Appendices A and B

Part of: Reinder Klinkhamer, ***'Capitalist Cattle Farming in the Eastern Low Countries (c.1470-1570): Bridging the "Commercialisation" and "Property Relations" Approaches to Rural Economic Change',*** BMGN – *Low Countries Historical Review*, 141:2 (2026) 33-60. DOI: https://doi.org/10.51769/bmgn-lchr.23487).

Appendix A

The rather unsystematic nature of the 1570s tax registers renders a further discussion necessary for assessing their value as a representation of the organisation of the agricultural economy in Zeddam and Netterden. First, the tax was repartitioned among the owners of properties that could yield income (*erfgoederen*). These were not limited to agricultural lands and farms. In a draft appeal to the Guelders chancelry expressing concerns about their share in the tribute, representatives of inhabitants mention how the partition was to be organised. It would be based on a previous tribute dating from 1532, and include all landownership, leaseholds, and rents (*renten*).[1] A declaration dating from 1572, however, also mentions tithes and fishing rights as taxed properties.[2] I excluded all properties explicitly referred to as tithes, fisheries, and houses without land. I also excluded all unnamed properties which only represent 0.03% of all taxed lease value in Netterden and 0.5% in Zeddam.

Secondly, since the local repartition was based on the ownership rather than the usage of land, not all users are recorded consistently. Apart from the small group of individuals explicitly mentioned as using properties, I counted all leaseholders as land users. This assumes that subletting was not widespread.[3] The main problem lies with distinguishing the cases where the user is omitted due to negligence from cases in which the owner was also the property's user. I consider the users of all properties with no recorded leaseholder or where the owner cannot be directly identified as its user as unknown. This does not fundamentally alter the presented results. Assuming all properties with unknown users were used by their owners also yields a sample of thirteen large-scale pastoral farmers (defined by properties worth more than 120 *daler* excluding farms, farmsteads, and arable fields) who

1 ECAL, HB, cat. nr. 1662, scan 12.

2 ECAL, HB, cat. nr. 1662, scan 21.

3 I could only find two cases in which a different leaseholder and user are mentioned in the 1570s tax registers: ECAL, HB, cat. nr. 1666, fs. 20, 26.

Published by Royal Netherlands Historical Society | KNHG

DOI: 10.51769/bmgn-lchr.23487 | www.bmgn-lchr.nl | e-ISSN 2211-2898 | print ISSN 0165-0505

used 26.4% instead of 26.1% of all leasehold in the parishes of Zeddam and Netterden combined.

Finally, the tax registers do not cover the entire agricultural economy because they lack information on the lands owned by local common property regimes known as the *marken*. These lands mostly consisted of woodlands and heaths but also, at least in the case of Stokkum, of meadows. *Marken* governed the use of commonly owned wastelands all over the eastern Low Countries. They were associations of a select group of shareholders who, based on the number of shares they held, enjoyed use rights and could join the decision-making of the *marken*.[4]

A number of normative sources (especially regulations) and administrative sources produced by the *marken* have been preserved, but they mostly deal with the exploitation of woodlands. They were used by the members of the *marken*, who, again based on the number of shares in their possession, had the right to cut a number of trees and drive a number of pigs into the forest during the pannage season in autumn – when pigs were fed on acorns and beechnuts. The local population, meanwhile, was granted limited grazing rights in the woods – though these were eventually abolished around the mid-sixteenth century – and the right to use the 'bare' heaths for grazing livestock and cutting sods to be mixed with manure (a practice known as sod-manuring or *plaggenbemesting*).[5] As was the case in most sandy areas of the Low Countries, these lands remained an integral part of the local agricultural economy dominated by mixed farming. It is thus highly unlikely that the absence of these common lands from the tax registers hides from view another type of large-scale and potentially capitalist pastoral farming. More importantly, the *marken* only owned lands on the sandy soils of the moraine in the western part of the parish of Zeddam where the large-scale pastoral farmers were not active. The absence of the *marken* lands thus probably leads to an overestimation of the graziers' share in the total rural economy of Zeddam but does not fundamentally affect their prominence on a local scale or in the parish of Netterden.

Appendix B

The data on the average yield per hectare is retrieved from the HisGis database as follows. I selected the pastures by including all properties marked as *Weiland* (pastures) in the column of *soort eigendom* (type of property), while

4 On the *marken* in general see: Jan Luiten van Zanden, 'Chaloner Memorial Lecture. The Paradox of the Marks: The Exploitation of Commons in the Eastern Netherlands, 1250-1850', *Agricultural History Review* 47:2 (1999) 125-144.

5 See the regulations and instructions for a forest ranger (*Vorster*) published in: J. J. S. Sloet (ed.), *Geldersche Markerechten*, part 2 (Martinus Nijhoff 1913) 37-65; For lists of owners of shares in the *marke* of Stokkum see: ECAL, HB, cat. nr. 7428.

the locations are based on the names of settlements recorded in the column of *plaatselijke benaming* (local name). It is impossible to establish the extent to which this covers the exact settlements recorded in the 1570s tax registers, but the main settlements could be distinguished in both based on their names. In most cases, the names are identical. Only the settlements of Zeddam and Netterden are both referred to as 'Het Dorp' (The Village), so an additional selection criterium was necessary based on the category of 'Gemeente' (municipality) which was set at 'Zeddam' and 'Netterden' respectively. The cadastre also divides the settlement of Groot Azewijn into three parts 'Azewijn ten Oosten', 'Azewijn ten Westen', and 'Azewijnsche Broek' which are taken together as 'Groot Azewijn' in table 3. Klein Azewijn is not mentioned but subsumed under the heading 'Vethuizen'. Table 3 includes both in the location of Klein Azewijn. The settlements of Speelberg, Borghees and areas to the west of Netterden could not be included because when the 1832 cadastre was drawn up, they were German. Finally, the relatively high share of graziers' holdings recorded under Zeddam and the relatively small share recorded under Vethuizen and Klein Azewijn do probably not represent the actual distribution. In the 1570s tax registers, a number of pastures were recorded under Zeddam pastures but referred to as located in Vethuizen.[6]

6 ECAL, HB, cat. nr. 1666, f. 5.