

The first step toward sobriety: the "Boozing Devil" in sixteenth-century Germany

BY HASSO SPODE

Dr. phil. Hasso Spode (Geisbergstr. 12/13, D-10 777 Berlin, Germany), a historian and sociologist, is on the faculty of the Historical Commission at Berlin. His latest book, The Power of Drunkenness, deals with the history of alcohol in Germany.

The long transition from feudal society to the modern era witnessed repeated attempts to contain excessive drinking, a phenomenon of interest to both social historians and historical anthropologists.¹ The building of the "iron cage" of modernity—in the words of Max Weber—was accompanied by the spread of a "rational lifestyle" involving changes in basic attitudes.² The struggle of preachers, humanists, and authorities against drunkenness in 16th-century Germany—probably the first great temperance campaign—marked an

AUTHOR'S NOTE: Cited sources are translated by the author if not noted otherwise. For their critical reviews of the text, especially their suggestions for stylistic improvements, I am greatly indebted to Deborah Cohen, Dolores Augustine, and the editors.

important step in this civilizing process. In the following article I shall try to place this campaign in the long-term evolution of sobriety. The main questions to be asked are: What arguments did the temporal and spiritual authorities, the humanists, and the physicians use? What was new in this discourse on drink, and what was old? What measures were taken? What was drinking behavior really like? And, finally, did the campaign produce (lasting) results?

1. The initial situation

In the Middle Ages the attitude of educated people toward "wine" followed from the Judeo-Christian principle that it was in itself a substance of manifold utility (*usus*), while its improper use was a waste of a gift of God (*abusus*). Inebriety and excessive drinking nearly always took place in groups, in the context of the "archaic drinking bout,"³ an institution that in Germany, as in many other pre-modern societies, fulfilled basic social and religious functions, providing an arena for making reliable personal ties in an insecure world, for demonstrations of physical strength and economic power (potlatch), and for the enactment of oaths and treaties (*Weinkauf*, "handage"), as well as for opening up a transcendental path to magical knowledge. Essential to the drinking bout were the ceremonial forms and the principle that one must not refuse a drink—rules that ensured that each participant had to consume the same quantities, not seldom to the point of unconsciousness.

Beginning with the Frankonian kings (Charlemagne, in particular, issued numerous decrees against drunkenness among soldiers, priests, and laymen) and the early missionaries and bishops, the practices of the drinking bout were periodically condemned by secular and ecclesiastical authorities, especially when they were associated with ancient pagan feasts. However, such admonitions did not play a major role in the struggle against the sins of the baptised and were not very

detailed. Preachers warning of the perils of drunkenness usually employed the vague set phrase that it does harm to the "soul, body, honor, and property." The most important was the "soul"—i.e., the moral aspect: immoderate drinking was gluttony (*ebriositas*, *Völlerei*), a deadly sin for which the drinker had to expect the severest punishments, not on earth but in the hereafter.

During the Second Feudal Age, as Braudel has called the High and Late Middle Ages, trade and affluence increased, and so did the urban population (in 13th-century Germany one person in ten lived in a city). In addition to sporadic heavy consumption, everyday use of alcoholic beverages spread, particularly among the new classes: the minor knight-hood, the wealthy burghers, and also the laboring poor in the towns. The production and sale of fermented beverages became an important part of the economy, with increases apparent in the acreage of wine grapes, in the number of brewing licenses issued (*Braugerechtigkeit*), and in the number of craftsmen's drinking-rooms (*Trinkstuben*) and of other sorts of taverns (*Schenken*, *Krüge*, etc.)—places where less formal drinking patterns also were common. Lyrical celebrations of the joys—and dangers—of wine emerged. Nevertheless, the focus of criticism of drunkenness remained the same: excessive consumption of alcoholic beverages was mainly regarded as the result of the "archaic drinking bout," where people were coerced into drinking according to certain rites. Therefore the 14th-century guilds passed special regulations (*Trinkstubenordnungen*) that attempted to contain disorder originating from the practices of mutual pressuring to drink.⁴

Medieval physicians were less interested in the abuse of wine than in its prophylactic and therapeutic values. As in other aspects of their practices, they assimilated Arab influences, such as the teaching that drunkenness is healthful because of its purging effects. Above all, however, medical thought based itself upon ancient authorities, drawing particularly from the works attributed to Hippocrates and Galen. Thus

humoral pathology explained the effects of the different sorts of beverages on the balance of the four *humores*—whose mixture made the four temperaments—and on the fine force of vitality, the *pneuma* or *spiritus*, respectively. (Alchemists had succeeded in synthesizing this force and called it *aqua vitae*.)

2. A menace comes into being

The Great Plague of the years 1347–52 marked the beginning of the end of the Middle Ages. Although Germany gradually recovered from this setback over the course of the 15th century, the fabric of personal ties of which feudal society had been composed began to disintegrate, and the structures of the transitional Early Modern period emerged. At every level of this process—from the formation of territorial sovereignty to the expansion of knowledge, markets, towns, and the money economy—increasing complexity demanded new rules, new disciplines, and new standards of morality. Humanists and reformers discovered the independence of the human being from innate qualities, his molding by education. One institution especially was destined for a head-on conflict with this “moralization of society” (Ariès): the drinking bout. “Unfortunately the whole of Germany is plagued with the vice of boozing. We preach and shout and preach against it, but it does not help very much,” complained Martin Luther.⁵

Drunkenness had been harshly criticized decades before the Reformation—for example, by the poet Sebastian Brandt and the preacher Johann Geiler von Kaysersberg in late 15th-century Strasbourg, a center of early German Humanism. Furthermore, after the schism the Reformers were strongly supported on this point by Catholics such as the theologian and satirist Thomas Murner (a strong opponent of Luther and Zwingli) and later by the moralist Ägidius Albertinus and by the most influential Humanist of all, Erasmus of Rotterdam. Like many other social, political and theological upheavals in

the Age of Reformation, the struggle against drunkenness was not invented by the Reformers, nor was it an exclusive peculiarity of theirs, but rather it was rooted in long-term evolutions that now accelerated or burst out, thus forming a new society. With this borne in mind, one might nevertheless regard sobriety as chiefly a matter of Protestant concern.

In 1517 Luther posted his 95 theses in Wittenberg with the intention of reforming the Church, and within the following three years the two sides broke completely apart. Fueled by pent-up discontent with the ecclesiastical, political, and economic situation, the reform movement spread rapidly over the whole of Germany (and subsequently a large part of Europe), becoming more and more radical and fractionalized. The movement split into a Protestant wing headed by Luther and Melanchthon—in Germany it was particularly the central and northern territories that joined this more moderate faction—and a Protestant-Reformed wing under the leadership of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin, rooted in urban communities in the south, particularly in the Swiss confederation, but also spreading in the western and central parts. Later, in the Netherlands as well as in other areas of the Holy Roman Empire, radical Anabaptists also gained followers and formed chiliastic sects. Civil wars devastated Germany—the rebellion of the Knights of the Empire in 1522–23, the Peasants’ War in 1525, and the Schmalkaldian War in 1546–47—before peace between the Lutheran and Catholic territories was declared in 1555. But this did not usher in a happy period. Because these territories were cut off from the new trade routes and markets, economic decay set in; political and military defeats doomed the dream of a united Holy Roman Empire, so that the peace agreement provided only a breathing spell until, in 1618, the Thirty Years’ War broke out.

The struggle against the Roman Church began in Central Europe, and the campaign against traditional drinking behavior began there too. Both developments were also closely connected to the emergence of the state.

treatises, tracts, and sermons on the perils of "boozing" appeared. One of the most significant admonitions "on the terrible vice of drunkenness" was issued in 1521 by the Lutheran theologian and later Anabaptist Sebastian Franck.⁶ Despite the efforts of educators, he warned, the world was heading toward an apocalypse of inebriation. "The guzzling, stuffing and drinking is undoubtedly a sign of the Day of Judgment."

Three general motifs deserve attention. First, Franck and the other preachers against drunkenness traced the overwhelming power and diversity of evil to one source, which could be eradicated simply by acting reasonably. Second, they were terrified by the dissolution of personal ties, of traditional authority, and of the firmly established universe: "The world is bottomless, money governs everything."⁷ Third, they stressed the inner-worldly costs (as Max Weber put it) of drunkenness rather than the outer-worldly costs—i.e., the torments of purgatory. Long before the Gin Epidemic of the 18th century and the temperance movements of the 19th, a first war on drugs was declared, not as a mass movement but as a campaign by ecclesiastical and secular authorities, backed in particular by pious burghers. However, it is not easy to find entirely new arguments in that discourse. It was more their specific composition and their urgency that made this a new phenomenon.

Soon the menace was personified: the Boozing Devil (*Saufteufel*) came onto the scene. In 1517 he was depicted by Hans L. Schüffelein, a student of Albrecht Dürer, as a horrible creature with wings and huge breasts, offering a bottle of wine to a nobleman.⁸ In about 1530, the Protestant parson Matthäus Friderich wrote "Against the Boozing Devil," which became the most popular admonition of all⁹ and was reprinted until the 17th century.¹⁰ Friderich summed up religious and medical knowledge in order to show "why everybody has to keep away from boozing": God will punish the

punishment in the here and now is explained in detail. The Boozing Devil deprives men of their senses and reason and therefore opens the way for other devils—e.g., the Cursing Devil and the Impurity Devil (Friderich estimated that there were about 6,000 devils). The drinker refuses to accept authority. He, his wife, and his children will be reduced to poverty. Friderich catalogued the harms drunkenness causes to the body, such as headaches, red eyes, catarrh, putrefaction of the lungs and the liver, bad stomach, blindness, weak memory, deafness, paralysis, tremors, gout, apoplexy, epilepsy, gallstones, dropsy, yellow jaundice, and mange. In the end, the drinker will die before his time has come.

The Boozing Devil was made responsible for almost every imaginable unwelcome condition of the world, body and soul. This devil resided not in the beverages but in their wrongful use; that is to say, in man himself. The struggle was not against wine and beer, but against a social institution: the drinking bout. A drinker was someone who constantly made the mistake of participating in such bouts. He was a vicious and unreasonable person, but in no way a sick one. (He could only *make* his body sick as an aftereffect of frequent immoderate drinking.)

However, physicians started to regard intoxication itself as a temporary disease (though by no means in the modern sense of addiction, for they stuck firmly to the principle of free will). In 1531 the well-known Professor Heinrich Stromer Senior published a disputation on the "ugly vice of drunkenness," the first medical publication to concern itself solely with that subject.¹¹ Drunkenness, Stromer argued, results from the improper and "superfluous use of wine" and is a "deliberate silliness." Physiologically it is a "disease of the head, the brain, and the veins growing out of the brain" (i.e., the nerves). These veins become "blocked and damaged" because they lose their "natural dryness" (required for the internal movements of vital substances). As a result of this malfunction, the drinker suffers from many other diseases ranging

from hangover to early death. Used moderately,¹² on the other hand, good wine is highly recommended.

Moderate wine drinking was recommended with similar words by Ludovici de Avila, physician in ordinary to the Emperor Charles V;¹³ in his view, it makes a "good and clear mind" and has many other positive effects on the body. Beer also "increases strength," but it does harm to "those who have a weak brain, they are made drunk by beer."

Both medical and popular thought strictly differentiated the effects of the different sorts of wine and beer in relation to the four temperaments. For example, the phlegmatic, with his cold and wet complexion, should avoid drinking young wine because of its cold quality. This thinking represents no change from medieval teaching.¹⁴ Sometimes it was emphasized that beer, too, might produce drunkenness. There was no sharply outlined category of alcoholic beverages; people did not possess the idea of a common active substance. In a world periodically threatened by food shortages, drunkenness was regarded as a form of gluttony, a waste of limited goods. As the sin of gluttony was the general consequence of immoderation, drunkenness was its general physical result. Stromer remarked that not only "many other beverages [besides wine] may cause drunkenness but also many sorts of food." (A more detailed account of this process is provided by a 17th-century author: "Pestering the stomach with food and drink causes bad *vapores* to rise to the brain, where they disturb good ideas and projects."¹⁵) Although people knew that wine, beer, and mead were the most common causes of drunkenness, they had no perception—or had at least a perception different from ours—of the uniqueness of the intoxicating effects of ethanol.¹⁶

3. Fighting the Boozing Devil externally: police regulations

Replacing personal ties more and more by abstract legal and economic relations, the corporative society produced new needs and new potentialities; in response, mechanisms of disciplinary control were developed. The age of the *Gute Polizei* ("good police") began.¹⁷ Among the tasks assumed by the *Gute Polizei* was that of ensuring sobriety: the custom of pledging and contest drinking (*Zutrinken*, etc.) was to be abolished.¹⁸

In 1495 an Imperial Diet (the *Reichstag*, the assembly of the prince electors, princes, and the cities) issued for the first time a decree (a so-called recess [*Abschied*]) forbidding any further pledging and contest drinking. Recesses "against the main vice of pledging" were passed by succeeding Imperial Diets until 1577. Charles V complained that "such orders and rules were not much kept to so far."¹⁹

The legal status of these regulations was somewhat uncertain. In theory they applied to all estates of the empire, but mainly they were aimed at the German nobility, among whom they were widely ignored, indeed. Because of the weakness of central power in Germany, composed as it was of numerous territories and free cities, the imperial orders and the recesses of the Imperial Diets functioned only as guidelines. In order to be effective, they had to be transformed into regulations for the individual countries as well as into church law, into corporate and municipal regulations, and into university laws.²⁰ The campaign against the Boozing Devil was more effectively fought in units of smaller scale, particularly in towns, where social control, fueled by religious fervor, ensured a higher degree of compliance. "What else is a city but a great monastery?" Erasmus asked.²¹ The objects of the municipal regulations were manifold, ranging from drunken behavior in the streets to the custom of treating; the majority

of them focused on the practices of the drinking bout, and all of them dealt with drinking in public spaces, and especially in taverns.

Since the High Middle Ages local authorities had sometimes tried to make forcing someone to drink a punishable offense (e.g., in Frankfurt/Main in 1360). During the second third of the 16th century, such bans became much more widespread and detailed. As mentioned above, discontent with drunkenness was not an invention of Reformers; they only added to the negative perceptions among educated people and tightened up existing measures. Already in 1496, for example, the city council of Nuremberg imposed a fine of five new farthings on any act of pledging, as it led to "blasphemy, discord, fury, injury, and manslaughter." The bearing of arms was likewise forbidden in taverns, and landlords were obliged to report pledging and indecent behavior by guests. In later police orders, wrongdoers were prohibited from entering taverns for a specific period of time.²² The religious upheaval in Germany culminated in the 1520s and 1530s. With a time-lag of approximately a decade, the discourses as well as the regulations by municipal authorities concerning the question of drunkenness reached their peak, and then slowly calmed down by the end of the century. The most severe laws were passed by the councils of Protestant Reformed cities of the south, such as Konstanz, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Zurich, Basel, and Bern. Not only pledging but also less formal drinking patterns were curbed. Earlier closing times, exact limits on the spending of time or money, and bans for recipients of alms, on drinking on credit, and on treating were introduced. The strongest actions were taken in Geneva, where in 1546 Calvin shut down all taverns (this situation lasted for only two months, however).

Over the course of the 16th century the German population grew from 10 million to 15 million or more, with most of the increase taking place in the towns. With this growth came increased poverty. The social disciplining of the poor in gen-

eral, and the curbing of beggars (*Bettel*) in particular, ranked high among the objectives of the *Gute Polizei*.²³ In view of this, it is remarkable that the connection between drunkenness and poverty did not play the major role in the regulations against boozing. Instead, the local authorities mainly feared drunkenness for the moral offenses to which it was seen as leading: blasphemy, cursing, carnality, disobedience—sinful behaviors that could attract terrible plagues. Though often regarded as the father of countless other devils, the Boozing Devil in this respect was not more dangerous than the Dancing or the Cursing Devil, whose activities could also provoke the day of doom.²⁴

Facing an increase in the number of recipients of alms, however, the authorities did not deny the old wisdom that drunkenness "does harm" to—among other things—"property" (*Gut*). Now the argument with respect to poverty followed one of two patterns. The first was the equation "drunkenness = waste = poverty"; the city councils tried to prevent working citizens from spending their money on luxuries, especially on fine clothing, and on lavish eating and drinking on feast days, such as weddings. When crops failed, sovereigns and councils sometimes restricted or prohibited brewing. The second set of equivalents was "drunkenness = idleness = poverty"; it was also applied to the classes belonging to the estates, in particular to journeymen, because of a fear that they and their masters could be impoverished. The longlasting struggle for the abolition of Monday absenteeism (*Blauer* or *Guter Montag*) started from here. But notwithstanding the serious nature of the problems created by "waste" and "idleness," the fear of poverty was of minor importance in the war on the Boozing Devil compared with the fear of moral offenses and general "disorder." Regulations on drinking initially did not aim to discipline the poor (whose very poverty served as an effective deterrent against overindulgence in alcoholic beverages), but rather those who were integrated into a growing interdependent system.²⁵

4. Fighting the Boozing Devil from within: example and self-commitment

That the nobility kept up the archaic drinking bout—especially at the level of knighthood, but partly, too, among the high and politically active nobility—was regarded as the severest problem of all. However, there was no getting at noblemen with decrees. It seemed a more promising approach to educate them by means of organized commitment: temperance orders were founded to set an example of sobriety and also to limit the thirst of their members.

With the motto "Be moderate!", the first of such orders was founded in 1470 by Frederick III prior to becoming emperor.²⁶ About 1517 the "Saint Christopher's Order for the Abolition of Cursing and Pledging" gathered 78 noble members, but it soon fell into oblivion. So subsequently did the "Brotherhood of Abstinence" and the "Palatine Order of the Golden Ring." (One member, Thomas Loedius, got into trouble when the English king Henry VIII urged him to pledge "in good German style" and Loedius obeyed. However, back home, the assembly of the order waived the applicable penalty because the rules allowed dispensation when a member traveled in "the Netherlands, Brandenburg, Saxony, Pomerania, Mecklenburg or other countries" where pledging was a strict custom.) The "Order of Temperance," founded in 1601 by the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse, was probably the last of its kind. Members promised to abstain from boozing and from coercing others into drink for a period of two years. Breaking the vow was punishable by fines of up to 300 talers, though it seems rather unlikely that such tremendous sums were ever collected. The last recorded mention of this society was made in 1602.

Apparently much more common than such orders were contracts between two noblemen, each of whom promised the other to stay sober for a specified period of time. On a

penalty of 1000 florins, for example, Christoph Vitzthumb von Eckstädt and Vespasian von Reynsberg und Dißkowitz vowed not to exceed a daily maximum of three standardized silver bottles of wine during pledging, and not to make additional pledges with beer—"since beer sometimes causes drunkenness, too"—but to use only as much beer as was necessary to quench thirst.²⁷ Pledges of this kind (we do not know how widespread they really were) and the handful of temperance orders could hardly have had a major impact on the drinking behavior of the nobility. Nevertheless they do indicate discontent with the traditional compulsory rites; furthermore, they are prototypes of techniques of modern behavior therapy.

5. Was there a Boozing Devil?

Chronicles, memoirs, and the literature of the 16th century and, to a lesser extent, the 17th century are full of descriptions of vast drinking revels. Not without relish did traditional German cultural history record in detail and adopt tales about heavy drinking as part of the canon. Early Modern Germany was characterized as the setting of the "major boozing period" in history;²⁸ this opinion is very old²⁹ and is still widely held.³⁰ The certainty of the judgment is astonishing, since all that such kinds of sources can indicate is that drinking behavior was problematized at that time and the ways in which it was problematized.

How they drank³¹ Indeed, among the nobility and the minor knighthood, in particular, excessive drinking was more than common. At the Imperial Diets, they drank to the decrees against drinking. At Worms, on one occasion, noblemen "wasted wine, so that they could wade in it" and "smashed 100 glasses or so"; each of the 24 participants consumed about seven liters (or more) during that drinking revel.³² Among the rulers, many a one went down in history as a heavy drinker. An outstanding example was given by the dukes of Liegnitz: Frederick III

was deposed by the emperor in 1559 mainly on account of his "passion for drink." So, later, was his son Henry XI. According to the diary of his companion, the knight Hans von Schweinichen, Henry XI subsequently went on a begging tour, visiting the German patrician and noble houses; the diary tells of vast drinking contests and drinking bouts held once a month or so, at least once at each host's table.³³

Excessive drinking was by no means an exclusive privilege of the nobility. The regulations of city councils, as discussed above, tell quite a bit about drinking practices in towns. As further centers of alcohol consumption, one has to count monasteries and universities, which were also centers of alcohol production. (As a professor in Wittenberg, Luther, too, had a brewing license.) Universities passed regulations against "gluttony and boozing" similar to those of the city councils.³⁴ So did church authorities of both denominations. On the one hand, they wanted to prevent the clergy—many of whom possessed brewing licenses—from joining in drinking bouts, a practice that "strongly hinders and deforms the church office." On the other hand, they tried to abolish traditional feasts of the peasants, such as the *Pfingstbier*, which kept them "boozing the whole night long so that they sleep through the sermon and snore like swine in church."³⁵

German reformers and humanists, as well as foreign visitors such as Michel de Montaigne, John Barclay and Fynes Moryson, declared a passion for drink to be the "national vice" in Germany. In his *Essays*, published in 1580, Montaigne defined drunkenness as a "brutal" and "carnal" vice which therefore only among the "rough" Germans is held in great esteem.³⁶ Moryson's travel diary, published in 1617, offers ironical and detailed descriptions of how the Nurembergians urged strangers to drink with them and how, in the evenings, the drunken could hardly find their way home.³⁷

Among the Germans, the Saxons were considered to be the heaviest drinkers. In his compilation of news about the nations of the world, Johannes Böhme wrote:

It is unbelievable how much this immoderate people [the Saxons] can hold, and how they encourage and coerce each other. No pig, no bull could guzzle so much. Not only do they drink to the point of intoxication and vomiting, but even again to the point of soberness, all day and all night long. [. . .] If you are repeatedly invited and refuse to drink without offering an excuse they regard you as an enemy; this insult can sometimes only be expiated by manslaughter and much blood.³⁸

Though Böhme reported nothing similar about other German countries—his only other reference to alcohol was with respect to the Franks, who were so poor that they had to sell their wine and drink water instead—his description of Saxonian drinking habits found its way into Sebastian Münster's famous *Cosmographia* (1544), where it was presented as being typical of the whole of Germany.³⁹

Thus the descriptions of drinking bouts, like Moryson's or Böhme's tales, are as difficult to judge as are the admonitions and regulations against the Boozing Devil. Do they point to new forms of drinking behavior, to a new critical attitude toward preexisting patterns, or even to an artificially constructed label derived from rediscovered ancient and early medieval texts like those of Tacitus, Venantius Fortunatus, or Hrabanus Maurus?

Most probably, the answer is a mixture of the last two propositions. In his *Germania*—still the most important source on the Germanic tribes at the beginning of the Christian era—the Roman historian Tacitus depicted the empire's northern neighbors as a free and proud people, but criticized their passion for drink: "Boozing day and night is not considered shameful."⁴⁰ As in all pre-modern periods, the handing down of *topoi* played an important role in thinking and surely helped to form and stabilize the stereotype of the German

"national vice." Not knowing he was founding an intellectual tradition that would be of long standing, Luther remarked that "Boozing is a bad old custom in the German countries, as the Roman Cornelius [Publius Tacitus] writes."⁴¹ Thenceforth it was naively taken for granted that the "Germanic" tribes were identical with the "Germans"—and so was their thirst. On the other hand, however, the critical Early Modern perception of drunkenness was more than a mere label; the ancient sources referred to the very old pattern of sporadic excessive consumption that had survived through the centuries. But what can be said about its spread? How much did the "boozing Germans" actually drink?

How much they drank

First of all, one should recall that fermented beverages were important foodstuffs, though more for lower incomes than for higher ones; in relation to price, their nutritional value was mostly overestimated in medical and popular thought.⁴² Wine and beer were regarded as nutrient fluids and not as drugs. Notwithstanding their partly different views on drink, reformers, physicians and humanists stood firmly behind the traditional teaching that the "Word [. . .] and every faithful preacher never forbid wine and beer, but teach the middle of the road" and that "Drinking turns into boozing only when more is poured into the body than necessity demands."⁴³

Only some hermits, excessive in their way, abstained from wine and beer voluntarily. People knew that water was dangerous, particularly in the towns (although some physicians recommended well water in case of great thirst).⁴⁴ Despite a decline in real wages starting in the late 15th century and accelerating in the mid 16th century,⁴⁵ even the lower classes sought to avoid drinking water if at all possible. In the period 1434–54, a Nuremberg day laborer could purchase either 8.1 liters of beer or 2.5 liters of wine with his daily wage. Due to rising prices, in the period 1590–1620 these figures declined to 6.5 or 1.1 liters, respectively;⁴⁶ although beer was 20% more expensive than it had been, even those with lower incomes could still afford it. And for those with higher

incomes—especially if they were landowners—the prices remained moderate in any case. Even the notorious drunkard Henry XI of Liegnitz spent only 14% of his budget on his cellar (as compared with 29% on his kitchen).⁴⁷ Drinking (well) water meant inhuman living conditions, while the level of wine and beer one consumed directly indicated one's social rank; this hierarchy was reflected, for instance, by the exactly graduated allocations in the court rules.⁴⁸ When Bartholomäus Sastrow (later Mayor of Rostock) was once completely impoverished, he suffered "greatest hunger and thirst."⁴⁹ The fact that it was preferable to suffer thirst than to drink water demonstrates the high nutritional and social value of fermented beverages, perhaps more strikingly than statistics can.

There are no precise data on average per capita consumption in "pre-statistical" times. Therefore the level of consumption of alcoholic beverages before⁵⁰ and during the age of the Boozing Devil is uncertain. Nevertheless it is certain that per capita consumption increased at the beginning of the Second Feudal Age, when beer—which had been hopped since Gallo-Roman times—and wine were being produced on a commercial basis and on a larger scale, whereas the traditional mead was starting to lose its importance. Rising wages, the spread of wine-grape cultivation up to the Baltic Sea, and additional fruit wines in southern regions would seem to indicate that consumption increased again during the 15th century and then remained more or less at that high level.

The available figures underscore the great importance of fermented beverages in the life of the people.⁵¹ In 16th-century Germany, average beer consumption ranged from approximately 250 to 400 liters a year. Lower figures applied to the southern "wine regions" and higher ones to the northern "beer regions." Thus in mid-16th-century Hamburg each adult drank more than 900 liters a year—i.e., two and a half liters a day (smaller quantities of wine were also consumed). The average wine consumption at the beginning of the century can be estimated for an adult in the southern towns at nearly 400

liters a year; including children, this meant an average per capita consumption of more than 250 liters (beer was also consumed). In the second half of the 16th century, wine was increasingly replaced by beer (and partly by fruit wine); that is to say, average wine consumption declined, while beer consumption increased. The decay of the real income of the laboring classes (the "price revolution of the 16th century" as Wilhelm Abel put it) did not lead to a substantial decline in the overall consumption of fermented beverages; on the other hand, of course, it did not allow for a substantial rise in consumption.

These figures, like all averages, level out big differences between population subgroups. Noblemen in general and the urban population, including the laboring poor, as a rule quenched their thirst with wine and beer, and even the registered poor got some wine from hospitals, whereas among the peasants the drinking of water was more common.⁵² Gender, age, local traditions and "personal attitudes," largely independent of socio-economic categories, also had strong impact on actual consumption. At the individual level, the range of recorded consumption figures proves to be enormous. A thousand liters of beer a year was not unusual, and up to 7,000 was reported, while many people, especially the peasant serfs, drank less than the average consumption rate indicates. Among the nobility, on the other hand, more than 2,000 liters seems to have been a moderate quantity. The "Order of Temperance" mentioned above allowed its members to drink 14 standardized goblets of wine or beer each day.⁵³

The emergence of brandy

Starting in the late 15th century, and increasingly after the middle of the 16th, the nonmedical use of brandy became common. *Aqua vitae* had left the occult laboratories and pharmacies, especially since it was now being made out of grain instead of grape.⁵⁴ This led to the presumption that brandy was the major cause of "the drug crisis of the 16th and 17th centuries."⁵⁵

In 1490 the surgeon and poet Hans Folz praised distilled wine—which "now everybody is drinking"—as a remedy against *phlegma* (sadness, etc.), hangovers and so on, but also warned against its immoderate use.⁵⁶ The first decrees against the abuse of distilled wine—by this was meant every form of nonmedical or nondietetical use—date from the High Middle Ages (especially decrees against the adulteration of wine). Now the role of brandy as both a stimulant and a medicine was recognized. At the same time, it became a concern to the *Gute Polizei*. In 1496, the Nuremberg city council prohibited the drinking of distilled wine in the streets and its sale on Sundays and holidays: it "leads to disorder and is almost harmful, especially to pregnant women and young workers."⁵⁷ Many cities and territories followed with similar regulations; between 1500 and 1654 in Hesse alone the Church and the state issued at least eleven.

However, to count brandy among the very urgent problems of that era would be a fallacy. Physicians still regarded it as a remedy or tonic. In the literature about the Boozing Devil brandy is hardly ever mentioned, a striking fact, since the admonitions gathered every detail that could help underscore the dangers of drunkenness. Among these, brandy played not even a minor role, so specifically were they associated with the rituals of the drinking bout. And the old rituals did not go with the new drink. Although brandy had already been "hedonized"⁵⁸ and had become, as critics said, "almost a beverage," it remained chiefly a magic tonic. Therefore brandy was not an object of the moral discourse but of the medical. It was consumed less by the rich and powerful than by the working burghers, and it was also given to miners and soldiers.⁵⁹ Brandy hardly caused a "drug crisis" in Early Modern Germany, but, like the Boozing Devil, it was an indicator and harbinger of new functions of drunkenness.

Actual consumption: summary

To sum up the findings about the consumption of alcoholic beverages: it is rather unlikely that Germany went through a "major boozing period" in the 16th century. It is doubtful.

too, whether Germany led the world in drinking.⁶⁰ Notwithstanding sharp ups and downs depending on the harvests, the overall intake of fermented beverages did not rise during the 16th century. Indeed, an opposite result would be surprising in a phase of falling real wages. It may be true, however, that in circles of noblemen and wealthy burghers, and especially among the obsolete knighthood, there was more excessive drinking even than usual—just as a protest against the spreading pious ideal of reason and sobriety.

At the same time as the temperance orders, "boozing orders" were founded in many towns, in particular in southern regions like Nuremberg and Augsburg, where the efforts to suppress drunkenness had been stronger than elsewhere. Matthäus Friderich complained that members of such orders had smashed his book on the Boozing Devil into dust, chopped it up, and thrown it into the fire.⁶¹ Grotesque forms of the drinking bout are reported: pledging with hats, shoes, or urinals, contests involving eating of glasses, singing birds, and wick-yarn, etc. Such bacchanalian revels did not influence per capita consumption. But in exaggerating the rituals of pledging, they not only mocked and protested against the temperance campaign, but possibly signified the beginning of the decline of the magic function of the drinking bout, even within the circles of its defenders. Nevertheless, the symbolic role of drink, as well as its nutritional and social roles, still did not undergo basic changes during the 16th century. The criticism of this "long-term structure" did not, therefore, reflect a sudden outburst of excessive drinking, but rather expressed a new will to sobriety. In this sense the Boozing Devil was doubtless a reality.⁶²

6. Results and lasting effects of the struggle against the drinking bout

In the 17th century the campaign faded away, though some

remains the question of the short-term and long-term results of the pedagogical efforts.

It is hardly surprising that educators mostly failed to change the drinking behavior of individual boozers. Surely not atypical is an entry in the diary of the Prince Elector Frederick III of Palatine: "The 22nd of October [1597] von Leiningen vowed not to drink for a period of one year. The 10th of November we drank again."⁶³ Evidently the municipal regulations did not have many lasting effects. Citizens who did not agree with the regulations found ways and means of avoiding punishment and of eluding the restrictions: not reporting violators, or drinking in nonpublic spaces or beyond the city walls. In any case, the nobility was not affected by such regulations. However, it is likely that the preachers and city councils succeeded in producing guilt feelings. This was a far-reaching result: failure to keep away from drinking bouts now manifested a *weakness of will*. Reversing traditional judgments, in which the heavy drinker was seen as a strong hero, the drinker could now be regarded as a weakling.

Moryson remarked that the rich people tried to conceal their excesses by staying at home.⁶⁴ In a "self-help" book, tricks on "how to survive pledging" were listed.⁶⁵ The moment the venerable institution of the drinking bout was challenged, it could be experienced as a social convention instead of a natural duty and so become subject to question.⁶⁶

Although the traditional functions, meanings, and practices of the drinking bout were not abruptly abolished, they had been shaken up. The spread of brandy-drinking among the burghers was the other side of this coin. In scrutinizing the old patterns of sporadic excessive consumption, which had started to become dysfunctional in an increasingly complex society, the campaign against the Boozing Devil pointed the way to the future. Hampered by the setback of the Thirty Years' War, the breakthrough of sobering-up came only after 1700, when coffee, the "great soberer," swept into the vinous

gatherings of noblemen and the bourgeoisie, and more individualistic styles of drunkenness—including a further increase in the consumption of brandy—replaced the rigid rules of the "archaic drinking bout." The bout was itself transformed into a frivolous game of youngsters, and especially of students.⁶⁷

The stereotype of the "national vice," however, was turned into a virtue that survived the actual changes in drinking behavior and became a stable part of the national self-image. In the late 18th century among the romantic literati, when Goethe and Schiller were aspiring poets, the idea of wine as the "dionysian" source of intuition was born (traces of this cult can be found in the works of Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Benn). Drunkenness became a sign of "deep" *Kultur*, in opposition to "cold" and "shallow" *Zivilisation*—a paradigm especially useful for apposing the alleged "characters" of Germans and Frenchmen. This self-image endured into the early 20th century. Although the German temperance movement of the Kaiserreich (1871–1918) was not a total failure (the respectability of drunkenness declined, and so did per capita consumption), in all classes the ability to carry great quantities of alcohol continued to be seen as a virtue⁶⁸ and also as part of the ruling machismo. Teetotalism was regarded as a strange and dangerous import from America—a "despotic measure," as a leading member of the "German Association Against the Abuse of Alcoholic Beverages" put it.

In 1520, two gods sitting on a cloud looked down on Germany: "In time the Germans, too, will become moderate, and it seems to me that this will happen soon," said one of them, according to the humanist Ulrich von Hutten, because "I notice that those who get drunk constantly are despised by the others (who are also not quite sober)."⁶⁹ Hutten's prediction that the Germans were on the road to sobriety came too early, yet it proved to be correct in the end. The struggle against the Boozing Devil had challenged traditional patterns

and meanings of drink and prepared the ground for later achievements. A threshold toward modernity was crossed.

Notes

1. Workable frameworks for the latter field can be found in A. Burgière, *L'anthropologie historique*, in: J. LeGoff et al. (eds.), *La nouvelle histoire*, Paris 1978, and W. Lepenies, *Probleme einer historischen Anthropologie*, in: R. Rürup (ed.), *Historische Sozialwissenschaft*, Göttingen 1977. On the similarities and differences between social history and historical anthropology, see especially H. Süssmuth (ed.), *Historische Anthropologie: Der Mensch in der Geschichte*, Göttingen 1984.
2. This development has been characterized variously as a movement toward more "cold-bloodedness" (Marcel Mauss), a growing "compulsion to farsightedness and patience" (Georg Simmel), a conversion of "outer restraints" into "self-restraints" (Norbert Elias), resulting in the creation of new "distances" (Mary Douglas) and "disciplines" (Michel Foucault). An object of fascination already to such founding fathers of modern thinking as Marx, Durkheim, Freud, and Weber, this enormous pedagogical achievement has been examined increasingly as part of complex processes in which the manifold techniques of power produce social discipline, not only imposing restrictions on the poor but also affecting the emotional standards and discourses of the leading or rising classes and, eventually, of societies as a whole. See St. Breuer, *Sozialdisziplinierung: Probleme und Problemverlagerungen bei Max Weber, Gerhard Oestreich und Michel Foucault*, in: Ch. Sachße and F. Tennstedt (eds.), *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*, Frankfurt/Main 1986; and see especially N. Elias, *Der Prozeß der Zivilisation*, 2 vols., Frankfurt/Main 1975; G. Oestreich, *Strukturprobleme der frühen Neuzeit*, Berlin 1980. On the impact on the role of inebriety, see also A. Legnaro, *Alkoholkonsum und Verhaltenskontrolle*, in: G. Völger and K. von Welck (eds.), *Rausch und Realität: Drogen im Kulturvergleich*, vol. 1, Reinbek 1982.
3. On this term cf. H. Spode, *Alkohol und Zivilisation: Berausung Ernüchterung und Tischsitten in Deutschland bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1991, pp. 18ff. On the functions of the bout, see pp. 43ff in the same work. On ecclesiastical and monastic rules, which are indicators of views of moderate and immoderate drinking in general, see I.W. Raymond, *The Teaching of the Early Church on the Use of Wine and Strong Drink*, New York 1927; H.U. von Balhasar (ed.), *Die großen Ordensregeln*, Zurich and Cologne 1961.
4. Cf. J. Müller, *Ueber Trinkstuben*, *Zschr. Kulturgeschichte* 2 (1857), especially pp. 783ff.

5. M. Luther, *Werke*, edited by O. Clemen et al., 5th ed., vol. 4., Berlin 1959, p. 365; the quotation stems from 1541. On Reformation thinkers on the subject of drink—Zwingli and Calvin had a severer stance than Luther—see F. Blanke, *Reformation und Alkoholismus*, in: *Zwingliana* 9 (1949/53); P. Brunner, *Die Alkoholfrage bei Calvin*, Berlin 1930.
6. S. Franck, *Von dem gewlichen laster der Trunckenheit . . . Und wie dem ubel zu raten wer*, n.p. [the edition here cited is that of] 1531.
7. Franck, *supra*, folio F(r)f. On the role of money in the emergence of a "rational" thinking and behavior, see (referring to Marx, Simmel, and Elias) D. Claessens, *Angst Furcht und gesellschaftlicher Druck*, Dortmund 1966, pp. 116ff.
8. This illustration to Hans von Leonrod's *Hymelwag* was probably the first mention of this devil (reprinted in *Hildener Museumshefte* 1 (1989), p. 37).
9. M. Friderich, *Wider den Sauffteuffel. Etliche wichtige vrsachen Warumb alle Menschen sich fur dem Sauffen hüten sollen*, [probably first printed at] Leipzig 1552. Collections of Early Modern publications on drink are to be found in many older libraries and archives, such as that in Wolfenbüttel. In addition, the former Prussian State Library (after the war divided into an East Berlin and a West Berlin branch, in 1992 reunited as "Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin") possesses a unique hand-written subject catalog (*Realkatalog*): for publications on drink from the 16th and 17th century cf. Db 707ff ("devils"), Db 749ff ("eating and drinking"), Fd 351ff ("temperance"). For further sources and literature see also Spode, *Alkohol*, note II.32 and 35.
10. The last edition was revised by J.L. Hartmann (*Saufteufels Natur, Censur vnd Cur*, Rothenburg 1679) without mentioning the original author.
11. H. Stromer, *Ein getrewe, vleissige und ehrliche Verwarnung Widder das hesliche laster der Trunckenheit*, Wittenberg 1531 [not paginated]. First published in Latin; the translation testifies to the broad interest it aroused. Although entrenched in the long tradition of humoral pathology, Stromer also anticipated some early iatrophysical ideas. The influential book by Fabricius Hildanus, *Christlicher Schlaftrunck*, Frankfurt/Main 1624, is based on Stromer.
12. On the meaning of "moderately" see below.
13. L. de Avila, *Bancket der Hofe und Edelleut. Des Gesundenn Lebens Regiment*, Frankfurt/Main n.d. [1530], pp. Xff.
14. Resuming classical teachings, only one new ban was imposed: Children (females to the age of 12 years, males to 14), who have a heated

temperament anyhow, should abstain from drinking wine at all. Cf. B. Merlinger, *Ein gar nützlich Regiment, wie man junge kinder halten und erziehen sol*, in: J. Cuba et al., *Ehestands-Arzneibuch*, Erfurt n.d. [ca. 1540], pp. 78ff. Bringing two strong qualities together would be like adding fire to fire, as Plato had said; whereas the modern argument claims that children are too weak for strong drink. On the reversion of the argument, see C. Lévi-Strauss, *Mythologica* III, Frankfurt/Main 1976, pp. 536ff.

15. Cf. H.R. Hoffmeister, *Christenliche Mahlzeit oder Schriffmässige Vnderweisung was gestalt ein Christ in speiß vnd tranck der Nüchternheit sich fleissen . . . sölle*, Zurich 1640 [not paginated].
16. Not until the late 17th century, with the introduction of coffee and the discourses of the "Cartesian" (iatrochemical and iatrophysical) medicine, did a novel theory emerge: beer, wine, and brandy were determined to contain a "fine oil" that causes drunkenness (cf. C. Bontekoe, *Kurtze Abhandlung Von dem Menschlichen Leben, Gesundheit, Kranckheit und Tod*, Bautzen 1684, p. 418); later this "oil" was called "spiritus" or "alcohol."
17. One may call the preoccupation of the 16th- and 17th-century authorities with "order" a "historical commonplace" (as does K. Wrightson, *Alehouse, Order and Reformation in Rural England, 1590-1660*, in: E. Yeo and S. Yeo (eds.), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict*, Brighton 1981, p. 11); however, a solid general picture as well as detailed studies for many countries are still lacking. For an overview see R. van Dülmen, *Entstehung des frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, Frankfurt/Main 1982, pp. 360ff; see also note 2 above.
18. On the terms see note 31 below.
19. Cf. *Deutsche Reichstagsakten, Mittlere Reihe*, vol. 5.2, Göttingen 1972, cit. p. 1143; see also J.W. Petersen, *Geschichte der deutschen National-Neigung zum Trunke*, Leipzig 1782, pp. 83ff; A. Fischer, *Geschichte des deutschen Gesundheitswesens*, vol. 1, Berlin 1933, pp. 263ff; F. von Bassermann-Jordan, *Geschichte des Weinbaus*, vol. 2, Frankfurt/Main 1975, pp. 1175ff; and M. Stolleis, "Von dem gewlichen Laster der Trunckenheit," in: *Rausch und Realität* (*supra* note 2), pp. 185ff.
20. Cf. note 34 below.
21. Cited by Th. Brady, Jr., *In Search of the Godly City: The Domestication of Religion in the German Urban Reformation*, in: R.P.-Ch. Hsia (ed.), *The German People and the Reformation*, Ithaca 1988, p. 20.
22. Cf. W. Grönert, *Die Entwicklung des Gaststättenrechts in der Freien Reichsstadt Nürnberg*, thesis, Nuremberg 1967, p. 27; and J. Baader, *Nürnberger Polizeiordnungen aus dem XIII. bis XV. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1861, p. 63, p. 115. On further sources about regulations

- cities and guilds cf. Spode, *Alkohol* (*supra* note 3), note II.44, II.51. A detailed case study is given by B.A. Tlusty, *Das ehrbare Verbrechen: Die Kontrolle über das Trinken in Augsburg in der frühen Neuzeit*, in: *Zschr. Histor. Verein Schwaben* 85 (1992). On the intertwining of temporal and spiritual regulations in consequence of the (unsuccessful) attempts to overcome the Christian bifurcation of authority and establish a theocracy in Protestant-reformed cities, cf. Brady, *Search*, *supra* note 21, pp. 14ff.
23. For a cross-national comparison, cf. W. Fischer, *Armut in der Geschichte. Erscheinungsformen und Lösungsversuche der "Sozialen Frage" in Europa seit dem Mittelalter*, Göttingen 1982, pp. 33ff.
 24. Cf. also J. Delumeau, *Angst im Abendland. Die Geschichte kollektiver Ängste im Europa des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*, Reinbek 1989, pp. 587ff.
 25. See also Tlusty, *Verbrechen*, *supra* note 22, especially p. 153. Not until the late 18th century was drunkenness—especially as caused by brandy then—regarded as a main source of poverty. On an apparently different development in England, where comparable actions against drunkenness started later but were immediately focused on the poor, see Wrightson, *Alehouse*, *supra* note 17, pp. 12ff; P. Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200–1830*, London and New York 1983, pp. 166ff.
 26. On these orders see the sources mentioned in Spode, *Alkohol*, *supra* note 3, note II.55.
 27. The contract was suspended on the occasion of christenings, weddings, and engagements; its term was three years. See J. Scheible, *Das Schaltjahr*, vol. 1, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1846, pp. 64ff.
 28. E.g., Bassermann-Jordan, *Geschichte*, *supra* note 19, vol. 2, p. 1174.
 29. J.B. von Rohr, *Einleitung zur Ceremoniel-Wissenschaft der grossen Herren*, Berlin 1729, p. 118.
 30. See, for example, G.A. Austin, *Die europäische Drogenkrise des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Rausch und Realität*, *supra* note 2, p. 117 ("unimaginable excesses, hardly reached by any other nation"); see also G.A. Austin et al., *Alcohol in Western Society*, Santa Barbara, etc. 1985, pp. XVIIIff.
 31. Many of the words used in the sources to describe the rituals of drinking no longer exist in modern German, and others conveyed different meanings from nowadays, even seemingly simple expressions like "drinking with someone"; these differences are a strong indicator that we are dealing with an alien world (cf. generally R. Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre*, 3rd ed., London, etc. 1991, pp.

12ff). Many corresponding English words have also died out, as in the case of "potting" or "propining" (an expression that refers to a main function of the drinking bout, the making of close relationships, or "propinquity"). This situation poses tricky problems of translation: the authors of sermons and regulations most commonly attacked the rituals of *Zwingen* (forcing to drink generally), *Zutrinken* (compulsory, sometimes also competitive, drinking to or pledging—not toasting, in the present-day sense), and *Bescheid tun* (pledging in response to *Zutrinken*), as well as *Gesundheitstrinken* (drinking to one's health or pledging one's health, often competitively), and *Wettrinken* (duel-like forms of contest drinking). That a great many other expressions also existed (e.g., *Saufen*, *Zechen*, and *Füllen*—guzzling, boozing, and fuddling) indicates the prominent role that immoderate drinking played in society, including less formal practices. Incidentally, it seems that most of the words describing rites of the archaic drinking bout did not die out before the 19th century (in German as well as in English), whereas many expressions associated with drunkenness in general or with informal drinking practices are still in use. Guidebooks on the meanings of Early Modern expressions of drink are V. Opsopoeus, *Vonn der kunst zutrinken*, Freiburg 1537; L. Schertlin, *Künstlich trincken. Eyn Dialogus von Künstlichem, vnd höflichem, Auch vihischem vnd vnzüchtigem trincken*, Strasbourg 1538; see also numerous articles ("Saufen," "Trunkenheit," "Wettrinken," "Zechbrüder," etc.) still dealing with such topics in the encyclopedia by J.H. Zedler, *Großes vollständiges Universal-Lexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*, 64 vols., Leipzig 1732–1750.

32. Cf. F. Zorn, *Wormser Chronik*, ed. W. Arnorld, Stuttgart 1857, pp. 379ff; see also J. von Schwarzenberg, *Ein Sendbrieff des Hellischen Sathans an die Zutrincker*, Frankfurt/Oder 1561, folio 13(r)ff.
33. *Memorial-Buch der Fahrten und Taten des schlesischen Ritters Hans von Schweinichen*, ed. E. Hegaur, München n.d. [1911], passim.
34. *Urkundenbuch der Universität Wittemberg*, vol. 1, Magdeburg 1926, No. 277.
35. E. Sehling (ed.), *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 1, Leipzig 1902, pp. 333, 456.
36. M. de Montaigne, *Die Essais*, ed. and transl. A. Franz, Stuttgart 1953, pp. 166ff. However, in his travel diary Montaigne noted: "On the occasion of contest drinking [I] was invited all right, but this was only courtesy and [I] never pledged." (*Tagebuch einer Bäderreise*, transl. O. Flake, Stuttgart 1963, p. 81).
37. Quoted by P. Frauenstädt, *Altdeutscher Durst im Spiegel des Auslands*, in: *Archiv Kulturgeschichte* 7 (1909), pp. 263ff.

38. Boemus Aubanus Teutinocus [J.Böhme], *Omnium gentium mores leges et ritus*, Freiburg 1536, pp. 211ff.
39. Cf. Scheible, *Schaltjahr*, *supra* note 27, vol. 2, p. 231.
40. *Germania* 23 (according to the text edition by R. Much, 3rd ed., Heidelberg 1967). Venantius, a Gallo-Roman poet of the 6th century, had reported after a visit to Rhine and Moselle regions of the local custom of pledging health "like mad and that one has to thank the Lord to survive their drinking bouts" (Poemata I praef., in: O. Schrader, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, vol. 2, Berlin and Leipzig 1929, p. 28). Three centuries later the influential ecclesiastical teacher Hrabanus Maurus complained that drunkenness is a vice among all sorts of people (cf. J. Samuelson, *The History of Drink: Social, Scientific, and Political*, 2nd ed., London 1880, p. 114).
41. Luther, *Werke*, *supra* note 5. Knowledge of ancient writers was already quite thorough; their opinions about drink were compiled by B. Seidelius, *De ebrietate libri tres*, Hannover 1594.
42. Calorie for calorie, beer was five to ten times more expensive than bread. Cf. H. Huntemann, *Bierproduktion und Bierverbrauch in Deutschland vom 15. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts*, thesis, Göttingen 1970, p. 48; W. Abel, *Stufen der Ernährung*, Göttingen 1981, p. 23.
43. Friderich, *Sauftteufel*, *supra* note 9, folios F2 and E2. That was precisely Luther's point of view (rather than the famous "without wine, woman, and song, you stay a fool your whole life long" inaccurately ascribed to him in the 18th century). For a summary of different stances see C. Scriverus, *Theologisches Bedencken Über die Fragen: Ob und wie weit es einem Christen zugelassen sey . . . einen Rausch zu trincken*, Helmstedt 1685. The vague set phrases used to define the abuse (e.g., *citra necessitatem* or "to the point of drunkenness") could already be found in monastic rules since Basilios and Benedict; they by no means implied an idea of exact physiological measurement but referred to the old basic concept of inequality—that God gives different gifts to each human being. Cf. also notes 3 and 5 above.
44. ". . . may not be afraid to drink well-water." Cf. de Avila, *Bancket*, *supra* note 13, p. 8. Fresh spring-water was usually regarded as healthy.
45. The grain prices, especially, rose much faster than wages (between 1470 and 1618: grain about 260%, wages about 70%). Landowners who produced for the market, in contrast to the majority of people, profited from this development, thus tightening social tensions. For a concise overview see F.-W. Hennig, *Das vorindustrielle Deutsch-*

46. According to Huntemann, *Bierproduktion*, *supra* note 42, pp. 115ff; for statistics on Bamberg, see p. 52.
47. Calculation based on H. von Schweinichen, *Leben Herzog XI. von Liegnitz*, Breslau 1850, suppl. 12. For evidence of similar shares in the budget of the Tuchers (the family of a very wealthy Nuremberg tradesman), see U. Dirlmeier, *Untersuchungen zu Einkommensverhältnissen und Lebenshaltungskosten in oberdeutschen Städten des Spätmittelalters*, Heidelberg 1978, p. 293.
48. In Küstrin (1561) they ranged from about 2 liters of beer for the caretaker to more than 40 liters for the chamberlain (probably including his guests and/or servants): calculated from A. Kern (ed.), *Deutsche Hofordnungen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 1, Berlin 1905, pp. 68ff.
49. Cf. B. Sastrow, *Herkommen, Geburt und Lebenslauf*, vol. 1, Hamburg 1907, pp. 65ff.
50. Cf. H.J. Schmitz, *Faktoren der Preisbildung für Getreide und Wein: 800–1350*, thesis, Stuttgart 1968, who estimates that water was generally avoided if possible.
51. Cf. Abel, *Stufen*, *supra* note 42, pp. 19ff and pp. 51ff; on beer see Huntemann, *Bierproduktion*, *supra* note 42, pp. 48ff and pp. 120ff; on wine also Dirlmeier, *Untersuchungen*, *supra* note 47, pp. 320ff.
52. Judgments about the role of water in the rural diet differ considerably. Cf. Spode, *Alkohol*, *supra* note 3, notes I.200 and II.73.
53. Their size is unknown; one might assume 0.5 liter. That meant 50–200 liters of absolute alcohol a year, depending on the types of beverage. The total amount of liquid consumed seems even more impressive—the additional use of light beer (*Cofent*), julep and spring-water was expressly permitted by the statutes. Cf. note 26 above.
54. For the following see Spode, *Alkohol*, *supra* note 3, pp. 68ff.
55. Austin, *Drogenkrise*, *supra* note 30, p. 119; similarly, Legnaro, *Alkoholkonsum*, *supra* note 2, p. 166.
56. H. Folz, *Wem der geprant wein nutz sey oder schad*, 2nd [?] ed., Bamberg 1493.
57. Cf. E.J. Rau, *Ärztliche Gutachten und Polizeivorschriften über Branntwein im Mittelalter*, thesis, Leipzig 1914, pp. 11ff.
58. Legnaro, *supra* note 55.

59. To Hungarian and German miners since the mid-16th century, to English soldiers in Holland since 1580.
60. Figures are rare and hardly comparable; cf., e.g., K. Glamann, Beer and Brewing in Pre-Industrial Denmark, *Scandinavian Econ. Hist. Rev.* 10 (1962), p. 129 (adults around 1600: 1,000 liters of beer a year); P. Charbonnier, La consommation des seigneurs auvergnats du XVe au XVIIIe siècle, in: *Annales* 30 (1975), p. 473 (adults in landlord households: over 700 liters of wine); K. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, London 1971, pp. 17ff, and Clark, *Alehouse*, *supra* note 25, p. 109 (England in the 16th century: most probably approximately 350 liters of beer/ale for the whole [urban] population; estimates for the 16th and 17th century range from 150 liters [without private brewing!] up to 1,400 liters [wealthier male adults?]). In the absence of consistent comparative data, one is reminded of Rabelais' adventures of Pantagruel and Gargantua, and of Shakespeare, e.g., *Othello* II,2: The English "drinks you with facility your Dane dead drunk; he sweats not to overthrow your Almain [German]; he gives your Hollander a vomit ere the next potle can be filled." However, it is possible that a real lag became obvious during the Thirty Years' War.
61. M. Friderich, *Ein Sendbrieff An die vollen Brüder im Deutschem Lande*, n.p. 1555, folio A3(r).
62. Also in the minds of pious preachers: feeling that the end of the world was near, they saw such demons as real beings. For many educated people, on the other hand, they were metaphors, and for many of the godless—who also could be found in those religion-prone times—they were malicious inventions.
63. Bassermann-Jordan, *Geschichte*, *supra* note 19, vol. 2, p. 1175. Frederrick himself forswore repeatedly.
64. According to Frauenstädt, *Durst* *supra* note 37, p. 263; similarly, Opsopoeus, *kunst*, *supra* note 31, folio A2.
65. On diluting the wine furtively, etc.: Opsopoeus, *kunst*, *supra* note 31, folio H3ff.
66. A. Gehlen (*Anthropologische Forschung*, Reinbek 1961, p. 81) defines "convention" as the discovery of "the arbitrariness of a claim to validity which is no longer the sole, natural possibility but a scrutinized matter from which people start to dissociate."
67. Cf. H. Spode, Der "Große Ernüchterer," in: D.U. Ball (ed.), *Coffee in the Context of European Drinking Habits*, Zurich 1991.
68. Typically enough, Richard Brathwait's *Jus potandi* (first Germ. ed. 1616) was, in the course of time, adopted into the canon of German

literature; even in its country of origin, Samuelson, *History*, *supra* note 40, pp. 192ff, drew a lot from it in order to describe 16th-century Germany.

69. Only "the Saxons resist all admonitions and stick to the manners of their fathers . . . oh what boozing, what belching, what spitting!" Quoted by M. Bauer, *Der deutsche Durst*, Leipzig n.d. [1903], p. 261.

CONTEMPORARY DRUG PROBLEMS

A LAW QUARTERLY



Copyright © 1994 by Federal Legal Publications

FALL 1994