Strom, “Conventicles in Lübeck,” in Pietismus und Neuzeit 27, p. 31. Strom concludes that the pastors found Lampe a minor threat compared to Taube and Tanto, to the extent that they did not find it necessary to campaign for his expulsion after 1669.
soon shifted their attention to the Calvinist craftsman they saw as the inevitable consequence of the new council’s efforts to stimulate growth in the manufacturing sector.

< “Tradition” and Community Consensus in Post-War Lübeck >

Church historians have stressed that Hanneken and his successors (Samuel Pomarius, who served as Superintendent from 1675 until his death in 1683, and August Pfeiffer, who took office in 1689) never rivaled the fame and prestige achieved by Hunnius, but this assessment overlooks the importance of a far more coherent Kirchenpolitik may be said to have begun with Hunnius’s recruitment, but only bore real fruit under Hanneken’s pragmatic responses to the economic, social, and political tensions of the postwar decades. Hanneken’s demonstrated commitment to lionizing Nicolas Hunnius during his career in Lübeck influenced subsequent generations of magistrates, who continued to recruit accomplished, Wittenberg-educated professors –men as like Hunnius and his student as possible— to fill the office of Superintendent. To be sure, magistrates of the post-war decades continued to act selectively in using their power to combat the religious threats identified by pastors, and their variable responses to the reform measures Hanneken preached ensured that the isolationist vision of urban community Hanneken articulated in the Theological Consideration remained unfulfilled upon his death in 1671. These differences of opinion remained a fact of life– Lübeck historian Johann Becker noted for the 1680s that “our clergy were frequently more attentive to the Lutheran Zion than was preferable to the council”—but the fact that magistrates repeatedly renewed their commitment to Orthodox church leadership in the last decades of the seventeenth century suggest that

---

660 Wolf-Dieter Hauchild’s assessment of Hanneken is typical; see Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 311: “An wissenschaftlicher Bedeutung trat er [Hanneken] an seinem Vorgänger [Hunnius] weit zurück, aber er verstand es aufgrund seines besseren praktisch-kirchenpolitischen Geschicks ... die unter Hunnius eingetretene Konfrontation zwischen Ministerum und Rat abzubauen.”

661 Samuel Pomarius (1624-1683) succeeded Hanneken in 1675 (the same year Spenerian Pietism took root in the city) while the pastors’s vocal response to Louis XIV’s revocation of the Edict of Nantes probably contributed to the council’s decision to recruit experienced polemicist August Pfeiffer (1640-1699) in 1688-89.
in Hanneken’s time, Lübeck’s rulers valued a disciplined and cohesive pastoral estate far more highly than had their predecessors prior to the Defenestration of Prague.662

Lübeck guildsmen –the core constituency of the late-medieval urban social order – adopted an unmistakably confessional position when they answered their Superintendent’s call to “defend the church” from the pious conventicles proliferating during Lübeck’s constitutional crisis. By using physical violence to drive Jacob Taube from Lübeck in 1666, enfranchised burghers articulated their dissatisfaction with a religious threat to the urban community in the same way they targeted patrician privilege during the Easter riots of 1665. It is therefore not coincidental that the magistrates introduced heretofore unknown policing measures – e.g. the visitation of homes and arrest of conventicles— during a time when they had also been pushed to make major compromises in constitutional politics. Popular violence once again became a rarity following the new constitutional settlement of 1669, but the fragile peace that emerged must also be understood as the outcome of a joint campaign of pastors, burghers and magistrates against perceived threats to their city’s religious traditions. This consensus laid the foundation for the public, orthodox Lutheran profile that re-made Lübeck into a Lutheran cultural capital in the time of Dietrich Buxtehude. Most conspicuous in church music and material culture, this development also constituted a collective affirmation of the clergy’s authority in community religious life, and of the urban estates’ shared loyalty to the Lutheran church they had inherited from the original Reformation of the 1530s.

Because the religious conflicts of the immediate post-war decades were infrequent, variable in type, and mobilized fewer middling Lübeckers to action relative to constitutional unrests, these prove difficult to reconcile with scholarship that tends to depict the post-war decades as either a “Silver Age” of Lutheran Orthodoxy, or as an embryonic period for the Pietisms that flourished under the leadership of Philip Jacob

Spener (1635-1705) and August Hermann Francke (1663-1727). What is clear for Lübeck is that between the spiritualist critique of Christian Hoburg in the 1650s and the conventicle movement of the 1660s, the struggle against teaching and practice unsanctioned by the institutional church broadened dramatically, involving pastors, magistrates, and regular burghers in the ongoing dispute over the correct forms of Lutheran religious devotion. As the political rift between magistrates and citizens reached its nadir in the mid-1660s, the outwardly “Lutheran” character of religious life in Lübeck proved to be a rare point upon which the urban estates could all agree regarding the demands of urban tradition. However limited in its implications for “reform of life” on the model envisioned by Luther, the new consensus of the 1660s set the stage for unprecedented social and religious cooperation between the urban estates after the 1669 Bürgerrezeß ameliorated the worst of the tensions dividing Lübeckers. In outward and visible terms, at least, the period after 1670 formed Lübeck’s confessional “Golden Age,” as magistrates and burghers expanded their support for public expressions of their “traditional” Lutheran confessionality in order to buttress their shared political and economic convictions in the changed world of the late seventeenth century.
Chapter Five

“A Grand Seat of the Pure Teaching”: Economic Re-orientation and Civic Lutheranism, 1670-1700

In the autumn of 1687, an extraordinary event took place in Lübeck. On 25 October, a journeyman blacksmith from eastern Prussia named Peter Günther was executed for blasphemy and atheism on the orders of the city council. The execution was noteworthy not for its gruesome public nature –this was typical of early-modern punishments-- but because this was the first execution for religious error in Lübeck in nearly three centuries. A brief witch-hunt had killed one person in the vicinity in 1637, but convicted witches were assumed to have consorted with the devil himself, and were therefore distinct from willful heretics who denied God’s divinity; in Lübeck, no-one had been put to death for the latter crime since an Inquisition trial had condemned an unrepentant Beghard in 1402.\(^{663}\) The exceptional nature of this event has made Günther’s case one of the most famous in the city’s history, and it has been thoroughly re-constructed by modern scholars of the Lübeck Law Code, or Lübisches Recht.\(^{664}\) According to Gustav Radbruch, Günther’s troubles began during an argument at the blacksmith’s Krugtag, a monthly convivial meeting held on Sunday, 13 February, in the course of which he repeatedly denied the divinity and sinlessness of Christ.\(^{665}\) It was still early in the evening when the conversation turned to religious matters, and when a fellow journeyman stressed Christ’s status of “Son of God,” Günther allegedly retorted: “If we imitate him, then we are all God’s sons. On the other hand Christ is also a sinful man (Mensch), no different than all of us.”\(^{666}\) The blacksmith then cited the youthful Jesus’s disobedience to his parents (Luke 2:44-50) as proof of Christ’s sin. When

\(^{663}\) Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 324. Begaheis (also called Beguines) were lay monastics associated with the Albigensian heresy. Hauschild notes that Günther was a Schlossergeselle, i.e. “joiner” or even “locksmith”; ibid., p. 323.

\(^{664}\) Cf. Gustav Radbruch, Peter Günther der Gotteslästerer: Ein Lübecker Kulturbild aus dem Jahrhundert der Orthodoxie (Lübeck: Schmidt, 1911) and “Peter Günther – Narr und Held,” in Elegantia Juris Criminalis, 2nd ed. (1950); 130-140.

\(^{665}\) Radbruch, Peter Günther, p. 5.

\(^{666}\) Quoted in Radbruch, Peter Günther, p. 6.
several of Günther’s fellow guildsmen pressed him to explain how he “had now become so inconstant in his faith,” Günther responded that he no longer believed in the confession of faith that had accompanied his (Lutheran) baptism. By late evening, Günther’s persistence in such talk brought him to drunken blows with a fellow artisan; he was denounced to the city council the following day, and arrested three days later.

The need to punish Peter Günther placed the city council in an awkward position during the months between his arrest and his execution in October. Neither magistrates nor pastors had been accustomed to seek such extreme punishments for errors of belief, but such a blunt and insistent act of blasphemy had not occurred in Lübeck for generations. Worse, Günther was reputed to be a pious man: he attended church regularly and was devoted to both the Bible and the edificatory works of Johann Arndt. Bürgermeister Heinrich Kerkring, along with many of the Ratsherren, desired to resolve the matter by quietly expelling Günther from the city, but this was complicated both by the blacksmith’s vocal adherence to his error while in jail, and by evidence that Günther held non-conformist views regarding the clergy, had demonstrated a predilection for disruptive behavior in other cities, and also had connections to Lübeck’s growing Pietist community. In the end, however, the blacksmith’s adherence to what the pastors termed “spiritualist” errors accounts for the harsh line adopted against him by the urban authorities.

In a series of interviews with Lucas Stein and other parish pastors, the incarcerated Günther persistently denied of Christ’s divinity – insisting on one occasion that “he [Christ] was not God, rather only a

667 Radbruch, Peter Günther, p. 6.
668 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 323.
669 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 324. Mystical leader Johann Wilhelm Petersen (1649-1727) came to visit him in jail shortly after his arrest, whereupon he “convinced himself of [Günther’s] innocence” and interceded with the council on his behalf. The son of a Lübeck chancellery clerk, Petersen was a veteran of Spener’s Frankfurt circle who returned to his home city in 1675, the same year his Spener published the Pia desideria. However, Petersen’s faith in Günther contrasted with the picture communicated to the council by members of the ministry. At Günther’s trial in 1687, interim Superintendent Johann Stein revealed that the Lutheran ministry in Wismar had written to him prior to Günther’s arrival, in order to warn the Lübeck pastors that the journeyman had revealed a predilection for disruptive public moralizing during a yearlong stay in Wismar.
simple man”—and supplemented his blasphemy with various mystical elaborations involving flames, lights and fires; for example, he argued to one senior pastor Christ could “prove his divinity by this; namely, when I receive communion, a blaze of flaming light bursts from my throat.” When his would-be confessors warned him he would surely be damned if he refused to recant, Günther cursed them for willful blindness toward mystical revelation, retorting, “let Him damn me then ... neither angel nor man shall turn me from my belief.” The pastors persisted in their attempts to reconcile Günther until he was brought to trial in August, but the blacksmith’s strange behavior meant that both they and the authorities they consulted felt their hands to be tied in matters of clemency. The legal and theological opinions the Lübeck ministry secured from Kiel and Wittenberg showed that the professors were similarly conflicted about how to punish Günther. While both faculties confirmed the propriety of the death penalty for blasphemy, they urged caution in its application; significantly, the Wittenberg professors stressed that execution should be prescribed “only in the case of obdurate blasphemy [and] for the purpose of exemplary deterrence.” Unfortunately for Günther, his repeated rebuffs of the clergy fulfilled both requirements, and he was beheaded with the sword on 25 October.

Like the circumstances of Peter Günther’s execution, the public maturation of Lutheran identity in Lübeck demands that we reject antitheses of “clerical” and “secular” response to crisis in seventeenth-century Protestant cities. In contrast to the influential “social disciplining” thesis, moreover, or studies that interpret the rise of German Pietism as a rationalizing alternative to a stagnated confessional “Orthodoxy,”

---

670 Quoted in Radbruch, Peter Günther, p. 10: ‘Er ist nicht Gott, sondern nur ein bloßer Mensch gewesen; ist er aber Gott so beweise er seine Gottheit, so daß ich das Abendmahl genieße, mir die Flamme lichter Lohe zum Halse ausschlage.” Günther often spoke of “flames, lights, and fire” in his talks with the pastors.

671 Peter Günther quoted in Radbruch, Peter Günther, p. 10: “Verflucht sind alle, die an ihn glauben, o ihr Lutheraner, Gott hat seinen Arm unter euch offenbaret, aber wer siehet ihn? ...So laß er mich denn verdammten ... Ich will doch nicht an ihn glauben, was bemühet man sich so sehr? Weder Engel noch Menschen sollen mich von meiner Meinung abwenden.”

672 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 324.
seeking “civic” manifestations of confessional identity enables us to transcend the binary perspectives through which previous scholarship has tended to explain early-modern social change. “Civic Lutheranism” as it developed in Lübeck was not primarily a struggle between the legacy of medieval sacral community and the first “modern” forms of socialization. In the long run, this was a public collaborative process, in which spiritual and religious authorities appropriated community traditions to finally reach an agreement with their parishioners qua citizens on the unresolved question of what it meant, in concrete social terms, to be Lutheran Imperial city between the Peace of Westphalia (1648) and the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Günther’s execution underscores that the goal of these efforts was not tolerance of dissent, but new stability for a society badly shaken by a century of overlapping crises. Eighteenth-century pastors would condemn the “strictness” of the confessional commitment that led to Günther’s execution, but in the crucial decades of Lübeck’s recovery, the obdurate nature of his heresy meant that too much was at stake for pastors and magistrates to consider an exceptional act of clemency. By the time of Günther’s ill-fated critique in 1687, the public face of Lübeck’s church life had become the capstone of a shared effort to finally forge a communal religious identity that could be used to unite and discipline all Lübeckers in the interests of economic prosperity and lasting autonomy. Though fictive antagonisms between acceptable urban “traditions” and unwelcome “innovations” were instrumental to its creation, civic Lutheranism was in essence a constructive process.

I. Lutheran Guilds and Reformed Weavers: Urban Tradition and Economic Innovation, 1670-1700

As the city council and guilds debated a new constitutional settlement in the second half of the 1660s, city syndic Dr. David Gloxin (1597-1671) wrote letters and paid visits to Lübeck’s commercial partners
in an attempt to convene a new *Hansetag* (Hanseatic Diet) for 1668.\(^{673}\) The cities and towns of the Northern Empire that had escaped the spreading jurisdiction of Sweden, Brandenburg, and other emerging power brokers of the Thirty Years’ War were finally galvanized to action by the destruction of the London Steelyard – one of the few Hansa-affiliated outposts remaining in England—in the Great London Fire of 1666.\(^{674}\) Despite the efforts of Gloxin and other Hanseatic diplomats, however, the revived Diets of 1668 and 1669 proved abject failures, even by the standards of the Hansa’s sixteenth-century decline: only five towns sent delegates to the *Hansetag* called for the summer of 1668, which prompted the official rump Hansa of Hamburg, Bremen and Lübeck to postpone the meeting, and to threaten absentee allies like Riga and Wismar with automatic exclusion from the League if they failed to send representatives the following year. Many of those cities did ignore the summons to re-convene in Lübeck in 1669, though the Wismar council took the trouble to explain that the privileges granted by their Swedish overlords were more advantageous than anything the Hansa could furnish; the League, they wrote, was now “more a shadow than a reality, and there was no hope of restoring it to its former prosperity.”\(^{675}\) Unsurprisingly, the final *Hansetag* of July 1669 marshaled only nine towns including Hamburg, Bremen, and the erstwhile Hanseatic “queen” herself, a circumstance that permitted city councils and merchants to entertain no illusions about the organization’s continued viability.\(^{676}\) These cities continued to cling to their few remaining privileges abroad, but even the

\(^{673}\) The post of “syndic,” or Lübeck’s leading diplomat, was an invention of the late-medieval Hanseatic period that the Lübeck council retained after the League voted its own disbandment in 1630. Like many of his predecessors, Gloxin was not a native-born citizen, but was recruited by the city on the grounds of his education and diplomatic connections. Gloxin represented Lübeck at the Peace Congress in Osnabrück from 1645-48, and oversaw the Lübeck council’s first post-war attempts to revive the league in the 1650s. Gloxin joined the council after being awarded the office of *Bürgermeister* in 1666, serving until his death in 1671; see “David Gloxin, Dr. jur.”, in Fehling (ed.), *Lübeckische Ratlinie*, pp. 128-129.


\(^{675}\) Quoted in Dollinger, *German Hansa*, p. 368.

\(^{676}\) On the final *Hansetag* of 1669 and its inability to produce a single “positive result” in the course of eighteen sessions, see Dollinger, *German Hansa*, pp. 367-369.
most traditionally-minded of Lübeck's merchants had to acknowledge that their accustomed practice using diplomacy to secure monopoly trading rights was no longer a viable guiding policy. Fortunately, the new constitutional settlement had dramatically affirmed the city's mercantile legacy by guaranteeing that merchants and jurists would form the majority of the council after 1669, to the cost of the patrician families who had borne the brunt of the burgher unrests of the 1660s. With few mercantile allies on which to rely, this re-constituted council now sought to chart a middle way between the dictates of urban tradition and needs of economic survival in order to address the competition facing the city from English piracy, Dutch shipping, and her erstwhile ally, Hamburg.

< Mercantile Politics Resurgent: The City Council after 1669 >

The new constitutional settlement of 1669 empowered the city's merchants and guildsmen by undercutting the oligarchic tendencies of the city's most elite constitutional corporations. Sonja Dünnebeil's study of the Lübeck Zirkel-Gesellschaft suggests that two patrician-dominated constitutional “councils” (Kollegien) --the “Society of the Circle” founded in the early fifteenth century, and the Kaufleute-Kompagnie to which patricians flocked after the Zirkelbrüder were temporarily disbanded by Bürgermeister Jürgen Wullenwever (c. 1492-1537)— played a decisive role in perpetuating the “oligarchic tendencies” that incited repeated violent resistance from citizens in the seventeenth century. While Zirkel-Gesellschaft members

---

677 For example, the Lübeck council invoked its status as “Hanseatic director” when it issued a new charter for the Hanseatic trading house (Kontor) at Bergen in May of 1672. See Chronologisches Verzeichniß aller seit 1655 bis 1816 einschließlich hieselbst erschienenen öffentlichen Verordnungen und Bekanntmachungen (Lübeck: J. H. Borcher, 1818), p. 7: “1672. 22 May. Renovirt und verbesserte Ordnung des Hansischen Conthors zu Bergen in Norwegen, wie diselbe von den drey Ehrbaren Städten, Lübeck, Bremen und Hamburg auf Anhalten der sämmtlichen Bergenfahrer einhellig beliebt.”

678 Dollinger, German Hansa, p. 368. In addition to the official rump Hansa of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen, Rostock, Danzig, Brunswick, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, and Cologne answered the call to a Hansetag in Lübeck in 1669.

accounted for only twenty-three of the one hundred individuals who held office on the city council between 1580 and 1669, they enjoyed massive influence relative to their overall numbers: the number of Lübeckers who possessed sufficient wealth and lineage to be eligible for membership in the city’s most exclusive corporation rarely totaled more than twenty (and never more than twenty-five) at any time between 1580 and 1700. 680 Dietrich von Brömbsen exemplifies the close linkage between society membership and social-political elitism suggested in this statistic, as he had been a Zirkel-Gesellschaft member for over two decades by the time irate guildsmen invaded his estate in 1665. 681 However, while the burgher opposition won a clear victory for their vision of urban politics when they forced the council to terms in the Kassarezeß and Bürgerrezeß, the influence retained by the urban patriciate vis-à-vis the far more populous merchant and craft corporations does much to explain the mix of innovation and traditionalism that characterized the “new” council’s initiatives in economic and religious life after 1670.

The dominating presence Lübeck patricians had gained on the city council by the mid-seventeenth century encouraged guild leaders to take a hard line against them during the negotiations of 1668-69. Though mortality and political exile had whittled council membership down to fourteen men by the time the Imperial commissioners arrived in Lübeck in 1668 (from a previous average of twenty-two to twenty-four members), nine of the acting Ratsherren were members of either the Zirkel- or Kaufleute corporations. 682 The new settlement enacted on 9 January, 1669 (under the watchful eyes of delegates sent by Friedrich Wilhelm of Brandenburg and Ferdinand Albrecht I of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel) vindicated the guild’s prejudice constitutional conflicts of the 1660s. Tellingly, the Zirkel-Gesellschaft was also known by the more overtly aristocratic designation of Juncker-Compagnie; cf. Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 392.

680 Dünnebeil, Zirkel-Gesellschaft, pp. 144-145.

681 Bürgermeister Gottschalk Kirchrin, a patrician who condemned the burgher’s violent protests in his chronicle of 1678 (see introduction) became a member of the Zirkel-Gesellschaft in 1669; see “Gotthard [Gottschalk] Kerkring,” in Fehling (ed.), Lübeckische Ratslinie, p. 131.

against both organizations by reducing both the total number of council offices, as well as those available to members of the patrician Kollegien; of the sixteen offices that would make up the re-constituted council, only three could be filled by members of the Zirkel or Kaufleute associations. Incumbent councilors were now obliged to maintain eight seats on the council with candidates belonging to the long-distance trading corporations and leading craft guilds, with a final two permanently reserved for members of the urban legal fraternity. The Zirkel and Kaufleute organizations collectively retained one vote each among the “citizen councils” (Bürger-Kollegien), but the new settlement ensured they would be overshadowed in matters of consultation by the combined voice of the city’s ten merchant and craft corporations (e.g. Schonenfahrer- and Bergenfahrer-Kollegien, Krämer, and Brauer), each of whom held an equivalent vote in finance, warfare, and other newly-required points of consultation. Unsurprisingly, members of both patrician associations initially refused to approve of such disadvantageous terms, and sought redress by appealing directly to the Imperial court, where Emperor Leopold agreed to renew the Zirkel-Gesellschaft privileges in January of 1670. In exchange, however, he demanded that both patrician councils adhere to the compromise brokered by his

683 Dünnebeil, Zirkel-Gesellschaft, p. 145. On the tendency of the Imperial commissioners Otto von Grote (delegate of the Elector of Brandenburg) and Dr. Joachim Friedrich Söhlen (representing the Duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel) to sympathize with the burgher opposition against the council in the negotiations of 1668-69, see Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, p. 161-162.

684 Dünnebeil, Zirkel-Gesellschaft, p. 145.

685 Ten of the twelve Bürger-Kollegien affirmed in the settlement of 1669 were “kommerzierende Zünfte” (merchant guilds) and craft guilds who had collectively formed the burgher opposition of the 1660s. One vote (of twelve) was promised to each of the Schonenfahrer-, Bergenfahrer-, Stockholmfahrer-, Novgorodfahrer- and Rigafahrer-Kollegien, to each of the Krämer, Schiffer, and Brauer guilds, and to a final Kollegium representing the amalgamated Schmiede, Schneider, Bäcker, and Schuster; see Dünnebeil, Zirkel-Gesellschaft, p. 145. See Asch, Rat und Bürgerschaft, pp. 170-171 for a full analysis of the points upon which the re-constituted council was required to seek majority consent from Bürgerkollegien, or citizen councils.
commissioners in Lübeck. After much delay, both formally acknowledged the new settlement in early July of 1672.686

Historians of Lübeck have long agreed upon the fundamentally conservative and traditional nature of the Lübeck Bürgerrezeß of 1669. The social and religious history of the new constitutional settlement gives no cause to dispute Antjekathrin Graßmann’s summation “that the Rezeß adhered fundamentally to the legal conditions inherited from the middle ages, and did not constitute a wholly ‘new constitution’.687 Of the various privileges the council retained, its customary “right to self-perpetuation,” according to which only the incumbent Ratsherren participated in the election of new council members, is particularly telling regarding the settlement’s conservative quality. In contrast to the internal upheavals of the early fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, moreover, the process of constitutional reform after the Thirty Years’ War never dissolved or exiled the council en masse, but rather sought to re-draw the lines of representation in keeping with the mercantile-craft foundations of citizenship inherited from the High Middle Ages.688 This deliberately conservative, even anachronistic approach to the challenges of urban self-government after the Thirty Years’ War meant that wealthy, well-born members of the urban patriciate retained significant personal influence

686 Dünnebeil, Zirkel-Gesellschaft, p. 145. On 5 July 1672, Newly-elected Ratsherr Thomas Heinrich von Wickede signed the Bürgerrezeß in the name of the Zirkel-Gesellschaft, while veteran council member Matthias Rodde did the same on behalf of the Kaufleute-Kompagnie.


688 Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 888. Political and physical displacement of the existing city council was a feature common to both the citizen unrest of 1408 (which culminated in the election of a “Neues Rat,” or entirely complement of city councils and mayors), and of the radical reforms promoted by Wullenwever in 1531; the citizen backlash against Wullenwever culminated in the so-called “purging” (Säuberung) of the council between January and March of 1534.
in the city’s politics, due to their very high ratio of representation compared to the other burgher associations empowered to furnish *Ratsherren*.689

*< Monopoly or Market? Tradition and Innovation in Commerce >*

Immediately following the *Bürgerrezeß*, the re-constituted council undertook a variety of initiatives designed to strengthen Lübeck’s domestic guild economy and mercantile interests abroad. Beginning in late 1669, the *Ratsherren* issued a spate of protectionist legislation favoring Lübeck’s craftsmen and citizen merchants. For example, brewers—the craft fraternity that had embodied guild volatility during the internal unrests of the 1650s and 1660s—received not only a renewed civic charter (*Brau-Ordnung*) in 1669, but also new quality-control assurances that privileged their product vis-à-vis competing brews and malts from abroad. Licensed beer vendors (*Krüge*) (including those that supplied beer rations to ships in the city’s harbor) were required to accept “bad beer” that failed the *Probe* or assessment “at a low price” only, and were likewise prevented from circumventing inspection: in 1672, the council commanded *Krüge* of all types “that [they] shall accept no beer apart from the *Probe*, at the loss of the publican’s privilege.”690 Craftsmen of all trades benefitted from the concurrent “Mandate against the unskilled laborers (*Böhnhasen, Pfuscher*) and their work” issued in May 1672, a precept guildsmen embraced with such alacrity that the council instructed the city’s port authority (the *Wetteherren*) “not to permit the pursuit (*Jagen*) of *Böhnhasen* by the craft corporations” the following year.691 The sheer frequency of these ordinances (the council issued eleven

689 *Dünnebeil, Zirkel-Gesellschaft*, p. 145.

690 *Chronologisches Verzeichniß*, pp. 6-7, “1671. 17 Febr. Brau-Ordnung,” and 1672. 1. Aug. Decreta, daß die Krüge, bey Verlust der Kruggerechtigkeit, kein Bier anders als von der Probe nehmen sollen.” This compendium was published anonymously (in the foreword the author identifies himself only as “der Verfasser”) in 1818, but relies in many points upon a previous work by Johann Carl Heinrich Dreyer, entitled *Einleitung zur Kenntnis der in Geist-Bürgerlichen, Gerichts-, Handlungs-, Policey- und Kammer-Sachen von E. Hochw. Rath der Reichsstadt Lübeck* (Lübeck: C.G. Donatius, 1769).

mandates on brewing alone between 1669 and 1680) suggests that enforcement was uneven, but the
magistracy’s protectionist stance toward the city’s brewers represented a reversal of the exploitative
patrician politics of the preceding decades. ⁶⁹²

Efforts to offset Lübeck’s commercial decline in the northern seas blended medieval practice with
necessary innovation in a matter similar to the constitutional settlements of the 1660s. Of Lübeck’s
merchants, “Spanish Collective” leaders proved the most innovative when confronting the slow dissolution of
the Hanseatic League. In 1639, the body of merchants invested in the Iberian trade (Spanische Kollekten or
Spanienfahrer) suggested that the council establish a maritime court for the city’s merchants and sailors,
modeled on the Admiralty College of Hamburg, in order to heighten efficiency, control costs, and address the
growing threat of piracy in both the Atlantic and Mediterranean. ⁶⁹³ Although the merchants, ship-owners and
legal specialists who owed their livelihood to long-distance trade gained other concessions in the coming
decades, the general “commercial college” (Commerzkollegium) only began operations in the spring of 1672,
after the Bürgerrezeß gave the merchant elite a fresh voice on the council. ⁶⁹⁴ Spanienfahrer elder Thomas
Fredenhagen (1627-1709) emerged as the city’s most dynamic mercantile leader in this period, going so far
as to urge abandoning Hanseatic vestiges completely in favor of market-driven commercial policies favored
by the Hamburgers, the English and the Dutch. In 1681, for example, he advised the council “that the course
of commerce no longer allows itself to be reckoned according to the old precepts and laws, but rather must

⁶⁹² Dreyer, Einleitung, pp.501-502. The author notes the limitations of council legislation concerning Lübeck’s Brauwesen
on the latter page: “In diesem Jahre [1576] ward eine Brau-Ordnung aus den bisherigen Ordnungen und Decreten i 40
Artikeln entworfen, es aber, daß es bey dem Entwurf geblieben, und derselbe die Kraft eines geltenden Gesetzes nicht
erhalten habe.”

⁶⁹³ Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 474. Specifically, the elders of the Spanienfahrer proposed that this organ
have powers to regulating transport charges, decide upon compensation for losses, and regulate the widespread
practice of “bottomry,” (Bodmerei), a practice in which shipowners raised capital for voyages by borrowing against the
value of the vessel itself. On the German cities’ growing losses of ships, cargo, and manpower to English and North
African pirates by the mid-seventeenth century, see Dollinger, German Hansa, pp. 346-347.

⁶⁹⁴ Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 474-475.
conform to the times, circumstances, and the conventions of other locales.”

As Lübeck’s youngest merchant corporation, the Spanish Collective proved more receptive to change than older Kompagnien like the Schonenfahrer; Fredenhagen’s leadership expanded the Collective into the city’s most profitable commercial concern in the 1680s, but factionalism between Hanseatic and new-style orientations moved elders to divide into two branches in 1697. While men like Fredenhagen successfully asserted themselves in both the traditional carrying trade and new Atlantic markets after 1669, persistent divisions over mercantile innovations ultimately prevented Lübeck from fully co-opting the example set by Hamburg.

The growing dominance of the Atlantic economy from the sixteenth century ensured Lübeck’s gradual eclipse at the hands of North Sea ports like Hamburg and Bremen. In the short run, however, the demands of competition ensured that at least one of Lübeck’s medieval monopolies remained inviolate in the face of the commercial innovations spearheaded by merchant leaders like Fredenhagen. In 1607, the council had renewed an antiquated law that prohibited shipping traffic from using the city’s major canal (the Stecknitz, connecting the city’s Baltic port of Travemünde to the Elbe at Lauenburg) unless Lübeck merchants were involved in buying, selling, or physically transporting the cargoes in question. Hamburg merchants, who used the canal to avoid the onerous tolls levied by the Danish crown in the Oresund near Copenhagen, challenged Lübeck’s right to monopoly control multiple times during and after the Thirty Years’ War, but without success; they remained the greatest contributors to Lübeck’s toll incomes. Although the council maintained its monopoly on the Stecknitz until 1728, internal divisions among merchant companies

---

695 “Unvorgreiflichen Gedanken und Meinung worin die fürnemste Interesse dieser Stadt Lübeck itzige Zeit für die gegenwärtige nahrung der Stadt,” quoted in Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 475.

696 Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 475.

697 Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 474. The council maintained this policy until 1728.

698 Graßmann, p. 474. Hamburg filed suit against Lübeck at the Imperial Chamber Court in 1620, without resolution; the matter was re-opened in 1660, and again produced no lasting resolution. Graßmann notes that Lübeck “sharpened its control measures” over the canal in 1672, the same year the council gave initial approval to the Commerzkollegium.
persisted, as established corporations like the *Schonenfahrer* continued to favor traditional protectionist policies of this type, at the expense of the innovations urged by market-oriented newcomers like the Spanish Collective leaders. This upper-echelon clash in commercial vision was but one source of the council’s inability to decide how to re-shape the urban economy in the decades following the *Bürgerrezeß*. The second obstruction to economic change was the city’s guilds, whose members had forced the old council to compromise through the perennial threat of urban unrest, and could thus be counted upon to enforce their traditional vision of burgher identity in both its social-economic and religious implications.

Regulating Lübeck’s commerce to the advantage of the guilds became a political necessity after 1670, as the council sought to offset its losses in the Baltic with new integration into the Atlantic and North Sea economies. In addition to measures designed to preserve the city’s advantage in the carrying trade between the Baltic and the North Sea, the city council promoted domestic growth by offering favorable terms to craftsmen and merchants specializing in weaving and spinning, an industrial sphere underrepresented among Lübeck’s guilds. On 30 June 1670, the council issued an international declaration (colloquially known as the “*Notifikation*”), in which it invited weavers, spinners, dyers, and cloth merchants to take advantage of the favorable market conditions in Lübeck. Authored by council secretary Arnold Isselhort (1635-1695) and circulated in print in the Dutch Republic and northern provinces of France, this document promised that “those select craftsmen, who could effect and create something in silk, wool, linen and hair, to the well-being and good of commerce, in whichever style and mode, would find, if they will desire and seek it, [that] they shalt, in the same manner as stated above of merchants, occupy good and comfortable lodgings, at

---

sufferable rates, and also other desirable good circumstances of shop and factory." Meanwhile, an accompanying decree assured the Lübeck guildsmen that the “foreign merchants, manufacturers and crafts admitted here” were invited “for promotion of commerce, against an annual security (Schutzgeld),” and were not intended to become permanent residents. Subsequent ordinances indicate that this advertisement enjoyed a certain success, though not without accompanying tensions: in early May 1675, for example, the council forbade “illegal sales on the part of foreign merchants and trades in their own residences,” while in late 1677, they had to dispatch the Quartierherren (parish constables) to collect the annual security monies (Schutzgeld) from “the foreigners who maintain fire and hearth here.” In contrast to their treatment of unlicensed competitors derided as Böhnhasen or “bumblers,” Lübeck’s guildsmen seem to have met an influx of non-incorporated textile workers with equanimity, not least because their aggregate numbers remained small. However, even a moderate increase in the population of Dutch and Huguenot weavers and merchants revived long-standing fears of Reformed influence in Lübeck, particularly after Louis XIV of France removed royal protection from his Huguenot subjects by revoking the Edict of Nantes in late 1685. By the

---


701 Chronologisches Verzeichnis, p. 6: “1670. 30 July. Patent wegen der, zur Beförderung des Handels gegen ein jährliches Schutzgeld, hieselbst zuzulassenden fremden Kaufleute, Manufacturisten und handwerder, so wie auch der denselben zugestandenen Freiheiten.”

702 Chronologisches Verzeichnis, p. 10: “1675. 5 May. Verordnung wegen des unstatthaften Verkaufs von seiten fremder Kaufleute und Krämer, in ihren Wohnung, so wie auch wegen der mit Waaren hausirenden Leute” and p. 12: “677. 16 Nov. Verordnung für die herren der Quartiere, daß die Fremden, welche allhier Feuer und Rauch halten, Schutzgeld geben sollen.”

703 Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 473. This initiative was not entirely new in 1670; the council had made a similar efforts in the years immediately following the war, issuing eight “concessions” (Konzessionen) licensing textile production and trade between 1650 and 1665. Between the “Notifikation” of July 1670 and the year 1700, they issued forty-nine such concessions, which represents an aggregate decline (2%) in new licenses per year over the immediate post-war decades.
beginning of 1688, the council had begun to demand that “the foreign weavers” who sought refuge in Lübeck furnish a written declaration of loyalty in exchange for the right to practice their craft in the city. Only small number of refugee Huguenots settled in Lübeck in the last decades of the seventeenth century, as the confessional policing enforced by magistrates and pastors encouraged most Reformed émigrés to seek refuge elsewhere.

< Economy and Religious Community: The Legal Parameters of Lutheran Identity >

Lübeck’s increasingly rigid legal stance towards “foreign religions” in the second half of the seventeenth century reveals an emphasis on civic tradition analogous to the sentiments that permeated the Bürgerrezeß and tempered the council’s enthusiasm for economic innovation. Magistrates, pastors, and craftsman had united to snuff out the threat posed by early pious conventicles during the 1660s, but the “Notifikation” of 1670 re-ignited the debate over the limits of toleration for Reformed practice in Lübeck. Though merchants of Reformed faith had resided peacefully in Lübeck since the council’s accord with the Estates of Holland in May 1613, the legal parameters governing Calvinist worship remained vague; like the Catholic confessors retained by a few members of the Cathedral Chapter, the city’s tiny Reformed congregation enjoyed no Kirchenordnung or formal charter, which meant members were neither permitted to hold “open” (i.e. public) services, nor were they allowed a permanent house of worship. At the time of the Bürgerrezeß, their practice of assembling in private homes depended wholly on the verbal permission the nascent community had secured from two Bürgermeister in January of 1666, who defended their concession to the rest of the council on the grounds “that monied foreigners could be drawn to Lübeck by means of such privileges.”

Despite the commercial benefit promised by increased toleration, however, the rest of the

---


705 Becker, Umständliche Geschichte III, p. 67. Mayors Henrich Kirchring and Gotthard von Höveln (a patrician later ousted by the citizen’s corporations and council) issued this permission in August of 1666, but council commissioners
Ratsherren refused any further concessions to Reformed worship in the midst of a constitutional struggle that had recently become violent.

Lübeck’s Reformed minority seized an opportunity to improve their tenuous situation when their co-religionist Friedrich Wilhelm I of Brandenburg visited Lübeck in the early summer of 1666. Led by a merchant named Claus Brun, the community appealed to the Elector for advocacy, and his subsequent letter persuaded the council to allow the Reformed to convene for worship at a fixed location, on the condition that their venue remained outside the city’s walls. Mayor Heinrich Kirchring, the most outspoken proponent of toleration, duly offered his Gartenhaus for this purpose, and the community celebrated their right to worship by recruiting a pastor from the University of Leiden, who took up his office that same August. This tenuous arrangement collapsed almost immediately following the Bürgerrezeß, as the reconstituted council turned against the congregation a mere month after the Imperial Commissioners left Lübeck. The new controls the council instituted on Reformed worship set a repressive precedent for the next generation of pastors and magistrates, whose efforts guaranteed Lübeck’s reputation as an unattractive destination for Reformed refugees.

Incited by the ostentatious behavior of certain well-to-do Reformed merchants – particularly their practice of bringing their household servants to Sunday worship— a majority of Ratsherren voted to curtail the community’s privileges in the early months of 1669. With the ousting of the patrician Gotthard von Höveln, only Kirchring remained in favor of toleration, and he was overruled as the council forbade formal Reformed assembly in late February, deploying soldiers to prevent the community from convening on the

Conrad Schinkel and Matthias Bornefeld subsequently denied the Reformed congregation’s request for “a written council declaration” permitting them formal worship.


last Sunday of the month. They repeated this order on 18 April, ordering the city-gate watchmen to prevent
the egress of known Calvinists to their meeting place, and sending guards to arrest pastor Wilhelm Momma if
he persisted in leading services. Thus beset, the Reformed appealed once more to their royal patron, but
the Elector’s subsequent demands for tolerance in Lübeck produced decidedly mixed results. Though the
council lifted the ban on private meetings by the Reformed in late spring of 1669, this ensured that the
Lutheran clergy responded to the appearance of the “Notifikation” in 1670 with a renewed polemical fervor,
encapsulated by Superintendent Hanneken in the *Theological Consideration* of 1671. In the meantime,
Friedrich Wilhelm’s renewed intervention permitted anti-Reformed magistrates to rhetorically stigmatize the
group as “agents of a foreign power” during council debates over the parameters of toleration. Though
Hanneken died in February 1671, deputy Superintendent Daniel Lipstorf and senior pastor Bernhard
Krechting firmly upheld his legacy, going so far in 1671 and 1672 to threaten the magistrates and merchants
who favored toleration with the Small Ban, a disciplinary measure of temporary excommunication that
included refusing them absolution and denying them the Lord’s Supper. The magistrates were reluctant to
expel merchants and weavers outright – to do so would surely provoke the Elector – but they also wished to
avoid a repeat of the anti-Reformed discontent Burchardi had incited in 1613-14, or the riots Hanneken had
encouraged by denouncing the conventicles in 1666. They avoided these extremes by placing official limits
on Reformed expression in Lübeck: in 1673, a council majority upheld the anti-Reformed position by
permanently prohibiting the congregation from holding “formal worship” on pain of imprisonment, and
formally banned adherents of the Reformed confession from acquiring citizenship, or serving as godparents

---

708 Becker, *Umständliche Geschichte III*, pp. 70-71. In Becker’s words: “Allein den 18. April ward die Wache beordert,
keinen Reformirten aus dem Thore zu lassen, und Soldaten hinaus zu senden, um den Prediger zu arretirn [sic] wenn er

709 Hauschild’s summary in *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 327.

to citizen children. Urban clerics would continue to inveigh against the dangers of “Calvinist” contagion in subsequent decades—as did Superintendent August Pfeiffer in his aptly-titled polemical digest Anti-Calvinism (1699)—but the fact that the city council continued to bar adherents of the Reformed faith from the legal and economic advantages of citizenship until 1811 meant that these latter-day polemics lacked the urgency and localized perspective of Hanneken’s Consideration.

By the time Louis XIV rescinded royal toleration for Huguenots in 1685, Lübeck’s magistrates had come to share the clergy’s minimalist interpretation of the new status granted to the German Reformed Church in the Peace of Westphalia. The Peace granted the Reformed confession legal protection by the Emperor, but, in keeping with the cuius regio, eius religio precedent of the Peace of Augsburg, left the administration of this toleration to the discretion of territorial and urban authorities. The de facto right of worship given to Lübeck’s nascent Reformed community in 1666 has been interpreted as the opening act in a “see-saw politics” toward religious toleration, but in the immediate seventeenth-century context, the council’s policies complemented their legislative regulation of guest workers from traditionally “Calvinist” regions and professions. New commitment to economic growth dissuaded the council from expelling Reformed residents (as Hanneken and his successors desired), but several generations of city councilmen refused to extend the permissive economic stance of the Notifikation into the public religious sphere. Beginning around 1670, they actually adopted stricter policies that marked Lübeck out as a community unwelcoming to permanent Reformed immigration. Population figures for the century after 1685 underscore Lübeck’s lasting unpopularity as a refuge: Lübeck absorbed a mere 83 émigrés during the century after the Revocation, while 922 Huguenots settled in Hamburg, and 474 moved to Bremen; though population growth

711 Ibid., p. 329.

712 “Schaukelpolitik,” in Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckische Geschichte, p. 466. Graßmann concludes that the clergy’s consistent opposition to Calvinist immigration significantly influenced the council’s policy toward Lübeck’s minority Reformed community during the later seventeenth century and eighteenth centuries.
and economic prosperity undoubtedly contributed to the popularity of the latter two cities, even far-off Berlin proved a more statistically desirable destination than Lübeck. Consequently, Lübeck remained overwhelmingly Lutheran in demographic terms, as the aggregate Reformed population never accounted for more than two percent of the urban population throughout the eighteenth century. After 1670, therefore, two generations of Lübeck’s magistrates affirmed their pastors’ long-standing antagonism toward the Reformed tradition, even though it meant losing a potential stimulus to the urban economy.

II. Polemic and Patronage: The Origins of “Civic Lutheranism”

Although the new constitutional settlement promised to re-establish a traditional model of urban politics more generally palatable to the council’s burgher constituency, political compromise alone neither ameliorated the economic challenges facing the city, nor reconciled the competing political visions of patricians, merchants, and ordinary craftsmen. Each faction pursued livelihoods demanding very different solutions to the problem of economic survival in the face of structures that had changed dramatically since the city’s medieval “Golden Age.” This worrisome state of flux – exacerbated by events like the failed Hansetag of 1669, the Great Comet of 1680, and the religious plurality promised by early Pietism and the Huguenot influx from France-- moved magistrates and enfranchised burghers to perpetuate the commitment to Orthodox forms of Lutheran confessional life they had originally formulated in response to the Little Ice Age and Thirty Years’ War. The process of re-defining Lübeck as publicly and irrevocably Lutheran was neither a “top-down,” nor a “bottom-up” process, insofar as it occurred incrementally, as a series of specific collaborations among the urban estates. Lutheran church life became an essential site and mechanism for articulating Lübeck’s “traditional” urban identity because it represented the only sphere of urban life in

714 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte, p. 329, on Reformed population trends in the eighteenth century.
which magistrates, merchants, and craftsmen had been able to agree in the midst of structural and internal crisis, and it remained one of very few urban spaces (in both conceptual and physical terms) in which all three groups could participate after peace was restored to Lübeck in 1669. Ultimately, the religious consequences of crisis in a city already suffering protracted economic decline requires us to seek fresh interpretations of the “Silver Age” of Lutheran Orthodoxy in urban Germany. The much-criticized hallmarks of this period—e.g. the failure to effect lasting reform of daily life through moral policing; the conspicuously derivative qualities of church leadership; an aggressively-maintained polemical tradition—all were regarded in their own time as lesser evils in the face of more urgent objectives. This was undoubtedly the case in Lübeck after 1670, as magistrates, merchants and pastors alike seized upon community religious life in order to inject a sense of permanence and stability into a local society suffering from prolonged instability in every other sphere of its late-medieval heritage.

< Early Pietism in Lübeck >

With the encouragement of their pastors, members of the reconstituted city council proved just as hostile toward early adherents of German Pietism, an attitude stemming in part from the suspicion held by some Lutheran theologians that the renewal movement shared certain theological “errors” with the Reformed tradition. In Lübeck, such suspicions informed the frosty reception shown to native son August Hermann Francke (1663-1727), who remained permanently estranged from his home city despite the far-reaching impact of his pious vision in other Lutheran polities. Cooperation between magistrates and pastors in prosecuting perceived heresies had taken a leap forward during the Thirty Years’ War, and subsequent generations followed this strident
example in their confrontations with the lay devotional communities that took root in Lübeck in mid-century.

Jonathan Strom has added considerable depth to our knowledge of post-war mysticism and early Pietism in Lübeck by distinguishing carefully between the first conventicles of the 1660s—some of the earliest pious assemblies in the Empire—and the movement founded by Johann Wilhelm Petersen (1649-1727) in 1675.715

To Lutheran leaders like Superintendent August Pfeiffer (1640-1698), however, Spener’s thought was merely a dangerous new incarnation of the “fanatical” mysticism that had threatened the urban community for generations.

When they expelled conventicle founders Thomas Tanto and Jacob Taube from Lübeck in the 1660s, Lübeck’s magistrates, pastors, and guildsmen revealed a deep apprehension regarding all forms of devotion that divorced communal religious life from the regulated sphere of the church. The violence visited upon early conventicle meetings—irate burghers disrupted meetings and physically attacked Taube in 1666—probably owed its impetus to the constitutional dissatisfaction that was then approaching its destructive apex; at least, we have no evidence of violent responses to the proto-Pietist community founded by Petersen in the mid-1670s. The son of a Lübeck chancellery clerk, Petersen was a veteran of Spener’s Frankfurt circle who returned to his home city in 1675, the same year Spener published the *Pia desideria*.716 A decade later, Petersen’s mysticism had become considerably more radical, emphasizing both chiliast expectations and the “necessity of new revelation” as a marker of true salvation.717 Early on, however, he enjoyed two advantages in his mission to create an “assembly of the truly devout” in his home city: first, several members of the


716 Strom, “Conventicles in Lübeck,” pp. 37-42. Strom posits numerous distinctions between the two movements in Lübeck, and between the Lübeck conventiclers and proto-Pietist movements elsewhere.

717 Hauschild, *Kirchengeschichte Lübecks*, p. 320, on Petersen’s growing “chiliasm” and increased emphasis on the “necessity of new divine revelation” by 1689.
Lübeck ministry were (initially) sympathetic to the notion of encouraging pious living in the urban community, and second, his early teachings lacked the prognostications and overt anti-clericalism that had helped to make the postwar spiritualist tradition anathema to Hanneken and his pastors. Petersen nonetheless rapidly soured his welcome in his hometown when he circulated a set of verses mocking Catholic doctrines of clerical celibacy, thereby making enemies of the few remaining Catholic members of Lübeck’s Cathedral Chapter. The Domherren (allegedly aided by the Jesuit connections of their private confessors) struck back by securing an Imperial Mandate in 1676, in which Leopold ordered that the would-be founder of a Lübeck collegia pietatis be arrested for libel. He fled first to Rostock, and then to Hannover before finding refuge in the service of prince-bishop August Friedrich at the former Lübeck Hochstift in Eutin, thirty-five kilometers north of Lübeck, whence he and wife Johanna Eleonara sought to guide their followers via letters and occasional visits. Petersen’s exile ensured that membership remained limited, as the community in Lübeck remained without a trained leader. When Petersen’s disciples began to mirror his emphasis on God’s direct revelation, the movement would be drawn into conflict with the ministry led by Superintendent August Pfeiffer.

The visionary Adelheid Sibylle Schwartz had been a childhood friend of August Hermann Francke, and the two maintained a correspondence between 1687 until 1692, whereupon she emigrated to Halle after being expelled from Lübeck by the city council. It was also she who did most to ruin Francke’s chances of joining the Lübeck ministry when he returned to the city following his studies in Lüneburg and Leipzig. Shortly

---

718 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 319. Hauschild distinguished sharply between the Orthodox conception of reform ("die Reform der Großkirche durch Besserung der Unfrommen") and the mission of Spener’s collegia pietatis, represented in Lübeck by Petersen; namely "die Herausbildung der wahren Kiche innerhalb der Großkirche durch Sammlung der wahrhaft Frommen.”.

719 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, pp. 319-320, on Petersen’s career in Lübeck and Eutin.

720 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, pp. 320-321 on the visionary Adelheid Schwartz, and her leading role in the proto-Pietist community in Lübeck.
after Pfeiffer’s installation as new Superintendent (late 1689) Schwartz divulged a prophetic revelation to the conventicle, in which she predicted that divine judgment would befall the city’s clergy: “you have an appearance of truth,” she allegedly warned the pastors, “but the power (Kraft) disowns you; therefore look well, and display the godly fruits of penitence … so that they [i.e. the laity] also do not also fall into the deep pit with you, and add their accusations to your damnation.”\textsuperscript{721} When Schwartz refused pastor Balthasar Hanneken’s efforts to persuade her of her error, the ministry commenced a disciplinary offensive against Petersen’s assembly that not only secured Schwartz’s expulsion in 1692, but also embroiled the Superintendent in a public battle with the “father of Pietism” himself, after Pfeiffer denounced Spener’s model of Christian devotion in a printed volume of his catechism sermons.\textsuperscript{722} The obvious volatility of this movement persuaded the \textit{Ratsherren} to have Schwartz questioned by the city consistory in late May of 1692, during which she demonstrated little contrition and no willingness to be reconciled. The pious gathering was placed under magisterial observation.

\textsuperscript{721} Quoted in Hauschild, \textit{Kirchengeschichte Lübecks}, p. 320: “Du hast Einen Schein der Wahrheit, aber die Krafft verleugnest du; Siehe Wohl Zu, und Thue Rechtschaffene Früchte der Busse dar, das es sehen, die du geärgert hast, damit sie auch Widerkehren, und nicht sampt dir in die Tieffe Grube fallen und diene verdamnung mit ihrer anklag mehrhen.”

\textsuperscript{722} Pfeiffer’s critique of Spener appeared as a foreword to his \textit{Klugheit der Gerechten: Darinnen in acht Catechismus-Predigten, denen Eltern gezeiget wird, wie sie ihre Kinder nach den wahren Gründen des Christenthums aufferziehen sollen} (Lübeck: Widermeyer, 1693), and was sufficiently incisive to earn a public rebuttal from the “Father of Pietism” himself in 1694. In 1694 Spener’s \textit{Thorough Reply} to Pfeiffer (and another critic, Wittenberg Professor Johann Georg Neumann) specifically named “D. August Pfeiffer, Church Superintendent at Lübeck,” as one several Orthodox leaders “who has taken it upon himself to refute my \textit{Explanation}”; see Spener’s introduction “to the Christian reader” in \textit{D. Philip Jacob Spener\textquotesingle s gründliche Beantwortung dessen / was Hern D. Augustus Pfeiffer Superint. Zu Lübeck / in der vorrede seiner so genanten Klugheit der Gerechten … der hoffnung künftiger besserer zeiten entgegen zu setzen / sich unterstanden} (Frankfurt: David Zunner, 1687), pp. 1-5.
– with the embarrassing revelation that one of Superintendent Pfeiffer’s nephews was a devotee—and Schwartz was ordered to depart the city after further “fruitless” proceedings in the consistory court. 723 Meanwhile, the alarm pastors and magistrates raised regarding this new movement inflected their reception of August Hermann Francke, who returned to his birthplace in search of a pastorate in early 1690. During a stay of several months, he was allowed only two trial sermons in Lübeck’s churches, in the face of vigorous protest from the Superintendent. 724 Francke’s previous clashes with Orthodox colleagues in Lüneburg and Leipzig undoubtedly contributed to Pfeiffer’s suspicions, but the ministry’s coolness toward Francke was not wholly personal. By 1690, Lübeck’s encounter with Petersen, Schwartz, and their followers had led pastors and magistrates to extend the confessional antagonism they harbored for the Reformed to the founding fathers of eighteenth-century German Pietism.

< Pomarius, Pfeiffer, and the Local Demands of Church Leadership >

The fact that Hanneken and his successors were all visibly imprinted with the Orthodoxy of Wittenberg before they received the call to Lübeck confirms that the council deliberately perpetuated Hunnius’s brand of Lutheran Orthodoxy as a practical administrative measure; in the midst of overlapping crises, Lübeck’s magistrates could not risk a reprise of the clerical factionalism that had imprinted the decades after 1600. When the magistrates recruited Meno Hanneken to the Superintendent’s office 1644-46, they sought to perpetuate the new cohesion that the well-known theologian and polemicist Nicolaus Hunnius had brought to the Lübeck ministry during the Thirty Years’ War. The Ratsherren, who had retained the right to selected and approve candidates for the head church office since they elected Luther’s contemporary Johannes Bugenhagen (1485-1558) to the post, went to considerable trouble to secure one of

723 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 321. Adelheid Schwartz went first to Halle, where Francke “received her enthusiasm for prophecy with skepticism.” Her return to Lübeck in 1693 led to renewed friction with Pfeiffer and the pastors, which drove her to Berlin in 1697; she died in 1703.

724 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 321, on Francke’s sermons in Lübeck, and Pfeiffer’s opposition.
Hunnius’s former students following the sudden decline of the Superintendent’s health in 1642-43. They refused to dispense with this precedent following Hanneken’s twenty-five year tenure of office, and the subsequent decades saw the birth of a coherent new policy of church leadership, during which magistrates and pastors cooperated far more effectively than they had in the decades after the Lutheran Formula of Concord. With internal order finally restored, the need to revitalize the city’s commercial prospects by expanding into new markets continued to frustrate the clergy’s grand goal of re-making Lübeck into a stronghold of the Augsburg Confession, just as wartime defense had trumped Hunnius’s farthest-reaching ambitions in the 1620s and 1630s. Despite these frustrations, Lübeck’s commitment to strong clerical leadership marked a sustained victory for the Orthodox vision of religious authority, and a permanent departure from the fraught Kirchenpolitik that had plagued Lübeck for four decades after the Formula of Concord.

Samuel Baumgarten (1624-1683), better known by the Latinized surname Pomarius, was initially more interested in philosophy than polemics. Born in April 1624 in Winzig, near the Silesian capital of Breslau, his tenure of study at Wittenberg was interrupted first by paucity of funds in 1643, and again by the wartime plundering of his property near Breslau in 1645, to which he had returned after leaving the university. A stipend from the Breslau city council enabled him to resume study in 1646, whereupon he concentrated on ancient languages: the Wittenberg colleagues who eulogized him following his death in 1683 listed his specialties as “Chaldean, Syrian, and Arabic languages,” later joined by the philosophical discipline of natural science (Naturlehre) and theological dogmatics. After achieving the master’s in philosophy (Weltweisheit) in 1647, Pomarius attracted the notice of the Wittenberg theological faculty, which enabled him to pursue the doctorate by means of a stipend granted in the years immediately following

the Peace of Westphalia. This training would serve him well in Lübeck, but early works like the Treatment of the Harmony and Dissent of the Natural Body (1669) --which records a learned disputation of this subject by ten participants at the university in Wittenberg—marked him as a man of academic inclination, an impression heightened by the commentaries on the Augsburg Confession he wrote while serving as professor in Wittenberg.

Despite a paucity of polemic in Pomarius’s early corpus, his eight-year career in Lübeck was marked by the same energetic defense of the Augsburg Confession that had distinguished his predecessors. This shift in his output owed much to local expectations for church leadership, which not only required a commitment to written polemic (in the tradition of Nicolas Hunnius), but also looked to the Superintendent to offer authoritative interpretations of contemporary events to concerned parishioners. In Pomarius’s case, these events included the plethora of visible comets that appeared over Europe in the 1670s and 1680s, to the great interest of contemporaries who sought to explain them according to religious dictates, as proof of geocentric or heliocentric planetary theories, or as predominantly luminary events (as Galileo did in his 1623 treatise The Assayer (Il Saggiatore)). As newly-appointed head of the urban church, Pomarius responded to

---

726 AHL Leichenpredigten, L.XII 2362.16, excerpted in AHL Pastorenkartei, “D. Pomarius (Baumgarten), Samuel.” Written tributes by Pomarius’s colleagues confirm that he served briefly as professor in Wittenberg prior to become Superintendent.

727 Pomarius, Samuel, Tractatus De Consensu Et Dissensu Corporum Naturalium: In Celeberrima Universitate Wittenbergensi ab Eodem quondam conscriptus (Wittenberg: Hartmann, 1669). Though published in 1669, the foreward to the the ten “disputations” does not reveal the exact dates of the disputations themselves. The written tributes of Pomarius’s colleagues noted that he served as professor in Wittenberg from 1673 to 1675, prior to receiving the call to Lübeck; see AHL Leichenpredigten, L.XII 2362.16, excerpted in AHL Pastorenkartei, “D. Pomarius (Baumgarten), Samuel.” It was probably during this time that he wrote his two treatises expounding upon articles of the Augsburg Confession, published under the title Analysis and Exegesis of the Confessio Augustana; see for example Pomarius’s Analysis Et Exegesis Articuli II. Augustanae Confessionis. De Peccato Originis (Wittenberg: Wilckius, 1674), published the year before he was called to Lübeck. In 1675, he published another installment on the nature of Christ – published under the analogous title Analysis Et exegesis Articuli III. Augustanae Confessionis: De Christo (Wittenberg: Wilckius, 1675)-- but does not seem to have continued the series after leaving Wittenberg.

728 Galileo’s publication of the The Assayer (Il Saggiatore) marked the climax of his debate with the Jesuit astronomer Orazio Grassi (1583-1654), which arose from their conflicting interpretation of the three comets of 1618; see Laura
the comet of April-May 1675 with an interpretation of the former type; in fact, he chose to commemorate his new office with a sermon entitled *Sacra Semiotica, Or the Interpretation of Spiritual Signs*. This sermon reminded a distinguished office of magistrates and merchant leaders that the *Predigamt* or office of ministry—the roots of which could be found in the “prophets, wise men, and scribes” of Israel—was ordained by God to interpret His manifest will, and was thus the sole authority “through which the body of Christ might be edified.” 729

As Christian Europe struggled to make sense of the “Great Comet” of late 1680 and early 1681, the Superintendent reprised his introductory homily to inveigh against “superstitious” reactions to this particularly bright and visible phenomenon. In so doing, he sought to reinforce the clergy’s self-ascribed monopoly on the interpretation of natural events. Though the pastors remained open to millenarian interpretations—when called to preach in honor of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Formula of Concord in 1680, pastor Thomas Honstede dwelt on “these last times,” warned of divine judgment, and alluded repeatedly to the holy kingdom of Zion—the Superintendent continued to eschew prognostication in favor of a more direct homage to the Lutheran Orthodox tradition. 730

---


730 Thomas Honstedt, *Wahrer Kinder Gottes Gläubiges / Kämpffen und Fröhliches Siegen / Vorgestellt von M. Thoma Honstedt / Prediger in Lübeck* (Lübeck: Gottfried Schultze, 1680). Honstedt’s militant and millenarian vision of his own times strongly recalls the sermons and writings of urban ministry during the Thirty Years’ War; see for example his “invocation,” p. x: “Jesu Christo / dem Fürsten über das herrn und Hertzog unser seligkeit / sey hiemit dies geistliche Kreigs-Rüstung sampt allem Zeug und Zugehör gewidmet…” Cf. his address “to the Christian reader”: “Wenn wir in...
One-Hundred Year Commemoration of the Christian Book of Concord emphasized the “unity of Christian Religion” effected by the Formula since its propagation, during which time it had “preserved and kept safe” the true church “in the face of so many dangerous contagions and entanglements of all kinds of errant papist, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Socianer, Enthusiast, and Syncretic leaven (Sauerteig) and weed (Unkraut).”731 Only one of these sections was devoted wholly to refuting such errors, which Pomarius lumped together as the “enemy” (inimicum) of the Lutheran tradition; others elaborated upon the “origin” (principium), “basis” (fundamentum) and “end purpose” (scopum) of the Formula.732 Collectively, the various proofs the Superintendent offered for his taxonomy of “Evangelical Concord” constituted an unmistakable affirmation of his predecessor’s disdain for irenicist interpretations of the Peace of Westphalia.

The fervor with which the council had pursued Hanneken for church leadership ebbed somewhat as the twin crisis of war and constitutional unrest faded into memory: the office had remained vacant for several years after Hanneken’s death in 1671, as it would after Pomarius died in 1683. However, the Ratsherren never again attempted to dispense with an experienced, theologically trained Superintendent as they had done for thirteen years after the death of moral reformer Andreas Pouchenius in 1600. In sharp contrast to the series of scandals and disputes that divided the ministry before the council recruited Hunnius, these late-century vacancies fostered neither discord among the pastors nor a tangible softening of the ministry’s antagonism toward alternatives to the traditional Lutheran faith. In 1688, for example, Hauptpastor Johann Peter Stein was more than willing to advise the council on the dangers posed by the upswing in Huguenot refugee traffic that followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes: his manuscript
dieser letzten Zeit einen Blick in die Welt thun / zeiget sich fast allenthalben anders nicht / als ein grausames Bild grosser und gewaltiger Kriege.”


732 See Pomarius’s own internal summary in Ehren-Gedächtniß, pp. 16-17.
Relation Concerning the Reception of the Reformed echoed Hanneken’s Theological Consideration (and thus also Hunnius) by arguing that sheltering Huguenots inevitably precipitated an “assault on the Holy Name of God” through the “erroneous teaching and impure liturgy” it encouraged among Lutherans.\(^\text{733}\) Worse, the disorder a Reformed influx would bring to the city’s religious life would compound the social friction inevitably caused by refugee traffic to strike a further blow against Lübeck’s international reputation, meaning that “here, where has until now been a grand seat of the pure teaching, shall now become a nest of heretics.”\(^\text{734}\) Faced with the very real possibility that Huguenot immigration would disrupt the careful balance of guild economy and guest workers established by their post-war policies, the council validated the ministry’s argument by choosing a more combative candidate to succeed the philosopher-turned-polemicist Pomarius.

Superintendent August Pfeiffer (1689-1698) was born in Lauenburg on the Stecknitz canal, and would devote much of his nine-year tenure of office to combating the Reformed tradition and the growth of early Pietism in Lübeck. Pfeiffer is particularly noted for a 1699 work entitled Anti-Calvinism, That Is, Short, Clear, Sincere and Humble Report and Instruction Concerning the Reformed Religion, which was republished in translation as late as 1881.\(^\text{735}\) Polemic ensured the Pfeiffer was remembered by later generations of Lutherans, but his anti-Reformed sentiment had grown in response to local challenges. His studies at Wittenberg in the late 1650s were devoted to “oriental languages,” the field in which he subsequently gained

\(^{733}\) Johann Peter Stein, “Relation, was A. 1688 in der commission des Raths zu Lübeck mit dem Ministerio wegen der Reformirten reception passiret.” SBL Ms. I, no. 36. (unpaginated), fol. i. Stein was Hauptpastor of the St. Aegidien parish, and the most senior among the parish clergy.


\(^{735}\) August Pfeiffer, Anti-Calvinismus, Das ist kurzter / deutlicher / aufrichtiger und bescheidentlicher Bericht und Unterricht Von der Reformirten Religion: Wie weit die Reformirten / oder insgemein genannte Calvinisten in ihrem Glauben und Lehre / von uns Evangelischen abgehen (Lübeck: Böckmann, 1699), was translated in English and republished into the nineteenth century; see Pfeiffer, Anti Calvinism. Trans. Edward Pfeiffer. (Columbus: Printing House of the Joint Synod of Ohio, 1881).
the professorship.\textsuperscript{736} Unsurprisingly, this genre of scholarship dominates his early corpus, culminating in a digest published in 1685, under the appropriately weighty title \textit{Introduction to the Orient, or Synopsis of Noteworthy Inquiry on the Origins, Nature, Use and Authority of the Oriental and other Extra-European Languages}.\textsuperscript{737} In the meantime, however, Pfeiffer served as pastor and General Superintendent in Saxony and his native Lauenburg, respectively, which prompted a return to theological study in Leipzig, where he achieved the doctorate in this discipline in 1677, and where he remained until he received the call to Lübeck in 1688-89.\textsuperscript{738} He entered the polemical arena via the channel of anti-Jesuit writings, as had both Hunnius and Hanneken, and while polemical combat was not an explicit duty of the professorship, Pfeiffer pursued it with alacrity during his years at Leipzig. His \textit{Lutheranism before Luther, or the Ancient Evangelical Christianity Renewed Through Luther}, was composed immediately following his doctoral promotion, and was intended “to reveal and defend [against] the fundamental questions disseminated against the Lutheran Religion... by Arnold Engel of the Society of Jesus.”\textsuperscript{739} Engel (1620-1690) had been born in Utrecht and educated in


\textsuperscript{737} August Pfeiffer, \textit{Introductio in Orienten, Sive Synopsis Quaestionum Nobiliorum De Origine, Natura, Usu Et Adminiculis Lingg. Orientalim Et Plerarumque Extra Europam Ebraice, Chaldaicae, Syriace, Samaritanae, Punicae, Arabicae, Aethiopicae, Armenicae, Persicae, Turcicae, Copticae, Ibericae, Siricae, Iaponicae, Congensis, Malaicae, Etc.} (Wittenburg: Schrödterus, 1685). The catholicity aspired to in this work indicates that biographer M. Loy’s claim that Pfeiffer “is said to have been acquainted with seventy-two languages” may not be a great exaggeration; see Loy, in Pfeiffer, \textit{Anti-Calvinism}, p. xxi.


\textsuperscript{739} August Pfeiffer, \textit{Luthertum vor Luther / Oder das alte Evangelische durch Luther erneuerte Christenthum und Das neue Römische durch Lutherum auffgedeckte Pabstthum} (Dresden: Hübner, 1684); earlier versions of this text date to 1679 and 1680, but the 1684 edition formed the standard for a series of later reprints.
Habsburg Prague, and the extensive missionary work he undertook in Protestant central Europe helps greatly to explain the seven reprints of *Lutheranism before Luther* that appeared in Pfeiffer’s own lifetime.  

The prospect of Jesuit infiltration had remained a popular concern and a current topic in Protestant pamphlet literature since the Thirty Years’ War, and Pfeiffer appears to have been well-versed in the genre. In the 1685 tract *Against the Papacy, On the Point That the Laity and Non-Consecrated Clergy Are Denied the Sacred Chalice*, he targeted the sacramental teachings of Engel and “fellow Jesuit” Georg Hiller, while his *Written Explanation of All Articles of the Augsburg Confession*, published the same year, included a special introduction warning against the “disseminated lies of the Jesuits,” addressed to the Elector of Saxony. Specifically post-Tridentine “errors” would be of less immediate concern to Pfeiffer in Lübeck, but his anti-Jesuitism revealed a clear affinity for the Gnesio-Lutheran interpretations that would define his efforts to defend that city’s Lutheran tradition.

Modern scholarship has stressed the uniqueness of Spener-inflected early Pietism in comparison to the conventicles inspired by late-medieval mystics and Johann Arndt. In the late seventeenth century, however, many Orthodox pastors still portrayed these as one contiguous threat to the well-being of the Lutheran community. As newly-installed Superintendent in Lübeck, Pfeiffer confronted the censure of pious leader Adelheid Schwartz with a two-pronged attack, which included the disciplinary proceedings that drove her from Lübeck to Halle, as well as two works of polemic. His first was a four-hundred-page condemnation of the group’s theological errors, which he dismissed as “that deceptive dream of the so-called Chiliasts,

---

740 Extant editions of Pfeiffer’s *Luthertum vor Luther* are dated 1686, 1687, 1689, 1691, 1693, and 1697. All but one of these were by Dresden printers.

741 The first of Pfeiffer’s anti-Jesuit polemics of 1685 was was entitled *Actio Rei Amotae Contra Papam, In Puncto Subtracti Laicis Et Non Consecrantibus Clericis Sacri Calicis, Instituta, Et P. Arnoldo Angelo, atque P. Georg. Hillero, Jesuitis impertita*. (Leipzig: Gleditschius, 1685); the second bore the equally unambiguous title *Der wolbewährte Evangelische Aug-Apfel / Oder Schriftmässige Erklärung aller Articul Der Augsburghischen Confession, Als des Evangelische Glaubens-Bekäntnisses / Darinnen So wohl die Evangelische Warheit / als der Papisten und anderer Falschglaubigen Irrthümer und Mißbräuche ... gründlich und deutlich vorgestellt werden* (Leipzig: Kloß, 1685).
regarding a future thousand-year golden Age, or visible Kingdom of Christ on earth,” published in 1691.742

This work paralleled Hunnius’s *Extensive Report on the New Prophets* in both structure and argumentation, but Pfeiffer also desired reach a popular audience—the ordinary Lübeckers who might be tempted to join the nascent pietist gathering. That worry led him to commission a new edition of Superintendent Meno Hanneken’s *Christian Inquiry of the New Fanaticism* (1669) in the months prior to Schwartz’s exile.743 Though Pfeiffer’s reputation for theological Orthodoxy was beyond reproach, the city’s campaign against Pietism gave the Superintendent a public stage upon which he could demonstrate his commitment to the Lutheran tradition of his adopted city.

Pfeiffer retained the original title, text and authorship notes (*vom ordentlichen Predig-Ampt in Lübeck*) in the 1692 edition of Hanneken’s *Inquiry*, but appended a new foreword portraying the “abberants and so-called Pietists of today” as the direct descendants of the heterodox movements of the previous sixty years. Though the names and personalities had changed, Pfeiffer opined, the essential threat of wartime mysticism endured, namely, that “the few Separatists and eccentrics, who upon from their own understanding and under the pretexts of a particular holiness depart from the parochial (kirchliche) and public (offentliche) assembly, and hold their own conventicles in their corners.”744 Because “[the] pseudo-Pietists also suppose themselves to be capable of a special familiarity with God and of direct epiphany; they


await the thousand-year kingdom, and claim their own brotherhood as the prelude thereto,” Petersen and Schwartz were to be viewed not as visionaries, but as fresh incarnations of the “skulking devils” (Schleicher-Teuffel) Thomas Tanto and Jacob Taube, who had inherited the false teachings of the “New Prophet” leaders Felgenhauer and Raselius. Although the proto-Pietist threat posed a danger at least equivalent to the conventicles founded by Tanto and Taube, Pfeiffer stressed that the remedy for this plague had already been prepared: “all of the supposed artifices of today’s deviants have already been thoroughly dispelled by our ministry in years hence.” This meant that to ensure their church’s survival, Lübeckers had only to respond to the treatment prepared by previous generations. By the time of Pfeiffer’s writing (his preface is dated 23 March, 1692) the ministry and city council had already begun disciplinary proceedings against conventicle leader Adelheid Schwartz, but the Superintendent emphasized the need to remain vigilant against the perennial threat, not least by consulting the Christian Inquiry: “thus I could hardly have omitted to recommend this book anew, and thereby to remind each person, not to be taken in by the fraudulent appearance of such people, and thus to allow oneself to be removed from unity in Christ.” Like Pfeiffer’s language, his decision to reprint Hanneken’s text in 1692 deliberately recalled and reinforced a polemical tradition dedicated to a narrow vision what constituted “unity in Christ” in a Lutheran city.

745 Pfeiffer, “Vorrede,” in Hanneken, Christliche Probe, p. xi: “[die] pseudo-Pietisten vermeinen auch einer sonderbaren Familiarität mit Gott und unmittelbaren Erleuchtung fähig zu seyn / warten des Tausendjährigen Reichs / und stellen zu dessen Vorspiel ihre Brüderschaften an.” Pfeiffer uses the term “Schleicher-Teuffel” to introduce his discussion of Thomas Tanto and Jacob Taube, who he likewise derides as “Winckel-Prediger,” and their followers as separatist-inclined “Winckel-Christer”; see ibid., p. vi. Pfeiffer’s preface leaves no doubt that wartime mystics, conventiclers, and “so-called Pietists” were all part of the same general “plague” upon Lübeck that prevailed in his own time; see pp. iv-v: “Mit dergleichen Sonderlingen und wunderlichen tollen Heiligen / ist unser liebes Lübeck von anderthalb hundert Jahren her zimlich geplaget gewesen ... in diesem Seculo hats an dergleichen Geschmeiß nicht gemangelt. Etwan für sechzig Jahren haben sich Paulus Felgenhauer mit seinem Geheimnisse vom Tempel des Herrn / Christophorus Andreae Raselius mit seinem Bosaunen und dem guldnen Schlüssel Davids, nebst andern der gleichen Schwärnern / allhier eingeschlichen / ihnen einen Anhang gemacht / und ihre Conventicula gehalten ... weßwegen die drey Ministeria, Lübeck / Hamburg und Lüneburg / den außführlichen Bericht von Neuen Propheten /(wobey der sel. D. N. Hunnius die Feder geführet) gestellt / auch die Christliche Obrigkeit mit Nachdruck das Enthusiastische Gelag zerstöhret hat.” Italics are Pfeiffer’s.

Like his anti-pietist writings, Pfeiffer’s *Anti-Calvinism* aligned its author unmistakably with the Gnesio-Lutheranism of the late sixteenth century. First published in 1699, the year after the author’s death, the Superintendent’s treatise against “the Reformed (*Reformirten*), or those generally called Calvinists (*Calvinisten*)” commences with a question that, in his words, summarizes “the whole controversy” between Lutheran and Reformed churches at the end of the seventeenth century; i.e. “whether it is right, notwithstanding that an article of faith is contained in Scripture in clear words, not to accept it because it does not thus harmonize with reason and the laws of nature.”\textsuperscript{747} Pfeiffer’s answer can be guessed: “to this we answer, no: this is not right: we must by no means concede such authority to reason.”\textsuperscript{748} This strict adherence to Luther’s *sola Scriptura* informs the Superintendent’s subsequent discussion of the leading questions that had divided Evangelical and Reformed theologians since Luther’s day, including the “universal call of grace,” whether faith, grace, and thus salvation could be lost through sin, and the Orthodox formulation “that the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially received by the communicants in the Holy Supper with the bread and wine.”\textsuperscript{749} The refined exegesis of *Anti-Calvinism* has led commentators to consider this work Pfeiffer’s magnum opus, but few have noted that his refutation of the Reformed tradition represents a late-career deviation from his larger body of work.\textsuperscript{750}

Because this text lacks the revealing parochialism of his addendum to the *Christian Inquiry*, we have little overt clue as to Pfeiffer’s motivations for devoting his last years to anti-Reformed polemic. Political context is suggestive, however, as the Lübeck city council had recently granted Lübeck’s Reformed certain

\textsuperscript{747} Pfeiffer, *Anti Calvinism*. Trans. Edward Pfeiffer, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{748} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{749} Pfeiffer, *Anti Calvinism*. Trans. Edward Pfeiffer, pp. 127 and 246. These are brief examples of the thematic discussions that underlie each of this work’s fourteen chapters; see pp. 127-161; pp. 270-302, and pp. 347-361, respectively.

\textsuperscript{750} From the 1670s onward, Pfeiffer produced numerous theological texts, edificatory works, and catechism manuals alongside his anti-Jesuit and anti-mystical tracts, but his *Anti-Calvinism* appears to be his only overtly anti-Reformed work. See AHL *Leichenpredigten* L.XIII 2310.2, quoted in Groß, AHL *Pastorenkartei*, “D. Pfeiffer, August” for an overview of his printed works.
privileges that had been withheld since Hanneken’s time. In 1692, the Ratsherren finally permitted the city’s approximately fifty Reformed congregants to acquire a pastor from Berlin competent in both Dutch and German. The following year, they allowed the congregation’s elders to purchase own meeting hall in 1693, with the stipulation that it remained relegated to an environ outside the city walls. These concessions did not constitute a decisive shift in the magistrates’ restrictive stance toward Calvinism—they continued to ban the congregation from holding worship in the German language for several decades, for instance—but for a self-styled successor of Hunnius and Hanneken, even these minor concessions provided sufficient cause to demonstrate his mastery of anti-Reformed polemic. Despite its predictable contents, therefore, Pfeiffer’s turn to anti-Calvinism at the end of his career is significant because it encapsulates the secret to his success as head of Lübeck’s church at the end of the century. Whereas his predecessors Hunnius and Hanneken had engineered significant changes in the council’s policies toward the urban church, Pfeiffer succeeded because he perpetuated their legacy, particularly the new partnership of council and ministry that defined the city’s confessional “golden age.”

The ministry that survived Pfeiffer would continue to uphold the clerical duty to defend Lübeck against the threat of increased Reformed influence. In 1701, the city’s five Hauptpastoren collaborated on the True-Hearted Warning to the Christian Community in Lübeck, To Guard Well Against Reformed Preaching, in which they refuted pastor Johann Melchior Fuesslin, who had lately visited the Reformed community “close before our gate,” and begun circulating his sermons in print. In a tactic well-known to any Lübeck pastor after 1650, this text was re-issued when the ministry confronted a similar circumstance in 1732. Like


752 Treuherzige Warnung / An die christliche Gemeinen in Lübeck / Sich für der reformirten predigten wol zu hüten / Aus Veranlassung einer von Johan Melchior Fuesslin gehaltenen / und darauff zum Druck beförderten Predigt / gestellt von dem ordentlichen Predig-Ampt in Lübeck (Rudolstadt: Johann Wiemeyer, 1701). The 1732 edition notes the publisher as “Johann Wiedmeyer, Buchhändler zu Lübeck,” but does not specify if this is the original or later printer. See p. 8 on Fuesslin’s appearance in Lübeck: “So zeuget auch davon eine besondere Predigt / welche Johann Melchior Fuesslin ein Reformirter Prediger nahe vor unserm Thor gehalten / und dieselbige darauf unter dem Titul: Pauli Hezlicher Wunsch
his predecessor Samuel Pomarius, Pfeiffer established a career in Lübeck (1689-1698) that was characterized by measures designed to enforce the minimum amount of religious toleration possible. While Lübeck’s magistrates and merchants made certain concessions to market dynamics and the advocacy of powerful Reformed princes, they took concurrent steps to ensure that a narrow interpretation of the dictates of the Peace of Westphalia prevailed in the city. These concessions were balanced by conspicuous disciplinary successes against those mystics and pious reformers who sought to establish low-church alternatives to Lutheran Orthodoxy in Lübeck. Neither Pomarius nor Pfeiffer could boast the spectrum of contributions and innovations Hunnius and Hanneken had overseen in urban confessional life, but their respective ministries were very successful in perpetuating the cooperative relationship with the city magistrates that Hunnius had pioneered, and Hanneken had solidified. As the self-styled disciple of both, Pfeiffer was more overtly polemical than his predecessor Pomarius, but his success owed more to his willingness to conform to and uphold the city’s established confessional traditions than it did to any breakthroughs in confessional advocacy. Assessments of this type are common in scholarship on Lutheran clergy during the periods of “Late Orthodoxy” and early Pietism, but what is more interesting about urban religious life in the final decades of the seventeenth century is the crucial role played by the successful melding of traditions – civic and confessional alike—in structuring community responses to the fresh challenges Pomarius and Pfeiffer encountered in their own time. In Lübeck, Lutheran Orthodoxy continued to outshine its various competitors because it contained a powerful appeal to community tradition that the Reformed tradition and early Pietism not only lacked, but also openly threatened.

< Social Discipline: Traditional and Extraordinary Initiatives after 1670 >
Luise Schorn-Schütte and other scholars of the early-modern clergy have stressed the Reformation’s transformative role in making the institutional church and its clergy “instrumental for the extension of secular power,” particularly regarding a magistracy’s communication and enforcement of secular legislation vis-à-vis its subjects. In Lübeck, the city council evidenced new enthusiasm for Policey measures characteristic of the European confessional age after the new constitutional settlement (known as the Bürgerrezeß) became law in 1669. Surviving consistory records for Lübeck are too sparse to allow conclusions as to the effectiveness of this latter-day enthusiasm for social disciplining, but the measures enacted by the council were clearly intended to shore up Lübeck’s battered social hierarchy and restore the peaceful co-existence of council, ministry, and citizens that had been conspicuously lacking for the last fifty years.

The 1669 Bürgerrezeß gave the city’s enfranchised citizens—merchants and craftsmen of respectable trades—new rights of collective oversight, but it did not give most urban dwellers any say in the process of civic decision-making. The men eligible for election to council or high magisterial office, i.e. the wealthy Junker, merchant guild leaders, and well-to-do jurists—numbered just a small fraction of one percent of the total urban population throughout this period, while the male burghers who enjoyed membership in the commercial and craft guilds constituted only 10-11% percent of the total number of Lübeck residents at any time between 1650 and the early eighteenth century. In Lübeck as elsewhere, sumptuary legislation (Kleider- and Luxusordnungen) was intended as the first line of defense against the dilution of these careful distinctions of status and privilege. A major new act of sumptuary law had been issued in the wake of the Reiser’sche unrests of 1598-1605, and latter-day councilmen placed renewed emphasis on visible “differentiation among ranks” after the Bürgerrezeß of 1669. Both the Ordnungen proper and their mode of dissemination—they were read from the pulpit following weekend sermons—stressed the importance of


hierarchy to the well-being of the Christian community. “Almighty God has thus ordained in all lands and cities” read one such declaration, “that a differentiation among ranks and persons must obtain, without which no well-formed Regiment can be maintained.” The Ratsherren had issued two edicts “through which the offense that is given by arrogant dress above the demand of rank might be controlled and done away with” in the first two decades after Westphalia, but it enacted five such ordinances in the crucial decade following the new constitutional settlement, in 1671, 1674, 1677, and 1680. In the wake of recurrent internal tumults and the temporary collapse of the council’s power, members of all of these groups had vested interests in promoting a visibly differentiated society, in which distinctions of birth, education, and occupation could be immediately recognized and thus more easily enforced.

The “Days of Penance and Prayer” (Buß- and Bettage) the council inaugurated during the Thirty Years’ War had allowed magistrates to evoke Lübeckers’ shared confessional identity, while also stressing a Lutheran subject’s debt of obedience to divinely-ordained authority. Chronicler Gottschalk Kirchring recorded that these events, defined by penitential sermons (Bußpredigten) and standardized prayers invoking the good of the urban commonwealth, had lapsed into disuse after the war: “Anno 1663 in the month of November, a general, solemn Day of Penitence, Prayer and Fasting was celebrated in Lübeck and in the whole Lübeck domains, which had previously not occurred in many years.” The council’s decision to revive an observance that asked God’s blessing on both the Holy Roman Emperor and the city’s magistrates was highly expedient in light of the food crisis of 1661-1662, which gave rise to the first citizen protests against

---

755 City council Luxusordnung from 1619, quoted in Graßmann, Lübeckische Geschichte, pp. 464-465. This ordinance reproduced the Ordnung issued shortly after the Rezeß that concluded the Reiser’sche unrests in 1605, and was perpetuated in later sumptuary decrees after mid-century.


757 Kirchring and Müller, Compendium Chronicæ, p. 332.
oligarchic privilege. Significant gaps in the ministry records for the final decades of the seventeenth century (i.e. missing volumes among the Kirchenbücher) obscure longer-term trends, but surviving sources reveal that the council ordered the parish clergy to hold “high-celebratory” and “publicly exercised” Buß- und Bettage on the Thursday following the twenty-third Sunday after Trinity in 1673, 1675, 1676, 1677, and 1678. Similar entries suggest that some years witnessed multiple events of this type, in response to contemporary events; in late 1680, for example, the council voted to hold a special Day of Penitence in response to the appearance of the Great Comet, held on 10 February 1681.

< Blasphemy and Buxtehude: “Civic Lutheranism” as Response to Crisis >

The execution of journeyman blacksmith Peter Günther for blasphemy in 1687 reveals that pastors and magistrates went to extraordinary new lengths to defend and uphold Lübeck’s reputation as a bastion of Lutheran orthodoxy in the late seventeenth century. Wolf-Dieter Hauschild has attributed the singular outcome of Günter’s blasphemy to an “inhuman strictness of principle on the part of the clergy,” and this view had pre-modern analogues -- in 1714, for instance, the acting Superintendent of Lübeck’s church would condemn the harshness of Günther’s fate in a tract on blasphemy. However, the pastors who attempted to reconcile Günther to the church did not advise the council to execute him on a whim. Significantly, Günther’s arrest, imprisonment and trial were all performed in accordance with the council’s orders, in which the clergy played an important but advisory role vis-à-vis secular Obrigkeit. To explain why religious and secular authorities opted to execute the blacksmith in spite of clear misgivings requires us to go beyond blaming the clerical intransigence that Günther himself condemned as inherent in the institutional church.

We can more profitably infer that the magistrates decided to execute Günther because he united several


760 Hauschild, Kirchengeschichte Lübecks, p. 325.
familiar threats—spiritualism, mysticism, and overt anti-clericalism—into a single assault on the Lutheran identity Lübeckers had constructed in the wake of violent internal unrest and the very public failure of the last Hanseatic Diet. By striking at the heart of what it meant to be Lutheran, Peter Günther “the blasphemer” imperiled a vital new tradition that Lübeckers had constructed to promote order and prosperity following a century of decline and instability.

Almost exactly two years after Günther’s arrest, Dieterich Buxtehude (c. 1637-1707) drafted his customary letter to the elders of Lübeck’s merchant guilds, requesting continued support for the Abendmusik he had performed in the city since 1673. “Having, by the grace of God, brought my recently-presented Evening Music of the Prodigal Son to an end after utmost efforts and unsparing diligence,” he wrote, “I doubt not, that my highly honored Lordships and worthy Patrons, but that you will ... condescend to favor me with a further yearly honorarium, that in the future I may have the greater cause to continue this musical ornamentation.”

That Buxtehude succeeded Franz Tunder (1614-1667) as “organist and Werkmeister” of St. Mary’ church at such a crucial juncture was, according to biographer Georg Karstädt, no coincidence, as the merchant elders who sponsored him intended his Abendmusik to commemorate the planned renaissance of the Hanseatic League in 1668. Although the Hansa soon dissolved for good, Buxtehude’s work had

---

761 “Dietrich Buxtehude to the Elders of the Commercial Guilds, Lübeck,” 5 February 1687, in Piero Weiss (ed. and trans.), *Letters of Composers Through Six Centuries* (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1967), p. 57. Cf. the original text in Anton Hagedorn, “Briefe von Dietrich Buxtehude,” in *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Lübeckische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde* 3 (1887-88), 192-196; p. 196. Buxtehude continued to enjoy the financial support of the Lübeck’s leading commercial guilds until the end of his life; cf. a similar annual request from 1697, which closely parallels the above in phrasing: “The usual remittal bestowed upon me by your noble and most respectable graces, in connection with my Abend musique performed during the last year, having done me very well, disposes me herewith and once again to express my most diligent thanks for the same, and hereby petitioning your most noble and respectable graces that you will be moved, on account of my newly presented music, allow me further enjoyment of such beneficial patrimony (Wohlvermögen).” “Dietrich Buxtehude dankt den Herren der Hispanischen Collecten und der Dröge 1697 für ein Geldgeschenk wegen seiner Abend-Musiken,” in Graßmann (ed.), *Lübeckische Geschichte*, p. 483. The “Hispanische Collecten” (or “Spanische Kollekten”) was an association of Lübeck merchants invested in the trade with Iberia; see *ibid*, p. 439.

gained much notoriety in Lutheran Germany by the time of his death in 1707, and his career in the city
should be viewed as a conspicuous component of the symbolic fiction of prosperity, order, and civic unity
Lübecker created in response to decades of political, religious, and constitutional turmoil. Whether
innovative or derivative in musicological terms – Karstädt argues that Tunder and not Buxtehude should be
credited with the “invention” of the Abendmusiken – Buxtehude’s longstanding performances must now be
re-assessed in light of their social importance. His organ concerts were not merely the audible, external signs
of a re-born cultural identity for Lübeck in the Lutheran Baroque idiom, but also the visible apex of a broader
social-religious effort to promote stability that blended the mercantile identity restored in the 1669
Bürgerrezeß with the unbending Lutheran confessional identity articulated by the ministry since the Little Ice
Age.

Lübeck’s magistrates embraced the social ramifications of high-church Lutheranism with alacrity after
1670 because it offered them a potent means of injecting stability into social institutions badly shaken by a
century of overlapping crises. In so doing, they attained a new common ground with Lutheran pastors
regarding the importance of defending the urban community against heterodoxy, sacrilege, and
unsanctioned alternatives to the institutional Lutheran church. All of these rivals had exacerbated the
constitutional unrest of the 1650s and 1660s, and city authorities had every reason to fear that they would
further undermine city institutions as merchants and craftsmen worked to resuscitate their endangered
livelihoods after 1670. Though the discriminatory interpretation of the Peace of Westphalia favored by the
city’s clergy was never fully instituted, the council showed itself to be deeply concerned about potential
threats to the newly re-established ordering of life in Lutheran Lübeck: even as they sought to attract guest
workers from known Calvinist regions, they balanced these with concrete initiatives designed to prevent
lasting growth of a Reformed community. The majority attitude toward pious reform movements contained
even less ambiguity; though we cannot draw a direct link between the first conventicles of the 1660s and the
nascent Pietist community of the 1670s and -80s, the energetic and collaborative suppression of both
discloses the mistrust pastors and magistrates shared when confronted with what seemed to them further mutations of the “new fanaticism” of the Thirty Years’ War. Finally, structural instability, religious frictions, and unsettling portents alike pushed the city council to revive public Lutheran ceremonial practices that had lapsed into disuse after 1648, and they couched Buß- und Bettage and sumptuary ordinances alike in unmistakably Lutheran language of obedience to civil authority. To be sure, this process of countering urban crisis continued to fall short of the idealized Corpus Christianum championed by Nicolaus Hunnius. At the same time, cultivation of his vision by subsequent generations of magistrates, pastors, and regular citizens produced a civic Lutheran identity that was more closely enmeshed in law and church life during Buxtehude’s career than had ever been the case before.
Chapter Six

“Buried Between Heaven and Earth”: Burgher Patronage and Material Culture

In the last decades of the seventeenth century, a proliferation of new furnishings and decorations transformed St. Mary’s church in Lübeck into a showpiece of the Lutheran Baroque style. The cenotaph dedicated to the Bürgermeister and jurist Dr. Johannes Ritter (1622-1700) was not the grandest bequest made to the churches during this period, but the mayor’s decision to include a life-sized wooden sarcophagus as the foundation of a massive wooden obelisk ensured that the Ritter memorial remained a well-known curiosity during subsequent centuries.⁷⁶³ In the years before the Second World War, oral tradition continued to attribute this unusual visual theme to Ritter’s desire to ensure his salvation: when Ritter’s confessor, bound by Luther’s soteriology of grace, could give no guarantee that the mayor’s soul would enter heaven, the later reportedly begged him “at least to make sure that I am buried between heaven and earth.”⁷⁶⁴ “Accordingly,” folklorist Wilhelm Dahms relates, “a place was prepared for him there above, high on the pillar.”⁷⁶⁵ This account bears certain hallmarks of apocrypha: in the first place, Ritter was actually interred in the church’s floor beneath his epitaph, “as is usual in the Marienkirche,” with the spot marked by a candelabrum; moreover, the Leichenpredigten preserved for Lübeck suggest that visual depictions of sarcophagi were a familiar memento mori of the seventeenth century, regularly appearing alongside devices composed of skulls and bones.⁷⁶⁶ However, the immediate social context in which Ritter commissioned his grand cenotaph is the most telling circumstance: the memorial was part of a ten-year “cycle” begun in 1693,

---


⁷⁶⁵ Dahms, Sagen, Geschichten, und Merckwürdigkeiten, p. 19.

⁷⁶⁶ Ibid., on Ritter’s actual resting place, beneath a gravestone in the flagged floor of St. Mary’s church.
which filled the central spaces of the *Marienkirche* with similar monuments in the “high Baroque” style.\textsuperscript{767} Though we cannot discount soteriological concerns in explaining Ritter’s desire to be commemorated ‘between heaven and earth,’ he was also following trends, and his lavish memorial bears witness to Lübeck’s new enthusiasm for the material culture of Lutheranism following the overlapping crises of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{768}

Ritter’s tenure as *Bürgermeister* (1669-1700) coincided closely with the long career of organist Dieterich Buxtehude (1668-1707), whose fame as a composer and performer helped to re-make the city into a Lutheran cultural capital by the century’s end. However, while Buxtehude now counts among the preeminent Lübeckers of the seventeenth century, he was overshadowed in his own day by men like Ritter, whose education and mayoral office ensured that he inhabited a much higher social rank than did the organist.\textsuperscript{769} Buxtehude’s recruitment built upon the nascent upswing in church patronage in Lübeck, where the urban elite had already grasped the potential value of Lutheran liturgical culture as a symbolic counterweight to Lübeck’s reduced status in the Baltic and North Sea regions. The internal upheavals that shook Lübeck in the years immediately prior to Buxtehude’s arrival were caused by conflicting interpretations of the city’s constitutional tradition, and these contained a strong religious component, as seen in chapters four and five. In the guild riots against Lübeck’s first pious conventicles, Lutheran belief and practice had emerged as the only point upon which the embattled urban estates could agree about what it meant to hold


\textsuperscript{768} On the complex of motivations underlying the “pious bequests” (testamentary gifts to benefitting church and/or clergy) made by seventeenth-century Lübeckers, see Eßmann, *Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz*, pp. 98-99 and 103-104.

\textsuperscript{769} Buxtehude’s letters reveal a distinctly subservient relationship vis-à-vis his patrons, comparable to the one J.S. Bach later bemoaned at Leipzig; as late as 1687, for instance, the organist pled penury in a genteel letter of complaint addressed to “my gracious and most honorable lords and patrons, by whom this *Abendmusique* was originally desired.” Dietrich Buxtehude, letter of 28 January, 1687, in Hagedorn, “Briefe von Dietrich Buxtehude,” pp. 193-194: “Muß derowegen tringender noth halber zu meine Großgönstige und Hochgeehrte Herren und Gönnern, alß *p.t.* Vorwesere der *Commercijrenden* Zunftten von welchen diese *Abendmusique* anfangs begehret worden, meine Zuflucht nehmen.”
true to the urban traditions inherited from previous generations. This reality explains the unprecedented cooperation magistrates and burghers demonstrated in church politics of the later seventeenth century, as well as their renewed commitment to a tradition of church patronage that, like the city’s much-venerated constitution, dated to the city’s medieval golden age. Although we cannot know what interior concerns motivated men like Ritter to spend lavish sums on organs, altars or cenotaphs, their decisions to devote their largesse to the city’s Lutheran churches was dictated by the need to reassure the outside world that Lübeck remained a stable, cohesive, and profitable community following a century of crisis.
The destructive impact of the Second World War renders this interplay of material and aural culture far more opaque today than it would have been in the time of Ritter and Buxtehude. On the night of 28-29 March 1942, Allied bombing reduced much of Lübeck’s Marienkirche and Petrikirche to ruins, and inflicted major damage on two of three remaining churches.\(^{770}\) In a 1983 study of the Marienkirche, Max Hasse optimistically noted that “the fire of 1942 made it possible to examine the building history upon the naked walls of the church,” but his work places the massive destruction in sharp relief; Ritter’s cenotaph, for example, perished alongside all the other epitaphs adorning the central nave of the Marienkirche, with corresponding damage to the organ works and other liturgical furnishings.\(^{771}\) Almost as bad, the Auslagerung of large quantities of city archival documents to the Soviet Union (1945-1990) has resulted in documentary losses that prevent us from adequately reconstructing the patronage networks that embellished Lübeck’s churches during the later decades of seventeenth century. Given this bleak outlook, the work of pre-war historians becomes essential, as do recent studies on burgher testaments and civic material culture in general; however, these are less useful for understanding how early-modern burghers perceived this late-century flowering of Lutheran culture in their churches. Fortunately, early modern guidebooks offer a textual solution for the permanent loss of many original sources. Here, Johann Krüger’s The Blessed and Ornamented City of Lübeck, published in 1697, and Jacob von Melle’s Thorough Report on the Free and Imperial City of Lübeck, the third edition of


which appeared in 1787, offer invaluable links to the material culture that marked Lübeck as a pillar of Lutheran Orthodoxy by 1700.\textsuperscript{772}

I. Beyond Buxtehude: The Visual Aspects of Sacral Culture

Inspired by Bach biographer Philip Spitta (1841-1894), twentieth-century scholars have elevated Buxtehude from relative obscurity to pride of place among the composers of the “middle Baroque” period.\textsuperscript{773} In particular, Buxtehude has become well-known as the object of a pilgrimage to Lübeck undertaken by the young Johann Sebastian Bach (1685-1750) in 1705, and the resulting status of musical progenitor to Bach has tended to obscure the circumscribed nature of his celebrity in his own time. Though widely renowned for both performance and his prolific composition, Buxtehude’s career in Lübeck depended more on circumstances and civic tradition than has heretofore been recognized. The restricted arena in which he labored is nonetheless highly important for understanding the multifold function Buxtehude’s patrons intended his works to perform. Though Buxtehude was undoubtedly famous in his own time -- his professional excursions to Hamburg and Stockholm underscored the demand for his skills, and his printed


\textsuperscript{773} The conventional depiction of Buxtehude vis-a-vis Bach is explicit. Arrey von Dommer’s summary depiction of the former as “einer der größten Orgelmeister und Instrumental-Componisten vor Seb. Bach”; in “Buxtehude, Dietrich,” \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie} 3 (1876), 667-668; p. 667. In 1962, Georg Karstädt attributed the origins of modern Buxtehude research to Bach biographer Philipp Spitta, whose multi-volume work included “the first researches into the work of Buxtehude” when published in the early 1880s. Spitta also edited a volume of Buxtehude’s collected works.
compositions circulated widely in Lutheran Germany-- little attention has been paid to the role of contemporary visual patronage in facilitating his ascent to international fame.\textsuperscript{774}

The circumstances of Buxtehude’s employment in Lübeck suggest that long-running political and mercantile concerns played as great a role in the maturation of the \textit{Abendmusik} in Lübeck as did musical connoisseurship. In particular, the facts of his initial recruitment to the Hanseatic capital urge us to question any teleological assumptions we might be tempted to make about his career trajectory in Lübeck. When the \textit{Kirchenvorsteher} of St. Mary’s recruited the thirty-year-old musician in 1668, it was the result of a general search for a candidate to replace the previous organist Franz Tunder – who had already garnered attention for his “evening performances in the style of concerts” in the Lübeck Marienkirche-- in time for the planned revival of the Hanseatic Diet.\textsuperscript{775} E.F. Fehling has noted that Johannes Ritter –then a freshly-appointed \textit{Bürgermeister}-- was selected to chair the \textit{Hansetag} of 1668, while Buxtehude scholar Georg Karstädt has established that the leaders of the “commercial guilds” intended to “sponsor an organ concert in St. Mary’s” in honor of the Hanseatic envoys.\textsuperscript{776} The decline of Tunder’s health in late 1667 explains the apparent haste with which the parish leaders undertook the search for a new organist: an anonymous entry in the church register for the same year recorded that “many applicants are to be heard upon the organ at varying times, both on workdays as well as on Sundays.”\textsuperscript{777} Though one of many candidates, Buxtehude quickly won the favor of the incumbent Tunder, not least because he declared himself willing to marry Tunder’s daughter, as

\textsuperscript{774} Matthias Range has very recently called for new attention to “how music was ‘materially’ present” in Lübeck’s churches, and in the urban churches of other core Hanseatic cities; Matthias Range, “The Material Presence of Music in Church: The Hanseatic City of Lübeck,” in Andrew Spicer (ed.), \textit{Lutheran Churches in Early Modern Europe} (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2012), 197-220. On Buxtehude’s career outside Lübeck, see Snyder, \textit{Dieterich Buxtehude}, pp. 107-132. Cf. pp. 307-329, on the much wider circulation of his compositions and manuscripts in the Empire and in Protestant Europe.

\textsuperscript{775} Karstädt, \textit{Abendmusiken Dietrich Buxtehudes}, p. 13.


\textsuperscript{777} “Chronik der Marienkirche” from 1667, quoted in Karstädt, \textit{Abendmusiken Dietrich Buxtehudes}, p. 13: “Merhreere Bewerber lasssen sich zu verschiedenen Zeiten sowohl an Sonntagen als auch an Werktagen auf der Orgel hören.”
bachelor organists had often done in the past.\textsuperscript{778} Tunder may have recommended Buxtehude to the Kirchenvorsteher directly; favor became apparent when Buxtehude formally assumed the post of “organist and Werkmeister” in St. Mary’s in April of 1668. Ironically, however, the event that had fueled this rapid search for an organist now failed to materialize, as the revived Diets of 1668 and 1669 proved abject failures, even by the standards of the Hansa’s sixteenth-century decline.\textsuperscript{779} Buxtehude soon transcended the inauspicious circumstances of his appointment in Lübeck – he debuted the first Abendmusik cycle in his own style in 1673 – but the events that actually brought him to Lübeck suggest that in 1668, Buxtehude’s patrons were primarily concerned with the political and economic utility of his performances to help restore Lübeck’s status as “Queen of the Hansa.”\textsuperscript{780}

Relatively little is known of Buxtehude’s everyday working life in St. Mary’s parish, but his biographers have reconstructed a set of career duties that went well beyond the artistic functions of performance and composition. His position as “organist and Werkmeister” gave him “considerable responsibility and prestige...as administrator and treasurer of the church,” but the organist’s job also required “diligent attention to the organs,” particular the very regular (often weekly) tuning of the delicate reeds that provided sound to the organ pipes, as well as collaboration with professional organ builders on repairs and renovations.\textsuperscript{781} The journeyman quality of such duties is underscored by Buxtehude’s compliance with another tradition analogous to urban guild culture. Buxtehude married his predecessor’s daughter, a practice common within urban guild culture and typical for the Marienkirche organists since at least the previous century. Werkmeister status also required him to keep the books for St. Mary’s parish: in addition to

\textsuperscript{778} Karstädt, \textit{Abendmusiken Dietrich Buxtehudes}, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{779} Dollinger, \textit{German Hansa}, p. 368. In addition to the official rump Hansa of Lübeck, Hamburg, and Bremen, only Rostock, Danzig, Brunswick, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, and Cologne answered the call to a Hansetag in Lübeck in 1669.

\textsuperscript{780} Karstädt, \textit{Abendmusiken Dietrich Buxtehudes}, p. 13-14.

\textsuperscript{781} See Snyder, \textit{Buxtehude}, p. 101, on Buxtehude’s maintenance and bookkeeping duties.
organ repair, he oversaw diverse structural and artisanal renovations and was responsible for procuring both building materials and liturgical supplies, e.g. the bread and wine for the Lord’s Supper. In fact, Kerala Snyder concludes, “it was his duty to oversee all the work that was done in the church and to pay the workers,” in which capacity he acted as proxy for the Bürgermeister and guild elders who served as Kirchenvorsteher for St. Mary’s parish.\textsuperscript{782}

Buxtehude’s surviving letters shed further light on the nature of this relationship, as the organist always used highly honorific forms of address when writing to the guild elders who paid his salary; as late as 1697 (by which time he occupied his post for nearly three decades), Buxtehude was deliberate about maintaining his flow of revenue. “The usual remittal bestowed upon me by your noble and most respectable graces in connection with my Abend musique performed during the last year,” he wrote, “disposes me herewith and once again to express my most diligent thanks for the same, and hereby petitioning your most noble and respectable graces that you will be moved, on account of my newly presented music, to allow me further enjoyment of such beneficial patrimony (Wohlvermögen).”\textsuperscript{783} Although he earned far more than the other musicians carried on the parish books, Buxtehude chafed occasionally at his short financial leash; in 1687, for example he went so far as to remind his patrons—in this case, the elders of several preeminent merchant guilds—of the financial responsibility they had inherited from their predecessors, “by whom this Abendmusique was originally desired.”\textsuperscript{784} While such complaints are rare in the letters, they reveal that the renown Buxtehude enjoyed during his later years did not confer the privileges of elevated rank in seventeenth-century burgher society. Our perception of Buxtehude must therefore remain balanced by his

\textsuperscript{782} Snyder, Dieterich Buxtehude, p. 102.


dependent status as a career Diener—a client or attendant in the home church of magistrates and rich merchants.\footnote{An analogue to Buxtehude’s social-professional status is found in J.S. Bach’s position in Leipzig, where he chafed under the duties and financial constraints imposed by his patrons; see Peter Williams, J.S. Bach: A Life in Music (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 165-178.}

Contemporary guidebooks stress that Buxtehude was one of the many attractions found in Lübeck’s churches. Published in 1697, Krüger’s \textit{Blessed and Ornamented City of Lübeck} praised “the great and grandiose organ-works, which, along with the small [organ], are governed by the world-renowned organist and composer Dietrich Buxtehude,” in St. Mary’s church.\footnote{Krüger, \textit{Kurtze Beschreibung der Stadt Lübeck}, p. 114: “Westlich zwischen den beeden Pfeilern der Thürme ist zu sehen das grosse und prächtige Werk die Orgel / welche / wie auch die Kleine / der Welt-berühmte Organist und Componist Dietrich Buxtehude anjetzt verwaltet.”} Krüger’s distinction between “organ-works” and organist is significant, as it implies that the organ was a spectacle in its own right, while his description of the “great Vocal- and Instrumental \textit{Abend-Music}... presented annually, on five Sundays, from St. Martin’s to Christmas” occupies only a paragraph of the twenty-five pages he devotes to St. Mary’s church (he did add that performances in this style “occur nowhere else”).\footnote{Krüger, \textit{Kurtze Beschreibung der Stadt Lübeck}, p. 114: “da dann insonderheit auff dergrossen Jährlich von Martini biß Weyhnachten an 5. Sonntagen die angenehme Vocal- und Instrumental Abend-Music nach der Sontags-Versper-Predigt / von 4. Biß 5. Uhren / das sonst so nirgends wo geschiehet.”} Some decades later, historian and pastor Jacob von Melle (1659-1743) followed suit in an analogous work entitled \textit{Thorough Report on Lübeck}, but with one key distinction: though the \textit{Thorough Report on Lübeck} also describes the physical adornments, refurbishments, and surroundings of the “world-famous Great Organ” in St. Mary’s, Melle failed to mention Buxtehude or the \textit{Abendmusik} at all, despite his demonstrated familiarity with Krüger’s work.\footnote{Melle, \textit{Gründliche Nachricht}, p. 166. Because this book describes numerous objects and events that postdated von Melle’s death in 1743, it is likely that later editions of this work was expanded and edited posthumously by Johann Hermann Schnobel, the self-described “Musikdirektor und Cantor am Gymnasio,” who appended his own index to the 1787 edition. The “Author’s foreword to the first and second editions” establishes von Melle’s familiarity with Krüger’s \textit{Kurtze Beschreibung}; cf. p. i and note a.} This omission suggests that both Krüger and Melle had other goals when describing Lübeck to their readers. Doubtless, both men sought...
to reach the broadest audience possible when stressing that Lübeck church interiors were most impressive in their own right, and it is possible that Buxtehude’s fame was such that Melle thought it superfluous to describe his role in liturgical life. The contrast between these contemporary depictions and the modern musicology is nonetheless revealing, as both authors gave pride of place to material decoration, regulating organists and organ music to the status of one among the many worthwhile adornments in Lübeck’s churches.

< A Reformation in Material Culture? >

The guidebook emphasis on the visual and material aspect of Lübeck’s churches gains fresh resonance in view of the symbolic importance of church adornments as markers of early-modern burgher identity. In 1954, Ahasver von Brandt stressed the “dual character” of the Marienkirche “as the religious and worldly home of the Gemeinde,” or urban community. This church had played a crucial role in the council’s ritual invocations of authority since the fifteenth century, but its status as “the council’s church” (Ratskirche) dated to the thirteenth, when the council sponsored construction of the first private chapel — the Bürgermeisterkapelle or “chapel of mayors” — in the still-incomplete Gothic building. Because the late medieval tradition of “consultation” between the council and guilds remained a de facto practice until the Bürgerrezeß of 1669, Lübeck’s leading burgher corporations were quick to copy the council’s precedent. The burgher corporations’ relatively weak constitutional position vis-à-vis their magistrates gave a clear

789 Buxtehude’s Abendmusiken continued to be performed regularly in Lübeck until the early nineteenth century, when the city was occupied by Napoleon’s army; see Snyder, Dieterich Buxtehude, p. 72.


791 Brandt, Geist und Politik, p. 93.

792 Brandt, Geist und Politik, p. 93. The new constitutional settlement of 1669 marks the first time Lübeck’s citizen corporations (i.e. the merchant and craft guilds) gained formal de jure status as “co-adjudicators of civil authority” (Obrigkeit).
political shading to the gifts guildsmen bestowed upon their home churches in the subsequent centuries. In all of the city’s churches, special altars, pews, and chapels highlighted the unique status of guild members vis-à-vis the majority of urban dwellers, and served as durable material symbols of guild belonging in the urban body politic.

By the time of the Protestant Reformation, Lübeck’s leading guilds had developed a tradition of church endowments specifically intended to articulate their self-ascribed status as collaborators in the urban Regiment. Burgher corporations were initially denied private chapels, which proliferated following the completion of St. Mary’s (1337) due to the largesse of the aristocratic Domherren who populated the city’s cathedral chapter (Domkapitel). As the leading merchant guild, the Schonenfahrerkompagnie took the initiative in carving out space for the guilds in Lübeck’s showpiece church, achieving its first successes at the end of the fourteenth century.

The Schonenfahrer entry into the sphere of liturgical furnishings occurred in connection with the city’s first experiments with organ music: in 1395, the guild contributed substantially to the council’s efforts to raise the funds for an organ in St. Mary’s, and in return, the council granted the corporation the privilege of constructing their own private side altar, reserved for the use of the guild membership. This was duly constructed in 1397, and enhanced around 1480 by the addition of a panel depicting the Virgin Mary and various saints, including the corporation’s patron, John the Baptist.

---

793 Max Hasse offers a detailed guide to the origins of the “private chapels and side altars” of St. Mary’s church in Marienkirche, pp. 167-173.

794 Dietrich Wölfel, Die wunderbare Welt der Orgeln: Lübeck als Orgelstadt (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 1980), p. 3-61, on the construction and renovation history of Lübeck’s organs, which numbered over a dozen (in varying sizes and dispositions) by the time of Buxtehude. On the fourteenth-century precursors to the “great organ” (which underwent many expansions from its initial construction in 1516-1518) see p. 23.

795 Brandt, Geist und Politik, p. 91.

796 Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 124. Hasse and others attribute this panel to Berndt Notke (c. 1435-1509), who is remembered particularly for his Totentanz murals in Lübeck and Tallinn. Prior to the Second World War, Lübeck boasted at least two other pieces by Notke, whose works also decorated churches in Norway and Sweden. He died in the Hanseatic capital in the winter of 1508-9.
following generation of Schonenfahrer staked a new claim to the church interior by means of a private pew-box, which, at ten meters wide and eight rows deep, was large enough to seat the entire guild membership. With its richly carved endpanels, the new Gestühl installed in 1506 was scarcely less grand than the pews belonging to the council, which dated to the end of the fourteenth century and occupied pride of place in the central nave.

The Schonenfahrer pewage did not mark the beginning of assigned corporation seating; rather, the new seat replaced a far smaller pew reserved for the corporation elders. Still, the response it elicited reveals that church furnishings had become a marker of competition among the leading merchant guilds during the previous century. From the first, the Bergenfahrer guild (long-distance shippers to Denmark and Norway) had sought permission for their own site of worship alongside their Schonenfahrer brethren. In 1401, they began to construct a chapel in a space remaining in the outer nave, between the church towers. The following generations of Bergenfahrer transformed the spot into a “formidable cultic space” dedicated to guild patron St. Olaf, whose veneration seems to have required not one, but two painted altar panels bearing his likeness.\footnote{Hasse, \textit{Marienkirche}, p. 125-126.} This rather trumped the Schonenfahrer, who had no chapel of their own, and does much to explain the latter guild’s heightened interest in church seating around 1500. Despite their splendid chapel, however, the Bergenfahrer leaders proved reluctant to leave this latter gesture unanswered: just over a decade later, the corporation celebrated the completion of their own Gestühl, which, when installed in

\footnotetext{Figure 10: Domkirche pew-end belonging to the Lübeck cooper’s guild (Böttcheramt), with crest and names of guild elders (renovated 1846). (photo: J. Strandquist)}
1518, fronted their company chapel in a single contiguous structure. As might be expected, the other merchant companies quickly developed a keen interest in these types of objects, often copying the Schonen- and Bergenfahrer outright. In 1439, for instance, the Novgorodfahrer (whose shipping addressed Muscovy and the eastern Baltic) acquired their own guild altar in the southern nave of St. Mary’s, and began to “establish an exclusive space for themselves thereupon,” which they soon transformed into a private chapel. In 1523, they followed the Bergenfahrer example by affixing a new pewage to the front of their chapel, backed with a decorative screen standing nearly six meters (19.6 feet) high.798 Last but not least, the relatively young company of merchants devoted to the Swedish trade (Stockholmfahrer) acquired an altar of their own in 1523, thanks to the largesse of one Cordt Wibbekink, who endowed a vicarage in 1523 for the express purpose of creating a benefice for his son Antonius. He also sponsored an elaborate triptych (1525) to grace the Stockholmfahrer altar, which was then the church’s newest site of corporate devotion.799

Pre-Reformation trends suggest that burgher-corporation patronage accelerated as evangelical preachers began to proliferate in Lübeck. This trajectory helps to explain why Lübeck’s transformation into a Lutheran city avoided the violent episodes of iconoclasm that accompanied the early Reformation elsewhere. The problem of assessing the transformative impact of European Protestantism on the practice of late-medieval religion has excited considerable attention from historians of material culture, particularly those interested in the Kirchenraum, the church building. Lee Palmer Wandel has reconstructed the anti-clerical grievances that drove the citizens of numerous south-German towns to make bonfires of the images and liturgical furnishings previously considered sacred, but Edmund Duffy has urged us to pay attention to

798 Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 129.

799 Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 130.
continuities with late-medieval material culture that survived the “stripping of the altars” in England. For Lübeck, however, closer analogues are found in newer studies by Carola Jäggi and Susanne Wegmann, both of whom stress the transformative impact of confessional change on material culture in areas that embraced Luther’s teachings, rather than Zwinglian or radical reform models. Stripping certainly occurred in Lübeck’s churches, first of objects and more gradually of the sacral meaning attributed to them, but this process did far less damage either to church furnishings themselves, or to the tradition of church ornamentation, than was often the case in cities that embraced reform on the Swiss model. In fact, the process by which Lübeck’s church furnishings were transformed from potential “idols” into adiaphora (“indifferent things”) appears to have been more deliberate and streamlined than was the introduction of Protestantism in Switzerland and Alsace, or in the cathedral towns of East Anglia. Adopting the Reformation required numerous painted and graven images to be removed from Lübeck’s churches, but this occurred relatively late, and with the explicit approval of the council and corporations.

When Luther’s antagonist Johann Eck decried the manner in which “the Hanseatics” plundered the gold and silver ornaments of their own churches -- “now, regrettably, one carries these to market in the large cities, which God will not leave unpunished” he wrote in 1531-- he was actually describing an act of public foreclosure, rather than an iconoclastic riot. The date is significant: though reform-minded preachers multiplied in Lübeck from 1522 on, it required repeated anti-clerical agitation in late 1529—a phenomenon known as the “singing war” (Singekrieg) due to the burghers’ chosen tactic-- to bring the


801 Carola Jäggi and Jörn Staecker, Archäologie der Reformation: Studien zu den Auswirkungen des Konfessionswechsels auf die materielle Kultur (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), and Susanne Wegmann and Gabriele Wimböck, Konfessionen im Kirchenraum: Dimensionen des Sakralraums in der Frühen Neutzeit (Korb: Didymos-Verlag, 2007).

802 Johann Eck, quoted in Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 174: “Jetzt layder tregt man sie [gemeint sind die silbernen Gefäße und Ornate] am drendelmarkt umb in großen stetten / nun will alle aus aller Geschrift / daß da Gott nicht ungestraft läßt.”
magistracy to terms concerning reform. Early the following year, council and burgher corporations (the latter represented by a sixty-four-man committee appointed especially for the occasion) agreed upon two immediate measures: first, they would adopt an evangelical church order on the order of the one Wittenberg theologian Johannes Bugenhagen (1485-1558) had crafted for Hamburg in 1528-29, and second, they would expropriate all Kirchenschatz or “church treasures, e.g. ornaments and likenesses containing gold, silver, and precious gems,” which were duly melted down and used to offset public debts. 803 Their approach to objects not made of precious materials differed signaly, however, as Bugenhagen’s church order drew careful distinction between “lying images” – i.e. “those that are superstitiously prayed to and worshipped by means of candles and lamps”—on one hand, and inoffensive decorations that did not fulfill this requirement. 804 The new Kirchenordnung stressed that this was done to preserve peace and order at home and abroad, or in Bugenhagen’s words, “so that we do not become image-breakers (Bildstürmer) and so that others, both known to us and strangers, do not come to regard the same as irksome.” 805 Knowingly, the church order warned that “if such idolatry and supposed worship should later occur in the case of other images, we will also remove these with licit power and right.” 806 In effect, however, the city’s new religious ordinance

803 Graßmann (ed.), Lübeckisches Geschichte, pp. 385-387; cf. Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 174. A portion of the resulting silver coinage was used to finance Lübeck’s war against Denmark in 1533.


805 Ibid.

806 Bugenhagen, Ordnung, quoted in Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 175: “Wenn aber spatter ebei einigen Bildern wieder solche Abgötterei und vermintlicher Gottesdienst durch abergläubige Leute entsehen sollte, so wollen wir mitordentlicher Gewalt und Recht auch diese wegtun, so oft es nötig sein wird.” Cf. Bonnie B. Lee, “Communal Transformations of Church Space in Lutheran Lübeck.” German History 26 (2008), 149-167; p. 153: Lee notes of the Lübeck church order that “Bugenhagen in fact gave the congregation much autonomy in the way they set up their church., letting the congregation decide patronage, decorations, and often allowing for an ‘option B’ if they wanted to retain Latin parts of Mass for Lutheran services. This was in keeping with Luther’s non-prescriptive attitude towards an order for services.”
brokered a compromise between the new faith and the urban corporation regarding the material impact the Reformation would be permitted to have.

Because Lübeck’s church furnishings served as a crucial medium for articulating the authority and enfranchisement of the burgher corporations, it is unsurprising that the city’s Reformation precluded a protracted struggle between iconodules and would-be iconoclasts.807 The single largest change occurred in 1533, when the lay churchwardens of St. Mary’s parish ordered the Werkmeister to remove the church’s namesake Mary statue from the central choir, and to take down the graven and painted images from the Briefkapelle, one of the oldest parts of the original church building. These areas probably contained the greatest overall concentrations of sacred images in the church at the time of the Reformation, but their purging contrasts sharply with the preservation of images in the guild chapels, which remained intact (though with obvious ceremonial restrictions) for periods ranging from several decades to several centuries after reform was introduced. This disparity raises the question of why the images in the choir and Briefkapelle were selected for immediate removal, while most of the images and artworks amassed by Lübeck’s burgher corporations escaped the classification of idolatry, despite their conspicuous links to the medieval cult of saints.808 Ultimately, the distinction between corporate and general church space offers a clue: while overt veneration made any image subject to removal, parish authorities seem only to have made preemptive attacks on those images available to the laity en masse. While private chapels were open only to corporation members, their families, and their guests, the Briefkappelle was the church’s main depository of objects for popular veneration, which naturally attracted all ranks; on feast days, for example, the statues of the saints

807 Lee, “Communal Transformations,” p. 149: “Iconoclasm is often assumed to have dispensed with vast amounts of spiritual capital across Germany, but [Bridget] Heal finds that many Virgin Mary icons simply remained in place in Lutheran churches, though they no longer held the same intercessory power to worshippers as before and were increasingly consigned to the background.” Despite this drop-off in sacral utility, Lee stresses the role played by “an active Lutheran congregation in the configuration of their church space and commission of the objects therein”; p. 150.

808 Hasse, Marienkirche, pp. 168-173.
were clothed in elaborate garments, as preparation for general devotion.\textsuperscript{809} For its part, the church’s centrally-located Madonna transgressed Bugenhagen’s strictures on idolatry “with candles and lights” in a manner too conspicuous to be ignored; after this icon was removed, the absence of its accompanying votive candles meant that this area of the church became appreciably darker during evening services.\textsuperscript{810} For the sake of regular Christians, therefore, images were removed from the city’s most “public” sacral spaces, while the guilds retained the right to dispose of their corporate patronage as they saw fit, in keeping with conciliatory tone of Bugenhagen’s \textit{Kirchenordnung}.

The fate of the guild chapels after the Reformation corroborates Bonnie Lee’s recent assessment of the Reformation’s impact on material culture in Lübeck. Though altars and artworks continued to mirror the urban social order in the Lutheran churches, Lee suggests “they no longer held the same intercessory power to worshippers as before and were increasingly consigned to the background” in the subsequent centuries.\textsuperscript{811} The new church order demanded that the likenesses of patron saints that adorned the altars and chapels belonging to the merchant corporations cease to be the object of veneration, leading to declining interest among later generations of guild brethren hard-pressed by the decline of the Hanseatic League. The pioneering \textit{Schonenfahrer}, who never owned a chapel, disassembled their altar in 1579, while the leaders of the \textit{Novgorodfahrer} actually rented out their chapel to a Lübeck book merchant as “storage space” (\textit{Lagerraum}) in 1657, suggesting that its symbolic significance had undergone a major devaluation during the intervening century. In seeming defiance of this trend, the ornate altar panels in the \textit{Bergenfahrer} chapel remained \textit{in situ} for centuries (they eventually burned with the rest of the church in 1942), but no longer attracted the competitive envy of the other merchant corporations.\textsuperscript{812} Corporate chapels thus underwent a

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{809} Hasse, \textit{Marienkirche}, p. 175.

\textsuperscript{810} Lee, “Communal Transformations,” p. 155.

\textsuperscript{811} Lee, “Communal Transformations,” p. 149.

\textsuperscript{812} On the post-Reformation disposition of corporate chapels, see Hasse, \textit{Marienkirche}, pp. 168-173.
\end{footnotesize}
clear demotion in response to far-reaching changes in doctrine, which diminished the soteriological value of such sites. Hanseatic decline undoubtedly played a part as well, since the trading companies had now lost the monopoly privileges upon which their late-medieval prosperity had depended. In sum, therefore, the material consequences of Lübeck’s Reformation were far milder than in iconoclastic centers like Strasbourg, but the new faith nonetheless had a deleterious impact on the traditional modes by which citizens articulated their corporate identities. As subsequent generations of Lübeckers adapted to their Protestant confessional identity, they adjusted their giving accordingly by focusing on new areas central to the Lutheran liturgy.

< From Images to Organs: The New Face of Patronage >

Church patronage continued to mirror community social and economic hierarchies during the centuries after the Reformation, but the transition to a Lutheran house of worship inaugurated new trends in lay gifts to the church. Church seating (a traditionally social-political, rather than liturgical or doctrinal issue) remained perhaps the most constant element in the transformation of Lübeck’s churches, as subsequent generations of merchant-guildsmen maintained their ornate pews, and continued to occupy them according to corporate membership until the pews became church property in the second half of the nineteenth century. Seats that fell vacant due to the death or departure of an incumbent owner were re-sold (i.e., let for the natural life of the purchaser) by the parish council against a one-time payment; in 1613, for example, Matthias van der Wiede of the Krämerkompagnie paid the Kirchenvorsteher of St. Peter’s parish twenty-five Lübeck Marks for the renovation and subsequent use of a pew “next to the pillar by the baptismal font.”

Other, more dynamic trends reflected the new doctrinal and liturgical emphases of the Lutheran confession, while also offering pragmatic solutions to the changes mandated by the new Kirchenordnung. Bonnie Lee

---

suggests that the churches became noticeably darker when the parishes banned Marian statuary and other “idolatrous” images. This change prompted many urban corporations to donate candelabra (Armleuchter) to offset the loss of votive illumination before these images. This trend began in 1543 in St. Jacob’s parish and proliferated into the seventeenth century, by which time the pillars and walls of the parish churches were fairly forested with candlesticks; by 1609, Lee reports, the “wax candles” burned for vespers -- and certainly at other times, given the dearth of natural light during Baltic winters-- accounted for the single largest annual expense in St. Jacob’s church.814 Because of their relative affordability, moreover, the candlesticks themselves proved particularly popular among craft guilds: the brewer’s guild, for instance, improved both the appearance and illumination of their seating area of St. Jacob’s by superimposing candelabra over their pews in 1583, while the less-prominent ropemakers’ guild (Leinweber) innovated by engraving members’ names on the double-armed candleholder they donated to the church in 1633. While the Lübeck Schiffer brought up the chronological rear when they added a two-armed candelabrum to their seating area in the Jakobikirche in 1689, church lighting was more than a one-time bequest in financial terms, as the corporations who owned these fixtures probably also made periodic donations to offset the aforementioned consumption of candles.815 Finally, both well-to-do citizens and their wives made their own compromise with the Protestant order of church illuminations, sponsoring a number of church lights designated in their own memory (as did Johannes Ritter), or in that of their deceased husbands, in the course of the seventeenth century.816

While both pre- and post-Reformation gifts to the churches articulated the patron’s wish to be remembered as both good citizens and good Christians, the visual language of commemoration changed as a

814 Lee, “Communal Transformations,” p. 155: at 1,275 Lübeck Marks, the annual outlay for candles dwarfed the salary of the parish Hauptpastor by a ratio of three to one.


result of the Reformation. Corporations and individuals adopted new patronage traditions that either coexisted amicably with the strictures on images (as did pewage and lighting), or embraced the new liturgical emphases of Lutheranism outright. The city’s Reformation was undoubtedly conservative in the material sense, which helps greatly to explain the eclectic mix of ornamentation that characterized the city’s churches by 1700, as pre-Reformation altar triptychs and baptismal fonts shared space with ornate new pulpits, a plethora of Baroque cenotaphs, and the latest innovations in organ building. In Ritter and Buxtehude’s time, the city’s church interiors were as unmistakably civic in their derivation as they were Lutheran in confessional devotion, suggesting that it was not for nothing that the title of Krüger’s guidebook praised the “blessed and ornamented (beglückte und geschmückte) city of Lübeck.” Ultimately, the new importance given to the sermon, to the celebration of one, public Lord’s Supper, to music, and to the participation of the congregation in the Lutheran Gottesdienst does much to explain why the corporate chapels and private altars fell into disuse after the 1530s. For the next two centuries, burghers concentrated upon pulpits, organs, and other church furnishings that, while indifferent in the process of salvation, offered corporations and wealthy elites a highly public sphere for decorative self-commemoration.

II. Burgher Patronage and the ‘Age of Buxtehude’

As the magistrates and guild elders who staffed the re-constituted urban Regiment devoted new energies to safeguarding Lübeck’s confessional identity, they used the patronage traditions of the Reformation era in order to forge their own symbolic links to the city’s Lutheran tradition. Bonnie Lee’s reconstruction of the material transition to Lutheranism in Lübeck highlights our comparative lack of

817 In her discussion of damages wrought by the Second World War, Kerala Snyder concludes: “St. Mary’s has been rebuilt, and once again its twin steeples dominate the center of Lübeck. Its interior looked very different in Buxtehude’s day, however; it was a profusely decorated then as it is plain now”; see Buxtehude, p. 75.

818 See note 11 above.
knowledge about the visual components of sacral culture in Lutheran Germany. Given the artistic output of Catholic courts of central Europe during the seventeenth century, it is unsurprising that historians of the European “Baroque” have tended to focus on the musical contributions made by German Lutherans, with little corresponding emphasis on the visual accompaniments that surrounded musicians like Buxtehude. 819 Lee’s focus on the Jakobikirche – the only church to escape bombing in 1942-- leads her to depict the process by which “Lutheran features emerged to the fore” as a chronologically uniform event, but other contemporary sources suggest that burgher patronage underwent a conspicuous surge after the city council and burgher corporations concluded the Bürgerrezeß in 1669. Corporation patronage in the post-Reformation idiom may have continued apace in St. Jacob’s after 1650, but the urban elite took a fresh interest in the Marienkirche; magistrates and leading merchants singled out their home church for significant new improvements during the same decades in which the organist Buxtehude occupied the office of Werkmeister. 820 Moreover, while the material bequests of the later seventeenth century remained firmly in the Lutheran material idiom developed in the century after Bugenhagen’s church order, these underwent a major stylistic shift between the Thirty Years’ War and Buxtehude’s death in 1707. Buxtehude is now synonymous with “middle Baroque” composition and performance, and it is also possible to speak of a

819 Webber, North German Church Music, p. 2-3: “Although much of the kind of artistic expression of religious fervor that took place within Roman Catholicism in the form of painting, sculpture, and architecture was avoided by the Lutherans, music formed a notable exception. Luther himself spoke repeatedly of the value of music in church worship, and stressed in particular the importance of singing...” While this is undoubtedly true in the aggregate, innovative research of the type found in Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Court, City, and Cloister: The Art and Culture of Central Europe, 1400-1800 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995) offers a counterpoint by highlighting the patronage role of Protestant princely courts in these spheres, particularly architecture.

820 Bonnie Lee also avowedly focuses on the longue durée transition from late-medieval to Reformation material culture; see “Communal Transformations,” p. 165.
recognizably “Lutheran Baroque” moment in church material culture during the peak decades of his career in Lübeck.821

Burgher testaments for seventeenth-century Lübeck suggest that the social meaning of “pious bequests” — testamentary gifts earmarked for the benefit of churches and clergy — underwent a social transformation in the course of the seventeenth century. In a 2007 monograph on the Lübeck Bürgertestamente, August-Wilhelm Eßmann demonstrates that after a spike in citizen giving to church and clergy during the Thirty Years’ War, such bequests declined in popularity during the second half of the seventeenth century; in particular, the frequency of gifts to the clergy declined as the mortal danger posed by the war receded into memory.822 Notably, however, he also identifies less frequent “pious bequests” as the negative corollary of increased support for “benign causes” — particularly institutionalized poor relief — in the course of the same century.823 Although far fewer citizens made legacies of pious nature after 1650 — by 1700, the frequency of such gifts in burgher testaments had fallen to one-half of what they were before the Thirty Years’ War — the aggregate annual sum earmarked for church improvements, as well as for pastors and theological students, increased consistently during the same period, peaking at just under 500 Lübeck marks per annum by 1700.824 Together, these trends suggest that social character of pious bequests changed from a generally small-stakes proposition in the early seventeenth century, in which many burghers participated, to a less frequent but financially conspicuous act by 1700, reserved mainly for well-to-do Lübeckers.

821 On Buxtehude’s career as a distinct stage in the development of Protestant church music, see Webber, North German Church Music, pp. 1-8.

822 Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, p. 125-129.

823 For aggregate trends in both spheres of testamentary giving, see Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, pp. 115-124 and 171-173; cf. 185-187 for the author’s conclusions. Significantly, giving to the Witwenkasse increased dramatically after mid-century, suggesting that this cause transcended Eßmann’s distinction between “pious” causes related explicitly to the church, and “benign” or “mild” causes that benefitted a testator’s fellow (lay) burghers.

824 Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, pp. 125-127.
The gifts willed by wealthy merchants Joachim Wulff and Hinrich Eckhoff to their parish churches were the two most generous single-purpose bequests of the seventeenth century. In his testament of October 1668, Wulff earmarked 4,000 Lübeck Marks for either “a large organ or a new altar” in St. Jacob’s church, a sum that constituted just under fifteen percent of his total aggregate worth; meanwhile, his testament earmarked another 2,300 Marks to be given to other pious causes, including the clergy of his home parish, the Schabbelstiftung supporting theological students, and the “widow’s chest” for the wives of deceased Lübeck pastors. Though he left the choice of “altar or organ” up to the parish leadership that would succeed him, Wulff was determined to preserve his own visible connection to his parish church, as revealed in the condition that his name appear on the finished object “in letters fully gold and outwardly inscribed.” By comparison, Eckhoff’s testament of 1687 was more detailed, stipulating that the three thousand Marks he left St. Mary’s church should be used for a new pulpit (Predigtstuhl) made “from marble and alabaster below, [with] a roof [Decke] of the finest wood.” Though more confident in his purpose, Eckhoff shared Wulff’s desire for commemoration, in that he sought to make his patronage conspicuous by stipulating that “my name and crest” appear on the pulpit’s wooden superstructure, that is, in an elevated an external position vis-à-vis the congregation. Though Eckhoff’s bequest was smaller in real terms, it constituted an analogous gift to Wulff’s in that it amounted to over thirteen percent of the testator’s net worth (compared to Wulff’s 14.8 percent), and was explicitly intended to be used for a central piece of liturgical furniture. Few other seventeenth-century additions could rival the cost of these gifts, but they were

---


826 Testament of Jochim Wulff (1668), quoted in Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, p. 102. Wulff’s testament also stipulated that a smaller memorial be erected for the family grave in St. Jacob’s, “whereupon a crucifix and my image, and those of my two deceased wives be painted.”

widely complemented by fellow citizens who shared a desire for linking piety to self-commemoration in their home churches.

Burgher motivations remain murky in the testaments, and we must be wary of using these documents to suggest that “ordinary” Lübeckers gradually lost interest in their inherited religious traditions after the century’s worst crises had passed. Eßmann suggests that the formulaic dedication “to the glory of God” (Gott zu Ehren) might have had roots in the continued desire by burghers to demonstrate evidence of good works, while bequests made “zum gedechtnus” (“in memoriam”) suggest that Lübeckers continued to ascribe some efficacy to intercessory prayer by those left behind, on behalf of the deceased. Certainly, persistent belief in purgatory and/or the merits of good works may explain why testators sought to ensure that they would be readily identified with their pious legacies. However, a critical reading of testamentary language allows few concrete conclusions about the innermost motivations of citizen benefactors, apart from their shared desire for a “Christian” death and burial. For instance, we might also explain these seemingly archaic emphases as a function of the formulaic constraints of testamentary law in Lübeck, which dated from the late middle ages, while accounting for recognizably “Lutheran” content by noting that many burghers consulted their confessors when making out their wills, occasionally including them as legal witnesses and/or testamentary executors. Ultimately, testamentary giving is but one source for the dynamic tradition of religious patronage in early modern Lübeck, which does not fully explain the dramatic transformation of the

---

828 Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, pp. 102-105. Eßmann argues that bequests made “zum gedechtnus” or “zu gedencken” were intended to “create a bond, that united the living with the dead. This guarded against ‘death through forgetting’.” He likewise suggests that burghers continued to hope that such remembrance would expedite the eschatological “process of purifying the soul of the deceased,” a conception that retained parallels to the medieval understanding of Fegefeuer, or purgatory.

829 Guild elder David Burnitz did exactly this in his testament from 1675. Burnitz’s testament names his confessor Bernhard Krechting as a legal witness and collaborator on the will, and the testament’s careful distinction between the “bodily infirmity” of the testator and his continuing “good reason” suggest that Burnitz made out his will near the end of his life. Archiv der Hansestadt Lübeck (AHL), Testamente, Neg. Nr. 5586 (1669 Aug. 28 – 1708 Mai 16.), Testament of David Burnitz, “Bürger und Althlicker hieselbst,” 3 April 1675.
city’s sacred spaces between 1650 and 1700. We can more profitably infer that magistrates and merchants spent huge sums on church furnishings and organ music after mid-century because they sought to reinforce the authority and status of their city and its institutions following a century of crisis.

< Liturgical Furnishings: Altars and Pulpits >

In the later seventeenth century, the new pew-boxes and candleholders the craft guilds commissioned to express civic belonging and collective piety were overshadowed by imposing bequests that

linked wealthier donors to the distinctive aspects of the Lutheran liturgy. The fact that both Wulff and Eckhoff fixated upon pulpits when making out their testaments reflects the emphasis Luther himself placed on gospel preaching as a component of Christian worship; along with the altar where the Lord’s Supper was celebrated, the pulpit was and would remain a focal point of community church life in Lutheran Lübeck. By the end of the seventeenth century, elite interest was such that patrons had existing structures torn down to make way for their own gifts; this occurred in the Marienkirche the 1690-91, and in the Domkirche in 1707-8. The latter pulpit, renovated in 1830 and visible in Lübeck today, suggests that pulpit design changed dramatically in the process, shifting from Renaissance austerity in the Reformation era to embody the elite taste for Baroque ostentation by 1700. Though pastors frowned upon replacing serviceable furnishings with ostentatious totems, pulpits and altars proved irresistible to wealthy burghers who desired to link themselves, in perpetuity, to the definitive public rites of Lutheran church life.
In 1533, the Kirchenvorsteher of St. Mary’s commissioned sculptor and woodworker Benedikt Dreyer (c. 1495-1555) to create five differently-themed images of Christ for a new wooden pulpit, to be erected in the church’s central nave. A subsequent generation of churchwardens had the pulpit rebuilt almost exactly a century later, but the renovation was structural; the St. Mary’s pulpit retained both its wooden design and Dreyer’s carvings. This changed dramatically with the death of the wealthy silk merchant Heinrich Eckhoff, whose testament of 1687 had stipulated that the three thousand Lübeck marks he left to St. Mary’s church should be spent exclusively on a new pulpit “of marble and alabaster.” In contrast to the old pulpit, Eckhoff’s design emphasized the object’s decorative and commemorative functions, a motivation that was not lost on Melle, who complained in *Thorough Report* that the pre-existing pulpit was not only handsome but also relatively new. “The third northward column is the pulpit-column [Kanzelpfeiler],” he wrote, “whereupon formerly stood a finely-carved, wooden pulpit built in 1634, in the place of which the current marble pulpit was established in 1691, according to the Testament of the blessed Hinrich Eckhoff.” Though Melle chafed at elite ostentation in the churches, his critique of Eckhoff’s pulpit may also have been aesthetic; in his reconstructive study of the *Marienkirche*, Max Hasse reports that although the 1691 pulpit boasted an array of graven images superimposed on the body of “red and white marble,” the object was decidedly “not a masterpiece” in terms of artistic execution. Eckhoff’s pulpit nonetheless excelled in the function of commemorating its patron, whose “name and crest” appeared on the pulpit’s superstructure, in keeping with his testamentary instructions.

---


831 See pp. 281-282 and notes 825-826.


We have seen that merchant-guildsmen of the post-Reformation generations gradually lost interest in the chapels and altars they had constructed at great cost during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but the same did not apply to the main or “high” altars of the parish churches. Because the altars continued to function as the spatial epicenter of the Lutheran Lord’s Supper, they remained in situ and retained their ornate, fifteenth-century triptychs, which continued to be manipulated according to the liturgical calendar.\textsuperscript{834} Due perhaps to their existing richness, or to lack of direct physical use compared to pewage, organs, and pulpits, the altars appear to have remained the longest untouched by burgher patronage; there is little evidence of significant renovations down to the end of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{835} This owed in part to the conservative attitude of the pastors toward the core liturgical furnishings. As head pastor of St. Mary’s in the mid-1690s, Melle protested outright when the very wealthy Spanienfahrer elder Thomas Fredenhagen (1627-1709) revealed his plan to commission a new high altar for the Lübeck Marienkirche.\textsuperscript{836} As both a city council member and head churchwarden of St. Mary’s, Fredenhagen got his way, which surprised no one in light of the fact that the shipping baron was also betrothed to the daughter of former church Superintendent Samuel

\textsuperscript{834} See Lee, “Communal Tranformations,” p. 152, on the liturgical continuities of Bugenhagen’s church order with the “old forms of the Mass.” Though the Reformation liturgy “filled them with new content,” Lee argues, “much of the Latin and the structure of the former Mass were retained. What did change, and not insignificantly, was the participation of the congregation in singing and recitation.”

\textsuperscript{835} The Kirchenvorsteher of St. Jacob’s chose to fund a much-needed organ with the funds merchant Joachim Wulff earmarked for either “a large organ or a new altar” in his testament of 1668; cf. pp. 300-301 and note 826.

\textsuperscript{836} Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 212.
Pomarius. Fredenhagen’s commission to the Antwerp sculptor Thomas Quellinus (1661-1709) duly produced a new, marble altar with no less than eight columns, a half-cupola inset over the crucifix, and four nearly life-sized figures arrayed in an “allegory of faith,” and carved in full relief. At floor level, meanwhile, the altar boasted a bust of Fredenhagen, his coat of arms, and an inscription (in German) stating that “Anno 1697 Herrn Thomas Fredenhagen, councilor of this city, bestowed this altar out of good and free will, to holy use and to the glory of God.” Krüger’s guidebook made special mention of the “new Altar given by still-living council member Herr Thomas Friedenhagen [sic], for his own commemoration,” describing it as “particularly worth seeing” and noting the great ceremony that accompanied the altar’s dedication on 15 August.

Considering that the costs for materials and labor were not deducted from Fredenhagen’s monetary gift to the parish, the new altar of 1697 constitutes the single most costly act of church patronage for early-modern Lübeck. For his part, Melle was unable to prevent one of Lübeck’s wealthiest men from articulating his legacy at a central point of Lutheran worship, but the pastor took minor revenge when he

---

837 “Thomas Fredenhagen,” in Fehling (ed.), Lübeckische Ratslinie, p. 133. Cf. Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 212. Fredenhagen became Ratsherr in 1692, by which time his fortune was such that he was able to give the civic fisc (Stadtkasse) a loan of 100,000 Lübeck marks in 1695. He made an additional donation of 2,659 Lübeck Marks to St. Mary’s parish, apart from the cost of the altar.

838 See Hasse, Marienkirche, pp. 211 and 212.

839 The tablet is reproduced in Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 212, image 135.2. The inscription reads: “Anno 1697 is dieser Altar Gottzuehren und Heiligem Gebrauch von Herrn Thomas Friedenhagen Rathmann dieser Stadt aus gutem freyen Willen verehret worden.”


841 Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 212.
wrote his guidebook, noting that a memorial to Superintendent Hermann Bonnus (1504-1548) could be seen “to the right of what is now perceived as the altar” in St. Mary’s church.842

Lübeck’s organ works long pre-dated the Reformation: the first mention of an “organist” in St. Mary’s church is found in a testament from 1377, while the first known incidences of organ music in Lübeck’s churches date from the century prior.843 The size and complexity of the city’s instruments increased dramatically during the sixteenth century, as the Bürgermeister and guild elite who made up the parish councils commissioned new organs to replace the outdated originals.844 The Lutheran concept of Erbauung –the notion that “through participation came edification” on the part of regular Christians845— ensured that music became a defining feature of the Lutheran liturgy in confessional-age Europe, and this new hallmark quality proved a boon to organ music in cities like Lübeck, where the organ gained a notably larger role in the liturgy in the seventeenth century, and where organists like Buxtehude become famous for their prolific composition of devotional and commemorative music.846


843 Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 23 and 5, respectively.

844 Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, pp. 5 and 26, on the complete replacement of “old Organs” in the Dom and Marienkirche.

845 See Lee, “Communal Transformations,” p. 164, for this summary of the “Erbauung principle.”

846 On the Lutheran confession’s characteristic emphasis on music and its role in spreading Luther’s style of reform in Germany, see Chistopher Boyd Brown, Singing the Gospel: Lutheran Hymns and the Success of the Reformation (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005). On the growing role of the organ in the Lutheran liturgy during the
The merchant Joachim Wulff got his final wish. Following his death in 1673, the Kirchenvorsteher who received the monies Wulff had earmarked for “a large organ or a new altar” set about renovating the main organ in St. Jacob’s church. This instrument had lapsed into disuse during decades-long overhaul of the church tower that began in 1628, and as money ran short during the Thirty Years’ War, the dirty and decrepit state of the organ became annoyance not only to organist Joachim Vogel, but also to the churchwardens, one of whom was Wulff himself. 847 Krüger’s guidebook reveals how Wulff’s bequest became reality: “the beautiful great organ, made in the year 1504, was renovated in the year 1573, and then renovated again by the Lord Masters of the Church (Herrn Vorsteher) in the year 1674, together with the coat-of-arms of the blessed Joachim Wulff.” Wulff was particularly fortunate in his efforts to commemorate himself in Lübeck’s “church of fishermen and seafarers”: further repairs and modifications in the 1720s and 1730s did not fundamentally alter the “extraordinary aspect” Wulff’s largesse gave to the main organ of St. Jacob’s church. 849 In view of the wartime damages sustained by the Marienkirche, only four hundred meters to the southwest, it is impressive that the honorific inscription “from the Legacy of Joachim Wulf [sic]” has survived to the present day, “in gilded letters running along the bottom of the large organ.” 850

Contemporary guidebooks to Lübeck offer far less information about the new organ erected in the Lübeck Domkirche in the final years of the seventeenth century. Johann Krüger is understandably silent on

seventeenth century, particularly as an accompaniment to congregational singing, see Joseph Herl, Worship Wars in Early Lutheranism: Choir, Congregation, and Three Centuries of Conflict (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 150-181. Finally Buxtehude’s many collaborations with colleagues in Hamburg, Stockholm, and elsewhere give insight into both the compositional autonomy many preeminent organists enjoyed, as well as their prolific output in the seventeenth century; see Snyder, Buxtehude, pp. 107-126.

847 Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 44.


849 Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 44. On the traditional designation of St. Jacob’s parish, see ibid., p. 42.

the *Dom* organ, as construction was still in the initial stages when his *City of Lübeck* appeared in 1697; meanwhile, Jakob von Melle gave this instrument a very cursory treatment in his *Thorough Report*, referring to it only in connection to the “choir newly-built by the Company of *Krämer,*” which he states was erected in 1712 “under the Organ” in the Cathedral’s central nave.\(^{851}\) Fortunately, Dietrich Wölfel has established that the new instrument was commissioned by the churchwardens, constructed by Hamburg organ-makers (*Orgelbauer*) Arp Schnitger and Hans Hantelmann, and completed at the beginning of the year 1699, whereupon Dieterich Buxtehude tested it “in the presence of various *Kirchenvorsteher,*” before the latter formally bequeathed the finished organ to the parish on 26 February.\(^{852}\) The relatively long duration of construction — Schnitger started work at the end of July, 1696 — probably owed to the fact that this was an entirely new instrument, built to replace an organ of 1606 that had incorporated parts from previous instruments, some dating from the end of the fourteenth century. The craftsman’s attempts to re-purpose as much of the old organ as possible explains the rapid deterioration of what otherwise seems a relatively “new” instrument: the outdated bellows and organ stops in particular required constant maintenance during the decades of the Thirty Years’ War, while by Buxtehude’s time, only three of the organ’s voicings remained fully functional.\(^{853}\) Although the bright-tin piping and Baroque accents (angels, scrollwork, etc.) visible in pre-war photos were impressive, the indifference of contemporary authors suggests that the *Dom’s* main organ still paled in comparison to Buxtehude’s instrument in the *Marienkirche.*

The *Kirchenvorsteher* of the St. Mary’s parish managed to put off renovating their church’s great organ until 1704, three years before Buxtehude’s death. They did so in defiance of the organist’s professional

---


\(^{853}\) Wölfel, *Welt der Orgeln*, pp. 6-7. All of Lübeck’s churches boasted a second organ — typically for weddings, funerals, and other small gatherings—and these were used when the main organ fell into disrepair, and during re-constructions and renovations; *cf.* Lee, “Communal Transformations,” pp. 163.
recommendation: at Buxtehude’s request, organ-maker Schnitger spent a month inspecting the organs in 1689, submitting a written work order that the Kirchenvorsteher rejected. Buxtehude tried again twelve years later, complaining in a memorandum of 1701 that the great organ “had not been repaired in fifty or sixty years and longer, was full of dust, and had many other defects which prevented it from giving its proper resonance, and thus was greatly in need of repair.”

By his own admission, Buxtehude made such pleas “out of love for the organs,” and his sentiment probably drove him to exaggerate for effect, insofar as his main instrument was far more up-to-date and better maintained from 1668 onward than were its counterparts in the Jakobikirche and Dom. The St. Mary’s organ had been renovated in 1637-1641, a date that corresponds almost exactly to the “sixty years” the organist lamented at the start of the eighteenth century. Moreover, Buxtehude oversaw (and disbursed funds for) cleaning and repairs the church’s organs on a nearly annual basis between 1668 and 1685, with an extensive cleaning and tuning occurring in 1673 (the year Buxtehude debuted the first Abendmusiken in his own style). Within two decades, however, Buxtehude had occasion to complain about decreased support for his music among the guild leadership, and the letter from 1687 indicates that he was occasionally forced to appeal to his patrons for the funds necessary to sustain his own performances and their accompaniment. He received the money, but his suspicions were borne out when the requested repairs finally materialized: in 1704, the parish paid 510 Lübeck Marks for repairs to the large organ proper, but paid nearly five times that amount the following year.

---

854 Buxtehude, quoted in Snyder, Buxtehude, p. 86.
855 Buxtehude in 1689, quoted in Snyder, Buxtehude, p. 86: “[Schnitger] spent four weeks there [in Lübeck] inspecting both organs; during this time Buxtehude provided his meals at no cost to the church ‘out of love for the organs’.”
856 Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 27. The “extensive work” done to the organ during these years was carried out by organ-builder Friedrich Stellwagen.
857 Snyder, Buxtehude, p. 86; cf. Lee, “Communal Transformations,” p. 163-164. The account books for the period after 1685 are no longer extant, but considering the increasing fame of Buxtehude and the Abendmusiken at the end of the century, it is likely that basic maintenance and cleaning continued well beyond 1685.
858 Snyder concludes for the beginning of the eighteenth century that “appearance seems to have been more important to the church directors than sound”; see Buxtehude, pp. 86-87.
for purely cosmetic improvements, which included gilding the organ façade and adding a silver coating to the wings of two large angel figures, newly installed at the top corners of the three-story pipe cabinet.\textsuperscript{859} This attention to the dual function of organs (i.e. as both instrument and showpiece) resonated in the early eighteenth century, as the subsequent generation of Kirchenvorsteher not only paid for the addition of new registers in 1733, but added a conspicuously high-Baroque touch in the form of three engraved and gilded panels spelling out the legend GLORIA IN EXCELSIS DEO.\textsuperscript{860} While performances of Buxtehude’s \textit{Abendmusik} survived him in St. Mary’s church by a full century, the burgher elite viewed the organist and his music as one component of the broader message of corporate piety and civic material grandeur being expressed in the city’s churches.

Citizens at various levels of affluence recognized the important role the church Werkmeister played in maintaining the splendor of their city’s churches, and their gifts and largesse helped to offset the massive costs associated with organ music. While small testamentary gifts to the churches declined in overall frequency after the Thirty Years’ War, a few artisans and merchants continued to remember the servants of the churches in their wills after mid-century. In 1659, for example, a middle-ranking craftsman named Peter Witte left a total of 130 Lübeck marks to the Bediente of the church; this included twenty marks for the cantor, twenty for the organist, and the same amount again for the Werkmeister.\textsuperscript{861} The slightly better-off Catharina Arendts, probably the wife of a merchant or prestigious craft guild member, left nearly identical sums to the inhabitants of each office in 1665. In the 1680s, two men of comparable rank simply bequeathed lump sums to the parish, which meant that the money might go to building renovations, organs, or church staff at need; specifically, a certain Jochim Warneke gave thirty marks to St. Jacob’s parish in his testament of

\textsuperscript{859} Snyder, \textit{Buxtehude}, pp. 86-87.

\textsuperscript{860} Wölfel, \textit{Welt der Orgeln}, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{861} Eßmann, \textit{Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz}, appendix C, p. 13.
1681, and Hanß Prehn gave fifty to the small Burgkirche at the northern extreme of Lübeck’s Altstadtinsel. The small overall number of surviving testaments allow few firm conclusions, apart from suggesting that both social elites and middling burghers continued to value music in their churches; notably, Hinrich von Lingen earmarked a full fifty-one percent of his modest wealth (100 Lübeck marks of a total of 194) for the organ in St. Lorentz’s parish (founded in the sixteenth century on an outer bank of the city’s main canal), while council member Cordt von Dorne left seventy-five marks of his conspicuous wealth for Werkmeister Buxtehude.

Bequests of this type undoubtedly assisted parishes in keeping the organs functioning and the churches clean and repaired, but they were nowhere near enough to offset the kind of costs the parishes incurred year upon year from organ-builders and organists. Though the preserved wills disclose only a fragment of the actual testamentary giving, the occasional nature of these bequests after 1650 suggests that Kirchenvorsteher must have relied heavily on the weekly giving of the congregation, and on frequent gifts by corporations and individuals in order to build and sustain the organ music that made Lübeck famous.

< Death from Lübeck: Funeral Monuments >

---

862 Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, appendix C, p. 17.

863 Eßmann, Eigennutz zum Gemeinnutz, Anlage C, “Fromme Legate im Lübeck des 17. Jahrhunderts,” p. 18. Lingen’s gift to the parish church is extraordinary in proportion to the total wealth of his testament, while von Dorne’s bequest of 75 Ml. to the Werkmeister of St. Mary’s was a miniscule proportion (far less than one percent) of the 25,350 Ml. declared in his testament; see ibid.
The practice of erecting *Gedächtnistafeln* or cenotaphs in Lübeck’s churches pre-dated the Reformation, but the transformation of this genre from simple wooden memorials to massive *objets d’art* testifies to a new elite enthusiasm for pious commemoration in the seventeenth century. Basic cenotaphs dated at least to the year 1518: Krüger’s description of St. Mary’s identifies Gotthard Wigerinck’s “brazen death memorial [Leich-mahl] upon the wall beneath the choir, next to the altar,” whereupon “the crest of the same” occupied pride of place. Family crests are characteristic of the original, late medieval style of cenotaph design that held sway throughout the sixteenth century, at seen in the monument to Bürgermeister and city ambassador Hermann von Dorne (d. 1594). In a post-WWII analysis of Lübeck’s funeral monuments, Lutz Wilde suggested that this monument “embodies” the typical sixteenth-century style: the wooden tablet was richly carved with Dorne’s family crest, and gave his name, social rank, and date of death “in brief form”, while omitting any image beyond the crest. As cenotaphs gained popularity among Lübeck’s elite merchants and magistrates, however, they became more ornate, causing a shift in contemporary language. Krüger refers most commonly to “crests” and “cenotaphs” (*Wappen* and *Gedächtnistafeln*, respectively) for the sixteenth century, but uses the term “epitaph” (*Epitaphium*) to denote the increasingly ostentatious memorials of the seventeenth. He also implies that the vast majority of this patronage was dedicated to St. Mary’s church, the parish home of
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865 Wilde, “Epitaphien,” p. 112.


**Figure 14**: Cenotaph of Hermann von Dorne (photo: Wikimedia Commons)
the city council and merchant companies, where the popularity of memorials grew in proportion to their stylistic richness. Krüger’s book describes only eight burgher funeral memorials for the sixteenth century, compared to twenty-two added to the walls and pillars of the Marienkirche between 1600 and the date of Krüger’s printing in 1697. Of these, twelve were dedicated to prominent men who died after 1650, with nine of the twelve bearing dates of death (objit Anno) between the new constitutional settlement of 1669 and the print year. Though the Short Description is certainly not comprehensive – it appeared at the beginning of a new, fifteen-year vogue for massive Baroque memorials à la Bürgermeister Ritter – both this work and Melle’s Thorough Report suggest a clear concentration of the new Epitaphien in the last few decades of the century. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the urban elites who lived through Lübeck’s postwar crisis had superseded their forefathers in the quantity and richness of their commemorative bequests.

Images on epitaphs were not taboo in Lübeck after the Reformation. Krüger locates “Herrn M. Johann Böckmann’s cenotaph and likeness (Gebilde) of Anno 1548” on the wall above the disused chapel of the Novgorodfahrer. Likewise, several other memorials from the subsequent decades featured visual depictions of Gospel scenes. However, a post-Reformation vogue for images seems only to gained permanent traction in the early seventeenth century, as burgher patrons began to commission epitaphs from artists schooled in the “northern Renaissance” style of the Netherlands. An emphasis on the family coat-of-arms (Wappen) ensured that the cenotaph dedicated to Bürgermeister Heinrich Brokes (1567-1623) retained a late-medieval appearance, but the work also demonstrated significant Renaissance influence in the
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867 Krüger’s Kurtze Beschreibung der Stadt Lübeck describes twenty-two new epitaphs dedicated to lay Lübeckers in St. Mary’s during the seventeenth century, compared to three in St. Jacob’s, three in St. Peter’s, and two in the Lübeck Cathedral.


detailed, “architectural” framing of the inscription tablets below the crest, which were flanked by two small allegories carved in relief. Though it may be said to straddle the two styles, Brokes’s monument appears the work of a traditionalist when we consider that the patrician Gotthard von Höveln (1544-1609), who died nearly fifteen years before, had embraced the Renaissance style in an epitaph that eschewed Wappen altogether in favor of a detailed relief carving of the resurrection of Lazarus, flanked by graven columns and topped with an overtly Italianate portico. The capstone of this era came ten years later, as philanthropic council member Johann Füchting (1571-1637) commissioned Amsterdam sculptors Aris Claeszon and Pieter Adriaenszon to produce a work that, in Wilde’s phrasing, “embodied the multi-story architectural epitaph with pronounced pillars and niches developed in the Renaissance,” and included a likeness of Füchting himself, kneeling in prayer. Like Höveln, Füchting appears a major innovator when placed in a continuum from the coats-of-arms of von Dorne and Brokes to Baroque monuments of the kind commissioned by Ritter in 1700. When Füchting’s epitaph was finally erected in 1637, the massive scale and rich marble of his monument dwarfed and outshone the wood and sandstone of previous generations, setting a precedent for the Baroque epitaphs of Buxtehude’s time.

The epitaphs of Mattheus Rodde (d. 1678) and Friedrich Plönnies (1607-1686) were destroyed or badly damaged in 1942, but their design and background encapsulated the major changes to Lübeck’s internal political order enshrined in the 1669 Bürgerrezeß. For Rodde, a Spanienfahrer merchant who helped to lead the negotiations that produced the Bürgerrezeß, Krüger describes only “a well-adorned epitaph and portrait” erected the year after his death in 1677. This monument was nonetheless conspicuous in its time,

870 Wilde, “Epitaphien,” p. 112-114 and Image 2. Wilde associates Brokes’s epitaph with the late-medieval style of Hermann von Dorne’s (see figure 15).


872 Hasse, Marienkirche, pp. 204 (Image 129) and 206.

873 Krüger, Kurtze Beschreibung der Stadt Lübeck, p. 109, and Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 207.
because it was the first to eschew triptych-style depictions of the patron in favor of “a very large, conspicuous quilled frame with the portrait in the center." Krüger offered a scant description of Friedrich Plönnies’s epitaph (1687), dubbing it merely “well-constructed”; in fact, the Plönnies epitaph was a deliberate stylistic anachronism. Like those of the pre-war council members Heinrich Brokes and Hermann von Dorne, the Plönnies memorial was dominated by “the coat-of-arms of himself and his forebears,” which hearkened to Friedrich’s grandfather Hermann Plönnies, a patrician who had staunchly opposed the radical reforms of Bürgermeister Jürgen Wullenwever in 1533. For his part, the younger Plönnies supported the patrician camp in the constitutional disputes of the 1660s, and would have worked closely with Gloxin and Rodde in framing the new constitutional settlement, which he signed on behalf of the patrician party (representing the remnant of the old council) in January of 1669. The difference in social-professional background that distinguishes these two men was not lost on Krüger. Both men served on the re-constituted council, but Rodde’s memorial named him Cons., for “consul,” or senate-appointed executive, while Plönnies was dubbed “Senator” (Senatus), in reference to his inherited patrician status. In the ensuing decade, the jurists and merchants who proliferated on the council after 1669 favored epitaphs in the innovative style chosen by Rodde; the lawyer Dr. Heinrich Balemann, for example, had himself commemorated in “a well-made and precious Epitaph with portrait” in 1694. The memorials of Rodde and Plönnies reveal a stylistic
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874 “Mattheus Rodde,” in Fehling (ed.), Lübeckische Ratslinie, p. 125. Rodde was a member of city council, and his concomitant status as a member of the parish council for St. Mary’s helps to explain his desire (and ability) to be recognizably present church itself in perpetuity.


879 Krüger, Kurtze Beschreibung der Stadt Lübeck, p. 111-112. Balemann died only seven years after Plönnies, he was a full thirty-six years younger than his fellow council member. A jurist by training, Balemann served for years as the city’s Syndic or ambassador, which propelled him to the rank of council member in 1680 and thereafter enabled him to
tension that obtained between members of guild elite—made upwardly mobile by the Bürgerrezeß—and the representatives of the urban patriciate, who lost their oligarchic claims to power in the new constitutional settlement.

The asymmetrical grandeur implied by the root word *barroco* achieved its clearest expression in a final wave of epitaphs built for the Lübeck Ratsherren during the last decade of Buxtehude’s life. The style of these later memorial can be readily categorized as “Flemish Baroque,” due to defining role of played in their construction by Thomas Quellinus, who came to the attention of wealthy city councilors in consequence of the altar he built for Thomas Fredenhagen in 1696-1697. Quellinus brought the same ornate craftsmanship to the four memorials he created for Lübeck Ratsherren prior to his death in 1709, and these continued to inspire imitators for a generation thereafter. The resulting wave of epitaphs not only transformed the central nave of St. Mary’s into a distinctly Baroque space, but also claimed it as the exclusive preserve of the reconstituted city council by populating this central liturgical sphere with portraits and monuments dedicated to men like Johann Ritter. Ultimately, these memorials ensured that Quellinus outlived Buxtehude as the resident artist of the Marienkirche: while Abendmusik performances continued to mark Lübeck as a seat of Lutheran “Baroque” culture until the Napoleonic occupation of the early nineteenth century, the massive epitaphs erected during the organist’s last years continued to “define the inner space of the church” down to the Palm Sunday raid of 1942.

---


881 Hasse, *Marienkirche*, pp. 208-209

The Baroque aesthetic entered Lübeck via the organ works, which wealthy citizens began to appropriate as sites for self-commemoration during Buxtehude’s early years in office, but it achieved full flower in the epitaphs constructed at the end of the century. Shortly after the dedication of Fredenhagen’s altar, the patrician Bürgermeister Hieronymus von Dorne (1646-1704) commissioned Quellinus to design an epitaph for the patrician Hartwich von Stiten, who had died in 1692 and made von Dorne his testamentary executor. The resulting memorial of 1699 was made of black marble, had winged cherubim supporting the funerary epitaph, and was conspicuous for a large memento mori comprising a berobed Death with wings and an hourglass.\textsuperscript{883} The epitaph Quellinus executed for the merchant Adolf Brüning (1634-1702) was nearly obliterated by bombs, but Max Hasse’s reconstruction reveals that it also boasted a centrally-located figure of Death, together with classical columns supporting a quantity of drapery, framing both the memento mori and a portrait of Brüning.\textsuperscript{884} Unlike Stiten, Brüning probably commissioned the work himself, though this seems to have altered Quellinus’s style little; in fact, the latter’s visual devices soon became the hallmarks of the Baroque vogue in Lübeck. Though the jurist Johannes Ritter innovated deliberately for his epitaph of 1700, his choice of a coffin is congruent in this regard with elements of two subsequent Quellinus epitaphs, one made for Hieronymous von Dorne himself in 1704, and the other for Dr. Anton Winckler (1657-1707). Von Dorne’s memorial was clearly inspired by the

\textsuperscript{883} Wilde, “Epitaphien,” p. 117-118 and Image 5.

\textsuperscript{884} Hasse, Marienkirche, pp. 217-218.
one he commissioned for friend Hartwich von Stiten; it too featured a central portrait with adjacent grim reaper. Meanwhile, Winkler’s epitaph downplayed the figure of death in favor of a large central bust of the deceased, carved in full relief and flanked by cherubim. Quellinus died in 1709, but his style would be imitated by various sculptors commissioned by a subsequent generation of magistrates. Foremost among these were the Lübeck sculptor Hans Freese, who crafted a close imitation of the von Stiten epitaph for the Bürgermeister Gotthard von Kerkring in 1707, and Hieronymus Jakob Hassenberg, who copied the Fredenhagen altar in two of the churches in Lübeck’s environs. The craftsmanship of the later memorials did not always equal Quellinus’s work, but these confirmed overtly Baroque themes as the dominant aesthetic in Lübeck’s churches.

The fashion for Baroque memorials in the last decades of the seventeenth century was more than a mere stylistic consensus. The visual culture maturing in Lübeck only became fully high-Baroque with the arrival of Quellinus and his imitators, but this had clear antecedents in church music, as Kirchenvorsteher and individual patrons rebuilt, maintained, and adorned the organs synonymous with the Abendmusik of Dietrich Buxtehude. Unlike organs, funeral epitaphs had no explicit liturgical function, and were thus adiaphora, like the pew-boxes and candle-holders with which they shared space in the churches. However, all these objects of patronage bore lasting witness to the fact that their donors were faithful Christians, devoted to Lutheran orthodoxy on the high-church model. The genres supported by individuals and guild served as markers of
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885 Lutz, “Epitaphien,” pp. 119-120 and Image 9. The choice of a neo-classical marble bust instead of a painted panel to represent the deceased would resonate in later epitaphs, but also bears more than a passing likeness to Fredenhagen’s chosen mode of self-depiction on the new St. Mary’s altar, which included full-relief busts of both the merchant and his wife.

886 Hasse, Marienkirche, p. 218, and Lutz, “Epitaphien,” pp. 119-121. Hassenberg’s altars were commissioned for the churches in Genin and Tavemünde. He also drew upon Quellinus’s epitaphs for the allegorical memorial he crafted for Bürgermeister Johannes Westken in 1714.

887 Lutz “Epitaphien,” pp. 121-127, and Images 12-17. These images suggest that the fashion for funeral monuments in Quellinus’s “Flemish Baroque” style only gave way to a new, neo-classical restraint after about 1750.
civic membership, but also of status; liturgical furnishings, for example, were the only sphere open to the city’s artisans, who confined their patronage mainly to church seating and candlesticks. The merchant corporations expanded and maintained their lavish pew-boxes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while individual elders memorialized themselves by means of pulpits, organs, and altars. Funeral monuments were the province of magistrates from the *rentier* patriciate and merchant elite, and it is no coincidence that the social composition of those who commissioned epitaphs mirrored that of the reformed city council after 1670. Like organ music, commissioning memorial tablets to adorn one’s home church was a practice that pre-dated the Protestant Reformation, but these became the preeminent spheres for elite patronage in a century when death seemed ever-present.

< *Conclusion: Civic Lutheranism and Lutheran Baroque* >

Seventeenth-century church patronage articulated the unity of all urban ranks, but also stressed the differences between the various ranks and honorable professions that comprised the urban body politic. These twin functions were not contradictory; apart from a few radicals like Jürgen Wullenwever, early-modern Lübeckers agreed that the differentiation of ranks was an essential element of the city’s constitutional tradition. Since the Reformation, church seating and lighting had been the preserve of the city’s guilds, who maintained their claims to the sacral space into the seventeenth century with few innovations. Wealthy merchants like Hinrich Eckhoff and Thomas Fredenhagen earmarked their gifts for new pulpits, altars, and organs, which commemorated them individually, rather than as members of their respective merchant guilds. By demanding that the city council be staffed with merchants and jurists, the *Bürgerrezeß* made Lübeck’s commercial elite upwardly mobile in the final decades of the seventeenth century. Accordingly, merchants like Mattheus Rodde developed a new taste for elaborate epitaphs which had formerly been the preserve of Lübeck’s oligarchs. Those who remained after 1669 had vowed to work closely with both the merchants and the guilds, but this was a reform rather than a revolutionary measure;
the patricians who remained on the council were not expected to abandon the quasi-aristocratic status built up over two centuries. Instead, they emphasized their wealth and influence by embracing the new potential for ostentation found in the “Flemish Baroque” of Thomas Quellinus, and in so doing, helped to forge a new church culture by the first decade of the eighteenth century.

Cultural life in seventeenth-century Lübeck remains closely associated with Dietrich Buxtehude, but concomitant developments in material culture suggest that his career should be viewed as part of a broader corporate image created by enfranchised Lübeckers in response to a century of overlapping crises. Church music – the chorale, the rich Lutheran hymnody, and the central liturgical application of the organ— has rightly been portrayed as a hallmark that distinguished evangelical church life from both the Reformed tradition and post-Tridentine Catholicism in seventeenth-century Germany. However, we must also account for the fact that the rapid growth of this tradition during Buxtehude’s lifetime was accompanied by a general upswing of citizen interest in church beautification, including both functional church furnishings (pews, candelabra, pulpits and altars) as well as commemorative additions (organ inscriptions, cenotaphs, and sculpted epitaphs). While numerous scholars have explained the thematic shifts in citizen patronage as a function of the original Reformation, no one has yet suggested links between the unprecedented collaboration of the urban estates in domestic Kirchenpolitik after the Peace of Westphalia, and the concomitant rise in Baroque patronage. By re-making their churches in the unmistakably high-church idiom

888 While the visual richness of Catholic churches remains virtually synonymous with the “Baroque” style of architecture and plastic arts, music and hymnody enjoyed no such pride of place in the post-Tridentine Catholic liturgy. This disparity was sufficiently pronounced that some representatives of the Counter-Reformation appropriated Lutheran hymns as part of their efforts to re-convert German Lutherans, a phenomenon Christopher Brown has reconstructed for Joachimsthal; see Brown, Singing the Gospel, pp. 140-145. At the other extreme, the whitewashed austerity of the Reformed tradition made only late and grudging allowances to musical accompaniment, with many communities retaining a cappella singing until well into the eighteenth century. This was particularly true in Lübeck, where the Reformed community only erected their first “small organ” in 1799, after more than a century in the city; see Dietrich Wölfel, Welt der Orgeln, p. 75.
of the “Lutheran Baroque,” magistrates, merchants and guildsmen of the post-war generations made a public and permanent statement of loyalty to their city’s home-grown constitutional and religious traditions.
Conclusion

“On Account of Pressing Need”: Civic Lutheranism and the Lutheran Baroque in Seventeenth-Century Germany

In a genteel letter of complaint written in 1687, Dietrich Buxtehude solicited additional financial support for his work in Lübeck’s churches. Citing in particular the cost of paying singers and instrumentalists, Buxtehude noted apologetically that “[I] must, on account of pressing need, take refuge in my gracious and most honorable lords and patrons, as leaders of the commercial guilds, by whom this Abendmusique was originally desired.”

Buxtehude’s work had gained much notoriety in Lutheran Germany by the time of his death in 1707, and his career in the city was a founding component of the international image of prosperity, order, and civic unity Lübeckers sought to create “on account of pressing need”; that is, after decades of political, religious, and constitutional turmoil. Whether innovative or derivative in musical terms, Buxtehude’s longstanding performances must now be re-assessed in light of their social importance: they were not merely the re-birth of a Protestant cultural identity for Lübeck in a Baroque idiom, but also the visible apex of a broader social-religious effort to promote stability in urban society. Far from a “secularizing” era in urban life, Lübeck’s seventeenth-century crisis produced a closer and more publicly visible bond between the mercantile identity restored in the 1669 Bürgerrezeß and the self-consciously orthodox Lutheran confessional identity advocated by the urban clergy since the Formula of Concord.

Today, Dieterich Buxtehude ranks among the best-known (and most-studied) Lübeckers of the early-modern centuries. However, the “pressing need” he cited in 1687 reminds us that in his own time, Buxtehude’s social standing was far less grand than his present-day place in the artistic genealogy of German composers. The hardships Buxtehude evoked were similar to those that afflicted Bach and Handel in their
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client relationships to urban elites and European princes. Even if such financial hardships were commonplace, concomitant trends in the social history of religion in Lübeck urge us to question the broader intentions of Buxtehude’s patrons. When placed in its immediate, seventeenth-century context, Buxtehude’s career represents a much broader patronage phenomenon: in the former Hanseatic capital, decades of crisis in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries provided the impetus for a new largesse that, in visual and aural terms, evoked the “high church” model of Electoral Saxony and the Scandinavian kingdoms. The conspicuously “Lutheran” and “Baroque” qualities of the Abendmusiken resonated in the ornate pulpits and funeral memorials that formed the most conspicuous element of the city’s confessional response to a matrix of new economic challenges and political tensions. Like the Lutheran worship service they assisted, the ornate pew-boxes and candlesticks that decorated the church interiors served as sites of citizen participation in a mode of church life designed to complement the new legislative and disciplinary initiatives agreed upon by magistrates, pastors, and ordinary citizens in the course of the seventeenth century. Even before Buxtehude’s debut in Lübeck, enfranchised Lübeckers of all ranks were accustomed to lavish patronage on religious life in order to convey a much-needed message of authority, political cohesion, and prosperity in the face of far-reaching changes in the political and economic ordering of northern Europe.

Newer research suggests that the confessionalized public face Lübeckers created for their city after 1650 influenced similar developments in other Lutheran polities of the Holy Roman Empire. Christopher Brown and Tanya Kevorkian have each stressed the evocative power of church music—as manifest in the Reformation hymnody of Joachimsthal and Baroque Leipzig, respectively—as a defining feature of Lutheran confessional identity in the two centuries after Luther. Meanwhile, Kerala Snyder has emphasized that the organ, as an instrument and artistic object, serves as a unique “historical and aesthetic mirror” of the

circumstances that produced a widespread vogue for this music in northern Europe between about 1650 and 1750. Though particularly ornate in Lübeck and Hamburg, this fashion was not confined to the core cities of the declined Hansa; decades before Bach’s pilgrimage to Lübeck from Arnstadt, the city’s organs had already served as the model for a new instrument constructed by the city council and merchants of Stralsund (on the Pomeranian coast) in 1659. Gisela Jaacks argues that this cultural nexus included not only cities, but also ducal courts, and stresses that “distinguished musicians” were valued for their political capital in both types of polity, as the ability to recruit and retain them “counted as sure sign of financial soundness and internal harmony,” and promoted a “political image as a trustworthy ally and partner.”

A vibrant church-music tradition proclaimed a similar message in the German-Lutheran network of territorial churches and university faculties. In a new study detailing the “material presence” of church music in Lübeck—organs, their facades, and choir galleries in particular—Matthias Range argues that “a rich musical culture was a characteristic of staunch Lutheranism ... and may have served to mark a difference from the Schwärmer and other Protestant traditions in which music was ‘scorned.’” In aural and visual terms, Lübeck’s musical treasures had many analogues by the end of the seventeenth century, and it is therefore appropriate to speak of “Lutheran Baroque” networks in the traffic of individuals like Buxtehude and Bach, and the material culture that accompanied their work in the churches.

Re-constructing church patronage in post-Reformation Lübeck suggests that by the 1680s, Buxtehude’s finances did not suffer because his patrons were losing interest in church music, but rather because guild leaders and magistrates had developed a keen new interest in the visual manifestations of art and architecture that accompanied their work in the churches.


893 Range, “Material Presence of Music in Church,” pp. 197-198. “Schwärmere” translates as “enthusiasts,” but was commonly used by the orthodox clergy to refer to religious non-conformists of varying types.
Lutheran piety. Scholars of the Lutheran Baroque have tended to stress the political, economic, and confessional ties that linked Lübeck to Hamburg, and joined the experience of both cities to the other urban and royal centers of church music; Jaacks in particular has noted that “restrictions with regard to law and religion” shaped the restrictive policies both city councils adopted toward immigration by “wealthy non-Lutherans.” However, no-one has yet linked the flowering of seventeenth-century church music to other contemporary genres of citizen patronage, nor explained why Lübeck – the “economically weaker partner” after 1650 – exercised such a leading role in this cultural epoch. The paradigm of “civic Lutheranism” offers an explanation, because it suggests that for Lübeckers in particular, a century of instability had made it imperative to create visible links between one’s status as a citizen and the communal religiosity inherited from the original Reformation.

Civic Lutheranism as it matured in Lübeck was not a natural outgrowth of the city’s original Reformation, but should instead be viewed as a community solution to the confluence of hardships that plagued Lübeck for a century after 1570. As the “shepherds of souls,” Lübeck’s pastors advocated visible reform on Luther’s model as the only true remedy for a century of overlapping crises. The Little Ice Age made the under-reformed state of life in Lübeck a pressing matter of civic government, as the reform desires of pastors coupled with constitutional unrest and a conservative response by magistrates to create repeated disorders in church and city after 1600. The council modified its ad hoc policies by recruiting Nicolaus Hunnius in 1623, but demonstrated little initial enthusiasm for the discipline of belief and daily life the Superintendent advocated in his writings. However, the spread of the Thirty Years’ War to the northern Empire coincided with new spiritual threats from the mystical conclaves that proliferated during the crisis, which pressed the council to new activism against the non-conformist “New Prophets” in the 1630s and
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894 Jaacks, “Ducal Courts and Hanseatic Cities,” p. 34.

895 Ibid.
1640s. The restoration of peace in 1648 initially seemed to vindicate the patrician council’s wartime policy of physical defense and financial diplomacy, but the massive debt and financial extractions these required plunged Lübeck into a second, more severe period of internal unrest between 1650 and the Bürgerrezeß of 1669.

As Reformed immigration and the final collapse of the Hanseatic League threatened to erode the mode of life that pastors, magistrates, and guildsmen had sacrificed to preserve through fifty years of war and internal crisis, public expressions of their inherited Lutheran confessional identity offered a rare site with which to reconcile hard-won urban traditions to the changed landscape of northern Europe after the confessional age. The growth of pious conventicles and radical Pietism in post-war Lübeck suggests that some Lübeckers were dissatisfied with the responses their Gnesio-Lutheran pastors mustered in response to the cycle of warfare, economic crisis, and internal unrest that plagued the city between 1620 and 1670. These, however, were a distinct minority; since the beginning of the century, the city’s pastors had dedicated their printed works and pulpits to urging magistrates and guildsmen to take a hard line against sectarianism and religious non-conformism in the city. While ill-received by the council at first, this message gained traction as disorders multiplied: the new enthusiasm for religious censorship the council demonstrated during the war was soon joined by a fresh emphasis on public ceremonies of thanksgiving and penitence, in the course of which the pastors publicly and unequivocally stressed a Lutheran subject’s duty to obedience. After decades of renewed unrest in the post-war generation, the council decided that the need to preserve internal order outweighed the potential economic benefit of confessional plurality; in a series of intertwined struggles over constitutional reform and religious non-conformism in the 1660s, pastors and guildsmen had made clear that they much preferred loyalty to the city’s established Lutheran traditions over tolerance and inclusion of other faiths. After the Bürgerrezeß restored a “traditional” constitutional model in 1669, the council took an increasingly hard line against Reformed immigration in the 1670s, and broke new disciplinary ground by executing the unrepentant blacksmith Peter Günther for blasphemy in 1687. Their political position secure,
Lübeck’s guilds maintained the symbols of their corporate devotion in the city’s churches. Merchants and members of the council went further as the last Hansetag failed to materialize in 1669, sponsoring a wave of elaborate church patronage that complemented their efforts to shore up their political legitimacy through civic-minded innovations in economic life and Kirchenpolitik.

While pastors bristled angrily at the allegations of ossified, legalistic Orthodoxy leveled by seventeenth-century mystics and Pietists, we must be wary of drawing too direct a line between seventeenth-century clergy and religious practice in Lübeck and the “harmless and well-intentioned men” who staff the churches and schools in Thomas Mann’s Buddenbrooks.896 To be sure, pastors remained heavily dependent upon the largesse of urban elite in 1700, and were not above piously meddling in the affairs of well-to-do parishioners. However, the dramatic new attention magistrates and merchants showed to their Lutheran confessional identity suggests that the secularized religiosity of the novel was still far in the future; the city council and merchant elite of the decades after 1670 proved much more conspicuously and lastingly Lutheran in both their discharge of office and public self-fashioning than had been the case fifty years earlier. Civic Lutheranism was the public process in which magistrates, guildsmen, and pastors fused the social and religious vestiges of their bygone golden age into a refurbished public image for Lübeck in the second half of the seventeenth century.897 The socio-political dimensions of this process underlay the new patronage dynamics of the late seventeenth century, which elaborated dramatically upon the shift toward central liturgical furnishings and functional adiaphora that characterized church patronage in post-Reformation decades. Wealthy magistrates like Johannes Ritter may indeed have sought to ease their fears of death by providing for their own commemoration in their home churches, but the social meaning of their lavish bequests depended upon the lasting commitment citizens of varying ranks had demonstrated to aural and


visual beautification of the urban churches in their weekly giving and their testamentary gifts. As the city council and guilds worked to regain the peace and prosperity Lübeck had enjoyed as the medieval “Queen of the Hansa,” they embraced a conspicuously Lutheran interpretation of the Baroque style in order to create enduring totems to the corporate piety, prosperity, and internal political cohesion they craved following a century of crisis.
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