

2002

The Public House and Military Culture in Early Modern Germany

B. Ann Tlusty

Bucknell University, tlusty@bucknell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_books

Recommended Citation

Tlusty, B. Ann, "The Public House and Military Culture in Early Modern Germany" (2002). *Faculty Contributions to Books*. 78.
http://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_books/78

This Contribution to Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Research and Publications at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Contributions to Books by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

The Public House and Military Culture in Germany, 1500–1648

B. Ann Tlusty

According to local chronicles, when the mercenary captain Schertlin von Burtenbach entered the city of Augsburg during the Schmalkaldic War in 1546, he was accompanied by four thousand men, all of whom were quartered in the city and its environs.¹ A year later, the victorious emperor Charles V entered the city ‘with great strength of troops.’² What would this many soldiers, many of whom were accompanied by their wives and children, mean to a city with a population of between thirty and forty thousand? Where did they stay and how did they get on with the local populace?

Since Michael Roberts published his theory of an early modern ‘military revolution’ in 1956, historians have debated the extent to which this period represents a turning point in the development of the professional military corps that gradually replaced local defence systems.³ The establishment of a standing army was an important step in the process of centralization and in the development of national identity, both of which attended the rise of absolutism. Studies of this process, however, tend to concentrate primarily on institutional aspects such as military organization, competing jurisdictions, improvements in technology, recruitment and financing of troops, and so on, and to pay little attention to parallel socio-cultural factors that also affected defence decisions.

Recent work that targets the social history of war has begun to correct this imbalance, initially by focusing attention on the primacy of the human needs of the soldiers as a factor affecting military decisions. Frank Tallet for example sees logistics, or the provisioning of troops, as a more crucial problem than the dangers faced in battle. Military leaders since antiquity had known that troop efficiency was tied to sufficient provisions, and by the seventeenth century, this

¹ W. Zorn, *Augsburg: Geschichte einer deutschen Stadt* (Augsburg, 1972), 188.

² ‘mit starker Truppenmacht.’ *Ibid.*, 190.

³ Roberts’s argument appears more recently as ‘The Military Revolution’, in M. Roberts (ed.), *Essays in Swedish history* (Minneapolis, 1967); see also J. Black, *A Military Revolution?* (Basingstoke, 1991); C. Rogers (ed.), *The Military Revolution Debate* (Boulder, CO, 1995).

was a major impetus in the development of standing national armies backed by state-controlled financing.⁴

Food for the soldiers, however, was only part of the problem. Soldiers also needed shelter to survive, particularly in winter. The public inn or tavern provided the obvious solution to both problems, for the provision of food, drink, and lodging in return for money was the basic form of economic exchange that defined the innkeeper's trade.⁵ Paralleling other forms of hospitality, the function of quartering soldiers was gradually taken away from private householders and assumed by inns over the course of the sixteenth century. Inns and taverns also furnished soldiers and military recruiters with space for both professional and social activities. Even the state financing of military operations was partially dependent on public houses, for they provided a significant amount of revenue in the form of taxes on alcohol sales.

This paper will explore the role of inns and taverns in defence systems and in the lives of soldiers in Germany from the sixteenth century through the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), primarily on the example of the imperial city of Augsburg and its environs. The importance of the inn to the highly mobile early modern soldier was related to its designation as a public form of household. Civic leaders after the Reformation placed increasing emphasis on the household as the key to the social discipline of their subjects. Control of the household and responsibility for its peaceful and productive functioning lay in the hands of the family head, and the sanctity of the home was protected by the traditional right of household peace (*Hausfrieden*).⁶ An innkeeper, as master of his household, was also responsible for what went on within his house, and could be held partially responsible for fights and injuries, illegal gambling, blasphemies, or even the conversations that took place on his premises. Nonetheless, as 'public' (*öffentliche*) spaces, inns were more subject to control by the authorities than private households. With the late medieval shift from private to public hospitality, territorial and town officials slowly took over the role of controlling and protecting travellers, and in turn controlling the houses

⁴ F. Tallet, *War and Society in Early Modern Europe, 1495–1715* (London, 1992), 53–5, 62–3; R. Asch, *The Thirty Years War: The Holy Roman Empire and Europe, 1618–48* (New York, 1997), 152–5. For an overview of recent trends in German military history during the early modern period, notably the recent attention to socio-cultural factors, see the review article by P. H. Wilson, 'War in Early Modern German History', in *German History* 19, no. 3 (2001), 419–38.

⁵ All public houses in Augsburg were required by law to provide beds and stables in order to be licensed to seat guests for food or drinks; thus the terms 'inn' and 'tavern' might be used interchangeably.

⁶ H. C. Peyer, *Von der Gastfreundschaft zum Gasthaus: Studien zur Gastlichkeit im Mittelalter* (Hannover, 1987), 34–51, 67.

in which they stayed.⁷ Only in a public house could the city government regulate the amounts and types of food and drink that could be served, the hours during which hospitality was available, and the sorts of facilities guests could expect. This aspect of control increased the suitability of inns for recruiting and military quartering.

Tensions between soldiers and local residents also played out in tavern settings. Inns and taverns had a role in the process of constructing the distinct soldier identities that would ultimately drive a cultural wedge between the military sector and the civilian populace. At the same time, segregation of soldiers from civilians strained relations between urban and rural populations, as soldiers were increasingly expelled from the civic community and forced on the villages.

The relationship between public houses and soldiers in many cases began at the outset of the soldier's military career, with his recruitment. The combination of public space and alcoholic drinks offered by the inn was particularly convenient for military recruiters. As was the case with many kinds of contracts, the fact that the recruitment occurred in a public place made witnesses easy to find. The innkeeper himself sometimes signed recruiting contracts as an official witness.⁸ Persons wishing to enlist not only received an immediate cash payment (*Laufgeld*) from the recruiter, but also a drink afterwards to seal the contract. The offer of cash and drink was naturally irresistible to some tavern patrons, particularly those who were broke, unemployed, and already under the influence of alcohol. Tavern visitors who contracted to enlist while in a drunken state could get out of the contract by returning the *Laufgeld*, for the actual enlistment, or swearing in, did not take place until the recruit appeared at the muster at a time and place designated by the recruiter.⁹ However, if the recruit

⁷ Stadtarchiv Augsburg (hereafter StadtAA), Ratsbücher no. 16 1529–42, 49; Schätze no. ad 36/8, 27; Zucht- und Policey-Ordnung 1537, fol. A4; Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg (hereafter SStBA), 4° Cod.Aug.132, fol. 38v; Peyer, *Von der Gastfreundschaft zum Gasthaus*, 34–51, 67; N. Schindler, *Widerspenstige Leute: Studien zur Volkskultur in der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt, 1992), 250; A. Erler and E. Kaufmann (eds), *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, 8 vols (Berlin, 1967), vol. 1, 2022–3.

⁸ StadtAA, Militaria 53, Werbungen 1578–1716.

⁹ The *Laufgeld* was normally one gulden in the 1590s, but was raised to six gulden during the Thirty Years' War: J. Kraus, *Das Militärwesen der Reichsstadt Augsburg 1548–1806* (Augsburg, 1980), 188. Based on prices for wine and beer in 1589 and 1602, one gulden would have been sufficient for nearly 4 litres of wine or over ten times as much beer: see StadtAA, Chroniken 10, Siedeler Chronik 1055–1619, 173, 284; U. Dirlmeier, *Untersuchungen zu Einkommensverhältnissen und Lebenshaltungskosten in oberdeutschen Städten des Spätmittelalters (Mitte 14. bis Anfang 16. Jahrhundert)* (Heidelberg, 1978), 570. For persons who enlisted while drunk and later returned the *Laufgeld*: StadtAA, Urgichten (hereafter Urg.),

had spent the money in the meantime and was unable to return it, then failure to appear for the muster could lead to arrest and possible punishment.¹⁰

The primary concern of local councils in military matters was of course local defence, and thus civic authorities in Augsburg did not tolerate recruitment of local citizens by foreign powers in their inns. The penalty for enlisting to a foreign power was loss of citizenship.¹¹ Foreign recruiters, however, did operate in Augsburg inns along with local and imperial military representatives, for local citizens were not the only source of new recruits. Strangers from outside the city sometimes reported the intention to enlist as their reason for coming to town.¹² Their activities would most likely have been welcomed by local innkeepers, who would be certain to profit from the combination of hosting travellers and providing drinks for recruits. In fact, some were not above allowing recruiters to advertise their presence by displaying military hardware outside the tavern door.¹³

Once the soldiers had been mustered, military leaders were immediately faced with the challenge of providing them with sufficient food and housing. For this, they depended primarily on local resources. Soldiers during the sixteenth and seventeenth century could rarely expect to be paid regularly, or at a rate sufficient to cover living expenses. Instead, they supported themselves by exacting food, shelter, and contributions from the local populace, or by resorting to plunder. Normally, the households in which soldiers were quartered had to provide provisions, usually in the form of food and supplies, but sometimes also as cash contributions. Provisions ordinances that listed these requirements were designed both to ensure that soldiers were treated in accordance with their rank, and to limit exploitation of their hosts.¹⁴ Cooperation in these matters was often

Hans Dietrich, 15 May 1590; Michael Jeckle, 30 Sept.–12 Oct. 1591; Matthäus Naterer, 1592; Georg Eberle, 10 Oct. 1594; Elias Köln, 9 May 1590.

¹⁰ Even more serious was signing up twice and accepting two payments from different recruiters, which constituted fraud (*Betrug*) and was punishable by banishment even after the money had been returned. StadtAA, Urg., Hans Dietrich, 15 May 1590; Hans Mair, 6 Aug. 1592; Matheus Funck, 5 Aug. 1594.

¹¹ An exception was made for recruiting for imperial forces, since Augsburg, as an imperial city, was officially under the Emperor's jurisdiction (Kraus, *Militärwesen*, 96).

¹² See for example StadtAA, Urg., Michel Jeckle, 30 Sept. 1591; Hans Mair, 6 Aug. 1592; Matthäus Naterer, 1592; Hans Büler, 25–6 Jan. 1594.

¹³ P. Burschel, *Söldner im Nordwestdeutschland des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts: Sozialgeschichtliche Studien* (Göttingen, 1994), 106.

¹⁴ J. Theibault, *German Villages in Crisis: Rural Life in Hesse-Kassel and the Thirty Years' War, 1580–1720* (Boston, 1995), 138; E. Landsteiner and A. Weigl, "'Sonsten finden wir die Sachen sehr übel aufm Landt beschaffen...'" Krieg und lokale Gesellschaft in Niederösterreich (1618–1621)', in B. von Krusenstjern and H. Medick (eds), *Zwischen Alltag und Katastrophe: Der Dreißigjährige Krieg aus der Nähe* (Göttingen, 1999), 229–71, esp.

the best policy. Providing for the soldiers was expensive, but resistance usually meant that the soldiers would be given permission to plunder at will.

During most of the sixteenth century, soldiers in Augsburg were billeted in pairs or with their families in private homes. Some were also put up in inns, which also served as homes for the innkeeper and his family. Sharing living quarters with local families for as long as a year or more, these soldiers and their families were thus integrated into the daily life of the local residents. This is not to suggest that they formed happy multiple-family groups. Certainly friendly relations between the soldiers and their hosts were possible; but such relationships are difficult to evaluate, for peaceful families leave few records behind. To most local citizens, however, the soldiers with their mobile lifestyle, even if they were travelling with wives and children, must have carried a taint of suspicion and disorder from the outset. Households without houses, the vagabond-like soldier families were particularly threatening to the metaphor of the orderly household fostered by civic leaders during the post-Reformation period. Soldiers thus remained 'outsiders' and tended to be unwelcome guests under the best of circumstances. Unmarried soldiers especially, who were usually quartered in pairs, were inclined towards rowdy and unruly behaviour.

In reading the statements of witnesses and defendants involved in altercations with soldiers, it is possible to identify a pattern. Most householders in either defending their actions or discrediting those of their adversaries used a vocabulary that represented the soldiers as a threat to the household. During the so-called 'armoured Imperial Diet' of 1548, for example, Augsburg craftsman Simon Schwert became irritated when he came home drunk and found 'several soldiers sitting about his oven none of whom had been presented to him'.¹⁵ Although the group had apparently been invited by a soldier quartered in his house, Schwert justified provoking them with insults by characterizing them as intruders at his hearth. Perhaps most typical was the household squabble that broke out between weaver Hans Heiss and his unwelcome guest Hainrich Imveld after Heiss tried to put out the fire upon which Imveld's wife was cooking. According to Heiss, the soldier's wife had too much wood on the fire.¹⁶ The accusation that the soldiers wasted wood and other household provisions was a common one, as were arguments over the control of keys and locked doors.¹⁷

234; StadtAA, Militaria 57, 1645. Officers were afforded amounts sufficient to support their entire entourage.

¹⁵ 'etlich lanndtsknecht vmb seinen offen herumb gesessen, vnd doch ime khainer eingefurt gewest', StadtAA, Urg., Simon Schwert, 23 Jan. 1548.

¹⁶ Heiss attacked both the soldier and his pregnant wife with a javelin. StadtAA, Urg., Hans Heiss, 11 Aug. 1548.

¹⁷ Landsteiner and Weigl, 'Krieg und lokale Gesellschaft', 257–8.

At stake in these squabbles was dominion in the household. In formulating their arguments, householders drew on traditional notions of household peace and patriarchal control. The intrusion of these outsiders threatened to undermine order in the household and corrupt the morals of its members.¹⁸ At stake, too, was the dominion of civic authorities; just as the presence of additional men in the household undermined the authority of the family patriarch, the presence of a separate locus of power and discipline in the city in the form of military authority threatened the power of local governors. Household dominion and civic power were related both on a practical and on a metaphorical level. Civic government especially after the Reformation was based on an image of patriarchal discipline and control, with the city council acting in the role of city fathers. They based their vision of a godly community on the model of an orderly household.¹⁹ The unruly soldiers threatened to destroy this ideal on both levels, for fights breaking out between soldiers and citizens represented a greater problem than the normal sorts of swordplay common in early modern city streets. What began as a household squabble could escalate to a confessional or political dispute, and a soldier being killed as a result might have political ramifications. The council's sensitivity to this danger is evident in an ordinance issued in 1547, in which city fathers demanded 'patience' in putting up with the unwelcome visitors and warned sharply against any form of resistance. Provocative or rebellious behaviour on the part of the citizenry, they warned, would lead to the city's ruin, and 'drown [it] in blood';²⁰ elsewhere they cautioned that actions that encouraged 'quarrelling and ill-will between citizens and the soldiers' could easily lead to 'havoc and pandemonium'.²¹

The disgruntled citizenry did not accept the burden of quartering without complaint. In fact, Augsburg's townspeople flooded the city council with countless petitions, seeking every possible avenue of relief. Again, their arguments were shaped to appeal to concern for orderly households and productive crafts. Some invoked moral concerns, complaining that the men of the house often had to be out and the women were left alone with single soldiers. Others complained of space problems, noting that they were sleeping

¹⁸ Tallett, *War and Society*, 166.

¹⁹ According to Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486–1535), the household serves as metaphor for the state ('Das Haus ist ein Bild des Staates'): H. C. Agrippa von Nettesheim, *Die Eitelkeit und Unsicherheit der Wissenschaften und die Verteidigungsschrift*, ed. F. Mauthner (Munich, 1913), 300.

²⁰ 'dardurch dise Stat ... gewisslich im plut ertrinckhen vnnd verterben muest'. StadtAA, Anschläge und Dekrete no. 23, 21 Feb. 1547. Relations with soldiers were particularly tense during the politically charged years of the Augsburg *Interim* (1548–55).

²¹ 'Hans Erhart von Augspurg hat zwischen Burgern vnnd den knechten, villerlay Rumor, Zankh vnnd widerwillen angericht, daraus leichtlich vnrat vnnd auffrur het ensteen mög[en]'. StadtAA, Urg., Hans Erhart, 25 Mar. 1548.

three to a bed even before the soldiers arrived and the only space left was the shop room, leaving them unable to practice their crafts. Many complained about the costs of wasted provisions and damage for which they were not paid, suggesting that their household could end up in financial ruin and their families would be forced to seek poor relief from the city.²²

As disruptive as soldiers could be in private homes, it appears that those billeted in pairs and small groups caused fewer problems for their hosts than larger groups stationed together in public houses. For Augsburg's publicans, hospitality was a matter of ordinance; all those who wished to serve drinks at tables were required by law to provide beds and linen for overnight guests and stables for their horses. A list of quartering costs that has survived from the Imperial Diet of 1550–51 allows a statistical look at the difference between quartering in inns and private households. Based on a sample of half of the entries in the list, 1,399 soldiers and family members were quartered in 553 private homes, for an average of 2.5 per household. Twelve of these were listed as including children. An additional 130 soldiers and their families, three of which included children, were quartered in sixteen public inns, for an average of eight per inn.

The concentration of soldiers in larger groups seems in turn to have increased the potential for disorder. Innkeepers were over ten times more likely to report both costs from damages and incidents of violence than private citizens.²³ It is of course possible that this statistic is inflated by the innkeeper's professional experience in keeping accounts. Innkeepers may well have been more savvy about reporting the costs of damage than private citizens, although the public inn had not by 1551 become so separate from the household as to account for a disparity this great. Unfortunately for the city's innkeepers, however, the threat posed by soldiers to the private household must have seemed more pervasive than the danger posed by rowdy tavern comportment. Over the course of the sixteenth century, soldiers were gradually moved out of the private households and into public institutions, including both permanent military quarters and inns. The result was to create a firmer boundary between the soldiers and the local populace.

The process of isolating soldiers from the populace began in Augsburg with the construction during the 1580s of permanent military barracks. In 1582 the first wing of the so-called *Zwinger* (or barbican)²⁴ was erected on the city wall.

²² StadtAA, Militaria 55, Landquartierwesen 1518–1638.

²³ StadtAA, Schätze 137e, Einquartierbuch 1551. 62.5 per cent of innkeepers claimed damages averaging 15.5 gulden each, and 25 per cent complained of violent incidents; by comparison, 5.4 per cent of other citizens claimed damages averaging 5.2 gulden each, and 2.2 per cent reported violence.

²⁴ The *Zwinger* was so named because of its location in the barbican, the area between the city's inner and outer fortifications.

The *Zwinger* was expanded between 1585 and 1597 to a total of 274 apartments. The apartments were originally built as a residence for permanent members of the local guard, who had formerly been housed in mean huts along the wall, but it was later used to quarter soldiers from outside the city as well.²⁵ The *Zwinger* even contained its own tap house, with wine available to the soldiers at a reduced tax rate. Unlike other publicans in the city, the landlord in the *Zwinger* tap house was also allowed to extend credit to his customers. These measures may have been intended as an incentive for soldiers to stay away from the local taverns (and out of brawls with local citizens).²⁶

The numbers of troops recruited in and around the city during the Thirty Years' War, however, far exceeded the capacity of the city's barracks. By this time, quartering in private homes was apparently no longer considered an option except in extreme situations. This development was not unique to Augsburg, but paralleled billeting decisions elsewhere in Europe.²⁷ Innkeepers, whose houses were considered public, were unable to raise effective objections to the forced billeting of soldiers in their homes. At the beginning of the war, the large numbers of newly recruited soldiers were quartered exclusively in public inns, nearly all of them outside the city walls in the surrounding villages. This remained the solution of choice for Augsburg's authorities throughout the war – whenever possible, troops were quartered in public houses, preferably outside the city. In addition, new military apartments were added to the city walls in 1619, according one chronicler, 'so that the citizenry would not be too burdened by the troops'.²⁸ Thus the city was successful, for the time being, in keeping distance between professional soldiers and the local populace. During this phase of the war, quartering in the city was generally limited to high-ranking officers, who were put up either in the finer inns or the homes of the local elites.

Of course, the quartering of common troops in country villages also had its problems. Based on complaints by the innkeepers of Oberhausen (a village just outside Augsburg's walls), soldiers billeted in village inns proved to be most unpleasant company. Innkeepers complained that they kept other guests out of the inns, either refusing to allow them in or frightening them off with their disorderly behaviour, and that they threatened the wives and families of their hosts

²⁵ Kraus, *Militärwesen*, 198; G. Grünstedel, G. Hägele, and R. Frankenberger (eds), *Augsburger Stadtlexikon* (2nd edn, Augsburg, 1998), 953.

²⁶ StadtAA, *Militaria* 196, 1603. Money to repay debts to the *Zwinger* tap-house could be withheld from the soldier's pay.

²⁷ See for example J. Hunter (England) and H. Heiss (Tyrol) in this volume.

²⁸ 'Damit aber das Kriegs-Volck der Burgerschafft nicht allzu beschwehrlich fallen möchte'. P. von Stetten, *Geschichte der Heil. Röm. Reichs Freyen Stadt Augspurg aus Bewährten Jahr-Büchern und Tüchtigen Urkunden gezogen*, 2 vols (Frankfurt a. M. and Leipzig, 1743), vol. 1, 833–4.

as well. One publican insisted that he ‘could not be sure of life and limb’ as long as the soldiers were in his house; another, that a soldier had beaten his crippled daughter.²⁹ Others told stories of soldiers wrecking inn property, injuring other customers, cursing, gambling, and committing all manner of ‘sins and blasphemies’. The introduction of tobacco in the seventeenth century led to an even greater threat – soldiers, the innkeepers complained, were smoking in the stables in a state of drunkenness, and were certain eventually to burn down their stables, inns, and yards.³⁰ Chronicles and other accounts from throughout Germany suggest that this was hardly an isolated problem; in fact, some historians have suggested that during the Thirty Years’ War, more damage occurred as a result of quartering than from any other form of military action.³¹

To make matters worse, collecting payment for the expenses incurred by quartered soldiers proved extremely problematic for the innkeepers. Theoretically, publicans should have been paid for feeding and lodging soldiers from moneys collected as war contributions. War financing, however, was in a transitional phase during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Ordinances regulating provisions and payments for quarters were difficult to enforce, and the responsible parties were often far away. Many innkeepers complained that soldiers simply refused to pay, or paid only ‘as much as suits their pleasure’.³² One innkeeper petitioned to the War Commission in 1619 for reimbursement after soldiers left secretly during the night without paying their bill of five hundred gulden, leaving an additional four hundred gulden in damages, and stealing much of his silver, linens, and other property besides.³³ Based on this and many other bills, the soldiers spared no expenses at their meals and drinking bouts. Officers in particular often chose expensive imported wine and drank vermouth or brandy with their breakfast. On many days they invited guests and held banquets, consuming amounts equal to five or six days’ ordinary board at one meal.³⁴

Village innkeepers rarely seemed to receive satisfaction for unpaid bills. The War Commission found plenty of excuses to refuse bills, claiming they were submitted too late or included inflated charges.³⁵ When the soldiers were

²⁹ StadtAA, Militaria 34, Werbungen 1624–1745, 1632; Militaria 55, Landquartierwesen Contributionsamt 1518–1638, 1561.

³⁰ StadtAA, Militaria 34, Werbungen 1624–1745, 1632.

³¹ Landsteiner and Weigle, ‘Krieg und lokale Gesellschaft’, 234.

³² ‘...nit, wie dann die verordneten taxier herrn taxiert, betzallt, sonnder sovill und was sy gelust ires gefallens geben’. StadtAA, Militaria 55, 1551.

³³ StadtAA, Militaria 55, 1619.

³⁴ StadtAA, Militaria 55. Foods consumed are not itemized in any of the bills. For similar descriptions from elsewhere in Germany, see for example *Die Chronik des Johann Philipp Mohr*, ed. Christian Waas, in *Die Chroniken von Friedberg in der Wetterau* (Friedberg, 1937), 243–53; Reginbald Moehner, *Reisetagebuch* (SStBA, 4^o Cod. Aug.83), fols 1v–5v, 101v.

³⁵ StadtAA, Militaria 55; Militaria 59.

imperial troops, their hosts often reported that they did not know to whom they could turn with their claims, and even when they applied to the appropriate authorities, the processing of the claim could take years.³⁶ Some innkeepers went into debt themselves in order to keep the inn running, and ultimately were forced to close their doors permanently.³⁷

For Augsburg and its surrounding villages, however, the most devastating phase of the war was yet to come. In March of 1632, between nine hundred and thirteen hundred Bavarian troops entered the city in a short-lived attempt to provide additional defence against the advancing army of King Gustavus Adolphus. They were routed and replaced a month later by several Swedish regiments with a total troop strength estimated at between two and four thousand men. The Swedish troops arrived under the command of the Swedish king himself, who was welcomed as an avenging angel by many of Augsburg's Protestant citizens.³⁸

Space limitations do not permit a detailed description of the complicated shifts in confessional politics that attended the fortunes of war during the years that followed; the primary point to be made is that beginning with Gustavus Adolphus's entry into the city in 1632, using quartering as a form of confessional abuse became the rule. Initially, these abuses still tended to target public institutions, although the numbers of soldiers present in the city during the Swedish occupation soon exceeded the capacity of public houses and buildings. Thus Swedish troops began by taking over Catholic schools, the various buildings associated with the Cathedral, and the Catholic welfare settlement known as the Fuggerei, as well as the *Zwinger* quarters.³⁹ But eventually they also moved into Catholic homes. The ruinous costs of maintaining these troops within the city, too, fell largely upon the unfortunate Catholic citizenry. Military finances by this time were becoming increasingly tied to the government bureaucracy, allowing a greater measure of control from the top. A large portion of the nearly 320,000 gulden spent on war costs in 1633, which made up nearly half of the total city budget, was collected from Catholic householders.⁴⁰ When the city again fell into the hands of the

³⁶ As one petitioner put it, payment could be obtained 'only with a great deal of inconvenience and trouble' ('erst mit grosser unglegenhait unnd mühe') (StadtAA, Militaria 34, 1632); another was still trying to get his payment six years after the fact (StadtAA, Militaria 59, 1638).

³⁷ StadtAA, Militaria 59; Fürstlich und Gräfllich Fuggerisches Familien- und Stiftungsarchiv, Kirchheim/Amtsrechnung, 10 April 1634.

³⁸ B. Roeck, *Eine Stadt in Krieg und Frieden: Studien zur Geschichte der Reichsstadt Augsburg zwischen Kalenderstreit und Parität* (Göttingen, 1989), 687–9.

³⁹ Roeck, *Eine Stadt*, 731; StadtAA, Chroniken 27a, Chronik von Jakob Wagner 1609–47, 150.

⁴⁰ SStBA, 2 Cod°Aug.123 (Singularia Augustana) fol. 33.

Catholics in 1635, the situation quickly reversed, with both the physical and the financial burdens of quartering now falling upon the Protestant members of the bi-confessional city.

Along with financial burdens, the city suffered physical abuse at the hands of both the Swedish and the imperial troops. The extravagant soldier banquets continued, according to one chronicler ‘beginning with brandy in the morning and continuing with wine and beer the entire day’. The drunken soldiers then engaged in malicious destruction of gardens and homes, carried off livestock, and left the city in filth and ruin.⁴¹ By 1635, the financial situation in the city was catastrophic. According to a desperate petition from local defence officials on the part of the citizenry, at least 100 households were already in ruin and the survival of the entire city was at risk.⁴²

At this point even the elite members of the Lords’ and Merchants’ societies began to petition for relief from the ruinous costs of contributions. In return for their financial support of the war effort (overwhelmingly extracted from the Protestant members), most of these wealthy citizens were exempted from actually putting up soldiers in their homes. The standard response from the Office of the Quartermaster to their complaints, then, was that his office was operating under the assumption that contributions were preferable to having the soldiers ‘in [their] very homes and about [their] necks’, but if they would prefer they could take in the soldiers rather than pay the contributions.⁴³

Yet the greatest burden of quartering troops within the city continued to fall on the innkeepers, whose houses were by now clearly viewed as public institutions. In 1634, when the Brewer’s guild petitioned against their disproportionate burden and requested that more soldiers be put up in private homes, they were rebuffed with the explanation that they ‘were all required by their duty and oath to keep public inns and stables’.⁴⁴ According to the brewers’ petition, they had been promised that they would not be disadvantaged by the presence of troops, but would be properly paid and thus should treat them as they would any other guest.⁴⁵ Instead, the soldiers were wasting precious commodities such as oil, wood, salt, and candles, all of which were in short supply during the war, for which they refused to pay. Added to this charge were the usual complaints that they chased off other guests and terrorized the

⁴¹ ‘vnd ist des eßens vnd trinckhens ... am morgen mit dem brandtwein angefangen, vnd hernach mit dem bier vnd wein den gantzen tag gewehrt’. StadtAA, Chroniken 27a, Chronik von Jakob Wagner 1609–47, 173.

⁴² SStBA, 2 Cod° Aug.123 (Singularia Augustana), 1635.

⁴³ ‘gar im Hauß vnnd ob dem Halß zue haben’, StadtAA, Militaria 55, 23 July 1633.

⁴⁴ ‘sie Bierschenckhen all offne wüthßsheüser vnd stalungen: auch pflicht vnd aydt halber haben müßen.’ StadtAA, Militaria 55, 1634.

⁴⁵ ‘hatt man vnnß darneben angezaigt, das wür sie anderst nit, alls für frembde Gösst annemen vnd halten, vnd irenthalber khain beschwerdt tragen sollen’. Ibid.

brewers' families and servants, jeopardizing the continued existence of their businesses. Although Protestant brewers were also more heavily burdened than Catholics, their real disadvantage lay less in their confession of faith than it did in their oath of profession.

Based on Augsburg's financial records, however, these urban innkeepers were ultimately more successful than their village counterparts in collecting reimbursement for the expenses of war. Some may even have profited from entertaining soldiers; at the least, they suffered less than many other groups. The Thirty Years' War had a devastating effect on all of Augsburg's society, but innkeepers as a group recovered more quickly than did most other trades. The total number of inns in the city remained fairly consistent despite a drop in the population of over fifty per cent, so that while there was approximately one inn for every 460 inhabitants around 1600, by 1646 the ratio was greater than 1:200. In poorer areas of the city, numbers of innkeepers actually increased, as did their average net worth, a rare phenomenon after the devastation of the war. Several of the brewing families, far from suffering financially, spent the war years expanding their business into larger breweries. By 1646 a number of beerhouses existed that incorporated two or even three buildings.⁴⁶ This degree of success in the face of adversity certainly contradicts the assumption that the sixteenth-century attacks on drunkenness died out during the seventeenth century because the common classes could no longer afford the luxury of drinking bouts.⁴⁷ Apparently social drinking bouts continued despite the pains of war.

The fact that tavern drinking continued unabated could only have been welcomed by city authorities, for (in the words of Augsburg patrician Markus Welser), 'the daily excesses in boozing [brought] to the city coffers a great and notable profit'.⁴⁸ In fact, the contribution made by innkeepers in providing quarters for soldiers paled in comparison to the financial contributions collected in the form of excise taxes on alcohol. These taxes had always been an important source of income. Between 1550 and 1650, taxes on alcohol made

⁴⁶ B. A. Tlusty, *Bacchus and Civic Order: The Culture of Drink in Early Modern Germany* (Charlottesville, VA, 2001), 43. Net worth is based on collection of property tax, which Roeck has shown to be a reasonable measure of comparative wealth; Roeck, *Eine Stadt*, 52–62; and compare Roeck's tables 56 and 144 (*ibid.*, 486, 938), which show that the mean tax payment of virtually every group in the city decreased between 1618 and 1646.

⁴⁷ As claimed, for example, by R. van Dülmen, *Entstehung des frühneuzeitlichen Europa 1550–1648* (Frankfurt, 1982), 209.

⁴⁸ 'Der Cammer bey solchem vbermässigen Sauffen ... täglich ein namhafften vnd grossen Gelt einträgt'. Welser's remark was made in connection with the excise tax raise of 1547. M. Welser, *Chronica der weitberühmten Kaiserlichen freien und des H. Reichs Stadt Augsburg in Schwaben* (1595, reprint Augsburg, 1984), 68.

up an average of over fifty per cent of Augsburg's total revenue, making them the city's largest single source of funds – and they gained even more in importance during wartime.⁴⁹ A raise in excise taxes on alcohol had helped to finance the cost of peace with the Emperor in 1547,⁵⁰ and the same measure in 1596 raised money to support the war with the Turks.⁵¹ When the expenses of the Thirty Years' War became too burdensome, the council again found that there was 'no more comfortable means' by which to offset the costs than to raise the tax once more.⁵² The first major tax raise came in 1623, and the income that resulted made up over eighty per cent of the sharp rise in total city revenue that occurred in that year.⁵³ The tavern keepers, however, found this solution more burdensome than the war, and filed numerous complaints. The following year, the tax was returned to the former rate, although a higher tax on brandy remained in effect.⁵⁴ The city was again forced to raise the tax on alcoholic beverages during the Swedish occupation between 1633 and 1635, although by this time the results were less spectacular. Still, the income from alcohol taxes made a quicker and more solid recovery after the siege than did other sources of civic income (for example, property taxes). Innkeepers were aware of the importance of this contribution, suggesting in their complaints that because the soldiers were keeping regular guests away from their houses, the city would suffer as a result of lost excise tax revenue.⁵⁵ Their claims were not exaggerated, for excise taxes on alcohol were second only to incurring debt as a means of financing local defence and paying off troops to prevent unrestrained plundering.⁵⁶ Even in towns that depended on raises in direct taxes rather than alcohol taxes as a solution to the problem of war expenses – as, for example, in

⁴⁹ Based on a total of all revenues excluding loans to the city. See Tlusty, *Bacchus*, 176–81. These statistics refer to the account 'Wine Tax' (*Weinungeld*), which included taxes on beer, mead, and brandy as well as wine. Brandy was taxed separately only between 1472 and 1543.

⁵⁰ The tax on wine was raised by 50 per cent, so that nearly half the price of a glass of wine was for tax. Tax on beer and mead was also raised, but at a lesser rate (Welser, *Chronica*, 68); 85,619 gulden in alcohol taxes were collected in 1547, an increase of 87 per cent over the previous year (StadtAA, *Einnehmerbücher*, 1546, 1547). Altogether, the city had to pay 270,000 gulden to the Emperor and his allies, most of which was financed by loans (Zorn, *Augsburg*, 189).

⁵¹ StadtAA, Evangelisches Wesensarchiv no. 458, 212.

⁵² 'kein bequemer mittel': StadtAA, Schätze no. 16, 438, Verrueff vnd Anschlag wegen erhohung dess Ungelts, 15 Sep. 1633.

⁵³ Total revenues for 1623 were 653,554 gulden, 536,772 of which came from tax on alcohol. StadtAA, *Einnehmerbücher*, 1623.

⁵⁴ StadtAA, Ungeldamt MM XVII (fasc. 2).

⁵⁵ StadtAA, *Militaria* 55, 1634.

⁵⁶ Roeck, *Eine Stadt*, 733–75; Zorn, *Augsburg*, 217–19. The relative importance of excise tax to city income, as compared to that of the property tax, increased steadily throughout the war years. StadtAA, *Einnehmerbücher*, 1624–48.

Nördlingen – the alcohol tax continued unabated, remaining a dependable source of city income throughout the worst of the war years.⁵⁷

The soldiers themselves undoubtedly contributed to the health of the drink trade, for their reputation for being less than consistent in paying for their room and board was far exceeded by their reputation as hearty drinkers. The combination of groups of soldiers and readily available alcohol was a dangerous mix. This was especially true as the soldiers were more likely than other citizens to be carrying swords. Early modern men in general were quick to resort to violence in defence of their honour, especially in public places, but military men were under even more pressure to do so. Their profession required not only that they maintain and carry a weapon; they were also expected to know how to use it. Thus tavern fights involving soldiers were a common occurrence. A tragic example of the pressure soldiers and members of the guards could face in tavern situations is provided in the case of Caspar Aufschlager, a guardsman interrogated in 1591 for killing another soldier in a duel that began in an Augsburg public house. Witnesses reported that the victim, Caspar Rauner, had accused Aufschlager of not being ‘man enough’,⁵⁸ to defend himself, and had said that if Aufschlager were an ‘honourable soldier’ (*redlicher Landsknecht*) he would meet him in the street. A local weaver who was present to hear Rauner’s insults also chided Aufschlager with the words, ‘I’ll hit you in the face myself, if you call yourself a soldier and put up with that’.⁵⁹ Thus Aufschlager had no choice but to defend his honour, a decision that was fully endorsed by his guard unit. A petition from his superior officers noted that Rauner had ‘not only greatly injured Aufschlager’s honour, but especially ... made claims that Aufschlager did not have the manhood or honour to fight’.⁶⁰ His actions, they concluded, were entirely in keeping with the expectations of his profession.

Particularly skilful use of a weapon could also win the respect of observers to a fight, as illustrated in the case of an officer identified only as ‘the

⁵⁷ Income from alcohol taxes in Nördlingen ranged from around 35 to 45 per cent of city income in the sixteenth century; during the worst phase of the Thirty Years’ War, there was a real rise in the alcohol taxes, although they dropped to 11.6 per cent of receipts as a result of raises in direct taxes. By 1700, excise taxes on alcohol again made up 39 per cent of municipal income. C. R. Friedrichs, *Urban Society in an Age of War: Nördlingen, 1580–1720* (Princeton, NJ, 1979), 146–62; Stadtarchiv Nördlingen, Stadtkammerrechnungen 1565–79, 1634.

⁵⁸ ‘nit mans genug’: StadtAA, Urg., Caspar Aufschlager, 16 Aug. 1591.

⁵⁹ ‘ich wolt dich selbs in das Angesicht schlagen, wan du woltest ein Landsknecht sein, und solliches gedulden’: *ibid.*

⁶⁰ ‘Er Rauner, nit allain Jhne auffschlager an seinen Ehren gröblich verlötzt, sondern auch ... Jhme fürgeworffen haben soll, als were er auffschlager, der mannlichait Vnnd Redlichait nit, sich mit ainem Zubalgen’: *ibid.*

Portugaller' recorded in 1596. Descriptions by witnesses of what would by our standards be considered a violent killing expressed awe and admiration for the randy soldier, who dispatched his opponent with such speed that he inflicted seven wounds before his unfortunate rival could draw his weapon.⁶¹ Elsewhere, soldiers were moved to violence when a tavern keeper insulted them with the accusation that they were not real soldiers if they had 'never seen a dead man'.⁶² These exaggerated norms of masculine behaviour were particularly likely to come into play in the public house, where tempers were heated with wine and the tavern company provided a supportive audience.

The situation was made even more volatile by the fact that most of the soldiers who shared tables with Augsburg's citizens were foreigners to the city (*Fremde*), and thus outsiders by definition. Local citizens often emphasized this fact by referring to them by their assumed place of origin rather than by name or profession (for example, as Hessians or Prussians). A clear expression of the distance and mistrust that local tavern-goers felt towards their unwelcome visitors is provided by the weaver Jacob Lang, who testified as evidence of his peaceful intentions that before entering an inn in 1548, he was careful to ask if there were any soldiers present, for he did not want any trouble.⁶³ Soldiers also drew on their foreign status to claim ignorance of local laws and ordinances regulating violent behaviour. Thus a soldier from Kassel, who was accused of violating tradition and local ordinance by continuing a fight after an offer of peace had been made, defended himself by claiming that 'he had just arrived, and knew nothing of the customs of this city or how things are here'.⁶⁴

The soldiers, then, were never viewed as a very orderly group, but their image was worsening by the later stages of the Thirty Years' War. The quartermaster in 1635 described the huge numbers of new recruits arriving every day as 'half-grown boys, old hopeless and used-up vagrant beggars, unemployed trouble-makers, [and] the hungry and poor', who, arriving with a great following of women, children, and other relatives, spend their days in bed and do no service beyond wastefully depleting provisions, 'many eating themselves to death before they once hold a weapon in their hands'.⁶⁵ Their dependents were then left to collect poor relief. The depiction of the unruly landsknecht, hardly

⁶¹ StadtAA, Militaria, 192, Georg Pfanner, 3 Feb. 1596.

⁶² 'waß wir fur Soldaten sein wolten ... heten wol vnnser lebtag khein todten Man gesehen'. StadtAA, Militaria 198, Frevel & Excesse 1584–1758, 13 Aug. 1648.

⁶³ StadtAA, Urg., Balthas Laimer, 23 July 1548.

⁶⁴ 'er doch ... aller erst herkhumen, vnd weder prauch noch gelegenhait diser Stat gewusst'; StadtAA, Urg., Hans Pilgerin and Niklaus (Claus) Lunckmair, 24–6 March 1545.

⁶⁵ 'halb gewachßene buben, dann auch alte hailoße auß gearbeitete offene landt: vnnnd straß pettler, störyer, erhungerte, [vnnnd] mangelhaffte ... auß welchen irer vil sich bereith schon zue todt gessen ehe sie ein mahl ... ein wöhr in die hand genomen haben'. SStBA, 2 Cod°Aug.123 (Singularia Augustana), 1635.

more than a vagabond, had by this time become a literary topos. The constant use by the authorities of terms such as ‘soldiers about the neck’ as a threat meant that the cliché of the disorderly soldier was likely to be exaggerated, further enflaming tensions between the occupying troops and the local populace. By this time, too, tensions between the unwelcome guests and their hosts were often exacerbated by confessional differences.

When we examine relations between soldiers and civilians from the perspective of the soldiers, however, these tensions are less apparent. Men at all levels of the military hierarchy attempted to repudiate the tarnished image of their troops, consistently representing their behaviour as honourable, exemplary, disciplined and obedient (as, for example, in the case of the duellist Caspar Aufschlager described above). And according to petitions filed in response to civilian complaints, the abuses of war were not one-sided, for the citizens also took advantage of the soldiers, stealing from them or plaguing them with false charges.⁶⁶ The traditions of hospitality normally associated with early modern public houses often did not seem to apply when it came to soldiers. Instead of being provided with beds, they might be expected to sleep on hard benches in the common room, or be sent to the stables to sleep with animals.⁶⁷ Innkeepers sometimes went to great lengths to try and trick the soldiers or keep them out of their houses, including strewing their homes with filth, claiming their ovens were broken, or charging inflated rates for food and lodging. Ordinances in Nördlingen published during the Thirty Years’ War provide support for such complaints, warning innkeepers to treat soldiers quartered in their inns properly, and in particular to stop insulting them and interfering with their preparation of meals.⁶⁸ Numerous accounts represent plundering by soldiers either as a result of desperation in the face of hunger and poverty, or retaliation for poor treatment at the hands of their hosts.⁶⁹

Unfortunately, sources providing the soldier’s side of the story are few. But where first-hand accounts by common soldiers can be found, they also tend, not surprisingly, to present a more orderly image of their own comportment than that gleaned from innkeepers’ petitions. Soldiers report rewarding good quarters by treating their hosts with respect, leaving their food stores and livestock

⁶⁶ StadtAA, Militaria 57.

⁶⁷ Examples in StadtAA, Militaria 34, Werbungen 1624–1745, 1632; StadtAA, Urg. Georg Engelhart and Mathaus Bosch, 21 April–3 May 1593.

⁶⁸ Stadtarchiv Nördlingen, Ordnungen und Decrete 1612–1640, fols 74r–75v, 226v–227r, 230r–v.

⁶⁹ Die Chronik des Johann Philipp Mohr, 243; StadtAA, Militaria 55; Peter Burschel, *Söldner im Nordwestdeutschland des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1994), 195–8; Landsteiner and Weigl, ‘Krieg und lokale Gesellschaft,’ 250; Asch, *The Thirty Years War*, 177.

untouched, and even presenting them with gifts upon departure.⁷⁰ They wrote fondly of ‘good quarters’ (*gute Quartiere*) and sociable times spent with amiable innkeepers, and especially praised landlords who provided them with good-quality food and drink. ‘I had a very good innkeeper’, reported a Bavarian soldier of his quarters near Halberstadt in 1631, ‘who did not serve beef, but only veal, young pigeons, chicken, and birds’. Elsewhere, quarters were highly rated because of the quality and quantity of the wine, the friendliness of the innkeeper, and the availability of cash contributions for the soldiers’ pay.⁷¹ Where none of these were lacking, soldiers enjoyed their quarters and, they claimed, treated their hosts accordingly. In fact, studies by military historians suggest that serious abuses were unlikely as long as soldiers were well provided for.⁷²

Soldiers and their commanders seemed to define ‘orderly’ or ‘honourable’ behaviour differently from their unwilling hosts. Consorting with prostitutes, engaging in duels, and enjoying feasts and drinking bouts that seemed excessive by civilian standards were privileges of military life; whereas theft of inn property, refusal to pay bills, and physical violence directed at the publican and his family were simply reasonable reactions to poor treatment by innkeepers. This reflects more than an attempt by the troops to cover up inappropriate behaviour. By the late sixteenth century, soldiers were operating from a different set of cultural norms. This was partly due to a conscious effort on the part of their military commanders, who at least by the period of the Thirty Years’ War were learning that fostering a separate identity and a special honour code among their troops could be an effective motivator in battle.

The growing cultural division between the military and the civilian sector paralleled other forms of increased social stratification over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as evidenced for example by increasingly detailed sumptuary laws (clothing and wedding ordinances) designed to shore up the lines of division between the social orders.⁷³ The sumptuary laws themselves provided soldiers with an opportunity to express publicly their cultural difference from civilian society. Military men especially flaunted their

⁷⁰ For example, M. Friesenegger, *Tagebuch aus dem 30jährigen Krieg*, ed. P. W. Mathäser (Munich, 1974), 148–9 (1646).

⁷¹ ‘Hier habe ich einen gar guten Wirt bekommen, hat mir kein Rindfleisch gegeben, sondern lauter Kalbfleisch, junge Tauben, Hühner und Vögel’. The soldier (whose identity is uncertain) credited the good quarters with restoring his health after being wounded. *Ein Söldnerleben im Dreißigjährigen Krieg: Eine Quelle zur Sozialgeschichte*, ed. Jan Peters (Berlin, 1993), 139, also 136, 141, 143, 147.

⁷² Burschel, *Söldner im Nordwestdeutschland des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, 195–8; Landsteiner and Weigl, ‘Krieg und lokale Gesellschaft,’ 250; Asch, *The Thirty Years War*, 177.

⁷³ A. Corvisier, *Armies and Societies in Europe 1494–1789* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1979) 181.

disdain for clothing ordinances, which proliferated during the seventeenth century and restricted styles and materials of garments to a level commensurate with social rank. The soldier's flamboyant clothing – slashed, stuffed, and decorated with colourful plumes and ribbons that bounced and rustled with every step – reflected their distinct sense of masculinity and their disregard for social norms. Their beribboned crotches also accentuated their contempt for sexual convention. In some ordinances, the ineffectiveness of trying to control soldier's clothing was codified with clauses allowing them to dress 'as they deemed appropriate'.⁷⁴

ILLUSTRATION

⁷⁴ 'wie j[n] gelegen': R. Baumann, *Landsknechte: Ihre Geschichte und Kultur vom späten Mittelalter bis zum Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Munich, 1994), 40.

Clothes were only one way in which soldiers set themselves apart from the rest of society. They further demonstrated their disregard for sexual norms by common-law marriages and open relationships with courtesans. They also developed their own distinct jargon, mixing technical military terms with creative curses and foreign terms picked up on their travels, calling even more attention to their status as outsiders.⁷⁵ The effect of this cultural segregation on social relations can be traced in the make-up of drinking groups in Augsburg taverns; while around twelve per cent of artisan drinking groups during the sixteenth century included soldiers, no such mixed drinking groups were identifiable during the 1640s.⁷⁶

In the interest of order, then, these increasingly marginalized elements needed to be distanced as much as possible from the civic community. The process that began with the construction of soldiers' barracks in 1582 as a means of getting soldiers out of private households continued during the Thirty Years' War, as local authorities fought ever harder to keep soldiers out of the city entirely. By 1639, the city had obtained assurances from the emperor that its citizens would be spared physical quartering in return for adequate contributions.⁷⁷

Despite the emperor's promise, soldiers did return to Augsburg during the final phases of the war, but never in the numbers suffered during the 1630s.⁷⁸ When quartering in the city could not be avoided, the pattern established earlier in the war was repeated; the troops were placed first in inns, and then in the homes of the less obedient citizenry. The bulk of the soldiers, however, were kept outside the city walls and housed in the surrounding villages. City leaders used every available argument to keep troops out of the city: their poor citizens had been burdened enough already; their wealthier citizens were already doing their part in the form of cash contributions; and the soldiers would be better off in the villages anyway, where raw feed and open pasture for their animals were readily available.⁷⁹

These economic arguments were underscored by a growing perception on the part of Augsburg's elite townsmen that a cultural division existed between

⁷⁵ Ibid; See also Tallett, *War and Society*, 142–3.

⁷⁶ Tlusty, *Bacchus*, 151.

⁷⁷ StadtAA, Militaria 59, 6 Aug. 1639. In the same year, Augsburg obtained guarantees from the Emperor that villages belonging to the city would also be spared further quartering of soldiers: StadtAA, Militaria 77, 5 Jan. 1639.

⁷⁸ In September 1646, Augsburg's council complained about a company of 945 soldiers in the city, which exceeded the expenses they had agreed upon. Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Kurbayern Äußeres Archiv 2574, fol. 229r.

⁷⁹ Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Kurbayern Äußeres Archiv 2574, fol. 278r; StadtAA, Militaria 57, Landquartierwesen, 1640, 1645. Peasants also complained about their unfair quartering burdens; Thiebault, *German Villages in Crisis*, 155.

town and country. Peasants, like soldiers, were often depicted in early modern art and literature as unruly, disorderly, even brutish. Although the bucolic pleasures of the countryside were appealing to townspeople, who were regular visitors at village festivals and country taverns, the attraction lay as much in the relative freedom from the watchful eyes of civic authorities as it did in the charm of country life.⁸⁰ The notion that the countryside was by nature less orderly made it a logical place to quarter soldiers. Civic leaders believed that the corporate identity of townspeople distinguished them from the surrounding countryside. Their increasing emphasis on respect for local power and orderly behaviour within the city's walls is reflected in the council's response to a soldier arrested towards the end of the war for drunken misconduct and resisting a local guard. Members of the council asked the soldier if he thought himself to be in 'a village, where he might defy and brutalise people at will', rather than in a locality in which 'better council' was appropriate.⁸¹ While condemning unruly behaviour in the city, the statement comes close to condoning it in the villages. This attitude not only further encouraged a separate social identity among the soldiers, but it exacerbated the already existing antagonism between town and countryside.⁸²

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries constituted a unique phase in German military history, one that deserves more attention than just as a step on the road to national armies.⁸³ This was a period in which cities struggled to maintain their independent dominion and local identity was paramount. During the first half of the sixteenth century, civic defence (whether welcome or unwelcome on the part of the city) was integrated into city life, and quartering was seen as a duty of citizenship. The threat posed by such integration to individual households, however, could not be reconciled with the powerful metaphor of the orderly household as the key to a disciplined citizenship. The soldiers, perpetual 'outsiders', were moved out of the household and into public inns – and

⁸⁰ A. Stewart, 'Paper Festivals and Popular Entertainment: The Kermis Woodcuts of Sebald Beham in Reformation Nuremberg,' in *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 24 (1993), 301–50; R. Haftlmeier-Seiffert, *Bauern Darstellungen auf deutschen illustrierten Flugblättern des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt, 1991), 80–97; M. Schilling, *Bildpublizistik in der frühen Neuzeit: Aufgaben und Leistungen des illustrierten Flugblatts in Deutschland bis um 1700* (Tübingen, 1990), 209–10; cf. also Stewart in this volume.

⁸¹ 'Ob er villeicht vermain das er allhie in einem Dorff sei, allwo er die leuth nach seinem gefallen trutzen und bochen möge, oder ob er nit alberaith befinde, das er an einem sollichen orth sitze, allwo man ... bessere rath ... zuerwarten khönde', StadtAA, Urg., Hans Schwarzenberg, 13 July 1643.

⁸² On increasing tension between town and country see Tallett, *War and Society*, 49–50, 154.

⁸³ Parrott has also made this point: D. Parrott, 'The Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe', in *History Today* 42 (Dec. 1992), 21–7.

wherever possible, out of the community entirely and into the less powerful (and, according to the opinions of many city-dwellers, less orderly) peasant villages. They were returned to private homes in the city only during periods of occupation by foreign powers, when they were utilized as punishment for confessional or political disobedience.

Financial burdens also threatened civic order. Here, too, inns played an important defence role, for the wine and beer drunk at their tables paid the bulk of the contributions that both financed local defence and kept the soldiers at bay. As recruitment centres, military quarters, and theatres for interaction with the citizenship, public houses also provided a means by which to contain and control soldiers – at least to the extent that it was possible.

The accounts of soldiers and their landlords differ significantly in their portrayal of this relationship. Soldiers report treating their hosts honourably as long as their quarters were dry, their food plentiful, and their wine of good quality. For their part, some urban innkeepers undoubtedly profited from the presence of soldiers, and most suffered less financial loss than did other members of the community. But nearly all sources from innkeepers indicate that their relationships with their unwelcome guests were strained. Multiple complaints by the beleaguered innkeepers suggest that greater social distancing of military troops from their hosts, quartering in larger groups, and the ready availability of alcohol led to an increase in the soldiers' tendency towards violence and other destructive behaviour. The inn thus had a decisive role both in the process of social segregation that set the early modern soldier apart from other citizens, and in providing the public theatre that encouraged him to live up to his reputation.