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Man’s Best Friend? Dogs and Pigs in Early Modern Germany

Alison G. Stewart

[Drunkards/wine fools] growl like a dog, grumble like a bear, vomit, and crawl into a stall with pigs.1

Civilized—characteristic of a state of civilization; especially characterized by taste, refinement, or restraint.2

When Jacob Seisenegger and Titian painted individual portraits of Emperor Charles V around 1532, a dog replaced such traditional accouterments of imperial power as crown, scepter, and orb.3 Charles placed one hand on the dog’s collar, a gesture indicating his companion’s noble qualities including faithfulness.4 At the same time, another more down-to-earth meaning for the dog had become prominent in the decades before the imperial portraits: the interest in and ability to eat anything in sight. This pig-like ability resulted in dogs, alongside pigs, becoming emblems of indiscriminate and gluttonous eating and drinking during the early sixteenth century when humanists, along with town and imperial authorities and reformers across confessional lines, addressed their heightened concern for social issues. These reform issues and other approaches will be discussed in this chapter.

Introduction

The age-old necessity of eating and drinking was scrutinized in German-speaking areas during the early sixteenth century and resulted in the publication of a variety of often illustrated works, such as entertaining and didactic stories, carnival plays, and ordinances. The latter were issued by the local and imperial authorities and were available to all sectors of society in the form of broadsheets, pamphlets, and books.5 Central to this discourse was the issue of drunkenness and its perceived deleterious effects on

society including heads of households. Such seemingly excessive behavior should be seen within the context of the social norms of the time when social hierarchies were firmly entrenched, with one authority attempting to control the social behavior of another group outside and below its own. For example the patricians in Nuremberg, the town that is a focus of this analysis, attempted to control the drinking habits not of other patricians, but of the middle and lower classes, especially peasants residing outside the town walls.

Sixteenth-century illustrated books and pamphlets, along with independent visual imagery in the form of single-sheet woodcuts on printed sheets glued together side by side, and engravings printed on a single sheet of paper, indicate a discourse in print on what constituted correct behavior.6 That discourse went back over time to the late Middle Ages, as we will see, and to antiquity, but what is new in the early sixteenth century is the addition of printing, which speeded dissemination and broadened audiences through the issuing of books, pamphlets, broadsheets, and printed visual imagery in multiple copies and impressions. Central to this developing printed discourse was the use of such animal imagery to indicate the kind of behavior that was seen as prevalent yet undesirable. Dogs and pigs are repeatedly found within the context of eating and drinking as emblems of gluttony and animal-like behavior. But far from serving only as moralizing emblems that condemned the behavior shown, as often argued, this chapter explores their use and meanings within the rich cultural context of their time as both animals in public spaces and within the burgeoning area of printed images, texts, and language in the form of proverbs. There were, in other words, other ways such images and texts could have been considered in their time.

In the half century after printing's initial incunabula period, the printing industry supported broader efforts at the reform of society decades before the Reformation began. I argue, with Bernd Roeck, that the discourse of drunkenness, and animal imagery with it, was less about what actually took place than that which was deemed undesirable and seen to be in need of reform at that particular moment in time. Dogs and pigs belong to this broader discourse, which was made visible in early sixteenth-century printed images, along with more popular texts. I also argue, as Peter Stallybrass did for the pig, that both the pig and the dog were the “site of competing, conflicting, and contradictory definitions.” Whereas Stallybrass emphasized England and a somewhat later and a larger expanse of time in the early modern period, I concentrate on Germany and the Netherlands in the first half of the sixteenth century and stress the town of Nuremberg.7

The issue of what specifically constituted being “civilized” for the time, a concept that was being developed in Germany during the sixteenth century, stands directly before the modern viewer and reader of early modern texts and images and becomes central to our understanding of the period. Today “civilized” means cultivated, couth, cultured, genteel, polished, refined; if
uncivilized, one is barbaric, philistine, uncultured, unpolished, unrefined. For early sixteenth-century authorities attempting to reform most areas of society, the “other” areas were deemed uncivilized even if they were not labeled as such. Within this context Norbert Elias’s magisterial Civilizing Process, recently reissued in a new, authorized edition and translation will be brought to bear on these images of dogs and pigs.

Pigs—Reality and Symbol

Pigs and dogs ran loose in early modern Europe, including in towns like Nuremberg. Both pigs and dogs were common occurrences on such streets where they found much to eat, thus they were familiar creatures to the early modern man and woman. Pigs including wild boars (Wildschweine) were kept on farms and were sought after as food across Europe where pork and beef were the dominant meats. Pieter Bruegel’s Schlaraffenland painting of 1566 shows a pig walking with knife tantalizingly at the ready, in its side, for easy slicing and consumption. Dogs often accompanied humans to church and, judging from visual imagery, also appear to have accompanied their masters and mistresses at meals, much as they have in recent years in restaurants in Germany. Dogs were also used for the hunt and for carrying and pulling small loads. Other dogs were important “hobby animals” that were true luxury creatures often shown in paintings wearing red velvet neck bands that marked their domestication. The inclusion of such dogs and other, even more elegant ones in visual representations, indicated varying degrees of wealth and worldliness, according to the type of dog. Such animals, both dogs and pigs, were domesticated as were many others from sheep to cats, chickens and ducks. Although a century later than the period under consideration, the papal nuncio was surprised how the citizens of Münster lived under one roof with cows, goats, and pigs.

Dogs and pigs in sixteenth-century prints, shown eating on the floor alongside tables, have been seen as indicating both the kinds of swinish behaviors believed to take place and the kind of bad behavior to avoid. In the German language of the time, expressions related to dogs and pigs indicated drunken, uncivilized behavior. Martin Luther (1483–1546) likened widespread drunkenness to the habits of pigs, writing that Germans became intoxicated daily like pigs (ain volle Saw, vnd ain täglichen trunckenbold ist), constantly like pigs (wie die Sew, in steter vollerei), such that foreigners call Germans “the drunken Germans.” According to Luther, drinking was so common that anyone who refused to partake in it and become a “drunken pig” was despised.

Pigs denoted slovenly, drunken, and disgusting behavior in both the language and literature of the sixteenth century. In his Sins of Drunkenness of 1528, Sebastian Franck (c. 1499–c. 1543) wrote that only pigs eat what the drunkard leaves in his pants. Likewise Luther informed in his Sermon on
1.1 Hans Burgkmair the Younger, *Fresikeit or Gluttony* from *The Seven Vices* series, 29.5 × 19.1 cm, woodcut, c. 1510. © Trustees of the British Museum, AN56653001
Sobriety and Moderation of 1539 that the “drinking devil,” or Saufstüffel, leads the lazy life of a pig. Luther also wrote that if one wishes to paint such an enthusiastic drinker, a pig should be shown.\textsuperscript{22}

Such ideas on drunkenness were visualized in prints of the time through the juxtaposition of a person holding a drinking vessel with a pig, as in a woodcut dated 1512 by Hans Burgkmair (1483–1531) from Augsburg entitled Gluttony (Fig. 1.1), another woodcut from the middle of the sixteenth century from Amsterdam by Cornelis Anthonisz. (1499–c. 1555) titled a Drunkard is a Swine (Fig. 1.2), and an engraving of 1549 by Heinrich Aldegrever (1502–61) from Soest of Gluttony.\textsuperscript{23}
Burgkmair’s figure of gluttony is surrounded by an elegant Renaissance frame with romping, naked figures, titled in German above the figure “Die Fresikeit,” or Gluttony, thereby mixing native German language with new Renaissance visual style. A large drinking vessel and a pack of playing cards are held up, and the flames of hell lap at the feet of Burgkmair’s plump drinker with her noticeably exposed décolletage, as a pig sits at her feet in the midst of flames. This image equates drunkenness with behavior that condemns one to death and Hell.

Anthonisz.’s drunkard bears the head of a pig, and the body of a man whose chest is encased by a wine barrel. He steps on grapes, making clear that the more usual personification in the visual arts of the time as a woman, seen in the Burgkmair print, is here shown as a man, a deliberate choice because the male sex was then deemed more susceptible to drinking and drunkenness. Anthonisz.’s man breathes foul creatures and his hair is decorated with playing cards; he swings a sword and holds a large tankard whose lid stands open ready for the drinker. As Lyndal Roper has shown, aggressive behavior and fighting, and playing cards, were seen as the purview of early sixteenth-century German males.

Pigs indicated slovenly, disgusting behavior, as in an engraving by Jörg Pencz (1500–50) from Nuremberg of the vice and deadly sin of Gluttony from c. 1540 (Fig. 1.3) showing a stocky winged woman with a large, round belly. She is shown as a personification by her wings and identified in the inscription below as Gula or Gluttony. The accompanying pig visualizes gluttony’s behaviors as disgusting, as it sniffs, eats, or expels a pile of filth or excrement. She holds a large urn or pitcher and wears a belt of grapevine and a wreath on her head of what appears to be barley, thus the major ingredients of wine and beer are emphasized as the reason for her girth.

Such graphic equations of human activity with that of an animal confirm the visualization of the then popular expression “A drunken person is truly a swine.” Today, the expression “drunk like a swine” (Voll wie ein Schwein sein), or in English “drunk like a skunk,” updates that centuries-old idea. Burgkmair from Augsburg, Anthonisz. from Amsterdam, Aldegrever from Soest, and Pencz from Nuremberg show ideas that were broadly known in the form of popular expressions and visual imagery across the social and geographical boundaries offered by woodcuts and engravings in Northern Europe during the first half of the sixteenth century in Germany and the Netherlands.
Prominent for such animal imagery is the concept of the Four Characteristics of Wine (Fig. 1.4), known during the early sixteenth century in a woodcut designed by Erhard Schön (1491–1542) and published at Nuremberg in 1528 with text below by Hans Sachs (1494–1576), Nuremberg’s shoemaker-poet. Schön’s woodcut centralizes a vine with three plump clusters of grapes where Noah, according to legend, has discovered the grapevine and tilled the earth, mixing into it the blood of ape, lamb, bear, and pig. Those animals’ behaviors, in turn, were believed to have influenced human behavior into four types: gentle as a lamb, aggressive as a bear, expulsive as a pig, and foolish as an ape. The association of specific animal behavior with that of humans derives from the ancient tradition of the humors, with the pig understood to fall within the context of the phlegmatic temperament in which drinkers, because of their excess bodily fluids, lose control of their bodily functions when drunk.

For sixteenth-century viewers, the effects of wine were comparable to the characteristics of the four animals whose blood provided the fertilizer for the first grapes. In Schön’s woodcut, six men are shown around a table and they drink from amply-sized vessels. One man vomits onto the table, another...
defecates down his leggings, while another has fallen to the ground where he has both vomited and dirtied his pants. Two pigs lap up what the man expels from his mouth while a woman turns her head away in disgust and checks the backside of his torn tights. These men act like pigs and typify the behavior associated with the third characteristic of wine. Here the cultural idea of the effects of drinking along with the language of the time, as expressed by Luther and others, come together to underscore and visualize the perceived pervasiveness of drinking during the early sixteenth century.

The accompanying text by Sachs describes such a drinker under the third characteristic of wine: overeating and drinking (*fressen, schlampen*), drunkenness (*trunken und stüdvol*), and filthy language (*Erst lat er die sew glocken klingenn*). Sachs also mentions farting (*er lest hindter im ein gestanck*), staggering (*dorckelt er hin und herwider*), lying in filth (*bsult sich im kot, wie ein schwein and Ligt etwan ein wil inn eym mist*), belching and farting like a pig (*gröltzt und fartzt er wie ein saw*), and urinating in bed (*Villeicht prunzt er auch in das pett*). These drinkers belonged to the sluggish phlegmatic temperament whose loss of bodily functions when drunk is clearly laid out for the viewer by Sachs, learned craftsman, writer, and humanist, and a populist one, who takes on the bodily effects of drink without shrinking from its realities. But he was not alone in doing so. As we will see, numerous woodcuts of the time from Nuremberg show pigs alongside drinkers. The third *Characteristic of Wine*, seen within Schön’s print, continued to hold currency at mid-century when an engraving by Virgil Solis (1514–62), from Nuremberg, placed grapevine alongside pigs who sample the issue of several drunkards.

These animals and the effects of wine need to be viewed within a larger framework of sixteenth-century writings of various kinds where the association between animals and human behavior was embedded in entertaining narratives describing drinking, which were published in the form of short pamphlets whose content supplements the already-mentioned concepts of the four temperaments and the effects of wine, and by extension the characteristics of drink and drinkers. These writings overlap in content and describe a drinker who grumbles like a bear, as did Sachs in his text above and Sebastian Franck in his *On the Horrible Vice of Drunkenness* from 1528. Franck appears to target the upper classes, judging from the clothing worn by the men on the title page woodcut of his long pamphlet subtitled *What overeating and boozing and toasting produce and bring with them for distress and danger, harm to soul and body, also poverty and dangerous necessity*. Below the woodcut a Biblical warning against immoderation (Luke 21:34) states: “But take heed to yourselves lest your hearts be weighted down with dissipation like a snare.”

Franck singles out dizziness, bad breath; sickness and fouling one’s clothing, and falling into filth that would be too horrible even for pigs; whoring and adultery; deterioration of other aspects of one’s life; poverty and violence, and blasphemy and disregard for God. Franck includes the animal associations of drunken behavior—“growling like a dog, grumbling like a
bear, vomiting, and crawling into a stall with pigs.” Franck likens dogs that eat the drunkard’s vomit to both the drunkard who lies in excrement and to pigs that consume the defecation in the drunkard’s pants. Such bacchants Franck calls wine fools.33

By 1528 publications treating the effects of drink were common currency throughout Germany and appeared in several printed forms, including Schön’s *Four Characteristès of Wine* woodcut, discussed earlier, with text by Sachs and published at Nuremberg, and Franck’s long pamphlet on drunkenness published at Augsburg. Also published in that year was the *Kermis at Mögeldorf* designed by Sebald Beham (1500–50) and Schön at Nuremberg.34 The latter, a large woodcut printed on six sheets of paper, begins with a pig placed before a small inn that is identified as such by the pole hanging from the roof. The pig appears to sniff, or consume, a pile of garbage or filth. The animal’s inclusion signals both the presence of the pig in everyday life and the possibility that the individuals who follow, eaters and drinkers, include some who have eaten and drunk to excess. The text above the print, penned by Sachs in Nuremberg dialect, describes peasants at kermis, the most popular peasant celebration, with carnival play-like exuberance and color. The peasants are boisterous, earthy, and eager for drink, love, and a fight. There is an abundance of food and drink, enough to cause the intoxication of several peasants who vomit as a result of being very drunk, blind drunk. One man, Eselsmüller from Potenstein, was the biggest glutton, and he hugged one woman until she threw up. Although the pig in the print points to the gluttonous behavior of some of the celebrators as described in the text, the majority of the print shows dancers stepping lively but decorously, indicating that the pig marks part, not all of the activity. The text therefore expands and supplements the images in the print with the pig serving as an enticement or invitation to the viewer to continue viewing the image, reading the text, or partaking in the celebration and fun.35

Drinking at the time was customary and permeated every aspect of German life, from sealing contracts and celebrating weddings to playing drinking games. Inordinate drinking and drunkenness were altogether different issues in the sixteenth century at a time when temperance was unknown. In Nuremberg, wine was popular and inexpensive enough to be drunk often and in large quantities by all classes, including common folk.36 When the Nuremberg council’s legal adviser, Christoph Scheurl (1481–1542), hosted a meal in honor of humanist Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560) in 1525, each guest received 2.5 liters of wine or roughly 2.5 quarts or 80 ounces. And Nuremberg’s day laborers received wine twice a day in partial payment for services, and council members drank wine during meetings and at the conclusion of a contract or sale, which included drinking by judge and witnesses alike. Wine was drunk at all meals and as a soporific.37

Drunkenness therefore meant consuming huge amounts of alcohol consistently, on a daily basis, such that a person—usually male—could not work, function, or support his family.38 Criticism of drinking in Germany
extended to all social groups, as Luther attested, but in the visual imagery of the first half of the sixteenth century it was usually the lower sectors of society, especially peasants and men, not women, who were shown as embodiments of drunkenness. It is important to remember that it was not the behavior of Germans that had actually changed. Rather the conservative approach of members of the elite had become more vocal and had turned toward moralizing attempts at reform, with the aid of printed works of various kinds. Proclamations of the Tea Party movement in the early twenty-first century, supported by new digital media, and of the moral majority of the late twentieth century offer parallels that connect conservative voices of the past to us.

Dogs

Dogs played an increasing role in early modern images where they accompanied men seated around a table eating and drinking. But unlike pigs, which could indicate the sin of gluttony, dogs do not appear to have carried the overt meaning of vice or sin. Nevertheless, dogs were similarly linked to eating and drinking in abundance within the visual arts going back to at least 1500.

German humanists likened bad manners to the habits of dogs. Already in 1500 Jacob Wimpfeling (1450–1528) wrote that only a boor brings a dog to a meal. In 1530 Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (c. 1467–1536) forbade throwing food from the table to a dog. He described as uncouth those who sit next to a dog on a bench, feed it, and catch fleas from its hair; in thanks the dog licks the master’s face and hands. Humanists also discouraged gnawing bones like a dog, and picking food from one’s teeth with fingernails like dog or cat. And in a print of 1534 from Nuremberg entitled Table Manners, designed by Pencz, the text below by Sachs states that sticking out one’s tongue like a dog was not to be tolerated at the table (Schlag nit die zung ausz gleich ein hundl), suggesting that the behavior to be recommended is shown in the woodcut and that to be avoided is described in the text. Text and image thereby complement each other while offering both more staid and more colorful presentations of the same subject. For moralizing humanists, dogs undoubtedly carried the association of crude, unacceptable, animal-like behavior similar to that of pigs for humans.

Dogs were also employed within similar contexts more visual than textual to indicate both indiscriminate, excessive, disgusting eating habits, and a proverb encapsulating such ideas. On the title page to a drinking tract by Hieronymus Emser dated 1505, published at Leipzig, an anonymous woodcut shows the inside of a small room where nine men from different social classes in varied dress surround a table and drink from large drinking vessels. Two men have fallen to the floor, dead drunk, as another stands over them and explains in a banderole that they are all drunk, “Alle fol.”
The young man at lower right, with long stockinged legs, lies on his back and has vomited onto himself, as a dog licks his mouth and what he has expelled. Similar images of the time combining drunkard and dog include a title page woodcut to *A New Song. The Song is Called the Drunken Matins*, a pamphlet published at Nuremberg and probably dating from the 1530s. Once again a group of men is arranged around a table with drunkard in the foreground at a bench. At the same time Beham designed at least two woodcuts showcasing dog and drunk male drinker lying on a bench or falling off it in his *Large Kermis* dated 1535 (Fig. 1.5) and his *Kermis (Erlangen)* from about the same time.

Together dogs and drunkards visualized a proverb on drunkenness called the “drunken matins” (*die truncken Metten*), first illustrated in visual form in Emser’s pamphlet of 1505, that was included in the title of the pamphlet *A New Song* decades later. The “drunken matins” proverb ironically and irreverently referred to the singing in church during matins, the early hour of the canonical day taking place in the middle of the night, as that which a drunkard emits. The first known explanation in print of this proverb was offered by Sebastian Franck (c. 1499–c. 1543) in his book *Proverbs* from 1541, to be discussed below. Between these dates woodcut images indicate the expression’s currency. Hans Weiditz (c. 1500–36) included the “drunken matins” in a woodcut from c. 1530 accompanied by a text. He shows a fat abbot sitting in a horse’s jawbone as nuns push him across ice. In visual

1.5 Sebald Beham, *Large Kermis* (detail, drinkers before a tavern), 35.9 × 112.1 cm, woodcut, 1535. Photo: author
imagery of the time, playing the jawbone of a horse denoted guzzling and revelry, even folly. The text explains that the abbot, who is very cold, wishes to be pulled off the ice and go drinking, after which time all the monks and nuns will sing the drunken matins. The modern Pennsylvania German, Catholic, expression, “having a bit of the hair of the dog that bit you,” an update of this proverb, refers to drinking the next morning the same beverage that put you under the evening before.

The separate images by Beham, Weiditz, and the anonymous earlier designer in Emser’s pamphlet describe a drunken peasant who slips from a bench and sings the drunken matins with long notes, a euphemism for vomiting, such that all dogs and pigs run and gobble the matins issued. Franck also clinched the link between wine and evacuation when he wrote in his Proverbs of 1541 that:

Oh it is a great honor, for whoever finishes working for the day, and has a bowel movement, is an [expletive, curse word] good drinking partner and his body is his hero. He may still ... wait for another good drinking partner and wine hero until Bacchus throws him under a bench ..., that he begins to sing the drunken matins with long notes, such that all dogs and pigs run to him, to eat the song and the matins.

Franck’s intention here is to capture the German proverb and codify it in print, just as other humanist writers of the time were describing popular folk customs in print. Franck describes without flinching, and without moralizing, one proverb that fits firmly into the colorfully scatological vocabulary of sixteenth-century Germany.

Reforming Culture

Erasmus attempted to effect better manners and behavior through his numerous writings and publications, most notably in his On Good Manners for Boys (De civilitate morum puerialium libellus), published in 1530 at Basel by Johannes Froben (c. 1460–1527). Although essentially a book of etiquette for children that addressed good manners, walking and dressing correctly, and how to behave, Erasmus wrote both for children and for the unlettered, for children of the lower classes and for well-born boys of noble ancestry. He tried to instill courtesy and manners into children with their first steps and indirectly to reach adults with what he called civilitas or civilité, a concept that had been known to only a few individuals in Germany during the early decades of the sixteenth century. Franz Bierlaire called Erasmus “a moralist with his eyes wide open,” pointing to Erasmus’s attempts at reform that were just that: attempts, rather than accomplishments. A few years earlier, in 1522, the humanist-Reformer Philip Melanchthon articulated the notion that behavior and appearance reveal qualities of soul and mind, thereby linking outward behavior with inward characteristics, thus the outward and the inward, the visible and
Attempts at reform in Northern Europe go back to the late fifteenth and continued well into the seventeenth centuries. They also went back to antiquity in lands south of the Alps. The reform movement, as it is often called, included humanists such as Sebastian Brant (c. 1457–1521), members of the clergy, and secular authorities who redressed abuses and all kinds of behaviors in both religious and secular practices. Peter Burke called this the reform of popular culture and viewed it as a systematic attempt by the educated to change the basic values and attitudes of the rest or most of the population.

In Nuremberg, legislation of a reforming nature goes back to the thirteenth century, but it was not until 1526, soon after Nuremberg officially adopted the Lutheran religion, that the secular authorities appear to have increased their efforts at social reform. This new vigor is suggested by an increased number of printed documents that have come down to us, especially mandates and police ordinances issued as printed broadsheets and pamphlets. Such legislation was, to use Gerald Strauss’s words, prohibitive not preventive, because it was “imposed after excess or abuse had been noted, and attempted to apply brakes to a process already underway.” And underway the process certainly was by the time Nuremberg became Lutheran. Earlier attempts at reforming social practices through sumptuary laws continued after Nuremberg adopted Luther’s religion in March 1525. But it would be a mistake to call the earlier attempts “Catholic” and the later attempts at taming popular culture “Lutheran.” Rather, the continuity of the intentions and writings in this reform movement needs underscoring. At first sight, the addition in 1526 by Nuremberg’s authorities of printed mandates to its ammunition against social ills appears to reflect Nuremberg’s Lutheran intentions. It may, however, reveal a stepping up of interest in reforming popular culture, yet that movement had been well underway prior to Nuremberg’s adoption of Luther’s religion.

The reform movement of the early sixteenth century speeded reorganization and broadened its base considerably through the aid of the printing press, which produced multiples of the pamphlets, broadsheets, and books that spread its message. The documents from this social movement show the responses of the authorities (official culture) and the educated elite (elite culture) to social ills and the attempts of both cultures to control or change most people below them on the social ladder (popular culture). Legislation by the authorities was issued, then disseminated orally and in printed form. In Nuremberg, decrees or Ratsverlässe were posted and announced from the town hall and pulpits of its two main churches if the contents applied to the public, as did decrees pertaining to drinking and eating. In town, printed mandates were read aloud by members of the clergy in church and
hung in public locations that included city gates, church doors, and chain poles serving as announcement centers. In the countryside, mandates were read aloud from the pulpit by the clergy or by an administrator or member of a subordinate office. Posting, reading aloud, and publication in printed form served as the means of public dissemination, as a set of laws from 1529 proclaims on its title page, Mandates or Laws to be Announced in the Countryside Annually on the First or other Sunday during Lent.

Legislation or prohibitions passed in Nuremberg had originally been imposed in the fourteenth century and only on the upper classes. However, in the fifteenth century increasing prosperity spread throughout all Nuremberg classes and prohibitions were extended to apprentices and artisans. By the end of the fifteenth century, all people in Nuremberg and all aspects of life were included in the laws. With the adoption of the Lutheran religion in 1525, specific aspects of popular culture were re-evaluated and prohibited for the first time.

The educated elite in Nuremberg included humanists, councilors, and members of the upper clergy who attempted to change the rest of society’s attitudes on religion and social customs. This elite included Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530), Lazarus Spengler (1479–1534), Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528), and Hans Sachs. This learned group was extremely small in number and included a painter and a poet-shoemaker. Its hallmark was reading and writing, and literacy. Rolf Engelsing estimated that although 10 to 30 percent of town folk could read, the national average in Germany during the sixteenth century came down to a low 5 percent, at best, and these figures do not include those who could write. Engelsing suggested that our narrow definition of literacy in the modern sense, of being able to read and write, should be expanded to include listening and looking for the sixteenth century. Engelsing noted numerous folk books from the fifteenth century that mention reading and listening as assuming equal weight.

The first important publication within the reform movement was a book written outside Nuremberg and published at Basel in 1494. Brant’s Ship of Fools satirized dozens of social follies ranging from scholars who collect books but fail to read them, to celebrators led into temptation on feast days, boors who offend with gluttonous, sloppy manners, and a variety of sinful behaviors including lust, dancing, and gambling. Nuremberg’s authorities followed suit with similar social criticisms, beginning in 1526 by issuing legislation in the form of printed broadsheets and pamphlets, often in both forms simultaneously. Other publications followed in Nuremberg, throughout Germany, and beyond.

The attempts at reform just noted need to be viewed within the civilizing process theorized by Norbert Elias. His now-familiar concept of social reform and social disciplining, first published in 1939 and recently issued in a revised edition, underscores that authorities imposed stricter requirements for civilized behavior and order on individual citizens at the time the early modern state emerged in the sixteenth century. Elias’s social disciplining
concept applies to the authorities controlling and prescribing the behavior of most people through official regulations over the course of centuries and assumes that those in control need only ask and those they controlled obeyed, eventually. The council’s goal in Nuremberg of controlling tens of thousands of residents in town and just as many in the countryside was undoubtedly ambitious, but their attempts appear to have been ineffective or extremely slow in achieving the desired results.

Elias’s approach maps a trend toward better manners and more civilized behavior. There is no question that behavior became more refined over time and that the threshold for the acceptable changed between the sixteenth century and the twentieth when Elias was writing, but the question remains why this change took place and if any one group was responsible for it. Using Elias’s model for Nuremberg, the official culture comprising the patrician town council (for Elias, the state), members of the clergy, and humanists would be understood as the shapers of more refined manners and behaviors. Although the council issued numerous decrees and mandates during the 1520s and 1530s, it is questionable whether these really effected the kind of reform Elias would claim for them. The efforts by those in positions of power might better be designated “social blueprints for action,” a kind of wishful thinking as called by anthropologists. Because prohibitions appear to have had no real effect, they needed to be amended, clarified, and renewed, as Robert Muchembled has shown. The police ordinances issued at this time have as their goal a well-ordered community, be it in town or country, according to Gerhard Oesterich. The issues addressed reveal areas deemed threats to society, what sociologists and anthropologists call “moral panic,” thus the “drinking problem” in Nuremberg, as seen by that council, can be seen as part of this exaggerated concern.

Within these reform attempts Erasmus’s important role is attested by his numerous writings and publications addressing the subjects of better manners and behavior that date decades before his On Good Manners for Boys of 1530. Such works include his Profane Feast (Convivium profanum) of 1518 where feasting and manners play central roles. His importance in this area is also underscored by the publication of his De civilitate morum in High German in 1531, one year after its publication in Latin, followed by its French edition in 1537, and a Dutch edition in 1546. The text enjoyed a minimum of 80 Latin editions by the end of the century. These publications spread Erasmus’s ideas widely. Placing such reform efforts into perspective challenges us today to understand the different ways people thought and responded in the sixteenth century. Erasmus was not as prudish about the body and its responses as attitudes today might suggest. In his De civilitate morum Erasmus wrote that one should “Withdraw when you are going to vomit; vomiting is not shameful, but to have vomited through gluttony is disgusting.” Erasmus does not call such behavior sinful, but one to be avoided. The line between observing and describing behavior and labeling it as sinful or as a vice is one to which I will now turn.
Conclusion—Understandings and Interpretations

Dogs and pigs indicated human qualities, albeit undesirable ones, that overlapped with those animals. The extent to which dogs and pigs in texts and images were intended to describe, entertain, or moralize, or indicate a particular proverb or oral expression then in currency, depended in part on the individuals viewing the animals or reading or hearing a text involving them. Although art historians have traditionally tended to privilege moralizing interpretations for such imagery, more recent approaches by scholars in various fields have offered more expansive and nuanced understandings. Were these dogs and pigs invitations and admonishments, a kind of entertainment, as Ann Tlusty has suggested for related drinking texts? Or did these animals teach acceptable behavior by showing the opposite kinds of behaviors that should be avoided, as Barbara Correll has argued for Friedrich Dedekind and Kaspar Scheidt’s writings at the middle of the sixteenth century, and to which we might add Pencz’s Table Manners and accompanying text? And to what extent were the visualizations centered around dogs and pigs responses to the contemporary interest in codifying language and verbal expressions including proverbs?

Seen within the varying sixteenth-century approaches outlined above, pigs and dogs can be seen as emblematic of evaluation and change at a time of “moral panic,” to use the term from sociology and anthropology, when attempts increased at shaping behavior and creating social identity across class and gender lines based on a common set of manners deemed acceptable, before “civilized” had become a widespread notion. Dogs and pigs were both vehicles of discourse on the subject of the civilized and culinary manners, and identifiers of unacceptable behavior. They appear to have functioned as calls for moderation while describing in vivid detail behaviors and pleasures to be avoided. Regardless of describing to entice or to convert, such “fruitful ambivalence,” as Michael Camille has called it, resulted in the centrality of dogs and pigs in the increasing discourse of social identity during the early sixteenth century. The early sixteenth century constituted a period of religious and cultural reform and exploration of both the New World and Old World behaviors. At a time when drinking played a central role throughout society, it is no wonder that reform extended also to the perceived “drinking problem” and to the familiar animals that embodied it, ones increasingly visible and present, at least in the case of pigs, in towns in early modern Europe.
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10 Robert Muchembled, *Popular Culture and Elite Culture in France 1450–1750*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985), 109 and 117, on the public problems posed by these animals running loose in France, including the spread of rabies. See Stallybrass and White, “The Fair, the Pig, Authorship,” esp. 44–48, on the ambivalent attitude toward pigs in early modern England and Europe as “both celebrated as well as reviled” — their running loose, disgusting habits, biting and killing small children, and their being almost like humans in having similar flesh and eating the same food.

12 For Bruegel’s painting (Alte Pinakothek, Munich), see http://www.pinakothek.de/en/pieter-bruegel-d-ae/land-cockaigne. Dinzelbacher, *Mensch und Tier*, 294–95, mentions that cows, pigs, lambs, horses, and goats provided meat in the transition from the late medieval to early modern periods in Europe, with 60 percent beef and 20 percent pork eaten.
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The common person complained about the increase in the price of wine and the ruin of the common wine market, according to a mandate of 1526 issued by the town council of Nuremberg. See Nürnberger Mandate, Rep. 63 1a, Bd. A, 20 no. 14 (2 May 1526), Staatsarchiv, Nuremberg.
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46 The late Karl Schwabenbauer, of the J. Paul Getty Museum of Art, kindly related this proverb in 1988.
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