TRAVELING JOURNEYMEN IN METTERNICHIAN SOUTH GERMANY*

GEORGE S. WERNER

INTRODUCTION

The nineteenth century was not the happiest time for traditional institutions in Central Europe. In particular, accelerated population growth and the Enlightenment—directly or through the filter of Revolutionary and Napoleonic France—had undermined the efficacy of traditional approaches to political, economic, and social life in the German states. The old givens and certainties were now called into question; the entire structure had begun the process of modernization. On the individual level, as social and economic relations changed, as the equilibrium established over the centuries among the various components of society was upset, each element found itself set adrift, liberated from old restrictions, but lacking the security they had provided. It is precisely when individuals are aware that traditional values have lost their meaning and that previous expectations can no longer be realized, that social tensions begin to take on crisis proportions, leading, in the extreme case, to social disintegration, until either the old institutions regain some degree of validity or new ones arise, able to accommodate the changes.

One group in nineteenth-century German society seemed to be more exposed to the misery that this dislocation caused than other segments. Journeymen were halfway through the process established by the guild system for the creation of new master craftsmen to replace those who had died or to tend to the demands of a larger population. They were beyond the training stage of apprenticeship, but not considered sufficiently developed to ply their trade without supervision. As long as the journeyman remained in a condition of becoming, of having not yet attained permanent status and thus security, he was exposed to the uncertainties and anxieties that change—modernization—magnifies. While some few consciously chose the route of radicalism, the vast majority consciously or unconsciously followed the path that had been followed for generations in the hope that they too would successfully attain acceptance as masters, thus guaranteeing their existence and livelihood.[1]

This hope was created and fostered by the guilds, even though they had changed in purpose and attitude in the centuries since their birth. Generally speaking, guilds had come into being during the Middle Ages as (usually urban) associations of the practitioners of a particular craft or trade, united to establish and maintain standards of training and production. Initially meant to carry on religious and social functions, they gradually took on economic and political qualities as well, increasing their importance in and control over their members' lives. They soon assumed the authority to determine what would be produced, in what manner and quantity, by whom, and how the product would be sold. Competition among the masters decreased by mutual agreement, while competition between, rather than within, cities began to increase as the medieval city ceased to be an isolated economic district. While journeymen and new masters suffered, others used the altered circumstances to advantage and the guilds developed into a craft aristocracy in many cities, defending their own.[2] The guilds became increasingly more exclusive, restricting membership and thereby limiting not only the opportunity to engage in guilded crafts, but also the chance to settle in the towns and cities which they controlled. Moreover, they tried to prevent craftsmen from working in the villages and would tolerate no work which someone outside the guild produced even for his own household. Well before the eighteenth century, the guilds had become monopolies, jealously guarding the rights and prerogatives granted or, through weakness, forfeited to them by the state. The old laws became privileges and more energy was expended on preventing competition from outsiders than on productivity and efficiency. Consequently, "subquality goods were produced at high prices,"[3] while large numbers of people were refused needed employment. To be part of the guild system was to be assured a livelihood; to be an outsider meant exclusion from the crafts and denial of a right even of subsistence.

The underlying logic of this attitude rested on the belief that the economy could be expanded only by population growth, since both incomes and the portion to be spent on craft products were assumed to be fixed.

* This study, made possible in part by a grant from the American Philosophical Society, sabbatical leave from the University of Delaware, and the expert help of Mrs. Joyce Storm of that university's Interlibrary Loan Department, is dedicated to the memory of George G. Windell—my mentor and friend.

[1] *Nahrung* was more than simple economic sufficiency. Rather it described rights and obligations in one's station as well.

[2] Bopp, P. Hartwig, *Die Entwicklung des deutschen Handwerksgesellentums im 19. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn, 1932), pp. 4–5.

[3] Shorter, Edward, "Social Change and Social Policy in Bavaria, 1800–1860" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 98.

To increase the number of masters engaged in a craft beyond a certain fixed number could only result in overproduction, which, given fixed demand, would force prices and artisan incomes dangerously low.[4] In this view of a static society, the artisan thought only in terms of "the local market, a secured livelihood, a closed community, patriarchal work relationships and unchangeable moral principles."[5] He worked to keep himself and his family at that level determined by his place in society, seldom seeking to outstrip his neighbor and even more rarely being allowed to try.

As long as the population grew slowly and innovation in production could gradually be absorbed without placing stress on the fundamentals of the craft, this logic was perfectly adequate: apprentices were trained, became journeymen, and could reasonably expect to attain masterhood. But by the eighteenth century this was no longer the case. Technical change disrupted the existing order by reorganizing the existing division of labor and stirring up antagonisms between those who had a vested interest in the traditional forms[6] and those who might benefit from the new ones. Moreover, while many masters were able to maintain themselves and their families, they could no longer profitably engage journeymen.[7] In some cases masters had to work for other masters as journeymen or to become day laborers in order to be fully employed.[8] Yet the number of apprentices and journeymen continued to grow, indicating not that the masters were hiring more to meet increased demand, but rather that they were no longer able to be absorbed into the system,[9] that they were becoming surplus labor. The only apparent avenue of escape for the unemployed journeyman was to leave the guild system and work in a factory, practice a free trade (one that was not organized as a guild), or seek a state license allowing him to practice his craft in the countryside. As the guilds proved less and less willing to absorb the increasing numbers of journeymen, more and more chose to settle in the villages where the artisans—nonguilded and working without apprentices or journeymen—filled local, basic needs,[10] dealing largely in "necessary wares for daily sale."[11] Yet while acting as a safety valve, the rural crafts were unable to absorb more than a fraction of the excess journeymen excluded by the guilds and began to complain bitterly of "overfilling," of being unable to provide an adequate livelihood for existing artisans, a complaint already expressed by the urban guilds.

What "overfilling" and surplus journeymen indicated was the accelerated process of change, the reordering of the German economic and social structure in the transition from the late feudal world to that of the industrial nineteenth century. No radical change in the economy had occurred since the Middle Ages, when the bulk of trade had been primarily local. Now, a world that had once seemed static took on a dynamic quality overwhelming to contemporaries. The guild masters were no longer able to grow with the psychological and organizational demands placed on them by the altered times.[12] Well into the nineteenth century they reacted in the conviction that the old social order had been sound and ought either to be restored or to serve as a model for a restructured society.[13] Instinctively, the guildsmen—masters and journeymen alike—aspired toward a return to "corporative unity with guild regulation and the independent existence of small masters."[14] What most refused to grasp was that a world experiencing rapid change in technology, production, money, competition, social mobility, and new forms of consumption[15] could not be controlled by the old institutions. Improvements in communication and transportation, for example, produced economic dislocation as the local artisans lost monopolies based partially on ignorance of competing goods and partially on the difficulty of obtaining them from outside the district even if one knew of them.[16]

At the start of the nineteenth century, the condition and prospect of the crafts were not favorable. Urban guilds were threatened by suburban and rural competition, while all artisans had to face change in technology and style. Imports (either from other German states or from Great Britain and France) and factory products also began to put pressure on the crafts, yet while it is clear that new techniques of organization and production did hurt the craft economy, it is not true that industry replaced the crafts. There was no

[4] Ibid., pp. 95–96.

[5] Schwarz, Gerard, *'Nahrungsstand' und 'erzwungener Gesellenstand.' Mentalite und Strukturwandel des bayerischen Handwerk im Industrialisierungsprozess um 1860* (Berlin, 1974), p. 55.

[6] Liebel, Helen, "Enlightened Bureaucracy versus Enlightened Despotism in Baden, 1750–1792," *Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **55,** 5 (Philadelphia, 1965): p. 33.

[7] Anegg, Ernst, *Zur Gewerbestruktur und Gewerbepoltik Bayerns während der Regierung Montgelas* (Munich, 1965), p. 43.

[8] Schmoller, Gustav, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kleingewerbe im 19. Jahrhundert* (Halle, 1870), p. 329.

[9] Walker, Mack, *German Home Towns. Community, State, and General Estate, 1648–1871* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1971), p. 334.

[10] It has been estimated that around 1800, more than 80 per cent of German artisans were blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, butchers, and the like. Henning, Friedrich-Wilhelm, *Die Industrialisierung in Deutschland von 1800 bis 1914* (Paderborn, 1973), p. 74.

[11] Schmoller, p. 74.

[12] Popp, August, *Die Entstehung der Gewerbefreiheit in Bayern* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 21.

[13] Fischer, Wolfram, "Social Tensions at Early Stages of Industrialization," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* **9** (1966–1967): p. 67.

[14] Stadelmann, Rudolph, *Social and Political History of the German 1848 Revolution*, trans. James G. Chastain (Athens, Ohio, 1975), p. 14.

[15] Schwarz, *Nahrungsstand*, p. 55.

[16] Walker, Mack, *Germany and the Emigration, 1816–1885* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), p. 46; Conze, Werner, "Vom 'Pöbel' zum 'Proletariat.' Sozialgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen für den Sozialismus in Deutschland," *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* **41** (1954): p. 174.

linear relationship between the growth of factories and the decay of the crafts in the nineteenth century, and the actual growth of large industry only began in the late 1860s. Moreover, in those crafts, such as construction, not faced with factory competition, the number of artisans and their assistants increased in absolute terms.[17] Still, the expansion of industry earlier in the century did alter the structure of the crafts. Those artisans who produced goods that could easily be finished by machine or that were capable of mass production by simplification were either forced out of the marketplace or, by adapting to the factory system (shifting from production to repair, for example), were able to survive and even to prosper.[18]

The crafts were also affected by population size. With the major exemption of such catastrophies as the Black Death and the Thirty Years War, over the long run since the late Middle Ages, both the economy and the population growth rate had been relatively stable, allowing a sufficiently large percentage of journeymen realistically to expect to become masters either to replace retired or deceased masters, or to fill places opened by slowly increasing demand. Beginning in the eighteenth century and accelerating dramatically after the Napoleonic Wars, population began to grow at a rate well above simple replacement. Soon this considerable population increase was no longer matched by an equivalent increase in the need for masters, a problem worsened by structural inefficiencies preventing young men from rationally choosing alternative occupations.[19] Yet the growing number of journeymen also meant sharper competition for most artisans due to the movement of journeymen to the countryside or, if they had given up all hope, to the factories.

Both technological change and population growth began to accelerate just at the moment when the state was acting to impose its authority on all of its subjects directly and to undermine intermediary institutions such as guilds or journeyman fraternities whenever possible. As the territorial ruler moved to consolidate his sovereignty, both the economic power of the guilds and the political independence of the guild-controlled cities and towns came under attack. Parallel to the growth of centralized state power was the attempt by mercantilists to exercise dominance over the economy. They realized that political power depended on economic strength and that "the economy should be used to develop the power of the state."[20] Under the assumptions that the state was the source of all law and that economic regulation had to be uniform on a statewide basis, the rulers sought to sweep aside the traditional, local ways of the guilds in order to attain their goal of economic self-sufficiency so as to have the strength necessary to win wars.

Properly seen, the history of the crafts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is part of the struggle between state centralism and the spirit of localism. The trade laws of this period did not abolish the old guild restrictions since the state was not yet in a position to be able to enforce such measures. The enlightened bureaucrats had necessarily to look on the guilds and their practices as obsolete, obstinate, and obstacles to the state and progress. Yet even in the nineteenth century, they accepted the guilds' method for training future craftsmen as valid and, once purged of "abuses," useful since it was done at no expense to the state. This, as well as weakness, explains why government officials at first tended to think in terms of reform and reorganization rather than of scrapping the entire system. Consequently, the central governments only gradually encroached on the authority and rights of the guilds by increasing the number of non-guilded trades, creating free masters (those licensed by the state, not approved by the guild), permitting the practice of the crafts in the countryside, and declaring certain trades to be state monopolies.[21]

The French Revolution, which destroyed the guilds in France and severely restricted those in the French Empire, strengthened the hand of those who hoped to end the guilds in the German states. The tendency now was not only to tighten official supervision over the guilds, but also to limit their autonomy and finally to break their monopoly over the crafts. When, for example, Maximilian IV Joseph became ruler of Bavaria in 1799, *Zunftzwang* (each guild having a local monopoly over a specific economic activity) and the *Bannmeile* (the geographical area in which that monopoly operated) tied consumers to specific producers, while *Realrechte* (property rights in a specific craft) stopped numerous journeymen from becoming masters and prevented other masters from practicing the craft. In 1806, a memorandum was prepared by the Ministry of the Interior, questioning whether the entire guild system ought not to be replaced by *Gewerbefreiheit* (freedom to choose one's occupation without institutional hindrance).[22] The question was raised less to free the individual from guild control than for the state to better control the individual.[23] But it was only in the Bavarian Palatinate, where reforms had been introduced by the French occupation, that the power of the guilds was broken. Since the remainder of Bavaria had not been occupied and was thus not subjected to the centralizing forces of the French, local institutions

[17] Dietz, Rudolph, *Bericht über die Gewerbeausstellung für das Grossherzogtums Baden* (Karlsruhe, 1847), p. 48.
[18] Schwarz, *Nahrungsstand*, p. 15; Schmoller, p. 23.
[19] Shorter, p. 303.
[20] Ibid., p. 164.
[21] Bovensiepen, Rudolf, *Die Kurhessische Gewerbepolitik und die wirtschaftliche Lage des zünftigen Handwerks in Kurhessen, 1816–1867* (Halle a. S., 1909), p. 8.
[22] Anegg, p. 92.
[23] Bopp, p. 35.

were able to continue to exercise authority. Accordingly, Maximilian IV Joseph and his chief minister, Maximilian Montgelas, were unable to introduce *Gewerbefreiheit* or gain direct state control over the individual there.

Nonetheless, between 1799 and Montgelas's fall in 1817, the guilds began to lose much of their autonomy. The power to regulate and police their members was taken over by the state, leaving to the guilds only minor fines as a means of punishment—and those only with the approval of the police. A royal decree of 1807 determining the maximum time necessary for a journeyman to wander before fulfilling this obligation showed the gradual encroachment on guild control over journeymen. But while the Bavarian government was sincerely concerned with the welfare and training of journeymen, it was also beginning to exercise a sharper supervision over them individually and collectively.

During the Montgelas era, the compulsions and jurisdictions that had tied consumers and artisans to one another in Bavaria were abolished. New masters could settle in the region around each city because the city's right of *Bannmeile* had been ended, city and country crafts were to be treated equally in rights and obligations, and a system of concessions (state licensing of masters) was introduced as a tentative step toward *Gewerbefreiheit*. Even after Montgelas's fall, the Bavarian bureaucracy continued to dismantle piecemeal the apparatus the guilds had erected to protect themselves from competition. The high point of this movement came with the trade law of 1825 which took from the guilds the power to limit entry to a craft and placed it in the hands of the bureaucracy. In particular, the right of testing journeymen to see whether they were qualified to become masters was placed in the hands of the police[24] (who turned, however, to the guildsmen for expert advice). If a journeyman passed, his promotion was permanent and valid everywhere in Bavaria. Nevertheless, there was a reluctance "to open anywhere the flood gates behind which large numbers of journeymen were accumulating." This hesitation was based on the knowledge that "the canals which were to channel this torrent into productive directions were not yet ready."[25]

Rather than blame their increasing difficulties on the antiquated guild system, the artisans responded by condemning this weakening of the "guild constitution." A storm of petitions and protests swept over the kingdom. After 1830 the laws against the guilds were carried out less energetically—particularly in light of the events of 1830–1834.[26] Given the apparently revolutionary threat of the journeymen and the demands by the masters for protection against competition, the law was revised in 1834 to give back to the guilds some of the monopolistic powers lost in the previous three decades.

In the same year, Bavaria and Württemberg joined with Prussia in the *Zollverein* (customs union) that would ultimately include all the German states except Austria. The purpose was to abolish the internal hindrances to trade (such as tariff barriers) that had accompanied the political division of Germany into thirty-nine states. But to create such a national market meant that the more advanced industries of Rhenish Germany could compete with the craftsmen of the South, something that some Bavarian government officials looked on as a threat to the welfare of Bavarian artisans.

In Württemberg, on the other hand, the government actively promoted industrialization by association with the *Zollverein* and through the General Trade Ordinance of 1828, which allowed factories to be set up to operate exempt from guild restrictions simply by obtaining a state license. Thirteen crafts were freed entirely from guild restrictions, while the remainder (about fifty) came under tighter state control. In effect, the state would henceforth decide who was qualified to be a master, and passing the master examination sufficed for the entire country as well as for all branches of that craft. Yet, as elsewhere, the guilds in Württemberg were not—could not be—abolished in toto. The guild nature of trades in other German states meant that they must at least be declared guilded in Württemberg since journeymen from nonguilded crafts found neither work with guilded masters nor financial support when they wandered outside Württemberg, and foreign journeymen would not accept work in Württemberg with nonguilded masters.[27]

Clearly, by now the guilds were on the defensive. They had lost the flexibility to meet the challenges posed by the absolutist state or to absorb the growing surplus of journeymen seeking entry as masters. It seemed to the artisans that their entire way of life, that the culture and ethos that had established the craftsmen "as men of status and stature" in the community,[28] were being destroyed before their eyes. Un-

[24] The police of this period not only had the modern task of maintaining order, but also had juridical, social, and economic functions as well. There were few areas of life that did not in one way or another concern the various police authorities. Thus one can understand their interest in the price of bread, sanitation, health, proficiency examinations, and the like.

[25] Shorter, p. 107.

[26] This period saw the revolutions of 1830, the Hambach festival, the activities of the German exiles in Switzerland, and the Frankfurt *Wachensturm*: all in all a most unsettling time for the German rulers.

[27] Köhler, Ludwig, *Das Württembergische Gewerbe-Recht von 1805 bis 1870* (Tübingen, 1891), p. 27.

[28] Noyes, P. H., *Organizations and Revolution. Working Class Associations in the German Revolutions of 1848–49* (Princeton, N.J., 1966), p. 30.

der assault, the guilds fell back to a position extolling a past when, they said in countless petitions and complaints, they had been the bearers of virtue and had been the fulcrum of society. Thus they deserved to be protected from interlopers and to retain their privileges. By the mid-nineteenth century, when the guild system was suffering its greatest strains and was beginning to break apart, most masters had become rigid, unwilling and unable to adapt to radically altered circumstances. For centuries the only means for securing their existence had been cooperative regulation and control, and they expected this to continue even under different conditions.[29] It would not be until late in the nineteenth, if not early in the twentieth, century that craftsmen were able to accommodate themselves to a new role in the German economy and a new position in German society. By then, however, both artisan and journeyman had been radically changed.

The Journeyman Ethos

Most journeymen really wanted to uphold the standards of their craft, to participate in the affairs of their guild, and to become masters. Until well into the nineteenth century, journeymen thought of themselves as integral components of the guild structure and willingly followed the path designed to lead them to masterhood. Shortcuts along the way were decried in that they seemed in some way to compromise the honor of the craft and to diminish the abilities of the future master.[30]

Ideally, a youth would be apprenticed at age fourteen, would become a journeyman after three to five years of training, would spend several years traveling and working, and at age thirty would be ready for acceptance as a master. Then he would marry, open his own shop, and settle down as a responsible citizen of the community. Active guilded masters were expected to undertake the training of apprentices (usually one or two at a time)—and only guilded masters might take on apprentices. Those youths who studied with nonguilded artisans were permanently excluded from guild membership. After a brief period of trial during which youth and master examined one another, the apprenticeship was formalized by payment of a registration fee to the guild and a training fee[31] to the master. The master promised to teach the basic elements of the craft to the apprentice and not to use him solely as a servant; the apprentice swore that he was Christian, that his birth and station were honorable (although the states attempted to abolish these restrictions), and that he would obey his master. Then the apprenticeship began.

Once the training period was concluded, the apprentice became a journeyman. Of great importance was the process by which this took place and under whose auspices it occurred. Traditionally, an apprentice was promoted to journeyman amidst jovial festivities by an assemblage of his guild's journeymen, who accepted the new journeyman after payment of certain fees, purchase of a round or two of drinks, and some rite of initiation.[32] The new journeyman was then given his journeyman's certificate and was free to seek employment with a guilded master in the same town or to begin his wanderings, seeking work en route.

By the eighteenth century, the states, seeking to exercise their authority directly on all subjects, especially those as restless as the journeymen, began to enact legislation removing all journeyman participation in the making of an apprentice into a journeyman. This promotion was declared to be automatic and was to be certified by the police who would issue a *Lehrbrief* (indenture) to him, while the often expensive celebration held by the journeymen was banned. Enforcement of these precepts, however, proved to be quite another matter, as will be seen below.

After the prescribed number of years on the road (which varied from guild to guild), working for wages in the shops of masters in other towns and abroad, and, presumably, after having gotten "the behavior of late adolescence out of his system,"[33] the journeyman was ready to become a master. In order to do so, he had to apply to the guild in the community in which he hoped to settle, offering proof of legitimate birth, certification of apprenticeship, and verifiable evidence that he had properly fulfilled his wandering obligation. Then, unless he was lucky enough to marry a master's widow or daughter, he had to work as a journeyman in the shop to which the guild head assigned him. Finally, after a number of years had passed and an opening occurred, the journeyman, upon completion of a masterpiece and payment of a number of fees, was accepted into the guild, given citizenship rights, and allowed to purchase property and marry.

Even in the nineteenth century, it was possible for some journeymen to successfully pursue this ideal path. Johann Conrad Stengel,[34] for example, was born in a small town in Württemberg in 1819, was fortunate enough to receive eight years of primary schooling in

[29] Fischer, Wolfram. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung. Aufsätze, Studien, Vorträge* (Göttingen, 1972), p. 323.

[30] The exception to this involved a master's sons if they were to follow the same craft as their father (which was not necessarily the case), since it could be assumed that they had already learned the rudiments simply by being in their father's workshop (which almost always was part of the house).

[31] By the nineteenth century, masters took on apprentices less as the way of training the next generation, than as a way of supplementing their income with the training fees (*Lehrgeld*).

[32] For an examination of the various practices and ceremonies, see Wissell, Rudolf, *Das alte Handwerks Recht und Gewohnheit*, 2 v., 2nd ed., edited by Ernst Schraepler (Berlin, 1971–1974).

[33] Walker, *German Home Towns*, p. 82.

[34] Stadtarchiv Nürnberg (hereafter cited as StAN), E 5, Buchbinder, 24, 27.

which he excelled in all his studies (except singing), and studied for one year at the polytechnical institute in Nürnberg before he became a bookbinder's apprentice at age sixteen. After eighteen months of training, he was promoted to journeyman and was issued the *Wanderbuch* (wander book) that each journeyman had to have in order to travel. He began his journey one month later (March, 1837) and for the next five years, except for a nine-month stay in Nürnberg during the third year (when he was declared unfit for military service and exempted from conscription after payment of 6 fl 4 kr), Stengel wandered through North and South Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Italy, working with several masters, perfecting his skills, and increasing his knowledge. In 1842 he passed his trade test, but had to wait another ten years before being accepted as a citizen and master in Nürnberg and receiving permission to marry Margaretha Walst of Nürnberg, a bookbinder's widow. It can be assumed that without the availability of this widow, Stengel's acceptance into Nürnberg would have been put off for several more years.

Johann Georg Schiller,[35] a journeyman tailor from Mögeldorf (near Nürnberg), also followed the prescribed path toward masterhood, but found another means of attaining his goal. After thirteen years as a journeyman, he passed his trade test in January, 1835, and immediately petitioned to be listed as an applicant to become a master and citizen in Nürnberg. His application was accepted, but it took an additional four years before approval was granted. Unlike the case of Stengel, Schiller's fiancée, while from Nürnberg, was not related to a master tailor. Consequently, he had to wait until a master tailor died leaving neither a widow nor a son capable of carrying on the trade. Since he was first on the list of applicants and could demonstrate financial independence, permission to settle in Nürnberg as a citizen and master and to marry was granted after payment of the "customary fees," in this case 23 fl. Once this was done, Schiller was a master; the customs and norms of the journeymen no longer applied to him.

It was the goal of the journeyman to become a master, and he was willing to accept privations now in the expectation of a better future in which he would occupy a secure place in the social order. Since he had finished his apprenticeship, the journeyman possessed some elements of the authority associated with the guilded artisan: he could order about and punish apprentices in the shop and he could become a member of the journeyman's association. Yet he, like the apprentice, was still part of the master's household and owed obedience to the master who oversaw him and his behavior.[36] Similarly ambivalent, the journeyman possessed some of the status associated with the crafts, but by the nineteenth century there was no certainty that this would permanently be his.[37] In effect, the journeyman was suspended between several worlds: those of the adolescent and the adult, those of the guild as insider and as outsider.

Above all, the journeyman desired to be part of the guild, yet often found his path blocked by masters who, since they looked on a well-trained journeyman as cheap labor and also as a potential threat to their own livelihoods, found little difficulty in manipulating the regulations to keep him from achieving masterhood. Nonetheless, most journeymen preferred their uncertain station to becoming nonguilded factory workers. Even to be treated as, or lumped together with, skilled workers was felt to be a fall from one's class. It had long been the rule that if a journeyman should work for a nonguilded craftsman, or as a colleague with nonguilded workers in a factory, or at a task outside that covered by his craft, his own guilded status was forever lost—regardless of what state law might declare.

Indeed, through conscious effort, the journeymen sought to avoid classification with laborers, apprentices, or *Pfuscher* (nonguilded artisans or journeymen working for themselves).[38] Not only did they refuse to work with or as *Pfuscher* (to do so meant permanent loss of one's guilded status), but they also avoided all social contact with the apprentices and refused to eat at the same table with the maids in their master's house.[39] They also distanced themselves from the masters, refusing, for example, to allow an impoverished master to work in the shop of another as a journeyman (although this included an element of fear that a work spot for a journeyman would thereby be lost).[40]

Journeymen worked only for a master or a master's widow and only at those tasks appropriate to their own craft. They were neither obliged nor, due to tradition, allowed to fulfill other functions such as selling the finished product. To work as a peasant, for a nobleman or the state, or in a factory was considered a mark of dishonor which endangered one's future prospects as master and citizen.[41] In particular, despite the growing number of journeymen who felt constrained to work,[42]

[35] StAN, *Niederlassungsacten*, 7327.

[36] Bergmann, Jürgen, "Das 'Alte Handwerke' im Uebergang," in Otto Büsch (ed.), *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der frühen Industrialisierung vornehmlich im Wirtschaftsraum Berlin-Brandenburg* (Berlin, 1971), pp. 241–242.

[37] Stadelmann, Rudolf and Wolfram Fischer, *Die Bildungswelt des deutschen Handwerkers um 1800* (Berlin, 1955), p. 52.

[38] The guilds' attitude toward such is clear in that *Pfuscher* means bungler or cheater.

[39] Schwarz, Klaus, *Die Lage der Handwerksgesellen in Bremen während des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Bremen, 1975), p. 217.

[40] Hauptstaatsarchiv-Stuttgart (hereafter cited as HSAS), E 33, Geheimer Rat III, Büschel 804, Landtag to King, Stuttgart, June 9, 1821.

[41] Abel, Wilhelm, "Der Pauperismus," *Wirtschaft, Geschichte und Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Friedrich Lütge* (Stuttgart, 1966), p. 83.

[42] Lack of work forced many journeymen to ply a related trade whenever possible, although simultaneous employment in two

at least for a brief period, in a factory, those who did so faced ostracism by their fellows. It was not only that the worker and the journeyman held different perceptions of work, but that journeymen believed that factories destroyed their entire ethos. Johann Eberhard Dewald, for example, a journeyman tanner, discovered that there was no togetherness among the journeymen who worked in the factories of Munich in 1837 and that the division of labor had reached the point where he did the same work the entire day, but lost sight of the final product. "The craft custom," he wrote, "seems to have completely died out here."[43]

The Imperial Trades Edict of 1731 had specifically authorized journeymen to take employment outside their craft with no loss of rights. By the nineteenth century, this had taken on special importance for the journeymen. Thus, for example, the journeyman butcher Johann Conrad Wagner of Nürnberg was able to work for several months as a porter for the "Italian fruitdealer Spiegler" in Vienna in 1837–1838; then after some thirty months' work with innkeepers in Pest, he worked for twenty-two months as an errand boy in a dye-stuff and drugstore in Nürnberg.[44] Similarly, the journeyman clothier Konrad Kehr from Schwabach was employed for several months in 1830 as a worker in a bookpaper factory before being hired by a cloth manufacturer in Nürnberg.[45]

While in both cases employment outside the practiced trade was necessary for survival (since both men had been unemployed for lengthy periods and were thus presumably without funds), the journeymen tended to discriminate against those who served outside their profession. This meant that as the surplus of journeymen to fill available master openings increased, as was the case throughout the nineteenth century, the chances for those who faced the wrath, as well as the competition, of their colleagues, were accordingly lessened. Konrad Kehr remained a journeyman the remainder of his life,[46] while there is no record, nor the likelihood, that Johann Wagner became a master, or even remained in his chosen profession.

But the journeymen not only differentiated themselves from other groups in society, but also found differences among themselves. While there was a class solidarity among the artisans and a subclass solidarity among journeymen, even here there were levels and strata where, for example, journeymen cutlers working with surgical instrument makers thought of themselves as being above those working with other cutlers.[47] The basic hindrance to the creation of a true class feeling lay in the variety of interests among the journeymen themselves. Journeymen of one craft distanced themselves from those of other crafts and often fought among themselves about whether one of them had injured the honor of the craft and was thus liable for punishment. The differences between masters' sons and others, local and foreign, single and married, fragmented the journeymen of a craft until the individual interest seemed more important than the common concerns of all.[48] Often the fear of unemployment proved the greatest incentive to prevent the promotion of apprentices and to interfere with the progress of one's comrades.[49]

As was true of the masters, the journeymen in their lodges and associations were quick to exclude any of their fellows. If a journeyman acted in such a way so as to put his brothers in an unfavorable light, he risked ostracism. In December, 1810, Conrad Oppel, admittedly a bad character, committed several sins and, in spite of official intervention, was simply disowned. This thirty-eight year old journeyman shoemaker, who lived with his girl friend (who was pregnant for the second time), and who tended to behave coarsely toward the masters and quarrelsomely with his fellow journeymen, had annoyed several people one evening in Fürth. He was chased, fell and broke an arm, but avoided capture. Since he had been recognized, however, he was quickly arrested and when his employer refused to provide his food, the head of Oppel's journeyman association was requested to pay for his care until he was well enough to be expelled to his home in Bamberg. Meeting at their *Herberg* (hostel), the journeymen voted to deny Oppel all assistance despite the fact that he had paid for the last ten years the required 12 kr per month to the journeymen's treasury for the care of ailing journeymen. Police orders notwithstanding, the journeymen continued to refuse to support him and were arrested and jailed. Since the master shoemakers wanted their journeymen back, they paid bail and 2 fl travel money for Oppel who was sent to Bamberg.[50]

Clearly the journeymen's ethos was a conservative, preservative one. Only among the few radical groups was there a spirit directed to the overthrow of tradition. The mass of journeymen continued to treat their norms and customs as fully valid. They recognized

guilded crafts was impossible. The second could be practiced only in a non-guilded area such as growing and selling fruits and vegetables. There was little hope for a journeyman to completely change professions within the guild constitution, since trained men were never accepted as apprentices. Schwarz, *Die Lage*, pp. 95–97.

[43] Dewald, Johann Eberhard, *Biedermeier auf Walze. Aufzeichnungen und Briefe des Handwerksburschen Johann Eberhard Dewald, 1836–38*, ed. Georg Maria Hofmann (Berlin, 1936), p. 87.

[44] StAN, E 5, Metzger 8, Conrad Wagner's *Wanderbuch*.

[45] StAN, E 5, Tuchmacher 33, Konrad Kehr's *Wanderbuch*.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Stadtarchiv-Munich (hereafter cited as StAM), Gewerbeamt, 2233, Protocol concerning journeyman cutler donations, Munich, December 14, 1837.

[48] Schwarz, *Die Lage*, p. 386.

[49] Ibid., p. 217.

[50] Staatsarchiv Nürnberg, Kammer des Innern 2701, 4927, Shoemaker trade to General Commisariat, December 8, 1810; Fürth police to General Commisariat, Fürth, December 10, 1810.

that they belonged to a privileged segment of society and rather than try to overturn that society, most sought to fortify their position within it. Accordingly, their customs and practices, while placing burdens and obligations on them, gave a feeling that they were part of a firmly united order and that they were protected from other, lower levels of society.[51]

As long as the journeymen had hope, there would be no mass demand for change. Even as late as the Revolution of 1848, most journeymen remained true to the traditional ideals of the guild. Since there was as yet no awareness that increased production could be the basis for a rise in the general standard of living, the economic crises of the nineteenth century were met by traditional means. In fact, journeymen were often the most fervent defenders of the guild standards of production and behavior. Accordingly, they cannot be understood as a closed social class, but rather as a group within the class (or estate) of artisans, deferring to the leadership of the masters in matters affecting the guild as a whole. Nonetheless, since each group tends to create its own ethos, there was no simple identity between guild and journeymen. Just as the masters had evolved rules, traditions, rights, and privileges, so too had the journeymen. Just as the masters took a certain pride in their station within the guild and the society as a whole, so too did the journeymen. In order to defend their rights and honor and to maintain their norms, the journeymen were prepared to stand together, to boycott, strike, or declare individual masters and entire towns in disrepute (*Verruf*), and those journeymen who worked in such places were "dishonorable" and to be shunned by all journeymen. Such uprisings could be caused by real or imaginary slights to an individual or to the group, by any act that might taint the journeyman with dishonor (thus endangering his standing throughout the German states[52]), or by an attempt to abolish what from the outside appeared as long obsolete customs or ceremonies that the journeymen considered vital for the continuation of their being. Although the state would become powerful enough to bring the journeymen under its control and to thwart organized resistance, the feeling of solidarity among journeymen did not begin to fade until the second half of the nineteenth century.

Nonetheless, the fundamental relationship for the individual journeyman was that with his employer and mentor: the master craftsman. To fully understand this tie, it is necessary to think of the family-like character originally carried by the crafts. Even as late as the nineteenth century, the journeyman was tied to the master's family: he was fully subject to the master's house regulations and, in theory, stood in the same relationship to the master as a son to his father. As long as this family feeling continued, the differences between master and journeyman (and between either and the apprentices) remained natural ones based on age, professional knowledge, experience, and responsibilities.[53]

As the journeyman wandered from town to town, changing masters each time he changed workshops, the paternalistic relationship was maintained with each master father to his journeymen of the moment. Consequently, almost every guild required that journeymen sleep and eat in the house of their master, a practice common into the 1840s. The journeyman was allowed to reside elsewhere, primarily the *Herberg*, only when he sought work and the Nürnberg *Herbergsväter* (hostelers) were threatened with heavy fines by the city magistrate if they gave lodging to journeymen who were employed. Those who violated this regulation were to be arrested.[54]

By residing with his master, it was argued, the journeyman was subject to a kind of parental supervision, so that he could more easily be disciplined and his moral training facilitated. Inasmuch as the training process from apprenticeship through acceptance as a new master dealt with the whole man and was not just a method for teaching professional competency, the master, as surrogate father, was charged to see that his journeymen (and apprentices, who also lived with him) also received proper moral, ethical, and religious training (as outlined with varying degrees of precision in the journeyman or craft ordinances). To be a guildsman was a way of life, and it was the obligation of the guild's fathers to instill this ethos in the upcoming generation. But this would be much more difficult if the journeymen lived in the hostel or, worse yet, at an inn. By limiting "domestic discipline," journeymen would become unruly, their respect for the masters and the guild would diminish.[55] Without this proper check, the lives of journeymen would become immoral and corrupt as they ran wild. Or so the argument went.

This paternalism had another, darker side. The right to inculcate an ethos could easily become simple authoritarian control. Masters consciously strove to maintain a position of authority over their journeymen just as the guilds sought to repress journeyman associations. Masters avoided any excessive familiarity or socializing with their journeymen,[56] upon whom they came to look increasingly as a source of labor and potential competition rather than as junior members of guilded society. Consequently, the trade and journeyman ordinances notwithstanding, to the master

[51] Schwarz, *Die Lage*, p. 204.

[52] Walker, *German Home Towns*, pp. 94–95.

[53] Proessler, Hans, *Das gesamtdeutsche Handwerk im Spiegel der Reichsgesetzgebung von 1530 bis 1806* (Berlin, 1954), p. 64.

[54] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 27 Nachtrag 1, Magistrate's decision, Nürnberg, February 6, 1844.

[55] [Bavaria], *Verhandlung der Kammer der Ständeversammlung des Königreichs Bayern*, appendix 7 (1831): p. 61, petition of Munich citizens' committee.

[56] Volkov, Shulamit, *The Rise of Popular Antimodernism in Germany* (Princeton, N.J., 1978), p. 101.

went the rights and privileges, to the journeymen went the obligations and responsibilities. Journeymen, for example, had no right to employment, but once employed could leave only under specifically defined conditions. Whereas the master could accept or reject at will those journeymen sent to his shop, secure in the knowledge that another would always be sent, the journeyman had to accept the first position offered or leave the city without guild support if he refused.

The masters fully understood that their position depended on their control of the journeymen and that this was facilitated by having them live separate from each other under the roof of the employing master. Given this attitude, it is not surprising that only about 5 per cent of the Nürnberg journeymen lived outside their masters' homes in 1797.[57] And if a journeyman lived in his master's house, clearly he could not marry or be married. As late as 1852, the police regulations for Mannheim (Baden) refused to allow foreign (i.e. nonlocal) married journeymen into that city.[58] Traditionally, if a journeyman made a girl pregnant, he had to make some sort of settlement with her or her family to avoid marriage or his prospects of masterhood were ended.[59] This prohibition on marriage was enforced by the guilds in order to place one more hindrance in the way of journeymen working to become masters and in order to keep wages low. A journeyman who received room and board required a great deal less money than one who had to seek either, while a journeyman with a family needed more money than one on his own. He would have to have higher wages or, as was more likely, would have to seek independent employment.

What is important to note here is that in most cases the guild was a compulsory cartel that determined wages for the working journeymen as well as prices and practices. Moreover, the material position of the journeyman was determined by the relationship between wages, room, and board on the one hand, and unavoidable expenses on the other. For the unmarried journeyman the seventy-hour work week was accepted as natural; the basis for their disputes with their masters was the quality and quantity of the food served them and belated payment of wages earned. The journeyman turner Christoph Weiss, for example, speculated that in the 1830s only one master in ten paid his workers on time.[60]

As the state grew stronger and its control over its subjects expanded, it was only natural that it would also establish wage levels for guildsmen. In the nineteenth century, this tended to take the form of wage ceilings or reductions, although this is to be understood less as an attempt to impoverish the journeyman than in terms of a revival of the medieval concept of "just price" and "just wage" whereby one received only that amount necessary to live as an average member of one's craft lived with no reference to supply and demand. In 1808, Bavarian authorities ordered the police to limit "capricious wage increases" and to disallow all "unreasonable demands" of the journeymen.[61] In 1820, wages for journeymen masons, carpenters, and stone-cutters, hired to carry out the architectural plans of Friedrich Weinbrenner to make Baden's capital a place of beauty, were reduced by 8 per cent.[62] Weinbrenner himself justified a further reduction the next year on the grounds that food prices had also been reduced and thus the daily wage would be brought into closer relationship with the reduced need of the artisans.[63]

The married journeyman was more strongly affected by the manipulation of wage levels than was his single counterpart. The latter lived with his master, traveled to perfect his skills, and looked on his earnings as a means to tide himself over between positions and as the source of the capital that he would need to establish himself as a master. To the journeyman with a family, legitimate or not, who needed a higher income in order to survive, his earnings were to be understood as a wage like that of any other worker. It is also fair to assume that if a journeyman had a family, he was a journeyman for life. It is this group that suffered the most in the nineteenth century since their numbers were increasing in absolute terms as well as proportionately among all journeymen. Consequently, to note that a journeyman had difficulty supporting his family does not necessarily mean that wages were low or had declined in real terms, rather that—as was traditional—they were geared toward the single journeyman and that the system itself was collapsing by being unable to accommodate a sufficient number of new masters.

Indeed, in the nineteenth century, the guild system was exhibiting signs of deterioration, characteristic of which was the dissolution of the patriarchal relationship. The master, Regensburg's mayor noted in 1840, was no longer a "family father" to his journeymen and the family relationship between master and journeyman had been "thrown overboard."[64] The narrow

[57] Wiest, Ekkehard, *Die Stellung des Nürnberger Gewerbes zwischen 1648 und 1806* (Stuttgart, 1968), p. 55.

[58] Generallandesarchiv-Karlsruhe (hereafter cited as GlAK), Stadtamt Freiburg, Abt 355, Zugang 1894/30, Nr. 45, Kreis to Stadtamt, Freiburg, August 10, 1852.

[59] Schwarz, *Die Lage*, p. 39.

[60] Zimmermann, Otto (ed.), *Auf der Walz vor 100 Jahren. Selbsterlebtes erzählt vom Nürnberger Drechslermeister C. Weiss* (Munich & Hamburg, 1928), p. 72.

[61] Cited in Ritscher, Wolfgang, *Koalitionen und Koalitionensrecht in Deutschland bis zur Reichsgewerbeordnung* (Berlin & Stuttgart, 1917), pp. 143–144.

[62] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt 236, 5809, Finance Ministry memo, Karlsruhe, April 10, 1820.

[63] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt 236, 5809, Weinbrenner to Foreign Ministry, Karlsruhe, July 4, 1821.

[64] [Bavaria], *Verhandlung der Kammer* **4** (March 23, 1840): p. 318, speech of Gottlieb von Thon-Dittmer.

tie between household and workshop gradually came to an end as the role of the guild was progressively limited to economic considerations. The workshop gradually became simply a place of employment for the journeymen and all sense of community within it perished. Those who lived with their masters were no longer treated as members of the family, but were given cellar or garret rooms, fed apart from the family, and excluded from participation in family life. Masters were no longer willing to accept in their homes a person who might work for only a few days before moving on, while others looked on the housing requirement as a none too subtle restriction on those who wished to expand their output, since the number of journeymen who could be hired was limited by the size of the master's house. In still other cases, artisans were too poor to provide their employees with room and board, choosing instead—especially when agricultural prices were declining—to let their journeymen seek their own accommodations and pay them a bit more[65] (but less than what the master thereby saved) or to pay them piecework rather than salaries.[66]

With this new freedom, desired or not, to establish private lives separate from their work, journeymanship had changed from being a stage in the development of a master artisan to that of being a permanent station. While the technique and organization of the craft shop had changed very little over the centuries and the hierarchical order traversed by a youth on his way to masterhood remained fixed in law or custom, more and more often this ended at the journeyman level.[67] Journeymen had borne the burdens brought on by the economic and social changes during the Middle Ages: what began as a way of protecting the craft and all of its members became the means for limiting entry to masterhood. Stricter regulations, longer waiting periods, higher costs: all served to effectively close the guild to new members. By the beginning of the industrial era, the journeymen found themselves "torn between the lost paradise" of the craft system and "the chaotic reality of the new factories."[68] The old corporations refused to let them become masters, while the new industries offered them positions as skilled workers, but without the honor of the guild. Nowhere could these journeymen feel at home and thus became the most rootless segment of German society. Small wonder that the political and economic authorities looked on them (along with the students) as the foremost revolutionary threat to the society of the *Vormärz*. Clearly, it was believed, they could have little interest in a continuation of the old guild structure which discriminated against them and allowed ever fewer of them to become independent masters. Would they not naturally listen to revolutionary agitators they met as they wandered to France, Belgium, and Switzerland and find their remedies—the destruction of the craft system—appealing?

Adding to this uncertainty and to the plight of the journeymen was the fact that the nineteenth century saw an extraordinary population increase with a disproportionate growth in the lower classes.[69] Since the 1770s, population growth was especially rapid in the agricultural sector and, with declining child mortality, between 1816 and 1864, the population of the German Confederation grew on average at a rate of .88 per cent per year, while that of Württemberg, Bavaria, and Baden increased by .45 per cent, .6 per cent, and .74 per cent per year respectively.[70] The result was a large surplus of journeymen and other workers and a growing "pauperism"[71] among these groups. In Bavaria, the number of journeymen increased at a rate about 20 per cent faster than that of the masters between 1810 and 1861,[72] while in Baden between 1829 and 1844 the number of artisans increased by 17 per cent while that of their assistants grew by 28 per cent,[73] indicative of a major shift in the ratio of masters to journeymen. In response, not only did the latter demand that the hindrances to their progress be removed but, since their position was strongly affected by the number of apprentices (who, in turn, would become journeymen and add to the surplus), some also requested that the number of apprentices that masters accepted be limited or reduced.[74] This demand was naturally ignored since apprentices were the cheapest source of labor and, in some cases, were a significant source of income for the masters.

On the other hand, just as the masters of a community responded to competition by preventing journeymen from becoming masters and attaining residence, they also reacted to the surplus by giving preference to the sons of local citizens, so that no foreign journeyman would be hired as long as one from the community remained unemployed.[75] Similarly, the journeymen looked on these foreigners as a drain on their resources or as a threat to their jobs. For ex-

[65] Schwarz, *Die Lage*, p. 157.

[66] It is this shift from salaries plus room and board to piecework that ended the last pretense that journeymen were anything more than cheap labor, that they were with a master primarily to sharpen their skills. These journeymen had become hired workers.

[67] Aubin, Hermann and Wolfgang Zorn (eds.), *Handbuch der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, 2 v. (Stuttgart, 1971–1976)**2**: pp. 339–340.

[68] Zimmermann, Ludwig, *Die Einheits- und Freiheitsbewegung und die Revolution von 1848 in Franken* (Würzburg, 1951), p. 189.

[69] Schieder, Wolfgang, *Anfänge der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Stuttgart, 1963), p. 85.

[70] Aubin & Zorn, pp. 2, 10.

[71] See especially Abel, "Der Pauperismus"; Jantke, Carl and Dietrich Hilger, *Die Eigentumslosen* (Freiburg & Munich, 1965); Klebel, Hubert, "Das Pauperproblem in der Zeit des Spätmerkantilismus und beginnenden Liberalismus in Bayern" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Munich, 1955).

[72] Schwarz, *Nahrungsstand*, pp. 143–144.

[73] Dietz, p. 45.

[74] Schröder, Peter, *Die Entwicklung des Nürnberger Grossgewerbes, 1806–1870* (Nürnberg, 1971), p. 18.

[75] StAN, E 5, Glaser 46, Circular note, Nürnberg, April 13, 1835.

ample, local journeymen carpenters came together one evening to drive out all foreign journeyman carpenters "by threats and violence."[76] That this could happen indicates that journeyman had become a permanent station in fact, if not in name.

Consequently, what had once been a transitional period had become permanent for ever larger numbers of journeymen who were now seen only as skilled laborers. Not only did they thereby feel material need, but they now suffered social discrimination. This was made all the more unbearable in that the new manufacturers were developing a true skilled labor force that lacked the guild tradition and possessed no claim to masterhood.[77] During the nineteenth century, the journeyman's customs gradually fell away as the ethos of this estate changed or was lost.[78]

Journeymen and their contemporaries were well aware that there was a problem, to which they gave the name "overfilling" of the trades and for which many blamed reform fostered by the state. The Bavarian reforms under Montgelas had been designed to open the trades somewhat, but not to allow the ever growing number of journeymen to become independent since it was not yet possible to channel them into productive directions. The 1825 craft law demonstrated no such hesitation, in effect creating new competition or, as the masters chose to call it, overcrowding in many crafts. In fact, the craft law had not created the problem, but was an attempt to solve the problem of a great many journeymen who had been excluded from their hoped-for livelihoods. Moreover, it was meant to be a way of rejuvenating the largely moribund Bavarian crafts by pushing out inefficient producers through the competition of new, better-trained craftsmen willing to experiment and to follow the forces of the marketplace.

But as Edward Shorter has demonstrated,[79] it did not work that way. Instead of entering crafts producing goods for sale in wider markets and which provided a reasonable livelihood, they flowed into those producing only for the local market. There seem to have been two primary reasons for this. The commercial crafts tended to be more difficult to learn and to practice and faced more competition from factories and imports due to the nature of their product. Moreover, the commercial crafts were often nonguilded and thus did not offer their practitioners the right of residency in most communities. Thus, not only was it easier, if less remunerative, to produce for the local market, but if a man wished to raise a family, he could do so more readily by taking up a local craft. So the problem remained.

At no time during the history of the guilds had all journeymen become masters. What had changed was the number of journeymen who could not achieve masterhood. It was not at all unusual in the nineteenth century to find that for each open master position there were ten to twenty applicants, some of whom were already over forty with no chance of receiving a master position.[80] Many would remain journeymen for life, working for others for wages. For these, to be a journeyman no longer meant a stage in one's development, but a profession, as had long been acknowledged in the construction crafts and those requiring high initial capital outlays. Journeymen masons, carpenters, tanners, and millers were accepted in many places as laborers with the right to marry and own their own homes.[81] The very existence of married journeymen, no longer living with their masters, is evidence that the guilds that controlled most communities (and thus residency approvals) no longer looked on the journeymen as a competitive threat. Rather, they were tolerated by the masters with whom they worked, but only as long as they accepted work only from masters or a master's widow and never worked on their own.[82]

Those journeymen who worked neither for a master, nor as day laborers (as too often happened to those whose talents or training were only mediocre), nor in one of those trades that required no approval from the political or guild authorities, could attempt to ply a trade illegally full-time or on the side. Ever alert to such illegal work, masters demanded punishment and expulsion from the trade and the community for those caught. The locksmith guild of Mannheim, for example, complained that hammersmiths and armorers were employing journeymen locksmiths in their shops to complete and sell lockworks,[83] while the shoemakers of Munich complained that their journeymen were working secretly for their own accounts and thus showed "little or no" interest in taking work with a master, causing "a not unimportant injury" to the legitimate shoemakers. The police were requested to help crush this evil, and new regulations were proposed to force unemployed journeymen who stayed in the city to keep themselves available and to accept work from the master to whom they would be assigned.[84]

Even the appearance of *Pfuscherei* or "black work" was to be prevented. The master tailors of Munich, for example, were warned that their journeymen were to work only in the shops of their masters, never at home or without supervision even if it were for their master's account.[85] Nor might a journeyman attached

[76] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 V, 2727, Landgericht to Magistrate, Nürnberg, April 27, 1848.

[77] Schremmer, Eckart, *Die Wirtschaft Bayerns* (Munich, 1970), pp. 446–447.

[78] Stadelmann & Fischer, p. 74.

[79] Shorter, pp. 199–203.

[80] Schröder, p. 17.

[81] Perthes, Clemens, *Das Herbergwesen der Handwerksgesellen*, 2nd ed. (Gotha, 1883), pp. 6–7.

[82] Wiest, p. 74.

[83] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt 236, 5821, petition to Landtag, Mannheim, April 23, 1831.

[84] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 1068, protocol shoemaker masters, Munich, August 27, 1825.

[85] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 2017, magistrate to tailor masters, Munich, February 25, 1825.

to a master in one town work in his name in another. Johann Gritzmacher, a journeyman locksmith, worked for a master in Fürth, but installed locks for an innkeeper in Nürnberg (a few miles away). When challenged by the Nürnberg guild, Gritzmacher produced a certificate signed by his master, Mende, certifying that the journeyman was working in his name. The Nürnberg artisans denied that such a certificate could even be issued by a master and requested that Gritzmacher be punished and expelled from the city.[86] The journeyman, when called to account, swore that the locks had been made in Fürth and that he had only installed them in Nürnberg. He also noted that no Nürnberg master would employ him because he was from Fürth, and since he could not set up his own shop (although he had been petitioning for eighteen months for acceptance as a master in Nürnberg), he worked with a master in Fürth.[87]

The guild, of course, was not satisfied and argued that a journeyman could work only where his master was, that Gritzmacher could work in Nürnberg only if his master were a Nürnberger.[88] Moreover, as part of the original complaint, Gritzmacher had been accused of living with his girl friend, a charge that he had foolishly denied, only to have a neighboring shoemaker swear that he saw him spend the night on several occasions.

Since his character had been destroyed, his only hope was for his master to substantiate his claim that he, like other locksmiths, masons, glaziers, and the like, in Fürth, took on work in Nürnberg and let it be completed by their journeymen. At first, Mende confirmed Gritzmacher's account, but soon disclaimed all knowledge, probably to avoid the charge of aiding *Pfuscherei*. Gritzmacher was caught in the middle: he needed the work to survive and a master as cover, while the master would accept the profits, but deny the journeyman if challenged. Both the Nürnberg court and the district court of appeal refused to believe Gritzmacher, who was sentenced to twenty-four hours police arrest, a fine of 5 fl 31 kr, and expulsion from Nürnberg for as long as no master there would hire him.[89] In effect, his banishment was to be permanent.

All that remained to Gritzmacher and those other journeymen who would never become masters was escape to the suburbs or the countryside where the guilds had no authority. Outside the *Bannmeile*, *Pfuscher*, free-masters, and independent journeymen could operate freely, so that before the end of the eighteenth century, the same crafts as in the cities and towns were represented outside their walls. Thus, while journeymen who were unable to be accepted as masters suffered in that they were excluded from normal *Mittelstand* society, often had illegitimate children with women they could not marry, wasted savings or inheritances trying to become masters, and faced total demoralization. For those who were able to accommodate themselves to reality, economic suffering did not necessarily follow guild exclusion; through personal ability, they could secure their livelihoods in the factories, in the countryside, or in the nonguilded trades. The elite among the permanent journeymen was a commodity eagerly sought by the entrepreneur and the factory owner. For the majority, however, social dislocation and economic misery were the rule. They found no escape.

On the Road

What set the journeyman apart from the apprentice tied to his master's shop and the artisan rooted in his community, were the ability and the requirement to move about from place to place. Indeed, an integral part of the journeyman's life was made up of the several years spent wandering, that is, traveling from town to town in order to work with and learn from a variety of masters before returning home to become a master himself. There was, in fact, a great deal to be said for the wandering years. Initially, one could learn a craft either through trial and error or, since trade schools did not exist before the nineteenth century, studying with an expert practitioner. The tendency in the latter case was for the pupil to learn the technique of his teacher, but to lack exposure to alternate methods or the stimulation to try new things brought on by several teachers. Moreover, since all the artisans of a craft tended toward uniformity of productive methods in each community, they, too, could benefit from exposure to new ideas brought in by outsiders. Consequently, it could be argued that compulsory wandering not only refined the technique of the journeyman wanderer, but also that of the craft as a whole as artisans were made aware of progress elsewhere. Even in the era of industrialization, many believed that by limiting the institution of wandering, the crafts and industries of the German states would be "severely injured."[90]

But wandering was also to serve a second function in the journeyman's development. Not only did he gain a knowledge of his craft, but he acquired a knowledge of himself and of the world. The difficulties of the journey, the uncertainties, the "struggle with life in unknown circumstances,"[91] as well as the opportunity

[86] StAN, Hauptregistratur, C 7 VI b 7, 3a Nachtrag 1, protocol locksmith guild *Vorgeher*, Nürnberg, May 9, 1832.

[87] StAN, Hauptregistratur, C 7 VI b 7, 3a Nachtrag 1, protocol Gritzmacher, Nürnberg, May 11, 1832.

[88] StAN, Hauptregistratur, C 7 VI b 7, 3a Nachtrag 1, protocol locksmith guild *Vorgeher*, Nürnberg, May 11, 1832.

[89] StAN, Hauptregistratur, C 7 VI b 7, 3a Nachtrag 1, police senate verdict, Nürnberg, August 6, 1832; appeals court decision, Ansbach, October 17, 1832.

[90] GlAK, Ministerium des Grossherzoglichen Hauses und der auswärtigen Angelegenheiten, Abt 233, 1586a, Report Blittersdorf, Frankfurt/Main, January 16, 1835.

[91] Rohrscheidt, Kurt von, *Vom Zunftzwang zur Gewerbefreiheit* (Berlin, 1898), p. 133.

to see more of Germany and Central Europe than would be possible to all but the wealthy, all this was designed to broaden and season the youth on the road to masterhood. There are journeyman diaries filled with descriptions of museums, churches, landscapes, and the pleasures of new acquaintances. The temptation to wax poetic about this kind of wandering journeyman was not always resisted by writers of travel books or political figures. "Long may the jocund handworker," William Howitt wrote in 1842, "traverse the hills and highways of his native land, giving a picturesque variety to its scenes, and gaining knowledge and experience for his future quiet and industrious burgher life."[92] And a report from Württemberg's parliament described how the journeyman went abroad with "moderation and modesty, with the knowledge that there is still much to learn" and whose "guild pride" would give him the strength to suffer all hardships in order to "develop himself into a useful citizen," to establish ties for the future, and to broaden his world outlook.[93]

Such was the theory and the myth. The image of the cultivated youth, knapsack on his back and walking stick in hand, merrily strolling through the picturesque landscape describes only the exception. The wandering years were often filled with misery and hardship. Diaries are filled with descriptions of sore feet, soaked clothing, lack of food, uncertainties of work and wage, the caprice of masters, the coarseness of hostelers, and the difficulties with the police. "In their entirely unromantic hardship," the wandering years were a "rough and relentless school" from which many never graduated. It was only a small step from wandering journeyman requesting the traditional support to vagabond surviving by beggary. And the standing armies found a good many of their recruits among journeymen who were stranded.[94] Small wonder that few journeymen had the inclination to contemplate the beauty of their surroundings. The same William Howitt who had praised the institution of wandering also noted that it let loose "a swarm of raw and rude youths" who garnered little good from their travels but who were "very capable of corrupting those" among whom they circulated.[95] As a result, this tradition began to undergo examination.

Accordingly, by the nineteenth century, the idea of wandering came under increasing attack by those who advocated an end to the guild system. One parliamentary representative, for example, agreed that while wandering might be useful to some crafts, especially those that stood "closely to art," there were many trades in which wandering had "more demoralizing and detrimental results" than useful ones.[96] Another speaker found it morally indefensible for all trades, since wandering had deteriorated into beggary. Moreover, he said, anyone who sought to "perfect himself in his trade" could do so "in each city, in each country." Compulsory wandering for a number of years, he concluded, was no longer necessary.[97]

Indeed, with the establishment of trade schools in the nineteenth century, the institution of wandering would become obsolete. Yet, in spite of this and in spite of the journeymen's disillusionment with compulsory wandering, it was continued well toward the end of the century, largely as a way of temporarily exporting unemployment and as a device by the masters to hinder the journeyman's progress toward masterhood.

Initially voluntary, the *Wanderjahre* (years of wandering) became institutionalized and obligatory for most journeymen in the sixteenth century. Since this was a requirement established by the guilds and only later given legal sanction by the state, both duration and location of the wandering varied from craft to craft. As a rule, soon after becoming a journeyman the youth would make application to the appropriate guild and/or state authorities, receive the proper legitimations, and begin his journey (although depending on time and place, he might be allowed to delay his departure for several months or years).

Military conscription was always a problem for the wandering journeyman, if only because of the annoyance and time lost having to return home to report in person to the authorities. The journeyman cooper August Forster was informed that he would have to return to his home in Erlangen from his position in Bremen in order to be present for the draft lottery.[98] Even though his father was part of the establishment, the best that he could do was to gain for his son a three-month respite before he had to return home.[99] As a rule, however, since the journeyman presented the governments with a pool of military age men, they had to keep in touch with their home authorities when they received permission to wander abroad. In times of peace, governments were a bit lax, but when war seemed possible, permission to wander was difficult to obtain. In Württemberg, only those journeymen who had completed their military obligations could leave the country, while in Bavaria, those not yet due to be called up might continue to travel about, but had to send monthly notice of their whereabouts.[100]

[92] Howitt, William, *The Rural and Domestic Life of Germany* (London, 1842), p. 140.

[93] [Württemberg], *Verhandlungen in der Kammer der Abgeordneten* **14,** appendix to protocol 175, June 5, 1821.

[94] Stadelmann & Fischer, p. 213.

[95] Howitt, p. 127.

[96] [Württemberg], *Verhandlungen* **15,** protocol 181, June 9, 1821, p. 1333.

[97] Ibid., pp. 1330–1331.

[98] StAN, E 5, Büttner 30, letter, Johann Forster to August Forster, Erlangen, November 10, 1839.

[99] StAN, E 5, Büttner 30, letter, Johann Forster to August Forster, Erlangen, December 19, 1839.

[100] StAN, Aeltere Magistrats Registratur C 6, II 8. 6. Nr 8, Rezatkreis government to Nürnberg police, Ansbach, July 11, 1808.

The journeyman linen weaver Benjamin Riedel related how his wandering companion appeared before an official to obtain a new passport around 1812. Having the misfortune of still being liable for conscription, "he was arrested and transported home."[101]

The state, particularly after the late eighteenth century, approached the question of wandering with ambiguity. For political and military reasons, the journeymen ought to have been kept within the country so that army recruits were always available and exposure to radical ideas might be limited. On the other hand, there were practical economic and social reasons why travel should not only be permitted but encouraged. Not only would the journeyman gain knowledge and refinement in his craft, which would then be brought back to his homeland, but also surplus labor and potentially troublesome youths could be removed from the country. Consequently, the trade legislation found in the German states vacillated between the two positions.

During the Napoleonic period, wandering decreased sharply, but the states did take pains to see that the obligation to wander was carried out. In 1801, for example, Bavaria's Maximilian IV Joseph ordered the resumption of the wandering that was being neglected. A list was published containing the towns of Europe most important for the individual crafts, and those journeymen who wandered to cities in regions where their crafts had reached a high degree of excellence were to be especially favored.[102] Despite the rapidly increasing attempts by journeymen to find exemptions through all kinds of excuses, as late as 1805 the Bavarian government reminded the guilds that wandering was obligatory and that they were to see that their journeymen fulfilled this requirement. This was soon to change.

Montgelas's legislation reflected that minister's distrust of those lacking permanent residence and whose mobility made it possible to avoid police observation. Moreover, he believed that Bavaria was large and progressive enough to enable each craft to advance without having to rely on foreigners.[103] Thus, in 1806, Bavarian journeymen were freed of the requirement to wander abroad, while a decree in 1807 proved even more limiting. It allowed wandering outside the country only if the craft was especially useful to Bavaria, if it were practiced at a higher level abroad, or if knowledge of major methodological changes would be useful for Bavarian ventures. Those persuasive enough to convince the authorities that their profession qualified, had to send written reports of their location every six months to their home town officials. All those unable to gain approval for travel abroad had to wander inside the Bavarian borders for a maximum of three years (a minimum of two and one-half years was established by 1810), during which time (like those wandering abroad) they were exempt from military conscription.[104] Until the prescribed wandering was completed, no journeyman was allowed to marry or to take up residence in Bavaria.

At about the same time, Baden was also establishing legal definitions for wandering. Journeymen of the duchy's major cities were to wander for at least three years (but no more than six) abroad, if they hoped to establish themselves in a larger city. Residents of smaller towns and the countryside had also to wander for the same period at least twelve hours' travel time from their home. There was no obligation to leave the country (and could be forbidden if officials found no need for it) since it was presumed that the coarser country crafts needed none of the refinements necessary in the major cities. Unless a journeyman obtained a dispensation, until the wandering obligation was completed he could become neither master nor citizen.[105]

Finally, the Bavarian law of 1825 defined the wandering requirement in that state (its provisions were typical for South Germany). As soon as an apprentice was promoted to journeyman, he had to begin a three-year wandering period. Insidiously, only the time spent actually working for masters away from the district in which one was trained counted.[106] The time spent traveling or searching for employment was not considered. Consequently, the total time spent wandering depended on whether and for how long the journeyman found work. So what appears superficially as a reasonable maximum for wandering was instead a minimum and, considering the increasing difficulties that journeymen had finding work in their crafts, could become an insurmountable barrier to those aspiring to become masters. Few journeymen, moreover, were able to bypass this obligation since the law allowed only the physically unfit to be excused from wandering. On the other hand, to encourage this surplus labor supply to leave Bavaria, each journeyman could wander abroad at will, subject only to the semiannual report of location to one's local officials for as long as the journeyman remained liable for conscription.

Thus in the space of less than a quarter century, the legislation regarding wandering reflected the ambiguity of the state toward the journeymen. They were a source upon which both the military and the crafts could draw in times like those of the Napoleonic Era

[101] Zollhöfer, Friedrich (ed.), *Gut Gesell', und du musst Wandern. Aus dem Reisetagebuche des wandernden Leinenwebergesellen Benjamin Riedel. 1803–1816* (Goslar, 1938), p. 133.

[102] Schimke, Franzl, "Der Stand der Gewerbegesetzgebung und Gewerbepolizei im nordostwärtigen heutigen bayerischen Schwaben während der Jahre 1801–1813" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Erlangen, 1948), pp. 22, 25.

[103] Kaisl, Josef, *Der Kampf um Gewerbereform und Gewerbefreiheit in Bayern, 1799–1868* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 65.

[104] [Bavaria], "Königlich-Baierisches Regierungsblatt," October 24, 1807, #45.

[105] [Baden], "Grossherzoglich Badisch Staats- und Regierungsblatt," February 17, 1808, #5.

[106] Printed in Popp, pp. 147–180.

when there was a shortage of trained men, and they were a source of social disruption after the Era of Liberation and in the *Vormärz*, when there was a surplus in the work force. That the period of wandering brought benefits to the society was accepted by the states as natural even after some began to question its utility. What was less certain was how to treat this mobile segment of society, how much autonomy to allow it, and how best to monitor and control its movements.

Originally, the incoming wandering journeyman had to show to the head of his craft his *Lehrbrief* (indenture) showing that he was indeed a journeyman, and his birth certificate proving legitimate, honorable, Christian birth. To prove himself as a member of the guild, he also had to speak the often complicated and lengthy formula of greeting that each apprentice had to learn by rote, originating in pre-literate times when few could read written credentials.[107] By the eighteenth century, it was common practice for the guild to issue a *Kundschaft* (testimonial) to each journeyman who had worked with a local master, noting for how long he had worked, how well, and with whom. This had to be carried by the journeyman and upon entering a town had to be shown to the guild head if he sought either work or support. If no work was found in the town, this was entered on his most recent *Kundschaft*. If the journeyman took employment, his *Kundschaft* was deposited in the guild chest until he left to wander further, when he received his old and a new testimonial. The amount of paper that a journeyman might have to carry could be staggering.

In 1762, an imperial edict mandated an official *Kundschaft* which was to contain the journeyman's personal data as well as the names of those with whom he had worked. What was unique was that these were to be issued and controlled by political rather than guild officials. Consequently, the guilds ignored the edict and the enabling legislation decreed by the states, and continued to issue testimonials without reference to the political authorities. Clearly the guilds were not pleased at this attempt to limit their autonomy and diminish their control over the journeymen, who, in turn, attempted to evade all forms of supervision, regardless of origin. Many of the latter spent their wandering years with no thought of employment, having only old testimonials, or knowing how to obtain new ones illicitly, so they had no interest in assisting the authorities. Ultimately, however, the state had its way. Bavaria finally succeeded in banning guild-issued testimonials in 1805,[108] while Baden, in order to control the increasing abuses and forgeries, ordered each *Kundschaft* to be signed by the master with whom the journeyman had worked and confirmed by a political official with an official seal.[109]

By this time, however, a new control device had been found: the *Wanderbuch* (wander book). This had been introduced into France by Napoleon as the *livret ouvrier* (worker's book) and entered the German states through the Prussian reform movement of 1808–1810.[110] Bavaria, Baden, and Württemberg were quick to follow suit, requiring each native journeyman to purchase a wander book from the government (not the guild, since that would imply that the state lacked sufficient authority and that the guilds had more authority than the states wished them to have) before they began their travels abroad or even within the country. The youth was required to appear before the local officials, produce his indenture of apprenticeship, and formally request a wander book valid for wherever he planned to travel, swearing to report his location every six months.[111] If there were no difficulties, he received his wander book containing all legislation pertaining to wandering, his vital statistics, and a number of blank pages upon which visas would be stamped and a history of the holder's work and behavior would be entered. Those journeymen who had already begun their wandering or who came from states without wander books were to be issued one into which the contents of their testimonials were to be copied.

On the road, journeymen were to obtain visas in their wander books before they might move on to their next goal. In Prussia (but not in South Germany), the exact route and expected travel time were entered in the wander book by the police, who alone could approve changes. Sidetrips or circuitous routes without the proper visas could raise an endless uproar (North and South). Wander books were to be shown to police and guild officials upon entry into each town and were to be surrendered to the guild or the employer when work was accepted. When the journeyman left, his wander book was to be returned with a note of the length and quality of his service included, signed by the master and a police official. All misbehaviors, especially serious ones, were to be entered in the *Wanderbuch*. Once the journeyman had completed his wandering obligations, a record of his development and conduct could be read chronologically from the pages of the wander book and could provide the grounds for granting or denying him the master rank.

Clearly, it was in the best interest of the journeyman to behave as the authorities might want, even when far away from home. Dewald, despite being with a

[107] Wissell **2:** p. 312.

[108] Anegg, pp. 156–157; Tyszka, Carl von, *Handwerk und Handwerker in Bayern im 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1907), p. 81.

[109] [Baden], "Staats- und Regierungsblatt," November 2, 1808, #35.

[110] Büsch, Otto (ed.), *Die frühsozialistischen Bünde in der Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin, 1975), pp. 43–44.

[111] For example in StAN, Aeltere Magistrats Registatur C 6, II 8. 6. Nr 1.

hen-pecked master who could teach him nothing, "behaved as a proper journeyman to the very end," since he had no desire to see his wander book "marred."[112] Thus the wander book was also a control device. All the masters' comments, all transgressions, all police punishments were contained in the wander book—signaling the police of each state and town how to treat its possessor. The journeyman bookbinder Richard Hirtz, for example, presented his wander book to the police authorities in Lindau to obtain a visa for Stuttgart. On inspection, it was found that he had been expelled from St. Gallen (Switzerland) for his presence "at forbidden gatherings." Despite his protestations that it was a misunderstanding, the district government ordered him to be closely watched as long as he stayed in Lindau and, while he was given a visa to Stuttgart, it was to be over a fixed route along which he had to report to each police station. Once Hirtz arrived in Stuttgart, the authorities immediately sent him home to Worms.[113] A man's career was thus probably ruined for having listened to a lecture about Abbé Ménais that he had not even understood.

As long as he was on the road, the journeyman had to have his wander book with him at all times; without it he was treated as a vagrant. But as with all control devices, there were attempts to circumvent this one. Some journeymen became quite adept at forging the official stamps used by the police to grant visas or notarize attestations of working time and good conduct. In 1834, for example, the police in Munich warned of such counterfeits that, while "very imperfect," were not easily distinguishable from badly impressed genuine stamps, except that instead of printer's ink, the forgers (a journeyman tanner and a journeyman tailor) used a mixture of polish and black crayon.[114]

Should the wander book contain any time not accounted for, the police demanded immediate explanation, while the claim that it had been lost excited the greatest suspicions. As happened all too often,[115] journeymen would try to replace wander books marked by a note of some misconduct with a new, clean one by claiming to have lost the old. Yet honest or ignorant journeymen would also be suspected of chicanery and might lose all work time accumulated while wandering. Whether that was the case depended on the local authorities and whether they believed the journeyman after he had been transported to his home town.

In one case, the mayor of Lauterbourg (a French town near Strasbourg) had opened a lucrative trade in the sale of wander books to any German journeyman who claimed to have lost his papers. One journeyman, when challenged by the authorities in Baden, claimed that the mayor, unable to visa his old *Wanderbuch* since it was full of visas and work testimonials, sold him a new one while keeping the old one that had been issued in Mannheim three years earlier.[116] No mention is made in the records of what happened to this journeyman saddler, but no journeyman would willingly surrender the only proof that he had fulfilled his wandering and working obligations. Clearly this was a racket, since several police stations in Baden reported that many journeymen ran around with those documents.[117] It was finally decided that since the mayor had no right to issue a wander book to anyone not born in Lauterbourg, Baden's police were to confiscate such wander books, deport foreign journeymen to their home states, and send those from Baden to their home towns.[118] Baden's foreign minister lodged a formal complaint with the French ambassador,[119] and the matter came to an end.

It should be clear that the states regarded the wander book highly as a means of controlling the wandering journeymen, and when compared to the *Kundschaft*, the journeymen's independence had been limited. Nonetheless, once a journeyman crossed the frontiers of a state, he effectively vanished. The Bavarian authorities were seeking Johann Salzmann, a journeyman clothier, on a charge of conspiring with other journeymen to commit arson, but lost all trace of him when he crossed into Württemberg.[120] The problem was that no listing was made of visas issued to and direction taken by transient journeymen. Of course, as the Württemberg Ministry of the Interior made clear,[121] that would be impossible since the paperwork would have been overwhelming and there was no certainty that a wandering journeyman would necessarily go to the place that he said he would. Consequently, the police were not yet able to supervise fully the movements of journeymen to whom some freedom of movement remained.

It was this very ability to move that gave the jour-

[112] Dewald, pp. 31–32.

[113] Geheimes Staatsarchiv-Munich (hereafter cited as GSAM), Deutscher Bund MA II, 1643, Report Lindau government to Oberdonaukreis government, Lindau, October 10, 1834.

[114] Staatsarchiv-Munich (hereafter cited as SAM), LRA 24108, Isarkreis to Munich police, Munich, April 8, 1834.

[115] Hauptstaatsarchiv-Stuttgart (hereafter cited as HSAS), E 33, Geheimer Rat III, 720, Interior Ministry to King, Stuttgart, February 26, 1827.

[116] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 2229, Report Amt Wertheim to Main und Tauber Kreis government, Wertheim, October 15, 1822.

[117] GlAK, Ministerium der Innern, Abt. 236, 2229, Report Stadtamt Mannheim to Neckerkreis government, Mannheim, June 27, 1822.

[118] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 2229, Interior Ministry to all Kreis governments, Karlsruhe, August 12, 1822.

[119] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 2229, Foreign Ministry to French ambassador, Karlsruhe, August 28, 1822.

[120] HSAS, Ministerium der auswärtiger Angelegenheiten, E 41–45, Fasz. 68, Bavarian Foreign Ministry to Württemberg ambassador, Teublitz, August 2, 1835.

[121] HSAS, Ministerium der auswärtiger Angelegenheiten, E 41–45, Fasz. 68, Interior Ministry to Foreign Ministry, Stuttgart, September 5, 1835.

neymen their one advantage over the masters. The latter were tied to their community by their craft, possessions, customers, and family—none of which the journeyman had. To avoid being tied down and to protect the ability to leave at a moment's notice, journeymen had long opposed extended contracts and marriage, both of which made them liable to the capriciousness of the masters. Not until some authority—guild or political—could be extended beyond the city walls could this advantage be countered. But with the growth of the state, with its statewide institutions, then the formation of the German Confederation, with its ties to all the German states, and finally with the creation of a united Germany, with its nationwide reach, this independence would finally be brought to an end.

Independent or not, the wandering journeymen had long been a common sight throughout Central Europe. Typically, they traveled on foot from city to city, not because they were forbidden to ride (as had originally been the case), but because of the expense of travel. Dewald and his companions had to pay a freight wagon driver just to be allowed to put their knapsacks on the wagon,[122] while Benjamin Riedel and his traveling companions, because of the extreme cold and snow, paid to ride post sleighs.[123]

In a real sense, however, improvements in transportation (especially the railroad) did much to destroy the institution of wandering later in the century, as did the founding of trade and technical schools. Both brought in a kind of constancy, useful in mass production, but which homogenized the idiosyncracies of the individual masters that could previously be learned only by wandering from shop to shop and town to town.

Except in those regions which forced journeymen to follow specific routes, most traveled according to no set plan. Prior to the nineteenth century, journeymen stopped where they found work or felt comfortable, and continued their journey if they were tired of a place or if good friends were going further. Any place whose masters were being boycotted was naturally to be avoided.[124] Those with a seriousness of purpose had as their goal those cities in which their craft had an especially good reputation and where they expected the possibility of better training. After 1825, when Bavaria's trade laws demanded three years of actual work time before a wandering journeyman might seek to become a master, it can be assumed that most traveled there where they expected employment and avoided regions in which work might be difficult to find.[125]

On route to their destinations, journeymen rarely received the hospitality offered to Riedel and his companions. In spite of an 1808 prohibition, an elderly couple insisted that the young travelers stay to eat and sleep with them and not only refused to accept payment, but compelled the journeymen to take a few coins to help them on their journey.[126] As a rule, however, conditions that wandering journeymen faced were primitive at best and when they chose to stay at a country inn, rather than sleep in a field or the forest, they were subject to all sorts of diseases. Personal hygiene was not a developed art and most journeymen were quite dirty since they traveled on foot in all kinds of weather.[127] To this were coupled landlord ignorance and greed, since bed linen (if it existed) was not changed with each new guest, so a journeyman might contract a disease like scabbies (*Krätzübel*) if someone with the disease had previously slept there. To prevent this, an official recommended, country innkeepers ought to be encouraged to give journeymen only clean beds or, "even better, straw beds,"[128] which could then be burned.

In order to prevent what had become a new epidemic of scabbies among journeymen in the early 1840s, the Bavarian government had instructed the police to examine the skin of each wandering journeyman requesting a visa for his wander book. This proved to be quite an undertaking, since the police saw a veritable flood of journeymen who needed visas. On October 18, 1842 alone, the police in Munich observed, 256 journeymen requested visas so that the doctor on duty could only ask each about his health and carefully examine only the "doubtful, dirty" ones.[129] At small police stations there was no doctor, a situation that forced the police to carry out the examinations themselves. Not only did this make real demands on their time, but it also partially explains the distaste with which they approached the journeymen. It also partially explains the antipathy which journeymen had for the police who humiliated them during the examinations. It was a relief for the journeyman to be able finally to move on.

When a journeyman entered a town, he showed his *Kundschaft* or *Wanderbuch* to the watchman, who either sent him to the police or to the *Herberg* of his craft. This last was the focal point of the journeyman's life. In most cities, each craft either had a house or contracted with an innkeeper to provide inexpensive accommodation for incoming journeymen. In smaller towns and in the country, several crafts might share a single *Herberg*, each craft hanging its insignia over a table so that a journeyman would know where to

[122] Dewald, p. 16.

[123] Zollhöfer, p. 27.

[124] Lenhardt, Heinz, *150 Jahre Gesellenwandern nach Frankfurt a. M.* (Frankfurt/Main, 1938), p. 3.

[125] Giebel, Hans Reiner, "Strukturanalyse der Gesellschaft des Königreichs Bayern im Vormärz, 1818–1848" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Munich, 1971), p. 60.

[126] Zollhöfer, pp. 83–84.

[127] SAM, RA, Fasz. 1091, 15490, Report Landgericht Ebersberg to Oberbayern government, June 10, 1850.

[128] SAM, RA, Fasz. 1091, 15508, Landgericht-Aktuar Standenhochtl to Oberbayern government, Rosenheim, December 13, 1842.

[129] SAM, RA, Fasz. 1091, 15496, Munich police to Oberbayern government, February 15, 1843.

go.[130] It was here that the traveling journeyman could find lodging for one to three days, depending on local law, after which he either took employment or traveled further. Those who stayed longer were treated as vagrants, since most of them begged or stole from the local populace.

While in many cases, especially where journeyman associations were strong, accommodations in the *Herberg* might be more than adequate, that was not always the case. Even at the best of times, given the raw character of many journeymen, there was a great deal of drinking, gambling, and noise. It was not uncommon to have a dozen or more in a room and Dewald described how, when he and his companions were shown to their beds, which were "grey as the earth," they chose to spend the night at "the fireplace seats" in the corridor, rather than sleep in them.[131]

But the *Herberg* was more than a hostel, as the *Herbergsvater* was more than a hosteler. It was the place to which journeymen came when seeking employment. Depending on craft custom and local or state law, either the *Herbergsvater* would send, or a specially appointed journeyman or master would bring, incoming journeymen to the shops of masters needing workers. The newly hired journeyman would then, as a rule, move in with his new employer. But his tie to the *Herberg* was by no means ended.

The *Herberg* was the place to which local journeymen and their foreign brothers met evenings to relax over a few beers. It was the place where apprentices were tested and promoted, the place where traveling journeymen were greeted and treated at the expense of the locals. It was the meeting hall of the journeyman association (to which all local and employed journeymen had to belong and to contribute), which, under its own elected leadership, met regularly to deal with matters of interest to the membership and to collect dues.

Depending on the trade, each employed journeyman had to contribute a portion of his salary to the association's treasury so that funds would be available to support wandering journeymen, cover the expenses of the association, and provide medical care for those sick and injured. In Freiburg, the journeyman joiners had to pay 3 kr quarterly (a nominal amount) to a fund which was used to pay the hospital 50 kr when a member was admitted. Should he die under treatment, his goods went to the hospital. The journeyman carpenters, on the other hand, paid the hospital the 50 kr only if they survived treatment, otherwise there was no fee.[132]

Given the relatively large sums collected by the journeyman associations, by the nineteenth century, few journeymen were allowed to control what had previously been their own treasuries. Often the state gave control to the guild, which, in turn, was responsible to the state authorities for its proper performance. The sole remaining issue was how and by whom these funds were to be collected. One method was for the dues to be paid at the regular meeting to the *Altgesell* (the journeymen's chief official) under the supervision of a master, thus leaving at least the symbolism to the journeymen. Alternatively, the individual masters could withhold a portion of their employees' wages, excluding all journeyman association participation.[133] Nonetheless, disputes as to the proper method of collection continued. In 1844, the Munich journeyman bookbinders met illegally in their hostel to "conspire" to withhold their dues in protest at the transference of their treasury to the control of the guild's chief master (*Vorsteher* or *Vorgeher*). However, this rebelliousness was broken when Xaver Kögl, the originator, was sentenced to six days arrest and one year special supervision, while the others had to serve between one and three days arrest. All back dues were paid.[134]

The same fate awaited the Nürnberg journeyman shoemakers who wanted to have their dues collected in their *Herberg* under the supervision of the two guild *Vorgeher*, rather than the less secure method of collection by a master and a journeyman who would then turn the funds over to the *Vorgeher*.[135] The latter objected since they had been rudely treated at the *Herberg* in the past and had no desire to see this repeated. Nonetheless, the journeymen were adamant, instructing their leaders to collect the dues, but not to turn them over to the *Vorgeher*.[136] The two *Altgesellen* were arrested and had their keys to the treasury confiscated. Together with the third key, held by a master, the journeymen's treasury was unlocked, the dues removed, and the treasury relocked. The third key was returned to the master, the other two were kept by the authorities. Despite the two journeymen's long service (Lang, age thirty-four, had worked in Nürnberg for fourteen years, while Bauer, age twenty-seven, had spent six years in Nürnberg after five years of wandering), both were sentenced to eight days arrest and to be removed from their office as *Altgesellen*. In order not to interrupt their work for too long a period, their request to serve their time on four consecutive weekends, Saturday night to Monday night, was approved.[137]

Despite the fact that most journeymen understood the need for payment of dues and argued only over the means of collection, some approached the question

[130] Howitt, p. 130; Zimmermann, p. 13.

[131] Dewald, p. 18.

[132] GlAK, Stadtamt Freiburg, Abt. 355, Zugang 1894/30, Nr 45, Report to Stadtamt, Freiburg, September 1, 1824.

[133] GlAK, Stadtamt Freiburg, Abt. 355, Zugang 1894/30, Nr 45, Stadtamt Freiburg to Stadtamt Rastatt, September 3, 1844.

[134] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 V, 3105, Munich police to Nürnberg police, Munich, April 6, 1844.

[135] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 5a Nachtrag 1, Shoemaker *Vorgeher* protocol, Nürnberg, May 11, 1835.

[136] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 5a Nachtrag 1, *Altgesellen* Bauer and Lang protocol, Nürnberg, June 19, 1835.

[137] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 5a Nachtrag 1, police senate decision, Nürnberg, June 20, 1835.

less in principle than in self-interest. The journeyman coppersmith Johann Siertl, who had already won the ill-will of his colleagues by refusing to take part in the meetings and carousals at the hostel, complained bitterly against the doubling of monthly dues to 12 kr per month because he felt that excessive amounts were spent on drink and because he resented the fact that while the dues were paid by local, working journeymen, they were paid to foreigners.[138] One can assume that Siertl had completed his wandering obligations and considered himself a journeyman in name only. Anyone not willing to partake in the affairs of the *Herberg* was different and thus an outsider (subject to all that that meant) since conformity to group norms was one of the highest values. To avoid the hostel invited ostracism from the other journeymen who strove to maintain the autonomy of the *Herberg* as much as possible, and Siertl obviously suffered for his views.

Precisely because the *Herberg* was the place where journeymen could assemble, the guilds tried to exert some control over it. Regulations were issued limiting the amount of time journeymen might spend there; attempts were made to keep local and foreign journeymen apart, and journeymen were forbidden to hold their meetings there except in the presence of one or two masters specifically appointed to the task. By the nineteenth century, the state looked on the *Herberg* as a center for conspiracy also and, as in the case of Nürnberg, ordered the hostelers to report immediately any political discussions, speeches, or pamphlets in their establishments. Failure to do so would result in the immediate closing of their businesses.[139]

This was a very real threat to the hosteler, yet it was well worth his while to keep on good terms with the journeymen who patronized his inn. A contract was entered into by which the innkeeper, in return for his services, received a set fee[140] and a guaranteed minimum level of spending by the journeymen for meals and drinks. Nonetheless, it seems that journeymen changed their hostels frequently either because of real or imagined mistreatment or because of a demand for more money. The journeyman hatters in Munich, for example, were ordered to return to the "Fox" tavern and to remain until they had settled their bill and received permission from the police to change their *Herberg*.[141] And while the Nürnberg journeyman coopers had police permission to change their *Herberg*, they found that the master coopers objected. The *Altgesell* explained to the police that they had always chosen their hostel independently of the masters, so that while they were notified, their formal approval was not necessary. No objection was raised to the masters' demand that the city gatekeepers direct incoming journeymen to the old hostel, as long as the masters supported them, "since we will have nothing to do" with those journeymen who went there.[142] At first, the city officials decided to let incoming journeymen decide to which hostel they wished to go, but after the masters complained, all were sent to the old hostel, where the masters still assembled.[143] Still, the journeyman coopers kept their new *Herberg* and made their point.

Of interest here is not only that the journeymen attempted to exercise autonomy or that the masters tried to maintain their authority by using the city officials, but also that the question of support (and its withholding) was involved. The basic assumption, questioned by very few before the mid-nineteenth century, was that wandering was necessary, or at least useful. It would get the journeymen where there was work, that is, where they could be used—and thus they could develop their skills. Accordingly, the wandering journeymen were to be assisted as they traveled from town to town. Not only would this facilitate their journey, but it was believed that this would make them less troublesome.

As a rule, an incoming journeyman received food and shelter in the hostel and money (the "gift" or *Geschenk*) to travel further if work were not available. Moreover, through the promotion of mobility, the journeymen strengthened their feeling of mutual belonging by improving communications between journeyman associations, often feared as the basis for superregional agreements and conspiracies by the state.[144] However, the governments recognized the importance of travel support since "only in exceptional cases" could journeymen complete their wandering without assistance.[145] This *Zehrpfennig* (travel money) usually came from the journeymen's dues, but was sometimes supplemented or supplanted by grants from the guild treasury or the community's alms box. Stuttgart, for example, paid all incoming journeymen 4 kr, to be collected at the police station.[146]

Yet while the governments recognized that the wandering journeymen needed support, as a matter of principle they denied that they had a right to it. Any journeyman violating police regulations, idly roaming the countryside, or facing expulsion could expect no

[138] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 512, protocol Johann Siertl, Munich, March 3, 1834.

[139] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 V, 2725, Nürnberg police to Magistrate, Nürnberg, September 14, 1834.

[140] Munich's journeyman shoemakers paid 30 fl per month in 1822. StAM, Gewerbeamt, 1068, *Altgesell* protocol, Munich, September 27, 1825.

[141] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 2197, Munich police protocol, November 28, 1814.

[142] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 29, protocol cooper *Altgesell*, Nürnberg, September 6, 1849.

[143] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 29, March 23–April 5, 1850.

[144] Wiest, p. 67.

[145] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 511, Oberfranken government circular note, Bayreuth, July 31, 1850.

[146] Zollhöfer, p. 85.

travel support.[147] A Württemberg law giving journeymen a formal legal claim to the *Zehrpfennig* was criticized by the minister of the interior on the grounds that such a right existed in no other state,[148] an opinion repeated three years later when the king was informed that there was "no inherent right for travel support for the wandering journeymen."[149] And in 1849, it was argued that regular contributions to wandering journeymen only promoted an "unnecessary, aimless running around" and increased laziness among the members of this group.[150]

But what was the alternative? The most common method for obtaining support was to beg. It had long been considered honorable for a journeyman to visit the homes and shops of masters of his craft to receive a *Zeichen* (token) of a few kreuzer if there were no work. This was an obligation on the part of the master who was not responding to a beggar, but to a member of his craft exercising an acknowledged right.[151] Yet this was open to abuse. The Munich police reported that several journeyman masons, locksmiths, and carpenters took blacksmiths' tools and pretended to be of that craft in order to beg from local smiths. In a variation, journeyman blacksmiths from nearby villages came to Munich on holiday and exacted donations from the Munich masters under the pretense that they were wandering.[152]

Indeed it was but a small step into straightforward beggary from the traditional system of going from master to master asking for work and accepting travel support in its stead. Particularly after the rapid demobilization after the Napoleonic wars and again in the 1840s, many journeymen found themselves unemployed and begged in order to survive. The Bavarian government was well aware of the "completely excessive numbers of foreign [non-Bavarian] journeymen" without food or work "and often without any to look for" who were begging and were not only a burden to "the residents of every town," but also endangered the public's security.[153] Often they would travel in packs so that, to some, there was little difference between their request for the traditional *Zeichen* and outright extortion.[154] Furthermore, it was presumed (with some justification) that more assaults and robberies taking place on the roads and highways were committed by itinerant journeymen than by local youths. Consequently, the Bavarian police were ordered to watch all journeymen who went house to house for travel money, who used forged documents or claimed lost wander books, and those who used a "thieves' slang."[155]

This last had been occasioned by the discovery of secret signs written on milestones and walls (including a police station), reawakening the memory (and fear) of the journeyman conspiracies and uprisings that had taken place during the latter part of the eighteenth century throughout the Holy Roman Empire. Although these marks proved to be nothing more than attempts to inform other wanderers which direction was taken by how many, whether the local police were hard on beggars and vagrants, and whether generous persons lived in a house, the police were ordered to keep a special vigilance.[156]

Gradually, the governments began to realize that begging was the result of the large excess of journeymen, many more than needed by present masters and future master positions. Since it can be assumed that few journeymen wandered farther or longer than necessary, the increasing number of journeymen on the road might be seen as an indication of an increasing unemployment (or, at best, underemployment) among the journeymen of most crafts.[157] In a report to the king, Württemberg's minister of the interior described the imbalance between the number of wandering journeymen and the need for them by local masters as a temporary phenomenon due in part to an influx of unemployed journeymen from other states, and in part to a recession in certain local industries brought about by a new Bavarian tariff schedule[158] (although dropping the tariff barriers that separated the German states as would happen with the *Zollverein* would only aggravate the situation in many regions by allowing entry to competing goods for the first time).

Nevertheless, as a rule these facts were rejected by the authorities, who tended to concentrate on the political threat to public order and on the great cost borne by the community, guild, and journeyman treasuries supporting the unemployed wanderers. These officials, who seem to have believed firmly in the wandering ethic whereby a journeyman who wished to become a master would use his travel time wisely, were convinced that it was the journeyman's fault or choice if he had not worked recently—he was either incompetent, lazy, or a vagrant. Accordingly, rather than try to resolve the real causes of unemployment, leg-

[147] HSAS, Kabinetsakten IV, E 14, 1133, Württemberg "Regierungsblatt," June 14, 1828, #39.

[148] HSAS, E 33, Geheimer Rat III, Büschel 805, Interior Ministry to King, Stuttgart, December 24, 1834.

[149] HSAS Kabinetsakten IV, E 14, 1133, Interior Ministry to King, Stuttgart, October 9, 1837.

[150] Staatsarchiv-Ludwigsburg (hereafter cited as SAL), E 170, 203, Zentralstelle für Gewerbe und Handel, transactions, February 1, 1849.

[151] Wissell **1**: p. 328.

[152] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 1151, Munich police to Magistrate, Munich, June 13, 1826.

[153] SAM, LRA, 24108, Circular note, Munich, March 15, 1817.

[154] SAM, LRA, 24108, Circular note August 15, 1817; Isarkreis government to police, Munich, June 3, 1832.

[155] SAM, LRA, 24108, Oberbayern government to police, Munich, January 22, 1844.

[156] SAM, LRA, 24108, Isarkreis government to police, Munich, December 9, 1829.

[157] For a statistical analysis see Giebel, pp. 253 ff.

[158] HSAS, E 33, Geheimer Rat III, Büschel 720, Interior Ministry to King, Stuttgart, February 26, 1827.

islation was passed restricting the journeyman's ability to find work.

Already in 1807, a Württemberg law allowed a foreign journeyman into the country only with a properly signed and sealed *Kundschaft*, not older than six months, proving that he had recently worked or had at least sought employment but had found none.[159] Over the next two decades, further restrictions were added so that no foreign journeyman over the age of forty or suspected of avoiding work (defined as having had no work in the last six weeks) could be allowed to wander in the kingdom.[160]

Regulations in other German states were even more severe. Baden, in 1829, ordered all foreign journeymen who had not worked in four weeks to be deported and sent to their home towns,[161] while Bavaria demanded that journeymen have proof of a job awaiting them or possess 10 fl "travel money" (*Reisegeld*) before they might enter the country.[162] Most restrictive of all were the Prussian rules that permitted wandering only if the journeyman was under thirty years of age, had wandered less than five years, and had 5 Taler travel money.[163] While the Bavarian government objected to the age restriction on the grounds that this excluded Bavarian journeymen "of mature years" from the "larger part of the *Zollverein*,"[164] the major impediment to journeymen came from the demand for travel money. This was designed to protect the local populace from indigent travelers who would beg and steal rather than work and to limit the economic burden on one's own state by preventing neighboring states from exporting their extraneous and impoverished journeymen. Since each state established similar restrictions to preserve the scanty resources for their own journeymen, rather than assist foreigners at the expense of local ones, the flow of journeymen across state lines was impeded (with results analogous to the effects of competitive protective tariffs on international trade and production during periods of economic downturn), while journeymen, who were required by law to wander, found it all the more difficult to fulfill their obligations.

Ultimately, however, the plight of the journeymen was recognized and attempts were made to obtain support for them, that is, maintain the guild system with a few modifications, rather than replace it with the freedom to carry on an occupation without guild restrictions. During the 1840s, there was a great deal of discussion over the establishment of journeyman support societies. In Munich, for example, it was decided that each craft was to have such a society to support journeymen in sickness and as they wandered. Every journeyman, "be he married or not, working with a master of his trade or with a manufacturer," was to contribute monthly to the fund which was only for the support of wandering journeymen and not for banquets, halls, and other social events "as was often the case before."[165] It is clear from these provisions that the entire concept of journeyman had been changed, since all that was necessary to be treated as one was possession of a state-issued wander book. Marital status or type of employer, so important in the past, meant nothing to the state. Even the idea of *Altgesell*, who was initially proposed to care for the society under the supervision of a master, was rejected by the government as "foreign to present regulations."[166] As finally approved, the head of the support society was to be a master. But to satisfy the needs and quiet the doubts of the journeymen, that master had to use one of their number to carry out the society's business—but that journeyman was selected by the masters with police approval.[167]

Unfortunately, even this modest plan to help the wandering journeymen collapsed in the face of resistance from the crafts. The police decided that the statutes only provided norms whereby such a society might voluntarily be set up, but were neither a requirement that they be established, nor an impediment to their dissolution.[168] Once again, the wandering journeyman was left to the mercies of his craft, but now he no longer had his own organizations and fraternities to offset the preponderance of the masters.

Authority and the Journeymen

Journeymen had begun to establish their own organizations in the medieval period when a social division between them and the master craftsmen began to appear. At first, these associations (*Gesellenschaften*), which could be found in each urban center, were usually for religious and social purposes. But as the guilds became more exclusive and rigid, ceasing to protect or consider the economic and social interests of the journeymen, the fraternities, societies, and other journeyman associations began to deal with these more secular needs and goals. By the fifteenth century, the *Gesellenschaften* had established an autonomy within the guild, including the right to hold periodic meetings

[159] [Württemberg], "Das Regierungsblatt für das Königreich Württemberg," September 11, 1807, #84.

[160] May 1, 1827, #14.

[161] [Baden], "Staats- und Regierungsblatt," May 12, 1829, #10.

[162] Giebel, p. 259.

[163] GSAM, Gesandschaft Berlin 701, Berlin, April 24, 1833.

[164] GSAM, Gesandschaft Berlin 701, Foreign Ministry to Bavarian ambassador in Berlin, Munich, September 19, 1834.

[165] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 512, Munich police to magistrate, Munich, February 17, 1846.

[166] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 512, Oberbayern government to Munich police director, Munich, August 9, 1846.

[167] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 512, Munich police to Oberbayern government, Munich, June 16, 1847.

[168] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 512, Munich police to magistrate, Munich, December 14, 1847.

under the leadership of journeymen elected by their colleagues, to hold them at their own *Herberg*, and to have and manage their own treasury to which each journeyman had to contribute and from which each needy journeyman of the craft benefited.

Just as the guilds within a community began to work together, so too did the *Gesellenschaften*; just as the masters of each particular craft began to link up with those in other communities, so too did the journeymen associations of each craft. Consequently, journeymen were able to travel freely from place to place, secure in the knowledge that they would always find a bed, a meal, and a hearty greeting wherever their trade was practiced. As more journeymen chose or were required to wander before becoming masters, the ties between their associations throughout the Holy Roman Empire became tighter, until an extensive network had been created.

Membership was obligatory and, while these associations promoted the interests of the journeymen as a group, all journeymen had to obey the decision of the *Gesellenschaft* or be declared dishonorable. This meant that the outcast had to be dismissed from his job (or else the master would lose all other journeymen), was excluded from the *Herberg*, lost all claim to aid and support, and, if he wished to leave to wander further, would receive no *Kundschaft* (without which he could receive travel support nowhere). Letters were sent out to the associations in other towns telling of the outcast's offense, so that he could have no hope of guild employment until he had expiated his transgression.

This very real power which the associations could exercise against individual journeymen and masters or against whole towns and crafts was meant to protect the interests of the membership against the increasing exploitation by the masters. Instead, the state grew alarmed and, as it began to develop organs of authority, it moved to destroy the journeymen's organizations. From the sixteenth century on, the state had sought to reject all their claims to exercise independent jurisdiction over the journeymen, and by the nineteenth century, it had, for the most part successfully, prevented local and regional correspondence and cooperation, deprived journeymen of control over their own treasuries, and reduced the *Herberg* to a simple hostel.

Since the scope of the journeyman associations transcended the borders of the territorial states, the Imperial Diet was used to pass legislation uniform for the whole Empire. Certain "abuses" were defined and prohibited and the power of the journeymen to judge their comrades was taken from them. The Imperial Edict of 1731[169] was the centerpiece of the legislation designed to destroy all attempts at independence by the journeyman fraternities (although it was placed in the context of a general reform of all guild practices). By it, all existing journeyman associations were abolished, their ordinances and articles were declared invalid, and all attempts to continue or revive either would be punished. All jurisdiction of the journeymen over their colleagues was forbidden and the journeyman certificate (*Gesellenschein*), issued by the journeymen as proof of their status, was to be replaced by the *Kundschaft*. All opposition to authority, all attempts to communicate between journeymen in different places, all foolish customs and practices (such as Blue Mondays or excessively complex greetings)—were to cease on pain of punishment.

Although the Imperial Edict also limited the caprice of artisans toward their journeymen and removed several restrictions (discrimination against married journeymen, necessity for legitimate birth, distinctions between honorable and dishonorable crafts), the main thrust was to curb the autonomy of the journeyman associations. The nearly invisible ties among all the wandering journeymen in Germany, "nowhere to be grasped, yet everywhere relentlessly active,"[170] stood in sharp contradiction to the principle of the absolutism of the state. Consequently, the customary rights and organizations of the journeymen were attacked, ultimately leaving only a shadow of their former power.

Yet for an imperial edict to have effect, it had to be enacted into law in each of the territorial states since there was no actual executive authority in the Empire. The Edict of 1731, while often cited and used as the basis for laws in the nineteenth century, had little practical effect when promulgated. Of all its provisions, only the introduction of the *Kundschaft* was put through over the course of the century. While legal sanction had been given to abolish the journeyman associations and seize their treasuries, the norms of the journeymen were not destroyed. Since only Brandenburg-Prussia immediately published the edict, few could treat it seriously and, wherever attempts were made to enforce its provisions, journeymen threatened to strike or leave as a group.

By the 1760s, however, the Imperial Edict was having some impact on the legislation of South Germany. Baden forbade journeyman meetings without prior government approval and ordered the masters to withhold one week's pay from any journeyman celebrating a "Blue Monday" (turning Monday into an unauthorized holiday from work). In Bavaria, this last was an "abuse" only if it were taken without the master's permission, while the Wittelsbach state not only left the *Herberg* to the journeymen, but also acknowledged a right to a kind of fraternity (subordinate, however,

[169] A translation can be found in Walker, *German Home Towns*, pp. 435–451.

[170] Ritscher, p. 91.

to the whole guild) with a limited jurisdiction over the membership, a separate treasury, and biweekly meetings (supervised by two masters). Württemberg had similar legislation.[171]

Quite simply, given the relationships of power in eighteenth-century South Germany, there was little choice but to leave the guilds, and the journeymen in the guilds, a great deal of leeway. As a rule, the guilds did not feel bound by state laws and were able to change them to suit their special needs or to ignore them outright. In order to enlist the aid of the journeymen in the struggle against the state bureaucracy, the masters often had to accept their independent activities. Only when the masters chose to cooperate with the state authorities might the journeymen be brought under control. That this could happen at all, that the guilds chose to ally with the bureaucratic state with its centralizing tendencies and antipathy to local autonomy, is explained by the large number of strikes and uprisings carried on by the journeymen, especially in the eighteenth century, often for the most frivolous of reasons. The 1790s saw a rash of such uprisings and as late as 1802 uprisings had to be put down in eight major South German cities.[172] Consequently the masters (who wanted a dependable, submissive labor supply) and the state (which wanted to develop the economy, maintain law and order, and extend its authority) worked together in an attempt to crush the journeymen's esprit de corps.

In his fraternity, the journeyman was sheltered from outside authority. The state, consciously trying to strengthen itself at the expense of all forms of local authority, could no longer tolerate the community of journeymen and thus had to destroy their organizations. The result was a struggle of institutions for control of individuals. The state felt no threat from the journeyman (except revolutionaries), who was looked on as a ward of the paternalistic government. The legislation passed was therefore designed to aid the individual, to free him from the caprice of masters and comrades, but it was also meant to prevent collective actions. Thus, for example, the Bavarian criminal code punished corporeally or with from one to six months imprisonment any journeyman who conspired to raise wages by strikes.[173] The *Herberg* as meeting place, the jurisdiction of journeymen over their colleagues, the associations themselves—all were banned or sharply limited. And by the 1840s, the states were ready to support one another in the destruction of what had once nearly been like a state within a state.

But repression served only to drive the journeyman associations underground. This threat to their corporate existence, coupled with their declining economic condition and social status, only served to bring the journeymen closer together to maintain their customary rights and organizations. Again and again ordinances were issued banning certain abuses (as the state described the journeyman's ethos), only to find that they were still being practiced. Journeymen refused to give up the practice of celebrating the Blue Monday, of carousing, of "making journeymen" (*Gesellenmachen*, promoting young men who had completed their apprenticeship to the status of journeyman), of issuing journeyman certificates, and of holding illegal meetings to carry on the functions of their forbidden associations.

What was meant by carousing was the traditional greeting of free bread, beer, and tobacco that the incoming wanderer received when he first arrived at the *Herberg*. Locally employed journeymen not only paid for this (a practice forbidden in Bavaria in 1808 on pain of a 5 fl fine or three days arrest), but often joined with their foreign comrade during working hours.[174] Even if a local journeyman chose not to participate, he had to contribute a portion of his salary. Refusal to do so meant ostracism, which at its mildest included insults, but could frequently result in physical abuse from which there was no escape since the "misdeed" was communicated to the journeymen of whatever town to which he had fled.

The loss of labor through carousing or ostracism infuriated the masters, who appealed to the city magistrate for help. But as the records of the Munich hatters guild demonstrate, the resultant prohibitions were ineffective. In 1817, 1819, and 1826, the journeyman hatters were forbidden to carry on the practice; but rather than break tradition, the journeymen gave their incoming comrades the money to pay for the entertainment instead of paying it directly themselves.[175] This, of course, did not satisfy the police, who called in the two leaders of the journeymen to hold them personally responsible to see that this abuse ceased completely.[176]

The result was a split between those journeymen who preferred to cease paying for incoming journeymen (presumably those who were more or less settled in Munich) and those who wanted to defy authority to maintain tradition. The latter accused the former of having instigated the ban against carousing, began to insult all who worked with them, and told all incoming wanderers of the perfidy of the "police journeymen," thus making their names known "throughout Germany."[177] If allowed to continue, such action

[171] Ibid., pp. 108–111.

[172] Augsburg, Memmingen, Nürnberg, Regensburg, Salzburg, Stuttgart, Ulm, and Vienna. SAL, D 51, 209, Police director to Duke Friedrich, Stuttgart, March 10, 1803.

[173] Bopp, p. 50.

[174] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 2197, Hatter masters to magistrate, Munich, nd [1817].

[175] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 2197, Hatter masters to police, Munich, February 7, 1826.

[176] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 2197, Protocol Munich magistrate, Munich, February 19, 1826.

[177] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 2197, Hatter masters to police, Munich, August 23, 1826.

would have deprived all who had opposed carousing of work and travel support if they decided to leave Munich. Consequently, the police acceded to the masters' wishes and the open attack on those journeymen ceased. Apparently, this was effective since no record exists of further problems with the hatters (although the problem of carousing certainly continued among other guilds and in other parts of Germany).

Closely related to carousing in the eyes of the state was the practice of the Blue Monday in that it too deprived the masters (and thus the entire economy) of the journeymen's labor. Worse still, from the authorities' point of view, it was a threat to public safety since journeymen often used the day to meet at their *Herberg* to deal with the affairs of their association. Probably originating in the pre-Reformation period as a religious holiday during Lent, Blue Monday took on a secular significance as it became the common practice for journeymen not to work on Monday during the rest of the year as well, or to work for only part of the day. By the nineteenth century, this abuse was committed less by the entire *Gesellenschaft* than by individuals or small groups of journeymen who preferred to spend a few hours in a tavern rather than in a workshop. A Nürnberg master tanner complained to the police that one of his journeymen, Georg Schwarz, had been celebrating Blue Monday for the last eighteen weeks, in spite of warnings to stop. Now that his four other journeymen sought to follow Schwarz's example, he had to be punished.[178] Schwarz was fined and had to serve forty-eight hours police arrest.[179]

While carousing and celebrating Blue Monday were considered abuses, the symbolism underlying the two had largely been lost. It was quite different with the making of journeymen. By the nineteenth century, most of the South German states had some provision whereby when an apprentice completed his training, the local police or guild authorities would promote him to journeyman (usually upon payment of a small registration fee). Henceforth, all that was necessary for the youth to prove to officials that he was indeed a journeyman was for him to produce his wander book—a document issued only to journeymen and one which every journeyman had to have.

To the journeymen, however, this was insufficient. For centuries they had participated in the promotion process, and in their eyes no one was a journeyman until he had undergone the traditional ceremony in the presence of the *Gesellenschaft*. As a rule, this meant the payment of several fees and footing the bill for the food, drink, and tobacco consumed by his new brothers at his promotion (a sum that could easily exceed 2 fl).[180] Those who refused would be treated as apprentices by the other journeymen of their craft and completely shunned, even if the police promoted them. The result, as in the case of the journeyman hatter Michael Laemmer who had refused to pay, was that he could no longer ply his craft anywhere in Germany and had to accept work in a factory.[181]

Journeyman-making (*Gesellenmachen*) clearly meant that membership in the journeyman association of one's craft was compulsory, and that the journeymen were holding meetings on their own authority, a practice which the states were trying to end. Frequently instructions were sent to the district and local governments to abolish entirely the participation of journeymen in the promotion of apprentices. But because of its symbolic importance (and the revenue that it produced), the journeymen were loath to surrender to the will of the state and continued the practice in all ways possible.

The method that they used was to demand a journeyman certificate or license (*Gesellenschein* or *Gesellenfreischein*). Without it a stranger would have beer thrown in his face, be ejected from the hostel, and be unable to obtain work.[182] This certificate was purchased by the journeyman from the *Gesellenschaft* at the time of his promotion, or from the local journeyman association in the town where he sought employment or travel support. Once purchased, the certificate was valid wherever the craft was practiced.

It was this aspect, that the fraternities transcended local boundaries, which the governments sought to suppress. The issue was an important one, since as a matter of practical authority over the journeymen, the definition of these latter became crucial. If the wander book was sufficient, then the state defined and controlled the journeymen; if a license was necessary, then the journeymen's rules and customs applied and the associations maintained their authority and their autonomy. Consequently, whenever a journeyman certificate appeared, the police were quick to act.

Kasper Dürr, a journeyman turner, discovered to his dismay in 1843 that the Bavarian authorities were serious about the ban on journeyman-making and journeyman certificates. Because he had taken part in the promotion ceremony and had used a certificate, he received the harsh punishment of three days police arrest, was placed under police supervision, had his wander book marked with his offenses and punish-

[178] StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 27 Nachtrag 1, Master turner Heerdegen to police, Nürnberg, August 23, 1841.

[179] Had Schwarz continued his wanderings before his punishment, as often happened for legitimate reasons such as a delayed judgment, the punishment would be carried out wherever the journeyman was now employed and notification would be sent to the originating authorities. See, for example, StAN, Hauptregistratur C 7 VI b 7, 27 Nachtrag 1, Nürnberg magistrate to Würzburg magistrate, October 3, 1841.

[180] StAM, Gewerbeamt, 512, Police to city magistrate, Munich, June 22, 1836.

[181] SAM, LRA, 137708, Protocol journeyman hatter Michael Laemmer, Regensburg, August 19, 1858.

[182] Ibid.

ment, and was no longer allowed to wander outside Bavaria.[183] Dürr was a Bavarian, so the authorities had no difficulty in dealing with him. But what could the individual state do for abuses occurring in a neighboring state?

The journeyman tinsmiths of Darmstadt, Kassel, Mainz, Mannheim, and Munich were reported to be demanding certificates from wandering journeymen before they were allowed to seek work or support. In Württemberg, on the other hand, a wanderer had only to display his wander book to identify him as eligible for the same benefits as the locals. Consequently, if Württemberg journeymen were, in effect, put at a disadvantage, ought not foreign journeymen of the relevant trades to be denied permission to wander in Württemberg, or at least be unable to participate in the arrangements available to assist wandering journeymen?[184] The only alternative to retaliation was for the state governments to cooperate in suppressing this abuse.

The medium through which this could be accomplished, the federal Diet (*Bundestag* or *Bundesversammlung*) of the German Confederation (*Deutscher Bund*), already existed. After the collapse of the Holy Roman Empire in 1803 and the destruction of the Napoleonic protectorate, the Confederation of the Rhine, in 1813, a new means of organizing the independent German states had to be developed. At the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815) where the victors were preparing for a post-Napoleonic Europe, a federation of sovereign princes and cities was established in order to preserve the external and internal security of Germany as well as the independence of the individual member states. The federal Diet, a gathering of ambassadors of the thirty-nine member states, was the organ through which the states were to work, and since the wandering journeymen traveled from state to state, it was natural that it would attempt to deal with their misdeeds.

In fact, confederate involvement was really a continuation of what the old Empire had attempted, only now the states were stronger and the Confederation was more tightly organized, allowing for more efficient execution of mutually agreed upon actions. About a century after the Imperial Edict of 1731, the German states began a concerted action to destroy what remained of the journeyman associations. In spite of the prohibitions, the governments discovered that the fraternities could still be found in Germany and in several neighboring states, demonstrating that the legislation directed against them by the individual governments had not been fully effective.

In August, 1835, the Saxon ambassador called the Diet's attention to the fact that journeyman associations existed in almost every guild and that the old "excesses"—promotion of apprentices, journeyman licenses, the exercise of independent jurisdiction over the membership—continued unabated, since the journeymen knew how to avoid police surveillance. Since these organizations could also be used for political purposes, he argued that the Confederation ought to ban them. Saxony, however, was concerned with more than the immediate political effects of the journeyman associations since a question of social equity was also involved. The journeyman certificate was forbidden in Saxony, but as long as other states tolerated them, Saxons would be unable to count on the support to which they were entitled, but which would be available to those with the illegal documents. The only way to end such abuses and inequities was for the federal Diet to prohibit both the journeyman certificate and the association.[185] In a later session the Saxon ambassador voiced his government's concern over the practice of denying employment to a wandering journeyman or of not supporting him when he was ill, if he could not verify his status with a *Gesellenschein.* Noting that it might simply be replaced by some other illegal proof of identity if it were prohibited, the federal Diet ought to decree once and for all that each wandering journeyman who had received a state-issued verification of his status would need no other verification. In this way, he concluded, the journeymen would "never lack work or the customary support."[186]

This, however, was overly optimistic, given the excess of journeymen over employment possibilities. The real problem, which the Saxon government had missed, was that since German society was no longer static, an economic system predicated on constancy would not be able to accommodate itself to relatively rapid growth and development. But few in the Confederation were able to grasp this point, and the federal Diet was structured so as to follow traditional approaches rather than what were perceived to be novelties.

Consequently, while the committee appointed to study the matter acknowledged that those journeyman associations "dangerous to the state" could easily be concealed in the guise of the traditional fraternities, it equivocated on the need for the Confederation to act. It concluded that it was in the best interest of the German states to ban the associations and certificates, but since those practices were very closely connected with the very existence of the guilds in several states, the committee would make no decision until all the governments had made their views known.[187]

In early 1836, Bavaria's ambassador explained that his government had decided to abolish the old guild system, a task made easier since the whole system had been "regenerated" and placed under continuous po-

[183] GSAM, Gesandschaft Frankfurt, 343, Unterfranken government to Munich, Würzburg, December 13, 1843.

[184] HSAS, E 65, Deutscher Bund, Verzeichnis 57, 216, Interior Ministry to Foreign Ministry, Stuttgart, February 4, 1843.

[185] *Protocolle der deutschen Bundesversammlung* (hereafter cited as PBV), August 27, 1835, 20, 20th session §324.

[186] PBV, October 20, 1835, 20, 26th session §417.

[187] PBV, September 10, 1835, 20, 22nd session §365.

lice supervision since 1825. Furthermore, he said, existing Bavarian legislation already banned both journeyman associations and certificates so that there were sufficient regulations to deal with journeyman abuses. A confederate decree that would only increase the existing "mass of regulations" would be superfluous. All that was necessary was to carry out the decrees of 1832 that had banned all political associations. A decree regulating the police supervision of the crafts would force the revision of the legislation of the individual states, something that was fully beyond the Diet's competence.[188]

While the governments clearly did want to control the journeyman associations, particularist sentiments and jealousies prevented concerted action. The Bavarian government specifically instructed its ambassador to see that the Diet did not frame or vote on any specific proposals. If such general principles, taken from the "unique circumstances" within the other states, were decreed, they might come into conflict with laws and institutions "uniquely Bavarian" concerning the organization of the crafts and other relevant matters. The ambassador was to sidetrack any proposal that might obstruct Bavarian legislation by limiting the government's free activity.[189]

This remained Bavarian policy until 1840 when journeyman activities had gotten so out of hand that Bavaria no longer wished to prevent the federal Diet from considering uniform actions. Now it appeared as if the policeman's nightmare had come true: an international association of journeymen conspiring to subvert the masters' authority. The Parisian journeyman tailors had struck their masters because of a salary dispute and the attempt to introduce work books (*Arbeitsbücher*, which were even more inhibiting to the journeymen than wander books). In order to continue their opposition, they called upon their colleagues in Dresden (Saxony) for contributions.[190] It was believed that North German journeymen had already sent funds and that the same would happen in the larger South German cities.[191]

Using this as a specter of things to come, the Saxon government revived its earlier proposals, concentrating particularly on winning Bavarian support. In fact, this was easily done. Only Württemberg raised objections on the ground that the symptoms, not the root cause of the problem, had been touched. The basis for Württemberg's position can be found in a memorandum which named Prussia as the state in which the problem of the journeyman certificates was the worst, not coincidentally because in that state public arrangements for the support of wandering journeymen were the least. Under such circumstances, it was argued, private actions were necessary. Until the need for journeymen to support their wandering comrades ended, the "special journeyman organizations" for this purpose would be preserved. Consequently, the "main inducement" for the creation of journeyman associations which exercised authority over their members and which might claim a special property or character would continue in spite of all prohibitions until public arrangements for the support of wandering journeymen were established.[192]

Since no other government supported Württemberg's position, her ambassador voted with the others, and before the end of the year the federal Diet had decreed that any journeyman who violated state law (the Diet, being in effect a diplomatic congress, had no power of legislation) by participating in illegal associations, courts, declarations of boycott, or similar abuses was to be punished, have his wander book marked with the crime and punishment, be sent directly home, and be allowed to work in no confederate state.[193] This draconian measure was quickly published in each member state. Consequently, Bavaria soon sent several home because of "illegal journeyman associations and other abuses," while Bremen returned others to Bavaria.[194]

But this is misleading. As had been the case with the 1731 Imperial Edict, so too did confederate decrees depend on the member governments for enforcement. And in spite of repeated ordinances and decrees, the states found that the journeymen continued their traditional practices unabated. In Württemberg, for example, state law threatened punishment to any journeyman presuming to exercise "official authority in any form" over his colleagues, specifically naming, inter alia, participation in the promotion of apprentices. Nevertheless, the government received reports that journeyman combmakers and chimneysweeps promoted apprentices through their own organs (*Organe*) or by a special act of promotion parallel to that done by the local authorities. The only excuse was that in several confederate states where there was no public support, journeymen were abused and excluded if they could not identify themselves with a document issued by a journeyman association.[195] Until Württemberg journeymen could be protected abroad, it certainly would not pay to enforce the law at home.

Bavaria, moreover, discovered that journeyman glazers and saddlers still maintained a tight network

[188] GSAM, Gesandschaft Frankfurt, 343, Instruction to Bundestag ambassador, Munich, January 29, 1836.

[189] GSAM, Gesandschaft Frankfurt, 343, Instruction to Bundestag ambassador, Munich, March 7, 1837.

[190] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA II, 1672, Letter to Gise, Munich, August 6, 1840.

[191] SAM, LRA, 137711, Oberbayern government to all police, Munich, August 22, 1840.

[192] HSAS, E 65, Deutscher Bund, Verzeichnis 57, 216, Interior Ministry to Foreign Ministry, Stuttgart, October 17, 1840.

[193] PBV, December 3, 1840, 25, 27th session §310.

[194] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA II, 1672, Instruction to Bundestag ambassador, Munich, November 25, 1841.

[195] HSAS, E 65, Deutscher Bund, Verzeichnis 57, 216, Interior Ministry to King, Stuttgart, February 4, 1841.

of fraternities throughout most of Germany and even in some Bavarian cities.[196] Membership fees were demanded and contributions for the support of wandering journeymen were collected, while the funds were controlled solely by the association's officers without master supervision. Those who refused to participate were persecuted and could find no employment, since any master hiring them would immediately lose all his other journeymen. Consequently, especially in North Germany, masters and journeymen requested the journeyman certificate as the only papers of legitimacy, in spite of the confederate decree of 1840.[197]

When complaints were made to the federal Diet about nonfulfillment of the decree, the complaint was sent to committee, where it vanished. In spite of repeated requests for action, nothing was done. Whatever successes the states had against the journeymen—Bavaria reported that in 1846–1847 there was no single case of punishment or expulsion for illegal journeyman associations or other abuses[198]—was due to the enforcement of their own laws, not to confederate cooperation. Yet all was not well. The social and economic problems facing the journeymen were intensifying, creating a situation ripe for an outburst. Strikes and boycotts sprang up sporadically in the 1840s, and some journeymen could always be found in popular demonstrations.

It was this aspect, the restlessness and apparent rootlessness, that tempered the paternalistic attitude of the governments toward journeymen. State officials looked back on the riots of the eighteenth century in the context first of the French Revolution with its liberating and antiaristocratic impulses, then of the July Revolution of 1830 which reminded the princes of their vulnerability. Many journeymen had joined with armed students in 1813–1814 in the War of Liberation against Napoleon, and while there was little political activity in the years after 1815, the authorities still lumped journeymen into the same category as students, liberals, and revolutionaries.

There was evidence to indicate that the July Revolution in France had created an echo among German journeymen, some of whom began to express their dissatisfaction with their condition in the German economy and society and to participate in *Volksfeste* (popular festivals) throughout Germany. Wherever there was trouble, some journeymen were sure to be found. In 1832, the popular festival at Hambach castle in the Bavarian Rhineland, held to celebrate the fourteenth anniversary of the Bavarian constitution with an outpouring of radical rhetoric, counted a number of journeymen among the several thousand participants. Similarly, a few journeymen were involved in the abortive attempt known as the *Wachensturm* (storming of the guardhouse) to seize Frankfurt am Main, the seat of the federal Diet, and were known to have distributed pamphlets with a revolutionary message.

Of particular importance were the politically active journeymen. Small in number relative to the population as a whole and to the journeymen as a group (they made up less than 2 per cent of the crowd at the Hambach gathering, for example), because of their mobility, the authorities feared them as carriers of revolution out of all proportion to their numbers. They were, as was often repeated, "the most effective propaganda on foot."[199] As a tool for revolution, they were believed to be the "cheapest, most certain, and quickest messengers" who needed only a valid travel document and a few coins. The journeymen came and went on foot, could travel on the back roads as comfortably as they wished, even if they lacked money. Those who were clever and aware could be used for everything possible.[200]

But this political awareness was developed not in Germany, but where the political atmosphere was freer and more lively: in Belgium, France, and Switzerland. Not revolutionary thoughts but favorable opportunity for employment drew the thousands of skilled journeymen across the borders. For decades, German journeymen had wandered into Switzerland, worked in several cities and towns for a few years and then returned home, perhaps via a detour through Italy and Eastern Europe or France (especially Paris) and Belgium. Few consciously planned to break all ties with their homes or to do anything but return home where they hoped to be accepted as masters. Consequently, it was only natural that they would come together in societies which could serve as an oasis of homeland culture and companionship.

In Switzerland, as well as in other Western lands to which the German journeyman might wander, political fugitives from the German police, students, professors, and other intellectual emigrées either infiltrated the existing societies or established their own associations in order to politicize and radicalize the wandering journeymen. Ernst Schuler, a former Darmstadt *Gymnasium* teacher, developed the technique of using front organizations like singing societies or reading clubs to gradually indoctrinate the journeymen with radical ideas.[201] Since all the songs and speeches dealt with revolution, and the journeymen were often flattered to be treated as equals by those of higher education, those who had "come together

[196] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA II, 1672, Interior Ministry to all Kreis governments, Munich, June 21, 1842; Interior Ministry to Foreign Ministry, Munich, November 5, 1842.

[197] SAM, LRA, 24108, Oberbayern to police, Munich, June 28, 1842.

[198] GSAM, Gesandschaft Frankfurt, 343, Foreign Ministry to Bundestag ambassador, Munich, January 17, 1848.

[199] Glossy, Karl, *Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz* (Vienna, 1912) **1**: p. xlv.

[200] SAM, LRA, 37584, Graf Seinsheim to Landgericht Erding, Munich, December 11, 1834.

[201] Bopp, pp. 74–75.

only for social pleasures" absorbed the ideas and, consciously or not, spread these ideas when they returned home.[202]

By and large, however, these fears did not materialize: most journeymen remained apolitical and only a few of those who accepted the new ideas seem to have understood them. Nonetheless, the German governments were sufficiently concerned, particularly after some 250 German journeymen celebrated the fourth anniversary of the July Revolution with incendiary speeches and the destruction of several German flags at the Steinhölzi festival near Bern. At first, the South German states sharpened their police surveillance over all journeymen returning from France and Switzerland. Baden's border police were ordered to search carefully the knapsacks of journeymen coming from Switzerland for suspicious writings,[203] and local officials were to inform parents of journeymen in Switzerland of the disadvantages that participation in radical gatherings would hold for their children's future and to request that they ask them to restrain themselves or go to another state where the journeyman associations did not exist.[204] Württemberg district officials were encouraged to dissuade journeymen from wandering to Switzerland or France whenever possible. Those suspected of involvement in revolutionary disturbances or the spread of revolutionary propaganda were to be punished or, if there were insufficient cause for judicial proceedings, were to be expelled to their home state if foreign or transported to their home town and kept under police surveillance if local.[205]

The overly exaggerated revolutionary threat by journeymen led the authorities to want to close the borders to them as they wandered. Carl von Hertling, secretary of the Bavarian legation in Bern, was one of the few who understood the realities of the situation. While making it difficult to travel to Switzerland might be desirable for control, he knew that journeymen could find in no other land work as abundant or as well paid as there.[206] Despite this situation, the Bavarian government did issue a partial ban, declaring certain Swiss cantons off limits to all Bavarian journeymen whether they were employed there or just wandering through.[207]

The next step was for the German states to work together in the federal Diet for a comprehensive ban on journeyman travel to politically dangerous states. The Württemberg foreign minister opposed a generalized ban in spite of the fact that this would mean less political contamination. Such a prohibition would have to create "dissatisfaction" among the numerous journeymen who "so often" wandered to France and Switzerland, while a recall of the thousands already in those states, he argued, would only lead to "a worse situation than the present one," since there was neither work nor sustenance for them in Germany.[208] Württemberg, however, went along with the other members of the German Confederation in early 1835 and forbade travel to places where associations and gatherings that threatened the peace in Germany were tolerated—Belgium, France, and Switzerland.

Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Baden, and Württemberg, supported by Sardinia and Russia, began to put diplomatic pressure on Switzerland to limit the political activities of German journeymen and to expel all political fugitives. Finally, in May and June, 1836, the Swiss authorities began to crack down on the societies and clubs, forcing many Germans to leave the country.[209] Still, the practical effect was slight. The majority of journeymen stayed in Switzerland, while there was no interruption of the wandering through from France.[210] Only at the Austrian border was penetration impossible. Dewald, who had innocently asked for a visa to go to Switzerland, found that it "seemed to be a dangerous piece of land" since he was prevented from wandering there by military troops.[211] Bavarian journeymen requesting visas to travel to one of the restricted countries were to be sent to their home towns immediately, although the government reconsidered and allowed those who had no reason to have been informed of the prohibition to be warned thereof and allowed to wander elsewhere.[212]

The recall of journeymen could cause hardships for their employers, who would be left with unfinished products if they left as ordered. Therefore the police tended to look kindly on requests like that from a journeyman lithographer who asked for an extension of three months and who was believed to be "quiet, devoted to his craft, and generally well-behaved."[213] The police were chagrined, however, as they learned that he was reported to be a member of the revolutionary society "Young Germany," using the cover

[202] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA II, 1642, Report Waldkirch, Zurich, September 23, 1834.

[203] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt 236, 8763, Interior Ministry to Kreis governments, Karlsruhe, September 21, 1834.

[204] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 8763, Interior Ministry to government director Rettig, Karlsruhe, October 14, 1834.

[205] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 8763, Interior Ministry to Kreis governments, Stuttgart, September 5, 1834.

[206] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA II, 1641, Hertling to Foreign Ministry, Baden bei Zurich, August 15, 1834.

[207] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA, II, 1642, Notice in "Der schweizerische Constitutionelle," September 26, 1834, #77.

[208] HSAS, E 33, Geheimer Rat 33, Büschel 1160, Foreign Ministry to King, Stuttgart, October 12, 1834.

[209] Schraepler, Ernst, *Handwerkerbünde und Arbeitervereine, 1830–1853* (Berlin, 1972), pp. 37–38.

[210] Brugger, Otto, *Geschichte der deutschen Handwerkervereine in der Schweiz, 1836–1843* (Bern & Leipzig, 1932), p. 30.

[211] In Fischer, Wolfram, *Quellen zur Geschichte des deutschen Handwerks* (Göttingen, 1957), p. 12.

[212] GSAM, Gesandschaft Frankfurt, 343, Instruction to Bundestag ambassador, Munich, January 8, 1835; Bundestag ambassador to Foreign Ministry, Frankfurt/Main, January 16, 1835; Foreign Ministry to Bundestag ambassador, Munich, February 7, 1835.

[213] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 8796, Oberrheinkreis government to Interior Ministry, Freiburg, October 1, 1836.

name of "Cromwell."[214] There is no record of his return to fulfill his military obligations as he had promised.

Even before the ban, if a wandering journeyman were in Switzerland with permission, the visas and notices of employment were stamped in his wander book, automatically bringing him to the attention of the police. Realizing the problems this would cause, the journeyman carpenter Georg Herrmann requested a new wander book. Not surprisingly, he was turned down, since "his several years in Switzerland should and must be kept open for the information of each police authority and thus elicit the maintenance of an alert observation of him."[215]

The ban on wandering to the three countries was lifted in 1840 by Bavaria, but this was not openly published so as not to encourage such travels.[216] When it finally was published two years later, only those with "fully irreproachable character and continually blameless behavior in political matters" and who had especially good reasons for their request would be given visas.[217] Even this limited freedom was canceled with a renewal of the ban in 1845. Certainly the danger of seduction must have been too great.

Yet when revolution broke out throughout Central Europe in 1848, it did so less as a result of radical agitation than because of a series of bad harvests beginning in the early 1840s and a corresponding downturn throughout the other sectors of the economy. More and more masters were dismissing their journeymen since they no longer had sufficient business to afford their salaries. The disintegration of the crafts system accelerated and increased the misery of both master and journeyman. This was combined with the discontent of the German liberals through the catalyst provided by the revolution in France in February, 1848. By this time, journeymen and masters were approaching issues from quite opposite directions. The masters, represented by the Craft and Artisans Congress, convened in Frankfurt am Main to pressure the National Assembly (the elected replacement for the federal Diet) to revive the traditional guild constitution. In the face of their current difficulties, the masters looked back to that golden age before the advent of mechanized production when the craftsman had been part of an estate dominating the economic and social life of the cities, when that estate could look upon its place in society with pride. Industrialization, as they saw it, threatened to destroy their independence by driving them from their shops into factories as labor for hire. Rejecting the ideals of the nineteenth century, which honored individual ability and exalted change and progress, the masters demanded a restoration of guild control over the crafts from which factories were to be excluded.

As a part of this, journeymen were to be kept "in a condition of subordination" as a matter of principle if "order and progress" were to be possible. While this was to prevent journeymen from competing with master craftsmen for as long as possible, it was clothed in terms benevolently paternalistic: "They are after all our children, how can it occur to us to neglect them!"[218] But children see most problems in personal terms and are thus unable to deal with major issues affecting an entire level of society. Consequently, the masters were perfectly consistent in excluding the journeymen from all deliberations.

The journeymen, of course, realized what underlay all the fine words: further limitations on their already limited independence in nonguilded trades and greater personal dependency on the masters in the guilded ones.[219] Instead of easing the path for them to attain masterhood, the masters were going to make it even more difficult. Consequently, when it became clear that, while they might remain at the Congress to listen but not to participate, the journeymen walked out to form their own German Workers' Congress which offered its own program for the National Assembly to consider.

While they endorsed the guild system generally, the journeymen resented the masters' "arrogant guardianship" and their treatment of journeymen—"the real producers, those who are the essence of Germany"—as minors. And while the journeymen were no friends of unlimited freedom of occupation, they rejected the masters' plan to limit factories since this would prejudice the interests of those who had become part of the journeyman estate by working in them.[220] Furthermore, to deal with the problem of wandering (which they accepted for the most part), they proposed that the guild treasuries provide all necessary funds for workers wandering between jobs, that travel money requirements and the sending home of a journeyman who had spent too much time traveling without employment should cease, and that the police should treat journeymen humanely, rather than hold them in tutelage. Finally, they requested job protection through a "German Ministry of Labor," the right to vote at

[214] GlAK, Ministerium des Innern, Abt. 236, 8796, Interior Ministry to Oberrheinkreis government, Karlsruhe, October 10, 1836.

[215] StAN, Aeltere Magistrats Registratur C 6, II 8. 6. Nr 1, Landgericht Würzburg to Nürnberg magistrate, Würzburg, April 14, 1835.

[216] GSAM, Deutscher Bund MA II, 1653, Interior Ministry to Kreis governments, Munich, January 11, 1840.

[217] Held, Max, *Das Arbeitsverhältnis im Nürnberger Handwerk von der Einverleibung der Stadt in Bayern bis zur Einführung der Gewerbefreiheit* (Stuttgart & Berlin, 1909), p. 63.

[218] Bundesarchiv—Aussenstelle Frankfurt/Main (hereafter cited as BAF), DB 51, 124, Protestation von 10,000 Gewerbsmeister, Augsburg, September 6, 1848.

[219] BAF, DB 51, 121, Petition of journeymen and workers to National Assembly, Augsburg, July 26, 1848.

[220] SAL, E 170, 204, Economic Committee report to National Assembly, Frankfurt/Main, March 30, 1849.

age twenty-one, state supported Sunday trade-schools, courts of arbitration for trade matters, and a shorter work week.[221]

None of these demands was seriously considered by the National Assembly's National Economic Committee in its report concerning a uniform trade law for Germany. A minority report, however, did forward the journeymen's wishes and included their view that the obligatory nature of the period of wandering ought to be ended. Both the committee's minority and the journeymen acknowledged the benefits of wandering for some journeymen, but wanted to leave it up to the individual to decide. Should he wish to wander, then he deserved guild support and the right to travel freely from state to state, free from "unnecessary tutelage and overzealous discipline" by the police. They argued that if the police treated the journeyman well and if he were given the chance to become a productive member of society, the danger of proletarianization would be removed[222]; the journeyman would not become bitter toward society, which was usually the case.

These views carried little weight in the National Assembly, none among the masters, and, in the end, did not matter. The National Assembly would dissolve within a few months, having accomplished nothing for the journeymen. While the old fears remained in the revived German Confederation, especially when it was discovered that radicals were collecting money for revolutionary purposes from journeymen under the guise of founding charitable organizations,[223] and while the question of setting up new journeyman ordinances was occasionally raised, nothing came of it.

By the middle of the century, the journeymen found themselves adrift in a society other than that which their traditions could comprehend. The process of deterioration had begun well before the Metternichian era, but because of the forces unleashed during and after the French Revolution—economic, social, political—the pace of change accelerated so that the guilds were transformed, leaving the journeymen without a place in the modernizing society. Impoverished, despairing of attaining masterhood, many simply became laborers. Some, of course, did eventually become masters, although the autonomy and power that the guilds once wielded were gone. Others became factory workers, earning the desired livelihood, but without the honor of the guild, and others became successful entrepreneurs. Yet successful or not, all had one thing in common. None was able to feel part of a journeyman class; none was able to depend on a journeyman ethos for security; none was able to seek assistance from a journeyman association. Economic change and the force of political authority had made all that impossible.

[221] SAL, E 170, 211, German Workers' Congress to Zentralstelle für Gewerbe und Handwerk, Frankfurt/Main, November 1, 1848.

[222] SAL, E 170, 204, Minority Report to National Assembly, Frankfurt/Main, March 30, 1849.

[223] GSAM, Deutscher Bund, MA II, 1825, Bockelburg to Foreign Ministry, Munich, March 19, 1850; HSAS, E 65, Deutscher Bund, Verzeichnis 57, 248, Interior Ministry to Foreign Ministry, Stuttgart, March 25, 1850.