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Abstract

This dissertation examines how human-animal relationships were formed through daily equine trade networks in early modern Germany. As reflections of human cultural values and experiences, these relationships had a significant impact in early modern Braunschweig-Lüneburg both on the practice of horse breeding and veterinary medicine and on the gendering of certain economic resources, activities, and trades. My study relies on archival and cultural sources ranging from the foundational documents of the Hannoverian stud farm in Celle, tax records, guild books, and livestock registers to select pieces of popular and guild art, farrier guides, and farmers’ almanacs. By combining traditional social and economic sources with those that offer insight on daily life, this dissertation is able to show that in early modern Germany, men involved with equine husbandry and horse breeding relied on their economic relationship with horses’ bodies as a means to construct distinct trade and masculine identities. Horses also served as social projections of their owners’ bodies and their owners’ culture, representing a unique code of masculinity that connected and divided individuals between social orders. Male identities, in particular, were molded and maintained through the manner of an individual’s contact with equestrian trade and through the public demonstration of proper recognition of equine value. My study ultimately demonstrates that early modern tradesmen each possessed a number of overlapping cultural identities, which together influenced the direction of state policy and popular economic practices in eighteenth century Braunschweig-Lüneburg.

A product and a motor for reconstruction after the Thirty Years War, farmers bred and took care of the bulk of the German horse population on a daily basis throughout the early modern period. Farmers developed a new socioeconomic identity as tradesmen-farmers, which depended on emphasizing male farmers’ usage of horses over the much more common, widespread, and traditional usage of oxen in agriculture. This newly developing male trade identity did not recognize a corresponding female trade identity beyond her non-trade specific social rank as wife and general help-mate. While medieval agrarian ideals celebrated German peasant couples working the land together and fulfilling their feudal obligations in joint labor, agrarian ideals of the late seventeenth century came to emphasize the agricultural knowledge and
skillsets of male farmers in order to leverage and elevate farmers’ social status and reputation as agrarian tradesmen.

Mediations both inside and outside of smith guilds between large-smith guildsmen and veterinary practitioners created a wide field of trade-associated titles and social hierarchies, each of which with its own implied set of trade knowledges and skills. The chapters of this dissertation demonstrate that like German farmers, large-smiths, hoof-smiths, and horse doctors had also begun to utilize horses’ bodies as cultural capital by the end of the seventeenth century. Yet, their use of horses to construct trade and masculine identities operated along different economic networks and toward different social purposes than farmers. Although servicing both the general iron-smithing and healthcare needs of humans and cattle prior to the Thirty Years War, it was during the period of economic and social reconstruction during the mid-seventeenth century that German large-smiths across the Lüneburg heath began to place a new emphasis on equine medicine and other equine-centric skillsets as iconic smith trade abilities. Independent and guild-based masters also employed equine-related trade skills as a means through which to expand their personal reputation and social status along with improving their economic prospects through guild hierarchies and marriage.
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Chapter One: Introduction

This painting [Figure 1.1] by Peter de Saint-Simon of Kranich, the favorite and famous mount of Anton Günther, the count of Oldenburg, is one of several images that Anton Günther commissioned of his prized stallion. It is also one of only a few visual depictions of Kranich that do not physically associate him with Anton Günther, usually through the comingling of bodies in which the count presented a bold yet stately figure while mounted upon his spirited horse. This stallion was in fact a very popular anthropomorphic means through which Anton Günther showcased his personal abilities as a horseman and savvy statesman through the demonstration of equestrian skill.¹ Here however, Saint-Simon’s portrait of Kranich presents the horse in a pose that appears relatively free from direct human influence. The bridle and tail decoration indicate that human hands have tamed the white stallion, and both the style and detail of the bridle clearly communicate that the horse has a wealthy owner. However, what can be said about the owner of the disembodied hand and arm lifting Kranich’s tail? Whose work is seen and appreciated yet not directly acknowledged?

Whether belonging to a stable-hand or the proud owner himself, the hand is a silent agent of the human influence in—and over—horses’ bodies. Through equine husbandry and veterinary medicine, humans throughout time have wrought large-scale physical and permanent changes in the bodies of the entire Equus species. On the daily level, humans of all ranks have fought to counter and alter horses’ natural inclinations, whether it was a different choice in reproductive partners or a desire to rub off part of their tail against a fence. In the case of this tail’s owner, Kranich was famous for possessing an incredibly long white mane and tail. On the surface, this may seem to be a fond idiosyncrasy of Anton Günther—that he took pride in allowing his horse to grow out its mane and tail naturally—but there is nothing natural about it, unless perhaps one was human. Whether or not domesticated, horses not only do not benefit from lengthy tresses but in fact, overgrown hair can cause injury to horses. For example, the tails of wild mustangs rarely extend pass their ankles since longer tails are caught and ripped out

¹ He had long cultivated a social reputation among noblemen for his abilities with horses, earning from them the nickname of riding master (Rittmeister). He also was known for trading horses during the Thirty Years War in order to bribe armies to leave his lands alone.
in both desert shrubbery and wooded environments. Instead of depicting Kranich in a manner that was truly natural to the stallion himself, Saint-Simon’s portrait illustrates the anthropocentric character of early modern human-equine relationships and hippological knowledge.

The visual pairing of this hand and tail subtly plays upon the universality of early modern human-horse relationships through its highly conscious and symbolic display of both socioeconomic and masculine status. Whether a rural farmer that worked daily with horses or a merchant that only hired a hack for a journey, any early modern person having spent much time with a horse would have recognized that the picture’s equine subject would have required a personal groom just to be in charge of his mane and tail. Kranich would have needed someone watching at all times to see that he did not ruin the natural attributes most prized by Anton Günther and cultivated by his stable-hands. Although Kranich’s mane and tail are free and flowing in the painting, such as one imagines they would appear naturally, his tresses in daily practice were bound up in protective braids. Since Kranich was the count’s favorite and most popular mount, someone would have needed to maintain and rebraid the horsehair at least once a week. Assuming that just one person performed this job, the task of braiding would have taken hours. This groom would also then have had to brush, clean, and condition the mane and tail constantly to prevent hairs from tangling or breaking off. Furthermore, because of Kranich’s white coat, the groom would have had endless work in removing spots and stains.

The historical impact of anthropocentric domestication however goes beyond the rigorous and unenviable task of ensuring that the count’s white horse always appeared tidy and clean. Beginning around the time of this painting during the Thirty Years’ War, the physicality and biological functions of equine bodies became a refigured focus of control through which men of

---

2 Beyond this, a tail that reached the ground would soon be shortened through friction with the ground as well as by other members of the herd stepping on it.
3 This type of hippological knowledge is reflected in contemporary literature, such as Georg Simon Winter’s farmer almanacs specializing in equine veterinary medicine for travelers.
4 In the majority of paintings of Kranich and Oldenburg, Kranich’s mane and tail braids are a central visual element. In these pictures, the braids act as another equine visualization of conspicuous domestication since they obscure over half the horse’s body.
5 For example, a single person takes over an hour either braiding or French-braiding a modern hunter’s mane, which is required to be kept short at less than six inches.
6 White spots, such as in blazes or snips, on horses’ muzzles can also get sunburned, leading to not only pain but also to patches of peeling or red skin. For modern handlers, this means constantly refreshing sunscreen on the affected facial parts throughout the day, and then afterwards reapplying fly repellant around the eyes, ears, and mouth.
all economic orders modified both the physical behavior and social function of horses. Controlling Kranich’s appearance also would have required curbing the most basic of equine behaviors, the ability to run. While restricting Kranich’s free exercise did stem in part from his handlers’ desire to protect the horse from causing himself injury, the situation existed only because of what humans desired of equine domestication rather than as a response to a preexisting natural condition of horses or of equine behavior. The natural beauty of Kranich’s long, white tail in this way validates the actions taken by the humans who seek to preserve it. However, horses have very different valuing systems for their bodies and thus a different perspective on what the natural purposes and shapes of their bodies are. For horses, tails are vital appendages that protect their bodies from stinging insects. For Kranich, having an incredibly long tail would have been very heavy, and it would have meant that he would have been unable to use it for its natural purpose, swatting flies.

**Historical Arguments**

The purpose of my study is not to simply document the anthropocentric world-views of early modern people but rather to employ early modern anthropomorphism towards my own methodological ends. Using anthropocentrism reflexively, I examine what humans believed, practiced, and experienced in the historical past by examining what humans have claimed to know about non-humans. To this end, I use human-animal studies as a method of revealing both how ideas about gender and masculinity changed life on the daily level and how, in turn, daily life influenced gendered practices and beliefs at different levels in early modern German society. In urban daily life, equine husbandry and horse breeding in Braunschweig-Lüneburg were both materially and symbolically important to state politics as well as to local guilds and court tradesmen. Both industries were also crucial to the dynastic aspirations of the Braunschweig-Lüneburg line during Reconstruction, the large-scale economic recovery efforts of urban and agrarian populations both during and following the Thirty Years’ War. Meanwhile, maintaining consistent and reliable patterns of equine health and reproduction was vital to the economic

---

7 Both early modern *Reitkunst* handbooks and modern equestrian guides agree that horses’ ability to run freely (e.g. not on lunge-line, not on halter and lead, and not under saddle) is closely tied to maintaining good internal, external, and mental equine health.
success and social goals of both German farmers and smiths from the late sixteenth through the mid-eighteenth century.

A product and a motor for Reconstruction, farmers bred and took care of the bulk of the German horse population on a daily basis throughout the early modern period. My fourth chapter looks at how farmers developed a new socioeconomic identity as tradesmen-farmers, which depended on emphasizing male farmers’ usage of horses over the much more common, widespread, and traditional usage of oxen in agriculture. 8 This newly developing male trade identity did not recognize a corresponding female trade identity beyond her non-trade specific social rank as wife and general helpmate. While medieval religious and social ideals about agrarian households celebrated German peasant couples working the land and fulfilling their shared feudal obligations, agrarian ideals now emphasized the agricultural knowledge and skillsets of male farmers in order to elevate their social status and reputation as agrarian tradesmen. I show in my second and third chapters that by the end of the seventeenth century, veterinary smiths and practitioners had also began utilizing horses’ bodies as cultural capital but among different economic networks and for different social purposes than farmers. Although servicing both general iron-smithing and bovine healthcare needs, my third chapter shows that during the mid-seventeenth century German large-smiths in cities and villages began to place a new emphasis on equine medicine and equine-smithing skillsets as iconic trade abilities. Independent (e.g. those working by special privilege) and guild-based smiths also employed these equine-related skills as a new means through which to expand personal reputation and social status along with improving one’s economic prospects through guild hierarchies and marriage.

The Duchy of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 1580-1735

Located in the modern German state of Lower Saxony, my study covers the central and eastern regions that were formerly united as principalities of the duchy of Braunschweig-Lüneburg. Emperor Friedrich II in 1235 first granted the Duchy of Braunschweig-Lüneburg to

---

Otto, a member of the well-established Saxon Welf dynasty. Shortly after his death, Otto’s sons in 1267 established two family lines, one centered in Lüneburg and the other in Braunschweig. The Braunschweig line’s adoption of the Saxon horse (*Sachsenross*) as their primary symbol of state in 1361 reflects the enduring power of dynastic ties for the medieval period, as does its continued use to represent the Welfs’ political interests on the battlefield during both the Thirty Years War and the Seven Years War. Over the early modern period, the losses of war and gains of marriage led to several redivisions of political territory between rival dynastic lines and factions. Local ducal courts (e.g. Celle, Hannover, and Wolfenbüttel) oversaw the central territory of Braunschweig-Lüneburg from the sixteenth until the early eighteenth century, at which point it largely fell under the jurisdiction of the Principality and Electorate of Hannover. In 1714, Georg Ludwig, the Prince and Elector of Hannover, gained international importance when he was also crowned as King George I of England.

The region is quite large and possesses a wide range of topographical features. Perhaps the best known of these is the Lüneburg Heath, a sandy area hospitable for grazing sheep and other small animals but for very few other industries. The administrative hub for the duchy’s southern half, Celle, is located along the Aller River on the central border of the southern Heath (*Sudheide*). Celle also serves as the geographic center point of my study. Small towns like Ebstorf, Uelzen, and Bodenteich, which acted as centers of administrative authority as well as important trade centers for large-smiths and other equine practitioners in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, make up the northeastern edge of the southern Heath. Located upstream from Celle on the Aller, Gifhorn retained economic relevance after losing its status as a court city (*Residenzstadt*) in 1546 by acting as a local trade nexus for merchants bypassing the moors along the southern Heath’s southeastern corner, farmers from the neighboring Boldecker region, and tradesmen traveling north from Braunschweig and Wolfenbüttel. The smithing guilds of large cities like Braunschweig and Hannover, which each form a point at opposing ends along the southern border area of my study, also helped drive local trade, as did the increasing number of smaller towns in the seventeenth century that began to host yearly livestock markets. With

---

some exceptions, the farming villages west of Celle maintained a strong regional focus on animal husbandry and breeding large livestock.

In Braunschweig-Lüneburg, livestock ownership—primarily that of horse ownership—determined both the tax obligations and social rank of agrarian households. A major function of regional administrative centers (Amt) was to oversee financial matters like taxation on a more localized scale. For the state official (Amtsmann), this responsibility included overseeing other state officials (e.g. village mayors), interviewing witnesses, recording testimony, and interceding either on behalf of or against a farmer’s petition. Starting in the seventeenth century, local and ducal authorities not only increased farmers’ taxes but also created new state plans, such as in the case of the stud-farm established at Celle in 1735, that were based on taking advantage of the rising equine populations of farmers through added forms of taxation. While the increase in the population of horses was the direct result of—and indeed the physical motor for—farmers’ economic Reconstruction efforts during and following the Thirty Years War, farmers at the same time began to utilize horse ownership and equine husbandry as new forms of cultural as well as of masculine capital.10 As one might imagine, the hippological networks and needs of farmers were quite different from those of wealthy city burghers or of ducal officials.

**Horse Ownership in Daily Life**

Let me begin with a common scenario. Imagine you are a man in mid-sixteenth century Braunschweig-Lüneburg, and you have decided that you would like to get a horse.11 What kind of horses were there, and from which kinds could you pick? If you were a nobleman, then you had access to private bloodlines and stud farms. This meant that unlike wealthy merchants and ordinary tradesmen, you would have had access to specialty horses. Gained through a personal agent or through personal networks, these horses came in a variety of different sizes for martial

---


11 German women of course were able to buy horses, but generally, men of every economic order had greater access to horses than women of the same economic order. For an overview of equine husbandry in early modern Germany, see Heinz Meyer, "Frühe Neuzeit," in *Mensch und der Tier in der Geschichte Europas*, ed. Peter Dinzelbacher (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2000), 293-403.
as well as state and social purposes (e.g. tournaments). At this point, it is important to remember that the modern system of identifying horses by emphasizing breed type over all other types of physical markers and identification systems (e.g. color, economic use, country of origin) was not common in Germany until the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Prior to this period, a few elite horse body types had corresponding breed types. For our mid-sixteenth century noblemen, he would have known about—even though he was unlikely to ever see or meet—the Arabian and the Turkish Barb. The Spanish Andalusian and the Dutch Friesian however would have been much more familiar. Among elite circles in Germany, horses’ body types instead were frequently connected to the noble family that bred for distinctive styles or traits. This was not just deference to the noble’s rank but also quite practical since nobles’ bloodlines very rarely stood the test of time. Occasionally a horse’s body type was so distinctive that its appearance became an identifier rather than its noble “creator,” such was the case with tiger-striped horses or the Württemburg spotted horse.

Outside of the elite private market, early modern men could either purchase a horse publicly from a livestock market or enter into a private deal with family, neighbors, and wandering horse traders. By the mid-sixteenth century, there were a handful of cattle and horse markets held across Germany at two or three regular times during the year (e.g. Johannistag), which meant that one might have had to travel some distance to reach the closest market. In each circumstance, a state official recorded the sale so that the proper taxes were applied and one’s work duties were modified (e.g. Herren- and Spanndienst). While extant livestock records are sporadic for this region during the early modern period (1500-1750), I have organized a large number of livestock tax registers into Appendix D in order to provide a better historical context both for Chapter Two’s discussion of horse breeding and equine veterinary care in early modern print culture and for the development of equine-based trade identities in Chapters Three and Four. This appendix shows that the majority of horse owners lived in the countryside. Belonging either to the agrarian upper (Höfner) or middle (Halb-höfner) class, these horse

---


owners were almost entirely farmers, who as a rule bred their own horses and sold the offspring.\textsuperscript{14} For mid-sixteenth century Braunschweig-Lüneburg, approximately half of village households owned at least one horse, and it was common for farmers to own a pair or even a team of horses. In contrast, all but the poorest households owned at least one cow or ox, and the vast majority of all agrarian households—both farmers and artisans—owned a large number of cattle, usually milk-cows and oxen.

\textbf{The Thin Line between Animals: Animality and Humanity}

Studying the history of the human-animal body challenges many traditional assumptions and generalities made about humans, such as the scientific rationality of human genders and sexes and the natural bounds of the human body itself. Keith Thomas, whose historical scholarship on early modern England precipitated the current emerging field of Human-Animal Studies, has astutely pointed out, “Man’s ascendancy over the animal and vegetable world…has much to offer historians, for it is impossible to disentangle what the people of the past thought about plants and animals from what they thought about themselves.”\textsuperscript{15} Extending Thomas’ claims about human hierarchies for the natural world to include an appreciation of their shared historical environment and survival mechanisms, Juliet Clutton-Brock found regarding daily life, that there has never been a society of humans whose lives were not heavily dependent on and influenced by non-human animals.\textsuperscript{16} Although animals existed prior to \textit{Homo sapiens}, humans have never existed in isolation from other animals. Thus, one cannot understand what a human is without considering how non-human animals interacted with humans and human-made conditions. Human-animal relations should instead be recognized as an intrinsic part of human evolution since non-human animals have given their flesh and labor to both help humans survive

\textsuperscript{14} While not noted specifically on Appendix D, I have found that population and tax records for agrarian households in Braunschweig-Lüneburg show few artisans owning horses.


and create human civilizations.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore the continually evolving co-dependencies of certain human-animal relationships demonstrates that domestication is neither a unidirectional process nor is it a strictly business arrangement, but is instead an ongoing cultural process for both humans and animals.\textsuperscript{18}

For all of its methodological strengths, Human-Animal Studies can have a somewhat modernist bent in that both its popular and academic authors tend to assume that animality can easily be determined on physical grounds.\textsuperscript{19} Yet this assumption does not translate well in the case of the medieval and early modern periods, during which times the theories governing recognition of human corporeal self and communal self were vastly different from those of today. In her work \textit{The Woman Beneath the Skin}, Barbara Duden has argued that early modern femaleness was neither genitally grounded nor always physically apparent on the body itself.\textsuperscript{20} For the premodern person, biological sex was a product of constant negotiation between self and society. From the knowledge that modern absolutes like sex were in no way rigidly defined premodern categories, one can then understand that other modern hierarchies, such as the elevation of the human species above and apart from all other animal species, might not be as clearly cut as previously expected. The early modern belief in the existence of werewolves is just such an example of the potential permeability of the boundary between human and animal. Much as some communities today dispute the theory of evolution because it obscures the line between human and ape, premodern people also were concerned with the boundary between the animal outside the human body and the frightening possibility of the animal inside the human body.

\textsuperscript{17} For more on animals as capital, see Nicole Shukin, \textit{Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).
\textsuperscript{19} For examples of good works that rely upon contemporary understandings of human-animal physicality and difference, see Steve Baker, \textit{The Postmodern Animal} (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2000) and Nigel Rothfels, ed., \textit{Representing Animals} (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002).
\textsuperscript{20} Barbara Duden, \textit{The Woman Beneath the Skin: A Doctor’s Patients in Eighteenth Century Germany} (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1998).
For example, John Friedman and A. W. Bates have tied the human fascination with monstrous births to premodern ideas about human race, animality, and hybridity. For Friedman, visual and intellectual representations of monstrous races were both compelling and terrifying for medieval audiences because of how animal hybridity challenged the lines segregating human races as well as humans from other animals. While ancient works like Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* provided numerous humanoid races (e.g. the Baltic Hippopodes, who had horses’ hooves in place of human feet) with physical differences over which to marvel and moralize, these scientific treatises also located species’ markers in cultural habits or characteristics, such as diet and dress. For the early modern period, Bates has shown that the amount of children born at one time could separate a mother—or her entire race in the case of non-Europeans—from her claim to humanity, as the practice of bearing more than two or three children was associated with domesticated animals like dogs or cats that birth litters.

Maintaining physical ties and social continuity between neighbors was central to premodern worldviews. In the name of self-preservation and social order, early modern people used animal monstrosities simultaneously to justify prejudicial or self-beneficial religious beliefs as well as discriminatory cultural practices. Friedman has found that despite a generally heavy reliance on Aristotle’s explanations of the natural world, medieval people were largely unwilling to believe a pagan’s claims about the natural unnaturalness of monsters. Instead, they favored an anthropocentric—and Catholic—interpretation wherein when God created humans, he created them to be naturally perfect, intact, and normative to European physical characteristics. Yet just as Edward Behrend-Martinez has found to be true in his study of the repercussions of childhood castration in early modern Spain, Friedman shows that in daily practice this argumentation was

---

23 Friedman, 8-10, 207.
25 Friedman, 115.
often used to argue that only people with intact and normative bodies could be considered fully human and thus able to be baptized.\textsuperscript{26} Likewise, A. W. Bates has found that while early modern audiences were intrigued by monstrous birth as a regular if infrequent part of the natural world, they tended in daily practice to interpret the presence of such animality or human hybridity as negative divine commentary.\textsuperscript{27} For example, illustrations in pamphlets of monsters could act as socially moralizing emblems that depicted the wages of sin through unnatural bodies. In this way, early modern audiences and authors used real monstrous births to ponder the religious significance of human-animal—and human-demon—hybridity and thus to reimagine the role and power of baptism for European humans as well as the humanoids discovered through imperialist ventures in Africa and the New World.

Since humans write historical and scientific narratives for a human audience, neither anthropocentrism nor anthropomorphism can truly be discussed objectively.\textsuperscript{28} The line defining humanity is subject to cultural biases and cannot be explained or experienced in universal terms. Friedman cites the classification of pygmies as animals as an example of this problem.\textsuperscript{29} Due to their attributed inability to speak, medieval philosophes declared that pygmies lacked a necessary precondition for human rationality. Comparing Western standards of human rationality to those of Japanese society, Pamela Asquith has argued that anthropomorphic uses of animals can be culture-bound and culture-specific in ways that are not readily apparent either to modern eyes or to western scholarship.\textsuperscript{30} For example, Asquith notes that Western culture reaches back to both religious and Cartesian divisions that rely on depicting the human soul and mind as signifier of human rationality whereas Japanese culture recognizes the human-animal divide based on emotionality, such as humans’ ability to cry or laugh.\textsuperscript{31} It is cross-cultural dissonances such as


\textsuperscript{27} Bates, 12.


\textsuperscript{29} Friedman, 192.


\textsuperscript{31} Asquith, 28.
these, which Asquith hopes researchers can avoid by teasing out the complexities and assumptions made by and in anthropomorphisms:

“With a better understanding of underlying assumptions about other species, our endeavors could more profitably be directed toward gathering the evidence and building up rich, verifiable descriptions of animal lives, rather than debating about the merits and demerits of anthropomorphism per se.”

Furthermore, since the boundary between human and animal is not the same between cultures, what anthropomorphism references is always somewhat unclear. Anthropomorphic descriptions and visual representations of animals however are never completely symbolic. Asquith insightfully notes that animal-based metaphors can only exist when they make literal sense through shared human experiences. As human logic is unavoidably anthropocentric, the rules governing the boundaries of human-animal difference and human rationality are both purposefully and arbitrarily altered through a type of cognitive dissonance when interpreting animals in order to reinforce a false human-animal dichotomy.

Supporting Asquith’s conclusions about the fine lines between animality and humanity, Erica Fudge has found that early modern explanations for the human-animal divide were neither absolute nor static and were acknowledged to be constantly in flux. She notes concerning seventeenth century English views that pitted the virtuous human mind against bestial physical pleasures: “The placement of humans between the angelic and the animal creates problems. The human is a self-divided against itself, a constant struggle of mind against body, reason against desire.” Many English humanists were troubled by the mutability of humanity and by animal-like behaviors of both children and the insane. Fudge charges that some early modern philosophers and political theorists held that children lacked the capacity for human rationality, which laudable metaphysical state they achieved only after physical adulthood and participation in normative adult society. Yet, this argumentation had a disturbing corollary. If a child had to learn how to be human, then humanity in theory could be obtained by any animal that sought to
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33 Asquith, 23.
35 Fudge, Brutal Reasoning, 46.
improve itself. Furthermore, if certain aspects of humanity were not granted by God at birth, then humanity was a temporary condition that could be lost again after adulthood:

The dangers of this failure to be truly human—this failure [by children] to use the rational soul—are clear, and are more troubling than would seem possible from the simple assertion that humans...possess that thing which makes them human at birth...Humans can fail to be human. They have the essence, but they do not always use it, and this failure makes them worse than the beings they have become.

Most philosopher-scientists like Francis Bacon and Descartes however viewed the process of gaining and creating knowledge as an intrinsically human ability. Humanity had a divine mandate through Adam not only to name new species but also to control them through the study of natural science and the production of new scientific knowledge. In this way, the Enlightenment science of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries promoted human dominance over other animals as a natural and divine mandate, which had the potential to restore humans to their pre-Fall position as superior Earth creations.

The close relationship between the production of scientific knowledge and the application of this knowledge in support of ideologically grounded social inequalities speaks to not only the lack of objectivity in Enlightenment science but it also reflects the personal biases and class-based experiences of early modern scientists. Friedman has shown that scientific illustrations, which were intended to be accurate and to be informative to audiences, of monstrous races reveal much about the worldview and experiences of artists themselves, such as their beliefs about human gender and social hierarchies. Looking at the institutionalization of scientific knowledge during the eighteenth century in England, Harriet Ritvo has similarly found that the

---

40 Friedman, 134.
process of species’ classification tells more about the classifier than what was classified.41 In part, this subjective application and production of knowledge about the natural world reflected the growing practice of de-legitimizing popular knowledge and non-elite methods of categorizing nature. As an example of this trend, Keith Thomas has traced the artificial evolution of plant names, from descriptive and locally idiosyncratic terms (e.g. mare’s fart and priest’s ballocks) in the English vernacular to abstract and sanitized terms in Latin, which were assigned by elite scientific experts.42

Enlightenment thinkers attempted to bring order to the disorderly and disobedient natural world through reclassifying and reorganizing the natural world.43 These intellectual elites justified their own position at the top of the natural social order by dominating scientific discourse—and thereby privileging knowledge created—about the natural world. As a result, Ritvo finds that “the rhetoric that celebrated the novelty and objectivity of Enlightenment systematics simultaneously signaled and created a gulf between all succeeding naturalists and previous students of the animal creation.”44 Reflecting what Fudge has termed the “New Science” perspective, these elite and highly educated men exercised power over the lower classes along with non-human animals by recognizing themselves as the highest human order and thus the least animal-like of humans.45 By the late eighteenth century, this institutional domination of natural science and biology led to European intellectual and political elites’ self-recognition as the most competent and skilled human authorities over the natural world. In daily practice, the scientific worldview that they idealized became a tool through which these elites sought to naturalize the subordination of local lower classes, racialized others, and non-human animals.46

42 Thomas, 85. See also Harriet Ritvo, *Platypus and the Mermaid*, 15-17. In this work, Ritvo demonstrates that the international scientific community was divided against each other as to the best way to organize the natural world since there were competing taxonomic models (e.g. Linnaeus and Ray).
43 This is not to say that these authors were unified in this approach. Ritvo notes that Linnean nomenclature did not satisfy later eighteenth century and nineteenth century naturalists. Ritvo, 57.
44 Ritvo, *Platypus and the Mermaid*, 16.
45 Fudge, 79. She notes that Montaigne was a rare exception among Enlightenment humanists for considering animals as animals, rather than the objects that the Cartesian mechanists suggested.
Scientific Constructions of Gender

According to critics within several modern scientific fields, not merely early modern scientists such as Descartes or Linnaeus have a problem with scientific objectivity. Gender and anthropocentric biases in contemporary science have been the target of many challenges by feminist scholarship, which seeks to address the problem of institutionalized biological essentialism of human and animal bodies.47 Coming from within the scientific discipline of biology, Anne Fausto-Sterling has written extensively about social biases in scientific studies about the construction and nature of mammalian bodies, while Barbara Noske has urged a feminist approach towards thinking more critically about human-animal relationships in modern scientific settings.48 Mirroring what Ritvo has proven to be historically true about scientific institutions during the nineteenth century, Fausto-Sterling shows that modern scientific communities have frequently inserted themselves into popular debates about human gender and sex.49 Using the false sexual determinism that is commonly attributed by scientists to steroids like estrogen and testosterone as a case study, Fausto-Sterling finds that:

Social belief systems weave themselves into the daily practice of science in ways that are often invisible to the working scientist…Widening our scientific vision would change our understanding of gender. However, of course, such changes can occur only as our social systems of gender change.50

Fausto-Sterling charges that the objectivity of medical experiments to determine the boundaries of the human body has historically been compromised through the interpretation of scientific evidence in gendered and racialized ways: “Ideas of both race and gender merge from underlying assumptions about the body’s physical nature. Understanding how race and gender work—

47 For the perspective of a historian of science, see Londa Schiebinger’s Nature’s Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1993).
48 Barbara Noske, Beyond Boundaries: Humans and Other Animals (New York: Black Rose, 1997). A historian of science, Noske has doctoral degrees in biochemistry and the history of medicine.
49 For example, the practice of sex testing by the International Olympic Committee. Fausto-Sterling, 2-3.
50 Fausto-Sterling, 194.
together and independently—helps us learn more about how the social becomes embodied.”

Similar to Asquith, Noske has found that the framing of scientific experiments can presuppose results and replicate cultural biases as well as play up abnormalities in test subjects and groups to support desired results. Noske finds her evidence in the political aspirations and social insecurities of elite male scientists in nineteenth century Europe, whom she faults for a lack of objectivity and the subsequent result of shoddy science. Needing something to act their masculinity and male dominance out on, these men chose to gender knowledge about the natural world, such that nature became a feminine—and thus passive—force.

Echoing aspects of both Thomas’ and Schiebinger’s arguments, the natural world of Noske’s scientists invited male dominance.

As many studies have shown for the modern period, early modern scientific experts argued that their professional expertise should give them privileged access to others’ bodies and lives. Over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, early modern rulers and political authorities increasingly came to rely on elite scientific philosophies about the natural world to legitimate publically imposing new social controls as well as political and economic policies. At the same time, veterinary and medical practitioners along with other scientists began to wield social power over the voiced opinions and legal rights of (generally) lower status individuals through the new scientific authority granted to them by the early modern state. Claiming legitimacy as representatives of state order and morality, doctors justified professional actions that were influenced by their own highly gendered and classed beliefs rather than scientific objectivity or biological necessity.

As a late twentieth century scientist, Anne Fausto-Sterling examines the situation of intersex children in modern America, whose bodies are often physically operated upon against their own and their parents’ will.
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51 Fausto-Sterling, 7. See also Ritvo, *Platypus and the Mermaid*, 120-130 and 164-174.
52 Noske, 56-58.
54 For example, Jürgen Schlumbohm has found that maternal death was not a concern for doctors at teaching hospitals in eighteenth century Germany. Jürgen Schlumbohm and Claudia Wiesemann, eds., *Die Entstehung der Geburtsklinik in Deutschland 1751-1850: Göttingen, Kassel, Braunschweig* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2004).
55 For more on intersexuality, see Michel Foucault’s *Herculine Barbin* (New York: Random House, 1980) for a discussion of the over-investment of French doctors in surgically treating hermaphroditism during the nineteenth century. See also Alice Dreger, *Hermaphrodites and the Medical Invention of Sex* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard
that the surgical aspects of children’s sexual reassignment are terribly subjective (e.g. at what length is a clitoris too close to a penis and at what point is a penis too small to save). Fausto-Sterling notes that in most cases, children’s sex changes are cosmetic alterations, which do not serve any practical scientific purpose and which can be heavily damaging to the child’s body and psyche (e.g. causing the child to become incontinent or to lose the ability ever to become physically aroused). Whether or not consciously aware of their behavior, these doctors dominate the bodies of intersex children and their parents in order to conform to and reproduce an unscientific, cultural belief in human sexual duality that rejects the physical evidence of lived bodies and genders.

Following a similar logic, Noske finds that the medical establishment pursues personal and political aims by rejecting the physicality of living animals. Recognizing human-animal bodies alone as worthy of either ethical or humane consideration, scientists portray medically unnecessary and physically invasive experimentation performed on non-consenting animals as scientifically laudable. Through its domination by humans’ pursuit of scientific knowledge, the non-human animal body becomes a feminized, controllable machine, meaning that its body’s reactions to scientific experiments are represented as or claimed to be objective results. Thus the denial of a non-human animal’s materiality and lived experiences is simultaneously used to legitimate human-animal hierarchies intended to offer information of interest and medical application to humans as well as to justify its inhumane treatment through scientific enterprises.

While doctors may claim that the unwanted and invasive surgery is performed for the child’s and parents’ benefit, Fausto-Sterling notes that hermaphroditism is common within nature and among animal species. Furthermore, she argues that recurrent institutional insistence on
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56 Fausto-Sterling, 75-7. Since there are at least three hormones that influence biological sex and since the two so-called sex hormones testosterone and estrogen actually code for a number of different biological and physical ends other than strictly for reproductive and gender purposes, sex hormones are falsely understood to be binaries. Furthermore, Fausto-Sterling notes that both modern and nineteenth century scientists have wrongly employed these same hormones to naturalize heterosexuality.

57 Fausto-Sterling, 85.

58 Noske, 84.

59 Noske.

60 Fausto-Sterling, 54.
the biological veracity of sex and gender binaries restricts scientific research along with other forms of intellectual scholarship. Just as Asquith criticizes the pseudo-scientific claims of Western scientists tying the possession of rationality and knowledge to their definition of humanity, Fausto-Sterling provides anthropological evidence of human societies that emphasize other physical characteristics (e.g. age) than sex to determine both their social hierarchies and cultural traditions (e.g. linguistic practices like pronoun determination) and that do not recognize the Western standard of biological sex as either a fundamental or significant social category.61 Western scientific communities falsely naturalize human sex and gender, and therefore the cultural fabrication and social construction of human sex and gender remains hidden, particularly to Western-centric understandings of the human body: “Since matter already contains notions of gender and sexuality, it cannot be a neutral recourse on which to build “scientific” or “objective” theories of sexual development and differentiation.”62 Ultimately, Fausto-Sterling concludes that along with those of other mammals, human bodies and sexes are never normative or uniform in either internal or external construction precisely because of humans’ reproductive dependence on genetic variation.63

**History and Living Bodies**

Contrary to the scientific evidence presented by Fausto-Sterling and Noske, Joan Scott has theorized biological sex as a historical constant, such that it is a universal construct both universally significant to and uniformly practiced by all human societies.64 Despite acknowledging that biological sex cannot always be resolved by a simple chromosomal analysis, Scott’s arguments about the importance of considering gender and class as categories of historical analysis depend upon an incorrect scientific belief in only two human sexes.65 Yet it is
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61 Fausto-Sterling.
62 Fausto-Sterling, 22.
63 She makes this argument in her chapter “The Rodents Tale,” but it is also a primary theme of this book. A sample quote from this chapter: “Because the control of hormone synthesis differs between primates and other species, a case can be made that studies on the hormonal basis of sexual behaviors in non-primates tells us little if anything, about primates, including humans” Fausto-Sterling, 232.
65 Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). She also presumes that sex and gender are intrinsically and naturally bound binaries of human existence. For a scientific counterpoint,
in fact because she believes biological sex to be ahistorical, that Scott argues that the experiences and motivations of historical women were not the same:

Questions about the constructed nature of experience, about how subjects are constituted as different in the first place...are left aside. The evidence of experience then becomes evidence for the fact of difference, rather than a way of exploring how difference is established, how it operates, how and in what ways it constitutes subjects who see and act in the world. \(^\text{66}\)

Due to the variances and pluralities of women’s social and class-based experiences, Scott sees gendered behaviors and class as more unifying factors for women than an artificial social concept of commonality based on biological sex.

Although biological sex has no innate connection to gender, biological sex and gender have long been influential on how one experiences daily life. The patriarchal society of early modern Germany placed great emphasis on naturalizing social inequalities based both on a person’s presumed membership to biological sex and on equating biological sex to the manner in which she or he was able to live their life. Lyndal Roper, Ulinka Rublack, Merry Wiesner, and Heide Wunder have examined different ways that gender roles and economic positions of women in early modern Germany changed following the Reformation. In *Holy Household*, Roper examines groupings of prostitutes, wives, midwives, and holy women in order to see how heteronormativity and patriarchy were perpetuated by Evangelical and Reformed beliefs and by longstanding social practices. She finds that the Reformation sponsored paternal moralism and sought to eradicate all traces of feminine spirituality, which had previously influenced both men and women’s relationships with the divine. \(^\text{67}\) Rublack describes the way that reformers actively used gender as a weapon for propaganda, depicting the pope in feminine terms and celebrating masculine friendships and values as unifiers of the entire Christian community. \(^\text{68}\) For Rublack as with Scott, distinctions between genders reflect socio-economic concerns as well as the way that sexual inequality is justified through rhetoric about the civilizing force.
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see Fausto-Sterling’s chapter “Of Gender and Genitals: the Use and Abuse of the Modern Intersexual,” *Sexing the Body*, 45-77.

\(^{66}\) Scott, “The Evidence of Experience,” 777.


\(^{68}\) Ulinka Rublack in Rublack, ed., *Gender in Early Modern German History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 3-5.
Merry Wiesner has long called for the use of gender history to reexamine the social categories of analysis taken for granted in Reformation history. 69 Wiesner points out that unlike early modern men, women have a long tradition of being discussed as objects of sexual—and thus social—concern. 70 For example in Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World, she looks at the scholarship on social discipline and how marriage as a form of social control of women was instituted by the Reformation. In these histories, women exist only to be characterized through the patriarchal weight placed on normalizing heterosexual social relationships. Just like Roper, Wiesner disproves assertions by earlier historians that since male society expected women to be passive, they were. 71 She goes further to state that communities themselves were fractured, despite the ideal of communal strength praised by reformers and stressed by secular authorities. 72 Like Roper, Wiesner is troubled by the modern tendency to read early modern bodies and to write early modern history with hegemonic motives. She is concerned by subjective academic works that perpetuate the myth of heteronormativity as well as those that minimize the historical effects of sexual inequality and gendered social relationships. 73 In response, Wiesner argues that research on sexuality is vital to a proper understanding of early modern Germany. As she shows, state and religious officials not only sought to control the sexual practices of the general population as a means to legitimize Reformation beliefs and practices, but by the eighteenth century, fornication had become a crime policed only in women, such that rape no longer carried great legal or social penalties for men. 74

Looking beyond the Reformation, Heide Wunder approaches the issue of social practices and relationships by arguing for a more inclusive, relational understanding of the role of gender in early modern German society. She argues that relations between genders were socially

70 Wiesner, Christianity and Sexuality, 61.
71 Wiesner in Ulinka Rublack, ed., Gender in Early Modern German History (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 159. See also Rublack in Rublack, 10.
72 Wiesner in Rublack, 163.
73 Wiesner, Christianity and Sexuality, 8-9.
74 Wiesner, Christianity and Sexuality, 67 and 81-83.
created and experienced in complementary, if unequal, ways. One aspect of this argument for example is noting that male dominance was not synonymous with patriarchy since being a father was an acquired social position. Contrary to the Scott and Rublack, Wunder finds that sex and gender were more important to the daily lives and decisions of early modern women than their individual class cultures. In terms of sexuality and historiographic heteronormativity, Wunder demonstrates that far from being natural destinies, marriage and parenthood were directly tied to early modern social hierarchies and to enforcing sexual inequalities. No matter the biological sex, one was not guaranteed the right to marry and to have children.

Gender and trade-related questions are part of the historiographic debate about the sexual division of labor prior to the development of highly gendered private and public living spheres in eighteenth century European society. Employing a cultural methodology towards examining the interplay of gender with household economic practices, Clare Crowston has found that there was not a single model of patriarchy practiced in early modern France:

Instead of positing one patriarchal family economy, we must acknowledge that a range of different familial and economic strategies existed for men and women. These alternatives potentially reinforced, paralleled, or undermined the patriarchal family as a discrete unit of production and consumption.

Contrary to critiques of early industrialization’s diminutive effect on women’s labor and social identities, Crowston argues that French seamstresses owed their success precisely because of the growing sexual division in labor and because of the changing cultural concepts of gender in society during the late eighteenth century. These new ideas, like that which construed the ability to sew as dependent on sex, were propagated by working women as well as men.
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75 Wunder in Rublack, 22-23.
76 Wunder in Rublack, 21.
78 Lyndal Roper has argued that the concern about women’s fertility and the related social expectation of female heteronormativity was a major factor in witch accusations. See Lyndal Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Sexuality and Religion in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 1994).
81 Concerning the Old Regime’s legacy in the nineteenth century, see Crowston, 385.
Although eventually invoking cultural repression of female workers, these assumptions were exploited originally to great benefit by seamstresses against male rivals. 

**Early Modern Masculinity**

Although my work ties masculinity and horses to a number of changing trade practices in eighteenth century Germany, I am not explicitly linking the growth of gender and economic hierarchies within equine-centric trades to larger narratives about the impact of industrialization on human society. Instead, I think that it is a much more important project for historians to study how gendered beliefs and codes of behavior operated and were experienced on the daily level. Continuing the good work of Wunder and Crowston in this direction, I seek to discover the intricate negotiations, performances, and experiences of both women and men. To this end, my work on early modern masculinity unravels the many ways that gender in the form of patriarchal beliefs and practices influenced aspects of daily life, particularly in trades and economic networks. Since cultural identities intersect on multiple levels in daily practice for both women and men, multiple social categories (e.g. animality, gender, class) can simultaneously influence human actions and experiences in daily life.

Despite the large number of histories of European guilds, there is not currently a large body of historical scholarship that deals with the issue of how both masculinities and early modern men’s social identities were created through early modern trade networks. This is particularly the case for the homosocial working environments of lower and middle order tradesmen. Coming out of social history, much of the scholarship about early modern labor in the Holy Roman Empire has been preoccupied with answering traditional economic questions
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82 Crowston for example discusses the case brought by the seamstress guild of Caen against tailors’ widows in their local guild during the early eighteenth century. Crowston, 230-231.
about the development of industrialization and capitalism in early modern trade practices.\textsuperscript{85} This methodology however restricts the range of conclusions that can be made from historical sources, particularly when it comes to cultural identities. My joint study of early modern gender and trade identities therefore makes an intervention into both smaller (e.g. masculinity, guild, household) and larger (e.g. gender, trade, society) areas of historical scholarship and inquiry by not forcing these cultural practices into large historical—and historiographic—narratives about preindustrial German society.

The field of early modern English literature has yielded a number of cultural studies historicizing gender and the human body over the last fifteen years. However when addressing the influence of masculinity on early modern scientific and popular beliefs, literary studies of early modern gender have a tendency to promote a set of sources and conclusions that provide more information about the author’s own intellectual methodology than concrete historical insights.\textsuperscript{86} Conrad Brunstrom, for example, reflects this trend to reproduce modern conclusions about sex through eighteenth century literature when he states that, “The maintenance of normative masculinity is a key aspect of The Oeconomy of Love … The title alone invites Foucauldian fascination, and this georgic is surely the most important poem Foucault never read.”\textsuperscript{87} Operating as arguments for different schools of critical theory, these studies routinely represent masculinity in a simplistic manner, such that its character and practices in daily life are rarely laid out in detail or explained in depth.\textsuperscript{88} Too often early modern sex—and the masculine


\textsuperscript{86} Examples of this include David Hillman and Carla Mazzio, eds., \textit{The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe} (New York: Routledge, 1997); Darryll Grantley and Nina Taunton, eds., \textit{The Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Culture} (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2000); Florike Egmond and Robert Zwijnenberg, eds., \textit{Bodily Extremities: Preoccupations with the Human Body in Early Modern European Culture} (New York: Ashgate, 2003).


\textsuperscript{88} I am thinking of works like Hutson’s \textit{Usurer’s Daughter}, in which the author continually references masculinity as if there was a canonical list of masculine standards and qualities and as if masculine characteristics never conflicted with each other. Lorna Hutson, \textit{The Usurer’s Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in
values tied to it—is taken to be monolithic and uniform in character and practice. A good illustration of this problem is Laqueur’s unisex model of human sex and gender, in which masculinity is forced to be identified primarily with male-sexed bodies and which thereby defines alternate forms of gender as effeminate or female sex-related. Yet as both Scott and Crowston have argued separately about women’s identities, early modern society could scarcely have embraced a single code of masculinity that linked men of all walks of life in common agreement.

Even if one assumed that early modern men believed that masculinity was uniform despite confessional variances and despite differences in economic and social orders, such an assumption does not mitigate the potential for conflicts and contradictions between the various public aspects of a man’s daily life. Moving ideologically beyond the scholarship on early modern England and its literature, historical and literary studies of masculinity in continental Europe have been much more engaged in how different constructions of humanity impacted individual lives and early modern society as a whole. For example, Wolfgang Schmale focuses on the cultural construction of human bodies by exploring the somatic realities and experiences of life in early modern Germany. Similar to the conclusions found in studies on early modern monstrosity and animality, Schmale finds that there was not a uniform standard within early modern German society that determined which physical characteristics and gendered behaviors were directly attributed to a biological sex. Instead, early modern human bodies were


92 He has also noted the association of horses with men and masculinity. Wolfgang Schmale, ed., _Geschichte der Männlichkeit in Europa, 1450-2000_ (Vienna: Böhlau, 2003), 28.

understood by negotiating cultural pluralities. Looking at gender then as a constant social performance, Schmale examines gender pluralities and finds that human genders take place on a continuum not only between feminine and masculine but also within types and codes of masculine behavior. For example, using the case of men accused of being pregnant, he points out that early modern men were at times considered capable of possessing female organs. Schmale also supports Duden’s argument that in practice, early modern people did not recognize their bodies as having strict physical boundaries.

Recent scholarship by Todd Reeser on the concept of moderate masculinity in early modern French literature explores aspects of masculinity and gender through the lens of Derridean hybridity. As opposed to the overly dominant or passionate ideal of masculine behavior promoted by many intellectual and literary historians, Reeser discovers that early modern French dramas reflected “the fluidity or the instability of these [male-dominant gender] relations.” Seeking to explore the social constructions of masculinity, Reeser focuses on the ways “in which a man oscillates between various relations of masculinity, how he is never really simply in any one position in any relation, but often somewhere in between.” Yet in terms of human experience, Reeser sees masculinity as a single set of cultural beliefs and practices that are applied or adopted. In contrast, I regard masculinity as a set of beliefs and practices, such that an individual commonly relies upon and expresses multiple masculinities at once—all of which are continually mutating in response to various cultural factors. At times, some of these masculinities intersect, yet the masculinities are not always—or necessarily ever—in dialogue with each other.

Following Derrida’s theorization of human-animal semiotics, post-structuralist approaches to masculinity tend to essentialize the physical boundaries of both human and animal
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96 Schmale, 26-27.
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bodies. Despite the insights made by post-structuralists on premodern European masculinity, post-structuralist models in general are closely bound to abstract concepts of hybridity and instability. These hybrid masculinities rely upon an almost dialectical understanding of masculinity, which mirrors the same type of models that post-structuralist theorists create to understand human-animal relationships. When two masculinities collide, they produce a masculinity that owes aspects of its new character to the reaction between the colliding sets of cultural beliefs. For example, in his discussion of the plural origins of early modern masculinities, Reeser claims, “Even the seemingly original models of masculinity themselves are not pure forms, but are already hybrid forms based on a mixture of other previous forms.”

Emphasizing the instability of early modern masculinity, Reeser replaces concepts of individual agency and identity with those of human subjectivity. Reeser prefers the term “subjectivity” over “identity” since the latter implies some type of stability and “subjectivity… suggests complications and a closer relation to cultural and psychological influences.” In order to destabilize the conventionality of uncomplicated social categories and boundaries, Reeser’s post-structuralism requires that social structures exist in some type of canonical form that is widely recognized or shared within a certain culture. This approach however overlooks the experiences of individuals—not ideals or literary characters—in daily life. As a result, it tends to assume that even if social categories could be ill defined, they are nevertheless historical constants, which did not change in either number or importance over time. Otherwise, the other person participating in the discourse would not notice a cultural disconnect. A deconstructionist approach may try to get at the motivations of early modern men and women through subjectivity,


101 Addressing the issue of Derrida and anthropocentric ethics, Calarco claims that the newest proponents of a return to “subjectivity” are neo-Marxist political theorists like Levinas, Zizak, and Badiou. Calarco, 12.

102 Reeser, 19.

103 Reeser, 13.
but the methodology ultimately precludes an individual from having an internal life unique to his or her own experiences. Of course, this begs the question, what should we do when a historical subject is a non-human animal and does lack both human legal and cultural agency? How can we truly know a human subject through his or her interactions and relationships with the animate world?  

**Human Identities and Early Modern Daily Life**

Early modern humans—as today—were complex. While many agrarian and smithing households in Germany did not improve their social status (Stand) over the eighteenth century, the daily lives and personal decisions of early modern people were not only motivated by socio-economic status.  

Examining the development of equine-centric masculinities and social identities expands what we know about the daily operations of social institutions in early modern Germany, such as the hierarchies at work in agricultural networks or in trade organizations like guilds.  

By approaching my subject from the methodological perspective of *Alltagsgeschichte*, I am able to speak to how the lived experiences of human genders and sexes operated on a daily level to alter humans’ personal decisions, social obligations, and legal rights. As recent studies of the human-animal body have demonstrated above, the scientific rationality of human sex is merely a historical construction. Not only a product but also a producer of cultural knowledge, sex profoundly shaped humans’ personal experiences, economic opportunities, and social identities.

---


106 Such as in the case of trade organizations like guilds and of socioeconomic hierarchies.
By examining gender and trade identities of these people rather than focusing on class identities, each of my chapters reveals how small changes made at the daily level over the seventeenth century influenced the economy and society of Braunschweig-Lüneburg during the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. My work illustrates that the cultural power of individuals’ social concerns and risky business decisions must be taken into consideration in order to understand more fully human actions and historical events. In terms of daily agrarian and urban life, it matters that some men would not have been very interested in or good at their trade and that some families had members suffering from poor health. Although bad luck is an unquantifiable measure, temporary forces like war, infertile soil, substandard iron, and poor weather could have long-lasting effects on local communities and regional economies. Histories need to have a mechanism that allows for unintentional failure and miscommunications.

As Jürgen Schlumbohm has shown for eighteenth century Lower Saxony and as both Rainer Beck and Govind Sreenivasan have demonstrated for southern German agriculture during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, human death could significantly disrupt daily and long-term farming operations by unexpectedly dividing land, resources, and labor. In fact, Beck argues that inheritance issues were one of the major driving forces in household arrangement and trade practice. Acknowledging the influence of gender on daily agrarian practice, Beck also notes that concerns about future inheritance led to the patriarchal character of agrarian households in Baden-Württemberg. Instead of holding to a consistent mode of household masculinity, Beck finds this new patriarchal practice devolved into awarding the eldest male all the property and thus causing their siblings to leave home and seek new trade possibilities. Over time the economic consequences of this cultural change led to an increasing number of displaced

---

107 As I discuss in the next chapter however, bad luck was a quantifiable force in early modern popular literature.
109 Beck, 412-413.
people forced into employing themselves as others’ servants, thus not only perpetuating social inequalities but also magnifying them.\textsuperscript{110}

Yet even without involving the social and economic complications caused by human death, it was neither particularly easy nor cheap to keep a horse or two alive through the year let alone a farm and household going for decades for farmers in the late sixteenth through the early eighteenth century. From a practical standpoint, the lack of restrictions on the amount of horses that a farmer could own in Braunschweig-Lüneburg made it possible for farmers to reinvent horse ownership as a means of social and cultural capital. In this way, farmers invested in equine husbandry and horse breeding in order to communicate information about an individual’s or an agrarian family’s wealth and status along with their trade expertise. Being a member of the top agrarian social class meant that one was wealthy enough that one was able to keep at least four horses up and running strong for over a year (i.e. the range of tax duties and the whole agricultural cycle). It also spoke volumes about the agricultural skill, access to good socioeconomic and hippological networks, and thus to the trade expertise of one’s household.

As I will show, the dukes of Braunschweig-Lüneburg depended on farmers to raise more horses. While equine husbandry benefited some farmers by raising their social rank (\textit{Stand}) and helping them speed up their labor, more importantly for local and ducal lords, horse breeding by farmers produced new streams of revenue.

Somewhat surprisingly given its interest in sociological questions, the traditional Alltags methodology grants tradesmen little personal agency in changing economic and social practices during this period.\textsuperscript{111} Urban and agrarian orders are depicted in composite, as if culturally uniform and static, while the role of gender—as opposed to sex—remains largely unrepresented.\textsuperscript{112} Yet guild regulations and livestock holding patterns did not just arbitrarily

\textsuperscript{110} Beck argues that although this type of legislation was ostensibly passed because too many peasants’ landholdings were getting divided up among all the children (and thus making the plots too small to support the sons and daughters that inherited them), the solution definitely favored the wealthy male landowners that had passed the legislation.


\textsuperscript{112} Race is another social category that historians of early modern daily life should reexamine more closely.
change over time, but emerged out of a series of deliberate decisions made by individual people, each of whom had a social life and motivations beyond economic survival. A trade’s skillsets and practices were cultural productions meant to both address a current situation and plan in some way for the future. Whether an urban smithing master, wandering horse doctor, or farmer, early modern humans continually modified their techniques and worked to learn new skills and knowledges that would help provide for themselves, their families, and their local communities. As such, the character and daily operation of both human and human-animal relationships had a great impact on the success and direction of early modern policies. As a result, it is important to evaluate the cultural practices and gender beliefs of early modern farmers along with the socioeconomic conditions into which they found themselves born.

113 Although Schlumbohm has deftly examined a number of case studies on individual agrarian families and their intermarriage with others, his conclusions speak more to the period of 1750-1860.
114 Richard van Dülmen, for example, ties social changes and cultural forces to confessionalization and thus to the early modern state and church. Richard van Dülmen, *Die Entdeckung des Individuums: 1500-1800* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1997).
Chapter Two: Masculine Hippologies and Prescriptive Print Literature in Early Modern Germany
Introduction

While many modern Germans generally interact with household animals sentimentally as pets and infrequently use them as work animals, the view in early modern Europe was very much the opposite. The modern household animal, although comprising a wide range of animals from snakes to songbirds to dogs, is generally kept inside the human living space of the home most often for companionship purposes. Yet the early modern household extended even to the stable. In fact, the home and stable were frequently used interchangeably for different economic purposes, especially on the farms of Lower Saxony.¹ For example, chickens, which are today associated with the stable or a farm’s out-buildings, would have been taken into the farmhouse’s living quarters for added warmth at times during the winter. In addition, although currently associated with domesticated interiors, cats were kept as vermin exterminators during the early modern era and consequently lived primarily in the barn areas. In this way it is clear that early modern people did not commonly relate to animals in a direct, emotional fashion—or at least, they did not regard animals as having or needing the same rights and same sensibilities as humans.² Descartes' promotion of vivisection as the best way to learn anatomy is more understandable in this context.³ Descartes' mechanistic view of animals as mindless automatons reflects a common early modern belief that rationality was one of the primary defining characteristic of human beings, a quality perceived to be wholly absent in other animals.⁴ With a

¹ In northwestern Germany, the farmhouse was frequently constructed with the family’s living quarters closely coordinated to work as a joint economic and agricultural space. For example, stalls for horses and cows were frequently located under the same roof and walls as the family's kitchen and bedroom.
² Along with a number of other authors, Harriet Ritvo and Margaret Derry along with many other authors have studied the creation of pets and the rise in the nineteenth century of antivivisection leagues and animal rights' concerns, which frequently were promoted in parallel with human-rights concerns dealing with poverty or race. Harriet Ritvo, The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1987) and Margaret Derry, Bred for Perfection: Shorthorn Cattle, Collies, and Arabian Horses since 1800 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2003).
few court and noble exceptions, sentimentalism was not attached to other species.\(^5\)

Within the last ten years, numerous theoretical and historical works about race and human-animal relations in early modern Europe have demonstrated that for early modern humans the line distinguishing between human and nonhuman bodies was variable.\(^6\) Using various methods, these works have investigated the boundary between human and non-human bodies, including examining medieval and early modern beliefs about monstrous bodies and about fantastical species, such as unicorns in animal books and the Plinian human races. With this research on the heterogeneity and dual pluralisms of early modern beliefs about animal bodies in mind, one must consider that if the line between species was itself somewhat in question—or at least permeable in both theory and daily life—then it is unlikely that the lines defining subsets of the species, such as the category of physical sex, would have been well-defined or operated in a strictly governed fashion within aspects of daily life. Therefore, just as the line between human and animal—human and inhuman—was variable, the line between man and woman was variable.\(^7\) Moreover, if the line defining the sexes was variable, then gender would not have been viewed as a constant in any practical sense, nor could gender be finite. However, while neither predictable to a modern audiences nor finite, in early modern culture and life gender does remain tied to a body that is read, performed, and identified as one of the sexual binaries, female or male. Therefore the early modern concept of gender is not a static contrasting pair, but a concept wherein its associated values are assigned, adopted, and performed according to the context of the situation as perceived and communicated by both individuals and other

---

\(^5\) For the exceptions to this rule, see Katharine MacDonogh’s *Reigning Cats and Dogs* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999), which offers many anecdotal accounts of beloved lap-dogs and cats of early modern philosophers, nobles, and religious leaders.


involved groups.

I have situated my study within this context in the circumstance of gender and its creation and performance through reinterpreting equine bodies and industries in early modern Germany as something that could reflect, fashion, interpret, and define a man's social position. Even more explicitly, I examine gender’s function in social and economic circumstances, reputations, and the individual sense of self within the larger community and, therefore, as something that according to early modern ideals was and should be controlled by the male sex. Mirroring the situation with early modern human race and sex, this control also took place on the level of the equine body itself through an increasingly gendered code forming around horse breeding, husbandry, and medicine. Thus while a farmer had used horses along with cattle in the medieval period, he was not associated nor did he associate himself with horses in a particular cultural or strategic manner. Whereas during the early modern period, one sees farmers begin to associate themselves with horses specifically and without a parallel or rival association with oxen. It was during the early modern period that farmers began to be recognized and classed by others through an increasing public, trade-based association of farmers with horses specifically.

While horses widely inhabited medieval Germany, it was not until the sixteenth century that one saw the development of hippological literature in Europe and not until the late sixteenth century, that one saw a print genre develop in support of hippological communities. Prior to these equine-specific texts, both theoretical and practical knowledge about horses could

---


9 This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

generally only be learned by word of mouth and through direct, personal experience. For the small percentage of the population who read Latin and could access these particular works, a handful of Roman agricultural treatises were printed in the late fifteenth century. The works of Vegetius and Palladius on agriculture and breeding livestock were translated into German and then published by various editors throughout the following century, although they remained of limited use for the general population because they were printed as expensive, deluxe editions with elite audiences in mind. Finally, while animal books did provide species-specific information about horses, this genre had other goals. An animal book provided basic descriptive details about the horse, explained its place in the human-animal hierarchy, and possibly anthropomorphized the horse’s behavior as a moral to the reader. It was a general reference source. Animal books were not designed to offer horse-owners practical information, whether how to buy a healthy horse, feed it, train it, and treat its injuries.

By the late sixteenth century, the reigning scientific authority on equine husbandry for the majority of German-speakers had been "Meister Albrecht" for almost three centuries. Albrecht, also known as Meister Albrant, had been the head horse doctor at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor Friedrich II around 1240. By the early sixteenth century, Albrecht’s collection of veterinary remedies had been copied and passed along to every corner of Germany. In fact it retained its popularity for so long that until the late seventeenth century, Albrecht’s original manuscript continued to show up in numerous print formats and forms, ranging from plagiarized clips in horse-buying broadsheets to large passages in numerous equestrian and veterinary manuscripts. Despite giving advice geared towards military injuries, it was effectively the only commonly shared and readily available resource for equine veterinary medicine and husbandry until the late sixteenth century.

11 These works were also just as frequently published in Latin as in German.
12 Considering that the initial development and spread of early modern hippology came out of Italy, it is potentially significant that at the time Friedrich II was officially the duke of Austria and the king of Sicily and other parts of Italy, Germany, Burgundy, and Jerusalem. His base of power lay in the kingdom of Sicily, which he had inherited from his mother at a young age.
13 According to Schrader, Laurentius Rusius' *Hippiatria*, which was written by the horse doctor during the fifteenth century in Rome, was not translated into German until 1535, when excerpts were published and attributed to Meister Albrecht. In 1531, a partial translation was published in France which depended so heavily on abbreviations from the original Latin version that one was required to have the original on hand to consult alongside the French transcription. However, eventually the text was translated into French, Spanish, and Italian. This work relied heavily on the writings of ancient Greeks and Romans and the author was clearly familiar with the human medicinal writings of Galen and Hippocrates. Portions may have been plagiarized in some German sixteenth and early seventeenth century horsemanship guides, but Rusius' influence was minimal in German-speaking areas. Georg
Due to a booming horse-trade with the Ottoman Empire as well as dealing with the military turmoil of unification, Italian courts in early sixteenth century produced the atmosphere and desire for an improvement in hippology that set off a storm of interest across early modern Europe. Contrary to the more informative aims of either Albrecht or medieval animal books and housefather guides, the focus of this new early modern hippology supported and expanded the masculinized court ideals associated with horses, especially those dealing with owning elite horses and demonstrating one's equestrian skills before private and public male audiences. Frederico Grisone and Giovanni Pignatelli answered the noble desire for Reitkunst, the new systematic cultivation of horsemanship as both an elite cultural and political skill, by founding the Neapolitan Riding School. While Pignatelli was the riding master of the school, Grisone wrote the equestrian guide that quickly became Reitkunst’s grammar book. Published in 1550, the Ordini di Cavalcare disseminated into courts and large trading centers in Europe over the next four decades.¹⁴ The first German translation appears to be in 1566 by Veit Tufft in Augsburg.

Starting in the late sixteenth century, published hippological literature began to develop several distinct genres in which information about horse breeding and equine husbandry could be learned in the German language. These prescriptive genres took shape through a wide range of print media formats in order to meet the evolving needs of equine tradesmen and horse-owners. Over time, early modern Germans from all orders came to depend on advice culled from hoof-smith manuals, Reitkunst books, farmers’ almanacs, farm guides for non-elite housefathers, and official proclamations, such as ordinances dictating equine “lemon laws” and livestock plague guidelines. The motivations for equine breeding and husbandry in prescriptive literature were diverse and numerous, yet all include some aspect of using equine bodies as a means to create and promote masculine social identities. Common to all of them was the assumption that their audience was an adult male, who was either already a member of the general social community or who was already in the process of gaining membership, such as engaged or soon-to-inherit farm boys, journeymen horse doctors and hoof-smiths, and junior noblemen. Also common to all the literature was the expectation that the prospective reader would have help in their tasks—

---

¹⁴ The work was first written in 1532 but not published until 1550. Grisone’s influence on other authors’ publications shows up as early as the 1560s for Spain, France, Germany, and Austria; the 1570s for Switzerland, Denmark, Poland, the Low Countries, and England; and the 1580s for Russia and Sweden.
primarily from agriculturally experienced adult men, secondarily from agriculturally inexperienced men, and lastly, if at all, from unskilled female laborers.

In this way, a gendered economic hierarchy was established in which the acknowledged possession of and knowledge behind the proper use of economic tools—in this case workhorses and breeding stock—was firmly dominated and controlled by a communal patriarchy. The only legitimate means to obtain and use equine knowledge was controlled by male social consensus—particularly that of the agricultural and noble spheres—and by proper deference to a masculine network of economic ideals. Thus, men claimed horses' bodies as territories for themselves only and as places through which men alone were permitted to create personal and communal identities, only as long as these identities also supported certain social assumptions about gender and class. Therefore, while the equine masculinities of authors and audiences could conflict with each other and even within themselves, they all supported the limitation of the growing body of equine knowledge to men, whose control of the subject was to be directed by considerations of social position as masters, fathers, and noblemen.

The collision and divergence of these masculine models, especially in the realm of equine tradesmen, demonstrate the flexibility and range of possible early modern masculinities. These identities and beliefs were always being negotiated and performed, whether consciously or passively, as equine tradesmen interacted with members of their own trade, those of the equine economic community, and those of the primarily agrarian community at large. Additionally, the basis of these masculinities was dependent on far more than an arbitrary division between the sexes. These anthropomorphic masculinities were dependent on interpreting, conforming to, and shaping perceived divisions between two species wherein horses served as a type of cultural foil for human economic classes, trades, and sexes.

**Hoof-smith Guides and Horse Doctoring Books**

Despite frequently consisting of content stolen from Albrecht, two new sources of veterinary information did develop over the sixteenth century—hoof-smith guides and horse doctoring books. Although not a large trend in the north at the time, hoof-smiths in the southern half of the Holy Roman Empire began a tradition of passing along personal collections of
veterinary remedies. These hoof-smith guides usually took the form of manuscripts written by one master and passed along to other hoof-smiths, while the horse doctoring guides were usually compilations of equine remedies collected by stable-masters (Stallmeister). For the former, the men passed along vital trade information to benefit both their journeymen and fellow masters as well as to ensure the care of their local community's livestock. The handwritten guides of hoof-smiths were meant to be living documents, which were augmented or modified according to one's experiences and practice. Horse doctoring guides on the other hand were meant to be encyclopedic, even if that meant containing numerous redundancies and possibly conflicting advice. While horse doctoring guides relied largely on work done by others, the sources and authors of the hoof-smith guides were the equine tradesmen that not only worked with horses as a central element of their profession, but that more importantly had direct, practical experience with remedies.

Due to the higher status of stable-masters and the increased visibility of their horse-doctoring and horse breeding collections in print, the period of 1580 to 1750 has often been termed the stable-master era (Stallmeisterzeit). However, this nomenclature produces an overly reductive and dismissive perspective on the situation of equine healthcare in the early modern period. First, this nomenclature has the effect of misrepresenting and improperly contextualizing equine medicine and equine tradesmen in the early modern period. An additional effect is the mischaracterization of equine masculinity at the time, particularly in focusing academic research on the work of stable-masters.

---

15 There are a few hoof-smith manuscripts, such as those attached to monastic property in southern Germany, that date to the fifteenth century.
17 For several such examples, see D. Karasszon’s A Concise History of Veterinary History (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1988) and Angela Driesch and Joris Peter’s Geschichte der Tiermedizin (Stuttgart: Schattauer, 2003).
hippological scholarship on noble horses and noble activities, such as the area of horsemanship or *Manage*. Furthermore, even a focus on noble horses and noble activities should incorporate the many court hoof-smiths and workers that noble equine masculinity was wholly dependent on both at the daily, economic level as well as the symbolic, cultural level.

As a final point, modern veterinarians are a convergent development over time from urban and pastoral guild-based groups like large-smiths (*Grobschmied*) as well as from free-range—as opposed to court-bound—practitioners of equine medicine. In this way, the overall impact and long-term influence of stable-masters is highly limited and restricted largely to noble and military interests. Thus by presenting a more inclusive approach to examining early modern equine medicine and husbandry, stable-masters are restored to their rightful place along with other noble breeders as noble equine tradesmen. As such, they depended largely on the work and experiences of the equine community at large in order to promote their own progress at court and as a means through which to express and to build masculine social and cultural identities. In order to best represent the daily use and practice of early modern hippological networks, the sources I have chosen for this subsection were selected based on the strength and clarity of their arguments as well as their availability to and their use by farmers, hoof-smiths, horse doctors, and nobles in northwestern Germany.

**Wolfgang II of Hohenlohe (1564)**

Only a few years prior to the Tufft's German-translation of Grisone in 1566, Wolfgang II of Hohenlohe, a count of Baden-Württemberg, consolidated his collection of veterinary recipes into two manuscripts, which were soon re-circulated at his court and eventually throughout the region. While these remedies were not originally his own, he certainly sought to improve veterinary healthcare for his own retainers—some of whom had provided a portion of the original material for the manuscripts—and their breeding stock.¹⁸ Wolfgang II is notable as one of the first to create such a recipe collection in a concise and systematic manner, and in this way, performing the role of noble housefather for local equine tradesmen as well as acting as a

---

¹⁸ Wolfgang II's first manuscript, which focused more on horse doctoring than the second that focused more on horse breeding, had ten remedies that were similar to and twenty-eight remedies that were exact copies of those in other manuscripts circulating in the area at the same time. See Gisa Humbert, *Eyn Arcney Büchlein vieler bewerter Künst den Menschen und Vihe zübraüchen* (PhD diss., Tierärztliche Fakultät der Universität München, 1969), 15. Humbert also finds that one hundred and fifty remedies that appear in Wolfgang's first manuscript also show up in Mang Seuter's published work. Humbert, *Arcney Büchlein*, 30.
housefather in taking care of the animals under his custody. Wolfgang II's source attributions reflect his understanding of equine trade knowledge as belonging to noble and court privilege and to benefiting noble tradesmen's identities. Despite having felt it necessary to learn practical knowledge of large-smithing not only though instruction by a smith but also by practicing the smithing trade under a pseudonym, Wolfgang II does not cite this unnamed large-smith master of Hochbach as a source for his knowledge of equine bodies or their care. Instead, he cites other noblemen, who have themselves learned equine biological knowledge through collections of equine remedies, along with two court medical practitioners, the first of whom is only identified by profession and the nobleman for whom he worked, "Herr Wolffin Lamparts Wundarzt"; the second, of course, is Meister Albrecht. Yet these citations are also rare: the majority of the text is presented as though the remedies have come from Wolfgang's own experiences rather than appropriated from others. The social and economic benefits gained from public (noble) recognition of the manuscripts' demonstration of equine knowledge are therefore awarded to Wolfgang II. It seems that the work and experiences were held to have little value unless channeled through and recognized under a nobleman's name.

Distinguishing itself further from the anonymous and communal manuscript tradition of hoof-smith guides and marking it as the start of a new genre, Wolfgang II's primary manuscript did not just cover prescriptions, but it also offered the reader a very class-centered, anthropomorphic reading of equine physical conformation. For example, Wolfgang II listed four categories of horse body types, each of which were closely connected to the perceived economic or social use of the horse: the warhorse (groß Stechroß and Streit-Pferdt); the traveling hack; the racehorse (Wetlaufer); and the common coach horse. It is immediately apparent from this list that farm horses had no place in the equine worldview of the Wolfgang II. His advice therefore speaks to exactly who he believed did—and did not—belong in the hippological community during the sixteenth century. Specifically, his audience must be able to recognize these varieties of horses if he wished to be part of the noble community of equine knowledge. By presenting these four horse types as completely representative of all horses in Germany, Wolfgang II was a rather exceptional man that learned some of these remedies first-hand. He apparently earned his smithing knowledge through working with a smith in Hochbach, where Wolfgang II operated under the pseudonym of Wolf Schmied. See Walter Seele, Das erste Roßarzneibuch Graf Wolfgangs II. von Hohenlohe (1564) (PhD diss., Tierärztlichen Hochschule zu Berlin, 1932), 9.

The names of the noblemen are of course given: Herrn von Freysingen and Pfalzgraf Friedrich des Herzogs Marstaller zu Venedig. See Humbert, 43, 53, 63.

"Es füre zuwißenn, das man die pferd hie zu land find inn vielerley weiß." Seele, 34.
demanded not only that his audience understand body differences that were significant only for elite purposes, but he also implied that only those with knowledge about elite horses should be participating in hippological conversations.

Unsurprisingly for a nobleman, Wolfgang II discussed the warhorse, which had already gained masculine cultural and symbolic value as part of noble, military masculine identities, in the greatest detail and with the most sentiment.\textsuperscript{22} The obvious familiarity of Wolfgang II with this variety of horse clearly influenced how he interpreted its mannerisms and nature. Depicting the warhorse as an animal that was almost able to overcome the limits of its species because of its close working relationship with noblemen, Wolfgang II imbued warhorses with human emotions and human rationale. Not only are these mounts separated from—and superior to—the other three equine body types by the warhorses' apparent, unique desire to spend time with and to be ridden by their masters, but they are also attributed unique extra-species abilities like distinguishing particular whistles or special behaviors such as a refusal to throw off their riders. In contrast, it seems that other horses—due to their distance from noble uses and thus their distance from the hearts of noblemen—were either unable or unwilling to perform any of these extraordinary actions.\textsuperscript{23} Wolfgang II presents these additional behavioral traits of warhorses not, as might be explained in modern times, as something learned by clever horses, who are dependent on swiftly understanding and obeying sensory cues by human men, but as something innate that proves their quality and justifies the dearness of warhorses to noblemen. Following the iconic path of the loyal servant, these war-horses:

"Hold their lords and caretakers so dear, that if they lose them, they will sometimes fast, and no longer want to eat, and from time to time they will flutter their eyes downward, as if they are crying, just how so many philosophers and masters have described."\textsuperscript{24}

Unlike the average shiftless or indifferent mount; this type of horse is elevated to almost human status by its inherent use of human rather than equine behaviors and by its deviation from other types of horses through its marked preference for human companionship and mastery.

\textsuperscript{22} See Jeffrey Cohen about the masculine identities of medieval noblemen constructed around their warhorses (\textit{Destriers}). Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, \textit{Medieval Identity Machines} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003).

\textsuperscript{23} While traveling horses are linked to the \textit{destriers} as being good to ride, their tractability is explained in terms of how well they should have been trained versus how they are by nature. Seele, 34.

\textsuperscript{24} "Haben auch ire herrn unnd diener so lieb, wen sie die verlierenn, das sie underweilen fastenn, unnd nit mehr eßen wollenn, unnd underweilen fließenth ihnen die augen darumb, als ob sie weinetenn, wie dan die philoßophi unnd meister deßwegen schreiben." Seele, 34.
As there were rarely absolutes in early modern medicine, the primary goal of sixteenth century veterinary remedies was to alleviate or to prevent problems rather than to cure them outright.\(^{25}\) This situation additionally illustrates that the need for large-smiths, hoof-smiths, and horse doctors was ongoing; these practitioners were required for constant and continual revisions of treatments for illnesses as well as for cyclical health requirements, such as shoeing and yearly bleeding. The remedies offer numerous possible treatments to be tried, with various steps and stages at which they could be stopped if successful or else continued beyond. The remedies could at times be combined on top of other remedies for the same disorder, yet they also could be modified based on one's access to certain active ingredients.\(^{26}\) Revealing the backgrounds of their authors, the veterinary collections of stable-masters and nobles like Wolfgang II often included ingredients that reflected personal experiences with court medicine and a particular ability to access expensive or hard to get ingredients.\(^{27}\) For example, in one remedy for a horse with a *krappen*, the treatment not only relied on silver as a key ingredient, the silver-containing salve needed to be applied twice daily for fourteen days. And even after all the lengthy exertions of grooms and hoof-smiths, the anticipated result was simply alleviative: the knowledge that the remedy was known to help (*hilfft gewiß*) but not cure.

However, lest one imagine that Wolfgang II's veterinary collection was entirely foreign or effectively useless to average horse doctors or farmers, one should note that it did include numerous ingredients that any early modern farmer could get their hands on.\(^{28}\) Using sympathetic medicine, the placement of objects in, on, or near the horse's body could be quite vital to the projected success of the remedy. Just as with humans of any economic order at the time, using amulets, walking over graves, or collecting certain herbs on specific days were all

\(^{25}\) For example, many of the recipes end with the phrase "Es hilfft," meaning that the treatment lessened the issue rather than definitively solving the problem or removing its cause. The presence of a handful of recipes that do offer or indicate cures (e.g. "so sol es ser heilen" and "so kompt es nimmer wider") gives further evidence for this conclusion. Humbert, 35 and 39.

\(^{26}\) At times, this could take the form of substitutions, but frequently, one was told that a step or an ingredient could be skipped. The remedy apparently would work almost as well, despite a change in approach or a lack of fundamental medicinal components.

\(^{27}\) Saffron shows up in a sizable minority of Wolfgang II's remedies. One odd recipe calls for whalebone attained from a goldsmith in order to treat an eye disorder. Seele, 41. Some ingredients were quite common, but the amounts called for would have strained the resources of an average person. For example, one remedy against "gelsucht" required fourteen eggs, and another demanded twenty-four. Seele, 66.

\(^{28}\) Seele divides the ingredients found in Wolfgang II's collections into categories of plant, animal, mineral, and those of special nature (*sonstiger Natur*). Some of the most extraordinary ingredients, at least to modern minds, included human hair and menstrual blood and the bones from humans along with those of pigs and horses. Seele 27-8. These ingredients are however far from uncommon in early modern veterinary recipes; products of animal bodies, including those of humans, were frequently relied upon for numerous ends.
actions believed to influence the health of horses. In addition, prayers could also be employed. In one notable case to treat dysentery, Wolfgang II suggested that if nothing else worked, one could call on the Holy Trinity through a special ritual. In this situation, one would begin by riding into a field, picking up the first rock that one sees, hitting the horse with it in front of the saddle, asking for the cure in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and then returning the stone to exactly where it had been. A perfect illustration of the widespread practice of phlebotomy and the importance of animal body products in veterinary medicine as well as the painstaking dedication of time, skill, knowledge, and resources that it might take to achieve a cure is the following recipe for use on a leg injury. First, one must rub blood against the direction of the hair on the withers or shoulder of the injured leg one or three times a day, for four or six consecutive days. Then one must take warm blood from a young male sheep—or the blood of a young male calf if necessary—and mix it with wine and with dog fat. This salve should be placed in the oven for fourteen or fifteen consecutive days before applying it. When it was ready, one was instructed to smear some of the salve into the hoof with a small piece of wood for six to eight days, or for ten applications. Finally, one was expected to apply cow dung, which would cement the cure.

The veterinary collection of Wolfgang II additionally reveals the use of remedies to treat ailments that would not be recognized as such today. For example, he offers recipes that cure horses of an inclination to bite or to whinny loudly (Schrey), the latter being largely a concern for those in battle. His association of behavioral control with preventative medicine also extended to the modification of equine body parts that the owner found inconvenient in some manner. Although Wolfgang II did claim that horses' wolf teeth were unnatural and must therefore be broken out, he did not recommend the mutilation of tails and mouths that some later elite horsemanship authors promoted as cures to raise horses to greater abilities than their natural

---

29 Seele, 22.
30 Seele, 81. This cure is shared among several other contemporary and slightly later veterinary and horse breeding guides as well.
31 “Ime das blut an dem bueg da der schad ist gegen dem haar...Schlag ime in huef mit schmer ein henfes werck mit hölzlein...ursach das derselb keren von herten stehe.” Seele, 85-6. The sole cure for this particular ailment, Wolfgang II cautions that it is only to be undertaken when the horse's limping is accompanied by swelling. Additionally, it is significant to note here that the sex of the animal from whom body parts are harvested matters to the success and creation of veterinary recipes.
32 Seele, 72. One sees later in numerous elite horse breeding and horsemanship guides advice on how to prevent or to train one's horse to be silent. At times in these works, certain breeds of horses—all of which are stallions—are also granted by nature the human ability of vocal restraint.
bodies allowed. These equestrian authors promoted slitting a horse’s mouth, specifically the sides of the mouth, supposedly in order to allow the horse to breathe in more air when it was running or exerting itself. In both circumstances, a physical body part that interfered with the nobleman’s smooth control and operation of the entire equine body was an affront to the proper ordering of society and therefore needed to be removed or otherwise altered to fit the nobleman’s design.

Equine Trade Imagery: Mang Seuter (1583) and Walther (1652 and 1658)

Unlike Wolfgang II, Mang Seuter, stable-master to Marx Fugger, illustrated a clear reliance on hoof-smiths by attributing his collection of equine remedies to the efforts of many experienced hoof-smiths as well as to previous notable literary works. The classically influenced frontispiece of this edition of Nutzliches Buech Roßarzney [Figure 2.1] also clearly displays a recognition on behalf of the author as well as an expectation on behalf of the audience that there were equine tradesmen, whose career and person could easily be identified with their trade through the use of certain, specific equine icons. Although the image was not necessarily depicting the situation and beliefs of people outside the courts at this time, it is clear that equine practitioners were not in the same class as grooms nor were stable-masters and those of higher class expected to have more equine knowledge than they did. Their identity with the trade of horse doctoring and with horses' bodies specifically gave them particular status within the existing economic and social hierarchies. The series of images show a man of lower economic order in complete, skillful charge of noblemen's horses and in command of his male assistants, whether a noble, Burgher, or groom. The veterinary techniques that the illustration shows him performing also reveal a very proactive view of equine husbandry and medicine that favors curative representations to signify visually the role and importance of horse doctoring. Unlike the medicine filling the bulk of hoof-smith guides and of later guides intended for low-ranking farmers, one does not see the hoof-smiths growing and gathering the herbs with which he makes

---

33 “Vonn dem wolfs zahnn. Dem pferd wachst oft hinder am keinkraif ein unnatürlicher Zahn...und die beste ertzenezey dartzu ist, das man ihn mit einer zangen heraus breche.” Seele, 86. Although wolf teeth are commonly removed or filed down today, the purpose for doing so stems from the use of bits in bridles. Therefore, wolf teeth are not in themselves a health concern. It is only when bits are introduced to horses' mouths that the wolf teeth become an issue by interfering with the bridle's—and rider's—control. See Pinter, Pferde-Schatz, 90.

his remedies, nor does one see him collecting animal by-products. It is also significant however that the two images at the bottom do illustrate preventative medicine. In this way, the hoof-smith was depicted as a master of hands-on, holistic preventative and curative medicine, as a master of horse doctoring and more. Horseshoeing thus demanded the same respect and skill as any other veterinary practice, rather than being regarded as a simple iron-based task that a general smith could or should undertake.

Johann Walther's frontispieces [Figures 2.2 and 2.3] portrays the same issue from a very different angle.\(^{35}\) According to the visual theme of both editions of his *Pferde- und Vieh-Zucht*, identifying the horse doctor is quite easy: he is the man who purges the horse's back end. For Walther, a horse doctor himself, the image depicts a master and a world of knowledge and skill that are equally worthy of respect. He shows a tradesman of steel nerve and strong dedication to treating his equine subject. Visually, the frontispiece also presents the curious association of the horse doctor as the main character upon which horse breeding relies instead of the reverse. Thus, the image demonstrates both the central role of equine medicine in the success of any breeding project and the deliberate distinction of the horse doctor as an equine tradesman of particular skills.\(^{36}\) In addition to the frontispiece, it is clear throughout his work that Walther expects his audience to understand that he is far from indifferent to his work, both the practice of equine healthcare and the horses themselves. Walther openly shares nobles' love for horses while aligning himself with what he views to be the consensus on the matter. He celebrates horses as the noblest and most humanly useful of four-footed creatures.

**Georg Simon Winter (1678)**

The *Wolerfahrner Roß-Arzt* is one of numerous works written and collected by Georg Simon Winter across several equine genres. This particular horse doctoring guide is quite lengthy and has a number of full page illustrations, which together would have hampered most people from owning it due to cost, but nevertheless it would have been useful to the few who


\(^{36}\) While the title addresses itself to *Hausväter* and *Hausmütter*, the content of the book does not offer much useful advice for women (i.e. that women could actually put into play as compared to what they could study for intellectual interest only).
could have afforded it. Winter organizes the guide as a systematic veterinary manual, which supplies identifications of disorders, their diagnostic signs, their causes, the techniques and tools to treat these disorders, and the ingredients and steps for preparing alleviative or curative medicines. Without relying much on phlebotomy, the recipes primarily use common, cheap household ingredients, herbs, and tools. Furthermore, the recipes emphasize the importance of hygiene—both for the horse's body and its living spaces—as preventative medicine as well as the lack of hygiene being a direct cause for certain medical conditions. Winter's practical experience in his occupation as stable-master and breeding-master (*Gestütmeister*) clearly influences his presentation and representation of widely accepted biological absolutes. For example, the academic medical and veterinary communities were relatively firm in their scientific opinion that females did not pass on any traits to their offspring and that males passed along any important physical and behavioral traits. Yet Winter reveals practical knowledge of heredity in reproduction in some of his remedies by noting that both mares and studs passed on the causes of certain disorders to foals.

As might be expected given the author's background, the *Wolerfahrner Roß-Arzt* presents a stable-master's perspective of horse doctoring as just one part of equine knowledge, whose entirety was best represented by a noble's dedication to and success in horse breeding. This shapes the ideal stable-master as a perfect housefather, as a master devoted enough to his trade and to his reputation to be driven to crafting and controlling the best and healthiest horses. The stable-master here is the complete equine master instead of the horse doctor.

Doctoring (*Arznei*) was the diagnosing and creating of medicinal treatments to solve medical disorders. As such, doctoring was an important aspect of equine healthcare, just as were veterinary techniques such as bleeding, purging, cauterizing, and cutting. Since hoof-smiths relied on cutting as part of their routine preventative and corrective maintenance on horses' hooves, it is not surprising that these techniques would also be used in the treatment of horses. Winter's awareness of and use of these techniques helps to illustrate the holistic approach to horse care that he advocates in his guide.

---

37 For example, an alternate titling of the work begins “Curiouser Stallmeister/ oder vollständige Ross-Arznei Kunst.” Furthermore, it is his success both with equestrian life at court and with breeding horses at the Marbach stud that led to his later ennobling as Georg Simon Winter von Adlersflügel.

38 Concerning the cause of “Vollhuff”: "Auch wird es von Beschaler und Stuten ererbt." Georg Simon Winter, *Wolerfahrner Roß-Arzt*, 980. While it was true that Winter himself in his horse breeding guide supports some idea of the mare influencing her foal by what she looks at while she is being bred, it is still the act of the stallion and the setting that the humans create around her that causes her to reflect things onto her unborn foal.

39 This is not to say that Winter is consciously devaluing the labor and trade identities of horse doctors and hoof-smiths.

40 Among various such statements: "Kein Thier an einem Glied wan der Mond in seinem Zeichen ist, arzneyen, es seye gleich mit Cauterisiren, Aderlassen, Schneiden, Purgiren und anders." Winter, 12.
hooves, Winter recognizes their distinct trade knowledge in any discussion of hooves and cutting techniques. However, he does not seem capable of regarding hoof-smiths as experts on the equine body at large, either physically in terms of areas outside the hooves and legs or intellectually in terms of how the horse's body works and how to perform surgery or make medicinal treatments for the horse. Yet Winter also makes extensive use of the tools, techniques, and knowledges that were specifically the province of hoof-smiths. In listing the tools needed for horse doctoring, he identifies the smithing hammer along with three other hoof-related instruments, each of which are marked with identifying tags and pictured together in a full page illustration of horse doctoring tools. The horse doctoring treatments themselves also demonstrate a deliberate use of hoof-smith knowledge, notably the use of tongs, hot iron, and a smith's oven.41

Johann Conrad Weybold (1701)

Largely a work on Reitkunst, Johann Weybold’s book, Kunst-beruhmte_Rossarzt, holds particular relevance for my study as it was a known reference source for the Hannoverian stud project around Celle.42 Weybold's book aspires to offer horse doctoring as an essential part of the equine knowledge that a noble rider would want to know. Unlike Winter, Weybold, who was also a stable-master, does not intend to provide a definitive horse doctoring collection nor a particularly scientific approach to equine bodies. Instead, Weybold actively supports a court-centered view of equine knowledge, husbandry, and medicine in which equine knowledge produced or gained outside of court is suspect and crude.43 In this way, he focuses on a class-based understanding of his professional identity and position as a stable-master rather than a trade-based one, such as that followed by Winter. His support of horse doctors over hoof-smiths and large-smiths acts as a public declaration, identifying him to other nobles as a member of noble court life and as a supporter for rigid, class-based hierarchy in communal equine knowledge.

At times, Weybold’s personal stakes in human social hierarchies at court explicitly

41 Winter, 955. The section in the index on hooves is exceptionally long and well-detailed. However, Winter includes no positive recognition of the importance either of proper and corrective shoeing or of the highly-skilled artisanal knowledge that the shoes themselves took.
42 It is in fact the only published work associated with the founding documents. The original copy remains with the collection and has its own call number. See HStA Hann. 147, nr. 18, 1701.
43 "Es kan auch solche Arzney-Kunst nicht besser erlernet werden, als an grosser Herren Höffen." Johann Conrad Weybold, Kunst-beruhmte_Rossarzt, 52.
informed his veterinary advice and public position:

"At this time indeed...[horse doctors] find few smiths who have an indepth knowledge of horse or equine medicine, and they hold it as a great insult that one calls them horse doctors, since equine medicine is so commonly viewed as part of smithing. Here [in this book] therefore a horse doctor is well-regarded because without his knowledge, an expensive horse frequently is lost and dies.\textsuperscript{44}

Weybold’s unequivocal devaluation of all non-court-based equine practitioners reveals there is more at stake in this matter than Weybold’s professional opinion regarding the quality of veterinary training and smithing skills outside of a court’s sheltered walls. By seeking to correct the misconception that non-court-based equine practitioners—particularly those gaining professional training through smithing guilds—had any reliable experience and knowledge with equine medicine, Weybold attempts to establish a socioeconomic hierarchy within equine practitioners, such that his own trade identity of court horse doctor and its related subset of equine medicine were at its top. In this construction, Weybold’s personal concerns and economic insecurities about the potential competition of new, foreign, and socially mobile journeymen and masters drive the logic of his court-based and socioeconomically grounded appeals to his current and future clients. Consequently in this court-centric view, the numerous guild and country smiths that Weybold wants to remain as lower ranking than and thus socially inferior to the few horse doctors given special privilege to work at courts already lack either good or complete knowledge of horses. And by virtue of their lower social order, these men conveniently can never gain a proper and full knowledge of the equine body. Through his close connection of horse doctors with expensive horses, Weybold furthermore indicates his disdain for the healthcare needs of average horses and lower order men. In doing so he both abandons lower quality horses to the less skilled ministrations of hoof-smiths and disregards the possibility of the lower orders (e.g. farmers) possessing a good or valuable perspective on equine medicine and bodies.

With this perspective of stable-master duties, Weybold emphasizes delegation and overseeing of tasks, such as horse doctoring. Yet, like Winter, he does feel that one must come

\textsuperscript{44} "Zu dieser Zeit zwar ...finden sich ihrer wenige, so der Pferd oder Roß-Arzney gründliche Wissenschafft haben, achten es auch wol gar für eine Schande, so man sie Pferd oder Roß-Aerzte nennet, vermeinende, es sey eine Sache so für die Schmide gehörig; Da doch ein Roß-Arzt billig hoch zu achten, weil ohne seine Wissenschafft das köstlichste Pferd offtmals müste vergehen und umkommen." Weybold, 51.
by one's equine knowledge honorably, that is, from personal experience. Claiming that he has personally tried and can therefore testify for the success of the recipes, he justifies his advice by presenting himself as an equine authority (i.e. as a stable-master) and thus an expert on horses.\textsuperscript{45} The illustrations throughout the \textit{Kunst-berühmte Rossarzt} also support the representation of noble equine knowledge as being engaged personally with their human and equine subjects. This furthers the idea that a noble rider must actively participate in the training and medicinal treatment of horses as the person in charge. While the labor involved is mostly mental on his part, the ideal equine nobleman is not afraid to work with his hands as the direct responsibility for the horse—and his reputation—is ultimately his own.

\textit{JVVNPC (1705)}

Published by the unknown author JVVNPC in Hannover, the \textit{Bewährtes und Approbiertes Roß-Artzney Buch} was intended explicitly for lower-order audiences. The author claims to be a horse doctor that was offering a veterinary guide in order to help common people and equine tradesmen by incorporating his own trade experience with the knowledge of several widely respected horse doctors: Meister Albrecht, Martin Böhme, and Friedrich Flißken.\textsuperscript{46} Similar to Winter's more systematic approach to veterinary medicine, it demonstrates some belief in diagnostics and curative medicine, in which diseases have symptoms that one should take note of and in which diseases can be diagnosed from their symptoms. It also includes a section giving practical advice for farmers, such as the fourteen questions that one should be able to answer about the death of one's livestock.\textsuperscript{47} While this provides evidence of the growth and intensity of concerns about livestock plague since the late seventeenth century, it also recognizes that the help of the entire equine community was necessary to aid horse doctors in providing preventative medicine through controlling and eradicating further contagion.

The work also exhibits a misogyny that is revealed through anthropomorphizing the cause of sexually transmitted diseases. The male author displays underlying concerns about lacking complete control over female bodies in his depiction of broodmares as sexually promiscuous and physically impure. Instead of the studhorses that covered tens of unfamiliar mares every day or the men that were in charge of breeding broodmares to unfamiliar stallions,

\textsuperscript{45} Weybold, 52.
\textsuperscript{46} There are no extant works by Flißken or that mention him, but he is credited by JVVNPC as an authority.
\textsuperscript{47} JVVNPC, \textit{Bewährtes und Approbiertes Roß-Artzney Buch}, 405-6.
JVVNPC rests the blame for sexually transmitted diseases completely on mares. His remedy for the condition gained if a stallion received a venereal disease from an "unclean" mare is also only a cure for stallions. Unclean mares apparently could either not be cured or were unworthy of receiving proper medical attention.48

**Noble Housefathers and Horse Breeding**

Books advertised as providing information about horse breeding generally also fall under the category of housefather (Hausvater) literature. This is not to say that all housefather works were concerned with horse breeding but rather that works on horse breeding justified themselves by claiming to promote the interests and concerns of housefathers. As a rule, German horse breeding literature depended on the prior and continued existence of this specific type of agriculturally focused man, whose position as head of an economic household was central to his identity as a full and active member of his local community as well as to his sense of self in society at large. In some senses, both horse breeding and housefather literature written for elite audiences wielded additional social force since their advice primarily benefited the upper and middle economic orders. The reader—and visually depicted master—was expected to be planning to force a cultural change and program of agricultural regimentation on the economic classes below him.49 Yet there is neither unified nor uniform approach by authors or readers to these ends until the early eighteenth century, the same time as Georg Ludwig (George I of England) began laying down plans for Braunschweig-Lüneburg to become a state-run equine powerhouse. Since the potential pool of sources is quite large, I selected the sources for this subchapter based firstly on availability to and known use by housefathers in northwestern Germany. Secondly, I considered the diverse plurality of personal and communal masculine, particularly those that use equine bodies as a way to understand their anticipated reader's own male human body—identities that they reveal to be part of early modern everyday life.

48 “Wenn ein Hengst ein böse Geschäfft von einer unsaubern Stute bekommt” JVVNPC, 82.
Elite housefather guides for horse breeding conceived of society split into miniature agricultural dominions in which patriarchy reigned. Frequently connected to a religious mandate to follow the path of Adam, men were expected to have the means and the noble desire to produce horses on a large scale, enabling them to sell and trade elite riding horses for additional profit and an increased masculine social reputation. According to these admittedly idealistic authors, these financial means extended to the possession of an entire stable of grooms and equine specialists. Thus, the ideal noble housefather was imagined as the male head of house for his family as well as for his stable of equine tradesmen.

Additionally, the noble housefather ruled separately over these two domains with a distinct identity for each: a social and religious figure as a married man in his own home, and a social and economic figure as the master of his household (Hof) and head of all agricultural operations. These worlds—of private and public life and of economic value and social rank—were artificially depicted as distinct from each other in the same manner as the agricultural labor of women was absented from the images and text of housefather literature. Housefather prescriptive ideals perceived the everyday through hyper-male-centric world. It neither could nor did reflect the actual desires or practices of women because the elite housefather identities had already precluded women from being involved with livestock or with the stable. Since the advice was intended for the middle and upper orders, these guides instead provided prospective equestrians and breeders the necessary knowledge for directing and controlling their underlings. Reflecting social rather than gender inequalities, these underlings, who were rarely mentioned or visually represented or mentioned, did the bulk of the work in training and taking care of the horses. One of the few exceptions to the mysterious invisibility that afflicted other lower order men that worked with the master's horses, hoof-smiths were at times granted an elevated status. Yet this was more due to their somewhat rare yet vital possession of large stocks of knowledge about equine health than due to their respectable, guild-protected profession.50

---

50 Stable-masters and masters of horses (Rittmeister) were themselves frequently from noble families. In fact, these positions were commonly used at court as places for young noblemen to work their way up to the local lord's inner circle. Grooms on the other hand were not granted any special equine knowledge or privilege. Instead they were generally regarded as if they were just generic servants that just happen to spend all their time in the stable taking care of horses but who have no ability, skill, or morality outside that imparted to them by their master and housefather.
Marx Fugger (1578)

After Grisone, Marx Fugger's *Von der Gestüterey*, whose illustrations act as frontispieces for each of my chapters, is the earliest printed treatise of horse breeding and horsemanship that was widely used across Germany. Its primary goal was to encourage men of large fortunes to invest in the equine market by breeding new mounts for themselves as well as for the general German population, by which Fugger meant anyone that was not a farmer. The driving force behind this goal was his contempt for farm horses, which he claimed were the only horses available for sale.\(^{51}\) To bolster his case for the current substandard, shoddy condition of horseflesh, Fugger cast the blame on farmers through introducing the classist trope of the proudly ignorant German farmer, who breeds bad horses and who should therefore no longer be entrusted with the social duty of breeding—let alone overseeing improvements to—horses.\(^{52}\)

Supporting a Plutonic humoral view of the world, Fugger justified the superiority of the breeds, like the Spanish, preferred by nobles over the local farm breeds by awarding the best nobly useful virtues to the horses from warm climes.\(^{53}\) In addition to these political and social interests in horse breeding, Fugger also promoted a type of noble equine masculinity, which leveraged history and literary and oral cultural traditions with noble political interests against general cultural values in an attempt to continue using horses symbolically for higher order men alone.

Fugger is a strong supporter of the prevailing social and economic hierarchy. This sentiment most often reveals itself through Fugger's use of equine examples as metaphors for class-based social "truths." For example, Fugger justified the varieties of horse breeds and body types in terms of human social hierarchies: "Just as humans are different in life and in deeds, one finds that horses differ in the same way, each acts according to his rank."\(^{54}\) Legitimating the origins of these different classes and qualities of horses, he connects the divine mandate of God

---

\(^{51}\) "Vor zweintzig un noch minder Jaren gesehen...das man für ein Hauptroß halten möchten, sonder allein Klepper, und Wagen oder Gotzi Rossz...die seind in wenigen Jahren so gar gemain worden in der gantzen Christenheit, das man sich der gütten Rossz nit mehr achtet." Fugger, *Von der Gestüterey*, v.

\(^{52}\) "Was ist aber die ursach: das man die Gestüt und Roßzucht überall hat lassen abgehn...das jetzundt schier nyemandt mehr Rossz zeücht als die Bauren, welche weder das vermögen noch die gelegenheit haben, kostliche edle Bescheller...zukauffen oder zubekommen, sonder brauchen gleich Bescheller so gut als sie gehaben mögen." Fugger, v. This allegation was to be much repeated in both word and sentiment throughout noble discourses about breeding projects in early modern Germany.

\(^{53}\) "Also volgt nun auch, das die Pferd inn denselben warmen Landen vil zerter, schöner, perfector unnd müttiger seind, als in unsren kalten Landen." Fugger, 28. Blurring the line between environmental effects on horses and humans, Fugger uses the same Plutonic model to suggest that warm climates produce the oldest and thus hardiest humans. Fugger, 30.

\(^{54}\) "Gleich wie das leben un das thün der Menschen unterschiedlich ist, also findet man auch unterschiedliche Rossz, die doch einem jeden Menschen zü seinem Standt." Fugger, 58.
for Adam to become a farmer and plow the earth with a divine sanctioning of class stratification between and within species. In this rather convoluted construction of the agrarian First Farmer social identity, God provided farmers with horses skilled in farm work, just as he designed other horses to be skillful for noble purposes.

Unlike Grisone, Fugger did not appear to value images and diagrams. He apparently did not want his tract to waste time and space on visual keys. He did however find it necessary to devote an entire chapter along with countless asides to the equine mythos, using biblical, historical, and literary sources to justify the nobleness of the species and its particular value as the primary non-human helpmate to man.\(^55\) In this intellectual approach to hippology, horses are documented as enjoying some of the same sophisticated desires, such as enjoying music, as humans.\(^56\) Humans are also attributed with an ability to influence equine fetal development or general demeanor. The quality of art seen by a broodmare could affect the appearance and thus health of her foal, while dancing could be used in order to influence equine behavior in a way specifically desired by men.\(^57\)

These examples of anthropomorphism—of predating a close human bond with horses on human interpretations of equine bodies and motivations—are particularly used to justify the elevation of noble horses and thus the cause of noble horse breeding.\(^58\) Fugger's long, exhaustive recounting and referencing of human-equine history in literature touches on cultural information with which educated, nobles would have been quite familiar, but which lower-class audiences would largely have been unfamiliar. This representation about the history of human-equine relationships is purposefully skewed, since the world of equine knowledge being created by Fugger is being created for noble and wealthy men, who want to breed horses for war and for riding, the purposes that not coincidentally at the center of the stories in his work. These histories are also purposefully gendered as stories in which women not only are invisible, but also are naturally prohibited and uninvolved. In this manner, Fugger sets up the new print world of equine knowledge as a place for men to share a history and future and for women to be written

\(^{55}\) The most noble and complete, perfect animals, according to Philosophi like Galen, were humans, horses, and elephants. Fugger, 19-20.

\(^{56}\) Fugger, 20.

\(^{57}\) Fugger, 21and 23.

\(^{58}\) Just like noblemen and separate from all other animals, noble horses value cleanliness and dryness. Fugger, 24. Fugger also attributes the close human-equine connection to the similarity of diseases between the species: "So haben sy auch ein grosse gleichnuß mit dem Menschen in vilen sachen, sonderlich aber in dem, daß sy allen den jhenigen kranckheiten, so die Menschen pflegen zuhaben, underworffen seind." Fugger, 24.
out of and prohibited from in the future.

**Displaying Dominance: Georg Engelhard Löhneyß (1624) and Johann Geissert (1615)**

The frontispiece of Georg Engelhard Löhneyß’ *Della Cavalleria* [Figure 2.4] is quite elaborate and has clearly been designed for multiple modes of communicating meaning. It is structured horizontally tripartite, with meanings demonstrated through gestures, equine body groupings, mutually supportive allegorical symbols, mottos spoken by mute animal hosts, and even a comprehensive poem. At the top are three equine witnesses, each endowed with a particular motto, standing before a landscape; in the middle, the title is flanked by a knight on the left and a nobleman on the right; and, at the base a nobleman proffers a bridle to a small herd of pastured horses. While the significance of the middle figures to the expected audience of Reitkunst enthusiasts is obvious, the first and last sets display a mutually defining logic in which nobles' love and use of horses is ennobled by Reitkunst, the noble art of controlling equine bodies.59

Illustrating this point, the horses of the top trio convey several complementary projections of the importance of the quality of nobles' horses to the creation and success of noble masculine identities. The center stallion is shown wearing the distinctive bridle of the Reitkunst approach to riding.60 A man’s arm descends from heaven to crown the steed with a wreath of laurels, literally and figuratively bestowing him with nobility and virtue. Attached to these icons—it is unclear to which it should be attributed—is the motto: "A good horse is worthy of you".61 There appears to be a visual form of zoomorphic anthropomorphism at work in this scene, using the behavior of horses, which are given human sentiments to express as their own, in order to explain the behavior of humans. The dapple grey stallion on its left uses this metaphorical complexity to strengthen the force of its argument, which is predicated on the cultural identification of horse riding with noble military endeavors and which promotes horses as both

---


60 The shanks on the bit are elongated and the metalwork is decorated along the sides. All three of the horses are shod in a fashion favored for elite riding horses.

61 "Ein gut Pferdt, Ist Ihren Werth." The earlier 1609 edition shows the motto as “A good horse is worthy of honor” ["Ein gut Pferd, Ist Ehren wehrt"], which communicates a slightly different message but which remains indebted to linking male human reputations to the quality and ability of their horse.
the root and result of the nobly connected masculine virtues of bravery, love of fighting, and power. In his motto, the speaker is clearly the horse himself: "I shy from neither weapons nor violence, in this way I have brought honor to many". This horse is proud of his ability to help men attain honor even as he somehow derives honor from behaving like men.

The bottom scene meanwhile depicts a man declaring his dominion over the herd and justifying the righteousness of this claim by convincing the herd that their obedience is for their own good. The conditions of this landscape are the opposite of the stallion trio. Far from expressing their own beliefs in the power of Reitkunst, the horses are silent and their desires are explained to them. Furthermore, the nobleman, who stands with a whip upright at his hip, addresses his equine audience with the tool acting as both threat and reminder of the human ownership of their bodies. Yet despite the theme of equine subservience, the argument is clearly expected to be persuasive for its human audience. The rider expects to be able to entice and encourage good equine behavior with his address by referencing values and virtues that the horses represent to the noble himself, not what the horses themselves would find significant.

Using a visual set-up quite similar to Löhneyß, the quarto frontispiece for Johann Geissert’s Ritterlich_Kunstbuch [Figure 2.5] is divided horizontally into thirds, each with its own theme—the top highlights noble coats of arms, the middle brackets the title between two mounted riders and the base portrays an ideal riding school at work. The image demonstrates a clear expectation on the part of the audience that they will be men and that they will be using the book's equine knowledge to promote themselves through Reitkunst, making an identity for themselves as men that were recognizably equestrian experts. In the scene running across the base of the page, the emphasis is not simply on the physical act of riding but is much more about the trained skills and knowledge of the rider. He and his horse are frozen together at the precise moment of completion of a very difficult series of equestrian maneuvers, each of which demanded absolute control both over every equine muscle and over the rider's own mind. From the intricate patterns of hoof prints that are neatly paired at well-spaced points on the outside of a circle and on the proportionally balanced internal circle, it would have been clear to all observers that they were not seeing common riding techniques. In addition, from the gestures of both the

62 "Ich schew weder Waffen noch Macht, Damit hab ich manchn zu Ehre bracht."
63 "Ich stehe alhie und sehe euch an, Wegen ewer gestalt und Complexion, Und was ich euch hinfert wil lehrn, Dadurch eur Lob und Tugend vermehrn."
64 Johann Geissert, Ein Ritterlich und adeliche Kunstbuch: Darinnen von Reiten, Zeünien,auch Roßartzne, item allerley Stangen, Kinnketten, geschlossen und offenen Mundstücken samt jedes Wirkungen (Coburg: Bertsch, 1615).
rider and his instructor, it is equally clear that they want the viewer to marvel and admire the
difficult task at hand—the absolute control over the swiftest, most powerful domesticated animal
body of the time.

Further towards this goal, the horse appears to have been taught to do the impossible. Its
movements show no sign of natural gait or locomotion, and it appears to deny its natural impulse
to move forward. Demonstrating the power of the author's and his noble student's riding
techniques, the horse has been taught to do the opposite. Instead of walking or charging ahead, it
collects its body together tightly yet remains stationary; instead of extending its legs into a trot or
gathering them into a canter meant to cover ground quickly; it has adjusted its body to balance
on its hind-legs in order to pivot around an axis set arbitrarily at the whim of the rider. The clear,
well-spaced prints on the outer ring are further visual evidence of the art and spectacle of
Manage since they show that the horse has not merely hopped around on its hind legs. For ten
times in a row, it has hopped sideways, landed, gathered its bulk upwards, contorted its body
without disturbing its rider, and then leapt at an acute angle to where it last stood. Manage was
obviously a terrifically difficult thing to do well, which is precisely why the noblemen were
learning it, investing their time in performing it for others, and expecting to gain masculine
respect and social reputation from this particular equine knowledge.

The frontispiece also subtly supports the author's belief in the importance of bringing
wealthy young riders into the established equine social hierarchy of nobles and their dependent
retainers. Instead of setting out on their own and creating personal schools of riding, Geissert
encourages his audience to seek knowledge from respected experts in the field of Reitkunst. Yet,
perhaps due to the implicit social hierarchy at play in court, Geissert recommends to experienced
readers that they too can always find more to learn; and thus, the book is intended as much for
them as for those in need of their first instruction:

And so this book is not meant to be different, as [being] only for the young, adolescent
rider to learn the basics and process of bridling a horse, controlling it in hand, and
directing it. Therefore I have included in [the book] little that would be unimportant, in
order to not irritate the reader and to prevent the situation of uncertainty.

In this way, Geissert imagines the equine community to be comprised of members from different

65 "Und ist also dieses Buch anders nicht gemeinet, als nur den angehenden jungen Reutern, ihnen den Anfang und
Wege, die Pferd zu zäumen, in die Hand zu geben und zu weisen: So habe ich auch nicht viel unnötiges herein
setzen wollen, dem Leser zu weniger Verdruss, vnnd verhütung Wettleufftigkeit." Johann Geissert, i.
social-economic positions, each of whom have different roles to play in the equestrian hierarchy, but which all have the central concern to promote and excel in the noble art of equestrian control, *Reitkunst*.

_Johann Christoph Pinter (1664)_

Pinter's encyclopedic *Pferdt-Schatz* grounds the purpose and knowledge of horse breeding in *Reitkunst*. Using his own situation as the standard, Pinter imagines his audience to be wealthy or noble men who are already well accomplished in *Reitkunst* and who are looking to take the next step towards becoming a true hippological expert, a housefather, through the necessary learning of horse breeding. Horse breeding is, in this sense, the journeyman phase of what a master housefather—a man who is truly in control of every aspect of his household and stable—would need to know. Successful horse breeding demonstrates to the noble breeder's social peers and underlings that he not only has the ability to judge and control equine bodies under saddle, but that he also can instruct others in this subject and create these bodies with his own needs in mind. Squarely within the province of perpetuating an extant, dominant social hierarchy, one should also understand a housefather managing equine and human bodies to be a quasi-religious act through providing a small scale model of the godly household: "All work should begin, be strengthened, and completed in God's Name, and therefore should not be undertaken with swearing, cursing, or blasphemy because maledictions frequently come true." Basing the housefather's economic success on his ability to keep his subordinates moral and obedient, Pinter advocates controlling humans by censoring their behavior in an active and ongoing fashion.

Much as with *Reitkunst*, Pinter focuses on the importance of a man's social reputation as an elite equestrian and the economic benefits (i.e. improved financial position and improved social standing) that this particular kind of self-identity could provide to nobles with available


67 While Pinter himself does not emphasize the title of housefather, his construction of a male identity grounded only in equestrian knowledge and equine agricultural experience matches precisely what Johann Becher, among other contemporaries to Pinter, did define as a housefather. See Johann Joachim Becher, *Kluger Haus-Vater und Wohlerfahrner Land-Medicus* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1685).

funds. In fact, he is so class-bound in his perception of the equine community that he cannot bear to admit that anyone other than nobles identify as horse breeders. Similar to the reactions of Fugger, the deviance of actual horse breeding practices from the ideals purportedly governing elite personal stud farms pains Pinter:

This abuse has already increased so much, that the improvement is much more to be wished at than hoped for. The damage grows steadily larger and more egregious, so that the studfarms are almost all gone, and of their reinstatement one neither hears nor sees anything, except that now all horse breeding is in the hands of common people, each of whom practise it as they will, according to their position and pleasure, which means that most end up causing more damage, and that most think of nothing other than sticking to their own inclinations and errant opinions.69

Pinter's class bias limits whom he recognizes as possessing equine knowledge. He takes it for granted that farmers bred bad horses and had no training on the subject. Despite the fact that farmers had been breeding viable horses in this manner for centuries and despite the heavy reliance of all members of early modern society on farmers to produce horses for sale, farmers' horse breeding was categorically deficient simply because the men performing and directing it were peasants. Thus, the reasoning behind farmers’ actions was never considered valuable or rational. Just like non-human animals, farmers are assumed to have no logic behind their choices in coupling horses.

Furthermore, the "pleasures" that farmers desired directly conflicted with what the nobles were expected to desire. Thus, Pinter views noble breeding as legitimate because he expects nobles to be breeding for military purposes or for political and thus financial profit—the desires typically and historically associated with nobles. Pinter structures noble breeding in this way as good for the whole of society since it supports the existing social hierarchy's control over all economic resources, which meant that horses, no matter their quality, were expected to be offered up immediately for whatever purpose the noble currently required or desired. Pinter therefore does not regard the short-term or long-term economic and agricultural well-being of a

---

69 "Es ist aber mit diesem Mißbrauch bereit so hoch gestiegen, daß die Besserung viel mehr zu wünschen als zu hoffen ist, der gemeine Schaden aber um so viel grösser und mehr zu beklagen, als die Gestüde nun fast alle abgangen, und von derselben Wiederanrichtung weder zu hören, viel weniger zu sehen, sondern es ist alle Pferd-Zucht nur in der gemeinen Leute Hände gerathen, von welchen jeder für sich thut was ihm beliebet, auch sein Verstand und Vermögen zulässet, an welchem es den meisten mangelt, und so lang auff keine andere Gedancken kommen, als sie auff ihrem Vorsatz und Irrigen Meinungen verharren." Pinter, 37.
noble's territory or state as a valuable purpose. Instead, he sees the desire of farmers, who tend to choose to breed horses in a manner that will be useful to the demands of Spanndienst and agricultural production and thus to the long-term economic well-being of a territory—in addition to their own personal short and long-term survival—as superfluous and useless. Farmers "mangle" horse breeding by breeding to a purpose that is at odds with the purpose that Pinter supports, not by breeding an unhealthy, unsound horse. Using circular, class-centric logic, horse breeding could not really be recognized as horse breeding unless one undertook it as a deliberate and calculated path to gain money, to increase his social reputation, and to have easy and constant access to highly trained horses, the educated noble man's preferred tool of trade.70

**Georg Simon Winter (1670)**

Like Pinter, Georg Simon Winter's horse breeding advice is guided by the class-based rather than the trade-based prejudices of its author. Demonstrating his rank as noble housefather, Winter's masterful horse breeder exerts absolute control over every aspect of his horses' lives and commands instant obedience from his grooms.71 This housefather also shows off his skill in other court-based knowledges, such as being able to converse in several languages. In this housefather ideal, Winter expressed a sense of elite equestrian masculinity triumphalism, whereby horse breeding is the means by which a nobleman demonstrates his authority and privilege. It was more of political and social orientation than personal devotion to hippology.

Winter's *Stutherey Mercurius* shares with Pinter a deep-seated misogyny and distrust of female sexuality that reveal itself through his discussion about the mechanics of breeding. Stemming from extant social and possible personal fears about cuckoldry, Winter projects a noble male morality onto broodmares and their forced couplings. As opposed to the age-old natural method of equine reproduction and to its domesticated variety of turning out a stallion and a mare in heat together in the same paddock for several days, Winter molded the process of impregnating a mare into an elaborate ritual that sought at every step to emphasize human, and
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70 Pinter, 4. Pinter also encourages the use of branding as a commendable equestrian tradition, as it can serve as a brand-name advertisement: "Die Brand-Zeichen seyn bey den meisten und vornehmsten Gestüdten ein alter loblicher Gebrauch, nit allein des Pferdes Ansehen und Wolstand zuvermehren, sondern auch des Gestüdtes Würdigkeit und Ruhm weit und breit bekandt zu machen, das Pferd damit zu erheben, und männiglich von seinem hohen herkommen zu recommendiren." Pinter, 38.

specifically noble, male control. First were the numerous preparations of the noble-blooded stud and his intended mate. The majority of these, which not coincidentally dealt with the unfortunate noble female object of the proceedings, included limiting the mare's intake of water and food as well as cleansing her sexual organs, securing her tail to her body in order to expose her genitals, and rubbing irritants like nettles on them. The next stage demanded the assistance of several more grooms and a host of man-made restraints specially designed for this purpose. These slings were attached between her legs and hooves, with additional ropes meant to provide leverage against her movement held tautly across her shoulders and firmly pulling downward from her bridle. According to Winter, it was quite possible to for him to require the assistance of four grooms by this point, in order to force the mare to maintain a stationary position. The third phase was the introduction of a teaser-stallion (Probier-Hengst) that is a lower-class stallion, who was solely used to sexually arouse and molest the heavily restrained mare. The teaser stallion's job, as a member of the equine lower class, was to serve the noble stud by preparing the mare for the arrival of her intended while ultimately being denying any pleasure from the task. Finally when the stable-master was suitably convinced that the mare will submit to the less than desirable sexual attentions of the chosen stud of quality stock and noble virtue, the teaser stallion was stuck in a neighboring paddock to watch as the mare's real partner (rechten Beschäler) was led in by several other grooms and forces himself on her. After the noble stud performs to the satisfaction of the observing stable-master and his grooms, he was led off to rest, while the mare has another round to go. Stable-masters like Winter were well aware that mares’ fertility decreased significantly by their insistence on breeding her "in hand." Therefore, in order to increase her chance of conceiving, cold water was splashed on her genitals, and she was compelled to spend the next fifteen minutes jogging around the stable.

Not content to exert control simply through selecting a noble female's reproductive partner for her, Winter's preference for "in hand" breeding seeks to maximize noble male control over every aspect of equine reproduction and reveals certain class-based insecurities about fertility and sexual attraction. By adding the unnecessary and counter-productive step of using a teaser stallion only when trying to arouse noble mares, Winter projected some of his own concerns and beliefs about noble women into his understanding of equine generation. The logic

72 Winter, Stutherey Mercurius, 78.
73 It is a concern that is reflected in a number of horse breeding and housefather guides in the seventeenth century as well as reflected for the eighteenth century in the charter of the Celle studfarm. See HStA Hann. 147, no. 1.
governing Winter’s recommendations for horse breeding relied upon an anthropomorphic expectation that equine females would rather not be monogamous and that they thought of sexual intercourse strongly in terms of sexual pleasure rather than of chaste necessity born to their sex by Eve. Instead, they were presumed to prefer the base pleasures of inferior, lower order male stock. From this perspective, if the mares refused to willingly partner themselves with the "best" mate for them, then Winter felt that they need to be forced into it for their own good because it was their female (and religious) duty to submit and obey. This moralization of forced breeding, which was practiced disproportionately by noble breeders rather than horse breeders of lower economic orders, demonstrated an intense suspicion and paranoia that elite women did not appreciate noble virtues and were not attracted to quality. Similarly, it was the duty of lower-order males to both be used for noble desires and offer up their bodies to ensure that the highest ranking male came out on top.

_Johann Misselhorn (1682)_

Somewhat akin to Geissert in predicking his social identity on his trade-based knowledge and experiences with training horses and noblemen, Johann Misselhorn offered advice in order to help instruct both green and experienced riders in the art of Manage. Yet Misselhorn also wrote on behalf of what he saw as an urgent need for young noble men to be actively trained in equestrian techniques for war. In fact, the greatest service that Misselhorn felt that he could do was to properly prepare leaders with the new equine knowledge that they would need to master for military—and thus political and social—success: "Today, a man no longer lives by books alone, but also by the sword, and neither does he just live by the sword without literature as well." If nobles truly wanted to learn Reitkunst, then they needed to practice it daily; they could not learn what they needed to without practical guidance to go along with their written guides. Misselhorn's Reitkunst school thus represented a safe place for young noblemen to be introduced into the equestrian world that is their birthright. It also served as a mechanism to bring them into the fold, where young men learned equine skills from older members of the elite

---

75 Johann Misselhorn, _Lüneburgische neu eröffnete Manege Oder Reit-Schule_ (Celle: 1682).
equine community, who had earned their recognition as legitimate experts by supporting the personal political aspirations and hierarchical economic policies of their social superiors.

Misselhorn did believe in excluding lower-order men from extensive study of Reitkunst because it could not be of use to them. Yet while he recognized Reitkunst as the natural province of noblemen and political life, he did so from a relatively sympathetic understanding of the middle orders and farm life. From this perspective while it might be true that the riding posture of Reitkunst was distinctive enough to be easily recognized and appreciated by all social orders, Misselhorn felt that it would be a waste of time and money for non-nobles to invest in it since they would have no way to profit from their knowledge. The training and riding of plow-horses was nothing like the equestrian skills they would learn from Reitkunst; and furthermore as Misselhorn noted, farmers had very different preferences and concerns in the equine livestock that they purchased.

While noble housefather literature was intended for a well-off, elite audience, it cannot be expected to have been wholly unfamiliar to lower order audiences. Although they were pointedly and strategically denounced for their alleged ignorance of equine bodies and industries by the higher-order authors of housefather and horse breeding literature, the lower, agrarian orders were interested in educating themselves about the best way to approach agriculture. After all, knowledge and experience with agriculture strongly influenced daily survival on a farm. In addition, it became increasingly true for farmers over the seventeenth century that their trade—and thus a social identity in the local community—was closely tied to the success not only of their horse breeding but also of their skill using horses as draft animals.

As will be explored next in discussion of the genre of farmers’ almanacs, the lower orders were just as sophisticated as nobles in the information that they required for daily lives and their trades. Although they were not participating directly in elite hippological networks, farmers did

77 Misselhorn, 12-3.
78 “Der Bauer stelt sich bißweilen zwar dum, wenn er ein Pferd verkeuffen wil, er raisonnirt aber anders, wenn er Geld davor geben sol, und seynd die Leute gar zu klug worden, und so verschlagen, daß sie das alles verachten, was der Verkäuffer an dem Pferde lobet, es sey in Kunst, im Leuffen, in Farben...so gefällt es ihme quansweise nicht, als dem Reiniken dem Birne.” Misselhorn, 29.
79 Bit-books, as Pia Cuneo has demonstrated, were generally purchased by an equestrian who then took the book's illustrations with him to the bit-maker so that they could discuss what style and design the bit-maker was to make. Additionally, the numerous Aderlass circles, which were copied widely and often, in low and high sources, were visual reference maps that anyone could follow. Pia Cuneo, “Just a Bit of Control: The Historical Significance of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century German Bit Books,” The Culture of the Horse, eds. Karen Raber and Treva Tucker (New York: Palgrave, 2006).
have scientific logic for their practices and traditions. Furthermore, farmers looked for practical rather than elaborate or theoretical solutions to their daily problems. This means that while they might have shared some hippological interests with the middle and upper orders, low-ranking audiences read a more diverse, although spotty, range of hippological literature. Unlike nobles and urban elites, farmers’ survival—not just their reputation—depended on successful equine healthcare, and their agricultural needs required information that elite sources could not or were not willing to give.

**Farmers’ Almanacs**

According to Karl Schottenloher's definitive work on early forms of cheap print literature, the ancestors of modern wall calendars showed up first in Mainz around 1447 and were published very sporadically through the rest of the fifteenth century. However, by the early decades of the sixteenth century, farmers’ almanacs had begun to take a significant role in everyday life. Unlike some of the other forms of disposable literature, almanacs were intended to be kept for an entire year and to be serviceable to their audiences on a daily level. They imparted vital information about astronomical predictions, which were crucial to planning when the times of good or misfortune might be in terms of planting and harvesting as well as to when the best times for bathing and planning other specific economic or health-related activities. Moreover, since it was the standard preventative method of human and livestock healthcare at the time, bloodletting was always a significant subject in early calendars.

Due to their use as disposable literature, few almanacs have survived to the modern day, and therefore it is quite difficult to recreate a complete sense or representation of the media and

---


81 Schottenloher also notes however that many of the early calendars were both made and marketed by physicians, who were already prone to favor bloodletting, so calendars’ emphasis on phlebotomy may also partially reflect the experience, interests, and training of physicians a bit more than the actual practices of all farmers at the time. For more on this topic, see Udo Benzenhoefer, ed., *Heilkunde und Krankheitserfahrung in der Frühen Neuzeit: Studien am Grenzrain von Literaturgeschichte und Medizingeschichte* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992); Rainer Wunderlich, *Alltags-Ordnung: Ein Querschnitt durch den alten Volkskalender* (Tübingen: Hermann Leins Verlag, 1982).
its genres. The almanacs selected for this subchapter were chosen based on a variety of factors that I thought would best approximate the equine and agricultural print knowledge accessible to everyday audiences in northwestern Germany. To this end, I have focused on texts that emphasize the agricultural and trade knowledges that early modern farmers needed and wanted to know, such as information about the best time to harvest and about yearly livestock markets. I have organized them chronologically in order to emphasize a major historical development in early modern agrarian life. Using the almanacs as sources of popular culture, I demonstrate how over the seventeenth century, agrarian knowledge became increasingly intertwined with equine knowledge (and specifically with the fields of horse breeding and husbandry) in print literature, artistic representations, and state documents. In the case of almanacs, this trend is revealed through the types and emphasis of veterinary information offered in the medium. While their general household farm tips offered beneficial information for all farm livestock, almanacs developed only one genre that focused on livestock healthcare and medicine and that one genre dealt solely with horses.

In the early sixteenth century, the most basic almanacs were pamphlet-style planners, like Leipzig's Der Bauren Practica (1517), which was a combination of monthly activity guide and almanac primarily marketed for farmers' use. The simplicity of this almanac's style worked well with the complexity of the images and material that it supplied, making it the dominant form of literature for both general and agricultural knowledge through the sixteenth century. While the Bauren Practica itself organized the coming year based on what day Christmas had fallen during the previous year, later almanacs expanded the Bauren Practica's monthly template into weeks and days, detailing exact dates for religious holidays and giving farming and household advice for every day of the year and not just in monthly overviews. Presumably due in part to the illiteracy of a large portion of its projected audience, these almanacs would eventually come to rely heavily on color-coded symbols representing an astonishingly large variety of meanings and suggested activities. In addition, in all of these almanacs and their codes, bloodletting was always the most commonly scheduled activity for human preventative medicine.

Although the general focus of their medium did not change in the early seventeenth century, almanacs became even more sophisticated and specialized. Using Johann Krabbe zu
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82 Angela Vanhaelen shows a similar problem in the Netherland with Dutch comic prints. Angela Vanhaelen, Comic Print and Theatre in Early Modern Amsterdam: Gender, Childhood, and the City (New York: Ashgate, 2003).
Wolfenbüttel's *Alt und Neu Schreibkalender* (1610) as an example, there was now a symbol key given for the various astrological, alchemical, and cultural symbols used to predict inauspicious times and to advise on daily farm and life events. These keys routinely used black and red ink to distinguish between meanings and uses of the symbols. Furthermore, the symbol codes were applied to more precise times of a single day. Thus, one could be instructed to undertake a task specifically in the hour before or after noon. Additionally, there were now parts of the day that might grant moderately good bloodletting and those that might provide extraordinarily good bloodletting. On top of these simple codes that utilized single characters, the *Alt und Neu Schreibkalender* utilized these "event" symbol codes with other symbols to create layered codes for further mis/fortunate emphasis. These symbols governed the various aspects of the day or time in question. For bad luck, four different varieties could additionally be stacked or doubled-up according to the intensity of luck that was associated. While the key did not explicitly define—as it did for the individual symbols—the special significance attached to symbol pairs, the fact that all three symbols for misfortune (*Unglück*) were used in these pairings indicates that the pairings had particular meanings outside those indicated by single symbols.

Farmers' almanacs of the early seventeenth century were far from being a simple peasant’s calendar. They were complex, sophisticated texts that imparted a great deal of information within a very concentrated area. And for those who could write, writing almanacs (*Schreibkalender*) offered about two inches per date-entry of space for household notes, plus the occasional reminder of a religious anniversary (e.g. the day Jesus turned twelve) along with more direct predictions (e.g. plague will occur on the fifteenth of August). For farmers and village artisans, who depended on such fairs for their livelihood, these ("transitory") publications also provided an essential record of where, when, and what types of markets would be held in the coming year.

By the mid-seventeenth century, almanacs had expanded the written portion to include much more than a handful of tips and religious facts. Offering something for everyone, almanacs gave post times and the distances between major German cities. Instead of a short, half-page listing of yearly markets (*Jahrmärkte*), there were now several pages devoted to the topic. The entries were more diverse in number and region, of course, but they also began to acknowledge
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83 “Mittel gut Aderlassen” (represented by a red cross) and "Ausserwelt gut Aderlassen" (represented by a red double cross).
the specialized interests of their audience by noting specific products or livestock for which particular markets were known. The listed specialties were still overwhelmingly representative of farmers and traders in agricultural goods, but they also indicated important times of year for artisans whose trade depended on a secondary use of livestock. For example while large-smiths as smiths depended on the wholesale iron trade for the raw material of horseshoes, they also depended on livestock trading, whether for general livestock or specifically horses, at yearly markets in order to bring in new trade as well as new customers. One never knew when one's horse might throw a shoe or when it might get sick. Additionally since the markets were predictable events, village-based farmers could plan and budget for whatever products (i.e. medicines, horseshoes, tools) that they might need for the rest of the year. For village-based large-smiths, yearly markets were chances to make extra profit by offering up a large, captive audience of potential customers that they could not normally access. While city- and guild-based large-smiths maintained exclusive rights to their trade in general, yearly markets were the one time of year during which non-guild and village smiths as well as guild journeymen were legally allowed to vend their wares, if only for one day, in town.

Clearly satisfying a demand for—or at least a general interest in—more specialized material for practical and daily use, almanacs had begun to develop distinct sub-genres by several decades later. These genres expanded the general use calendar format and advice with more trade-specific and special interest information. For those living in mining towns like Goslar, there was a *Haus...Bergwerck Calendar* (1687); for those who traveled for their livelihood, such as soldiers, horse-traders, and merchants, there was the *Reysender Leute und Soldaten... Reut-Schmid und Ross-Cur* (1686) to help them deal with any mishaps like a sick or wounded mount that might occur on the road. The general interest portion of even such specialized literature maintained its original purpose of offering agricultural and household, which were considered synonymous, information. For example, an illustration in the Goslar mining almanac connects the human body's nodes to their phlebotomic purposes in routine
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84 It is for this reason that even today, one can always find a farrier—and usually a veterinarian—at any size American horseshow.

85 Johann Bergmann, *Haus...Bergwerck Calendar* (Goslar: Johanne Bergmann, 1687); Georg Simon Winter, *Reysender Leute und Soldaten...Reut-Schmid und Ross-Cur* (Nürnberg: G. S. Winter, 1686). In the latter's case, Georg Winter was a well-known, published authority on general equine care as well as on the use of horses in the military. So, at least in the case of Winter, who also had published a *Reysendrer Leute und Soldaten RossArzt Calendar* the previous two years, there was an added bonus of authorship by an established expert in the field of the specialized subgenre.
preventative healthcare routines and to common cures for humoral disorders.

At the same time, some of the subgenres were hyper-specialized in agricultural and home concerns. As might be expected, there clearly was interest in human healthcare advice. At this time, few elite human medical texts had practical advice to offer about the bodies of expectant or nursing mothers, infertile or old men, or children of any age. Therefore, it is not surprising that almanacs were similarly incomplete, comprising few specialized remedies for a large number of specific human conditions and giving little focus to animal bodies outside their use as components of medical remedies and producers of human goods. Early modern audiences were grateful for any useful tips and hints for healthy living for themselves, and it seems that anything else was more than generally even hoped for. Thus, predictions about months and seasons did not tend to conjecture on the possibility of animal plagues or the best, most fortunate time to wean foals. The information for which people bought specialized almanacs for healthcare and agriculture instead took the shape of poems to help one remember the proper places and times to bleed one's family or the variety of ways in which tobacco could be beneficial.86

Yet despite all this—and indeed significant because of this—there were still traces of the centrality of horses to everyday agricultural, economic life. Horses, their stabling, and advice on their health showed up in entries that spanned several months, thus indicating the importance of equine well-being over that of other livestock as well as the importance of horses to everyday agricultural and economic life. Looking at the visual information that the almanacs provided as well as the cultural information that the visual relies upon, farmers were clearly being associated through their trade with horses more than with cattle or any other element of farm life. In this way, almanac frontispieces followed a similar development that was springing up at the time in common material art. This type of art involved the depiction of farmers through aspects associated by them to their position in society as both men and as promoters of equine-based agriculture. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four however, farmers also associated themselves to these masculine and equine developments in agricultural practice. When male farmers were depicted at work—and they were rarely shown at leisure—in almanac frontispieces, the draft animal that the men were most commonly and widely linked to was the
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86 For the poem, see Anon., *Haushaltung und Arzneey Calendar* (Hannover: 1681). For human plague predictions without accompanying non-human animal concerns, see Michael Crünger, *Schreib-Haus...Gesundheit Calendar* (Goßlar: Michael Crünger, 1679). For tobacco advertising and marketing via home remedies, see J. H. Voigt, *Haß-Artzney und Baum-Garten Calendar* (Minden: J. H. Voigt, 1686).
horse. Even though all forms of published literature acknowledged farmers' use of cattle along with horses and despite the indications of tax records showing that farmers owned many more oxen than horses, the authors and printmakers of elite published guides as well as those crafting the calendar consistently depict the idealized animal icon of farmers to be the horse. In addition, their male audience appeared to agree.

Furthermore, through a comparison of farmers’ almanacs giving the locations and numbers of horse and livestock markets (Ross-und Viehmärkte) in Braunschweig-Lüneburg during the seventeenth century, one can observe an increase both in numbers of these specialized trade markets and in villages hosting them. In addition, while both horse and livestock markets increased over this period, horses alone earned the significance of their own unique category and were sold at both locations. Over the seventeenth century, these markets quickly grew into localized centers for equine-related industries, becoming places where a farmer's mares might be bred, fitted with shoes specialized for plowing, and treated for any ailments before pulling the farmer’s wagon back home. Johann Krabb zu Wolfenbüttel's Alt und Neu Schreibkalender (1609) reveals that Hannover, Hildesheim, Erfurt, Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Osterode, and Wolfenbüttel all had notable livestock markets. Absent from Krabb's list were the towns of Celle, Ultzen, and Münden. If there had been markets geared towards farmers at this time, they would have been small, local affairs that primarily featured agricultural products. Despite the destruction caused by the Thirty Years War on local farms and livestock populations on the northern heath, Stephan Fuhrmann's Almanach...Haus-Calender (1649) demonstrates that the demand for horses was strong on all levels of society. His market chart documents that while Hannover continued to hold a single yearly livestock market, Celle and Ultzen now both had three livestock markets and Münden had four.

Prior to the development of newspapers during the mid to late eighteenth century in Germany, almanacs served a broad number of interests and aided the development of, at the time, niche markets. While ultimately offering the most benefit for the low orders and for the agricultural economy in which the majority of the population worked and on which taxation and

___

88 Stephan Fuhrmann, Almanach/ Auff das Grosse Hall- und Jubel-Jahr...Beneben dem ...Haus-Calender (Lüneberg: Sterne, 1649).
89 The existence and genre focus of the anonymous work, Hauß- und Reise- Calendar (Berlin: 1733) among others, demonstrates that this medium continued in popularity and in serving special interests while maintaining household use and focus.
state obligations were based, almanacs provided information that could not be gained in other areas. Additionally, they offered this information in a manner that did not expect a classically literate focus on text-centric narratives and that did not push a strong social or political philosophy on its audience. Their versatility and broad appeal were strengthened by their format as cheap, reusable, and easily tradable guides.

**Farm Guides**

Developing at the same time as almanacs but serving a slightly wealthier audience, farm guides were books that focused at length on specifically agricultural advice. Somewhat distinct from horse breeding and housefather literature, these guides gave general, yet highly detailed advice to farmers on how best to set up their households and farming trade. Unlike the editors and authors of almanacs, the authors of farm guides were at times guided by a political or social motivation; however, unlike explicitly housefather works, the philosophies of farm guides represented a lower-order perspective and approach to agricultural knowledge rather than a higher-order promoting and centered political or economic ideology. Farm guides had a very basic goal, to provide farmers with enough knowledge to properly set up their farms, organize their work force, and strengthen or expand their home—and thus agricultural—industries. This was to be accomplished through a number of different activities, including: diversifying crops, breeding and raising livestock, using the local environment to directly benefit farm life, and providing healthcare for livestock and people.

The earliest farm guides were colored by the religious convictions of their authors. For example, Erasmus Sarcerius, a pastor in Leipzig and strong supporter of Bucer, composed his *Hausbuch für die Einfeltigen Haus* (1553) explicitly as a guide for housefather behavior that was entirely grounded in the Bible. Yet despite this professed purpose, Sarcerius had an ulterior motive. Reflecting the confessional insecurities of his time, he intended his work to be used by Catholics along with Protestants and thus for the work to surreptitiously convert Catholics. As might be imagined, the *Hausbuch’s* religious content heavily outweighed its agricultural advice. The book has little of practical value dealing with health, household, or agricultural trade.

---

Although the title of housefather originally had a different emphasis—or was part of an existing plurality of meanings—during the early to mid-sixteenth century, it quickly became rooted in the masculine trade and community identity of farmers. Just as with Pinter's and von Hohberg's works on horse breeding for housefathers, a few farm guides made clear that religious scruples had motivated their creation. However, for these authors, the religious motivations were directed towards serving the good of their peers. That is, they wrote to help others of the exact same circumstances, who currently lacked experience or knowledge but who were already searching for a way to improve their lives and economic viability. They gave advice as an equal, as one who had been in the same circumstances that others were finding themselves. These housefathers spoke as a father, but as a father who had worked the same tasks in the same conditions as the families he advised. Their superior knowledge was gained through communal and personal life experience rather than being generated by university or court education and by the social and resultant economic superiority inherently granted to them by their class.

The sources selected here are meant to best represent the genre as a whole as well as for their use in being a counter to the elite housefather literature of equitation and horse breeding guides. The literature additionally illustrates that northern Germany increasingly became involved over the seventeenth century with the world of agricultural and equine print knowledge. Moreover, this involvement came to exercise a great deal of influence on the genre's development as well as on the practice of farming in northwestern Germany. Farm guides started as a genre created by middle order authors to provide lower orders with useful agricultural information. Afterwards they developed into a genre that, in stark contrast to the elite housefather literature, did not emphasis the personal social reputation of authors as validation and proof of their equine knowledge, but which instead emphasized a communal spirit and purpose to creating, demonstrating, and sharing agricultural and equine knowledge. In this approach, a man's identity and economic position in society was gained by direct, everyday personal experiences with farming and by the social and economic connections that he made through farming, particularly with his use of equine bodies. In this way, farming became a trade in its own right, which linked and united farmers through agricultural and equine skills and which refigured farming as a specifically masculine undertaking.
Martin Grosser (1590)

As early as 1590, the connection between raising crops and livestock breeding as central practices of farm life and practice was clear. In Martin Grosser's Zu der Landwirtschaft: beydes im Ackerbau und in der Viehzucht, this association was emphasized in the title as the foundation for Grosser's work, and it stemmed from his underlying purpose of promoting housefathers as a good model of religious and gender values. A pastor, Grosser was motivated to write a farm guide due to his understanding of the biblical foundation of agriculture. His reading of Genesis located the roots of agriculture in biblical commandments and events, such as God's commandment to Adam to make the earth fruitful and God's decree after the fall from Eden for men to till the fields. Grosser also noted that Jesus' sermons frequently used farming terms as well as figured him as a farmer. From this biblical evidence, Grosser saw God as being invested in the proper practice of farming and livestock breeding as a spiritual and physical duty of an individual according to God's command. As a result, Grosser illustrated a model of masculinity based on Adam as the First Farmer. In this way, he viewed farming as a type of communal duty, one that if not taken seriously and performed with skill and energy by all earthly participants could result in crop failure as divine retribution.

Grosser divided his work into two parts, the first for farming and the second for livestock breeding. Serving to further support his argument, the two halves clearly were meant to be used together—one half was not meant to stand alone, say, as a complete guide for a farmer who did not also breed livestock. From his perspective, it would have been folly and counter-productive for a farmer to attempt only half and it was essentially unthinkable. For example in his discussion about the best types of fertilizer for crops, Grosser discussed the matter by weighing the merits of different livestock's excrement. This type of consideration could only occur if one had different types of excrement on hand to choose between and if one had a sizable quantity and cheap, renewable source of them.91 In this first section, he also included advice on growing herbs, whose crucial use for fodder and medicinal purposes is only explained in the second section. While discussing the proper feeding of nursing cows, he reminded the reader not to forget to supply these herbs along with hay and water or else the calves would die and there

91 The commonness of household remedies using excrement as a binding or a curative agent also supports this claim. Livestock excrement could be used to additional, magical use on both humans and horses. Wolfgang Hildebrand credits Gabriel Fallopius for one recipe in his Magia Naturalis that relies upon chicken droppings being applied to the face of a black horse's face in order to turn it white. Magia Naturalis, das ist Kunst und Wunderbuch (Erfurt: Wolfgang Hildebrand, 1611).
would not be any more milk.

Concerning horses, Grosser distinguished their nutritional needs based on their current work classifications. Through his own personal experience with the demands of farming, he recognized—unlike the elite authors of housefather and horse breeding guides—that there were, in fact, several different types of farm horse common to early modern Germany. Showing a more sophisticated understanding of the caloric needs as well as the demands of different equine body types, Grosser noted that wagon horses should receive different fodder than that given to plow horses. Furthermore, he was even willing to grant pregnant mares a little special consideration. Unlike pretty much all of the non-personally experienced, higher-order authors of housefather and horse breeding guides, Grosser advised his middle- and lower-order audiences to avoid working heavily pregnant mares and to improve their fodder mix. He justified this argument through the very common-sense observation that if a mare got worn out from too much work and poor feeding, she would not produce good foals, only low quality (gering) ones.

Grosser did not think highly of the actual, practical knowledge of higher-order equine tradesmen like stable-masters. Correspondingly, he did feel that farmers along with lower-order equine tradesmen have the most complete knowledge and experience with equine husbandry. This view is evident in his closing words on equine husbandry: "That belongs alone to the horses, as the farmers here plow and fodder themselves. Concerning the horse, lords and the middle-orders support feeding it nothing but oats, which lower-order riders and good grooms know to avoid." The men with the most practical, everyday experience with horses were the ones with the best—which Grosser equated to the most productive—understanding of how to maintain a horse's complete physical well-being. More than nobles, they understood how to use a horse's potential to the best personal and communal uses.

---

92 Horses could, through their lifetime, serve in several different classifications, usually in a descending order of recognized value and recognized skill that was uncoincidentally connected to the descending order of social position of its new owner. While many horses began and ended their lives as plow horses or even as saddle horses, there was an industry based around remarketing old saddle horses of the middle and upper orders as viable wagon or plow horses for lower order men.

93 "Der Stutten auch/ wenn sie sehr tragende oder trechtig/ (wie man es nennet) mit der Arbeit verschonen/ und etwa mit der Fütterung was gütlicher thun." Martin Grosser, *Zu der Landwirtscafft: beydes im Ackerbau und in der Viehzucht* (Görlitz: 1590), 21-2.

94 "Das ist allein von den Rossen, wie hie die Pawren dieselben Ziehen und füttern. Anlangende aber die Ross, so Herren und Junckern stette beym lautern Haber halten, damit wissen Reuter un gute Stallknechte umbzugehen." Grosser, 32-3.
Kurtzer Bericht (1619)

The anonymously authored *Kurtzer Bericht* offered another everyday perspective on what a good farmer should do and care about. A pamphlet in verse, this work was written as a guide for low-order behavior from a sympathetic, lower-order perspective. The author offered specific advice for agrarian families. This advice clearly relied on an extant understanding of farmers both being housefathers and wanting to know how to be the best housefather—and consequently the other members of his family wanting to view and support the housefather in this identity—that he can. The author found that proper gendered behavior along with maintenance of the fields and livestock made a farm housefather happy and put him on good terms with God. His skillful and dedicated labor had an additional material bonus as it often resulted in more monetary profit.

The book supplied lessons for each member of the family, beginning with the farmer as the head of the house and followed by his son, the economic and social second-in-command for the family and a future housefather himself. Emphasizing this future need of the son to be educated as a housefather properly, the son was advised to read the lessons for his father in addition to those assigned to him. In elite housefather models, women commonly were treated as irrelevant and physically distant as well as uninvolved in any aspect of planning or execution of agricultural tasks. However this pamphlet specifically recognized and even depended upon female involvement in livestock husbandry and daily farm operations. Contrary to many elite models, this wife was positioned as a housemother, a complimentary yet subservient role to the housefather. This housemother, along with her future housemother daughter, was expected to fodder the livestock, to keep a general watch over the dogs, pigs, and cats, and finally to milk the cows. The fruits of this unsophisticated feminine labor supported the grander, more complicated tasks created for men.

The tasks for men were more specialized in several ways. First, they were recognized as part of a network of agricultural skills necessary for the proper performance and practice of a trade, farming, that was itself already denied to women through the self-fulfilling cultural belief

---


that women did not have trades and that a woman could not run a farm on her own. In this way, 
women could not learn agricultural skills nor did they have direct access to specifically 
agricultural tools—whether or not inanimate—but rather performed farm chores along with 
whatever was considered to be already in the province of female labor, such as cooking and 
cleaning. For example while the housemother and her daughter were reminded to perform the 
basic duty of providing livestock with fodder daily, the housefather and his son were reminded 
that they need only be concerned with plowing and with the well-being of their horses. 
Secondly, as will be detailed in Chapter Four, farmers increasingly began to identify horses as a 
necessary part of the symbolism and cultural life of their trade over the seventeenth century. 
Concurrent with this trade evolution, farmers began to shape the stable and horses as the rightful 
province and property of men and as bodies through which masculinity was performed and 
revealed. A farmer's sense of masculine self, such as his understanding of self in relation to the 
housefather ideal and as a legal, social authority, and his membership in the local community 
became defined precisely through his knowledge and control of equine bodies and behavior. 
While cattle and mules were often better choices due to feed costs, the terrain, crops to be 
harvested, obtainability, and sturdiness of health, farmers consistently began to recognize their 
agricultural work through an equine host, even though their agricultural work may—and 
frequently did—rely more heavily on bovine labor. 

In terms of the Kurtzer Bericht, the farmer became a proper man and part of the proper 
masculine social order through skillfully controlling his equine tools and through the proxy of 
organized, male-guided labor. He thereby produced agricultural and monetary commodities, 
which belong to the housefather as reward for a trade well done: 

"A farmer must take on the household concerns and wait on his horse himself. He must 
like plowing back and forth, at whatever hour and time he wants, because there are many 
obligations that accumulate on the land. He must yearly set up his land well, for that is 
what bears him fruit and brings him money."97

Master of himself and his trade, this farmer needed to watch over his horses himself and to 
identify when and for how long to work his team. He was neither a lazy or idle man nor one that

---

97 "Zum dritten muß sich ein Bawrsman, Getrest der Haußsorg nehmen an, Und seine Pferd selbst warten sein, Daß 
er mag spannen auß und eyn, Zu welcher Zeit und Stund er will, Im Hof samlen des Müstes viel, Jahrlich zu tügen 
hübsch sein Feldt, Das tregt ihm Frucht und bringt ihm Geldt." Kurtzer Bericht (M.C.H.P.L.: 1619), A iii. Despite 
the chapter title ("Von der Haußhaltung"), this farmer is identified by the tools of his trade in the field and thus 
through what those labors bring to support and direct the household.
was unconcerned with his social reputation. Instead, this housefather was proudly content with a well-recognized household position, social status, and trade reputation. The crops, tools, and commodity acquisitions merely served as a means to personal and communal identity.

Outside the strictly gendered division of tasks, the economic and social behaviors expected of men in the *Kurtzer Bericht* were generally also expected the entire household. The success of a farm depended on equal efforts by both housefather and housemother—and their economic dependents. For example, the chapter devoted to financial saving identified frugality as a concern of all family members. According to its advice, each family member had to play his or her part in properly conserving and using household supplies. In this way, the housefather had neither total jurisdiction over nor total access to the financial and agricultural tools of trade. The same standards for proper godly and social behavior was required of the housefather and his son as of the housemother and her daughter; and, the pamphlet advised both housefather and housemother against domineering behavior in the home with the advice, "Be not a lion in your house."98

*Johan Mathesium (1631)*

While it did not offer much as far as an alternative mode of housefather masculinity, Johan Mathesium's *Oeconomia* (1631) offered spiritual assistance for all ages of men in an agrarian household. Published in Lüneburg during the Thirty Years War, a war that was particularly devastating to the farmlands and livestock of the southern heath, the *Oeconomia* was a pocketsize devotional work that provided general prayers, such as the Nicene Creed, along with prayers for healthy, dying, disabled, or old housefathers.99 Perhaps representing the lack of horses being used for agricultural labor—due to high theft, death, injury, infertility due to malnutrition, and noble "acquisition" rates—at the time, none of the numerous species of livestock mentioned in the "Poor People's Prayer for their Dear Livestock" (*Armer Leut Gebet für ihr Viehlein*) were horses. Despite the constant disruptions to agricultural production, livestock breeding continued to be important to everyday farm life and practice; and, farmers' concern for livestock manifested through anxiety over—and increased emphasis on—the magical

98 "Sey nicht ein Löw inn deinem Hauß."

99 The fact that only one prayer of the book offers relief to a woman, a “Haus-mutter,” further emphasizes farming as being only performed and important to men as well as underscoring the divine mandate to Adam to farm.
Salomon Gubert (1649)

First published by Salomon Gubert only a year after the Thirty Years War, the *Akker-Student* (1649) presents a very different approach to farming. A farming guide, it offered help for crops and provides advice for animal husbandry. While it was generally comparable to elite housefather guides in content, its tone was what makes it stand out from these contemporaries. Neither religious nor socially conscious, Gubert used humor that depends on shared experiences between author and audience in order to present common sense, practical advice. Concerning how to recognize which colts to geld, Gubert, for example, humorously asserted that: “The colt who sticks his whole head into the water-bucket to drink and who pisses against his own foreleg is a gelding (*Wallach*).” Horses that lacked the most basic common sense and intelligence brought their fate upon themselves. Although pathetically comic through their lack of self-awareness, these horses should not be allowed to pass on those behavioral characteristics to potential offspring and should be gelded to prevent that possibility.

Gubert also offered husbandry and handling advice for horses that depends on a minute knowledge of horse's bodies, complete to a hair. For example, he advised that the eyelashes and hairs growing out from the horse's eyes should be ripped out as part of the general upkeep of a workhorse. Although that might seem unnecessarily cruel, his advice addresses a long-standing problem of equine upkeep. Judging from the numerous recipes treating in-grown hairs and eye infections in earlier veterinary works, Gubert advocated a proactive approach to the horse's future health rather than supporting an aesthetically fueled mutilation. Unlike the encyclopedic, removed advice of housefather literature or in the field-focused details of most farm guides, Gubert expected his audience to work so closely with horses as to be able to recognize and watch out for these follicle growths.

---

100  "Viehzucht...für der Teufels Zauberey und allen bösen Augen" behüten. Johan Mathesium, *Oeconomia, oder Bericht vom Christlichen Haßhalten* (Lüneburg: 1631), 27.
101  Salomon Gubert, *Akker-Student* 1st edition (Riga: 1649).  Gubert, *Akker-Student* (1673), 164. The *Akker-Student* is also notable for being one of the extremely rare works both in the regard that it acknowledges the existence of geldings and that it also references the annual gelding process necessary for any livestock breeders.
102  Gubert, 167.
Furthermore, Gubert’s advice ran counter to that in other works, which advocated that a horse's nostrils or mouth be cut in order for it to supposedly breath better and thus perform to impossibly high, unnatural, man-made ideals. However, Gubert did believe in the naturalness and inevitability of physical inferiority in non-human animals—and thus a related superiority of the construction of human bodies. Gubert had a humoral understanding of mammalian bodies as unstable physical constructs that needed constant surveillance and preventative care (e.g. phlebotomy) in order to maintain their health.

**Johann Christoph Thieme (1682)**

A lengthy work with multiple volumes and editions, Johann Christoph Thieme's *Haus-, Feld-, Arzney-, Koch-, Kunst- und Wunderbuch* (1682) attempted to be as encyclopedic as possible while still providing a beneficial, self-experienced narrative to help the reader determine for himself the best choice of available solutions to animal husbandry concerns. This *Wunderbuch* was a compilation of Thieme's own commentaries about basic farm managing and of well-known published authorities, whose excerpts were included in the *Wunderbuch*. While it is a bit hard at times to recognize when Thieme was plagiarizing another author, the *Wunderbuch* itself was ultimately greater than its partially stolen parts. Despite pulling the majority of these published expert opinions in the world of *Reitkunst*, noble stud farms, and court horse doctors, Thieme cited sources less to impress and more to support his own arguments. He wished to offer his audience the best advice that he could, which for Thieme meant pulling from the entirety of his experience, both as a reader and enthusiast and as a practitioner whose practices are tried and true to life.

Regarding aesthetic choices and the modifying of equine bodies, Thieme was much more in line with Gubert as far as his expectations of his audience having a close, daily interaction with their equine charges. Thieme revealed a number of interests that might have seemed too lowbrow for comment to housefather authors, but that were clearly fascinating to some and

---

103 For example, this could be either because the horse is already being worked hard and needs to keep that up or because it is being trained to be faster and more battle- or saddle-ready. For more about body modifications in early modern animals, see Jason Hribal, *Animals are Part of the Working Class: Commons, Enclosure, and Resistance in the Atlantic World* (PhD diss., University of Toledo, May 2002).

104 For example, he does not cite ancient Roman experts, his best friend who just happens to be some powerful duke, or things in Latin, Greek, French, or Spanish. He also does not inform his audience when stealing from others’ works. This may be because he expects his audience to already be familiar with them or because he did not want to get in trouble for plagiarizing.
practiced by many cultures differently at the time. For instance, Thieme proposed the circumstance that perhaps one would like to change the natural color of one's horse. Although Reitkunst, horse breeding, and housefather works certainly describe bits and equestrian trappings for the horse's body in graphic detail, this farm guide and Wunderbuch explains how one can customize the horse's body in a non-invasive, somewhat whimsical manner. It gave recipes for how to dye a horse brown or black and how to make or mask facial markings, and it also explained how to dye a white horse red so that it looks like it is swimming in blood.\textsuperscript{105}

Explaining this last effect, Thieme noted that one should dye the entire body of the horse, as according to the Turkish custom, and not just the mane and tail, as according to the German custom. He thus revealed here that dyeing one's horse was a common practice and that it might be undertaken for a variety of effects.

There were many useful outcomes of dyeing one's horse. The Turkish military were known at the time to decorate their arms and signify rank with the use of horsetails. Presumably, for Germans however, the psychological effect of approaching another army mounted on a visual sea of blood must have aided directly the attack of one's cavalry. If one intended to sell a horse whose phenotypic color suggested a bad temperament, changing the color of the horse could certainly benefit the seller. Additionally if one had stolen a horse, changing its color could help the theft go untraced. Yet for several reasons, it appears that Thieme was actually advocating dyeing as something fun to do. His preface, text choices, and tone make it clear throughout his work that Thieme was speaking to an agricultural—and not a military or criminal—audience. His point about Turkish dyeing technique makes it clear that he was not expecting his audience to have used his other recipes to dye the entire horse. In addition, according to the elaborate humoral-phenotypic table stolen from Lohneyss that Thieme follows in another section of the book, dyeing one's horse black would reduce its selling value and might even make it more unlucky.\textsuperscript{106}

Speaking to his dedication towards providing useful, but also interesting facts for common audiences, Thieme was one of few widely published early modern German works that give hands-on, graphic details about procedures for gelding colts and stallions. Although

\textsuperscript{105} "Als warn es in Blut geschwämmet wäre." Johann Christoph Thieme, \textit{Haus- Feld- Arzney- Koch- Kunst- und Wunderbuch} (Nürnberg: 1682), 1519. He also notes that the Turks dye the entire horse, and not just the mane and tail as apparently the aesthetic preferences of Europeans dictated.

\textsuperscript{106} Thieme, 1386 and 1391. The Rappe is the worst color for a horse; its blackness is the root of a host of issues. As mentioned earlier, this table was stolen from Lohenyss' 1588 bit-book.
meeting his match in Winter, he went further than Gubert and Pinter by providing the information that castration was a necessity. Not only did Thieme point out that one needed to have a strategy in place for when colts became sexually mature, but he also noted several ways in which the farmer could accomplish the task. He noted that there are at least two different methods, German and Spanish, and then he set up a comparison of these two models.

While Thieme unfortunately did not document exactly with which tools and in what manners Germans typically castrated colts and stallions, one can glean some information about the German practice from how Thieme contrasts the Spanish variety to it. These cultural differences offer more than an everyday perspective on international veterinary practices. They also demonstrate how at least two different constructions of early modern masculinity relied upon associating human male bodies with equine male bodies:

The Spanish cannot bear it when their horses are hard to control and whinny loudly, but they want instead for the horses to be obedient and docile. Moreover, for that effect, they clamp rather than remove the testicles. In this way, they are able to bi-pass the wildness of a stallion while making the gelding still appear to be intact.107

Since Thieme at other points praised the reputation of Spanish horses for their appearance—and the phenotypic virtues signaled by their color—as well as for their bold spirit, this quote clearly reveals he did not think highly of the Spanish as very accomplished or respectable horsemen. While German upper orders sought the improvement (Verbesserung) of local horsestock in order to create more spirited, bolder mounts, they did so either by importing sires that exhibited phenotypes associated with beneficial qualities and behaviors (e.g. such was the case for the Braunschweig-Lüneburg dukes in the late seventeenth century) or by fine-tuning nature through proper selection and training-for-task of each horse (e.g. such as Misselhorn suggested for the mounts of the Lüneburg Ritterschule). Yet here, from the lower- and middle-order German perspective, the Spanish nobles appeared to be so foolish that they cannot recognize a good thing.108 They already had a horse who behaves ideally by nature, yet they want to crush its noble spirit and break its body to fit their convenience. The Spanish did not manipulate equine

107 "Die Spanier können nicht leiden, wann ihre Pferde viel schreyen und wild sind, sondern wollen, daß sie gar fromm und sittsam seyen, darum lassen sie dieselben klemmen und nicht auswerffen...dadurch ihnen die Geylen vergehet, und scheinet also ein Pferd ganz seyn, das doch an ihm selbst castriret ist." Thieme, 1423.
108 The white horses alluded to by Thieme are clearly Andalusians, who are widely praised for their virtues of bold spirit and heart. This breed is also primarily ridden by upper-class men, who frequently performed public Manage displays as a way to build an elite masculine identity and to participate in higher social or political spheres.
bodies to good purpose, socially or economically. They invasively manipulated the body and literal maleness of a horse in order to cheat their way into an easier riding mount and thus a better masculine equestrian reputation.\textsuperscript{109}

By inferred contrast, German men of all ranks carried on a tradition of being good, capable riders, who unlike the Spanish know how to handle strong mounts and thus were not afraid of their stallions crying out loudly or acting wild. Instead of seeing the behavior as a direct challenge of human male authority, Thieme represented the wild behavior of stallions simply as masculine behavior that any intact, strong male might want to do. In this sense, to deny it by force—such as through an unnecessary castration—would be to deny nature and perhaps God. In addition to its male, social dishonorableness, the false theater of making a gelding appear to be a stallion is ridiculous on practical grounds—as Thieme noted that castrating a horse makes it less fit for riding as it loses all its strength and courage.\textsuperscript{110} Exhibiting little to no true knowledge of equine behavior nor appreciating the masculine code of equestrian culture, the Spanish preferred to be imposters rather than to educate themselves as proper housefathers would. They chose to castrate a stallion to force a behavioral effect, which could have easily been trained out of it.\textsuperscript{111}

The overwhelmingly symbolic emphasis, which the Spanish place on the visual intactness of geldings—and of course stallions—equated equine male genitals to human male virility and by proxy to the intactness of the virile man.\textsuperscript{112} Unable to reproduce, geldings are demoted in this Spanish gender hierarchy from the masculine/male equine ideal of riding mount and part-time stud to something beneath the feminine/female equine ideal, a draft horse and continual broodmare. Through riding a horse that is visually coded as a stallion, a Spanish rider not only appeared more manly, but he became more of a man because he appeared more manly. Only a highly capable equestrian with quick reflexes and a close eye on his surroundings would attempt to navigate city streets mounted on a stallion, an animal whose unbroken male spirit granted it

\textsuperscript{109} Thieme, 1424. He does mention that clamping is a common method used by German farmers, but for oxen and steers. It is therefore not the method of castration, but rather its frivolous and rank-cheating use that raises Thieme's contempt.
\textsuperscript{110} “Solche Pferde verlieren nicht allein allen Muht und Herz, sondern auch die Stärke, im Wagen möchten sie vielleicht noch zu brauchen seyn.” Thieme, 1423.
\textsuperscript{111} Thieme, 1435. However, he does recommend castration in cases of natural or unnatural behaviors that cannot be controlled by other means.
extra speed and strength along with a strong opposition to domestication. Through the rider's
decision for a mount to be intact or castrated and by giving weight to the expectation that
intactness and supposed maleness of a horse had any bearing on the masculinity of its rider, this
type of equestrian masculinity depends on the objectification of the stallion through its male
genitals. This validates the construction and performance of a human masculine socio-economic identity.113

Thieme recognized the Spanish equestrian identity of men to be completely centered on
sexualized equine bodies. While he did agree with the Spanish that the behavior of the horse—
its virtues and class-based abilities—was heavily influenced by sex, he was primarily concerned
with the practical veracity that the sex provides and not its symbolic applications. Thieme was
interested more in how to adapt equine bodies and sexes for practical, economic uses than in how
to manipulate one's own cultural and personal identity through riding selective sexes. For
Thieme then, a man would not ride a mare because mares are best fit for heavy labor and
unrefined work. Unlike others, he did not see riding a mare to be disgraceful to a male rider,
either by associating the male rider with female genitals and thus with having a female body or
by symbolizing lack of equestrian skill through the comparative lack of challenge it took to
control a supposedly simple female. In the same way, a man would ride a stallion because
stallions possess virtues like intelligence, courage, and aptitude for Manage, which are all three
needed for being a good mount. Likewise for Thieme, a draft horse pulling a wagon required
none of these abilities, but instead needed to have a calm disposition, brute strength, and
steadiness—qualities that mares had.

Nevertheless, Thieme's beliefs about equine sexes were highly influenced by his own
human male ideas about masculine virtues and about human-animal bodies. Yet, they play out
differently than in the Spanish model due to the middle- and lower-order bias of the author and
audience and due to the preferred focus of equine knowledge in the text on agriculture and
economic productivity. In some aspects, Thieme’s professional advice represents a particular
German cultural perspective, which attempted to universalize masculine qualities and male
physical characteristics across species’ boundaries. This type of anthropomorphic argument is

113 While certainly true that many horses were rented or borrowed for riding purposes, the audiences that Thieme is
speaking directly to—the noblemen who bred their own saddle-horses and agricultural workers who bred their own
workhorses—were presumed to own the horses that they might be riding, whether for Manage performances or for
market trips and guiding wagon teams astride a lead horse.
found in many seventeenth century hippological guides, such as in claims that by nature of their sex, intact males of all species were granted either sole possession of or the highest quantity and quality of certain virtues like intelligence, courage, and talent. In other respects, Thieme’s prescriptive advice projected the belief that sex was not enough to unite or characterize males equally across species. This construction of human masculinity was grounded not only on the primacy of humans within animal hierarchies, but also on the primacy of males above females within animal species and human sub-categories. Accordingly, this human male model suggested that equine skills and activities should be both ranked and gendered according to the importance placed on them by existing human male socio-economic hierarchies. In this construction, some physical and intellectual attributes were more necessary to certain trades and social positions—and the humans that belonged to those trades or elevated social positions were automatically assigned those attributes, leaving other humans to be assigned the leftovers. Thieme uses both the universal male and human male models of masculinity to understand and differentiate between equine types, uses, and sexes.

Universalized anthropomorphic male model

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, animal books were common print sources of knowledge about the animal kingdom. They were both popular and influential as aids identifying specific anatomical and behavioral attributes of animals as well as locating each animal in its proper place in the human-headed zoological hierarchy. In some of these works as well as in other popular forms of media, horses were granted specifically gendered social vices, such as the lustful, wild, and vain behavior of mares. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, for example, has written at length on the formation of masculine identities by medieval knights through their mounts and on how the economic and social dependence of the knight influenced how he valued, praised, and represented himself through descriptions of his horse. Although Cohen studies medieval England, it is exactly this type of anthropomorphic process that one sees operating in Thieme's understanding of virtue and in how Thieme attributed certain virtues to different types and sexes of horses by human standards of class and sex.

115 For bit-books but also for the use of bridling to make correlations between mares and women, see Cuneo, “Just a Bit of Control,” 141-173.
Thieme recognized wildness as an intrinsically natural male behavior, albeit somewhat uncivilized or animalistic if practiced by a man without discretion. Stallions and colts are represented as being born with it, and mares and fillies without. Noble men breed it—and thus its linked virtues of courage and indefatigable energy—into the horses they plan to use for battle and for equestrian performances. Although not understanding the practical use behind the testicular symbolism, the Spanish still rely upon the literal image of wildness to increase their human reputations. Wildness of spirit and heart was perhaps the most fundamental attribute for equine males. As such, for German agricultural and equestrian audiences, it was to be kept as intact as possible. Only when the stallions grew so uncontrollable that they threatened the proper hierarchy of human-equine power or the daily operations of the farm should their masculine spirit be somewhat subdued.

In German farm guides like Thieme's, there were not insecurities about an existing or looming absence of masculine spirit in local herds. The improvement of local herds—and thus the new male generation of horses—involves increasing the size of existing herds. Likewise, castrations were never urged on the grounds of lack of masculinity or because of a stallion's lack of interest in reproducing or lack of skill under saddle. Castrations sought to cure an excess of male spirit: "When he becomes uncontrollable and sex-crazed after mares, or after other horses, one should geld him, which he will protest with a loud cry." The stallion here challenges the proper human-animal hierarchy in several ways, both of which are results of too much masculine desire. His heterosexual desire for mares is so excessive that he can think of nothing else, and his sexual desires are so strong that he transgresses human standards of sexual propriety by seeking sexual release in geldings and other stallions. In these cases, this uncontrollable and unpredictable behavior would interrupt and endanger the traditional breeding and work cycles. The stallion has so much excess masculine spirit that he fights even stronger against losing the source of his heteronormative potency.

Just as with Gubert, Thieme bases his primary focus in the proper selection of studs on the fitness of the stallion's body. However, while Gubert dealt primarily with the lack of such

---

117 In addition to the already-mentioned evidence, chapter twenty-one's title: "Von der Grösse und Tugend eines Pferdes, so man zum Krieg brauchen will." Thieme, 1413.
118 "Wann es wild und toll nach den Stutten, oder anderen Pferden ist, so lassen es verschneiden, und Wallachen, zerschlagens jämmerlich mit grossem Geschrey." Thieme, 1435.
119 This is similar to how Reeser discusses the situation for men in French literature. See Todd Reeser, *Moderating Masculinity in Early Modern Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
virtues as intelligence and coordination, Thieme focused on how the animal body conforms to several overlapping scientific (human) male ideals. As much of early modern human medicine followed a humoral understanding—although not one specific universal model—of the body, it is not surprising that humans should have also applied the same tenets to other animals' bodies. It is highly significant however that the only cross-species application of humoral medicine consistently made during the seventeenth century was between humans and horses. While numerous printed works encouraged farmers to bleed their large livestock at certain points throughout the year, there were not dedicated guides for interpreting bovine humors or phenotypes. Among all non-human animals, horses alone are widely and continually the focus of detailed veterinary studies and of this humoral-sharing anatomical closeness.

Throughout all of the printed equine sources in this chapter as well as in the foundational documents of the Celle state stud, the potential virtues and vices of a horse are determined through humoral-phenotypic semeiotic relations. The various phenotypic signifiers involved aspects of color, shape, size, location on the equine body, geographic location, and astronomical conditions of the horse's inception. For example in Thieme's chart of elements, which he had plagiarized from Löhneyß' 1588 bit-book, the metaphysical elements of air, fire, water, and earth were listed with their corresponding inner properties (i.e., humors), external properties (i.e., phenotypes), and the resultant behaviors. Horse colors were thus limited to four categories: air (e.g., chestnut brown or apple grey), fire (e.g., fox or light brown), water (e.g., white or "liechtfahl"), and earth (e.g., black, black-brown, or mouse-colored). Hues within those elemental color categories were somewhat distinct, although the justifications given for how and why they were related to their virtues or to their color category were a bit specious. Such is the case with the colors of air. While the chestnut brown was somewhat universally praised in printed hippologies—and in Celle foundational documents, it is not clear why a distinction was

120 In addition to ancient philosophers, like Aristotle and Galen, there were medieval anatomical models, such as those by Avicenna and Albrecht, and various early modern models, such as those by Vesalius and Paracelsus. During the early modern period in northern Germany, all of these overlapped through direct and indirect competition and general uses. For an intellectual history of early modern human-animal scientific models, see Erica Fudge, Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2006).

121 Charles Estienne's anatomical illustrations of bovine bodies demonstrates that it was possible for veterinary experts in the early seventeenth century to use human medical understanding of humors and bodies as a way to understand and diagnose cattle along with horses. However, it is clearly not an idea that was widely accepted by early modern German authors and audiences.

122 Other than Pinter, Misselhorn is pretty much the lone exception. Misselhorn's call for more empirically based appreciation of horses largely falls on deaf ears.
made in favor of chestnut brown over apple-grey, since both hues had the same humoral nature, "geschickt." Additionally, Thieme's simple rhyme to remember differences between hues added no concrete information towards the superiority of chestnut browns, but just assumed it as fact: "Chestnut brown is the best of all colors, none of which can be confused with it, as it is characterized by the exact color of ripe chestnuts, and thus why it is so named."¹²³

Knowledge of equine bodies was thus derived from the scientific knowledge and universal application of humoral categories and characteristics. A phenotype and its cultural, scientifically laden associations are more telling as signifiers of virtue and fitness to a prospective buyer or breeder than the actual performance and medical history of the individual horse. Relating to one's choice of studs, this type of universal categorization of body types could also be seen as gendered male, both because the assumed audience is male and because the type of scientific humoral models that are being used are already gendered male through their focus only on male equine bodies and their gendered understanding of reproductive inheritance.

Like many other German hippological and housefather authors, Thieme’s assumed audience was a male head of house that was in charge of all the agricultural and genetic resources. Much as the housefather was recognized as head because of his ability to impregnate his wife and because of his socioeconomic abilities, the stallion is represented in equine literature as head of herd in his function as stud and as a valuable socioeconomic resource in his riding and draft skills. The farm wife and housemother showed up rarely in housefather and farm guides—despite the success of the housefather's socioeconomic and agricultural ventures being wholly dependent on her physical performances as both supportive labor and as producer of new workers (i.e. Zucht).¹²⁴ Similarly, the female plow horse and broodmare was absent in works on farm work and horse breeding, both enterprises whose success were ultimately decided by the fitness and reproductive ability of female equine bodies.¹²⁵ Instead, the primary focus of hippological and housefather guides' discussion of equine bodies was on the male body. Thieme’s veterinary sections did not include any listing or reference to female ailments, even

¹²³ "Kastanienbraun, ist die allerbeste unter allen Farben, welche nicht anders siehet, als die rechten Kastanien, wann sie wol zeitig sind, daher sie auch den Namen haben." Thieme, 1388. Likewise for apple-grey: "Diese werden für gar herzliche ausbündige Pferde gehalten, dann man findet deren nicht viel, und ist wol zu merken, daß alle graue Pferde, je länger sie leben, je weisser sie werden." Thieme, 1389.
¹²⁴ Marion Gray and Fritz Hartmann disagree with me on this point.
¹²⁵ This fact is unconsciously acknowledged by the mid eighteenth century. During the first half century following its foundation, officials at the Hannoverian project in Celle were quite concerned that less than half of all the mares bred to state stud horses were producing live foals. See HStA Hann. 147, no. 1-10.
those that were related to horse breeding like swollen teats, protracted or infected uteri, and the
inability to produce milk. There were however swollen scrotum, unsheathable penises, and the
inability for a male horse to urinate.\footnote{The treatments for urination problems always mentioned that they should be applied to a penis. Pinter, 11-2. It should be noted though that Pinter's \textit{Pferdt-Schatz} does note that miscarriages are a problem that someone needs to solve.} The generic equine body was thus gendered as male just
as the generic human body has been historically in both philosophical and medical fields from
Plato to Foucault.\footnote{Pinter among others uses the stallion as the generic horse in the illustrations accompanying discussions of blood-letting for preventative and curative uses. For this trend in biology, see Anne Fausto-Sterling about gendered human bodies and sexes. For modern science's misogynistic assumptions about gendered predictability in human sexes, see the entire field of behavioral sciences and see FDA standards for testing medications, dosages, and side-effects. In terms of ancient philosophers, see Aristotle and Plato; for medieval scholastics, see Avicenna; and for early modern philosophers, see Descartes. For modern philosophers and theorists who assume the generic body is male, see Foucault, Lacquer, and Lacan.} The bodies of female horses were conceptually and categorically invisible. In contrast, stallions' and geldings' bodies were scrutinized down to the micro-level. Horse-
buyers were commonly advised how to distinguish between and judge precise details about the
appearance of a male horse's scrotum, penis color, penis length, penis width, and semen.

Stallions were scrutinized for their possession of certain physical ideals and not for what
would make them the best representative of equine or human reality. While planning for how to
create a future improvement change in an existing population should involve some concept of a
specific physical ideal to be reached, the ideal horse by nature could not truly ever transcend its
species and become human. Therefore, the needs towards health, fitness, and reproductive
ability of one species (\textit{equus ferus}) cannot be entirely judged and directed to follow the same
path as another species (\textit{homo sapien}). Yet at times this was exactly what Thieme—among other
authors—did. Just as according to Aristotle, human males were ideally supposed to have
modestly sized penises, the proper size of an equine penis was also to be small to moderately
sized.\footnote{This is precisely what Reeser has found to be true about men in early modern French literature.} Thieme did give some rationale behind why small scrotums and penises were good but
only in relation to what the appearance of the genitals indicated about the general health and
strength of the horse, rather than to the horse's actual reproductive abilities as reliable stud or as
successful passer-on-of-genes:

\begin{quote}
"The scrotum should be small, black, uniform, and well-tucked...it means that stallions
are healthy, strong, and clean. These horses are uncommonly good for breeding. But if
the scrotum is large and hangs low, it means the opposite, that these horses are lazy,
\end{quote}
unclean, and unhealthy. Likewise the penis or shaft should also be short and black.”

The reasons given here for the necessary length of scrotum and penis do not give any indication of a connection between shortness and an increased volume or viability of sperm. Nor is there a discussion of whether this proscribed short length could be too short and therefore cause sperm to be wasted on the ground. Additionally, the topic of the size, shape, and color of a mare's teats and vaginal opening is never introduced. This type of universalized physical masculinity, as developed here by Thieme, was absorbed entirely with male anatomical standards, regarding female standards as either somehow irrelevant to the specific breeding purposes of the book or simply not interesting enough to mention to a male audience.

**Human male model**

Coming more from religious and cultural perspectives than scientific, the human male model of equine masculinity relied on strongly gendered assumptions about the differences in sexes in human-animal society. This model stemmed in part from a derivation of a gender hierarchy from the biblical human-animal hierarchy that placed Adam in charge over all other animals on earth. The other part relied on applying certain human cultural reproductive practices and stereotypes to expectations of equine reproductive ability and maturity. Both parts depended on understanding reproduction and animal physiology through an assumed natural inequality of animal sexes. Just as Adam birthed the inferior Eve, Adam as divinely ordained First Farmer set the standard of sexual and gender inequality for all other animals to follow through his trade practice of animal husbandry and reproduction. Moreover, just as God set Eve's Eden punishment to include the pain of childbirth and thus linked Eve's primary use for Adam with reproduction and dependent aide to men, Thieme felt free to demand reproductive sacrifices of fillies and mares, including discomfort, ruining of their bodies, and the premature shortening of their lives, that he does not consider for stallions. Furthermore, Thieme unconsciously

129  "Das Geschrot soll klein, schwarz, gleich, und wol aufgeschürzet seyn...es bedeutet, daß solche Pferde gesund, stärk und rösch sind, und sind dieselben Pferde sonderlich gut zum Beschellen; so aber das Geschrot groß und hangend ist, so bedeutet es das Widerspiel, daß solche Pferde träg, faul und ungesund sind; das Glied oder Schafft soll auch kurz und schwarz seyn." Thieme, 1409.
130  Pinter alone discusses the problem of weak sperm. In his *Pferdt-Schatz*, he comments that thin sperm will not be fertile and that, furthermore, the sperm could be dangerous (*schädlich*) to the mares. Pinter, 17.
131  Pinter also notes that a stallion that comes too quickly or too late wastes sperm: “Daß her auch weder zu frühe noch zu spat abgehe, denn wo er allzu begierig und den Saamen gehen läset, ehe er recht auffkommet, ist so wenig eine Frucht zu hoffen, als wann er die Studten zu lang auffhält.” Pinter, 17.
132  See Thieme's introduction for the invocation of Adam as justification for horse breeding, housefathers, and patriarchy.
employed his own misogynistic and classist stereotypes to explain female equine behavior as well as to justify the reproductive abuse of equine females.

Thieme did hold some standards in common between male and female breeding stock. He believed that the parents in each cross should be of relatively the same size and same color, in order for the foal to have the best chance of inheriting its parents' good phenotype. He also cautioned that both studs and broodmares should lack deficiencies in order to produce good offspring. It was for this reason that he felt that studs should not be allowed to reproduce until around age five, so that any deficiencies will have had time to manifest. Yet despite his prior statements that heritable deficiencies could come from either parent, Thieme argued that mares should be bred before the age of three, that is when they were not yet adults. This new advice did not reflect Thieme’s belief that fillies mature much faster than colts—and therefore the related corollary that mares would have manifested any deficiencies by three when they had reached adulthood. At the age of three, Thieme explicitly acknowledged that fillies are not yet adult and thus that possible deficiencies would not have yet had time to show up. It was, in fact, because the fillies were not yet adult and because their bodies were still growing that Thieme wanted them to be bred so young. He believed that the flexibility of the growing pubic bones and ribs provide an extra benefit in delivery, presumably having sculpted the interior of the filly into whatever was most comfortable for the unborn foal. Thieme neither claimed that the first two foals of a filly bred at three years old are any better or healthier than those produced by adult mares, nor does he explain why God made birthing easier for adolescent fillies rather than for adult mares. Thieme instead blindly focused on the issue of a filly's ability to produce a foal—whether genetically deficient, physically malformed, or accidentally healthy—as soon as possible than in investing time and resources into ensuring that her pregnancy will produce a viable and useful offspring. Consequently, he had no regard at all for the short-term or long-term internal damage of breeding fillies, which were not yet sexually or physically mature and which

---

133 Thieme, 1442 and 1447.
134 Thieme, 1446-7. Additionally, some of the same things that make studs physically attractive (schön) should also be true for mares while they are being used in breeding. In other words, the breeding male is considered physically attractive as long as he is fertile, while the breeding female is bred only as long as she is considered physically attractive.
135 Thieme, 1451. Their pelvis (Schloßbein) is more malleable, which makes it easier for foals to force their way out.
136 Although one could chose to read his belief that fillies gave birth easier than mares in light of God's infliction of pain in childbirth to Eve, and therefore to all adult human females. In this way, by interpreting horses through specifically human examples, mares are supposed to have difficulty giving birth, just like human females.
would spend eleven months of each year pregnant.\(^\text{137}\)

This brand of misogyny can also be seen in Thieme's advice concerning nursing. Thieme considers the quantity of milk being produced to be more important than the ability to produce healthy, well-formed foals. Although he noted that older mares did produce the best foals since they had so much experience at the task, Thieme emphasizes that these broodmares should eventually be expelled from the farm in favor of adolescent fillies, whose bodies were not finished developing but who supposedly produce more milk than older mares.\(^\text{138}\) Connected to his anthropomorphic projection of old broodmares as undesirable old women, Thieme considered the younger and middle-aged broodmares that did not produce much milk far more favorably. These reproductively and physically useful mares gained a reprieve from slaughter and were sent instead to labor in the fields.\(^\text{139}\)

Along with his general misogyny and female objectification, Thieme shares a fear of uncontrolled female desire with other hippological authors of the time. This is most clear in his statements about mares' supposed preference for monogamy, the horniness of fillies, and their related desire to be pregnant. Although mares were frequently associated culturally with vanity and promiscuity, Thieme insists that mares naturally prefer to stick with a single stallion.\(^\text{140}\) The topic comes up while Thieme is discussing local farm practices towards changing studs yearly or maintaining a common stud, which is used for all one's mares over several years. Despite noting many farmers' preference for using a new stud every year, Thieme claims rather arbitrarily—and certainly for the first time in his work—that one should consider the opinion of the mares, who just so happen to prefer a single mate over playing the field.\(^\text{141}\) According to his experience, mares cannot love foreign stallions nor do they find them sexually appealing; they only have eyes for their local lothario. It is therefore quite significant that Thieme seemingly contradicts

\(^{137}\) Thieme even claims that breeding fillies is good for their bodies because it makes them more fruitful, which is pretty much impossible. Since horses are pregnant eleven out of twelve months and very rarely have twins, Thieme's argument has no empirical basis for claiming added fruitfulness, particularly since he is not concerned with the continued fruitfulness of older mares.

\(^{138}\) Thieme, 1451-2. Older mares are mares that show their age (das Alter...zu scheuen). The intellectual parallel between Thieme's distaste for older mares and his opinion on the roles of women's faces and bodies is obvious. Since horses do not go through menopause, these old broodmares would have still been producing healthy offspring at the time that Thieme recommends them for slaughter.

\(^{139}\) "[Es] ist das beste, daß man sie bey zeitgen hinweg thue, oder in andere Wege zum Feldbau brauchen." Thieme, 1447.

\(^{140}\) Cuneo discusses this as one aspect of misogyny. See Cuneo, “Just A Bit of Control.”

\(^{141}\) "So giebts auch die Erfahrung, daß die Stutten viel lieber einen Bescheller annehmen, den sie kennen, und der sie zuvor besteigen hat, als einen fremden, den man erst zu ihnen lässet, tragen gegen dem Bekannten vielmehr Liebe, und werden auch eher von ihme voll und trächtig." Thieme, 1443.
himself on this front during a discussion shortly thereafter about how to objectify old broodmares through subjectively judging their milk production by age and personal physical attractiveness.

A further justification for breeding fillies was to preempt their natural promiscuity and to thereby save them from themselves. Monogamy in this case insured that the fillies acted in their place and did not destroy the careful patriarchy of the studfarm. As it turns out, sexual frustration not only was common to fillies but it caused them to act in a number of socially distressing ways: "So they become heavily plagued by sexual desire, and have neither rest nor relief...as they want to be mounted...If they are but bred and impregnanted, then they are at ease, going along docilely with the other mares in the pasture and do not run around." All the poor fillies could think about was sex. However, in the mind of Thieme, who believed in Zucht as a noble, virtuous practice for well-bred humans, a well-bred filly thought in terms of well-bred human patriarchal virtues. In addition, as such, she could only desire sex so strongly if for the appropriate Christian result of having children. Once mated and bred like a respectable adult female, she will be content and behave herself like the other broodmares by doing what is expected of her, instead of running away or pursuing her own interests outside of motherhood. Well-bred fillies would never want to have sex simply for sexual pleasure nor would they want to venture outside of their arranged marriage to the farm's common stud, even if another stud were more reproductively viable.

Housefather trades and masculinities

Outside of its lower-class audience and trade focus, Thieme's Haus- Feld- Arzney- Koch- Kunst- und Wunderbuch could almost be categorized as a socially motivated emblem book for housefathers. As somewhat of a hybrid of the two genres, the Wunderbuch has a frontispiece that relies on several aesthetic techniques common to Reitkunst frontispiece, such as various windows along each side. However, instead of scenes of riding and farm management, it is done in more of a folk style with scenes depicting different farming activities and products. For example in the chapter illustration for "Maintaining and Overseeing Horse Breeding" (Pflege und Wartung des Pferdzucht), one does not see direct actions or other materially indicated symbols of human dominance over equine bodies. The representation of Stutterei is the most simple yet practical

---

142  "So werden sie von der Gäylen hefftig geplagt, haben weder Rast noch Ruh...suchen, daß sie mögen besteigen werden...Wann sie aber beschellet und voll sind, so haben sie Ruhe, gehen fein sittsam mit den andern Stutten auf der Weyde, lauffen sich nicht ab." Thieme, 1451.
image—a herd of horses in the background with a mare nursing a foal in the foreground. There are no saddles and bridle indicating ownership and control nor are there grooms hovering nearby. Yet, as the image is contained in a series of illustrations, which together with each other as well as together with the accompanying text and title are used to depict everyday farm life, its meaning is quite effective and clear. If the work can be considered in some sense to be an emblem book, it is one created distinctly for rural and lower-order audiences, rather than highly literate urban elites.

At times, the motto that accompanies each image and chapter subdivision appears to suffer a disconnect with both text and image. For example, the introductory motto of the twelfth chapter seems conflicted on whether its audience is more high or low ranking, since it appears to introduce the new section as being primarily for riding and as being noble-connected: "A noble horse one loves, and in order to ride it, one spends a great deal of money." Yet, both the title and explicit purpose of this chapter address the breeding and maintenance of horses by lower-order farmers of extremely modest estates, who will not often be riding their horses nor will they be purchasing horses, expensive or otherwise. Further confusing the issue of class interests, the chapter’s establishing illustration has much more in common with artisanal hoof-smith images like Walther’s frontispiece than with either the Reitkunst suggested by the motto or with the basic practices of farming discussed in the numerous preceding chapters on fieldwork (Feldbau).

Judging from Thieme's repetitive use of "edle" as an equine attribute in other submottos of chapter twelve (i.e. hoof-smiths), he does not intend for the horses belonging to his audience to be of particularly noble stock or of having a noble horse's skill set (e.g. Manage or cavalry). However since both the prologue to and main introduction of the Wunderbuch announce his intention for his work to be supportive of social and economic hierarchies, it does indicate that Thieme's tone does reflect the author's slightly superior social status and education over his audience. Thieme's purpose remains fixed throughout the guide on promoting proper social order, where each member of the household have specific roles divided by gender and, within male homosocial relationships, by trade. Thieme's economic and agricultural ideal farm is an orderly household run by a skilled, knowledgeable, and masterful farmer. In addition, he sets this farming community as the model for Christian society at large.

---

143 While the modern English translation for Stuterei is “studfarm,” the German word actually indicates that the farm is based around herd of mares rather than a centralized location of stallions that mares visited.
144 "Ein Edles Pferd man liebt, und sich im Reiten übt, Viel Geld man da vor gibt." Thieme, 1353.
Using Adam as the social and economic model set for humans by God, Thieme justifies a
gendered agrarian trade hierarchy through Adam's stewardship and divine commandment to
breed and take care of animals and fields through the trade of farming. Eve's divine
commission involves little apparent work, outside being a generalized "helpmate" and thereby
shutting her out from the potential to have a trade as well as to exert any control over the primary
resources of the household and farm. These economic and gender roles are in this way God-
mandated with the man alone recognized for having and learning a trade and with the woman as
only having a place in marriage and bearing children. Along with farming skills, the good
housefather must make use of other equine trade-related abilities. He must know to consult with
and learn from experts in other equine related trades; he must have an innate and learned
appreciation for equine bodies and their maintenance, having an interest and ability in horse
doctoring and an intricate knowledge of how to evaluate equine bodies of all types. Animal
husbandry involves more than knowing and growing proper feed regiments; a proper farmer and
housefather must be a good father and master for the good of his farm, his local community,
society, and his soul.

\textit{Schatz-Kammer (1697)}

A short work distinctly made for lower class, farming audiences, the \textit{Schatz-Kammer}
(1697) attempts to offer something for every occasion. In regards to the rising significance of
horses to northern German agricultural practices, only horses are given consideration in the
chapter covering general veterinary medicine. Although addressed to the illnesses of animals,
horses were the only livestock referenced or described in that chapter's recipes and situations. The
anonymous author also includes snippets of information that shed a little more light on the
use of non-invasive manipulation of equine bodies in everyday farm life. Similar to Thieme, the
\textit{Schatz-Kammer} offers several cosmetic yet curative cures, such as a treatment to make a horse
have a good coat in winter, two remedies to encourage growth in the mane and tail, and, one to
add bulk to a horse's body, which was a perennial health concern. Another cosmetic remedy

\begin{footnotes}
\item[145] This is in keeping with what Susan Karant-Nunn has claimed about the use of Adam to justify masculine control
\item[146] “Ein gut Pferd erkennen.” See \url{http://www.gbv.de/du/services/gLink/vd17/39:127315G_016,800,600}.
\item[147] The chapter is "Of the Illnesses of Animals" (\textit{Von den Krankheiten der Thiere}). Dogs were the exception, having
their own two-page section.
\end{footnotes}
that was clearly being used for specific social or personal effect rather than for the health and well-being of the horse, hair dyeing is suggested for use on old horses. Presumably this practice could be used when one wants to sell an old horse for a slightly inflated price, but it seems more likely to be used in order to spruce up one's draft team should they look too grey around the face.  Perhaps due to the effect of the ingredients for the recipe but also possibly due to a prevalence of the color in the area and in the general equine population, the remedy specifies that it be only for chestnut brown horses.

**Neu-vermehrt...Vieh-Büchlein (1697)**

The anonymously authored *Neu-Vermehrt: Nutzliche und vollkommende Vieh-Büchlein* (1697) was one of few works in any of the equine-related genres that tackles the issue of livestock use and setting up one's farm properly by comparing horses to oxen on purely practical grounds. It does not appear to be written to satisfy a particular political nor ideological goal, such as seen in Fugger and Pinter’s writings. Instead, its goal was to offer the best advice for farmers so that farmers themselves could make their own informed decisions on the matter. Illustrating this point, the *Vieh-Büchlein* is one of very few early modern German works that gives any notice to the common farm practice of breeding horses with mules. Furthermore, the author clearly felt that he needs to counter the misinformation spread by noble perspectives and elite agendas. He stated that whatever the virtues and uses of horses were, that plowing with oxen was traditionally the most reliable way to get farm work done.

---

149 Although the method does not show up in this work, some other works of this time period, such as Pinter and the *Vieh-Büchlein* (1697), do suggest that one judge the horse's age by its teeth. This method is, in fact, still used today by veterinarians and riders as one of the best ways to estimate how old an unknown horse is. Therefore, dyeing a horse to appear younger would only really fool a complete novice and not an experienced farmer or equine tradesman.

150 “Castanienbraun, so man schwartze Ding darzu thut.” Schatz-Kammer, 217.

151 Anon., *Neu-Vermehrt: Nutzliche und vollkommene Vieh-Büchlein/ Darinnen Die eigentliche Beschreibung derer darwider dienenden Artzneyen/ der Pferde/ Maulthier/ Esel/ wie auch der Rinder/ Schafe/ Ziegen/ Schweine/ Hunde/ Hühner/ Gänse/ Endten/ Tauben/ Bienen/ u. a. m. Zu finden* (Nürnberg: Martin Endter, 1697). This edition was published about fifty years after the original. Significantly, the latter edition now deals extensively with the veterinary care of large livestock.


153 Considering that the first edition was written so long beforehand, it is highly likely that the new material added to this edition would have been written by another author.

154 *In Summa, ein Ochse ist ein nutzlich und nothig Thier, daß der, so viel Acker des Jahrs zu bestellen hat, ohne Abnehmen seiner Haushaltung, der Ochsen nicht entrathen kan, und bleibt wol bey der alten Regel: Wo der Ochs
This work recognized the importance of trade knowledge for economic survival in everyday life and in the male homosocial environment of equine trade communities. It pointed out that decisions about farm animals and practices were not made in some elite, ideal world in which money is no option and one can always find the perfect color and type of horse easily. Being a housefather involved tough decisions and the good, reliable performance of one's trade on the everyday level.\textsuperscript{155} A man had to identify himself as a farmer first and think in terms of what is good for his own household and agricultural needs, rather than allowing others to dictate his mode of production or his choices in tools. A good, practical housefather had to obtain for himself—through any available source, human or written—an educated means through which to be able to evaluate judiciously his situation and his prospects for improvements, because, as the male head of household, he was the one that is responsible for selecting the best resources for his purse and economic situation.

The \textit{Vieh-Büchlein} suggested that social cache attached to horses should have no bearing at all on a good housefather's decisions concerning whether or not to breed and use horses.\textsuperscript{156} Farmers should have confidence and pride in their own equine knowledge and superior trade abilities; they should not be swayed by the opinions of men who are not intricately involved in the farming trade. While these men, who may be involved with other equine trades like horse doctoring or with noble breeders, might provide some general information of use, their own trades and interests prejudiced their advice. Noble breeders, hoof-smiths, and elite advice books did not know what type of equine abilities or bodies farmers should be looking for, nor did they know what the general equine population really needed. The \textit{Vieh-Büchlein} argued that these men of the middle and upper orders had little to no extended and direct experience with the demands of farming. Furthermore, it pointed out that it was generally against urban and elite interests to promote knowledge of equine bodies and breeding outside of the narrow focus on riding and military uses.

Although produced out of the seventeenth century agrarian trend, wherein farmers’ increasingly represented agrarian activities as primarily equine husbandry and thereby relied on horses as social capital, the third edition of the \textit{Vieh-Büchlein} can be understood somewhat as a

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{155} For example, he had to know that a sweaty horse should not be put back into its stall immediately after work nor should it be allowed to drink its fill of water at that time. \textit{Vieh-Büchlein}, 10-11.

\textsuperscript{156} \textit{Vieh-Büchlein}, 46.
reaction to the economic and political agendas of noble horse breeders and elite advice books. Fugger relied upon using this cultural and economic connection in the late sixteenth century as part of his rhetoric to support the primary use of horses—and therefore to influence the breeding patterns of farmers to favor horses over oxen—in agriculture. Fugger's underlying concern was that farmers were not prone to favoring horses over oxen. A century later, the *Vieh-Büchlein* concluded that noble and elite discourses about equine bodies had been too successful. Farmers' dedication to equine husbandry and horse breeding had not produced much benefit for agriculture, and it was beginning to damage the farming trade. The *Vieh-Büchlein* spoke to what it saw as a problematic tendency of farmers wholeheartedly embracing the cultural and social aspects of owning horses, and specifically those of more elite bodies or abilities. In its view, farmers' adoption of equine-centered trade identities led them to take equine husbandry too far and to become ignorant of important trade skills, primarily the lack of a thorough knowledge of all available livestock and their agricultural uses. The *Vieh-Büchlein* viewed the rising cultural trend of regarding horses as a privileged animal among farm livestock as both arbitrary and counter-productive to the type of trade interests a farmer should have. Instead of being concerned with selecting the best (animal) tool for the task at hand, farmers' discussions about livestock inordinately favored equine needs and bodies over those of other equids and bovines.

The *Vieh-Büchlein* however should not be understood to be antagonistic towards any use or even the primary use of horses in the farming trade. It sought to redirect the developing, elite-focused discourse and influence hippological communities to include a greater degree of input from low-order farmers and from the needs of regional agriculture. If anything, it actually promoted a new order of livestock and intra-trade hierarchy, in which horses were characterized as new, specialized tools that forward-thinking, knowledgeable, skilled farmers were beginning to put to good use. Oxen in this model were valued as unskilled laborers, whose masters were not required to be as skilled or knowledgeable as those owning and using horses:

A farmer can accomplish more then with oxen, who are strong for plowing, driving back and forth, and doing other heavy labor, than with horses; in comparison, a horse is an expensive animal regardless of the fact that it can perform the same type of heavy labor, can travel a long distance in one day, and is smoother and easier to drive. A horse will eat up all the profits that their labor has earned.157

---

157 "Denn ein Bauersmann mit der Ochsen stärke im Ackern, Ein-und Ausfahren, und andern grossen Arbeit, mehr
The benefit of oxen is primarily that they are cost-efficient. They can shoulder heavy weight dependably, can be trained to do simple repetitive tasks, and require few resources for their upkeep. However should one want to plow or pull loads faster or should one need to turn or travel a long distance quickly, then one would need to make the investment by upgrading to a horse.\textsuperscript{158}

In addition to the sizable financial burdens that came along with horse ownership, such as price, increased taxation, and increased feudal obligations, a farmer would also need to know how to train the horse—or to already know how to harness and drive it. He would also need to know the proper care of the horse, which animal was widely understood from then until today for being quite delicate and somewhat prone to illness as well as having frequent dietary concerns and supplementary needs.\textsuperscript{159} Oxen on the other hand were the sturdiest livestock, who had such simple healthcare needs that farm girls could feed and tend them.\textsuperscript{160} Likewise, the \textit{Vieh-Büchlein} did not need to note special health tips for oxen—either because they had none or because the audience was presumed to know them already as part of the most basic elements of farm knowledge. Instead, the \textit{Vieh-Büchlein} restricted its health information to horses, such as not putting up the horse for the night when it is still damp or hot and not allowing a horse to drink a large quantity of cold water directly after it had been exercising.\textsuperscript{161} The farmers who might need to use oxen fell into many more categories than those who would actually need and who would be able to effectively use horses.\textsuperscript{162}

Despite recognizing the housefather as the center of power and authority for the household—and therefore supporting some type of human gender hierarchy, the \textit{Vieh-Büchlein} did reveal some equality of the equine sexes in the realms of reproduction and work. Unlike

\begin{quote}
als mit Pferden verrichten kan; in Betrachtung, ein Pferd ein kostbares Thier ist ob es gleich eine grosse Arbeit thut, und des Tages einen weiten Weg reisen kan, und ihm alles besser von statten gehet; so frisst es schier alles wieder weg, was es erwirbet." \textit{Vieh-Büchlein}, 46.
\textsuperscript{159} For more about equine veterinary care, see Louise Curth, \textit{The Care of Brute Beasts: A Social and Cultural Study of Veterinary Medicine in Early Modern England} (Leiden: Brill, 2010).
\textsuperscript{160} See various print images of the time along with the farm guides I have already discussed.
\textsuperscript{161} These tips continue to be used today. The concern is that the horse will colic or founder itself, which are both potentially fatal maladies. See Chapter Four for more details.
\textsuperscript{162} As a list, those who would be need to rely on the simplicity and economy of oxen and for whom choosing oxen would be the best farm decision for their situation: first-time farmers; young farmers setting up a household; farmers that do not have much aptitude at plowing; part-time farmers; farmers of small plots; farmers that have not yet learned all of the ins-and-outs of equine bodies in order to take the necessary care with them.
\end{quote}
Thieme, this author did not rely heavily on understanding horses' economic worth by interpreting them through his own cultural and scientific beliefs about human-animal bodies and behaviors. After discussing how and whether one should use studs in everyday farm activities, the *Vieh-Büchlein* advised to treat one's broodmares with the same care and concern that one would use with one's stallion: "The mother should also then not be confined, nor suffer hunger or cold, nor stand in a crowded space." A good housefather would also know that it was important to break both sexes to the bit, and not just the stallion: "And when the foal stands still with pleasure, one should stand a bridled horse of its own gender next to it, so that the foal can learn from it." In contrast to Thieme's retributive work assignments of geldings and non-lactating broodmares to the fields due to his own insecurities about human gender roles and social hierarchies, the bald fact of using and training mares for work tasks required no special note or explanation. It was also not represented as a somewhat degraded task because mares and emasculated males were used for it.

Speaking explicitly in terms of a smart, practical farmer that was well versed in the nuances of livestock's bodies, the *Vieh-Büchlein's* author claimed that horses, rather than just a single sex, as a collective species were almost as strong as oxen. This author thought in terms of categorical animal (e.g. human above other animals; horses or oxen being best for a situation; asses as the lowliest, yet effective large livestock) and intra-trade skill (e.g. farmers, good housefathers) hierarchies. He neither was interested in providing agricultural justifications for the existing social and economic hierarchies nor was he interested in pitting trades or farmers against each other.

This author's view of farming was certainly informed by his own gendered experiences. He did not recognize the agricultural work that women do as a trade, and he clearly addressed his work to housefathers, men like himself who regard farming as their primary trade and economic support. The local communal networks of farm and equine knowledge that the author expected his audience to rely upon were also gendered male for the same reason. If farming was a trade, then only men could be farmers and only men could gain a complete knowledge and control of

---

and expert experience with equine bodies. Housefathers were concerned about what other men think and about how the success of their farm and family depends ultimately on the success of their labors and knowledge alone. They might also wish to improve their social reputation by improving their agricultural skills and becoming more knowledgeable at their trade. In this way, their increased productivity in crop and livestock yields helped the community as did their sharing and providing of new information and experiences to the local networks of equine knowledge. An average farmer knew the basics and does not provide new information or particularly useful experiences for other farmers; a housefather was a good farmer that was experienced enough to appreciate the importance of paying attention to details and to recognize that he was responsible for knowing these details in all areas of his trade.

*Edle Landleben (1721)*

Showing the further development of reactive yet constructive advice for lower-order housefathers in northern Germany, *Das Edle Landleben* (1721) lampooned elite prophets of farming and presents the trade and experiences of daily farm life from the farmers' perspective. It revealed that while poor, exploited, under-appreciated, overtaxed, and vulnerable to abuses by other social classes and groups, farmers could be proud of and virtuous through their masculine trade identities, thereby providing other socioeconomic orders and groups (i.e. students) with a good Christian model of behavior. Unlike the *Vieh-Büchlein*, the *Edle Landleben* explicitly pitted society and in parts against the farming trade, as a united class and as subclasses with at times opposing interests based on their exposure to farming as a trade and use of horses in their farming tasks.

The *Edle Landleben* was a direct and practical guide, and it sought to re-identify farming as a distinct trade and craft as opposed to something done by default (such as, in absence of a better trade or any trade) or done in addition to one's primary occupation. To this end, it directly stated that farming cannot truly be considered a trade—complete with social and economic benefits and drawbacks—without training, experience in the field, and particular devotion to the craft. Although anyone can farm, a trade farmer did not regard agriculture and livestock

---

165 Examples of communal knowledge are referring to traditional knowledge ["der alten Regel"], passing on personal experiences, and providing words of caution, like warning against riding at night: "Auch is zu wissen, daß ungewöhnlich reiten bey Nacht, Schade gröslich." *Das Edle Landleben* (Braunschweig: 1721), 12.

166 "Bey einem iedwem verständigen Haußwirthe auf dem Lande kommt die Sache auf 4 Stücke an. 1) Auf die
breeding as something that just anyone can do nor something that he did not have to keep putting constant effort into. Just like any other trade, running a successful farm was a serious business. In addition, it did not require farmers merely to keep up-to-date with changing tools and techniques. It expected them constantly to seek to expand their knowledge outside their own fields, to look towards the horizon, and to anticipate new methods. The author included farmers in his prediction that the men who just focus on getting good at their profession end up “in beggary or remains an anxious, miserable, and plagued man...because he either does not have common sense or because he does not use his knowledge correctly.”

In addition to explicitly depicting farming as a craft, the Edle Landleben also reveals how important horses have become to farm life and to farming itself. Although written almost a century after the start of the Thirty Years War, the book made it very clear how the war influenced both agriculture over the next century and the collective, shared heritage of farmers. The agricultural and economic devastation of the Thirty Years War, particularly in the territories of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, was used as the primary evidence for why farming should be respected as a trade, why agricultural knowledge held by farmers was crucial to the success of the community and state, and why livestock—specifically horses—should never be taken from farmers for any reason. Giving an answer to nobles' continual myopic and self-centered complaint about farmers both having terrible horses and thoughtlessly breeding those terrible horses, the Edle Landleben pointed out that since farmers had not been considered to have a trade or anything worth protecting or respecting, they had not been allowed the right to keep good horses. Good horses had always been taken away from the supposedly ignorant, ill-informed farmers, who were presumed by their social superiors never to miss them. This was of course, as the author pointed out, a self-fulfilling prophesy as well as a very short-sighted plan, since the farmers had been expected to keep tilling the land and to keep producing new horses that the government and army would then steal to use for other purposes.
Due to the government's lack of appreciation for agriculture as well as the general lack of respect for farmers, farmers were been left without any livestock with which to plow. As a result, the fields reverted back to the wild state, which meant not only that many fields were unable to be cultivated and thus less produce could be generated overall but also that to fix the problem now, even more work is required to get those fields back into use.\textsuperscript{171} By stealing livestock as a political, social, and economic policy, society at large had made it almost impossible for farmers to do their job in producing food, animals, and goods. This policy had also led to the subversion of the proper Christian running of the household. For without other animals to put in the traces, farmers had been obliged to use their wives instead. Instead of running their household as a gendered hierarchy of father, mother, children, and livestock, the farmers had been reduced to using women and children as livestock, instead of feeding the livestock. While the farmer might have retained his proper masculine place as driver of the plow, a father could not be expected to relish nor derive any honor from literally driving his family through the muck.\textsuperscript{172}

The \textit{Edle Landleben} firmly anchored the use of horses with the trade of farming as well as with men alone. Although women were absent from discussions about the farming trade, they were not entirely absent from the discussion of farm life. In discussing the rigors and tasks of farm life, farm wives were recognized as working from dawn to dusk and struggling with the livestock and in the kitchen.\textsuperscript{173} It was clear that the type of livestock this referred to was, in fact, only the horned livestock since farm wives were tasked with making cheese and butter as well as with gathering milk. Farmwives were never associated with any task that connected them to the horses.\textsuperscript{174} Like their mothers, farm girls were never associated in word or in task with horses; their daily chores included only giving grass and hay to the horned livestock and driving them out to the pasture.\textsuperscript{175}

\textsuperscript{171} The author points out that even if one now had livestock to help, it was possible that the damage already done was too severe. For example, "Wer Rasen umreissen will, muß vier Pferde vor dem Pflug spannen, kann gleichwohl nicht tief pflügen." \textit{Edle Landleben}, 88.

\textsuperscript{172} And, as a final misfortune: "Auch kan ein Mensch im Pflug nicht so nachdrücken, wie ein Pferd, sondern erschindet nur überhin, welches alsdenn kleinkörmige Frucht giebt." \textit{Edle Landleben}, 87.

\textsuperscript{173} "Mit dem Vieh und mit der Küche quälen." \textit{Edle Landleben}, 168.

\textsuperscript{174} While horsemeat is currently sold at city markets in Braunschweig, horse milk is not, nor is there any evidence that horse milk was used in daily life in the area, outside the odd usage for medicinal recipes.

\textsuperscript{175} While the term used here is "Vieh," one does not use the phrase "driving out to pasture" with horses, only cattle.
Addressing feudal, state obligations, the book divided farmers into three tax brackets, each with related agricultural duties, which were described in terms of how many horses the farmer uses. As will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four, Höfner, the group with the most horses, were not coincidentally also those that have the most land and the highest social status. Unlike the Halbhöfner and the lowly Brinksitzer, this group's possession and reliance solely on horsepower led to additional obligations, not only to the state but also to the community. The Halbhöfner, who owned at most a pair of plow horses or oxen, were required to serve the community by hand. The Höfner however, who had invested their economic and social future entirely in delicate, expensive yet highly versatile equine labor, had to also take on the risk of straining their workhorses or exposing them to potential mishandling by unskilled noble and parish agents. Although most likely thinking of Höfner, the Edle Landleben associated the numerous labors and obligations of all farmers with that also performed by their equine partners: "The farmer, who already must especially love to work, must now work twice as hard, working just as if they were a horse or ass."

Conclusion

Throughout the genres of published hippological literature, there was a constant, dominant emphasis by men involved in the industries of horse breeding and equine husbandry on creating trade and social identities through the combination of differing concepts about masculinity and male cultural values with the anthropomorphic representation of human-equine relationships and biologically grounded hierarchies. For these early modern authors and their male audiences, there was not one common equine or equestrian masculinity but instead each man exhibited or anticipated plural masculine interpretations of self within the artificially reinforced homosocial community of equine knowledge and work experience. While one could question why these values are specifically gendered as opposed to being generally human, the

177 "Obriage bey der Burgrichte und im Ackerbau mit Pferden und Wagen zu Hofe, und dem Pfarrer und der Kirche dienen."
178 "Der Bauer, der sonst nur zur Lust arbeiten dürffte, doppelt arbeiten, ja rechte Pferd- und Esels-Arbeit thun muß."
cultural codex of implicit and explicit contextual clue in early modern hippological literature neither acknowledges nor offers possibilities for women's involvement.

Culturally, hippology was being actively constructed as a field of knowledge in which women's experiences and equestrian practices could not exist. While wealthy and noble women were at times called upon to defend their land holdings in battle, few women would have been permitted to devote all their time to learning elaborate cavalry maneuvers and to teach, as their respected profession, those techniques to noblemen and Burghers. Women's status and social position at court were not influenced by the excellence of their seat—the currency of Reitkunst only held cultural capital in a male homosocial world. While not intentionally misogynist, this situation of gendering neutral bodies and physical territories was intended as a useful strategy by which men could help themselves and improve their lot in life. Yet even then, prescriptive literature was primarily written by and aimed at men who participated and supported a belief in non-radical social and gender hierarchies.

Nevertheless, the male homosocial world of equine knowledge and experience in prescriptive literature was an idolized fantasy in practice. As several non-elite farm guides hinted towards, women did in fact belong in the stable and in the fields. As will be discussed in Chapter Four, women worked by foddering livestock and loading horse-driven wagons as well as by traveling to market mounted on horseback with their goods guarded in their lap. Therefore, a network of knowledge, which was personally and communally identified as demonstrating some manner of masculinity, was not necessarily inaccessible to women. As all gendered values are artificial constructions, there was no practical reason that certain masculine-identified beliefs and practices could not have been personally meaningful to early modern women. Nor is it true that values attached to equine trade identities could not have been in other context coded feminine or some other cultural signifier. Masculinities are not closed objects. They are necessarily open cultural beliefs that are ever evolving, since evolution is their means of operation. The equine masculinities at work in prescriptive literature—and for that matter hoof-smith guides—are far from being socially predetermined or internally cohesive. Instead, they are being constantly negotiated through the very process of writing, translating, arranging, printing, selling, reading, and referencing these texts.

In the next chapter, I will be examining how these models of masculinity and social order manifested and developed through the labors of everyday life. I will be using the theme of
curative medicine in order to explore the meanings constructed by men, whose trades as farmer, doctor, or smith depended on their skills with and around equine bodies. I will also be showing the role that knowledge of equine health played in creating new masculine social identities and in reshaping personal and communal notions of the economic values attached to established equine-related trades. Following a strategic use of male familial sponsorship within guild spaces in hopes of ensuring economic stability for their children, the increasingly institutionalized patriarchy practiced by large-smith guild masters would not have been possible if not for the prior existence of an equine community of veterinary knowledge in cities and courts. Neither would it have been so successful at binding these guild members together in a non-competitive alliance based on preventing non-guild members from learning or practicing equine curative medicine.\footnote{Iron would not have been enough, since Kleinschmiede were always at odds with the other smiths. Likewise, there was no affiliation—as might be expected if iron were significant as being a shared cultural sign—between the Krüger, who sold iron to smiths, and the smiths who sold finished iron products.}

Under the shared moniker of equine health tradesmen, city and court large-smiths, hoof-smiths, and horse doctors could share masculine identities between fellow guild members but also the plurality of equine health trades contributed to the ease with which a guild member could add new equine trade identities to their old ones without fear of losing status. Yet these everyday practices of guild masters in constructing an ideal homosocial world of equine healthcare was also a weapon used against other equine tradesmen, the countryside large-smiths and farmers, whose comparative low-class standing obligates their exclusion from the guild's fragile fantasy of the complete control over equine bodies through curative veterinary medicine.
Chapter Three: Equine Trade Identities and Curative Masculinities in Daily Life, 1580-1735
Introduction

Throughout the sixteenth century, equine medicine was primarily associated in the public mind with court life. For one, as the renown of Meister Albrecht illustrated in the previous chapter, courts had been associated since the twelfth century with centralized groups of nobly bred horses, whose quantity required their own human retainers to care for them. In northern Germany, there were several different private studs, notably those owned by the Count of Oldenburg and the Duke of Holstein, which had achieved regional and international renown for trading high-quality horses for political and military advantage.¹ Stud farms however were different from courts, which hosted large numbers of horses that had to be stabled individually. The healthcare needs of a noble's stud farm, which principally consisted of large groups of pregnant or nursing mares with foals, were obviously quite disparate compared to those needs required in court stables, which mainly housed intact male horses.

Following a similar pattern to human medical literature at the time, there was a total lack of any urgency towards the necessity and usefulness of gynecological medicine, including prenatal care, assistance in delivery, or postnatal help for mother or offspring. It certainly was not a coincidence however, that mares and their foals did not receive much medical attention. With few exceptions, German noblemen invested their resources entirely in adult horses, whose bodies they were using for social and political purpose. While this investment did at times take the shape of bestowing a valuable breeding animal upon another noble, it primarily took the form of purchasing and supporting horses used for war and military posturing. Additionally, early modern German noblemen believed that the best military horses were stallions.² Although in general, horse doctors and hoof-smiths tended to be more common around large herds of horses, this was not the case at private studs—or obviously the numerous wild herds that roamed the

---

¹ The mid-to late seventeenth century was a popular time for politically motivated horse breeding projects (e.g. Colbert in France) justified on the grounds of producing better state warfare.
² As opposed to, say, the Mongols, who had made much use of mares’ maternal love in order to ensure their speed in battle or the Ottoman Empire, who frequently made use of mares in estrus in order to disrupt the battle plans of early modern European armies. European men had become invested in their belief that riding stallions imparted masculine powers to male riders that they simply did not know how to deal with an enemy who used this cultural belief against them. Unable to separate themselves from their intact male mounts, the Europeans thus suffered constant defeat and embarrassment to this tactic yet refused to switch to mares themselves or geldings. Military failure and death were apparently preferable to the emasculating disgrace of riding a gelding or mare in front of other men.
The value of keeping female bodies and non-adult male bodies alive and healthy was instead coded as insignificant and unrelated to the importance of preserving intact male adults of noble equine breeding. In this way, stallions used by elite social orders for *Reitkunst* and in the cavalry were granted first-class status among horses as a reflection of the value their owners placed on the activities and skills that the horse was trained to do. The healthcare of nobles’ mounts and studs became the main priority of the burgeoning field of early modern veterinary medicine over the free development of curative medicine towards satisfying the veterinary needs of farmers and merchants. In addition, to further this end, noblemen granted special trade privileges to attract those deemed by other noblemen to be the most skilled in equine curative medicine and husbandry to their courts.

During the seventeenth century, the increasing use of horses in existing social situations and economic engagements, such as farming, animal husbandry, and healthcare along with the growth of new trades that were wholly dependent on equine labor, provided a new forum for cultural reconstructions of equine-focused communities and those in early modern society that benefited from equine labor and trades. This was new terrain without clear, communally recognized cultural values. It is therefore particularly notable that smiths, veterinary practitioners, farmers, and noble breeders all began to use horses specifically as a means to represent and understand themselves as male individuals and as social beings. The new cultural values generated, shared, and reshaped by these men, however, did not all follow the same path. Instead, they developed as co-narratives of early modern masculinity and trade identity. The masculinities constructed and performed varied due to the needs, skills, and desires of the individual equine tradesman. Additionally, how he perceived the significance of these particular masculine virtues to his local community affected a trademan’s masculinity.

Tradesmen that were concerned with equine husbandry and medicine were unique among equestrian-related artisans for their reliance on horse bodies—whether direct or indirect—as symbols to culturally and economically represent themselves. Large-smiths and hoof-smiths

---

3 It also is significant that broodmares generally were not shod as they spent their time in the pasture and fields. Therefore the hoof-smiths in particular would have little to do except for servicing a few carthorses.
4 Some of the new industries that began to rely on equine labor include surveying, mining, mills, postal service, and carriage building.
5 Equine-focused trade positions include bridle-maker, saddler, coachman, and spur-maker. As discussed in my second chapter, bit-books originate from the same areas, authors, and *Reitkunst* culture that produced equine husbandry and breeding guides, yet neither bridle-makers nor bit-makers developed major trade identities grounded in equine semiotics.
imbued personal items of trade-related material culture with these shared equine symbols. Additionally, they restructured guild boundaries on the basis of communally enforced beliefs regarding the association of the guild with both shoeing and horse medicine. Large-smiths and hoof-smiths created and expanded their trade identities through a shared, yet localized code of masculine honor that was grounded on their mastery of equine bodies. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century, smiths increasingly used guild privileges concerning the regulation of equine husbandry and medicine as a way to adapt to economic changes in local markets as well as to maintain their traditional economic monopolies and the related higher social status that the guild's control of equine-centric trade resources and knowledge granted them.⁶

This chapter traces the close connection between how equine veterinary practitioners, independent large-smiths, and members of hoof-smith guilds in Braunschweig-Lüneburg thought about their own human bodies and how they formed relationships with other animals, whether humans or livestock. Individual and group development of masculine identities within these equine curative trades resulted from a reinterpretation—one that began to be ever more imbued with qualities associated to men—of the role that horses and trade played in men's daily lives. Given the major role that economic occupations played in defining men's rank and position in a predominantly patriarchal society, looking at how early modern men's trade identities were constructed and performed offers great potential as a way to get at how early modern masculine identities were also being constructed and performed.⁷ By examining the methods through which they created trade identities, early modern equine tradesmen are shown to have relied on horses as the primary means through which to reinforce both trade and masculine identities. As such, it is vital to study these men's relationships with horses as a way to understand why they did choose equine icons as the primary cultural, social, and economic medium through which

---

⁶ Local markets could change through the addition of new local livestock markets or increased competition by independent large-smiths and equine practitioners.

⁷ Although this particular combination of equine trades, masculinity, and individual or communal social identities is my own intervention and as a result of my cultural approach, there are other recent works that look more closely at the interrelations between several of these categories. See Kathy Stuart’s *Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts: Honor and Ritual Pollution in Early Modern Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000) for a discussion of trade virtue and communal trade identities. Pia Cuneo has connected the formation of gendered ideas to equine-trade items. Pia Cuneo, “Just a Bit of Control: The Historical Significance of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century German Bit Books,” in *The Culture of the Horse*, eds. Karen Raber and Treva Tucker (New York: Palgrave, 2006), 141-173.
they created individual and communal personal identities. However, I am not simply showing that horses were apparently important to equine tradesmen. Instead, I attempt to analyze both how and why horses were important to equine-focused healers and smiths. By looking at situations in which horses were central to the construction of individual and communal trade identities for these groups, I explore how mutually constructive beliefs about human gender and trade abilities influenced early modern equine tradesmen’s social and economic relationships with other humans as well as their understanding of their own cultural place within human-animal hierarchies.

Curative Medicine in Daily Life

Wandering Healers

Wandering through towns and across the countryside, traveling veterinary practitioners were comprised of two main varieties. There were those that specialized in very specific medical practices much in the vein of the itinerant human eye doctors or tooth-pullers that vended at markets and went door-to-door for customers—and, there were those that served a population that was frequently on the move, such as the military and very wealthy and warring nobles. Of the first group, pig castrators (Schweinschneider) were the most notable in terms of veterinary knowledge. There is little extant information on which precise tasks pig castrators performed around early modern Braunschweig-Lüneburg. The job was a trade regulated by noble privilege and it was a special trade that was fiercely guarded by the independent men that had been granted the monopoly. However, there is little evidence in farm guides, official ordinances, or personal petition letters by pig castrators to indicate whether these men simply castrated pigs or applied their trade to humans or other animals, which was the case in other parts of Europe at the time.

8 The Stadtarchiv Braunschweig (StdA BS) holds records of several complaints concerning the medical (mal)practices of “Oculists and Stein- und Bruchschneiders” in 1653 and 1666-7.
9 Although of very low status akin to that of executioners and tanners, the trade did attain guild status in some cities. For example, there are complaints involving the Braunschweig Schweinschneider Amt as early as 1576 and 1594. For an idea of the scale of the role that pig castrators may have played in later cities, there is one identified in the 1671 Braunschweig registry compared to fifty butchers and twenty-three large-smiths. On protecting rights of individual pig castrators in the StdA Braunschweig, see petitions by Johan Potker (Celle: 1636, 1661, 1663), Hans Iserlohe (Braunschweig: 1603), and Dietrich Brauwer vs. Johann Iserloh (Braunschweig and Stöckheim, 1646-1653).
Despite the rising importance of cavalry units and the continuing large amount of horses used for transportation, there were actually few opportunities provided by the army to men to learn curative veterinary medicine. Although the sixteenth century saw a change in military composition and approach, its new mercenary armies were not funded in any manner to support specifically financing men with veterinary training. The issue was further compounded by the nobles that organized these armies, who still held on to the traditional, medieval association of veterinary medicine to horses at court. This meant several things: firstly, that only the needs of the men at top were attended to and secondly, that nobles in the military were expected to finance their own staff, including equestrian-smiths (Reitschmied). This policy had the effect that almost no one was able to afford to keep a servant solely for his ability to treat equine injuries, even though these injuries not only were common, but also heavily affected the potential success or failure of their noble owner's current military maneuvers as well as his future political life. In retaining a traveling equestrian-smith per male head of household, the ducal family of Braunschweig-Lüneburg was actually a long-time exception to this rule. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the dukes—both at court and at war—consistently hired traveling equestrian-smiths to tend the injuries of their personal herd.11 The horses of the mounted soldiers, the farm horses stolen by soldiers and soldiers' women, and the wagon horses appropriated by the army however were left to the largely uneducated, unskilled ministrations of the soldiers.12

Despite the lack of encouragement from their superiors, mounted and foot soldiers were concerned about keeping the vital resource that was horsepower alive and running.13 There is very little direct evidence for how men came to be trained in equine medicine or husbandry in the army, but one can gather a fairly good idea through statistical documents of towns and armies

---

11 This has been well documented in Wolfenbüttel's court records during the Thirty Years War as well as at other times.
12 Unfortunately, there is little work done on the daily life of sergeant-smiths or mounted soldiers in sixteenth or seventeenth century Braunschweig-Lüneburg. For a good description of sergeant-smiths and soldiers‘ daily experience and skills with horses during the eighteenth century in Hannover, see Friedrich Schirmer, Das Celler Soldatenbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Standortes Celle (Celle: August Pohl, 1937), 50-51. For more about military horse stealing, see John Lynn, Women, Armies, and Warfare in Early Modern Europe (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008). As a final note, while it is possible that soldiers' women could have also tended to the horses, there is little evidence to support a claim that women took care of horses' healthcare. The duty must have largely fallen upon or been claimed by the male soldiers themselves.
13 See Heike Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Pferdes und der Pferdezucht vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert im
as well as the complaints that large-smith guilds made about the encroachments of former military men in their privileged areas of equine knowledge.\footnote{There are also some printed sources that demonstrate that mounted riders were interested in helping horses, such as Winter's veterinary almanac and several general-population recipe collections.} Using tax records and military registers, one can see a consistent sprinkling of former and current mounted soldiers (\textit{Reuter}) in the villages and towns around the Lüneburg heath.\footnote{See the biographical notes in Appendices B-C, which are located on the website, \url{www.animalsastools.com}.} These men rarely stayed in a single location for many years, although a number did have families. While most mounted soldiers had absolutely no veterinary skills, there were a small number that had picked up veterinary knowledge through coarsely applying human first aid to horses, long-term practical experience with re-shoeing and treating the minor wounds of their mounts, or seeking out the knowledge for personal intellectual or economic interest. In general, this particular subgroup of mounted riders was left alone to ply their trade for as long as they remained wanderers and rare visitors at town markets. However, when they lingered too long after public vending days or when they were successful enough to affect the profits of city guild members, city large-smith guilds were quick to take action against them.

To illustrate one such case, the general smith guild of Celle in 1695 brought a complaint against three men who were operating outside of the guild yet performing work that legally should have been given to guild smiths.\footnote{Hauptstaatsarchiv Hannover (HStA), Hann. 74 Celle, nr. 1044/1, May-June 1695.} The complaint was brought by the large-smith division (\textit{Grobschmieds Amt}) of the general smith guild on behalf of the hoof-smith (\textit{Hufschmied}) members, as it was their particular trade and reputation that was being injured by the three men, two of which initially are referred to as a "Guerde Reuter" and one who is named as Meister Ludolf Meineke. Of the two retired mounted soldiers, the first is discovered to be a Johan Moltman, a man currently working as a smith in the village Blumelage. The second is a Major Courselon, who had belonged to a cavalry company and had been both running a free-smithy in the village Hamerstein for four years and selling his services regularly in Neustadt Celle.\footnote{For the former mounted riders' names, see HStA Hann. 74 Celle, nr. 1044/1, 16. June 1695 for Major Courselon; 18. June 1695 for Johan Mollman/Jurgen Moltman. The third man, Ludolf Meineke, was a hoof-smith master, see 3. May 1695.} Major Courselon, unlike guild-sanctioned smiths, was not permitted to retain journeymen as assistants, which would have been quite a hardship if he did much shoeing—either for corrective or preventative care—but much less so if he concentrated more on

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Kurfürstentum Königreich Hannover} (Hannover: Leibniz Universit"{a}t, 1997).
\end{flushright}
the skillful use of healing herbs and minor surgeries. In the latter case, he could rely on the assistance of the horse's owner to apply the medicine or to hold the animal still. Without assistants—either in the form of apprentices or in the shape of his own sons—a large-smith would be able to eke out a living for himself, but he would not be able to teach others or to pass down the economic advantages of his hard-earned equine knowledge and experience.

It is also clear that unlike the guild members or Meister Meineke, neither of the former mounted soldiers were identified specifically with their current trade of hoof-smithing. The state authorities instead associated them with their old occupation as soldier—whether they were a cavalry officer like Major Courselon or a lower-level mounted soldier like Moltman. Significantly, the quality of their equine knowledge is not a concern for the state authorities or the guild. In fact, the soldiers are regarded as being a threat of the same skill level as the free hoof-smith. A hoof-smith, as both a smithing master and a possessor of an additional equine medicine skill set, would clearly have been educated through at least one other urban, communal source of equine knowledge, namely another large-smith guild or master. Yet, it is also important to note that of the three men, only the hoof-smith welcomes an opportunity to join the guild. The two former soldiers therefore presumably see themselves as individuals that happen to have some equine veterinary knowledge that they can put to use to support themselves now that they are no longer in the army. Meineke on the other hand views his equine knowledge as trained abilities that should ideally be protected, improved, and shared within a guild structure. In this way, it is not just mastership of a trade's skill sets that early modern men recognized as granting social and economic privilege, but it is also through earning the right to participate in controlling and directing the practice of these skill sets. Living and working in the countryside and small villages the mounted soldiers are not working to increase their socioeconomic status; they are already socially appreciated for being the only men locally with both broad and specialized equine medical knowledge. By working to join the city guild, the hoof-smith could increase his social ranking at the same time as he improved his economic future through

---

18 According to the 17. June 1695 letter, the investigating official feels that the guild is overly concerned about Major Courselon precisely because he works alone and thus cannot perform enough work to really take away work from the guild smiths: "Habe er eben so viel nicht gearbeitet auch keinen geholfen gehabt sondern nur alleine gearbeitet."

19 The main issue in this situation is the loss in income, which means that they cannot pay the tax privilege to be in a guild. As a result, they are concerned about their livelihoods no longer being protected and their trade no longer being honorable and respected.
maintaining constant, reliable work opportunities as well as through the potential to teach and learn new equine trade skills.

Other than mounted riders, who had learned equine medicine while on the job as soldiers, the military produced squadron-smiths (*Fahnenschmied*). Unlike the veterinary-inclined mounted riders, who identified primarily as soldiers, squadron-smiths were recognized primarily as large-smiths with equine medical knowledge, who plied their trade primarily in the military. Due to the financing issues mentioned above, the standing army’s population could not support many squadron-smiths. Even by the age of light cavalry in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century there were very few squadron-smiths, especially when compared to the number of large-smiths servicing villages and towns over the same period. For example, garrison marriage records of Hannover list just four squadron-smiths between 1680 and 1812. During the same period, the city of Hannover had two smithing guilds—one in the old city district and one newly formed, equine-focused branch in the new city district. Similar to the situation in Celle’s large-smith guild, each of Hannover’s smith guilds consistently had around six guild masters, who each had journeymen and several apprentices. Expanding the potential local pool for veterinary knowledge and education, the English regal court in Hannover maintained several resident horse doctors and equestrian-smiths. Moreover, during wartime, the court retained several personal traveling horse-smiths, who were expected to simultaneously service their masters’ mounts for veterinary and shoe-related needs. The squadron-smiths were comparatively then quite a small group and therefore were not able to exhibit a group-based equine trade identity, despite their probable education originally from village large-smiths or as former large-smith journeymen from cities. Other statistical sources do indicate that some squadron-smiths after leaving the military did continue to identify themselves with the particular equine trade skill set that they had developed serving military horses. Yet the type of specialized equine medicine that they learned from battle did not offer them many opportunities outside of combat areas, which is evidenced by their lack of entry into general smith or large-smith guilds.

---

20 HStA, Hann. 74 Celle, nr. 1044/1, 18. June 1695. See also Appendix A.

21 A host of grooms was routinely hired to take care of preventative and alleviative treatments.

22 A small handful does show up throughout Theo Bosse’s village inhabitant and livestock tax records. Theo Bosse, *Die Register und Kataster der Ämter Gifhorn, Fallersleben und Isenhagen ab 1563/64* (Hannover: Schlütersche
Village Curative Medicine

In addition to the more transient mounted soldiers and squadron-smiths, practitioners of veterinary medicine in villages were both diverse in approach and background as well as scarce in number until the mid-eighteenth century. Prior to this point, the potential pool of equine tradesmen that might have provided veterinary services included horse herders, grooms, farmers, and smiths. In the case of horse-herders, there were relatively few men around the heath primarily or exclusively guarding horses, due to both the lack of large herds and public financing to warrant their use. For the same reasons, there were also few grooms in these villages. Additionally, while horse herders and grooms were able to cure some minor wounds on horses, their veterinary knowledge however small or large—was largely limited to preventative and alleviative medicine. Farmers and large-smiths then were the primary curative veterinary caretakers for horses and they were therefore recognized in the village as veterinary specialists, albeit of differing focus.

The main difference between approaches stemmed from disparate backgrounds of farmers and smiths in terms of both practical knowledge of particular areas and types of equine medicine and in terms of their orientation to equine bodies. As will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter, farmers dealt with different concerns than large-smiths—a situation that was reflected in farmers’ primary veterinary focus being general practice procedures as well as preventative and alleviative treatments. Already by the early sixteenth century, farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg depended heavily on horse power (e.g. for swift plowing and carting goods to market) and on horse bodies in order to provide for themselves and their families.23 Having also grown up on a farm with daily chores and discussions involving livestock, farmers had the most practical experience with how real, non-elite horses lived and worked. In the public mind—that is both the majority of the population, who were farmers, and the state officials deciding legal cases—farmers, whether as individuals or agricultural communities, were widely recognized as having the most to lose from a dead or sick horse. Thus, farmers had the most incentive to be vigilant about and interested in veterinary medicine, as far as it related to the recurrent ailments of their own horses. Large-smiths, on the other hand, needed to know something about other people's horses. Their daily practical experience with village horses

23 Farmers made use of horse bodies in medical treatments as well as for producing new horses that could be sold
generally came from house calls to treat herds as well as visits by horses whose owners sought their services for shoeing, diagnosing symptoms, and administering veterinary treatments or preventatives. Although much of their knowledge as large-smiths was equine-focused, the culture of smithing remained orientated more towards setting the equine-tradesmen apart from and socially superior to rural customers, even as the reason behind the respect granted to large-smiths by agricultural communities was grounded largely on the large-smith's reliable performance of equine healthcare. The incentive to practice the large-smithing trade and dabble with curative medicine on the side originated from a sense of responsibility about maintaining the economic viability of the village's living resources along with the large-smiths' own livelihood as an artisan, rather than from a need to protect personal or family resources.24

Judging from the type of information provided by both contemporary printed texts like farmers' almanacs and the types of activities depicted in contemporary material culture and art, the type of veterinary medicine that farmers engaged in dealt primarily with preventative medicinal practices. The presence of cheap veterinary pamphlets early in the sixteenth century, however, does indicate that information about curative medicine was definitely appreciated and sought out by some farmers.25 It is certain that farmers made frequent use of spiritual authorities and sympathetic magic for curative aims. In post-Reformation southern Germany, Catholic farmers continued to make use of ritual cleansing processes through participation in saint day processionals, including even bringing the sick horse or cow into the chapel to be healed by the saint. In Protestant Lower Saxony, St. Blasius' water continued to be employed to heal livestock, as were strategic prayers and magical formulas.26 Of course, household medicinal herbs and prefabricated apothecary's concoctions were always tried as well.27

Due to the lack of many records and to the lack of uniformity in how officials identified for profit.

24 Having recorded village smiths' ownership of horses in Lower Saxon areas during the process of making Appendix D, I can say that while some smiths did own a horse, it was not in proportion to the other men in the village during the seventeenth and early to mid-eighteenth century. Smiths were, on average, much less likely to own a horse, and they were even less likely to own several horses, as was rather common for farmers and millers.

25 For information about prescriptive literature promoting equine-based agricultural identities along with human curative medicine to farmers, see Fritz Hartmann, “Hausvater und Hausmutter als Hausarzt in der Frühen Neuzeit,” in Staat und Gesellschaft in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, ed. Katrin Harms (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1983), 151-175.

26 The twelfth century St. Blasii cathedral in Braunschweig and the Hannover-Münden church, which was completed in 1584, both testify to the long and continued popularity of St. Blasius in Braunschweig-Lüneburg.

27 See Nadja Kosuch’s dissertation Tierseuchen und ihren Bekämpfung in der Weser im Spiegel Nienburger Quellen: 17. bis 19. Jahrhundert (PhD diss., Tierärztliche Hochschule Hannover, 2004) about the development of
smiths in church and state records, it is impossible to determine just how many smiths—and of which trade specializations—operated in villages or how many were utilized by villagers.\textsuperscript{28} What can be known is that smithing was recognized by municipal and ducal authorities as a trade that was vital to the proper functioning of farming and village trades. Of all the trades in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, large-smithing was one of five that was protected by ducal law and, in fact, was promoted by the same official edicts that prohibited most other trades in villages.\textsuperscript{29} Additionally, the traditional rights of village large-smiths to vend at yearly markets were continually protected throughout the early modern period, despite numerous complaints and petitions by city guild smiths. In terms of veterinary medicine, this meant that village hoof-smiths provided for at least some healthcare needs of horses, but that the main focus of these large-smiths was necessarily broader and more generalized. As legal provisions set them in charge of providing for all iron-based farm tools such as plows and pitchforks, village large-smiths were primarily engaged in supplying preventative medicinal care for horses through crafting specialized horse shoes. While large-smith could refer to a smith that constructed large weapons or tools out of iron, hoof-smiths were associated in common parlance as well as in public documents in Lower Saxony with the combined abilities of equine preventative and curative medicine.

Making blank shoes and nails was quite a different matter from fitting those shoes to a specific horse. Large-smiths and hoof-smiths had to have both the knowledge and skill to shape the iron in the way that would best assist the horse's life, ailments, and gait issues. While shoes for oxen were mostly concerned with traction, horse-shoes could also be temporary aids to help the hooves heal or grow in a certain way, such as to protect a heel that was too low to the ground while the back grew or to encourage a soft hoof to harden. Just as today, they also acted as the pharmaceutical industry in Nienburg and its importance for local city human and animal medical treatments.

\textsuperscript{28} See Appendices B and C. The difficulty in determining and verifying the duties of equine-centric tradesmen has been recently documented in both Heike Schmidt’s and Nadja Kosuch’s dissertations. Additionally while some economic studies do give some figures, smithing trades are not broken down into sub-specializations nor are those in guilds as masters separated from those working as journeymen in guilds or those who worked at court. Smiths who lived and worked in neighboring villages become in this way historiographically invisible. For an example, see Siegfried Busch, Hannover, Wolfenbüttel und Celle: Stadtgründungen und Stadterweiterungen in drei welfischen Residenzen vom 16. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert (Hildesheim: August Lax, 1969), 227.

\textsuperscript{29} I am referring to the Gandersheimer Landtagabschiede of 1601 and 1695. The 1695 legislation recognized only wheel-makers, cobblers, tailors of farm clothing, master carpenters, and large-smiths as legitimate village tradesmen. Klaus-Dieter Vogt, Uelzen: Seine Stadt- Umland- Beziehungen in Historischer Geographic Betractung (Göttingen: Geographischen Instituts der Universität Göttingen, 1968), 67. For the political relationship between smiths, guilds, and ducal economic politices during the Thirty Years War, see Ulrich Brohm, Die Handwerkspolitik
permanent aids to protect against gait-related injuries or to relieve stress on a certain part of the hoof, such as a tendency to clip the front heel or a roll in the back to redirect pressure caused by a bad canon-bone that made the horse limp.\textsuperscript{30} Fitting and modifying shoes required an intimate knowledge of how horses moved, their natural behaviors outside and within human influence, their gaits, and the effects of the environment and disease on their body.\textsuperscript{31}

Both German hoof-smith guides and private studfarm accounts document that village smiths did provide additional veterinary cures through their strategic use of herbs as well as deliberate cultivation of herbal gardens for this precise purpose.\textsuperscript{32} Village hoof-smiths notably then did not just diagnosis the issue and compose a medicinal recipe for the town apothecary to follow as was commonly the case with city and court horse doctors (\textit{Pferde Arzt}), but their veterinary training could be much more complex and demanding than that used or needed by city hoof-smiths and smithing guilds.\textsuperscript{33} In addition to needing to know various techniques of shoeing cattle and horses, the education of village hoof-smiths required that they be intimately involved with the identification, collection, and growing of the ingredients, the handling and vending of the recipe's ingredients, and the making of the medicine itself.\textsuperscript{34}

Village tradesmen were not always able to be as exclusive as the members of city guilds were when it came to the trades united under a shared guild privilege. Burgdorf smiths' 1679
plea for equal treatment among trades before the law in terms of recognizing guild requirements and rights illustrates how merely having a legally recognized privilege was important to village smiths and their beliefs about job security. It is reasonable then to assume that general smiths did not always desire or benefit from a separation from other smithing trades or from guild-mates, who performed completely different skill sets than their own. Of course, it is important to remember that despite that for which the village smiths might have petitioned, the duke or his officials could ultimately deny the request or decide that it was better for commerce to place smiths together with and unrelated trade in a new guild, such as apparently had happened to the Burgdorf smiths and tailors by 1688.

City and City-area Medicine

Very little academic work in guild or agricultural history has focused on Lower Saxony as a distinct cultural geography during the early modern period. While there are excellent economic studies of Lower Saxony, they do not address cultural issues and have a tendency to speak only to the post-1650 period. For example while Heike Schmidt's dissertation on the significance of horse bodies to the successful running of the early modern economy identifies several categories of curative tradesmen, she does not explore the role of guilds and guild-members in defining what veterinary medicine was and who could practice it nor does she devote much time to the early seventeenth century. City-specific popular works have a tendency to create guild history through foundational dates related to city-specific major events, such as dysentery, plague, or new trade routes. Due to the lack of a systematic study dedicated to smith guilds, the wider

37 See Schmidt.
38 Hans-Jürgen Vogtherr, Die Schmiede aus Bodenteich (Suderburg-Hösseringen, Uelzen: Landwirtschaftsmuseum Lüneburger Heide, 1999); Reimer Egge, "Es hat auch diese Stadt großen Handel": Eine Wirtschafts- und Handelsgeschichte der Stadt Uelzen (Uelzen: Becker Verlag, 1998). It is, in fact, this exact tendency by local historians of early modern Braunschweig-Lüneburg to chronicle city events through biological disaster that the title of Ulf Wendler’s recent statistical study references. Ulf Wendler, Nicht nur Pest und Pocken: Zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte der Lüneburger Heide, des Wendlandes und der Marschen des Fürstentums Lüneburg
historical context for the development of these guilds is difficult to construct. Nevertheless, one is able to note several general trends in guild development in this area over the sixteenth century through the mid-eighteenth century.

During the sixteenth and early to mid-seventeenth centuries in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, the majority of middle- and low-ranking urban smiths belonged to a general smith guild. This guild was sometimes further subdivided into a large-smith half (Amt) and a small-smith half and at times, this large-smith division was referred to specifically as a hoof-smith group (Amt).

Despite recurrent war and plague decimating the agricultural and urban populations during the seventeenth century, some of the heath's towns did see some economic development, such as in Bodenteich, Uelzen, and Gifhorn, which can be seen by the continuing existence of old guilds as well as by the establishment of new guilds in towns previously without guild protections. In a number of these towns, as has been demonstrated in the preceding chapter, these same towns correspondingly saw a rise in livestock specific markets during this period—a factor that demonstrates the strong tie between large-smiths and the dual crafts of equine farriery and veterinary medicine. Due to the traditional presence of a court and its resulting significance to regional trade, there was continuous industry by smiths inside and outside of the local smithing guild in Celle and Wolfenbüttel. Over the later seventeenth century, the new residences of the Braunschweig-Lüneburg ducal courts, Hannover and Braunschweig, saw a great deal of economic growth. Hannover in particular, as the seat of the newly dominant branch of the ducal family, was home to a number of state-building projects all of which required smithing in some degree. The breeding and stewardship of horses, as will be detailed in Chapter Four, continued to grow due to traditional practice as well as by ducal mandate, such that despite the numerous wars, there was always a need for large-smiths particularly those with curative equine veterinary

---

39 While there are in fact several works that deal with smiths in Celle, they tend to focus on the achievements of silver and goldsmiths to the exclusion of other smiths. For a recent example, see Heike Plass, *Celler Bier und Celler Silber* (Münster: Waxmann, 2004).

40 Gold and silversmiths belonged to their own guild, which enjoyed a much higher social status than those of other smiths or, indeed, most other trade guilds or professions. Some founding dates for smith guilds in Braunschweig-Lüneburg: Celle (1455 for general smiths and by 1714 for hoof-smith Amt), Braunschweig (1293 for general smiths and by 1717 for hoof-and weapon-smith guild), Hannover (1427 for journeymen smiths), Wolfenbüttel (by at least 1594 for general smiths), and Uelzen (general smith guild since the fifteenth century).

41 See Brohm. A partial list of Hannoverian state projects during this time included the Herrenhausen with its stables and promenades, castle-upgrading, military garrison headquarters, and livestock markets. For more about the construction of state projects, see Helmut von Rüggeberg, *Geschichte der Stadt Celle im Rahmen der Niedersächsichen Landesgeschichte* (Celle: Bomann-Museum, 2007).
It is through the inclusion of equine knowledge (as large-smith or hoof-smith) and then equine curative abilities (as hoof-smith or horse doctor) into their communal trade identity that smithing guilds increased their social and economic influence during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Yet, conversely, the increased significance of equine knowledge as part of the entire smithing guild communal culture also led to a splintering of ranks between large- and small-smiths as well as among large-smiths themselves. The economic development of these urban smithing guilds is disparate and case-specific, as the guilds were responding to a number of local legal challenges at the same time as they were attempting to increase the social recognition and cultural value of smithing on both personal and regional levels. However, the constant between these divergent situations lies in the emphasis increasingly placed on equine-related trade by large-smiths over the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Consistent among all the cases was this emphasis by large-smiths—whether large-smiths as a whole or through an equine medicine sub-group—on the new locus of the smithing trade. Thus the general smith guild's right to exist was rooted in the relationship of a large-smith's abilities with equine bodies rather than to the needs of humans.43

The majority of guild masters with equine knowledge in larger towns eventually left general smith guilds. They either made equestrian-focused guilds, such as the one formed by Braunschweig's large-smiths and hoof-smiths in conjunction with weapon-smiths, or established separate, equine-focused smithing franchises, such as Hannover's large-smith guild, which was established in the new, industrial district by hoof-smith masters from the still-extant, old-city general smith guild.44 Yet for some large-smiths, such as those in smaller or court towns like Celle, keeping the future economic viability of their bargaining unit intact was the most pressing issue on their mind. Concerned more with retaining a dependable source of income, these guild-masters attempted a compromise by staying within the same guild but refiguring the large-smith

42 As has been detailed already in the previous chapter, the primary focus of early modern veterinary works was on horses in both popular and elite sources.
43 For an excellent overview of the changing role that working animal bodies played in early modern industries and daily life, see Jason Hribal, Animals are Part of the Working Class: Commons, Enclosure, and Resistance in the Atlantic World (PhD diss., University of Toledo, May 2002).
44 By the early to mid-eighteenth century, one did find an additional form of equine-focused smithing cultural development, the hoof-smith and nail-smith (Huf-und Nagel-Schmiede) guilds, such as that in Helmstedt, Staatsarchiv Wolfenbüttel (StA Wolfenb.) Findbuch 2 Alt 12787, 1749. Given the very lowly place that nail-smiths typically held in smithing guilds, these guilds appear to originate from a sympathetic trade alignment based on
division into a hoof-smith division (*Hufschmiede Amt*).\(^{45}\) Meanwhile, other urban large-smiths staying in general smith guilds acquired the reputation for attempting to dominate and control all guild activities. This occurred both in the sense that they legally pursued cases that most benefited the large-smiths, and in the sense that they attempted to reduce the rights and voice of the small-smith guild masters, even going so far as to refuse to allow small-smiths the right to see or use the main guild records and master-books.\(^{46}\) In cities like Braunschweig, this power-grab resulted from rivalry between the guild's two branches, wherein the large-smiths felt that equine-based services required more skill and technique than any used by the small-smiths, and thus that the large-smiths deserved the higher status within the guild as well as the greater share of control of the guild and its resources.\(^{47}\) For Braunschweig in particular, the discord between the halves of the smithing guild reached a sudden peak in the spring of 1703, when the large-smiths first petitioned for a separate guild. By November of the same year, the guild was divided, with the large-smiths uniting under the new equestrian-oriented title, Hoof-, Weapon-, and Large-Smith guild (*Huf- Waffen- und Grobschmiede*).\(^{48}\) By 1717, the large-smiths had further tailored the guild's name to Hoof- and Weapon-smith, thereby emphasizing their trade specialization—and communal identity—in equine curative medicine.\(^{49}\)

Over the late sixteenth and seventeenth century, large-smith guild masters consciously began to employ a single trade-related icon as the primary signifier of their guild in order to better focus their guild's collective energies and thereby to protect its economic interests and social standing. During this time, the symbol of the horse was taken up by guilds to represent and remind beholders of the guild's control of the knowledge of equine medicine as well as of equine bodies.\(^{50}\) The adoption of an equine-associated interpretation of guild-favored skills and

---

\(^{45}\) Celle's large-smiths were subsumed by the Hufschmiede Amt by at least 1714.

\(^{46}\) StA Wolfenb. 4 Alt 5, nr. 247, 9. April 1705 (1676-1734).

\(^{47}\) This group of large-smiths included men that had undergone double periods of journeymen training before achieving a joint trade identity of large-smith and horse doctor or large-smith and hoof-smith. Small-smiths however did have their own specializations. Clock-makers and locksmiths were at this same time undergoing an explosion of popular and noble patronage across northern Europe. See also StA Wolfenb. 4 Alt 5, nr. 247, 25. Mai 1734. By 1734, the large-smiths that focused on equine-centric skills along with those that created agricultural and military tools of trade had separated from the rest of the smithing guild into their own division.

\(^{48}\) StA Wolfenb. Findbuch 2 Alt 12980, 1708; StA Wolfenb. 4 Alt 5, nr. 247, 15. November 1703. The sudden crisis is caused by a guild cultural rift over making the smithing guild into an equine-focused smithing and medicinal guild.

\(^{49}\) StdA BS G. VIII A, nr. 448, v. I.

\(^{50}\) Equine attributes were widely adopted on official signs and seals to represent smithing guilds across Lower Saxony—and indeed Germany and the Netherlands.
knowledge led to a communal guild identity that became dependent on restricting the right to profit economically and socially in advanced equine curative medicine to a select, pre-vetted group of local townsmen, who paid dearly for the privilege. Both guild concerns about trade exceptions granted to court-sponsored large-smiths and horse doctors and the hardship of maintaining a guild, which guaranteed steady employment during a century of almost constant warfare across Lower Saxony, led to the city guilds' standard practice of suing country and foreign large-smith masters into either desisting from vending or into joining the guild and paying a percentage of the yearly guild permit fee. The situation between smiths here however was not antagonistic by nature but out of necessity. During the seventeenth century, many village and city guilds lacked members with an advanced knowledge of tending to a horse's preventative and curative needs. Without a master who could teach curative skills to others, the perpetuity of the guild and therefore the security of guild-masters' jobs was at risk. Over the eighteenth century, this uncertainty encouragedsmithing guilds to form insular communities of increasingly patriarchal structure, wherein masterships were passed down no longer to the best-qualified local journeymen, but to the best connected among close male relatives.\textsuperscript{51}

**Masculine and Equine Trade Identities**

The majority of documented equine curative medicine was performed in cities either by large-smiths and hoof-smiths that were usually connected to a guild or by equestrian-smiths (\textit{Reitschmied}) that worked nearby at a court.\textsuperscript{52} During this time other equine tradesmen (e.g. bridle-makers, saddle-makers, bit-makers, and spur-makers) were also experiencing a change in traditional practices due to the increasing diversity of economic, political, and military uses of horses in early modern society. Therefore, it is particularly significant that of all these trades,\textsuperscript{51}

---

\textsuperscript{51} See Appendices A-C for smiths' names, locations, and dates. Rolf Uphoff does note that unlike in some other German areas, the smith guilds of Hannover did not grant all masters’ sons admittance to the guild by nature of the birth, but continued to require that one have enough smithing ability to construct a masterpiece. Rolf Uphoff, “Der Kampf um die Zunftautonomie: Die Handwerkerkorporationen der Alt- und Neustadt Hannover im ausgehenden 17. und 18. Jahrhundert,” in \textit{Hannover und sein Umland in der frühen Neuzeit}, ed. Carl-Hans Hauptmeyer (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 1994), 115.

\textsuperscript{52} There is very little direct archival evidence of wound doctors, executioners, and skinners involving themselves in curative medicine for horses in Lower Saxony. I could only find one document that dealt clearly with this issue, the 1758 complaint about executioner, skinner, and horse doctor Peter Krätzer in the StA Wolfenb. For more on dishonorable trades, see Kathy Stuart, \textit{Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts: Honor and Ritual Pollution in Early Modern Germany} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
only the smith guilds made a play for monopoly of the growing field of equine medicine in any capacity, whether curative or preventative.53 Yet, this was done not simply for trade monopoly, but for the large-smiths of Lower Saxony it was additionally about the intellectual and cultural control of an economically valuable tool—the horse's body. Whether through using visual symbols of actual horses or items associated with horses (e.g. horseshoes), the smith guild's members, individually and communally, developed their trade identity based on certain perceived to be shared values that they read into horses' bodies. The values and virtues that they attributed to these controls reinforced certain ideals of social and economic patriarchy. Additionally, the manner in which large-smith guildsmen interpreted and practiced equine healthcare and husbandry became grounded in notions of their own masculine personal and communal identities, particularly in terms of social and gender hierarchies (i.e. status as Burgher and as guild-master). In this way, large-smiths used horses and equine bodies symbolically in a number of manners: to justify an increased social stratification within artisanal rankings, to defend imposing new, "traditional" gender roles in equine-related areas of iron-smithing, to explain the potentially risky strategy of reorienting local general smith guilds' culture towards horses specifically rather than to cattle and oxen or livestock in general, to participate actively in the growing scientific and political domain of creating and directing the development of equine knowledge and trade skills, and to involve themselves as experts in public debates about equine healthcare and horse breeding.

In order to explore the myriad issues at play in the perception, formation, and performance of early modern German equine masculinities, I will be addressing different aspects of the contexts for and practices of an equine trade identity as well as those of guild masculinities, both individual and communal. Once I have shown how they are intricately involved in the same issues and concerns, then I will unite the two—guild masculinities with equine trade identities—in order to discuss how they informed each other as well as early modern society. In this way, I will be emphasizing the plural dynamic conditions and possibilities for early modern tradesmen.54

53 While farmers could be said to have been rivals of a sort, they neither had guilds nor would it have been in their economic interest to challenge smiths for the legal right to learn, teach, and practice veterinary medicine. Bridle-makers and saddle-makers meanwhile united together over their shared resource of leather.
54 For a Bourdieuian study of guild education as a system through which to reproduce and create social capital in addition to unified male group identities, see Johan Dambruyne, “Corporative Capital and Social Representation in the Southern and Northern Netherlands, 1500-1800,” in Craft Guilds in the Early Modern Low Countries, ed.
Gendered Legalisms in Guild and State Documents

Deceulaer and Panhuysen’s recent essay “Dressed to Work” studies the influence of gender on the development of trades and of economic and social institutions, querying: “in what measure could individuals or groups (i.e. craft guilds) enforce their ‘will’…and in what measure could they restrict the options available to other persons or groups (i.e. women)?” As part of this project, they examine the complex relationship between female workers and tailor guilds in the Low Countries in order to determine in which ways men could and did attempt to control women’s economic options within guild institutions. In terms of female labor within German smith guilds, women became ever more excluded from learning or practicing equine-focused smithing and healing skills during the mid-seventeenth century through the eighteenth century. While it is true that there is a general trend over the early modern period (1550-1750) in which men of all backgrounds and for various purposes increasingly push women outside of guilds and trades, I believe that the large-smiths and hoof-smiths of Braunschweig-Lüneburg present an interesting case for the study of early modern masculinity. An idealized male-gendered environment peculiar to equine-focused smiths and horse doctors did develop out of the smiths’ particular trade focus on and personal interests with horses. This community’s unique character was also in part the result of concurrent actions by both north German nobles and independent equine practitioners that alternately challenged and recognized the authority of large-smiths as legitimate members of the established social and economic networks surrounding equine curative health and equine husbandry.

Early modern trade legitimacy was grounded in myriad public performances of maleness—identifying one's actions as belonging to certain groups of socially accepted men and therefore taking on the masculine values and practices of the group as one's own. Cultural exclusion of women from guild operations and internal hierarchies was part of the mechanism that enabled both a masculinization of equine-centric smithing and medicine and new trade identities that recognized hippological knowledge as a male-only commodity. Even guild-

56 For more on the significance of gender to early modern concepts of labor and economic regulations placed on guilds, see Claire Crowston, Fabricating Women: the Seamstresses of Old Regime France (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001).
widows, who were allowed to practice the trade itself while they retained the vending rights of
the deceased spouse, were not recognized publicly as contributing towards communal smithing
or veterinary knowledge, nor were women publicly recognized on an individual level for their
own possession of smithing or equine healthcare skills. At no point in this region during the
early modern period are female large-smiths granted full status of master, even though smithing
guilds in the region did at times permit them to learn basic iron-smithing skills, such as making
nails.

The presence of women in the general smith guild is very much a geographic as well as
temporally specific situation. While the hoof-smith guilds that formed around the end of the
seventeenth century did not permit women to be officially recognized or educated within their
ranks, the general smith and large-smith guilds that their masters and journeymen had come
from—and continued to come from—could be more ambivalent on the issue, as well as on the
potential for granting females equal treatment as males of the same rank (e.g. apprentices or
members of the same family) at any time. In Alfeld, guild documents from 1613 reference the
existence of masters' daughters and rank them equal in value to masters' sons in terms of fees that
masters' have to pay for their children. However, the girls appear to be simply members of the
household and not of the working staff in any manner. For example, a master's work staff
(Gesinde) is cited later in the same document as being comprised of journeymen (Gesellen) and
boys. Throughout the other articles, the pronoun for individual journeymen remains male.
According to a petition in 1647, the general smith guild of Lüchow did permit the entrance of
women into the guild, for it lists the materials that both men and women attempting to join the

57 I would also argue that this goes privately as well. Internal guild documents do not list women as owing or
paying guild fines for any reason. While some men in Celle are recorded as having bought their wives into the
guild, the wives’ names are not mentioned then or afterward. See Stadtarchiv Celle (StdA Celle), 23 M 024, 1703.
58 While nails were the first product an apprentice large-smith learned to make, there were in fact master nail-smiths
during this time period. It was the lowest-ranking position in smithing guilds, yet as long as the person was male, it
was a legitimate and reputable trade.
59 As noted earlier, free-smithies were granted by noble or city privilege to a petitioning smith. I have found no
evidence of a woman petitioning for such a spot nor mentioned as operating one anywhere during this time period in
Braunschweig-Lüneburg.
60 In a related note, when referring to the other four village trades that had the benefit of legal support, Burgdorf's
smithing guild identifies both sexes as prospective members of a labor force that is being denied access to village
guilds and hints towards the inclusion of both sexes in existing village guilds: “Es sey gesell oder Jungfraw, der
nicht die gilde zuvor hat, und von außen hinnen kommet” Celle Br. 61a, nr. 2421, 1679, p. 5. The term of
“Jungfrau” is also seen in the general guild regulations of 1541. See Bessenrodt, 27.
guild had to produce before they would be considered.63 However, the particular material cited was simply a valid birth certificate, which served a bureaucratic purpose rather than demonstrating any of the trade skills that were demanded by the dukes and officials granting guild privileges and by city customers that were required to use guild services. In a 1676 brief, Wolfenbüttel's general smithing guild is actually quite explicit about denying women the right to work with iron or in any craft-based activity of the smithing trades.64 The language of the document, which is focused on internal regulations of the guild, denotes potential smithing students only as apprentice boys (Lehrjunge) and journeymen. Daughters of smithing masters are restricted to vending goods (Krug), which presumably her father or another male relative was expected to have made for her. These daughters were then also reminded not to vend outside authorized times, prohibiting them among other unauthorized times from selling during mealtimes.

**Internalized (Male-) Gendered Behaviors and Guild Identities**

The increasingly male-gendered culture of smithing guilds was not merely a result of their restriction of full membership to men. It was also a reflection of how the guilds represented themselves to their local communities and clients as well as of how guilds were experienced by their members in highly male-gendered ways. As was the practice in many early modern trades, this process began with an apprentice's first contract and introduction to his or her master, and it was maintained over the years through participation in rituals that tied journeymen to each other and to their current masters with whom they lived and to whom they had traveled from other towns.65 Thanks to a host of social conventions and guild practices of the time, women were unable to participate in many of the activities that were meant to build camaraderie and trust among journeymen and masters as well as to offer journeymen a way to learn from and share their own knowledge with others through regional equine smithing and healing communities. In this way, women were prohibited from learning the widest range of trade skill sets through regular channels. They could not make the guild-mandated educational circuit between masters in different towns, nor was it seemly for them to dwell in their master's home, as guild

---

63 HStA Celle Br. 58, nr. 1107, Lüchow, 20. May 1647.
64 StA Wolfenb. 4 Alt 5, nr. 247, Wolfenbüttel, 1676.
65 Such as are detailed in the general smith guild documents of HStA Cal. Br. 10, nr. 259, Alfeld, 1613-1634.
regulations at times demanded. 

Although they certainly may have had large-smith-based trade identities, women involved with the large-smithing trade and equine medicine would not have had the same types of trade identities as men. In no way, however, should this be understood as evidence that early modern women did not perform any large-smithing or veterinary labor nor that the contribution of women within the social and economic networks of large-smiths and horse doctors was negligible or unimportant to daily economic and cultural operations of men, guild, and trades. A woman’s gender changed the usual operating rules of the guild and of equine-related trades so that she could not participate in the usual networks of equine and smithing knowledge through the daily interactions of semi-equals under the law. The cultural and emotional unity formed through male homosocial relationships and society was categorically denied to females. Due to legalized sexual hierarchies and to cultural constructions of heterosocial relationships outside the family as inferior for men and potentially immoral for women, the primary interactions through which equine smithing and veterinary knowledge were communicated and learned were the social relationships in which women were not culturally permitted to engage.

Large-smith guild-sisters certainly were never true social equals to their brethren, regardless of the equine healing and smithing skill sets that some real women could and did perform on a regular basis. A comparison between Appendices B and C reveals that large- or hoof-smith widows in city guilds were not allowed to practice horse doctoring as a single or joint equine skill set. While some of these widows may be documented as operating as large-smiths until their remarriage, the equine-focused large-smithing and healthcare that emerges by the end of the seventeenth century materializes as a particularly male-only trade specialty. In the situation of Celle by 1730, for example, a woman could only be accepted into the guild if she was the widow of a local large-smith master and was now engaged to a qualified male applicant.

---

66 In a discussion of the discrepancy between the trade education of women and men, Katarina Simon-Muscheid notes that the guild requirement for journeymen to learn trade skills by wandering would have been unthinkable for a woman. Katharina Simon-Muscheid, “Was nützt die Schüsterin dem Schmied?” in Frauenarbeit und Männerehre, ed. Katarina Simon-Muscheid (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1998), 13-33. For a look at the importance of that migratory rituals played in guild culture, see Rainer Elkar, “Lernen durch Wandern: einige kritische Anmerkungen zum Thema ‘Wissenstransfer durch Migration,’” in Handwerk in Europa: vom Spätmittelalter bis zur Frühen Neuzeit, ed. Knut Schulz and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999), 213-232.

67 As standard practice for German smiths and possibly other trades, the widow would at this point be documented in formal and informal state and guild records under her husband’s family name. See Appendix B for further evidence.
to the guild.\textsuperscript{68} In this way, the legal ownership of large-smith tools was passed through the body of the widow from man to man, but she herself was never granted full guild privileges without a male proxy.\textsuperscript{69} This is not to say that women did not or could not have skillfully arranged their own remarriages in order to continue practicing a trade that they knew well or enjoyed. Yet they were certainly both explicitly and systematically objectified throughout official guild and state documents for the primary benefit of socially approved, generally resourceless men.\textsuperscript{70} Through the symbolic and practical aspects of prescriptive remarriage between single male guild members—whether journeyman or widower—and widows of hoof-smith or large-smith masters, guild and noble officials provided certain men with a means through which to further gain and produce social and economic honor.\textsuperscript{71}

The ever-elusive quality of honor (\textit{Ehre}) was a primary condition for guild mastership for journeymen during the mid-seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{72} According to Fallersleben’s general smith guild charter from 1650, a dishonorable man may not become a master, and the guild masters were responsible for making sure that its members did not do dishonorable things. Honorability was constructed through a man’s social and economic reputations: a masterpiece was not enough. That is, according to the charter’s author, Duke Christian Ludwig, a tradesman had to have more than just technical skill at his craft before he could be granted with a guild mastership. A journeyman smith had to demonstrate a long-term engagement with the other men in his trade-related networks and he had to get along with the guild’s current masters.\textsuperscript{73} Attainment of the status of mastership depended upon a journeyman’s work and skill as a tradesman and as a dedicated member of the guild and local communities. This type of idealized relationship both between journeymen and masters and between journeymen and local society reflected the duke’s legal position that conditions for mastership were met over time and that they were always contingent on noble confirmation.

Celle’s hoof-smith fraternal charter from 1708 reveals that hoof-smith masters grounded

\textsuperscript{68} The standardized forms used for entrance to the Celle large-smith guild in 1730 only permit boys (\textit{Junge}).
\textsuperscript{69} Internal guild documents do list a fair number of men who bought their wife into the guild. I believe that it was basically imagined as an insurance policy for her, but regardless, she was not permitted to buy herself in.
\textsuperscript{70} The paternalistic support of master-less women granted by remarriage to a large-smith or hoof-smith was a far secondary concern.
\textsuperscript{71} The documents themselves say nothing about compatibility between prospective partners. While love was not a major factor in marriages at this time, differences in religious confession or age (e.g. one’s ability to produce children) might have been considered to be relevant to address.
\textsuperscript{72} For discussions of honor within guild regulations in Hannover, see Uphoff, 110-111.
their guild’s legitimacy in its historical origins and in their personal practice of a set of praiseworthy behaviors. In this document, the six hoof-smith guild masters prefer to represent their guild as laudable (löbliche) instead of simply honorable.74 Having cited the medieval origins of their guild privilege, they then assert their commitment to this laudability through the promotion of peace and unity within the group and through maintaining the guild’s honor and reputation.75 The masters present the guild as an institution meant to benefit masters and society at large and to guide inexperienced, immature journeymen. While both journeymen charters prohibit certain groups of dishonorable activities, hoof-smith masters had a more practical approach to infractions. Clearly understanding the cultural role that beer and gambling played in male social situations, the masters offered journeymen the possibility of atoning for immoral behaviors by paying fines.76 Yet, internal guild transgressions were not so lightly punished, particularly those that had the potential to denigrate a master’s reputation or to disrupt his ability to run a successful workshop. Journeymen that quit on Sundays, for example, were prevented from working with another master for a month. This time could act as a cooling-off period for all of the concerned parties, but it was primarily intended to punish a journeyman for leaving his master. From the masters’ perspective, there was a large distance in degree between the journeyman, who gave his master at least a day of forewarning, and the one that suddenly disappeared one night or stormed off after an argument. Whether or not the master was actually to blame for the departure, a journeyman that did not show up for a workday and that could not be found for a week was effectively thrown out of the guild. The journeyman was banned for a year and a day from working on his own or with any of the large-smiths associated with the guild, including those in the surrounding countryside as well as those within the city guild

74 Laudable is used elsewhere as a virtue attached to the reputations of Celle hoof-smiths and their guild. In an entry in the Celle large-smith guild book from 1714, Heinrich Schültze, a hoof-smith from Harmensburg, petitions to enter the laudable hoof-smith division of the large-smith guild: “daß löbliche Huffschmiede Ambt zu halten.”

75 “Haben wir…zu erhalten Fried und Einigkeit Ehre und reputation,” HStA Hann. 93, nr. 2932, 1708. The origin date of 1455 it cites, however, is that for general smithing journeymen. The hoof-smiths are clearly depicting themselves as proud successors to a long, praiseworthy tradition of smiths.

76 Rather ironically, Christian Ludwig, the cousin of the ruling dukes of Braunschweig-Lüneburg that had zealously dragged his family (and their extensive land holdings) back into the Thirty Years War, seemed to feel that some sort of expulsion would have been best for journeymen that exhibited dishonorable behaviors and did not obey their elders and social betters. For a discussion of absolutist political theory in the ducal family, see Christine van den Heuvel’s essay “Christian Ludwig – Herzog von Braunschweig und Lüneburg (1622-1665): Regierung und Hof” in Stadt- Land- Schloss: Celle als Residenz, ed. Brigitte Streich (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2000), 87-96. For a discussion of the ducal practice of absenteeism from court and political responsibilities, see Brigitte Streich’s essay in the same collection. Brigitte Streich, “Celle als Residenz der Herzöge von Braunschweig-Lüneburg” in Stadt- Land- Schloss: Celle als Residenz, ed. Brigitte Streich (Bielefeld: Verlag für
Officially designed for setting up journeymen with proper working habits and techniques, the 1703 and 1708 fraternal charters for the hoof-smith journeymen in Celle reduced them to an infantilized social status of partial citizenship from which masters as full members were free. To their professed end of education, the articles do enforce several traditions that were meant to give journeymen practical lessons in professionalization. They specify, for example, that the journeymen must meet at least once yearly on “Johannes Tag” and that older journeymen keep and teach the society’s rules to new members. However, the charters also prevent them from sharing guild beer or playing cards, two activities that served both as social bonding mechanisms among fellow large-smiths as well as business purposes with clients. Preventing masters from accessing guild beer, which guild dues paid for, was a serious affair, and, as such, it was a frequent cause for legal intervention into intra-guild politics. Ostensibly for the purpose of preventing bored, drunken, and therefore rowdy journeymen, the charters’ restrictions on beer also meant placing younger men under the authority of senior guildsmen. By the eighteenth century, Celle hoof-smith masters had come to view their role in the guild as that of a patriarch, of which the ideal social form was that of a disciplinarian father in the workshop but in a political manifestation meant being a strict enforcer of economic privileges and gender hierarchies. For state purposes, this type of internal structure made the guild much easier to govern, as the senior men (i.e. the masters and patriarchs of the guild) were held responsible for the actions of the junior men. In practice, this also meant that many journeymen, who were waiting for a mastership to free up in the guild, were forced indefinitely to labor in a prolonged adolescent state that had nothing to do their actual bodies, abilities, or honorable status.
Smithing Identities and Monopolies of Equine-related Resources

When the guild large-smiths came together to protect their economic and social privileges, control of some type of equine knowledge and its related access to equine-related resources were always central to the dispute. However, this did not have to be the case. Iron, which was a primary resource for all smiths and was the only base material other than equine bodies that large-smiths worked upon and shaped, could have been taken up by the large-smiths as the symbolic matter around which to form a trade identity, whether a communal or individual one. Moreover, in fact, there is some evidence that general smith guilds did. In their disputes with other guilds or economic organizations, guild records consistently reveal that smith guilds felt that they had the right to maintain a monopoly over the importation of iron as well as the vending of it in any form, whether in its raw form or in a processed state such as with horseshoes. In a 1594 correspondence between Duke Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and Duke Ernst of Celle, the smiths' belief that they had a right to a monopoly appears to be clearly grounded in a ducal policy towards large-smiths that dated back to 1548. The letter, which deals with an imperial law controlling the supply of certain raw materials—specifically wood, coal, and iron—identifies large-smiths as the primary injured party of non-artisanal vendors of these goods and recommends public posting of this law and its related fines.

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, general smith guilds around the Lüneburg heath repeatedly brought complaints on behalf of their large-smith members against the encroachment of general goods merchants (Krüger) and against merchant trade guilds (Kramer) in the trafficking of raw iron. In addition, while merchant guilds did at times attempt to bring up a petition against smiths vending iron, the cases were rarely decided in the merchant guilds' favor. Numerous records of the Wolfenbüttel court reveal a further potential affinity between

---

80 Furthermore, the general smith guild of Braunschweig in 1594 tried to set up their privileges as a guild based on a shared trade resource commonality through wood, coal, and iron. StdA BS, B IV, 10c, nr. 528.
81 HStA Celle Br. 59, nr. 43. See also guild foundational documents like "Die Schmiedegilde...in Helmstedt: ihre Gildebrief und deren Bestätigung, die ihr erteilte Erlaubnis zum Eisenkauf" in Sta Wolfenb. 2 Alt, nr. 12787, 1622.
82 StdA BS, BIV, 10c, nr. 523, "Die Schmiedegilde gegen die Kramer und andere einheimische und fremde Händler wegen ihres Handels mit Hufeisen, Sensen, Sporen (1583-1652)"; HStA Hann.72 Einbeck, nr. 539, 1635-7. In terms of the other two raw materials, wood does not come up in disputes. Coal however does surface as a point of contention, particularly within the guild. For Celle, see HStA Celle Br. 61, nr. 928; for Braunschweig, see StdA BS, GVIII, 455a, Morgensprache und Strafrechnungsbuch.
83 HStA Hann. 72 Einbeck, nr. 539, 1635-7. The iron trade is the main issue at hand as well as the fact that the smith has been vending iron for decades.
equine-focused smiths and the use of iron to forge trade identities. The Braunschweig-Lüneburg dukes promoted the policy that all of their equestrian- and hoof-smiths were responsible for either obtaining their own iron or paying the court directly to supply them with the iron necessary for making horseshoes and for repairing hoof-smith-related tools. In ducal recommendation letters for equestrian-smiths and hoof-smiths, pension requests by equestrian-smiths, and court billing records, hoof-smiths and riding-smiths have their trade abilities as smiths evaluated in part through their judicious use of iron. In recommendation letters, these smiths are credited with paying the bills for their iron promptly as well as always keeping enough high-quality stock on hand to satisfy their own needs—as far as tools and routine shoeings went—in addition to any further equestrian demands that the duke's court may have required. Likewise, in pension requests and bills it is significant that the main trade-related resource specifically referenced by smiths is in fact the raw material out of which they were expected to reform and create hoof-smithing tools and horseshoes. In none of these sources is the artisan's general possession of a set of tools notable. Instead, the emphasis is placed on large-smiths being reliable and knowledgeable in creating whatever secondary materials and products they might need or be required to use out of this single raw material. In this way, smiths' resource management training recognized iron as the most essential (inanimate) material to a hoof- or riding-smith, and it is the iron that is always visually figured culturally as symbolically representative of the smiths and their trade itself, primarily in the form of a horseshoe.

Issues involving the monopoly over equine-related resources can also be seen in disputes concerning self-advertisement and guild marketing at city markets. In these disputes, the parties and concerns at hand involved the privileges of city and town smith guilds and the perceived encroachments of foreign and village large-smiths. By the mid-sixteenth century, the guilds' primary concerns in this area tended to be focused on simple jurisdictional questions between city or town guild domains and country practitioners, such as whether or not a particular large-smith was permitted to set up a smithy of his own and whether he was permitted to advertise his

---

84 StA Wolfenb. 3 Alt 230, 1575; StA Wolfenb. 3 Alt 536, 1634-1655
85 Hans Holste, StA Wolfenb. 3 Alt 281, 1571-2; Joachim Nolte's payment request, StA Wolfenb. 4 Alt 19, nr. 1188, 1666; StA Wolfenb. Kammer-Kasse, nr. 4103, 1666, Holste, the riding-smith, requested more steel to improve work tools and to take care of the horses under his charge. In case he was not able to get much more steel, he indicated that it was more important to him to shoe the horses under his responsibility than to improve his own tools.
86 Concern about foreign and village tradesmen stealing guild work was a common fear for the time period and region. For works dealing with Lower Saxon smiths, see Plass and Bessenrodt.
services with a trade sign. The general, progressive demand for more smithies along with frequent ducal legislation in their support generally led to permission for limited-ownership, independent smithies (Freischmiede) to be set up in villages throughout the seventeenth century. Yet, by the mid to late seventeenth century, guild involvement in such trade disputes had become more complex as economic arguments and maneuvering for both sides became complicated by the adoption of strategic, quasi-legal methods to insure each’s economic future. In the situation of Harburg, the local general smith guild brought petitions against any and all Hamburg-area smiths from 1647-1668. While ducal legislation authorized country smiths and visiting journeymen and masters to vend at certain livestock markets, the Harburg smith guild alleged that the Hamburg-area large-smiths were attempting to bypass these regulations by arriving days ahead of time. The largest horse market in Harburg took place following several religious holidays during which local guilds were not permitted to work. Therefore the Harburg smith guild protested that the visiting smiths were gaining an unfair advantage at the biggest yearly market for large-smiths by setting up their booths early and using the interim time to make extra stock before the market. Presenting itself favorably in light of concerned community leader, the guild also noted that Harburg citizens were themselves being harassed by the noise, being unable to participate in or attend to the holiday's religious services due to the constant sounds of pounding iron.

Along with the growing sophistication of legally-ambivalent, equine-skilled tradesmen operating outside of guild legislation, jurisdictional and procedural concerns of city and town guilds by the late seventeenth century were further complicated through conflicts between local traditions and official policy and through the territorial claims of some general smith guilds over neighboring villages and markets. The issue generally boiled down to opposing opinions on the grounds by which a smith or horse doctor could be refused the right to vend at public horse markets and at what times. In a series of petitions running from 1683 until 1704, the general smith guilds of Bodenteich and Uelzen fought each other, state officials, free-smiths in the region, and ducal economic policy in order to control the vending rights of visiting and country smiths. Both towns had begun the century small but gained economic success rapidly in its last

87 A range of city, court, and guild archival records document this general practice in both Wolfenbüttel and Braunschweig. For an example, see HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 2005, Burgdorf, 1621.
88 HStA Celle Br. 60, nr. 218, Harburg, 1647-1668.
89 HStA Hann. 74 Oldenstadt, nr. 579[580], 1683-1704.
decades through their increased prominence in local and regional trading networks. For the two smithing guilds, this meant that there was now a constant stream of potential customers and regulars for large-smiths, hoof-smiths, and equestrian-smiths as well as a new source of financial anxiety and economic rivalry.

All parties agreed that independent smiths had a legal as well as a traditional right to vend at some point during the weekend of the horse market. However, local officials in both towns wanted to expand the rights of free-smiths by allowing them multiple days to vend—without explanation other than an unsupported claim that it was good for local industries. Ducal judgments continually advocated maintaining the status quo by being faithful to previous legal rulings on the issue rather than to informal practices, yet state officials at the court in Celle were sympathetic towards favoring daily, local traditions (den alten Gebrauch) as precedent for settling disputes about local economic policy.\(^90\) Having been drawn into the conflict by the independent smiths originally claiming allegiance (Botmessigkeit) to it—and thus its legal protection—the mercantilist Bodenteich smith guild used the situation to encourage local and state officials towards actions that would take income away from Uelzen's smithing guild.\(^91\)

As might be expected, the general smith guild of Uelzen hotly disputed the positions of these officials and the Bodenteich smithing guild on the grounds that none of them had addressed the detailed, documented offenses by free-smiths on the Uelzen guild. In his 1704 letter directed to Celle on behalf of the Uelzen smith guild, Uelzen's mayor argues that the other state officials have been misinterpreting the language in ducal charters for the horse markets, such as reinterpreting “foreign” to apply only to country-living smiths and not also to village and foreign smiths. He also objects to insinuations by Bodenteich's guild and Peter Krüger, a country hoof-smith living near Wittingen, who had been caught vending in Uelzen, that by not having successfully enforced their guild privileges prior to—and in the fifteen years during—the current legal, jurisdictional dispute, Uelzen's general smith guild had lost its right to have a voice in regulating independent or itinerant large-smiths and hoof-smiths in neighboring districts as well as in regulating equine-focused trade in their home town.\(^92\) The Uelzen official countered that

\(^90\) Ducal legislation that dated from the refiguring of these regulations in 1661 was cited in the guild dispute of 1683-1704 in order to detail guild privileges and restrictions of the vending rights of free-smiths.

\(^91\) In at least one document from 1696, they argued that the Uelzen smith guild needed to provide evidence that the extra-legal vending by free large-smiths was causing it harm.

\(^92\) A smaller town at the time of Krüger's 1704 petition, Wittingen is located at the southern edge of Bodenteich's jurisdictional area and is around thirty kilometers away from Uelzen. Bodenteich is located about halfway between
not only did the 1661 legislation explicitly forbid large-smiths outside of the Uelzen guild vending in town at any time other than the last day of annual livestock markets, the hoof-smiths themselves had a high regard for the law and for the contract granting their guild its rights. They in no way had been ungrateful or neglectful in exercising the privileges that ducal authority had granted to them. Ultimately, the conservative, state-supportive arguments won out over those placing greater weight on local customs, and the state sided with Uelzen.93

While disputes about iron did arouse concern and legalistic ire in early modern smiths with both general and equine-focus, unprocessed iron by itself did not exercise much cultural force for large-smiths. For whatever reason, iron was not compelling or useful for large-smiths as a physical and intellectual sign until it was either formed into a shape for direct use in equine-based industries or designated for use on horse bodies. Guild large-smiths along with rural veterinary practitioners such as Krüger demonstrated a shared belief that by emphasizing their trade skills as smiths that could construct, modify, and vended iron products for horses, they could exercise a new type of cultural capital. By associating themselves to horses, these men sought to improve the social and economic status of both independent and guild large-smiths. However, in so doing these gendered beliefs about the transfer of trade skill sets and resources began to influence and direct the practice of large-smithing in daily life.

**Gendered Family Ties within the Equine-focused Smithing Community**

As has already been discussed in some detail in Chapter 2, there was a host of masculine gender roles prescribed for early modern equine tradesmen, some of which could conflict even as they operated in parallel or tandem with others. Over the early modern period, the gender role of agriculturally relevant tradesmen as housefather (Hausvater) developed and was promoted by a wide range of literature, in which the standard presentation of adult men, whether masters in a guild or journeymen granted a free smithy by noble or city privilege, was that of the head of his family. This patriarch was the producer of order and manager of work at the household level just as he was expected to be the provider of food for his dependents. Additional or separate roles

---

93 Dukes and state officials did not necessarily always support prior rulings—even their own. As discussed above,
could be played by early modern tradesmen through acting as a local investor, such as presenting himself as an upstanding member of the social, political, or business community. This is seen, for example, in Heinrich Bollkopf’s 1654 petition for a position at the free smithy outside of Dannenberg. He predicates the request not just on his own talents as a large-smith but also on his desire to answer the locals’ call for horse-doctoring services. He therefore presents equine-curative abilities and training as providing him with the opportunity to become an even better friend than the previous smith to local agricultural and business communities. Bollkopf’s request for the free smithy would have been judged by the Braunschweig dukes on its merits individually and not as part of general policy on guild matters, which also indicates that this type of community provider could be constructed entirely without consideration of local guilds and their practices. Instead of looking to join the local guild, Bollkopf aligns himself to his prospective new clientele through his emphasis of their shared business interests.

Early modern guild tradesmen could experiment with further derivations of economic and social power. Large-smiths and equine practitioners often represented themselves as producers of public order at the workshop level, as will shortly be demonstrated in the realm of visual representations of both self and trade. Since their economic position provided them with better trade resources (i.e. the skilled labors and improved productivity of journeymen) than non-masters, urban equine-centric master smiths did at times choose to interpret economic privileges as further grounds for social hierarchy among fellow tradesmen. In this formulation, the master hoof-smiths and large-smiths with equine healing skills regarded themselves as providers of quality education and consequently as rightful masters over the bodies of their socially-inferior trade associates, whether assistants, journeymen, or other masters.

Braunschweig’s hoof- and weapon-smiths took this expression of gendered social hierarchy to another level during the eighteenth century. By 1728, the guild had an internal

---

dukes frequently did not support guild petitions against free-smithies being set up in the nearby country.

94 “Sonderlich weil Ich zu zeiten von der burgerschafft zum Pferde artzen unterschiedlich gefordert,” HStA Celle Br. 58, nr. 1078. In the same file, see also Jhurgen Smidt, 1660, Uelzen/Dannenberg, who also has worked with many experienced masters in order to obtain equine-curative skills.

95 While Bollkopf does not mention this, large-smiths that also had equine healing skills did need access to medicinal ingredients. This may have been why Bollkopf sought access to the countryside, in order to keep his own herbal gardens.

96 Considering that Bollkopf had worked for a time at court, this may be because he had never been indoctrinated into guild society and life.

97 Uphoff discusses the use of hierarchy within groups of Hannoverian guildmasters (Amtmeister), such that there were positions for junior, intermediate, and old masters. Uphoff, 115.
ranking system, which placed those who had mastered the skill sets of one trade as subordinate to those who had continued to pursue additional trade-related knowledge. For example, Heinrich Andreas Krauel was made a master of the minor guild (*kleine Gilde*) in 1728 and achieved major guild mastership (*Grosen Gilde Meister*) in 1740. It did not however always take a long time between the stages. Johann Nicolaus Krauell, clearly and not insignificantly a male relative of Heinrich, was master of the minor guild in 1738 and became a major guild master three years later.\(^98\) One could certainly move up the ranks within the guild based on familial experience, access to resources, and networking, but it was not necessarily a certain thing. Not only were one’s failures to complete masterpieces recorded in guild register books, but also each failure was fined and awarded with a mandatory period of several years more training before one could try again. A journeyman or minor master’s male relatives could only take him so far.

The minor guild master Michael Köchy (1740) provides a potential case study between the privileges granted by guild-connected kinship and the potential of individual minds and bodies to limit patriarchal mechanisms. Looking at 1594 on Appendix B, there is a large-smith named Karsten Koch, who is an ancestor of Hans Koch (1671-1687), Heinrich Köchies (deceased by 1672), and Michael Köching (1671-1672). By the eighteenth century, the family had explicitly expanded into curative medicine. In a 1721 city register, Daniel Koch is listed as a traveling horse doctor (*CurSchmied*)\(^99\) and Johann Frantz Köchy is found next to Michael Köchy in the hoof-and weapons-smith guild records. However, whereas Michael never attains major guild mastership, Johann makes a quick jump from minor (1738) to major mastership (1741).\(^100\) Since the time period between masterships averaged over three years, the examples of Johann Kreauell and Johann Köchy demonstrate that either they were exceptionally skilled in their work and knowledge of their crafts or that they had the political and social clout of their families’ guild reputations to aid them.\(^101\) If the smith himself was unwilling or unable, as was most likely the case with Michael Köchy, it did not matter what resources were available to them.

Although this presents guild families as recognizing a certain amount of autonomy on behalf of their individual (male) members, these type of situations actually still served to play

---

\(^98\) Heinrich’s attainment of the status during the previous year could also have played a role in how quickly Johann moved from minor to major guild master. For a look at the type of familial resources the Kreauels were able to pull from, see Appendix B, Dieterich Krauel, 1671-2, Braunschweig.

\(^99\) See Appendix C.

\(^100\) Michael had not been granted major guild mastership by 1759. Johann is also listed as Hans Frantz Köchy.

\(^101\) The guild records state that a minor master must wait three years until he could try for major master.
into and reinforce the gendered means through which resources were passed between guild patriarchs. By focusing not just on local masters’ sons, but also mentoring suitable male relatives, a large-smith master could ensure the continued presence of his family in the industry and guild as well as to maintain the quality of the products associated with his family name. Over the mid and late eighteenth century, marriage registers from the villages and towns around Braunschweig-Lüneburg demonstrate that hoof-smiths from city guilds began to colonize villages and free smithies and used them to establish hoof-smith franchises across the country. In this way, while the overall trend was for large-smiths’ sons to pick up equine veterinary skills along with those already taught to them by their fathers, there were opportunities for a large-smith to have his brother or brother-in-law educate his son in equine-focused skills.

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, smith guild-associated women masters’ daughters and widows—were objectified and promoted as special cases that men could exploit to marry into guild mastership. While this was a trend among north German guilds at the time, it played an increasingly integral role in large-smith guild culture and life. The practice operated as a way to bind men within equine healing and smithing networks closely together by creating kinship ties. Originally intended as a means to induct unknown, foreign large-smiths into local society, by the eighteenth century this method brought local masters’ sons and journeymen into the equine-focused smithing community through a process that awarded guild-sanctioned behaviors and that ensured continued productivity. For masters’ sons and the successful journeymen, marrying-in also operated as a way to gain job security and a means to build and maintain an honorable social reputation. Furthermore, it made certain that guild families had an incentive to pass resources between themselves, which would ultimately go to benefit ones’ heirs and male descendants.

**Visual Self-representations of Equine-centric Trade Identities and Masculine Virtues**

First turning up around the middle of the seventeenth century, personal objects of material culture belonging to large-smiths emphasized their economic position and social rank by depicting them as tradesmen both actively and skillfully engaged in their craft. At the same time, this type of art—no matter the medium—also frequently employed a horse as the central

---

102 See the biographical notes on Appendices B-C for evidence of these trends.
103 Equine-smiths’ requests to nobles and to mayors or city councils in order to become Burghers were dependent on
trade-signifying object for equine-based smithing and medical skill sets.  

This visual technique contrasts with those used by other guild and trade groups, who tended to produce material cultural icons that relied on inanimate objects to act as trade symbols and that rarely depicted the tradesmen or women visually defining their skill sets.  

Looking at the window (Wappenscheibe) of Hans Knicker [Figure 3.1] from around 1640 and the window (Kabinettscheibe) of Luedet Rohmot [Figure 3.2] from 1673, one can see these dynamics at work. The glass windows as a general art type and within their own subgenres were expensive vanity objects, but they were a popular medium for early modern men—and the occasional woman—of middling and lower social orders. While there is little extant information about Luedet Rohmot other than his position as a large-smith, much more can be determined about Hans Knicker—despite the paucity of what is known about his own life—from examining the lives of his male relatives. 

Referring to Appendix B, there is a Cordt Knickers listed as large-smith operating in Braunschweig during 1594, and in 1672, a large-smith named Heinrich Knicker is listed in a Braunschweig city register. This register also includes the information that Heinrich was married and that he has an apprentice, which is further evidence that Heinrich was a master large-smith if not also a guild-master. Given that Hans Knicker was known to be a large-smith in 1640 and that Knicker is not a common name among smiths or horse doctors in this general area, it is logical to extrapolate that both of these Knickers are relatives of Hans Knicker.  

Cordt is the first to be recorded specifically as a large-smith, meaning that he shoed horses as one requirement—although not necessarily the only—requirement of his trade. Comparing trends across Appendices A-C, a significant percentage of guild large-smiths and hoof-smiths in Lower them showing themselves to be upstanding, productive senior members of society with good reputations.

104 Smithing guild-based and funded items date back at least to the thirteenth century.

105 For example, despite relying on the animals’ flesh and skin for their livelihoods, butchers and tanners for whatever reasons did not employ symbols of cows to communicate vital information about their trade or about themselves to others in their community until the eighteenth century. The main exception to this rule—other than with soldiers and elite men—is with farmers, who also relied on animate equine symbols (i.e. living horses and symbols of living horses) and depicted themselves actively engaged in a trade task (e.g. plowing with horses or driving a wagon pulled by horses). This will be discussed further in the next chapter.

106 For specifics on the glass piece, see Sabine Wehking, Die Inschriften der Stadt Braunschweig, 1529-1671 (Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001), 441. Additionally, the sign from the Braunschweig city museum in the picture I took of the glass window claims that the window is from around 1640. I have taken the date (1640) assigned by the museum to be more accurate than that attributed to the window (1650) in the book since my photograph was taken in 2006, several years after the Inschriften’s publication.

107 See Appendices A-C.
Saxony practiced their trade for twenty or more years.\textsuperscript{109} Since tradesmen in the sixteenth century and early-to-mid seventeenth century commonly finished their journeyman education by their late twenties, this means that Hans Knicker could be Cordt's grandson or grand-nephew, but it is unlikely that he is a son.\textsuperscript{110} That would also imply that Hans Knicker is either the grandfather or grand-uncle of Heinrich.

However, then there is the documentation of a Hanß Knicker in 1687. This Hanß Knicker was married and had two journeymen, which suggests that he had a good, established business and thus reputation in the city. It also shows that, as he was permitted to have and therefore to train journeymen, this Hanß was a member of the local city guild. Furthermore, as he had more than one advanced assistant, Hanß held a significant position of social and economic power among the masters in the Braunschweig smithing guild. Operating around forty-seven years after the window was produced, it is unlikely that this Hanß is the same one who commissioned the glass. However, since boys born to male members of the large-smithing guilds in Lower Saxony were commonly given the first name of their father, the 1687 Hanß is almost assuredly related through his father to the moderately successful Hans Knicker depicted in the 1640 glass window.\textsuperscript{111}

The lineage revealed to be operating behind Knicker’s glass window serves to illustrate how equine-related knowledge and resources were passed along to benefit directly living as well as future male members of their direct extended family. This type of lower-order patriarchy valued behaviors by men that rewarded both paternity and paternal investment in future generations of the patrilineal extended family. While this style of patriarchy was neither unusual for the region nor for its growing popularity among tradesmen during the later seventeenth century, it bears particular mention due to its growth and promotion by urban equine tradesmen. Their cultural practices would later have a great impact on the direction of veterinary and

\textsuperscript{108} For example, large-smiths also shoed cattle and oxen.
\textsuperscript{109} A fair number of city guild large-smiths and court equestrian-smiths actually practiced for more than thirty years. Appendix A and C also demonstrates that the longer—and historically later—a large-smith is, the more likely he is to have added equine curative skill sets to his main guild-based trade identity. In fact, using Celle as an example, by the early eighteenth century, almost all of the masters in the large-smith guild either were in fact hoof-smiths or were identified in guild books and city records as large-smiths with additional horse-doctoring duties and identities.
\textsuperscript{110} By the eighteenth century, the Celle guild regulations estimate the apprentice stage to be three years and then two more years as journeyman.
\textsuperscript{111} Or they might be given the name of their uncle or grandfather if their father had been not been the first-born male. The male names acted here as inheritances, part of the son's paternal family's heritage. Look at Appendices
smithing trades, the spread of equine skill sets across rural and urban environments, and the new identity of equine-related trades with male-only abilities and virtues. Patriarchal development and eventual widespread practice over the eighteenth century was the result of daily decisions made by equine tradesmen, reflecting how they thought of themselves, the world (i.e. both men and women of other classes, nationalities, and races), and what was best for their trade, concurrently and in the future. This patriarchal system's related code of male-defining social and economic practices operated by promoting equine trade-based relationships between extended family members and through close ties between male members of the large- or hoof-smith guild and other equine-centric communities. In this way, equine curative knowledge and hoof-smithing resources (e.g. tools, workshop, and constant demand for services) became masculinized as well as ultimately urbanized over the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. While city large-smiths and hoof-smiths ventured into the countryside and into smaller cities to find potential brides, it is clear from marriage registers by the early eighteenth century that village large-smiths were no longer allowed the same privilege of choice in bride.

Urban and usually then guild-connected equine tradesmen in this way chose to deny outsiders the ability to gain social adulthood by urban and state standards as well as to participate in local social order and political-climbing activities, primarily gaining the status of Master and then Burgher. Unproven and unknown men—the foreign journeymen and wandering smiths that are so commonly the subjects of complaint by city guild-members—were thus refused the main legal means through which they were granted direct access to the social network and resources of urban male privilege. Not coincidentally, hoof-smiths and large-smiths that were also trained as horse doctors, who were the main proponents of those same privileges, exercised an ever-increasing communal control over the possession, transmission, and generation of equine smithing and curative knowledge.

Returning now to Hans Knicker, the glass window of 1640 presents a rather human and straightforward picture of its owner’s trade abilities in daily life. Farmers, as will be discussed in the next chapter, did at times purchase mass-produced glass windows. However, this does not appear to have been the practice among large-smiths or hoof-smiths. A close examination of

---

112 As I will discuss in my next chapter, farmers also began to re-imagine their trade and their place in human society through equine bodies, by singling horses out of the barnyard rabble and coding them as particularly masculine creatures that men alone were equipped to handle.
Knicker’s window shows that this particular piece of art was a personalized object through which Knicker mediated his own trade identity as both master of the workshop and household and as an experienced hoof-smith and horse doctor.\footnote{As it belongs to the subgenre of family crests (\textit{Wappen}), the inclusion of Knicker’s own shield of arms is quite literally also a sign of a master of household and family.} Unlike the common narratives and depictions of hoof-smiths in public religious art, such as those of St. Eligius, this depiction is not simply representational or allegorical.\footnote{For more on the use of hagiography to address contemporary social concerns and to reflect group identities, see Cynthia Hahn, “Picturing the Text: Narrative in the Life of the Saints,” \textit{Art History} 13, no. 1 (March 1990): 1-30 and Magdalena Carrasco, “Spirituality and Historicity in Pictorial Hagiography: Two Miracles by St. Albinus of Angers,” \textit{Art History} 12, no. 1 (March 1989): 1-20.} It is instead an active performance of self-identity in addition to being purposefully illustrative of daily experiences. The main subjects—both human and horse—are given a story to act, a story with multiple possible nuances, but which all build together towards formulating the same conclusions about the smith.

The scene is set. It is a summer day in Braunschweig, and the trees are in bloom. A wealthy Burgher in a large red coat trimmed in black velvet or fur, most likely a merchant, has walked his horse over to his local large-smith. The horse is tethered to the large tree shading the small courtyard outside the smith’s workshop. While the Burgher has been explaining the specifics of the issue with the horse, the large-smith, with a thick leather work-apron already tied around his waist, has set his toolbox nearby on the ground. From it, he has selected a medium-sized hammer in order to adjust the fit of an already formed horseshoe. Left behind in the toolbox are his tongs, which were used by all smiths when heating and reshaping non-precious metals, and a barber’s knife, which was used by human or animal medical practitioners for preventative as well as curative practices.\footnote{The tools read here to me as symbolizing the different trade skill sets of which the smith is master, which here is: master of iron, master of horseshoes, and master of equine curative and preventative medicine. Non-equine-focused smiths do not have equine tools or symbols associated with them. Neither do goldsmiths, even those self-representing in guild art dedicated to the cult of St. Eligius.} Out of fear or nervousness, the horse lifts its left hind-leg to dance around, but it is well restrained by its tethered bridle and by its right fore-leg, which is firmly clasped and up-ended in the hoof-smith’s left hand.\footnote{Strictly iconographic depictions of horses and horses being shoed, such as in prescriptive veterinary, farming, or horse breeding literature, do not show them behaving in this manner. However, if one had ever seen a horse being shod, this is exactly how it would behave. I have personally witnessed this countless times in both American and}
merchant has hastened forward, gesturing with his hands, in order to: stop or criticize the hoof-smith, amend or add details about the ailment, to positively identify the area of the ailment, declare that the price was too high, ask for additional services for this horse, and so on. It is important to note that the typical German hoof-smith did not shape or nail horseshoes in the fashion depicted by Knicker here. Normally, his journeyman assistant would support the horse’s leg by some combination of his hands, arms, and thighs—just as Knicker is depicted doing in the glass. However, in medieval and early modern German visual representations of large-smiths and hoof-smiths, it is masters who are shown holding a raised hammer in their right hand, poised to strike. In addition, there is no doubt that both men in the glass are full-fledged adults and that the man on the right is a master of his trade.117

With so many valid possibilities, the glass then is intended to be read as a polyvalent symbol of parallel and conflicting yet simultaneously complimentary actions and meanings. While the story’s particulars could be different each time it was read, and in fact, that would most likely be the appeal for a man who was not likely to own many more pieces of art—they collectively communicate a relative set of conclusions about its owner as a person and as a tradesman. Within these trade identities, Knicker was: a large-smith able to create and adjust iron shoes, a large-smith that had particular experience with working with horseshoes, a hoof-smith master that ran his own workshop (either as a Free Smithy or through a guild), and a hoof-smith and horse doctor that served the wealthy, urban population. As a tradesman advertising and belonging to certain social networks, Knicker shows himself acting in his social position as an adult male of good reputation—a man, elevated in status through his expertise and skilled handling of horses and thus deserving of equal respect as the socially-superior client. He is highly attentive to the questions or needs of his human (male) clients. His demeanor, body, and tools reveal him to be confident in his own abilities and widely-knowledgeable in his chosen trade, having sought out additional hippological skill sets to learn instead of being content with just shaping iron and treating the legs of livestock. Having mastered horses’ idiosyncrasies, he skillfully handles restless horses and restrains them humanely with ease. With this calm self-

---

117 If the smith was not a master then it would have been illegal for the merchant to hire him instead of going to a guild master. Moreover, it makes very little sense that a hoof-smith journeyman during the tail end of the Thirty Years War in northwestern Germany (i.e. in an environment of long-term over-taxation, land devastation, and equine population depletion) would have enough funds to pay for such a window.
assurance, he is then able to address issues concerning the horse’s gait and entire body, not just its shoes. In short, he possesses all the trade and masculine virtues, not simply of a large-smith, but also a hoof-smith or large-smith that was also possessed of equine healing abilities.

Comparing this window to Luedet Rohmot’s from Fuhlenhagen in 1673, the primary objects and subject matter along with the depicted trade identity are shared with Hans Knicker and, indeed, Rohmot’s window is just as successful as Knicker’s in communicating which equine skill sets the smith who owns it has accomplished. Furthermore, the figures depicting both Knicker and Rohmot demonstrate ultimately the same trade skill sets (large-smith, hoof-smith, and horse doctor) as well as social orientations (adult male, master, and man of good reputation) of their trade. Yet with a close eye, the carriers of meaning and the main visual tropes in Rohmot's glass window actually pull from a different set of hippological symbology, an allegorical representation of equine skill sets and the man that skillfully practices them.

Judging from their clothing and demeanor, both male figures in the 1673 glass work as large-smiths, the right one a master and the left one his journeyman. Outside of Rohmot's window, the visual juxtaposition of a large-smith as master of an equine-based and equine-centric trade as well as master over his male assistants is common to medieval religious art as well as to later hoof-smith guild signs from the early eighteenth century. It is also a generally accurate depiction of the daily life of a hoof-smith and of the male community among which equine smithing and curative knowledge was passed and to which it was restricted. Medieval and early modern Catholic guilds across Europe sponsored religious art in order to venerate the bishop-saint Eligius (d. 660) for his skills in smithing and horse doctoring. Yet seventeenth century large-smiths and hoof-smiths around Lower Saxony repurposed the visual icons of their trade's former religious identity in order to fashion personalized trade identities in which they replaced Eligius as the master of horse and metal. Large-smiths and hoof-smiths in this way co-opted the masculine virtues associated with Eligius’ masterships and piety.

According to its medieval cult, the smith was intended to identify himself with Eligius

---

118 These are: two adult males, one horse, the horse's bridle or halter is tethered to a tree, a tree as the central orientation point, a tool box, several tools in tool-box, a raised hammer in the hand of one large or hoof-smith, a horseshoe attached to a horse's hoof that is being held off the ground, and the smith’s name along the bottom middle.
119 The male figure on the left appears younger, and he is in the position typically taken by a German journeyman.
120 The visual tradition of depicting Eligius as master hoof-smith continued in Catholic Germany and neighboring regions (e.g. Hildesheim) and presumably still influenced how Protestant hoof-smiths depicted themselves in material culture.
through trade-focused and smith-centric lessons, such as the miracle wherein Eligius conserves his materials so well that he is able to craft two chairs out of one chair's mass of gold.\textsuperscript{121} The fact that Eligius was beloved by goldsmiths and large-smiths is quite evident in both the mass-sponsoring of Eligius’ images by their guilds as well as in the widespread practice of celebrating his smithing talents through his cult across Europe.\textsuperscript{122} Eligius, as an authentic goldsmith turned saint rather than as an equally authentic bishop, was particularly compelling to all smiths, as Eligius provided a true model of someone who was able to overcome his sinful human nature and improve his social rank through his earthly trade.\textsuperscript{123} Eligius was the man who had done it all and who had thus justly won eternal glory and salvation. He was respected by his community yet able to remain pure of mind and soul. In fact, he worked wonders at his trade through his reliance on God’s provenance and on his own abilities and experience.

Eligius is one of very few saints that were widely venerated for their trade skills.\textsuperscript{124} In this regard, he is further exceptional since he was less frequently celebrated for the trade he did perform (i.e. court goldsmith) in life than for the trade of village hoof-smith that he was revered for in death.\textsuperscript{125} Eligius' cult is particularly notable due to its celebration of his apocryphal performance of a miracle through shoeing and curing the mortal wound of a fractious horse. Quite a singular icon in itself, the horse’s severed leg, whether or not actually shod, is a primary attribute of Eligius and frequently is used as the central identifying characteristic of the religious


\textsuperscript{122} And in fact, the Braunschweig goldsmith guild’s seal during the late sixteenth century (1588) honored Eligius, although depicting him as a bishop holding a goldsmithing hammer and at work on a chalice and including the animal attributes of three Apostles. See Wehking, 163.

\textsuperscript{123} The historic Eligius started life in Noyon as the son of a man of good birth. His father recognized his skill with crafting and sent him to Limoges to be trained by a master goldsmith. Eventually, Eligius’ talents got him a position under the royal treasurer of Clotaire II, and he became the court goldsmith for Dagobert. Ultimately, his connections at the Frankish court along with his own pious charities led to Eligius being appointed bishop of Noyon—even though Eligius had never been a member of the priesthood.

\textsuperscript{124} The depictions of this miracle in the cult of St. Eligius range in location from Italy and France to England and Sweden. St. Panteleon, the patron of physicians and one of the fourteen Helpers, is also credited with performing miracles with his piety through his trade of physician. St. Crispin and St. Crispian, the patrons of cobblers, were originally nobles that gave up their elite position in order to craft shoes, as a devotional act, for alms to give to the poor.

\textsuperscript{125} While Eligius himself freed slaves, converted pagans, and buried criminals, it is his abilities as a tradesman highly skilled with both metal and with horseflesh that were most honored by medieval and early modern religious art.
figure himself [Figures 3.3 and 3.4]. In the religious art tradition, as also shown in Rohmot’s
glass, the leg is the key that gives meaning to the whole image. The severed limb references not
only the events surrounding its amputation by the saint, but even more so Eligius’ subsequent
reattachment and miraculous cure of the horse’s leg. Were the leg not Eligian, the scene or
person so presented would be quite gruesome. The master hoof-smith would become a pitiless
butcher, who ripped horses’ legs out from under them and who proudly paraded the cause of their
torment as grisly prizes before the faces of his hapless clients. Using an allegorical reading of
the attribute however, the severed leg takes on values attached to an Eligian hoof-smith. The
physiognomy of the sign invites attention to the plural trade identities of an increasing number of
large-smiths even as it testifies to the challenges inherent to curative veterinary medicine or to
shoeing intractable horses. In this way, it praises equine-focused smiths for their personal trade
abilities as well as for their socially directed behaviors, namely their selfless devotion to human-
animal agricultural communities.

By employing the quintessential Eligian attribute, Rohmot's glass window aims to
underscore and strengthen its owner's historical and professional ties to equine curative healing
as well as to horseshoeing. To put this icon in better context, look at the additional Eligius' hoof-smith depictions below. As these pictures demonstrate, the horse's leg is depicted in the
hands of the man allegorically interpreted as Eligius. Viewing the object held by the master
hoof-smith on Rohmot's glass as a severed leg also rectifies the direction of the horseshoe
depicted, which is then anatomically correct given the position of the horse. This orientation
would also align it with the most common representation of the severed legs in the visual
religious and economic tradition of Eligius' equine curative miracle. Furthermore, the Rohmot
glass employs other minor attributes associated to Eligius and his workshop towards the same
object. Eligius’ work-place, tools, male assistant, and horseshoes all operate as signs that
identify him as an equine-focused smith even as these signs operate on a secondary level to
underscore his importance within local communal networks of equine knowledge.

126 It is quite common for Eligian legs, such as those in Figures 3.3 and 3.4, to be long and to have jagged or bloody
ends. If the horse itself is depicted, its body also emphasizes the severity of the act. The site of amputation
frequently drips blood, and the horse is shown clearly lacking a leg to stand on. For my current collection of Eligian
imagery, see http://www.typesix.net/Gallery/index.php/Eligius.
127 Rohmot’s window was most likely done in Lübeck. It was housed in a rural church in Fuhlenhagen, Saxe-
Lauenberg, which was dedicated to St. Georg (Jürgen) but which was definitely Protestant in the sixteenth and
Lower Saxon Guild Signs and Urban Guild Masculinities

At least as far back as the sixteenth century, secular smithing guild objects primarily made use of icons in the form of horseshoes, which referenced—rather than overtly depicted—the bodies and needs of living horses. This use of visual synecdoche by guild culture reinforced qualities with which the guild wanted to be associated even as it produced different readings by guild members and their clients. The practicality (Billigkeit) of using the physical product of their trade as a guild advertisement could be appreciated by clients, who trusted it as solid evidence of the guild's skills, and by hoof-smiths, who knew just how much time, iron, and training it had taken to accomplish. In this way, an equine icon used by guild material culture operated as a series of related interpretants that simultaneously developed individual meaning while reinforcing other interpretations and values.

Looking at the sixteenth century Braunschweig guild seal [Figure 3.5], one can see the horseshoe already incorporated into the general smithing guild’s legal representation of itself and its trade skills. Over the next century in Germany, horses' bodies were at times added to the inanimate objects symbolizing the large-smithing trade. Yet the horse's body alone apparently did not suffice as an adequate symbol for the trade-based interpretations and economic results desired by the guild. Instead, the semeiotic value of a horse's body rested in its pairing with the body of a man. Naturally inferior to men, horses' bodies had no meaning without a human context. Equine bodies were shown as objects—often with gendered and sexualized undertones—being operated upon by a self-referential large- or hoof-smith. As one sees in Ill. 6, the metalwork along the sides of the guild sign denotes the sex of the horse as neither neutral nor indeterminate but as clearly male. This clear representation of the ideal or imagined horse as a male also adds a flavor of social posturing to it, since the primary clientele that actually used geldings and stallions were not farmers. The horse’s sexed body communicates a number of gendered meanings about the tradesman shown. It furthermore connects to several of the contemporary masculine tropes discussed in the previous chapter: the male that dominates another male, a man’s ‘proper” dominion over horses, and the exceptional, masculine abilities that this guildsman had to have in order to control this other male creature of known wildness.

---

728 Practicality as a positive trade virtue comes up in numerous petitions by large-smith guilds, who justify their value to the local economy and their clients based on this socially constructed concept of equity between economic partners.
and strength.

This trend in public, secular guild art matches the rise in use and popularity of personalized depictions of village and city large-smiths. For the large-smiths of Braunschweig, the first few decades of the eighteenth century were particularly important to the creation of trade identity and unity and to their relationship with equine-focused smithing. As was discussed earlier, they had petitioned in 1703 for separation from the general guild and formed a new guild geared more distinctly towards equine-focused smithing and medicine later that year. Yet, by 1717, the new guild had left no room for those large-smiths that preferred to work for a broader range of clientele (e.g. farmers with cows and oxen) or that were reticent to entrust their economic future to the popularity and continual presence of horses. The guild sign of 1720 [Figures 3.6 and 3.7] would have been expected to serve a number of purposes for the guild.\textsuperscript{129} Advertising the guild to society as well as to its members, the guild sign needed to present an idealized front of guildsmen’s shared values and abilities. While the guild sign then is an idealized form which does not reflect whether large-smiths or hoof-smiths could truly have operated within a completely equine-centric network, it is not coincidental that the metalwork symbols chosen to represent the guild’s trades all relate to equine-centric activities or to equine healthcare.\textsuperscript{130}

Conclusion

The issue of who had legal privilege to control knowledge about and access to equine bodies influenced the direction and development of guild as well as ducal state policies through the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century. Within the environment of general smith guilds and particularly within groups of equine-focused large-smiths, tradesmen’s perceptions about the meanings attached to horses' bodies began to influence how they thought of themselves as individual men and fathers, their trade and skill sets, and their relationship to other equine-focused tradesmen. Medieval equine trade icons took on a renewed importance for large-smiths

\textsuperscript{129} Although the sign was redone in 1887, the metalwork appears to be original (i.e. from 1720) when compared with other smithing signs from southern Germany. It is not clear however whether the workshop imagery was painted or repainted in 1887.

\textsuperscript{130} The weapon-smiths’ presence in signs appear to be secondary in importance if not invisible. Since wagon wheels were made out of wood during the early eighteenth century, it is not clear whether the wheels in Figs. 3.6 and 3.7 were meant to represent the weapon-smith.
and hoof-smiths by providing and personalizing a cohesive cultural base for a collective economic and social identity. Although the number of cattle in the area far outnumbered the horses, it became equine curative knowledge that was very much in demand as an economic skill throughout the countryside and cities. Over this period, the number of men specializing in equine-focused smithing and medical skills increased exponentially, despite the size of the actual equine population in the area. Furthermore, the majority of large-smiths that trained in additional skill sets also trained in equine-focused veterinary knowledge.

There was neither a distinctive nor a progressive increase in frequency that large-smiths called themselves hoof-smith over time, nor can it be said that there was a definite, time-bound trend that these equine tradesmen might use that term simultaneously for themselves. Hoof-smith and large-smith were at times interchangeable titles for some smiths even as for others, the title of large-smith already indicated an agriculturally necessary focus on shoeing and on possibly medically treating horses. Yet overall, as a general trend, the title of hoof-smith was meant to signify an additional set of trade abilities that complimented and thus added to the identity of large-smith. It is also significant to note that multivalent smithing identities and their attendant economic privileges and social obligations clearly did not make large-smith guild masters or members feel insecure about their own abilities. Nor did these various smithing identities generally spark discussion about whether equine-focused large-smiths and hoof-smiths should separate from each other in order to make their own guilds, being as they were so far-removed in experience and skill set from non-equine-focused large-smiths. Furthermore during the eighteenth century when large-smiths and hoof-smiths did begin to restructure smith guilds based on shared interests, hoof-smiths along with many large-smiths frequently joined forces with weapon-smiths, who had little in common with them in terms of equine knowledge but whose commonly shared clientele's urban and military livelihoods depended on properly performing equine bodies and labor.

However, there certainly were some hoof-smith guilds in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that did declare their independence from those of all other smiths, such that the hoof-smith guild stood alone from both large-smiths and weapon-smiths. Yet in these circumstances, there was no one region in pre-modern Germany in which this type of separation was particularly uniform. The behavior was not restricted to only large towns or even to many towns at all, nor was it particular to cities that had reputations for having annual horse sales. Additionally in this
situation, there is evidence that large-smiths and hoof-smiths could be members of both guilds, or at least there is evidence showing that large-smith and hoof-smith guilds tended to try to work together towards similar goals instead of disavowing or discrediting the work of these potential competitors. This shared sense of unity between smiths in the area of equine trade knowledge demonstrates smiths’ strong belief in the value of equine community to the continued viability of these trades through joint goals of increasing production and protection of horse bodies. There was therefore a linked social and economic network, in which the legitimacy of prospective male guild members depended on public performances of mastership in multiple skill sets and in which the additional skill sets beyond those involving metalwork were directly connected to horses’ bodies and equine-focused knowledge.

Over the seventeenth century, smiths that worked with equine medicine attempted to increase the status of their trade and of their own reputation through the strategic use of old and new tropes of masculinity. Somewhere between individual petitions, letters of noble privilege, and bureaucratic guild and state documents, equine tradesmen produced hippological networks of knowledge and practice that relied on gendered interpretations of smithing trade abilities and social order. By the end of the eighteenth century, the combined force of anthropomorphic and masculine constructions of trade identity had led to an elevation of social and economic status for equine-curative skilled large-smiths within city guilds at the expense of the large-smiths and hoof-smiths, whose equine skill sets were limited to hoof-shoeing and preventative medicine. The institutionalized practices and varieties of masculinity that early modern tradesmen and nobles formed through anthropomorphizing horses also directly impacted the growth and development of the modern institutions of veterinary knowledge. This namely included the research and education at early German veterinary schools, which were ostensibly founded to help rural farmers cure and treat cattle plague yet in fact focused resources toward court and urban interests like equine sporting and military medicine.

I have just looked at how large-smiths, hoof-smiths, and equine healing practitioners negotiated and characterized themselves through these types of public and private performances. In the next chapter, I will be examining the ways in which farmers, who operated in continual discourse with large-smiths, healers, and nobles, understood the significance and importance of their role as housefathers. Imagining themselves to be divinely-ordered masters of the household and care-takers of valuable household economic resources, these early modern men made
deliberate use of horses’ bodies as specialized tools, as cultural capital to help others in their local communities, and as a new tool to move up the social ladder.\footnote{Since male farmers were typically given bovine-centric trade knowledge and resources, it took skilled reasoning and a lot of effort to learn more about horses. There were also many new things to learn.}
Chapter Four: Animal Husbandry, Equine Masculinities, and Daily Reproductive Labors in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 1580-1735
Introduction

Looking at the economic practices of farmers around the celebrated heath of Braunschweig-Lüneburg as a miniature of early modern German—and European—daily life, one sees two major trends that become increasingly consistent and universal over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. First, farmers’ masculine identities (i.e. how they understand themselves as men and what they identify as the rightful province of men) and farmers’ agrarian trade identities (i.e. how they understand what they do as a distinct economic trade and what activities they believe to be the most important to that trade and its success) are closely integrated. Secondly, horses are foremost and central to the creation of each individual identity. The historical dilemma that this chapter seeks to resolve then is why horses became central anthropomorphic symbols for farmers to construct agrarian identities by the end of the eighteenth century.

To answer this question, I will be examining the numerous ways in which equine discourses were central to the development of agricultural practices as well as to agrarian culture and daily life. Horses were not a new technological resource for German farmers in the seventeenth century. Not only were they common in regions of southern Germany, but they were used in significant quantities in a number of communities around the Lüneburg heath from the late sixteenth through the mid-seventeenth centuries.¹ The increase in horses’ significance therefore cannot be explained simply in terms of introduction as an agricultural tool or in terms of farmers’ suddenly increasing their reliance on equine labor and products. Equine husbandry carried so many onerous legal and social drawbacks (e.g. increased taxation and sharing of village pasture) and practical liabilities (e.g. absences of a team due to Herrendienst) that farmers’ continued reliance on equine labor cannot be explained by an egotistical desire to imagine themselves as nobles or wealthy merchants.² On a very real and practical level, status symbols were not going to keep farmers and their families alive during the winter. Furthermore, although farmers bred the vast majority of horses during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the types of horses that noblemen and merchants desired had very different characteristics and shapes than the sorts of horses that farmers wanted to use for draft. These differing class-based

¹ By significant quantities, I mean the same quantities that one sees regained around 1680. See Appendix D, “Equine Populations in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 1535-1770,” Animals as Tools, www.animalsastools.com.
² This is the underlying presumption when one assumes that farmers must have liked horses just because their social superiors liked horses.
breed types only increased in both idealized and realized difference over the eighteenth century.

Yet also as a result of financial obligations and real-world conditions, equine husbandry could not have provided farmers with enough economic or agricultural incentives alone to justify the large and continued growth of equine industry as well as the continued large-scale breeding of horses by farmers after the Thirty Years War. Horses were much more delicate, more expensive, and much harder to replace than cattle, a fact that caused horse owners both to pay for more and additional veterinary services—such as for shoeing, dentistry, and treatment for colic—and to spend more time collecting, preparing, and applying veterinary remedies for their numerous ailments. Raising horses not only meant caring for their bodies but also knowing how to use the biological products of their bodies. Even if a farmer was not breeding and training horses, he needed to know how to feed his horse—meaning that he needed to both grow and harvest the crops necessary for the horse’s grain and hay fodders as well as how to use its manure to fertilize other crops without inhibiting their growth. A farmer also needed either to own or have ready-access to the specialized equipment and training that went with using horses for plowing and other draft purposes. Since Lower Saxon farmhouses commonly were composed of a single large building that housed the human family and the livestock, farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg would also have to be sure that they had enough room both to stable their horses and to account for this loss in space for their cows and oxen.³

It is within this historical context that the manner in which horses became a cultural symbol among agrarian orders is so important for understanding why equine husbandry came to dominate the culture of daily agrarian life and the development of masculine agrarian identities. Early modern farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg did not blindly follow local tradition or ducal and state regulations when determining their agricultural practices. Farmers, who had been trained almost since birth for their future trade, were scientific experts in their own right. Not only did the survival of a farm depend on a farmer’s willingness to adapt crops and change techniques, but also the personal reputation and social worth of a male farmer depended on his

---

³ See Hans-Jürgen Vogtherr, *Bauen im 17. Jahrhundert: Der Aufbau eines Bauernhauses in der Lüneburger Heide* (Uelzen: Landwirtschaftsmuseums Lüneburger Heide, 1980). In addition to altered requirements for doors, windows, and foddering spaces, the length and width required for horse stalls are not the same as those needed for cows and oxen. These types of building concerns are in direct opposition to practices in southern Germany, where issues of space were more easily solved since one could always build a new stable just for horses or enlarge existing cow stalls without damaging the structural integrity of one’s own home. For further information about the separation of horses from cattle in northern Germany, see Kai Sievers, *Ländliche Wohnkultur in Schleswig-Holstein: 17.–20. Jahrhundert* (Heide, S-H: Boyens & Co., 2001).
performance as a legitimate agricultural authority. It would be wrong then to assume that there necessarily was any causation linking noble equine masculinities with farmers’ dealings with livestock.⁴ In other words, just because some elite masculine codes emphasized male horses as powerful anthropomorphic symbols, it does not mean that farmers’ masculine codes necessarily valued male horses or even horses as a species. In the face of the immense challenges and meager rewards that equine husbandry appeared to offer early modern farmers, it is in fact counter-intuitive to correlate masculine constructions of agricultural equine trade identities with court or urban-based constructions of equine masculinity. Instead I will show that by the end of the eighteenth century, farmers—in their own right and in their own culturally hybrid ways—had begun to leverage horses and equine husbandry as a valuable cultural resource through which they could increasingly negotiate agricultural trade identities and masculine social identities.⁵

By elevating the status of horses within the agricultural world of sex-divided labor, farmers attempted to elevate their social status along with their economic expectations. Through these culturally imposed hierarchies, male farmers sought to improve their own individual status among other early modern agricultural and economic orders.

Animal Husbandry and Agrarian Identities in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 1566-1689

Like many German farmers in the sixteenth century, farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg depended on harnessing the immense power of large-bodied livestock to help them break, till, and harvest the land.⁶ Along with breeding livestock, the practice of animal husbandry in early modern Braunschweig-Lüneburg consisted of several main skill sets of trade knowledge, which were meant not only to help an individual farmer survive but which were also meant to provide substantial supplemental benefit for the farmer’s community. As discussed in the previous chapters, farmers did not frequently have access to veterinary specialists nor could they always

⁴ For modern literature that makes this assumption, see Peter Dinzelbacher, ed., Mensch und Tier in der Geschichte Europas (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2000) and Erhard Oeser, Pferd und Mensch: Die Geschichte einer Beziehung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007).
⁵ For the use of livestock and horses as social and economic capital, see Michaela Fenske, Marktkultur in der Frühen Neuzeit: Wirtschaft, Macht und Unterhaltung auf einem städtischen Jahr- und Viehmarkt (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2006) and Heike Schmidt, Die Bedeutung des Pferdes und der Pferdezucht vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert im Kurfürstentum Königreich Hannover (PhD diss., Leibniz Universität Hannover, 1997).
afford the costs of on-going treatments. Of course, farmers did not always see the point of paying a stranger to take care of a matter that might be done more cheaply and easily at home. Agrarian housefathers, who followed a Lutheran pastoral ideology of Adam as the First Farmer, which emphasized farming both as a divinely ordained trade and as a trade identity intended only for married men, were responsible for the success and longevity of their farms. In practice, this meant that a male farmer was trained in providing preventative and curative means of veterinary assistance and in how best to nourish and manage his livestock—to the extent that they were able to continue providing maximum economic benefit for him and his household. While female farmers could have gained this knowledge and may have had to use it often, this economic reality was not reflected—for very specific reasons—in the patriarchal social models promoted by hippological literature and advocated by men involved in equine husbandry.

Breaking from a traditionally dispassionate former disinterest in the specifics of animal husbandry, German noblemen had begun to promote horse breeding by the end of the sixteenth century as an industry that was superior to the reproduction of other livestock species. As has already been discussed in some detail in Chapter Two, these ruling elites and state officials expected farmers—or indeed any early modern man—to conceptualize and appreciate horses for the same reasons that upper orders at court and in cities experienced and idealized elite horses. Somehow in this anthropomorphic construction, the elites’ symbolic uses of horses were infused and conflated with elites’ imaginings of all the other uses of such a noble—and ennobling—beast. For example, Gabriel Danup claimed, “God the Lord endowed the noble creature of the horse, above all animals, with special talents and abilities.” Marx Fugger appealed to an elite humanist-educated audience when he emphasized the importance of horses and horse breeding in

---

8 While Graf Anton von Oldenburg might seem to be a great exception to this trend, Georg Wilhelm and stud farm officials like Brown referenced his horse breeding strategy, which was based on out-sourcing the labor to farmers and their mares, as a cautionary tale of what happened when farmers resisted improvement (Verbesserung) of their mares. See HStA Hann. 147, nr. 1.
9 For example as part of his argument for why farmers should abandon bovine husbandry for equine, Marx Fugger argues that the horse is a noble animal and that God himself ordained horses to be superior to oxen. Fugger, Von der Gestüterey, 58.
10 “Gott der Herr das edles Geschöpf der Pferde/ für allen anderen Thieren/ mit sondern Qualiteten und geschickligkeiten begabet.” Gabriel Danup, Ein Sonderliches Newes und Lesewürdiges Gesprach...Supplication der Pferde/ Uber ihre gar Abschied in der Sachen/ daß weil die bißhero begangene Fehler/ nur allein aus mangel einer wahren definition eines wolabgerichten Pferdes/ entstanden (Heliconischen Druckerey, 1623), i. This is a common justification given by prescriptive authors for their study and love of hippology.
ancient Greece and Rome for military purposes.¹¹

Neither Danup’s nor Fugger’s motivations however say anything practical about why horses should or did matter to farmers. What was it specifically about the bodies of horses, a unique species of animal that was expected to be of direct and particular use for farmers? They would not be riding their horses into battle, and they were not in a position to be able to keep herds of horses to breed and trade for political gain. Removed from the actual agricultural practices and needs, the equine-centrism of elite prescriptive literature about animal husbandry progressively fused equine husbandry with animal husbandry over the seventeenth century, in response to the increasing economic and social reliance of elite urban populations on equine bodies, industries, and trades. This elite and urban bias can also be seen in prescriptive advice of farm guides marketed towards housefathers, in which the housefather is invariably treated as a well-off man that needs advice on how to control and take care of his family and horses—and whose cattle and pigs apparently procure their own fodder and healthcare.

This literary development was complimented by changes in ducal policies and attitudes toward agricultural recovery following the Thirty Years War. Despite the chaos of wartime, farmers had been expected to finance the war through their traditional feudal obligations as well as through the payment of “Contributions,” allegedly temporary taxes levied during wartime that were based on the amount of livestock owned.¹² Presumably voicing the sentiments of numerous farmers, the author of the Edles Landleben writes, “War, that evil thing, presses farmers the most, there always comes a head tax and war tax on top of the others, a quartering on top of the others, and if the farmer has handed in everything that he has in life, he then finds the enemy at his throat.”¹³ As can be imagined, the onus of these taxes set farmers back in almost every conceivable way. Since many farmers were forced to flee their homes as the Thirty Years War progressed, unworked farm land soon became overgrown with weeds and roots, causing those who returned to toil even harder in order to restore it to its former state. Reconstruction

¹¹ As noted in an earlier chapter, Marx Fugger is one of the first in a long line of hippological authors that use these arguments. In the eighth book, he expands at length on Alexander and Bucephalus, ancient Romans, and medieval German kings. Shortly afterwards in the ninth book, he cites the practices of ancient Scythians as part of his argument in favor of eating horsemeat. Fugger, 55-6 and 62.

¹² These heightened livestock taxes and Contributions, however, were far from a new burden for the farmers around Celle. Viehschatz was doubled in 1589, 1592, 1597, and 1606. See Stadtsarchiv Celle, 15C 137, 1589-1597; StdA Celle 15 C 136, 1606; and, StdA Celle 15 C 138, 1606.

¹³ “Der Krieg, das böse Ding, drückt den Bauer am meiste, da kömt immer ein Kopff-Geld und Contribution über die andere, eine Einquartierung über die andere, und wenn der Bauer alles hingegaben hat, was er im Leben hat, muß er doch wohl endlich den Feind übern Halse haben” (Anon., Edles Landleben, 1721), 159.
practices by farmers, who had been practicing equine husbandry and thus whose survival depended on them, began during the late 1630s and early 1640s. Interestingly enough, some official support for reconstruction efforts was actually granted at this time. In the case of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, several new horse and livestock markets were established in 1640 with the explicit goal of reconstruction in mind. Yet guided by similar motivations to those behind tax relief for dead horses, state support for new horse and general livestock markets generally originated from a self-interested—rather than a philanthropic—political agenda.

By the mid- to late seventeenth century, the use of horses by male farmers to increase both their social and economic status was largely feasible due to concurrent developments in equine-based industries. Newly created equine-dependent jobs or those jobs that had recently become equine dependent, such as the postal service, land surveying, and milling, were increasingly visible in daily life to the public. Horses now held important economic value for a wider range of early modern society; and due to their diverse usage in daily life, their bodies were a highly mobile means through which status could be negotiated. Horses therefore offered farmers more potential room for status improvements than oxen. Despite the particularly high tax burdens placed on farming households that branched into equine husbandry, male farmers found horses to be useful as social capital—in addition to horses’ prior known usefulness in

---


15 According to a local almanac from 1610, Hannover and Wolfenbüttel had livestock markets, but none are listed for Celle or Gifhorn. Johann Krabbe zu Wolfenbüttel, Alte und Neu Schreibkalendar auff der Jahr 1610 (Erfurt: 1610). As noted in an earlier chapter, Fuhrmann’s Lüneburg almanac documents that by 1649, Celle, Uelzen, and Münden each had three yearly livestock markets. Stephan Fuhrmann, Almanach...Haus-Calendar (Lüneburg, 1649). For archival evidence, see HStA Celle Br. 60, nr. 218, 1647, “Kanzlei zu Celle: Kirchmessen, Hochzeiten und 3 Pferdemärkte in Harburg.” For a look at the character of earlier livestock markets, see Frank Kreissler, Die Dominanz des Nahmarktes: Agrarwirtschaft, Handwerk und Gewerbe in den anhaltischen Städten im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert (Halle: Mitteldt Verlag, 2006).

16 For example, there is a 1646 ordinance from the Frankfurt city council concerning people that evaded taxes by selling horses on market day at times and in places that officials were not overseeing. In the eyes of the council, both buyer and seller were obligated to pay for the privilege of buying a horse. Around the same time, the dukes of Braunschweig-Lüneburg began requiring that many horse sellers buy passports (Paß) for their horses. See the mandate by Friedrich Ulrich on 23 June 1625. For later dukes’ horse passport policies, see the mandate by Rudolf August and Anthon Ulrich on 29 November 1688.

17 Martin Haller notes that it is a little-known fact that horses began becoming significant in work and travel over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Martin Haller, Pferde unter dem Doppeladler (Hildesheim: Olms Presse, 2002), 130.
breeding and in plough-based agriculture. In this way, farmers focused their agricultural practices specifically towards equine husbandry in part so that they could exploit local and ducal authorities’ constant need for a steady supply of horses. In this sense, farmers’ equine husbandry and horse breeding had the potential to disrupt a primary means of elite social and military power and of elite masculine identities.

Prescriptive Agrarian Masculinities

While there is not a definitive list of masculine agricultural identities, there were several dominant prescriptive ideals concerning agricultural patriarchy practiced at the household level. The seventeenth century housefather model for agricultural patriarchy is similar to and usually concurrent with the masculine agricultural trade ideal of Adam as the First Farmer. However, unlike the Adam trade ideal, the housefather ideal of agricultural masculinity and trade identity emphasized the importance of equine husbandry to agricultural trade mastery and personal pride. As part of the Adam ideal for example, Grosser claimed that God can become angry when farmers are not working the land and may make the crops fail as a result. In this way, a farmer took on the role of shepherd and earth-guardian (Erdwuchter) but he did not have an explicit trade or social identity as a farmer.

As a masculine religious ideal born out of the Reformation, the housefather ideal was intended to apply to every adult male and every household during the sixteenth century. Yet by the eighteenth century, print culture promoted it as an economic ideal that presumed the housefather’s interest in horse breeding, frequently to the exclusion of interest in breeding other livestock. Both housefather and Adam ideals are based on religious patriarchal models of agricultural and agrarian life. Yet despite the dominance and popularity of both ideals in early

---

18 On the growing popular use of horses and other livestock as social capital over the seventeenth century, see Heinz Meyer, "Frühe Neuzeit," in Mensch und der Tier in der Geschichte Europas, ed. Peter Dinzlachbacher (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2000), 395-396. Livestock taxation continued to be a favorite revenue generator for the dukes of Braunschweig-Lüneburg. For example, Celle got hit with Extraordinary Contributions in 1670, 1687, and 1709 and then another in 1711-1712 that was higher still. StdA Celle 15 C 136.
19 Susan Karant-Nunn has argued that since it was Adam’s duty to control animals, the control of both animal and human-animal relations was understood to be a masculine duty. Susan Karant-Nunn, “‘Not like the unreasoning beasts’: Rhetorical Efforts to Separate Humans and Animals in Early Modern Germany,” in Cultures of Communication from Reformation to Enlightenment: Constructing Publics in the Early Modern German Lands, ed. James Von Horn Melton (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2002), 232.
20 Martin Grosser, Zu der Landwirtschafft (Görlitz: 1590), viiib.
21 The Edles Land-leben is a major exception, which is not surprising since its main purpose was to counter falsehoods about farming that were getting printed at the time.
modern culture, the agricultural masculinities men associated to these models differed in daily practice. For patriarchally grounded masculinities, internal and external class hierarchies among men fundamentally influenced how they interpreted and experienced housefather and Adam-centered farm trade identities. For example, the implied divine mandate to all humans behind the biblical source of the First Farmer identity gave it persuasive religious authority to German Protestant farmers. Farming was no longer just an activity performed out of servitude and necessity, but it was now also noble work in a socially recognized and virtuous trade.

The First Farmer model had a darker side when evaluated from a gendered perspective. God’s biblical ordination of just Adam as a farmer and divinely mandated livestock breeder was quickly used to support a gendered reinterpretation of agricultural work and agrarian society. As the result of this ideal only recognizing a man as the legitimate tradesperson, women were recast into a helpmate position, in which they had no professional position or divine support outside of marriage. Interpreting men as the only legitimate farmers, a literal interpretation of this biblical story also thereby naturalized a man as head of the agrarian household as well as his desire for absolute control of farm resources. Whether or not motivated by religion it is certainly true that by the end of the seventeenth century, farmers’ self-representations along with state archival documents and literature marketed to the lower orders do not discuss women having access to horses or women being involved at any stage of the process of horse breeding.22

Statistical Data for Animal Husbandry in Braunschweig-Lüneburg

To begin evaluating the changes and growth of equine husbandry in early modern Braunschweig-Lüneburg, we first need to get an idea of animal husbandry and general livestock populations. Throughout my study, I have structured my analysis of agrarian daily life into three periods that use the Thirty Years War as a historical anchor since it led to the widespread and long-term destruction of animal husbandry all over the Holy Roman Empire. Prior to the Thirty Years War, the tax registers represented in Appendix D cover sixty years of equine populations and agrarian horse-owners in five jurisdictional areas of the duchy (Amt Gifhorn, Amt Medingen, Boldecker Land, Amt Ilten, Amt Burgwedel). Since there is neither contiguous nor

22 For example, in accounts such as this one where a stud fee is possibly due so all involved parties testify as to the actual process and all the players in how one person’s mare became pregnant. HStA Celle Br. 61a, Amt Hoya, no. 5264, 1686, “Verdacht, daß Stuten des Henrich von Schlepegrell zu Rethen durch einen der fürtlichen Hengste zu Hoya gedeckt sein sollen.” There are more of these types of accounts in the Celle foundational documents from the 1680s to around 1760. See HStA Hann. 147, nr. 4.
comprehensive information for Braunschweig-Lüneburg’s towns and jurisdictional areas during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I have selected Amt Gifhorn and Amt Medingen as sample populations for the first period, 1566-1625. The town of Gifhorn, which had enjoyed court status during the first half of the sixteenth century, maintained a strong regional influence over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in both trade and agriculture along the southern heath. Located along the opposite border of the heath, Amt Medingen and Amt Ilten act as points of reference for Amt Gifhorn prior to the Thirty Years War. Although speaking primarily only to the first period, the livestock numbers for Amt Medingen and Amt Burgwedel provide a good perspective for understanding later changes in agricultural practices. For example, one can establish that prior to around 1625, the population of cattle was always significantly higher in comparison to horses, and oxen and cows were present in the vast majority of livestock-owning agrarian households. Along with Amt Gifhorn and the Boldecker region, Amt Ilten provides the most frequent—and therefore the most precise—information about livestock holding in any area of the Lüneburg heath, particularly for the second period, 1625-1678. During this period of rising livestock taxes, farmers helped reconstruct the early modern economy by reinvesting in equine husbandry and horse breeding. The final period, which is represented by the 1680 and 1687 records, builds upon the success of decades of Reconstruction efforts towards re-cultivating farmland and repopulating equine herds.

Due to their methodological origins in social history, studies of early modern agriculture and agrarian daily life often lack an appreciation of the cumulative effects of minor cultural changes over time. For example, a number of microhistorians in German-language scholarship tend to interpret the actions of agrarian communities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries through the lenses of eighteenth century industrialization and the nineteenth century Prussian farmer freedom (Bauernbefreiung) acts. Yet this periodization implicitly assume that agrarian

---

23 For a discussion of the livestock in the area, see Christine van den Heuvel und Manfred von Boetticher, Politik, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von der Reformation bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts (Hildesheim: August Lax, 1998). Incidentally, entries on tax registers do not typically provide details about the type or use of bovine populations. Therefore an entry for “Rinder” may actually include cows and oxen along with animals raised for slaughter.

24 During this period, Boldecker Land fell under the jurisdiction of Amt Fallersleben. It is currently overseen by Amt Gifhorn. For the majority of my primary source material for Gifhorn, see Theo Bosse, Die Register und Kataster der Ämter Gifhorn, Fallersleben und Isenhagen ab 1563/64 (Hannover: Schlütersche Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei, 1988).

25 For an example of this approach, see Jürgen Schlumbohm, Lebensläufe, Familien, Höfe: Die Bauern und Heuerleute des Osnabrückischen Kirchspiels Belm in Proto-industrieller Zeit, 1650-1850 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck
culture and techniques remained static for over three hundred years. Only by recognizing the ability of agrarian culture and trade practices to evolve and adapt as quickly as those in major cities, can historians fully address the nature of early modern life.²⁶ Between villages and among polities, agrarian culture and trades in Braunschweig-Lüneburg developed drastically differently from the southern Holy Roman Empire.²⁷ For example, southern agrarian life quickly developed over the eighteenth century into centering on large farming households in which most labor was performed by day laborers and servants. In this way, southern agrarian subclasses were created in a different manner and for different purposes than those in Braunschweig-Lüneburg.²⁸

Looking at Appendix D.1 as an illustration of this common type of reading, we can see the importance of looking at the cultural background of agricultural data as well as the importance of considering how much can change in a decade or two even within the countryside. While some types of arguments can be made by generalizing across a century or two of agricultural data, this use of statistical data can lead to false conclusions. On the surface, this usage can support teleological Enlightenment narratives about agrarian motivations and practices. Comparing just the figures of horses in Amt Ilten from 1585 to 1680, it seems as if not much change had been made and as if horse breeding was a relatively consistent and mundane agricultural practice. Anderten appears to have a net loss of three horses over the century, and the whole district appears to have a net gain of twelve horses. Looking at it more closely, the data within each town reveals that the number of horse-owning households did increase over the century, which was potentially the result of new people moving into abandoned and razed farmlands following the Thirty Years War.²⁹ The data in Appendix D.1 for Amt Ilten demonstrates that there was a clear increase in horse-owners at the same time that the average number of horses in the district grew only a modest amount from what it had been a century

²⁹ This is in accordance for what Sreenivasan has found for southern Germany.
prior. Although the sample is too small to make a definitive statement, I believe that this increase reflects German farmers’ re-deployed equine husbandry as an agricultural strategy of Reconstruction.

While the equine populations of Amt Ilten appear as if they have remained constant, that cannot be true given that the Thirty Years War was fought across this whole region. As the figures for Boldecker Land from 1566-1612 reveal, the equine population was neither small nor located only in a few high volume areas before 1618. So a potential for equine-centric agrarian culture already existed in the sixteenth century, but both tax petitions and popular sources marketed to farmers like farm almanacs and broadsheets do not reveal that German farmers felt anything particular about horses, and certainly not above what they already felt toward their bovine livestock.  

In four Boldecker villages—Jembke, Osloß, Tappenbeck, and Weyhausen—during 1566 and 1612, the number of households within each village increases slightly, and even though the number of horses had declined, the number of horse-owning households did not decline responsively but at a much slower rate. The same households were practicing equine husbandry, but in the latter year some farmers no longer owned as many horses. It is also clear that not all the farmers in Boldecker Land had horses, but the majority of them did in both 1566 and 1612.

Since the feudal taxes and services of agrarian classes were contingent on how many horses one owned, this means that there was a class hierarchy system operating within the local agrarian community of Boldecker Land by 1566 that continued through 1612. Comparing the southern heath of 1612 Boldecker Land to the northern heaths of 1608 Amt Medingen and 1589 Burgwedel, there were definite complexities to the operation of horses as social capital or as indicators of economic status. For Amt Medingen, almost every agrarian household was involved in equine husbandry. In terms of socioeconomic order, these farmers were all generally the same rank.

---

30 The lack of personal sentiments towards livestock prior to the late eighteenth century has been documented by Keith Thomas. Thomas’ work shows how early modern societies came to imagine that the two worlds were separate over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Keith Thomas, Man and the Natural World: A History of the Modern Sensibility (London: Allen Lane, 1983).

horses, which would have categorized them all as Höfner or Halbhöfner. A Höfner owned three or four horses. In the district around Burgwedel, the commonality of equine husbandry lay only in the shared fact of ownership. The high ratio of horses to households indicates class stratification both within agrarian horse-owners, the Halbhöfner and Höfner, and between these agrarian horse-owners and other horse-owners, urban merchants and nobles.

Statistical Data on Equine Husbandry During Reconstruction

The most damage to livestock during the Thirty Years War was done around 1630, which is represented by the livestock numbers of Boldecker Land for 1625 and 1630. Instead of representing the conclusion of a steady decline due to farmers’ mishandling and poor reproductive techniques, the German horse population was heavily reduced as the direct result of local political policies, military thefts, looting, and other wartime damages during the second half of the Thirty Years War. It certainly did not help reconstruction efforts that farmers were obligated to pay taxes on livestock that had been stolen or killed. While farmers could petition individually or as a collective group for a reduction based on the loss of livestock due to wartime causes, they rarely were awarded amelioration.

Over the seventeenth century, the economy of Braunschweig-Lüneburg grew progressively more dependent on farmers’ taxes and their unpaid labor for the state. Following a ruling in 1601 that permitted farmers to have up to two horses graze for free in the communal pasture, the general agricultural policy of Braunschweig-Lüneburg fostered farmers’ horse breeding. Contrary to practices in many areas of Germany and Europe, farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg were encouraged to own horses. They then were obligated to pay an annual fee for pasturing additional horses. Furthermore, the more horses produced by farmers, the more horses that local and ducal lords could requisition both for transporting military or state

32 Other terms for this agrarian subdivision include Vollhöfner, Kötner, and Anspänner.
33 See Heinrich Eggeling, Das Amt Gifhorn im Dreißigjährigen Kriege und in der Nachkriegszeit (Gifhorn: Vereinsdruckerei Gifhorn, 1930). Much to their long-term economic detriment, the Braunschweig-Lüneburg dukes did not follow the example set by the count of Oldenburg, who used horse trading as a bargaining tool to save farmers’ land from the combined destructive efforts of Saxon, Swedish, and imperial troops.
34 As a representative of this large group, see HStA Celle Br. 61a, Amt Bodenteich, nr. 1380, 1638.
36 This was the Gandersheim Landtagsabschied of the 10th of October 1601. The Corpus constituent. calenbergens, T. 4. cap. 8 is the legal code setting up the important rights and the related tax burdens of each economic order (Stand). Albert Häne, Geschichte des Königreichs Hannover und Herzogthums Braunschweig (Hannover: Hahnsche Hofbuchhandlung, 1830).
goods and for providing additional wagon and plowing duties on their land.

While at time local officials did argue in support of farmers because of their youth or extreme circumstances, they became progressively less concerned over the seventeenth century with day-to-day hardships or long-term damage caused by this form of taxation. For example, the Hannover state archive is full of petitions in which a horse was loaned out for Spanndienst and returned home in a much diminished capacity. In a case from 1664, Margarete Tievermanns, the widow of Peter Osterloh zu Klein Hehlen, petitioned for funds to replace a horse wounded in Herrendienst. In a different account from 1664 in Amt Hoya, Hermann Hanefeld zu Klein Borstel petitioned the court in Celle due to damage done to his brother’s horse during Herrendienst. Hanefeld alleged that a local official, Carsten Henrich zu Bensen, had been abusing his right to borrow farmers’ horses for work duty (Wagendienst) by taking his horses for more days and for different purposes than were legally permitted. Given the obvious practical difficulties of being legally bound to entrust their horses with possibly inexperienced handlers and at unpredictable times, it is not surprising that it took Braunschweig-Lüneburg farmers forty years of dedicated labor to restore the equine population to its pre-war numbers.

Comparing Amt Ilten records from 1680 to those of Amt Medingen from 1608, we can see that the ratio of cattle to horses remained quite high. Farmers clearly were continuing to rely on bovine bodies to supply many of their agricultural needs. Bovine husbandry clearly must have played a significant part of Reconstruction efforts for the cattle to have regained numbers as quickly as the horses. While one could posit that agrarian equine identities developed because equine husbandry had grown so consistent and widespread in practice that horses had become effectively the new face of plough agriculture to all farmers by the end of the seventeenth century, these large numbers of cattle would seem to disprove that hypothesis. Almost all farmers continued to rely heavily on bovine husbandry and the draft abilities of cattle. Even those farmers that practiced equine husbandry certainly did not do so by reducing their bovine herds or no longer using oxen to pull equipment.

Agrarian horse-ownership prior to the Thirty Years War was either relatively constant or

37 HStA Celle Br. 61a, Burgvogtei Celle, nr. 2853, 1664.
38 HStA Celle Br. 61a, Amt Hoya, nr. 5226, 1664.
39 It is important to remember that foals gestate for eleven months and then require several more years before they are physically able to reproduce.
40 Tax registers do not indicate which cows and oxen were raised only for slaughter. The practice of eating meat in northern Germany was generally focused on buying animals to quickly slaughter and not on raising massive herds to satisfy local and foreign demands. Taxes therefore were unlikely factored using their numbers.
slightly in decline. Farmers were not under legal obligation to breed and use horses, and it was a widely acknowledged fact that it was quite difficult for any one—noble, merchant, or farmer—to get access to a steady supply of good horses for any purpose. This appeared to remain somewhat of a problem throughout the seventeenth century. As discussed earlier in terms of elite hippological literature, the supply of quality horses was an issue with which military-focused nobles and state officials became increasingly obsessed. This resulted from the fact that farmers collectively produced the most horses for the mass-market, yet farmers’ horses were bred to be primarily of use for farmers, not for cavalry, carriages, or Reitkunst.

Although there were a few exceptions, the general trend in Amt Gifhorn between 1640 and 1678 was for a larger number of households to own horses even as the number of households per town fluctuated up or down. From the increase in horse population, it is clear that some equine-focused households in 1640 owned more horses by 1678. In some villages like Allersehl or Stüede, if no one owned horses in 1640, then it was unlikely that any would in 1678 and 1687, unless a farmer with training in equine husbandry moved into the area. This evidence suggests that during Reconstruction, agrarian social hierarchies were not exclusionary on the basis of horse ownership. Successful equine husbandry not only depended on farmers’ ability to find and buy good horses, but it was also heavily reliant on maintaining local networks of information and experience. The more farmers relying on equine husbandry as part of their standard agricultural practice, the larger and stronger the local hippological community became.

Conclusions about Equine Husbandry in the Late Seventeenth Century

As my reading of the data shows, the new equine-centrism of animal husbandry and German agriculture could have developed much earlier in seventeenth century Braunschweig-
Lüneburg than it did. Looking at 1687 on Appendix D, horse populations were just beginning to reach what they had been before 1630. Therefore from the 1630s to the 1690s, farmers could not have used horses in a greater number per household nor in a greater amount of households total than before 1580 and before 1630. Farmers’ equine-centrism of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not simply the result of a sudden trend in which the number of horses owned by a single farmer or farm household accelerated rapidly over the span of a few years. It also cannot be attributed to a change in general agricultural practice in which the holding of many horses came to be common enough among the majority of farmers that individual farmers began reimagining their trade practices and cultural identities as farmers in terms of horses.\textsuperscript{46}

Nor is the increased equine-centrism due to equine husbandry having grown so consistent and widespread in practice by the late seventeenth century across Lower Saxony—even if only one or two horses for each household—that horses had become effectively the new face of plough agriculture.\textsuperscript{47} Instead, the growing public visibility of horses working in an ever wider range of economic activities (e.g. postal service and land-surveying) along with the restructuring of agrarian social networks during Reconstruction led to farmers’ re-adoption of equine husbandry as both an agricultural strategy and as a major type of social capital.

**Veterinary Science in Agrarian Life, 1550-1735**

By going through a farmer’s daily activities with livestock and animal husbandry, I will demonstrate that as they coalesced into a distinctive trade identity over the seventeenth century, agricultural practices became increasingly equine-centric and gendered. Using archival sources, tax records and petitions, statistical data, print images, and objects of material culture, I rely on an intersectional analysis of the relationship of agrarian trade identities in early modern Braunschweig-Lüneburg to the changing cultural rationales used to justify the sexual division of farm labor and resources. Healthcare was an integral part of animal husbandry, although it is not always recognizable to modern eyes as either scientific or veterinary. As already discussed in Chapter Two, sixteenth and seventeenth century farm almanacs advised the use of phlebotomy as a routine measure for preventative healthcare in both livestock and humans. The admonishments

\textsuperscript{46} This argument would also imply that farmers then also individually decided to practice more strictly gendered labor division at home.

\textsuperscript{47} Sreenivasan, 245.
of several prescriptive veterinary and farm guides towards farmers that tried to save money by shoeing their own horses suggest that German farmers did perform preventative and curative maintenance on their livestock. While differing in specifics, the stereotypical farmer of both elite and popular prescriptive literature was expected to have several professional veterinary skill sets and to be experienced specialists in animal reproduction.

Far from being regarded as ignorant or untrained in animal husbandry as elite prescriptive guides often implied, archival sources reveal that in practice state officials and ducal lords in Braunschweig-Lüneburg both recognized and relied upon farmers as trade professionals in veterinary healthcare and livestock breeding.48 In tax petitions as well as in ducal decrees on cattle plague, farmers are expected to be knowledgeable in preventative healthcare dealing with proper nutrition, hygiene, and the common sources of crop contamination.49 And of course, the Celle stud was predicated entirely on the expectation that, unlike noblemen, farmers could sustain a long-term horse breeding project. Despite this public recognition, state officials and ducal lords in Braunschweig-Lüneburg worked towards establishing a state-sponsored professional hierarchy of veterinary practitioners. By the end of the eighteenth century, this hierarchy had on the one side guild training being devalued in favor of university veterinary schools and on the other farmers’ expertise with animals and horse breeding being simultaneously exploited and undermined by state agricultural projects.50

Despite the numerous costs and inconveniences that came with it, German farmers continued to invest in equine husbandry. From a practical standpoint, horses were much more fragile in health, much more difficult to buy or replace, and much more expensive to feed than oxen. German farmers did not have access to—let alone own themselves—many horses during Reconstruction, and they certainly would not have seen as many horses working the fields as they had had before the war. Yet this is the same period in which equine-based masculine trade identities first develop in agrarian practices and culture. Why did Braunschweig-Lüneburg

---

48 For example, both Fugger and Pinter expressed this opinion a number of times throughout their works.
farmers after the Thirty Years War continue educating themselves and their male children in equine husbandry and healthcare when doing so obligated them to owe increasingly more labor and tax revenue to their local and regional lords? How did such a risky financial venture not only remain a viable option for farmers, but even increase in practice over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries?

This section explores the reinvestment by farmers in equine husbandry following the Thirty Years War and traces the impact of equine-centered anthropomorphism on daily practices of animal husbandry. During this time, equine veterinary medicine and preventative care by farmers developed both at the potential expense of other livestock and contrary to existing agrarian technology and practices. By looking at the veterinary knowledge and skill sets that farmers were required to know for their trade, we can better see the human-animal hierarchies that characterized agricultural work—and that justified gender hierarchies among humans—in early modern Germany. Lacking autobiographical sources that present agrarian activities from the farmer’s perspective, the archival and prescriptive examples discussed in this section represent the range of veterinary expertise that farmers were acknowledged to have in official documents. These historical materials include the foundational records of the Celle stud project (Hann. 147), cattle plague ordinances, and requests for tax deferments along with those represented by popular and elite German media sources, including print illustrations, almanacs, and prescriptive agrarian guides.

Each of these sources can speak to the point that equine husbandry was not easy in daily life. Equine veterinary healthcare was not intuitive, and horses’ bodies function very differently than either humans or other large livestock. As the shared prescriptive advice by German noblemen and urban elites about how to cause a horse to vomit illustrates, an education about the human body did not mean that one knew the first thing about the anatomy of non-humans. The only dependable way to learn equine husbandry was through years of experience and training, just as was true for the veterinary skill sets and knowledge in which smiths and court horse doctors trained.

52 As discussed earlier, the authors of these works—early modern court veterinarians and noble horse breeders—assumed that horses could vomit because humans did. Yet they did not extend this logic to cattle and either their veterinary care or their dietary practice of regurgitating food. Furthermore unlike bovine healthcare in early modern Germany, equine veterinary techniques were commonly borrowed from human medicine.
Podiatry and the Lower Saxon Farmer

As practiced by farmers, hoof trimming was primarily a preventative practice, but one that was shared with large-smiths and some hoof-smiths. In terms of the equine-centric development of hoof-smiths and large-smiths, veterinary and shoeing-focused smiths did work on oxen and cows, and this activity could include shoeing as well as hoof trimming.\(^5\) In terms of actual practice however, archeological evidence from Braunschweig and Hannover does not indicate that the proportion of bovine shoes was comparable to the number of horseshoes crafted and used.\(^4\) Bovine hoof care and traction are not discussed in housefather or farm guides of any order nor is it a topic in farm almanacs. Taken together this evidence indicates that for unknown reasons, professional smiths did not want to make bovine shoes. Perhaps there was not enough social or economic profit in it for them to learn the bovine-related shoeing skills, or perhaps a trimming by itself was not profitable enough for guild smiths to bother with the effort. Maybe there were not enough master tradesmen with the knowledge how to make good or long-lasting bovine shoes. If that were the case then there would not have been enough bovine-focused smiths to teach others and sustain the trade’s skill sets. From a farmer’s perspective, perhaps the price of the iron and labor required was greater than a farmer could afford for all of his livestock so he did not hire smiths for the job. In his study of equine husbandry in early modern England, Peter Edwards has noted that many farmers could not necessarily afford the prices that even a journeyman or village smith would charge—let alone what a guild smith was required to charge—and thus farmers trimmed and shoed their own horses.\(^5\) Unlike horseshoes, cow and oxen shoes were aids reserved for specific or seasonal jobs, which suggests the possibility that farmers may have preferred hoof trimming over shoeing for bovine podiatry.

As is similarly true for horses, bovine hoof trimming is a good general maintenance procedure.\(^6\) In the process of trimming uneven or irregular growths of the hoof walls, farmers

---

\(^5\) Although Curth does not go into the details of hoof-trimming in cattle, she has a brief discussion of bovine veterinary medicine provided by equine tradesmen and farmers. Louise Curth, *The Care of Brute Beasts: A Social and Cultural Study of Veterinary Medicine in Early Modern England* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 62-63.

\(^4\) As of 2007, both the Hannover and Braunschweig city historical museums displayed both cow and horseshoes in local archeological finds.

\(^5\) See Peter Edwards, *Horse and Man in Early Modern England* (New York: Continuum Books, 2007). Since prescriptive works often reference farmers attempting to shoe or trim their own horses, it is probable that German farmers attempted to shoe or trim their dairy cattle, breeding bulls, and/or oxen.

or other veterinary practitioners would have checked for injuries, abscesses, and other problems that could affect the gait and thus the health or use of the animal. Hoof trimming is less necessary when the animal is able to walk around more, meaning that the practice possibly was not that beneficial to many cattle since early modern farmers usually expected and planned for their cows to be out in the pasture. However, it should not be forgotten that in some villages and for poor farmers, pasture space was limited. The quantity and quality of grass in shared pastures frequently suffered due to overpopulation for the relative space, over-use by farmers, and not properly conserving grass by rotating grazing species. Notably when the raiding and damages were the worst around the heath during the last decade of the Thirty Years War, farmers would not have given their animals long grazing time since raiding parties scouted villages based on visible livestock and even allegedly friendly troops routinely stole livestock for mounts, draft labor, or food.

Given these circumstances, it is perhaps more useful to consider the question of why German farmers—as opposed to French and Belgian—were not interested in bovine hoof trimming in terms of its feasibility for the average farmer. Since a cow’s or ox’s legs neither bend as flexibly as a horse’s nor can a cow or ox balance as well on three legs, the bovine body has to be tilted or laid prone on its side for one to trim its hooves. This could have been accomplished in the early modern time period with ropes held by several assistants, which in fact is how it is practiced by some modern farmers. The use of ropes in training horses was well established at this time, having been promoted by Grisone and followers of his school’s core training principles. In the training protocol of Reitkunst, nobles and grooms were expected to pull the ropes tied to horses’ legs not only in order to teach them new gaits, but also to force them

---


58 Cattle and horses graze very differently. Horses, whose bodies are set up either to graze or to run, tend to pull large clumps of grass out or to nibble away half the blades. Cattle, whose bodies require constant grazing and cannot run fast, methodically raze the ground.

59 For more on the effects of the Thirty Years War on farming practices, see Christian Heppner, Burgwedel: Die Geschichte der Sieben Dörfer-Engensen, Fuhrberg, Grossburgwedel, Kleinburgwedel, Oldhurst, Thönse, Wettnar (Burgwedel: Gemeinde Burgwedel, 1999), 70-72. See also Heinrich Eggeling, Das Amt Gifhorn im Dreißigjährigen Kriege und in der Nachkriegszeit (Gifhorn: Vereinsdruckerei Gifhorn, 1930).
to comply with their rider’s orders. As one might imagine for a two thousand pound animal, this feat—whether to instruct or to punish—would have taken quite a few humans to accomplish much the same is the case today for horses that refuse to re-board their trailers after horse shows. However, male farmers usually did work in groups, or at least their plots of land were directly next to the fields of other farmers, who all would have had personal experience with bovine handling and who therefore could have been relied on to provide some aid. Furthermore, the trimming could also have been performed at livestock markets prior to sale or before the journey home. As previous chapters have already discussed, large-smiths, hoof-smiths, and other veterinary practitioners were regular vendors at livestock markets. Therefore, a farmer could have attempted the trimming at a market where he would have had more than enough general assistance and where there would have been a well-trained expert nearby if anything went wrong.

Yet despite the potential viability of bovine hoof trimming in the early modern period, it was never practiced on the same scale as horses’ hoof trimming and shoeing. As already noted, bovine legs are not as flexible as those of horses. While today with the help of mechanical chutes and tilting tables trimming bovine hooves can take several hours, there is no telling how long it would have taken with ropes during the seventeenth century or how damaging that process would have been to bovine bodies, which are ill-designed for lengthy periods of lying prone. Compared to the rate for oxen and cows, horses would have been able to be trimmed in much faster time with less human assistance required and with much less chance of bodily injury to either animal or farmer. Furthermore, a farmer would have needed to acquire and learn how to use a different set of trimming tools. While the rasp and nippers might have been able to be shared between livestock species, one would have needed a different carving block and potentially a cutting knife designed for working on cloven hooves. Finally while farmers at best owned several horses, they all owned herds of cattle. Hoof trimming for horned livestock would then have been an all-day affair, causing a farmer to potentially lose several days of labor

60 For example, both Italian (Grisone, 1550) and French (Salomon de la Broue, 1593) schools of Reitkunst advised force for training a horse that was scared of water out of its phobia. In the scenario of hydrophobia, they advised that the horse be brought near the water, restrained with ropes, beaten, and have its head forced under the water. In this way, the horse would learn to fear and thus never question the commands of its riders, owners, or other men.
61 There is no evidence of it being a common or widespread practice in Braunschweig-Lüneburg in my archival files and excerpts. I have not found records, for example, that concern one farmer badly trimming the hooves of a relative’s or neighbor’s cattle—as I have seen regarding horses. I have also seen no evidence of it in elite or popular hippological literature.
compared to the several hours cost by shoeing one or two horses. The organization of human labor that bovine hoof trimming required was likely quite prohibitive for any farmers who did desire to truss up all of their cattle at regular intervals for maintenance. Farmers apparently felt that they did not get enough of a return for the time, money, and resources it would take away from their other tasks.

Equine Veterinary Knowledge and Skill Sets

Little archival evidence remains about which veterinary practices farmers actually carried out for most of the early modern period. What does remain—notably that in folders like Celle Br. 61a and numerous folders of cattle plague ordinances—gives remarkably little information about the specifics of animal healthcare in early modern Germany.\(^62\) In light of the high numbers of cattle seen in Amt Medingen in 1608 and in Amt Ilten in 1680, the absence of information on bovine healthcare is surprising.

Similar to the practices and trade culture of large-smiths and equine veterinary practitioners, bovine healthcare was not a big area of interest for farmers before or after the Thirty Years War.\(^63\) The lack of healthcare for cattle was not due to the area being a large meat-producing area in which long-term healthcare would have been unnecessary. Braunschweig-Lüneburg was not a major source for German or Dutch meat.\(^64\) In addition, unlike the neighboring region of east Friesia, the breed type of bovine livestock pastured around the Lüneburg heath were not regarded as bountiful milk-producers and thus commonly were exported to the Netherlands and other agricultural areas. Instead, the lack of veterinary information was largely because early modern humans adapted non-human animal bodies to serve human purposes and goals, not to benefit an individual animal’s medical or a species’ hereditary good.\(^65\) It was human culture and interest that guided the development of veterinary science and early modern agriculture. As a result, horses, a much smaller population than oxen

\(^62\) The situation is different in the neighboring Netherlands, which prized daily agriculture and which developed bovine-centric trade and national identities.

\(^63\) Bovine healthcare had to wait until the late eighteenth century—really, the nineteenth century for Germany—to get much veterinary attention outside of cattle plague treatments. Humans were more interested in making bovine bodies produce more milk, have more supple skin for leather, and produce more fat to marble their flesh.

\(^64\) This information comes from a personal conversation with Karl Appuhn, who presented a talk at the 2010 AHA about the effects of Italy’s consumption of beef on the forests of international cattle producers. Karl Appuhn, *Meat Matters: Epizootics, Economy, and Science in Eighteenth-Century Italy* (work-in-progress).

and cows with fewer agricultural uses, became the center of not just elites’ veterinary science but also farmers’.

Despite the lack of archival documentation, it is clear that equine husbandry involved a number of veterinary knowledge and skill sets beyond that needed for bovine husbandry. It is additionally clear then that equine husbandry could be an expensive undertaking that required hands-on training, particularly in the area of surgical practices and tools. As was briefly discussed in the previous chapter, dental care was important for routine equine maintenance. The technique of dental floating generally involved the use of a specialized file and a pair of nippers. Since a horse’s molars grow throughout its life, they can form jagged points that rip the inside of the horse’s mouth, prevent it from eating and drinking, or prevent a bridle’s bit from working. While the horse’s head is tethered to a fence or, more ideally, held by an assistant, the file would be dragged across the uneven surfaces in its mouth. The nippers were used to trim the tips on a horse’s canine teeth when they had grown unevenly.

A preventative measure that involved careful and quick surgery, castration was a skill that some farmers had to learn. While many farmers owned mares, some farmers did own stallions, and it was certainly true that not all farmers involved in equine husbandry were interested in equine reproduction. Archival records—even livestock tax petitions—rarely detail the sex of equine livestock owned and operated by farmers, which makes it impossible to say anything at all about the practice of gelding by farmers. There is evidence that some farmers did own

---

66 Today this practice, which is more or less an annual event, is frequently done by a farrier. Some people prefer to do it themselves since it is relatively simple to do. If the horse needs a sedative due to it being too stressed out for the job to get done otherwise or due to the amount of pain that the dentistry will cause, a horse doctor is called in and then either the veterinarian does the job or a farrier. I know this due to two summer internships with an equine veterinarian as well as through my prior ownership of two colicky horses as well as through my personal experiences with other horses and horse owners over several decades.

67 Within the modern field of veterinary medicine as well as in popular American equestrian culture, it is common knowledge that gelding is both a behavioral health measure as well as a preventative measure for long-term physical health. I have also assisted a horse doctor with several geldings, which were performed for these rationales.

68 Since they believed that the foal inherited most of its qualities from its mother, keeping stallions served little purpose for horse breeders. For an archival look at the value of a mare based on the colors and patterns that she’d pass on to her foals, see HStA Celle Br. 57, nr. 6, 1650-1654. For a discussion of how this belief worked out in daily horse breeding practices in early modern England, see Margaret Derry, Breed for Perfection: Shorthorn Cattle, Collies, and Arabian Horses since 1800 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2003) and Horses in Society: A Story of Animal Breeding and Marketing Culture, 1800-1920 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006).

69 In his dissertation, Jason Hribal briefly addresses the lack of information about the specifics of gelding for early modern American veterinary sources. Jason Hribal, Animals are Part of the Working Class: Commons, Enclosure, and Resistance in the Atlantic World (PhD diss., University of Toledo, May 2002), fn. 111. Louise Curth has noted that few details were ever published about the tools or techniques of horse castration in early modern England. Curth, Care of Brute Beasts, 139. Additionally when I interviewed him on this specific point, the head of the
geldings, but as detailed in Chapter Two, prescriptive literature was largely silent about how, when, and why a stallion should be rendered a gelding.\textsuperscript{70} Since the majority of horse-owning farmers only kept mares—either as a means to make extra income by selling her yearly foals or by using those foals to increase their own herds, then there was a constant population of colts born every year whose intactness became increasingly significant over the two to three years that it took them to mature sexually into stallions.

Contrary to what was discussed in Chapter Two about elite equestrians’ preoccupation with forcing broodmares to be bred by stallions hand-picked for the occasion, German farmers were not worried about colts maturing prematurely and impregnating fertile females.\textsuperscript{71} They had more practical and economic considerations about which to be concerned. Simply put, stallions demand many more resources than either mares or geldings. They eat much more than mares and geldings do, as stallions’ bodies need the extra calories to build and maintain muscle mass. Their stalls must also be reinforced so that they cannot kick the walls apart in order to get access to mares or to attack other stallions.\textsuperscript{72} When stallions are pastured, they cannot be pastured nearby mares or other stallions. For early modern farmers, this meant that stallions could not be kept in the common pasture with other farmers’ horses, and farmers that owned stallions would have had to employ a system of large neighboring pastures so that there would be a wide buffer zone between stallions or between stallions and mares with foals.\textsuperscript{73} Furthermore, stallions are easily distracted from their work when a mare in heat is nearby. In Braunschweig-Lüneburg, where farmers were obligated to farm strips of land that were located all over their village and which were rarely grouped altogether in a cohesive block, this would have been particularly problematic. For all these reasons then, life was difficult for a farmer who wanted to keep and use a stallion in an area in which many other farmers were using mares.\textsuperscript{74}

When a farmer relied on stallions or geldings, there were additional preventative

\textsuperscript{70} One of the few authors to gesture at the topic, Pinter claims that it is better to do away with stallions of weak sperm than keep them on the stud farm. It seems as if he suggests here that it is better to kill them instead of gelding them and using them for other purposes. Pinter, \textit{Pferde-Schatz}, 17.

\textsuperscript{71} The teaser-stallion breeding method, for example, was advocated by Winter in the revised 1672 edition of \textit{Stutherey Mercurius}.

\textsuperscript{72} The walls also need to be reinforced because a stallion can easily injure itself or break a leg in the process of trying to get out. Pinter also notes that mares’ stalls are much cleaner than stallions’ because mares like to keep their stalls neat and tidy. Pinter, \textit{Pferde-Schatz}, 10.

\textsuperscript{73} Such as the pasture system depicted in von Hohberg’s \textit{Georgica Curiosa}, 117.

\textsuperscript{74} For a discussion of the different patterns that farming sub-classes used when plowing, see Meibeyer.
measures to ensure the health of the horse. As already discussed in Chapter Two, veterinary guides since the Roman empire have included remedies dealing with male equine genitalia.\textsuperscript{75} Notably, there were multiple recipes dealing with ailments like painful or blocked urination or a swollen penis. The frequency of these types of complaints also indicates that male horses might not have been groomed properly. For example, today sheath cleaning is a regular preventative practice in which the entire genital area is meticulously cleaned, including washing the entire shaft and removing the wax build-up from the penis’ tip as well as that contained inside the sheath.\textsuperscript{76} If this is not performed regularly, the genitals can become inflamed, causing the horse pain and preventing him from urinating. Sheaths also must be cleaned if one intends to breed a stallion in order to keep both horses safe from accidental infections and to make sure that the semen is able to escape.

Contrary to the situation with podiatry, dentistry, and castration, both elite and popular prescriptive sources do discuss not only the importance of maintaining humoral balances in one’s livestock, but they also detail how one was supposed to go about doing that on a daily basis. Preventative humoral techniques and tools for livestock were practiced similarly as those used by humans on humans, but they still differed in application. Non-human bodies were recognized as having different humoral make-up than humans and thus bleeding a cow or a horse required different applications from humans as well as from each other. Bleeding was recommended prior to horse breeding by both elite and popular prescriptive literature as a preventative measure and as part of a cyclical procedure for human and animals. As shown in Chapter Two, farmers’ almanacs provided lucky dates and times for one to bleed large and small livestock that were frequently separate from the dates and times suggested for humans. Yet bleeding was not the only method of purging bodies of excessive or dangerous humors. The wisdom in veterinary guides and almanacs advocates any physical orifice as an appropriate means to expel humoral waste. Although modern veterinary medicine recognizes vomiting in horses to be almost physically impossible and certainly a dire sign of health, early modern guides included vomiting

\textsuperscript{75} Yet none of course that have anything to say about female reproductive organs, including her mammary bag.  
\textsuperscript{76} I have personal experience with this type of maintenance, which I was advised to perform on my gelding not only by other horse owners but also by my veterinarian. Sheath-cleaning solution is regularly and widely sold at livestock supply and tack stores. Additionally, I have helped physically support tranquilized male horses, whose inflamed genitals were in the process of being cleaned. The tranquilizer was administered to cause the horse to become so relaxed that his penis became completely extended out of its sheath so that it reached the ground. At that point, it is not only much easier to clean the folds of the horse’s genitals, but he is also much less likely to physically injure the person cleaning him.
as a type of desirable purging method for horses.\textsuperscript{77} The frontispiece of Johann Walther’s 1658 work on animal husbandry illustrates one common method for purging a horse through an enema.\textsuperscript{78} In the image, the horse’s tail has been skillfully pulled up and held to the side by the male assistant while the titular housefather inserts a large syringe into the horse’s anus. JVVNPC notes the use of purgation fodder in order to treat a sick horse that does not want to eat.\textsuperscript{79} Löhnyß has a subsection of his 1609 work devoted to the beneficial powers of sweating, smoking, and burning out humoral imbalances, which are echoed in the air-purification practices suggested by later cattle plague ordinances and guides for contaminated stables.\textsuperscript{80}

Sometimes the type of equine preventative knowledge taught was meant to influence human behavior, as was the case with colic and founder. Certainly, a serious health issue in early modern Germany and probably the top killer of horses even today, colic is a medical condition that comes on suddenly from a number of individual or a combination of physical and environmental factors.\textsuperscript{81} Although the affliction can be triggered by unknown causes, one of the most common causes of colic is not properly cooling down a hot or sweaty horse before it is stabled, and another is allowing a hot or sweaty horse to cool itself down and drink too much water at one time. While this is knowledge that other equine-based tradesmen (e.g. grooms and horse trainers) were expected to know as well, farmers were the largest group of equine tradesmen that put this training into use on a daily level.\textsuperscript{82} Moreover, unlike grooms, farmers had to either pay for or make for themselves all of the veterinary treatments that their livestock needed. In terms of modern home-care colic treatments, an immediate response is important if surgery is to be avoided.\textsuperscript{83} The primary and traditional treatment for an average case of colic is

---

\textsuperscript{77} Colic is in fact caused by a horse’s physical inability to vomit. This fundamental confusion about equine anatomy was true not just for German guides, but was very much the case in English guides as well.


\textsuperscript{79} JVVNPC, “Pürgr-Futter,” \textit{Bewährtes Roß-Arzney} (1716), 27.

\textsuperscript{80} JVVNPC also advises on smoking out disease in some remedies as well as blowing smoke up a horse’s nostrils in order to cause the horse to purge humors. As discussed in Chapter Two, farmers’ almanacs can involve tobacco smoke as part of a remedy.

\textsuperscript{81} I was planning to be an equine veterinarian when I was younger, so I spent a lot of time studying equine illnesses in the \textit{Encyclopedia of the Horse} and reading \textit{Equus}, which was an American magazine that specialized in recent popular veterinary developments. Colic was always a major topic within it. See Elwyn Edwards, ed., \textit{Encyclopedia of the Horse} (New York: Crescent Books, 1987), 205-6.

\textsuperscript{82} For example, one needed to recognize the symptoms of colic in order to benefit from state lemon laws.

\textsuperscript{83} Modern veterinary surgery for colic is not always ultimately successful. Even if the surgical intervention does go well, horses can commit accidental suicide while they are waking up from anesthesia as well as during the weeks following the surgery. I have personal experience with knowing horses that died in this manner, and I have
exercising the horse, which can eventually lead to the animal’s body expelling the blockage.\textsuperscript{84} In this method, the horse’s handler must force the horse to remain on its feet by keeping the horse walking however long necessary. As physically powerful animals, horses have quite a lot of strength to resist commands if they choose. In fact, colic pains invariably cause horses to refuse to move.\textsuperscript{85} Since horses’ bodies are not designed to spend more than very short periods of time on their sides or back, one of the classic signs that a horse is colicking is its refusal to get to its feet. When a handler prevents it from lying down, the horse will attempt at all times to return to the ground. This process cannot only take hours, but it can be physically exhausting. The more serious the colic and its symptoms, the more assistants one needs to keep the horse moving, whether as alternate walkers at the horse’s head or as additional aides that crack whips, yell, or chase after the horse. All too often, however, colic tends to occur during the most inconvenient times for finding able and willing assistants, such as during thunderstorms and late at night.\textsuperscript{86}

Laminitis or “founder” is also another lethal health condition that can be caused by negligence in equine husbandry or preventative care. Founder, which can actually be triggered by colic, causes the hoof linings to separate from the walls of the hooves. In the case of founder, the lethality of the affliction takes place after the initial medical event. Unfortunately little can be done at that point to save the horse’s life. A horse that does not die from founder invariably becomes lame and must be euthanized to spare it further pain. Whether or not the ability to recognize the problem or the technique to resolve it was complex, good preventative care was trade information that a farmer could only have gained through years of personal experience and usually with some guidance from other equine tradesmen.

A careful education in equine nutrition was quite valuable to a farmer, particularly when the types of crops that best grew in his region were not the crops needed for his livestock’s diets.\textsuperscript{87} For farmers, it was not enough to know that one fed oats to broodmares but only grass or

\textsuperscript{84} More serious cases of colic will always require surgery, due to the intestines being twisted to such a degree that the blockage cannot pass through the colon. In these cases, no amount of walking will save the horse’s life.

\textsuperscript{85} These pains commonly cause horses to roll around on their back and sides, which unfortunately has the result of entangling their internal organs further.

\textsuperscript{86} Colic can be related to stress, as might be caused by thunderstorms or by other uncertainties in its living environment like war or a change in diet. Horses’ high risk of nighttime colic is one of the primary reasons for modern barn managers’ nightly circuits.

\textsuperscript{87} For example, Gladitz notes that oats were not able to grow in some parts of England due to the climate and wet
straw to plow-horses and geldings. In early modern horse breeding guides, elite authors describe a host of potential maladies, bad behaviors, and dietary needs that can all be influenced by the type of a horse’s fodder as well as by when, where, and how often that fodder is given and how to process it before feeding it to livestock. In terms of fodder, such as the merits of foddering solely straw or hay, and in terms of the effects of more complex feeding arrangements, such as the merits of feeding solely hay versus one feeding livestock both hay and barley or hay and barley and oats. In terms of how to process it and why, one might soak the hay to prevent too much dust collecting in it and thus prevent against heaves. One also might want to wash out some of the sugars or carbohydrates to prevent founder.

Farmers also had to plan for the planting, raising, and storage of all the crops necessary to feed their livestock and to provide components for veterinary recipes. Horse breeding guides noted the importance of controlling how often a horse has access to pasture, both in terms of the benefits gained from grazing a herd of broodmares on mountain pastures at specific points in the year and in terms of preventing a single horse from colicking or foundering because it stayed too long in the pasture and ate too much rich grass at once. While nobles used horse and cow herders to take care of this in practice, farmers did not often have the luxury of paying herders to check on their horses or of choosing their own pasture land.

The Holistic Farm

Equine husbandry required constant vigilance and demanded many farm resources. Success however did not always rely on one’s own actions—sometimes a farmer had to depend on the actions taken by others in more distant places, a neighboring village or in the metaphysical world. According to the various cattle plague ordinances, which were regularly circulated and widely posted in villages across the Lüneburg heath after 1680, farmers were individually responsible for being vigilant against infectious diseases in their own herds. If there had been a contagion, they were expected to sanitize their buildings and livestock stalls and to purify the air around the farm. They were expected to examine all of their living and recently dead cattle for telltale signs of plague, to make the medical remedy, to obtain the correct surgical soil conditions. Gladitz, 154.

88 In terms of fodder, such as the merits of foddering solely straw or hay, and in terms of the effects of more complex feeding arrangements, such as the merits of feeding solely hay versus one feeding livestock both hay and barley or hay and barley and oats. In terms of how to process it and why, one might soak the hay to prevent too much dust collecting in it and thus prevent against heaves. One also might want to wash out some of the sugars or carbohydrates to prevent founder.

89 For many intricate details on the differences between European and ancient philosophers on where and how to graze one’s reproductive herds, see Gladitz.

90 For a discussion of horse herders in the early nineteenth century, see Heike Schmidt, 180-181.

91 For the fascinating account of a horse-healing stone, see Edward Bever, Realities of Witchcraft and Popular Magic in Early Modern Europe: Culture, Cognition, and Everyday Life (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2008), 280-2. The study also has a detailed section about popular human-animal medicine, which included lots of verbal techniques, somatic components, and ritual beliefs, in Württemberg up until the nineteenth century.
tool, and to operate on their sick cattle. This legal requirement was grounded in the ducal state’s concern about the spread of contagion between animals in a single herd and among the herds in every village.92

Meanwhile, ducal concern about contagious or heritable equine diseases led to restricting letters of passage for livestock to sick or infertile horses of reproductive age. With a mercantilist appreciation of disease and heredity, importing healthy, noble horses from one’s allies and exporting contagious or genetically deficient horses as low-grade biological warfare was sound political and economic policy. Foreign herds—and thus rival territories’ agriculture and economy—would be contaminated and impacted negatively for a long time by the influx of bad genes and infertility. In the long run, this would make Braunschweig-Lüneburg stronger militarily as the opposing armies would be mounted on weaker horses and would not be able to have a ready supply of new horses to replace others killed in battle. By the end of the seventeenth century, the dukes of Braunschweig-Lüneburg had adopted a ‘lemon law’ policy that prohibited anyone from selling a horse within their territory that was sick with one of four serious medical conditions—glanders, colic, lung troubles, and blindness.93 These affections were recognized by ducal authorities as permanent and incurable conditions, which incapacitated horses for labor and which led to premature death.

Even before the 1697 ordinance, a new owner could contest a sick horse that exhibited the symptoms of these disorders. As is seen in the case of Jürgen Harl’s purchase of a rotzig horse in 1646, if the horse died the new owner could be reimbursed with up to the entire sum that the horse had been bought for—not a depreciated value as was standard practice in livestock tax payment reductions.94 As equine populations regained numbers, horse-owning farmers increasingly had to share a common pasture with other farmers, only some of which had any

92 Other elements of the announcements point to differences between the communities focused by humans on equine bodies as compared to bovine bodies. Illustrated by the low number of horsemeat butchers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, humans focused on health for equine bodies. For cattle, the focus was on death, as demonstrated by the large number of early modern trades and industries depending on components of dead bovine bodies (e.g. skin, fat, and meat). Guild leatherworkers, for example, fought other guilds for the right to control the trade in bovine skin. See HStA Celle Br. 61a, Amt Bodenteich, nr. 1269, 1584 and HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1300, 1599.
93 See HStA Celle Br. 65, nr. 189, 1697-1698, “Verordnung des Herzogs Georg Wilhelm über den Pferdehandel, insbesondere die vier Hauptmängel an den Pferden als Rotzig, Kollersch, Herzschlägig, Mondblind und wie lange der Verkäufer deshalb das verkaufte Pferd zu wandeln schuldig sein soll.” Unlike the guides published outside of Braunschweig-Lüneburg which make no reference to this type of law, JVVNPC notes that his remedies for rotzig horses are meant for someone to treat their own sick horses because one cannot legally sell horses with glanders around Wolfenbüttel. JVVNPC, Bewährtes...Roß-Arzney-Buch (1716), 134.
94 See HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 5383, 1646, “Juergen Harl zu Eversen gegen Eberhart Paxmann...wegen eines ihm verkauften rotzkranken Pferde.”
interest in or knowledge about equine husbandry. In addition to the fair and careful rotation of pasturing schedules between livestock species, horse-owning farmers were also socially and legally responsible for insuring that horses’ fodder was stored correctly and did not become contaminated.\textsuperscript{95} Looking at the case of Peter Bautsche von Dörmbte in 1624, we can get a closer idea of the social impact of proper equine maintenance.

\textit{Peter Bautsche von Dörmbte, Master of Social Indifference}

According to archival records, Peter Bautsche was a farmer that was actively involved in horse-trading, which business took him on several yearly circuits between Celle and Dörmbte, a village located in the jurisdictional area around Bodenteich and which lay close to the jurisdictional boundaries of Medingen. He used both oxen and horses in the fields, and he stabled his draft livestock in the communal pastures at home and along his horse-trading routes. The problems for Bautsche began in March 1624, when the village of Dörmbte accused his horses and cattle of being “schorbende,” which was a contagious and potentially lethal oral infection.\textsuperscript{96} Specifically, Peter Bautsche was accused of having brought a \textit{schorbende} horse into the village of Dörmbte and thus having infected other horses with his sick ones. In their complaint, the villagers present a very straightforward and powerful account of how easily agrarian life could be disrupted through the illness of livestock, and of how easily one farmer’s lack of attention to veterinary issues could ripple through agrarian communities:

We are greatly burdened by our neighbor Peter Bautsche. Through the sale of a schorbende horse, he has brought a (terrible) (disaster) and plague on our horses. Several have already died, and several more have been infected…The misfortune tears apart everything, and the damage therefore continues to grow larger.”\textsuperscript{97}

Taking their concerns seriously, Wilhelm von der Wense, the official charged with

\textsuperscript{95} Interestingly enough in light of the witch trials taking place during this time, contaminated fodder does not seem to be a major issue between species (e.g. cross-contamination via straw of both horses and oxen) or within tax petitions and disputes involving horse pastures.
\textsuperscript{96} See HStA Celle Br. 61a, Amt Bodenteich, nr. 1343, 17. March 1624. The petition was filed under the collective name of “Leute zu dormpte.”
\textsuperscript{97} “Über unsern nachpaurn Peter Bautschen [unl]ß hochlich beschwert, wie Nemblich derselbe, durch ein gekauftes scherbichtes Pferde, Leider ein Abscheu_lich unheil und pläge unter unsere pferde gebracht dadurch albereits ezliche Umbgekommen, Ezliche aber damit annoch vorgifftet sein, das sie es sch(w)enlich überbringen werden unnd ist zubesorgen wo Ime nicht furgeburet wirtt, das ungluck uber alle werde einreißenn, unnd der Schade desto großer sein.” HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1343, Amt Bodenteich, 17. March 1624.
overseeing Bodenteich, investigated the claims against Bautsche by interviewing all of the villagers whose livestock had become ill after being exposed to Bautsche’s animals. Although the villages’ oxen were also afflicted and some had even died, state officials in Bodenteich and Celle primarily focused their attention on the issue of dead horses. By his report on the 26th of November in the same year, Wense had found three farmers that had a strong case against Bautsche: Lutke Lutkens and Jochimb Schultzen of Amt Bodenteich and Christoff Harmens of Amt Medingen. Lutkens’ horse was valued at eight thalers and had therefore probably been quite old. Both Schultzen’s and Harmen’s horses however were valued around the average price of a farm horse at the time, which meant that they had had the right to expect several more years from their equine investments. In fact, both Schultzen and Harmens requested “schadegelt,” additional money as compensation for the lives of their horses, which they were granted. Due to Bautsche’s intent to continue selling and pasturing horses across the heaths of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, Wense concluded his report by (re-)ordering Bautsche’s compliance in person. Bautsche was instructed to travel immediately to Bodenteich in order to pick up the legal judgment in his case, which he must then deliver to the head court in Celle along with his surviving oxen and their fodder. Bautsche’s lack of social responsibility and his disregard for the resources essential for others’ survival and livelihoods utterly confounded state officials and villagers. Not only does he refuse to admit that his livestock and their fodder have infected other animals, Bautsche dismisses the validity of the petitioners’ concerns. In his petition from the 30th of October for example, Bautsche objected to paying anything to his neighbors in compensation on the grounds that their horses were old nags, which had been driven into the ground and which were already weak as a result of malnourishment. Without a trace of irony, he continued on to

---

98 This is also true of state officials’ investigations into other areas affected by Bautsche. Wense and the officials in Celle remained primarily focused on his horse-trading practices, even though the contagion could be spread between species.

99 In the letter dated 26. November 1624, Christoff is identified as Hans Harmens.

100 Judging from a quick survey of Celle Br. 61a claims by farmers, the average cost of a farmhorse at the time would have been in the mid-twenties. Harmens’ horse had cost him twenty-seven thalers and Schultzen twenty-six thalers.

101 Unusually for the time period, state officials in this case emphasized the need to include fines that reflected the senseless, personal damage done to Schultzen and Harmen. Both men were awarded four thalers each in damages (Schadegelt).

102 The idea was that the fodder and the oxen could be checked to see if they were contaminated. Bautsche’s argument against his guilt was that it was not his animals or fodder, but if it had to be one then he must have bought some bad fodder off someone. The officials therefore were determining the cause of infection.

103 “Da doch der beiden Kerll ihrer pferde, alte kümmeliche pferde gewesen, die ganz abgetrieben, und woran mangel des foders und korns vorschwachet sein.” HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1343, 30. October 1624. In the villagers’
complain that no one was concerned about how these fines impacted Bautsche’s ability to farm. In particular, he was incensed that three of his best oxen were taken as collateral to make sure he would pay the damages that he owed and, since he had obstinately been refusing to pay his neighbors, he had been without them since July.\textsuperscript{104} Harmens and Schultzen, of course, had been without their equine plow teams since March.

Throughout his narrative, Bautsche appears entirely unmoved by the fact that his actions have had serious consequences for other farmers in his local community as well as for other farmers along his trading route.\textsuperscript{105} Bautsche’s flippancy towards communal resources and towards the health of livestock in general contrasts deeply with the villagers’ social expectations, particularly the responsibilities of Bautsche’s agrarian trade identity. In the March petition, the villagers are astounded: “that a neighbor should inflict upon others such misfortune, where there already had been enough, and he could bring such on others so easily.”\textsuperscript{106} To them, he was both “our neighbor” and a member of a local, cooperative agricultural social system. In contrast, Bautsche’s personal identity as a farmer is centered solely around his own economic activities. Underscoring the selfish origin of his legal position, Bautsche does identify himself as an inhabitant and member of Dörmbte, but when it served his own specific, temporary goals. For instance, Bautsche complains about Wense’s involvement in the case on the basis that Dörmbte lay within Medingen’s jurisdictional area and thus that Wense was not legally able to oversee the complaint. In this way, Bautsche hoped to invalidate Wense’s seizure of his cattle and therefore to avoid paying any fines to his neighbors or to the court in Bodenteich.\textsuperscript{107}

In the case of Peter Bautsche, one sees that a single farmer’s ignorance or indifference to the lives of other farmers’ horses could impact an entire village, including how successful other community members might be with animal husbandry as well as with harvesting and other


\textsuperscript{105} For example in his petition on the 30\textsuperscript{th} of October, he continually refers to Harmen and Schultzen as “Kerl” and does not use their names at any point.

\textsuperscript{106} “Unwillig und unrecht, das ein Nachbaur dem Andere solch ungluck soll zufugen, da es gnug an dem seinigenn were gewesen, und er solches von Andern leichtlich vorhutten kommen” HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1343, 17. March 1624.

\textsuperscript{107} His signature as “Peter Bautsche von Dörmbte in Amt Medingen” on the 30\textsuperscript{th} of October letter notwithstanding, officials were quickly able to determine that Dörmbte was in Bodenteich’s jurisdiction. See HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1343, 6. November 1624.
agricultural practices. This highlights then the importance of maintaining good preventative care of equine and animal husbandry as well as keeping up to—and agreeing with—local social, veterinary, and agricultural standards. A farmer that knowingly provided another person—or someone else’s horse—with contaminated fodder was held legally responsible for the veterinary treatment or the value of each horse he had endangered.\textsuperscript{108} It was similarly the agrarian head of household’s legal and social obligation to identify, quarantine, refrain from selling or breeding, and ultimately dispose of horses with infectious diseases.\textsuperscript{109} Access to the public pasture was a fundamental collective right, but individuals who abused that right and violated the trust of their neighbors could still find their pasture access revoked, particularly when individuals disregarded rules meant to keep other farmers’ livestock safe.\textsuperscript{110}

**Conclusions about Training Needed for Equine and Animal Husbandry**

Although it seems an obvious conclusion, it is important to remember that farmers equally earned the title of specialist in animal science and medicine, just as much as military veterinary smiths, guild-educated animal doctors, university-educated state officials, and Enlightenment-sponsoring noblemen. Even though they lacked a political voice and institutional training, farmers trained through an informal apprenticeship in particular agrarian trade skill sets, some of which included equine husbandry, but all of which included bovine and general animal husbandry. As this section has detailed, there was quite a lot of species-specific knowledge and practical experience that a farmer had to have in order to be successful. While this argument may seem to be inconsequential at first, it is important to note that farmers had learned the economies of agriculture and had been gambling on horses for several decades by the time of the Thirty Years War. Farmers obviously put a lot of thought into their business and certainly into the best odds for their own survival. Their trade motivations were not characterized by centuries of indifference or by a lack of innovation, but were guided instead by dealing with harsh economic and social realities.

\textsuperscript{108} See HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1343, Amt Bodenteich, 27. Oktober 1624. Bautsche’s fodder is also considered a possible culprit for infecting the villages’ livestock by both the villagers as well as the officials overseeing the case, as is seen by Wense’s order for Bautsche to bring the fodder along for inspection in Celle.

\textsuperscript{109} Guild butchers were official representatives of the state when it came to diagnostic cattle plague verdicts. Butchers got involved rather often on the daily level since they were frequently called to kill the sick animal and to give a professional opinion on what the interior of the animal’s body indicated about its probable former health.

\textsuperscript{110} Cattle plague ordinances and farm guides both emphasized the spread of contagion through common pastures as a serious concern.
This point is therefore highly significant when placed in the context of seventeenth and eighteenth century agriculture because it gives a better sense of the economic realities of equine husbandry and the variable nature of economic choices in agrarian life. By considering the daily implementation and practice of equine husbandry, one begins to ask different questions about early modern agriculture. If farmers had to be educated in a wide range of additional skill sets and knowledge in order to attempt equine husbandry, then why did they bother in the first place? If good horses were hard to locate, required extra resources and space, were prone to getting ill, and were terribly expensive in terms of purchase fee and resultant tax increases, it seems a wonder that farmers devoted so many of their limited resources to horses for so long and with so little guarantee of long-term success. In prescriptive housefather and horse breeding guides intended for elite audiences, it was a common observation that despite their financial resources, abundance of pasture, and the availability of servants, noblemen were rarely successful in maintaining stables or a horse-stud for long.111 For these authors, it was understood that farmers’ shot at success with equine husbandry was even more limited, due to their lack of finances, space, and labor.112 Yet is it true that early modern farms lacked the labor? Given that an eight year old suburban girl today could carry fifty pound feedbags, both saddle and bridle a horse, drive a wheelbarrow of manure across several acres, and handle four-foot hay bales, an eight year old farm girl could surely have done the same in the seventeenth century.113 In addition to her other household chores, she already likely would have been grooming oxen, cleaning stalls, lugging milk pails, herding intractable cows and calves, refilling and carrying water buckets, and feeding the bull.114

Was it truly a lack of available labor, or was it really a lack of the type of people that agrarian patriarchs wanted to be able to do that labor? Using the example of Amt Gifhorn in the 1680s, the number of village households involved in equine husbandry distinctly increased since

111 See Fugger, 5. This failure was attributed to their lack of hippological knowledge, which the guides were more than happy to provide to the would-be successful horse breeder. Other authors like Pinter and von Hohberg also attributed it to a lack of discipline and a lack of attention to details—both masculine trade attributes of a good housefather.
112 Although at opposing ends of the spectrum in terms of authorship and audience, Fugger, the Vieh-büchlein, and Das Edles Land-Leben are all in agreement on this point.
113 I was seven when I worked on a horse farm and was required to do these tasks along with a number of others. On women and cattle in early modern England, see Curth, 64.
114 Prescriptive farm guides can offer mixed perspective on who did bovine husbandry, since the chores would understandably be different if one only bothered with bovine husbandry versus one that did both bovine and equine husbandry.
1625, while the number and size of households in each village had largely remained constant.115 New people within the same town—and possibly more people within the same household—were clearly getting involved in the risky business of equine husbandry. If before the Thirty Years War there was not already an influx of servants within households and if at a minimum boys and men were already recognized as being involved with equine husbandry, that means either that girls and women were working with equine husbandry before the Thirty Years War in at least the same amount as they were by the end of the seventeenth century or that girls and women began to help out with their families’ equine husbandry during or following Reconstruction. One would therefore expect to find historical evidence of the many girls and women being assigned horse-based chores, particularly in light of how many unskilled tasks children could do in this regard. Yet there is little evidence of women being permitted to be engaged in equine husbandry either in public media forms like farmers almanacs or in varieties of self-expressive material culture like wedding art and ceramic tiles, both of which became ever more popular media in agrarian culture over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.116 If the topics of labor distribution and of household training in equine husbandry comes up at all in prescriptive horse breeding, farm guides and almanacs, print-based literature about equine husbandry—along with household art and the illustrations in broadsheets, emblems, and animal books—did not advocate or mention women performing equine-related labor.

This is not to say that women were not involved in equine husbandry, just that labor performed by women in equine husbandry was not socially recognized as trained or skilled labor by the eighteenth century. While the social coding of farming was not particularly an issue for male or female farmers in the sixteenth century, it became important when agrarian populations began to reevaluate their social and economic identities through the roles they played in the

115 According to the tax records for villages in this region of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, the number of servants living in the agrarian households is very low. See Peter Bardehle, Das Erbregister der Vogtei Burgwedel von 1669 (Hildesheim: August Lax, 1986); Jens Kaufmann, Niedersächsische Trauregister Celler Land (Braunschweig: self-published, 1998-2006); Heinrich Porth and Dieter Boe, Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf (Uelzen: Museums-und Heimatverein des Kreises Uelzen, 2005); and, Jürgen Ritter, Niedersächsische Trauregister aus den Kirchenbüchern im Calenberger Land (Hannover: self-published, 1993-2003).

116 Tax petitions are a problematic source with which to study women’s equine trade identities. There are not many petitions raised by women on behalf of their horses and livestock, but that is largely a consequence of other cultural factors. For example, sons and other male relatives may petition on women’s behalf and may be helping out widowed family members behind the scene. Furthermore when widows did petition, they were already members of local society and were dictating their request through a scribe, who could have transcribed the oral account into a narrative that he thought would be most beneficial and that consequently presented the farmer’s widow as unskilled and unable to survive on her own.
reconstruction of agriculture following the Thirty Year War. For this reason women did not
develop farmer trade identities along with men, since women’s gender increasingly prevented
them from ever possessing the training and social recognition necessary to be one. Furthermore
even if male farmers tried to make the realities of agricultural labor match the newly gendered
social ideals of equine husbandry, it did not mean that they were always successful. The growing
emphasis on equine husbandry as a specifically male trade activity suggests that some men and
women had not always regarded horses as an intrinsically masculine subject of knowledge and
experience. The use of horses as major symbols of agrarian trade identity in agrarian wedding
art and the visual marketing techniques of farmers’ almanacs demonstrates that as the
hippological world became more defined, it became increasingly important to all male members
of the growing hippological sphere to gender equine work as masculine work.

This brings us back to the labor-force question and underlying patriarchal idealism of
early modern agriculture. Was the lack of labor a natural void or was it a lack caused by other
cultural factors, such as a desire for part of the available labor force to do other activities and a
desire to institutionalize exclusionary policies around central social and economic resources?
Within the province of a single farm, housemothers and their daughters were not widely
employed in to performing either subservient or complimentary equine-based work tasks under
the more knowledgeable, head-of-command housefather.117 The next section will look at the
question of how female horses’ bodies become the just and proper province only of men and
male expertise, while at the same time, human women were assigned work in bovine husbandry
based on men’s assumptions about physical abilities that linked females across species
boundaries.

Equine Physicality and Gendered Agricultural Labor, 1630s-1735

What made mares highly desirable as vital resources and as masculine cultural capital for
some male owners, while for other early modern men, mares’ femaleness rendered them largely
useless outside of reproduction? The traditional narrative, which does not consider the
intersections of gender, class, and culture in historical sources and context, of the role that horses

117 These jobs could include working as a groom, who was in charge of foddering, cleaning and grooming the horse
and keeping care of tack.
played in early modern society argues that all of early modern society treated intact male horses as communicators and receivers of human virtues to their human operators. While this perspective is generally based on what early modern male elites claimed about themselves and attributed to the lower classes, this perspective omits a substantial portion of the early modern populace—both elite and lower class females as well as the vast majority of the population that were the agrarian lower classes—thereby missing a vital source of data regarding early modern life. This oversight is significant for the study of early modern society because it overlooks the key roles played by gender and class in daily life for early modern farmers and elites as well as for the early modern economy and development of political power in Braunschweig-Lüneburg over the eighteenth century.

Just as is true of modern society, the impact of human sex and gender should not be divorced from daily economic practices and personal experiences in early modern Germany. Similarly, early modern life cannot be fully understood without a proper appreciation of the ways in which the operations of non-human sex and gender have influenced the development of fundamental economic tools, productions, and resources. Using methodology common to both animal studies and environmental history, wherein humans are recognized to be part of—rather than separate from—the non-human world, one opens up additional research sources in areas of interest to both gender history and the history of daily life. Reevaluating the role of human-animal relationships within human social environments and economic networks can offer a deeper understanding of how culture influences political policies and social practices. In this way, human beliefs about gender were grounded in and revealed by cross-species physicality. When one looks at the situation for early modern humans’ relationships with geldings and mares, it turns out that the virtues transferred from equine to human bodies really


119 Dorothee Wierling gets into this point in her discussion of the importance of gender—including how it changes over time—when one looks at the division of work in the household. Dorothee Wierling, “The History of Everyday Life and Gender Relations on Historical and Historiographical Relationships,” in *Alltagsgeschichte: Zur Rekonstruktion Historischer Erfahrungen und Lebensweisen*, ed. Alf Lüdtke, (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1989) 149-168.

depended on the situation and context. The medieval church for example had long connected religious piety and humility to monks riding geldings.\textsuperscript{121} We have already seen in Chapter Two Thiem\'s derision of Spanish noblemen that geld stallions by crushing the testicles such that the men appear as if they are commanding the brute force and noble, free spirit of a stallion even though their mount is in truth a gelding. In the previous chapter, large-smiths and veterinary practitioners were generally unconcerned with the sex of the horse, since it was the species of animal that mattered more for their own masculine and trade identities. Finally, in this chapter, we have been looking at the combination of species and female sex through which farmers valued their own work and created agrarian trade identities.

As was argued in Chapter Two, authors\textquotesingle socio-economic and gender identities strongly influenced their perspectives about horse breeding by both elites and average farmers. Comparing these men\textquotesingle theories on sex-based agricultural hierarchies, there is a consistent trend to locate those hierarchies in the natural functions of female bodies and in the naturalized sphere of feminine labor. Elite theories in prescriptive guides about the physical basis of sex-based economic hierarchies can be summarized from Chapter Two as comprising several major themes: lower class women and farm mares were sturdy workers but served little purpose economically by themselves; noble women and elite mares were generally unfit for purposes outside of reproduction; all women and all mares served their most important economic function through reproduction of their species; lower class men were sturdy workers and served some purpose economically as individuals; and female bodies of any class were categorically inferior to male bodies of every class. As we will discuss, the agrarian male perspective was similar, but maintained its own preferred ordering, valuing, and construction of social virtues and economic abilities.\textsuperscript{122} Part Three will look at the contradictions in human ideas about the innate qualities of human-animal sexes, particularly in light of both historical and modern female gendering as the physically weaker sex. This next subsection discusses the process of exclusion on the day-to-day level, through which women\textquotesingle experiences with horses were restricted and men\textquotesingle

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{121} It stems from a mix of the denial of the monk\textquotesingle hereditary right as a nobleman to ride stallions in battle with the humility demonstrated by Jesus when he entered Jerusalem on Palm Sunday riding a mule rather than a showy horse. For more on religious aspects of horse-riding, see Ann Hyland, \textit{The Horse in the Middle Ages} (Stroud: Sutton, 1999).
\item \textsuperscript{122} The unskilled or boorish (male) urban citizen comes up often in the \textit{Edles Landleben}, which uses this agrarian-created stereotype to champion the virile spirit and abilities of male farmers.
\end{itemize}
experiences were expected to flourish.  

Animal Husbandry and the Visual Culture of Gendered Agrarian Labor

Animal husbandry in Braunschweig-Lüneburg prior to the mid-seventeenth century had been comprised of a sexual division of labor and agrarian skill sets, yet as discussed above it took on a new character in the late seventeenth century wherein farming became recognized as a distinct trade, a trade that valued equine husbandry, and a trade only practicable by men. As a by-product of this development, hippological knowledge and equine husbandry became restricted in practice to male social and economic networks. If equine husbandry became masculinized over the early modern period, how was a male farmer’s working relationship with horses gendered? At least partially, this was done through the artificial, targeted exclusion of women from equine husbandry and the recasting of agricultural labor performed by women as unskilled work rather than as trained trade-related work.

Relying on the visual evidence in early modern prescriptive guides, we can see that women worked nearby horse-driven wagons, such as when loading them up for market, but were not directed to hold the horses, harness them, or drive the wagons themselves. At times farm women did ride on horseback themselves to market, yet they were expected to balance their goods between the folds of their skirts and legs while seated sidesaddle. Archival records, such as tax petitions, throughout the seventeenth century do not mention women being expected to perform or performing *Herrendienst*. Unlike the work duties involved in harvesting and other agricultural labor required by state taxes, an agrarian widow’s horse-related work duties either fell to a male relative like a son or were excused on the ground of her poverty, meaning her lack

---

123 This is at least the daily level in Europe. Pinter notes as a curiosity that unlike in Europe where horses are tended by boys: Dahero in der Barbarie die besten Pferde den Weibs-Personen anvertrauet werden/ zu deren Wartung sie meistentheils die gefangene Selavin erwehlen/ worzu die Pferde eine sonderliche Liebe tragen/ und such desto lieber ziehen lassen sollen/ welchen sich aber nicht jederzeit an allen Orten/ und in allerley Geschäfften nachthun lässet. Pinter, *Pferde-Schatz*, 42.

124 For example, see von Hohberg, 133. While Marion Gray discusses the text of von Hohberg’s *Georgica Curiosa* and argues that von Hohberg championed housemothers as well as housefathers, I am primarily concerned here with how visual representations supported the equine-centrism of animal husbandry and was used by men for their farming trade identities. Marion Gray, *Productive Men, Reproductive Women: The Agrarian Household and the Emergence of Separate Spheres during the German Enlightenment* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 68-69.

125 Most farm women could not have afforded to own their own sidesaddle and would have had to reposition themselves on top of the horse in order to take that position. Developed for noblewomen in the sixteenth century, the sidesaddle increasingly came to be used over the next two centuries as a cultural tool meant to hamper a woman’s freedom of action and ability to control horses. By the late eighteenth century, the sidesaddle had come to be used to justify denying many women the right to ride on horseback because of the dangers that sidesaddles offered their female riders that the newly men’s-only “regular” saddles did not offer their male riders.
of legitimate trade.\textsuperscript{126} Just as with male farmers, she was forced to loan her horses out for state purposes, but she had less control and no oversight over the potential mishandling of her horses.\textsuperscript{127} Uncoincidentally the institutionalization of these unequal, gendered work conditions over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries made it increasingly difficult for women to be engaged in equine husbandry on a daily basis and limited women’s access to equine resources and knowledge in the long run. Male farmers were certainly never called upon to perform highly inconvenient riding positions or to juggle heavy bundles in their lap.

Discussed above in terms of farmers’ training in preventative healthcare, animal husbandry was integrated into every part of agrarian life in early modern Germany. The demands of reviving animal husbandry during and following the Thirty Years War required complex daily strategies by male farmers, who as legal heads of the house were socially expected to delineate work tasks for the rest of their households or as sons were socially expected to learn household maintenance techniques from their fathers.\textsuperscript{128} In general, farmers had to be concerned with the potential allocation of resources and labor as demanded by the seasonal pattern of work and taxes, the current value of their resources, and their estimated future needs. While these issues were nothing new for agrarian life, it was new for farmers to imagine these views as part of a distinct and socially honorable trade identity. The right to access and learn hippological knowledge in agrarian communities had not been explicitly—or at least not aggressively—gendered prior to the mid-seventeenth century.

A study of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century wedding glass [Figures 4.1-4.5] reveals that men’s agrarian trade identities—if indeed they were professional identities of farming at all rather than a recognition of shared feudal obligations between agrarian peasants—were not heavily invested in equine associations and in fact frequently emphasized bovine husbandry.\textsuperscript{129} The first window [Figure 4.1] is from Switzerland in 1599; however, the image is

\textsuperscript{126} This is in contrast to urban women at the time, who were limited as to the range of trades that they were recognized as performing, but which were still nevertheless recognized as tradeswomen, whereas farm wives were never permitted to perform a trade as (single) individuals.

\textsuperscript{127} In that, she was not allowed to perform some of the labor herself and in that way insure that her horses were not injured in the process. Furthermore, women did not have the same authority to contest the injury as men did since she was not recognized as having an occupation that someone else’s negligence had endangered. She had even less of a voice if she did not have a son whose future profession as a farmer she was safe-guarding by protecting his rightful inheritance. For an example of this situation, see HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 2853, 1664.

\textsuperscript{128} This is also true for a step-father and step-child or an uncle and nephew.

\textsuperscript{129} This trend was true even when the farmers did practice mixed equine-bovine husbandry and were not just limited to bovine ownership.
fairly typical of its genre across Central Europe during this period. This glass does not depict the reality of the married couple but rather their ideal—or their families’ ideal—self-representation as both wealthier and of a higher social status than they are.130 As demonstrated in the detail [Figure 4.2], the male farmer is not only a farmer who is heavily invested in bovine husbandry, but the economic activities here are performed by men, even those like dairy production which was an industry more commonly associated to women’s work in the northern Holy Roman Empire, the Dutch Republic, and England. Incidentally, this could also illustrate how Swiss agrarian masculinities developed which valued female bovine—rather than how the Lower Saxon farmers valued female equine—bodies and a Swiss agrarian trade identity that prized bovine husbandry.

The second painted glass window [Figure 4.3] is also from 1599 and commemorates the marriage of Georg Wilhelm Rhem von Kötz. The message of the glass—in terms of what it intends to say about the newlyweds’ future life together—communicates that the social and economic identities of the new couple should be understandable primarily as a joint work relationship between man and wife. This agricultural identity is based on generalized agrarian ideals about human labor and sociability and is not specifically concerned with livestock or masculinity. As a farm-dance (Bauerntanz), the top scene is a rather traditional, heteronormative depiction of agrarian daily life. Presumably working just as she is shown dancing and celebrating above by her husband’s side, the farm wife is represented as the reciprocal component of her husband’s social identity. Looking at the central depiction of the pair the tools—the rake and the hayfork—that they hold act as agrarian icons communicate that the couple maintain livestock themselves or are involved with animal husbandry. Through these particular agricultural attributes, both the farm wife holding the rake and her husband with the hayfork are symbolized as performing farm work of equal social value. The labor of the male farmer is coded as genderless—or at least as lacking a specific agricultural masculinity linked to horses or other animals. His economic contributions are performed at the same time and in the same location as his wife. In addition, the work and skill level for the agricultural tasks involved in animal husbandry as represented by the trade icons appear to be equal between the partners.

We see from the top portions of the third and fourth windows [Figures 4.4 - 4.7] above
that like Figure 4.1, the glasses showcase the households’ focus on bovine husbandry. Moreover, similar to Figure 4.2, the couple’s idealized social identities are meant to complement each other. Yet the glass illustrations of sexually segregated agricultural labor as an agrarian ideal reveal that complimentary identities are not necessarily equal identities. And this is especially the case when the actual social identities of the couple are categorically unequal. As can be seen from the two upper panels of Figure 4.4, the social and economic identity of farmer, with all the rewards that came from having even the meanest type of political or economic standing, is granted entirely to the Swiss husband. His pride in this reputation is demonstrated by his visual association with bovine husbandry, which is depicted as a central trade activity for male farmers. On the upper left [Figure 4.5], the husband is shown performing agricultural work with a son or male servant. On the upper right, the husband is visually assigned a herd of horned livestock and is thus directly associated with bovine husbandry. By possessing the attribute of a large, vigorous herd of oxen rather than just a team, the farmer is lent an air of improved social stature and wealth. In the idealized world of these glass images, the husband has been well rewarded for his hard work and careful husbandry. Similarly, the fourth window, which was created for a couple from Celle in 1623 [Figure 4.6], also highlights the household’s focus on bovine husbandry. In this glass, the husband leads a herd of oxen, which are numerous and which look healthy and strong. Showing oxen instead of cows (as in Figure 4.2), the glass associates the male farmer with agricultural skill sets that deal with plowing and draft labor rather than dairy production as in the Swiss window.

While these farmers were not necessarily also involved in equine husbandry, this visual evidence does illustrate the cultural development of agrarian bovine anthropomorphism during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. However, by the end of the seventeenth century, male farmers around Braunschweig-Lüneburg increasingly responded to the use of horses as the central anthropomorphic trade symbol in material objects used for self-representation or in printed material for trade knowledge. In this way instead of adopting noble equestrianism or artisanal veterinary skill sets as a masculine or central trade identifier, male farmers favored representations of themselves as men skilled in the practice of agrarian equine skill sets and their farming trade.131 Dating back to the origin of popular almanacs in the

---

131 Bovine husbandry could still have enjoyed a strong cultural influence in farm life, either in the agrarian subclass that never owned horses (Brinksitzer) or even some of those that occasionally used horses but which raised cattle
sixteenth century, horses were the only large animal commonly visually associated to male farmers. Significantly however, this explicit connection of farmers with using horses as a trade symbol did not surface until the mid- to late seventeenth century.

The frontispiece of the *Land und Bauer-Leute Practic* (1650) [Figure 4.8] is one of the earliest depictions in an almanac of the explicit connection between a farmer and equine agricultural labor. Contrary to the visual traditions established in the wedding glass, oxen do not appear in the cover illustrations of farmers’ almanacs—nor, in fact, are they common icons in other subgenres of this popular print medium. Despite the large numbers of cattle kept and used by early modern farmers, the central zoological icon associated with practicing the trade of farming is a horse. In Figure 4.8, the farmer is showing tilling the land, which was just one of several farming activities that could be done with horses but which was more frequently and more traditionally done by oxen. In addition, given the date of the publication, it is unlikely that many farmers had access yet to horses—even those that used to own them and those that would like to buy one. This is clear evidence that as early as 1650, the artists, publishers, and vendors of this very popular subgenre recognized that male farmers responded well to being depicted personally using horses and that these men also responded well to having their trade entirely visually associated with equine husbandry. In this way, a horse’s use as a successful marketing tool over the second half of the seventeenth century played on male farmers’ existing and growing reliance on equine icons in constructing agricultural masculinities.

Reflecting the patriarchal values encouraged by contemporary genres of elite agricultural literature, the cover illustration of Gottfried Wohlraht’s *Sorgfältiger Jahrdiener* [Figure 4.10] emphasizes that a farm couple’s future economic success should be predicated on the division of agricultural tasks through highly idealized gender roles. And just as in the previous almanacs, this frontispiece continues to promote the new belief that the use of horses in agricultural labor is an essential, defining trade icon for male farmers. It is for this reason that the *Jahrdiener* shares a central visual theme with Figure 4.8 and Figure 4.9—in which one sees a man holding the reins of a team of horses in his left hand. Underscoring the meanings inherent to that shared attribute, the horsepower of the man’s team in center background breaks up the ground, while the

---

132 This would have particularly been the case given the year of the publication as horses were in short supply following the Thirty Years War.

manpower of farm men perform other agricultural activities in the fields behind the intended audience’s male avatar. The courtyard itself is full of small farm animals, which together demonstrate the true range of livestock that early modern farming and animal husbandry required and relied upon for daily survival. Yet the horse is the sole animal depicted in the print’s wide array of livestock that is both clearly and distinctly associated to one sex and with a specifically agricultural task.

In the foreground [Figure 4.11] the husband has a pile of farming tools literally at his feet for immediate use. The close connection emphasizes that the knowledge required by farming is comprised of many different, specially trained skills. As the farmwife has no equivalent icons or tools, the pile’s visual tie to her husband also emphasizes that these skills should be taught to and performed only by men. She is not shown performing any distinctly agricultural trade talents or skills, just the generic female-coded ability to spin. Contrary to the more realistic depiction of a woman working in the field in Figure 4.9, the frontispiece frames the wife by the doorway and thus shuts her away from the agricultural labor taking place in the fields. Her husband, on the other hand, is framed by a large shade tree in the background and by the open fields surrounding it in which men and horses toil together.

**Conclusions about the Visual Culture of Agrarian Labor**

As we know, farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg commonly used mares since farmers could breed them yearly and get extra value from mares’ reproductive labors in addition to their draft work. The quality of the labor performed by a mare, however, was not regarded as requiring much skill or intelligence on her part—merely skill on the part of the men training her. This is the result of a misogynistic belief about human gender and sex and men’s ranking in gender hierarchies. The underlying logic of this belief is that men are always the best and most talented humans because women can never be as good or as talented as men. As was shown for certain elite guides in Chapter Two and mirrored in the tasks assigned to women on

---

134 While Fig. 4.9 carries on the sixteenth century visual tradition of showing agrarian women working in the fields, it is not the most frequent depiction of agrarian labor. As already noted, women were generally absent from the picture altogether.

135 Misselhorn discussed this for Celle in his *Manage* but this preference of farmers was not limited to Braunschweig-Lüneburg. It was also recognized outside the region in elite horse breeding guides like Winter’s *Stuterey* and Pinter’s *Pferde-Schatz*. For England, see Ann Hyland, 43.

136 This is true in both elite and popular housefather and horse breeding guides.
farms, female bodies were considered to lack the ability to learn higher quality skills. As the unskilled female sex, mares’ bodies were best suited for draft and heavy, dull work. The bodies of mares—particularly lower class broodmares—were thus characterized as coarse and interchangeable as compared to the bodies of intact male horses, which were routinely characterized as refined and intelligent. Print images of agrarian work commonly depict women as unskilled or generic, yet subservient labor, such as gathering hay with men in the field or loading bushels of crops onto a wagon while men stand around at the horses’ heads.

Throughout elite and popular visual depictions of equine husbandry in action, women were never visually associated with overseeing a major component of completing a task or taking charge of finished jobs. Instead, these images promoted equine husbandry as both a means to define farming as a legitimate, recognizable trade and as a male-only practice. This cultural nullification of women’s trade activities artificially raises the economic value and social status of male farmers by casting women as perpetual assistants and by representing the economic impact of their labor outside their own household to be minimal. These type of depictions present women that were unable to participate in the economic world outside of the farm, yet were likewise prevented from being identified as farmers. They were not permitted to engage in all of the economic or agricultural activities that male farmers are shown performing. Through their inability to drive the wagons, women have no control over how their goods reach the market and they are refused the right to have access—even for the generally female-coded purposes of nursing or feeding—to the most importance economic resource on the farm.

**Equine Homosociality**

For some reason instead of grouping draft livestock together by mass, early modern farmers treated equine bodies as the exception to the healthcare rules established for the bovine

---

137 In terms of requiring higher intelligence and in terms of Reitkunst.
138 As discussed in Chapter Two, even geldings were expected to have slightly more capacities than mares and therefore deserved better treatment and fodder.
139 As noted in Chapter Two, this was similar to how some noble women were considered at the time. In this way, noble Turkish or Spanish mares were considered capable of being pretty and delicate.
140 In the section entitled “Haus-vater,” illustrations depict both these tableau. Von Hohberg, 121 and 127. See the illustration in the section “Ackerbau” for a visual narrative of men being the only people riding horses and harnessing oxen and horse teams. Von Hohberg, 21.
141 I am not suggesting that this is a complete public/private household and work divide. Women still had social standing as wives, but this identity was tied to her husband and their economic situation together rather than on her own trade abilities or politically separate identity.
and other livestock.142 Girls and boys, men and women could all be herders of the smaller geese, sheep, and pigs as well as the significantly larger cows, oxen, and bulls.143 As was common across northern Europe from the sixteenth through the eighteenth century, women and girls were expected to groom the cows and oxen in the stalls and to fodder almost all of the other livestock on the farm.144 They were also expected to haul truculent cows up to their hooves in the morning when the cows didn’t want to be milked, evade loose stool and kicks while they were milking, and lug large pails of milk. This was the type of labor that many early modern men did not want to have to do and that they believed that women and girls were more than able to carry out—in spite of any philosophical ideas they may have had about the inherent physical weaknesses of female bodies. So, if it was not because women lacked finesse or the strength to work around large animals, then why was it so important to male farmers that only men and boys got to groom horses and that only they were permitted to carry the grain and hay into horses’ stalls?145

It was not just because agrarian equine-related spaces like horse stalls and stables were becoming associated with male farmers’ labor, but also because access to both equine knowledge and horses’ bodies was simultaneously becoming reimagined for all early modern women as unseemly and improper for their gender.146 Just as the public freedoms of elite and urban women were limited by the rise of the sidesaddle and their sudden exclusion from participation in mounted sports that they had enjoyed for centuries, agrarian women of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were culturally forced out of agrarian activities associated with the daily practice of equine husbandry. As horses became more visible in everyday life for all of early modern society, they became viable for use in the creation of new homosocial cultures and thus viable for use as cultural capital within single-sex economic and social networks. These cultures

142 Since each of these animals weighed over a thousand pounds, this could have been a logical categorization, such as is done today with motorized vehicles in terms of tax deductions, driving licenses, and toll roads.
143 The archival record at the HStA Hannover is full of these references. However, I have been unable to locate either in tax or in other records more than a few examples of women or girls herding horses, whereas I have seen a number of male examples. Schmidt’s dissertation does not make any mention of female horse herders in nineteenth century Braunschweig-Lüneburg.
144 This included bulls, whose ferocity was publically recognized at the time through bull-baiting just as they are today in bull-fighting.
145 I believe the many women on Olympic equestrian teams in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries combined with numerous German girls’ magazines devoted to the love of horses and riding certainly speaks to the ability of modern German female bodies to work around horses.
146 Zerdick’s dissertation mentions that in sixteenth and seventeenth century farm houses, boys slept over horse stalls and near tools while girls slept near the laundry room. Peter Zerdick, Zweiständerbauten im Landkreis Celle. Eine baugeschichtliche Untersuchung der von 1600 bis 1800 entwickelten Gefüge-, Raum-, und Sozialfunktionen sowie Formen der Umnutzung (PhD diss., Leibnitz Universität in Hannover, 1991), 58.
did not have to be limited or categorized by hippological focus, but the ones involved in horse breeding and in equine healthcare were. As argued in Chapter Two, prescriptive and elite hippological cultures developed through print and through equestrian schools, such as those by Grisone and Misselhorn. For the horse doctors, large-smiths, and hoof-smiths of Chapter Three, their hippological focus was mastery of equine bodies through their practice of veterinary skill sets and techniques while the culture developing around this mastery became ever more urban-focused and hierarchical. For farmers, hippological knowledge in the form of equine husbandry and draft labor provided an ideal network for creating homosocial relationships among local male agricultural communities.

This scene [Figure 4.13] from von Hohberg’s *Georgica Curiosa* (1682) depicts an ideal agrarian world in which women are notably absent.148 As several other illustrations in this book do include depictions of women working tirelessly to load up wagons and to harvest crops, this illustration stands apart from them, not the least of which because there is no such equivalent image of a woman’s ideal landscape. The text explicitly links the illustration to the healthcare suggestions by referencing the need for one to keep horses clean in the summer heat, yet there is clearly much more being communicated by this illustration.149 Looking at Figure 4.14, the bottom right section of the full image, there are two horses but six men in the swimming party. Of those men, only one man is actually looking after the horses. It also just so happens that a number of activities that agrarian men already enjoyed—and from which agrarian women were already largely shut out—are conveniently occurring all around these allegedly hard-working men. There are two men in a boat hunting birds with a rifle and then there are the men who are fishing together. Framing these leisure activities on the left are two men, who act to underscore male farmers’ trade identity with horses—one under the guise of equine husbandry (bottom left) and the other transporting farm goods and *Wagendienst* (upper left).

Compared with other images that represent horses being taken to water in order to rinse

---

147 Grisone here represents the international equestrian culture of noblemen in the sixteenth century, whereas Misselhorn represents the character of noble riding schools in Celle and the Holy Roman Empire by the late seventeenth century.


149 “Die Fullen in her Hitz früh aus und zeitlich vor der Hitz eintreiben/ den Pferden fleissig Saltz geben/ und wann ein heisser Tag ist/ die Pferde tief in die Schwemme reiten.” von Hohberg, 125.
them off, there is another common factor enforcing the cultural reading of equine husbandry and hippology as masculine pursuits. The men are also all naked. Male nudity and sexuality also acted as a means of women’s exclusion from equine workspaces, particularly when workspace was expanded to include anywhere that the horse was present such as when bathing. Nudity or the possibility of it also could serve as a means of exclusion by preventing women’s choice in work tasks and by keeping women from enjoying certain public behaviors. Prohibitions against public female nudity prevented women from sharing in the health benefits that were granted to men and horses. Furthermore swimming horses was depicted as a tactic that a smart man would know to do in order to cool the horses off and protect them from colic and founder. While that may have been true, baths at the time were also advocated for both human sexes’ health. Human women and girls had to sweat out in the stable and fields with the men as well as finish household chores in the hot kitchen. Instead of families washing their horses together or trading the chance to go horse swimming between single sex groups of men and women, it became a task that specifically boys and men were able to do. Moreover, women, as the socially unequal—even if complimentary—work partners of men, were categorically excluded from enjoying this work.

As the spaces and places surrounding horses’ bodies became associated to men, they also were explicitly imagined as heteronormative extensions of human social morals. For example, no matter where the offense took place and no matter the sex of his partner, a man that practiced bestiality with a horse was always in the wrong. There are only a handful of records between 1550-1750 that deal with bestiality in this region; and of those three, the accused were male and

150 Philip Wouwerman’s *Flußlandschaft mit Pferdeschwemme* (mid-seventeenth century), in which Dutch farmers swim with their horses, also shows the men naked, which is a generally uncommon presentation of men in non-classical paintings at the time. This depiction leads me to suspect that this was a rather common practice in daily life.

151 Winter among others advocated swimming as a good form of exercise.

152 One of the earlier mentions of bathing for humans was in a 1659 farmers’ almanac.


154 The social morals of patriarchy: if men should only have sex with women and women were not allowed in the barn, then there would be no sex happening in the barn unless a man snuck his girlfriend or wife inside. As modern animal behavior studies have found however, horses along with many other (farm) animals engage in regular homosexual activities. Relatedly, horse breeding guides did bring up the issue about incest and were very creative in justifying inbreeding for non-human animals. The authors grappled with the issue in a way that they did not when it came to the frequent efforts of geldings and stallions to mount each other.
their punishment was always severe.\textsuperscript{155} In the first case from Amt Wolfenbüttel in 1636, a young man from Blickenstett carnally mingled with a wild horse in the pasture.\textsuperscript{156} He had been out one night drinking with his friends near the pasture, and it apparently seemed like a good idea at the time. Despite it not being a premeditated act, the punishment was beheading.\textsuperscript{157} In Hildesheim, a secret act of bestiality by Bartold Miehen caused his blood relative to report him into the authorities and led to a manhunt. One night in June of 1722, Hanß Langkopff, a servant to the Juncker of Garmßen, woke up in the stable to find Miehen standing on a pile of excrement and physically mingled with the Juncker’s stallion.\textsuperscript{158} Miehen’s initial reaction to Langkopff’s horrified cries for Miehen to think about what he was doing was to ask him not to say anything about it. But Langkopff’s desire to help a blood relative was trumped by a stronger desire to be spiritually rewarded in heaven. Hearing that, Miehen ran away. Although he hid for several weeks, the authorities sent a description of him to all nearby districts and eventually caught him.\textsuperscript{159}

\textit{Practices and Social Expectations of Equine Husbandry in the Hannover Archive}

It is difficult to find much material like these bestiality reports or ego documents, which allow a direct glimpse of farmers’ experiences and their actual work practices. However, I have gathered a survey of general habits and concerns of male farmers from HStA Celle Br. 61a, which is the central folder for dealing with conflicts between villages around Celle and which deals with all sorts of events in agrarian life.\textsuperscript{160} Since it is a very large folder, I selected an initial

\textsuperscript{155} There are not many afterwards and I saw none before this time period. The third case is StA Wolfenbüttel, Justizkanzlei, nr. 805, 1730, “Heinemann, Johann Jost, Pferdeknecht zu Varrigsen (Amt Greene).” Heinemann, who like Miehen was exposed by the testimony of an eyewitness, was executed.

\textsuperscript{156} Each time it was the same phrase, “fleischlich vermisschet.” StA, 8 Alt Wolfenb. nr. 1206, 1636. The young man was apparently eighteen or nineteen and is cited as both a \textit{Junge} and \textit{Geselle}. The wild horse could have been of either sex, although it is more likely that the horse was a mare given the habits of farmers in this area catching wild mares as a free way to expand their herds.


\textsuperscript{158} HStA Hild. Br. 2, nr. 777, 1722. Unlike the other cases, Bartold was thirty-seven years old. He was also unmarried, only having a brother Cord Miehen to inherit his belongings and his land obligations.

\textsuperscript{159} Amt [St]euerwald, Amt Peine, Amt Marienburg, Amt Lichtenburg, and Amt Steinbrück. The last document in the file from the 13th of August 1722 suggests that Miehen has died, but no other specifics are given. According to a document from the 31th of July 1722, the stallion appears to have been executed by an skinner (\textit{Abdecker}) and then buried deep underground.

\textsuperscript{160} The HSTA’s folder on Celle’s “Städtasachen” (1302-1818) covers “Amtsbedienstete, Bausachen, Deichsachen, Handelssachen, Hochzeitssachen, Höfesachen, Jahrmärkte, Kontributionen, Kornzehnt, Landgericht, Mühlensachen, Privilegien, Prozesse, Schatzregister, Schulsachen, Viehsachen, Zehntsachen, Zollsachen.”
pool of about two hundred files from about eight main districts: Amts Bergen, Bissendorf, Bleckede, Bodenteich, Bütlingen, Burgdorf, Ebstorf, and Gifhorn. The districts were chosen to best represent the agricultural regions of the northern and southern heaths as well as a general proximity to the development of the Celle-centered stud system after 1735. While I did not select specifically for sources in areas of large equine usage, I did narrow the focus of my study on districts that had numerous petitions involving horses. Since I knew that, in addition to equine husbandry, animal healthcare was a major concern for farmers, I also surveyed several eighteenth century folders that dealt with topics in which one might expect details about preventative and curative veterinary practices—those that dealt with livestock plague. Finally, I looked at folders dealing with horse trading and horse breeding in hopes of getting at the nature of the relationship between farmers and horses. In particular, I examined the Hannoverian stud’s foundational documents in order to get a better perspective of the working relationship between Braunschweig-Lüneburg dukes, their state officials, and horse breeding farmers.

As one might expect, there is a great deal of evidence that early modern men used horses to perform agricultural duties for local officials and ducal lords as well as for their own needs. Petitions about stolen horses and horses injured by other farmers in Herrendienst or by marauding soldiers, however, reveal interesting aspects about horses in daily farm life. For example, some men would do anything in their desperation to track down a stolen horse. Tonnies Stelter zu Vellingen’s case against paying his livestock taxes in 1613 was based on having two of his cattle die, a horse stolen out of the common pasture, and a leg disability that he had suffered for eight years. Despite this chronic leg injury, which had already caused him to spend sixteen thalers on medical treatments that year, Stelter tracked the horse-thief across a

---

161 This was ultimately whittled down to fifty files. Other than the folders dealing with Rossdienst (i.e. local lords’ obligations to provide military service and horses to their political superiors), HStA Celle Br. 61a is by far the location of the majority of references to horses in the Hannover archive.
162 Previous and future patterns of horse populations did not appear to be tied to an increase in petitions for the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. For example, the village pastures of Amt Hoya had been a place where nobles kept private studs and herds since the early seventeenth century and became a central area for the Hannoverian stud system in the eighteenth century, but Amt Hoya had relatively few complaints recorded in HStA Celle Br. 61a.
163 These included HStA Hann. 74 Harburg, nr. 1586, 1733-1734; Hann. 74 Medingen, nr. 714, 1732-1786; and, Hann. 74 Münden, nr. 8035, 1707-1717.
164 For example, HStA Hann. 74 Celle, nr. 994, 1682-1763.
165 HStA Hann. 147, Landgestüt Celle, primarily nrs. 1 and 3-4.
166 HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 3298, 1613.
number of villages before finally losing the trail. And if a farmer complained about local officials abusing their positions as tax enforcers by borrowing his horses whenever they felt like it, the farmer had very little political power to do anything about it. Peter Gatze zu Hagen first petitioned in 1611 by describing how Johan Altena the elder, the Vogt zu Bergen extensively and inappropriately borrowed his workhorses. The Vogt denied that Gatze’s horses were used without payment and suggested therefore that Gatze had no problem with having to drive his horses back and forth from Hagen in Amt Bergen to Ulzen, Celle, Hannover, Braunschweig, and Walsrode. Then knowing that Gatze would not be able to complete his tax obligations without his team of horses, the Vogt apparently confiscated them as retaliation against Gatze.

Social commitment to careful equine husbandry was important within agrarian communities and could strengthen one man’s word against another’s. In the case of Hans Lenhardt and Jaspar Engelke aus Bilm from 1650-1654, it came down to several collective lifetimes of experience in equine husbandry. The dispute centered on a mare that Lenhardt alleged was his horse, which had been stolen several years earlier, and that Engelke alleged was his horse, which he had purchased legitimately as a filly from a Swedish captain. In the testimonies of both parties, it is clear that a farmer’s individual reputation was not enough to convince officials of his claim, but the continued support of one’s local community (Dorfschaft) mattered, particularly when it came to determining how one came by one’s horses. More interesting to our purposes is the testimony of the Hans Lenhardt and his brother, who helped him with plowing and who sold him the mare in question. The farmers’ extensively detailed descriptions of her body reveals that there was a special type of agricultural knowledge and experience that came with plowing behind the same horse day in and day out. Moreover, the farmers’ deep level of engagement with the care and use of their horses was not overlooked by state officials either, who expected each witness to describe how many whorls were on his
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167 For context, the horse that Stelter owned had cost him twenty thalers.
168 HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 450, 1611-1612.
169 This is the subject of Gatze’s second petition in 1612. He explicitly was concerned about no longer being able to perform Herrendienst and about wanting his horses back precisely for that reason.
170 I did not find such details in petitions about the theft of cattle, such as the expectation of a farmer knowing individual bovine bodies like the back of his hand. For more on the importance of communal reputation, see David Sabean, Power in the Blood: Popular Culture and Village Discourse in Early Modern Germany (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984) and Susanne Pohl, “Uneasy Peace: The Practice of the Stallung Ritual in Zürich, 1400-1525,” Journal of Early Modern History 7, no. 1-2 (2003): 28-54.
171 HStA Celle Br. 57, nr. 6, 1650-1654.
172 The support for Engelke wavered over the time period as some as his character witnesses—unlike those of the Lenhardts—decided that maybe Engelke was not as honest as they had thought him.
alleged horse and in which places they were located.

As revealed in petitions, the most common skill sets of equine husbandry included driving wagons, plowing one’s own land, and exhibiting intimate knowledge of the individual characteristics of one’s horses. Even if a farmer bought a horse at market, he might have bought a young horse like Engelke, which would have required him to know how to raise and train it properly himself. While these activities were not all daily practices, they were all expected training of farmers invested in equine husbandry. Yet from the narratives of archival records for horses injured during *Herrendienst*, it is obvious that an interest in equine husbandry neither made one good at it nor did an interest indicate that the temperament of the farmer was amenable to working well with horses, which required a very different training approach than bovine livestock. Horses can startle easily and they are quick to react to a perceived danger—frequently by bolting and dragging everything and everyone attached to them along. Even with the support of a local hippological community not all male farmers knew how to drive horses well. Some male farmers did not pay close enough attention to their assigned task and some farmers were careless with other men’s property.

In terms of the significance of equine husbandry to bovine husbandry, the differences were subtle but important. In petitions and tax amelioration requests that mentioned sick or dead oxen along with a similarly afflicted horse, the horse was overwhelmingly the animal that was most emphasized as a loss. Injured or deceased bovine livestock were infrequently mentioned by either officials or the farmer in case summaries and responses. And, horses were generally given more descriptive information as far as the situation that led to its death or illness. This of course was in part due to strategizing on the part of the petitioner (and the scribe), who knew that noblemen had long held a soft spot for horses and thus may actually pay more attention if horses were centrally involved. In this manner, equine husbandry paid off for farmers. However, farmers’ frequent claim that the loss of a horse might lead to a serious loss of income and of their livelihoods was also very much true. Unlike the loss of a cow or of an ox, the loss of a horse

---

173 I know this because I have been the person dragged along.
174 Cows and oxen that were injured or that died were frequently no longer mentioned by either officials or the farmer when it came to recaps and repetitions. Officials also generally gave horses more descriptive information as far as the situation that led to its death or illness.
175 You see this in the case of Peter Bautsche. See HStA Celle Br. 61a, nr. 1343, 1624.
176 Male farmers might have been choosing to rely more on horses since if there was a loss, the taxes—even if higher—might be lessened a bit, plus the noble and local authorities might actually have cared more about helping them since horses more directly benefitted authorities than tax money.
could directly cause the farmer to lose or lower his economic status and social reputation since the farm trade’s tax brackets were arranged based around horse ownership. The potential loss of income (Nahrung) was a very common concern that farmers brought up in petitions.

Also unlike an ox or cow, the loss of a horse could result in the immediate loss of money. The farmer now needed to find the funds to replace the dead or stolen horse. Even if he did get reimbursed or did get his taxes deferred, he was still out all that time that he would have been using the horse. Resulting from the loss of such valuable resource and tool, the farm family may have had to sell some seed crop or other goods in order to get the cash required for buying a horse from a market. Prematurely using or selling off next year’s seed crop could then lead to a future loss in seed, fodder, and market crops. If one could only now afford to replace a horse team with oxen, one may no longer have enough time to plow. Numerous accounts attest to the fact that the much slower oxen made a poor substitute for horses when one had been used to equine draft labor. A farmer’s financial burdens could be further compounded by having lost work time in order to find a suitable and affordable new horse. Since agrarian resources tended to be limited and carefully allocated, the loss of this equine labor could lead to not having enough food and fodder for livestock over the winter. Furthermore, as was the case claimed by a large percentage of tax petitions, the loss of a horse could set off a domino effect, wherein a farmer no longer had enough produce to fulfill his yearly tax obligations. In other cases, the farmer may have used all his resources to take care of taxes this year but which left him without any saved seed crop, meaning that he would be behind next year.

Owning horses was always risky business even in the best of times. Despite one’s best efforts at prevention or the best nursing and veterinary care, horses could easily founder themselves and become crippled or get colic and die. Yet as the statistical figures and tax petitions demonstrate, farmers chose to breed horses, relied on equine labor to pull their wagons and plows. And contrary to what one might expect for early modern men working with the female sex of a species already known for its physical frailty, male farmers in Braunschweig-Lüneburg preferred to associate themselves and their trade activities with horses rather than with cattle, which were the sturdiest, most dependable, most widely useful and practical animals on their farm. This peculiar emphasis of horse over cow or ox as a trade symbol reflects that by the

---

177 Officials did in fact ask whether or not the horse was injured by negligence on the part of the farmer, and they wanted to know if one had tried to treat the animal for its injuries or illness.
end of seventeenth century, horses now had a growing political importance in farmers’ daily lives that they did not have before.

The designs for the Hannoverian state stud system in 1728 and in its implementation over the next several decades depended upon farmers’ personal engagement and investment in equine husbandry for the success of the Celle breeding project. The absolutist rulers of Braunschweig-Lüneburg—notably Georg I and II, both electors of Hannover and kings of England—were heavily invested in farmers’ production of horses. Farmers’ reliance on horse breeding and equine husbandry to construct masculine trade identities meant that such a massive state undertaking as creating an entirely new breed type of horses was not only thinkable, but viable as a long-term method of taxation and as a means of expanding political, military, and dynastic influence over the eighteenth century.

**Conclusion**

What can be said about agrarian trade identities and equine masculinities? From all levels of society, men involved in veterinary medicine, animal husbandry, and horse breeding in Braunschweig-Lüneburg firmly supported the governing political philosophy of a Christian society as a patriarchy that consisted of multiple intersections between gendered economic and social hierarchies. Unsurprisingly, a man’s understanding of what those patriarchal hierarchies were, how they worked (i.e. for society at large, for men in his local community, or for him personally), and why they existed was heavily influenced by his personal experiences and rank in society. During the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, a German farmer’s personal and trade identities frequently adapted semi-religious and prescriptive housefather models of masculinity to reflect the conditions of his daily life. But as the lowest ranking member of early modern society, a farmer had different needs, desires, and concerns than those of other equine tradesmen.

Unlike the exclusionary equestrian masculinities of noblemen or the hierarchical veterinary trade identities of smiths and horse doctors, German farmers developed masculine trade identities that recognized equine husbandry as a central trade symbol as well as a new and renewable source of cultural capital towards the end of the Thirty Years War. As horses were

---

178 The necessity of farmers’ involvement shows up in HStA Hann. 147, nrs. 1 and 3.
important resources and tools necessary not only for individuals’ success but crucial to the long-term survival both of their local communities and of the Braunschweig-Lüneburg economy, farmers leveraged the value of their equine work experience and skill sets within male social and economic networks. Although farmers in the area had already been invested in equine husbandry, the gendering of equine labor became much more explicit after the 1640s during Reconstruction. In practice, farmers’ ideal of equine-centric husbandry developed into a means to impose both a new gender-based interpretation of farming as a trade and a new sexual division of agricultural resources and labor.

In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ducal lords and state officials of Braunschweig-Lüneburg agreed that agrarian orders should reallocate more of their limited economic resources and time towards equine husbandry in order to satisfy the needs and interests of absolutist state politics. Their plans to implement these agricultural and economic changes through the establishment of a state horse breeding program at Celle depended first, on the continued wide-scale practice of mare ownership by farmers and second, on an agrarian cultural shift from farmers using cheap, local stallions (without regard to male hereditary influence) to farmers relying on cyclical visits from noble stallions and paying for the privilege of ennobling farm bloodlines and broodmares by this process. The uncertainty of this situation was in fact a concern that Georg Wilhelm and his officials frequently addressed in their letters while setting up the stud system from its early years up to as late as the 1760s. Farmers truly had a different relationship with horses than did noblemen. Moreover, in the end, it was farmers’ anthropomorphic trade identities and cultural values—not those of elite equestrians or pre-modern veterinarians—that powered the early modern economy.

179 See HStA Hann. 147, no.1 and no. 3 (e.g. 14. Juni 1742). Following the foundation of the Celle breeding project, Oberjägermeister Brown for example often represented the political and economic interests of the Welf dynasty. He also operated as a scout, asking around in villages and with authorities in Oldenburg in order to figure out how best to coerce the peasants into accepting the stud system without first revolting or in other ways sabotaging the long-term goals of the Celle breeding program.
Chapter Five: Conclusion
Introduction

Histories of daily life—or indeed historical work—need to better integrate categories of cultural analysis to better understand both individual categories of analysis as well as early modern society. Culture is historically dynamic not static, and as such, more attention needs to be paid towards the impact that culture has on all aspects of a person’s life. As this study has shown, changes in agricultural practices caused changes in urban daily life even as urban trade practices affected and influenced agrarian culture. Likewise, practices of daily life both influenced and were influenced by different beliefs about gender and social rank, whether or not that of humans or non-human animals. To take my methodology a step further, one must accept that the animal is already and always of the everyday. The animal is more than Derrida’s non-human or not-myself. The life experiences of the human are so intricately bound with the animality and lives of non-human animals that the human is never fully free.

Each of the four emerging literary genres highlighted in my second chapter operated as an important new avenue through which early modern humans communicated cultural information and personal values. Enduring through the foundation of the Celle stud project and other state institutional projects like university veterinary schools in Göttingen and Hannover in the late eighteenth century, the genres provide a broad yet generally cohesive overview of the varieties and character of hippological knowledge during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Representing an entirely new way to access privileged trade knowledge, these published prescriptive works also testify indirectly to both existing and evolving social and economic structures governing access to equine bodies.

The veterinary guides created by court stable-masters, horse doctors, and hoof-smiths did not change fundamentally in terms of the type of information they provided about large livestock. Regardless of what their work activities involved in daily life (e.g. taking care of cattle), these authors’ expressed their own trade identities through social identification with—largely due to their economic dependence on—court interests, which were entirely focused on producing horses suitable for war or Manage. Yet other factors were at work as well, such as professional disdain towards rival equine tradesmen of similar yet different veterinary skillsets and the gendered nature of their discussion of veterinary treatment. These identities were
constructed on a daily basis through a variety of shifting personal and economic considerations, including one’s desire to re-join a smithing guild and the availability of work at court.

Popular oral and visual sources of information about animal husbandry like farmers’ almanacs, housefather literature, and household art reveal much about the reach of the early modern state and the influence of social inequalities on the development of science and agricultural technology on the daily level. Although commonly overlooked as a historical source, popular print material was both easily accessible and often read aloud. Artistic content like that of frontispieces could be removed and displayed for public benefit as well as private enjoyment. Over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, visual depictions of equine trade identities began to mirror the cultural changes taking place around it in daily life. As the Eligian and guild art in Chapter Three and as the wedding art in Chapter Four illustrated, the self-representation of veterinary practitioners and farmers and those produced in the popular press came to share iconography that established equine husbandry as a masculine agricultural activity. Additionally it reconfigured the medieval visual trope of the working farm couple into a new, more unequal patriarchal vision in which the husband alone has claim to household, tools, and trade identity.

**Equine Husbandry and Trade Identities**

Early modern farmers were not a passive audience nor were they unaware of the power that a little new knowledge could bring to one's crop or household. Seeking advice from farm guides to veterinary recipe collections to housefather guides and horse breeding pamphlets, early modern farmers and urban guild masters were far from fearing economic change or technological innovation, as elite authors and court tradesmen like to claim. On the contrary, farmers, both as a trade identity and as part of a masculine religious (i.e. First Farmer) or social (e.g. housefather) identity generated the most demand for prescriptive genres of veterinary knowledge in early modern society. Eventually evolving equine trade-specific subgenres in order to satisfy some of the public’s demand for veterinary information, almanacs were a major source of scientific and general trade advice for farmers. Through sharing practical information on veterinary remedies and nearby horse markets, the popularity of these works testified to the increasing importance of
equine husbandry within early modern farmers’ daily lives as well as to the dominance of hippological knowledge over that of all other non-human animals. Furthermore, the flurry of ducal veterinary mandates in the late seventeenth century (e.g. plague ordinances and equine lemon laws) was a public and legal recognition of the power that farmers could wield over the early modern economy and society.¹

Despite these trends in the German literary world, the most traditional method of learning a trade as either a horse doctor or a smith with equine veterinary skillsets remained an apprenticeship to a guild-master or, more ideally, an independent master that lived at court. As we saw in Chapter Two, some court-centered authors and equine tradesmen obfuscated the major role that guild-based veterinary smiths and horse doctors played in practicing and producing equine healthcare. Since urban masters of equine smithing trades often had a great deal of practical experience and specialized training in veterinary skillsets, this was in part a professional reaction against the perceived encroachment of local guilds into court masters’ trade privilege and expertise.

As we saw in Chapter Three, there was neither a distinctive nor a progressive rise over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the frequency and number of equine tradesmen that self-identified as veterinary smith or doctor.² For both clients and masters, “hoof-smith” and “large-smith” could be an interchangeable title and skillset. While the trade identity of large-smith indicated that the smith had some type of training with shoeing and possible medically treating horses, hoof-smithing was more commonly an additional trade skillset of a large-smith. To complicate this matter, there certainly were some smithing guilds in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that did declare their independence from other smiths, such as in Braunschweig with the hoof-smiths or in Hannover with the equine-focused large-smiths. Yet, there was no one region in premodern Germany in which this type of trade separation was particularly uniform. The behavior was not restricted to only large towns or even to many towns at all, nor was it characteristic of towns or cities that hosted annual horse sales. Furthermore, there is evidence that large-smith and hoof-smith guilds tended to try to work together towards similar goals instead of disavowing or discrediting the work of competitors. Smiths, who trained

² See a comparison among Appendices A-C.
in large-smith and hoof-smith skillsets, could be members of a wider range of guilds. This fact is particularly significant since it indicates a strong sense of unity between smiths in the area of hippological knowledge and experience. It demonstrates a shared belief in the necessity of community to the success of all equine trades and thus in the continued viability of these trades through increased production and protection of horses.

**Cultural Identities in Early Modern Daily Life**

Daily life is not neat and tidy like the printed word. Bodies and minds will mutate. Similarly, housefather identities in farm guides were not governed by uniform or structured codes of gendered behavior but were instead followed idiosyncratic cultural currents. A composite work, the underlying logic of Thieme’s expansive *Wunderbuch* depended on its reader being an adaptable and intellectually curious tradesman, who wanted a variety of tools and approaches to deal with an uncertain future. Thieme’s espousal of plural masculinities then reflected the layered, heterodox nature not only of Thieme’s source material but also of what human characteristics and behaviors he identified as either masculine or beneficial.

In each chapter, I have examined the cultural force of gender from the angle of a different equine trade relationship. This approach reveals that there are a host of different models and meanings of masculinity for early modern men. There are scientifically oriented masculinities, and there are trade practices that become only performable by men. As they have played out through equine trades, cultural pluralities like masculine co-identities indicate both that studies of the early modern economy and society need to include agriculture and livestock as significant factors and that studies of early modern trades must also include farmers. Furthermore, these pluralities demonstrate that it is not enough to examine the economy through categories of mass grouping, whether by guild (e.g. smithing) trade identity (e.g. horse doctor) or by *Stand* (e.g. farmers). Historians need to integrate the nuances of trade and culture—smiths’ equine skillsets and farmers’ reliance on horses as social capital—in order to fully understand early modern life in either an economic or social sense.

Cultural identities in daily practice intersect each other, producing limitless layers of co-informing meaning. As a form of cultural identity, early modern masculinities were cultural
constructs, which had few if any concrete intellectual boundaries yet which in practice were constrained by a number of social and economic factors. The level of importance and the type of significance that individuals placed on their own or others’ masculinity was continually negotiated through social interactions, which were themselves negotiated by personal experiences and beliefs. While feminist scholarship has shown that masculinity and gender identities are not created in isolation, they are not constructed entirely within the species either. My dissertation has shown that early modern humans’ reliance on animals for survival had a very profound effect on how humans constructed their sense of self and identity. As a number of contemporary theorists in Human-Animal Studies and of early modern gender historians have argued for Europe, early modern humans both could not and did not want to remove nature and animality from their understanding of daily life. As I have demonstrated, it was not generally in the best social or economic interest of equine-focused smiths to ignore or neglect the aspects of their trade that depended on dealing with a living animal. It would have been legally and socially impossible for farmers to abandon their herds and other agricultural obligations and economically suicidal for local and ducal lords to forgive the taxes and Spanndienst of every petitioner.

Looking Forward: Farmers and the Politics of Equine Race

The Hannoverian breed type was imagined as a wholly new category for evaluating horses’ bodies. Through race (Rasse), Georg I and II hoped to institutionalize a scientific process to achieve both physical and mental perfection in horses. Based entirely on the color brown, the logic behind the Hannoverian Rasse was deceptively simple. The breed’s appearance was much more than the result of a noble’s personal or familial preference—the horse’s color was its confirmation. The exact color of a horse’s coat and markings played the primary role in which behavioral qualities were passed on to its offspring. In this way, the hue chestnut brown in particular became intricately bound to Hannoverian Rasse and the dynasty’s political identity.³

This equine race did not spring out of Enlightenment philosophy or science. It originated from a politically motivated rehashing of noble and family traditions crossed with sixteenth century hippological literature. In the Hannoverian case, foundational sires primarily came from high quality Holstein stock, which had been a personal favorite of ducal breeding projects in Braunschweig-Lüneburg since the sixteenth century. Given this strong reliance on the scientific authority of family traditions, it seems quite ironic that elites criticized the horse breeding done by farmers because farmers relied too much on traditional practices. As earlier detailed, prescriptive literature written for elite horse breeders—like that of Fugger in the late sixteenth century or Pinter in the seventeenth century—displayed strong currents of classism in their discourses about horse-breeding efforts by farmers and equine physical ideals. Yet the widespread confirmation problems laid at farmers’ door can best be described as body types that were not suitable for noble and military purposes. Along with the dukes and state officials of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, hippological elites argued that farmers’ reliance on non-elite breeding stock was the root cause of low-quality horses in early modern Germany. Misselhorn’s sensible yet unheeded suggestions concerning selective breeding spoke to some of the many complexities of veterinary reproductive science at court during the late seventeenth century. Written to advise young noblemen at the Braunschweig-Lüneburg riding academy, Misselhorn’s emphasis on breeding horses for practical qualities like dependability and athleticism stands in relief to the emphasis a few decades later on noble-created, phenotypic bloodlines that drove the Hannoverian stud project.

The creation and ultimate success of the eighteenth century’s new concept of human-animal race was closely tied to Enlightenment ideals that espoused the domestication of the natural world. In the case of the Hannoverian breed type, the dukes of Braunschweig-Lüneburg employed horse breeding as a process of domestication and improvement of the local natural world. In this way, equine race became a mechanism of political and agricultural change over the eighteenth century. As official state biological protocol, the Hannoverian Rasse institutionalized social inequalities. Complementing yet contrary to Europeans’ use of domestication to justify imperialist ventures overseas, the Hannoverian innovation that created

---


Both the HStA and the StA Wolfenbüttel contain a number of letters between siblings and extended relatives of the Welfen dynasty requesting this type of horse.
equine race out of a phenotype was the politically motivated domestication of one’s own—rather than a foreign—territory and its subjects. In this, the Hannoverian monarchs of England built upon earlier noble breeding projects for their concept of equine race. They took the seventeenth century noble practice of creating distinctive equine phenotypes, such as Württemberg’s spotted horse, and expanded it. Instead of limiting the scope of their horse breeding program to their own personal properties—as was traditionally the noble practice in German lands, Georg I and II envisioned its range extending to the political borders of Braunschweig-Lüneburg. The Hannoverian then was much more than a horse breed. It became the living symbol of the power of the Hannoverian state and its ruler.
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APPENDIX A: The Grobschmied Guild's Equine-focused Masters and Veterinary Practitioners in Celle, 1618-1766

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Matthias Meye-</td>
<td>Christoffer Tribbe-</td>
<td>[Hans Arckenbarch-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>[Matthias Meye-</td>
<td>[Christoffer Tribbe-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS]</td>
<td>RS]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>[Tonnies Detmer-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RS]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Cordt Telge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>(married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Cordt Telge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>(married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>(married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>(married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Cordt Telge (married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Cordt Telge (married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(HG-S) widow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remarried Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td>Hermen Meine (married Telge's widow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td>Jürgen Johann Schulte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Herman Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Additional Names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer (married)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Hermen Meine</td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Herman Meine [M]</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinrich Drösemeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name and Titles</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Bartolt Gössel</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolt Göstel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Bartelt Gößell]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Amt-Schmied)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Bartolt Göstel</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultze v. Elty</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Hinrich Linderman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Bartolt Göstel</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Hinrich Lindeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Bartolt Gösten</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultze [(HS-m)/Jurgen Schultze jr?]- M</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td>[M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johan Görken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td>Herman Jürgen Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td>Herman Jurgen Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Heinrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td>Herman Jurgen [M]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Name 3</th>
<th>Name 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Bartolt Gösten ['Gosschen?']</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Henrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td>Herman Jurgen Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Bartolt Gösten ['Gosschen?']</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Henrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td>Herman Jurgen Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Bartolt Gösten ['Gosschen?']</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultzen</td>
<td>Henrich Drüsemeyer</td>
<td>Herman Jurgen Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Middle Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Bartold Gössel</td>
<td>[M]</td>
<td>Ernest Schultzen</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Bartold Gössel</td>
<td>[M]</td>
<td>Ernest Schultzen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Bartold Gössel</td>
<td>[M]</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Bartol Gössel</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Barthold Gössel</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Barthold Gössel</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Barthold Gössel</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drosemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Barthold Gössel</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>First Name 1</td>
<td>Second Name 1</td>
<td>First Name 2</td>
<td>Second Name 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Bartoldt Göstell</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Heinrich Drösemeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze [HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer [HS]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Ernst Schulte [HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Ernst Schulte [HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Ernst Schulte [HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Ernst Schulte [HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer [HS]</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Riebau [M-HS]</td>
<td>Ludolf Linneman</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Riebau [M-HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Riebau [M-HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caspar Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Riebau [M-HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Riebau [M-HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Riebau [M-HS]</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caler [M]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Caler [M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer[HS-Schitz?]</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Joachim Riebau</th>
<th>August Meine</th>
<th>Anton Spangenberg</th>
<th>Bartolt Nolte</th>
<th>Johan Ludolff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Anton Spangenberg</td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Anton Spangenberg</td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Anton Spangenberg</td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Anton Spangenberg</td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td>Anton Spangenberg</td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>August Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolt Nolte</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf Heinrich</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Joachim Riebau</td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Schütze</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Schütze</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Peter Jürgen Riebau</td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Schütze</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Peter Jürgen Riebau</td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Schütze</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Schütze</td>
<td>Johan Ludolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name 1</td>
<td>Last Name 2</td>
<td>Last Name 3</td>
<td>Last Name 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jürgen</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jürgen</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jürgen</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jürgen</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Jürgen</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>Gewine</td>
<td>Riebau</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hinrich Gewine</td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td>Drösemeyer</td>
<td>Heinrich Tobias Branß</td>
<td>Rudolf Heinrich Schütze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A (cont.)

1618
1619
1620  Jürgen Wilcken
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Hennig Düßhop- GS Walsrode]
1630  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Hans Wöhler, GS zu Gifhorn]
1631
1632  Henning Wilcken, d.J  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1633  (married)  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1634  Henning Wilcken, d.J  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1635  (married)  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1636  Henning Wilcken, d.J  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1637  (married)  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1638  Henning Wilcken, d.J  [Riepke Sanders- RS]  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
1639  (married)  [Riepke Sanders- RS]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Riepke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS] Jobst Bröckel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS] Jobst Bröckel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS] [Hans Pingeling- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sanders- RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Henning Wilcken, (re-married?)</td>
<td>[Ribke Sander- fstl. RS]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Arnt Ilten</td>
<td>Hennige Wilchken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Arnt Ilten</td>
<td>Hennig Wilken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Arnt Ilten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Arnt [M.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Harbor Meyerken [Harbort Meyerkort (M)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Johann Gößell [(Amt-Schmied-meister)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Meyerken [Harbort Meyerkort (M)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Hinrich Lindeman jr [M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößell [(Am-Schmied-meister)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Heinrich Lindeman jr [M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößell [(Am-Schmied-meister)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heinrich Lindeman jr / Johann Gößel (Am-Schmied-meister)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Heinrich Lindeman jr [M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [HS-M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Heinrich Lindeman jr [M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [HS-M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Heinrich Lindeman jr [M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [HS-M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Heinrich Homburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [HS-M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Heinrich Homburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [HS-M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Heinrich Homburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [HS-M]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M- Celle/Wolfb?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Heinrich Homburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Gößel- [if Johan Goßer then in Blumelage/Celle]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frantz Bütepage [Blumelage/Celle]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle/Wolfb?], Hinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel [HS-M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle/Wolfb?], Heinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle/Wolfb?], Heinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle/Wolfb?], Heinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle/Wolfb?], Heinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel [Jürgen Moltman- GS Hänigsen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle/Wolfb?], Heinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel [Jürgen Moltman- GS Hänigsen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Arend Ilten [M-Celle], Heinrich Hornburg, Johann Gössel [Johann Harbort Meineke- fstl. RA] [Jürgen Moltman- GS Hänigsen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Heinrich Hornburg, Johan Gössel [Jürgen Moltman- GS Hänigsen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Left Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Heinrich Hornburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Heinrich Hombarg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>[Johann Huck- HS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>[Johann Huck]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>[Johann Huck]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Jürgen Ahlfeldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedrich Allfelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Johann Huck]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan Hücke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan [Hugk HS?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>Johan [Z_ ke?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
<td>Johan Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
<td>Johan Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
<td>Johan Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
<td>Johan Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
<td>Johan Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
<td>Johan Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conraht Gössel</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conraht Gössel</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conraht Gössel</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Conraht Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Conraht Gössel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Johan Huck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Warner Jürgen Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Warner Jürgen Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Warner Jürgen Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Warner Jürgen Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Warner Jürgen Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Warner Jürgen Arens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Hennige Frecken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Hennige Frecken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Hennige Frecken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Hennige Frecken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Ernst Christoffer Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hartwig Rubrecht
1652 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1653 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1654 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1655 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1656 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1657 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1658 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1659 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1660 (married)
Hartwig Rubrecht
1661 (married)
Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
1662 Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
1663 Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
1664 Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
1665 Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
1666 Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
1667 Hardtwig Ruprecht [Fstl. RS Celle]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Hartwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Hardtwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Hartwig Ruprecht- RS</td>
<td>RS Celle</td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Person(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>[Barthold Jürgen Stapelberg- PA am Schloß]</td>
<td>Harmen Jürgen Meyne (Hermann Jürgen Meine) (H.J.Meyer?)- GS-m, HS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harmen Jürgen Meyne (Hermann Jürgen Meine) (H.J.Meyer?)- GS-m, HS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>[Aschen- PA]</td>
<td>Harmen Jürgen Meyne (Hermann Jürgen Meine) (H.J.Meyer?)- GS-m, HS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>[Aschen- PA]</td>
<td>Harmen Jürgen Meyne (Hermann Jürgen Meine) (H.J.Meyer?)- GS-m, HS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>[Aschen- PA]</td>
<td>Friedrich Thiele [fstl.RS and PA]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>[Aschen- PA]</td>
<td>Friedrich Thiele [fstl.RS and PA]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>[Aschen- PA]</td>
<td>Friedrich Thiele [fstl.RS and PA]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Harmen Jürgen Meyne (Hermann Jürgen Meine)(H.J.Meyer?)-
GS-m, HS-m
Appendix A (cont.)

1689 [Aschen- PA]

1690 [Aschen- PA]

1691 [Aschen- PA]

1692 [Aschen- PA] [Major Courselon- HS]

1693 [Aschen- PA] [Major Courselon- HS]

1694 [Aschen- PA] [Major Courselon- HS]

1695 [Aschen- PA] [Major Courselon- HS]
Appendix A (cont.)

Harmen Jürgen Meyne (Hermann Jürgen Meine)(H.J.Meyer?)-GS-m, HS-m

1696 [Aschen- PA]
Appendix A (cont.)

1697  [Aschen- PA]  Harmen Jürgen
       Meyne (Hermann
       Jürgen
       Meine)(H.J.Meyer?)-
       GS-m, HS-m

1698  [Aschen- PA]  [Laforge- PA]  Harmen Jürgen
       Meyne (Hermann
       Jürgen
       Meine)(H.J.Meyer?)-
       GS-m, HS-m

1699
1700
1701
1702  Jürgen Friedrich
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]
1710  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]
1711  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]
1712  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]
1713  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]  Heinrich [M- Tsch?]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Heinrich Behrens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Heinrich Behrens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Brand, jr</td>
<td>Heinrich [M- Tsch?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>[M- Tsch?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>[M- Tsch?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
<td>[M- Tsch?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = Meister  
PA = Pferdearzt  
HS = Hufschmied  
RS = Reitschmied (both Fürstlich and otherwise)  
RA = Rossarzt  
Tsch = Tierschneider

In addition to the primary sources from Hauptstaatsarchiv Hann/etc, I am also using: Jens Kaufmann's Stadt Celle- Trauungen der Stadtkirche (1618-1678), Jens Kaufman's Burgvogtei Celle, Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812.

Relatedly, Vogt's Uelzen [Tabelle 7] shows that in 1724, there were 8 GS in Celle, and 9 GS in Uelzen in 1727.
# APPENDIX B: Equine-focused Smiths in Lower Saxony, 1567-1763

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Years</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sources and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>Schöningen/Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Carsten Berger</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 4 Alt 1, Nr. 2911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/ Niedersachsen</td>
<td>[many, see list below]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by Braunschweig guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>[many, see list below]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Kloster Barsinghausen</td>
<td>Johann Braun</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Cal. Or. 100 Barsinghausen, nr. 555, has wife Elisabeth and daughter Dorothee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604-1609</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Hans Pflaumenbaum</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 4 Alt 1 Nr. 2573, GS working at Hof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Bissendorf/Eltze</td>
<td>Henning Trappe</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1652</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Henning Höper</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung, as HS when daughter married in 1652; Celle Br 61a, nr. 4063, GS in 1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Klosters Mariental</td>
<td>Jochen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 11 Alt Mart Nr. 826, he dishonors a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Klötze</td>
<td>Johchim Berndes</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 5590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Gifhorn/Fallersleben/Allenbüttel</td>
<td>Heinrich Palemann</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 4494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1629]</td>
<td>Osterode</td>
<td>(Jonas Spetter)</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Cal. Br. 3, nr. 183, widow is bringing complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Walsrode/Celle</td>
<td>Hennig Düßhop</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B (cont.)

1631  Gifhorn/Celle  Hans Wöhler  GS  Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle; NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married in 1631; Meister and dead vor 1659 when daughter (Ilse?) marries; probably related to 1647 Hann GS Bernd Wöhler, 1658 Gifhorn GS/HS-m Jürgen Wöhler, 1672 BS GS Ditrich Wöhler, 1680 Hann GS Kurt Wehler, and to Ilse Wohlers, a Gifhorn widow who married in 1643 Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels and then who remarried Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645, and then remarries S-m (who afterwards becomes a GS-m) Andreas Öelman in 1666

1632  Hildesheim/Hohenhameln  Christof Meyers  GS  Celle Br. 24, nr. 101

1636-1640  Wolfenb.  Gebhard Gülzow aus Dahlenburg  GS  Wolfenb. 3 Alt Nr. 543, HofGS

1637-1659  Osterode/Harz  Friedrich von Einem zu Eisdorf  GS  Cal. Br. 3, Nr. 776

1637  Hannover  Tile Moller  GS  Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover

1638  Ebstorf  Heinrich Bargmann  GS  Celle Br. 61A, nr. 3491

1639  Bleckede  Hans Böning  GS  Celle Br. 61A, nr. 1158

1639-1644  Wolfenb.  Matthias Hane  GS  Wolfenb. 3 Alt Nr. 543, HofGS


1641  Osterode  [unknown]  GS  Cal. Br. 3, nr. 76, GS's petition at herrschaftliche Eisenfaktorei zu Osterode

1643-1669  Burgwedel  Herman Schmidt  GS  Bardehle's Erbregister der Vogtei Burgwedel von 1669, Kurtzreiser; now/nunc Berend Schmidt”; Celle Br. 61A, nr. 2561 as Hermann Schmiedt in 1643

1644  Hannover  Chrysogen Berndes  GS  Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as “aus Hildesheim”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>Ercke Bödeker</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 541 Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover; probably related to 1631 Gifhorn/Celle GS-m Hans Wöhler, 1658 Gifhorn GS Jürgen Wöhler, 1672 BS GS Ditrich Wöhler, 1680 Hann GS Kurd Wehler, 1730 Fallersleben GS Andreas Wöhler, and to Ilse Wohlers, a Gifhorn widow who married in 1643 Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels and then who remarried Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645, and then remarries S-m (who afterwards becomes a GS-m) Andreas Öelman in 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Bernd Wöhler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Rössing</td>
<td>Didr. Curd</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 5. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Engelnstedt</td>
<td>Christoph Adenstedt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Staatsarchiv Wolf. 2 Alt Findbuch 13115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653-[1670]</td>
<td>Braunschweig/Stift</td>
<td>Eduwalt Schaper</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 50 Neu 3 Stet Zg. 63/2004 Nr. 1078, GS complaint for wages, which is continued by his heirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654-1655</td>
<td>Hildesheim/Hannover</td>
<td>Thomas Hamer</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, as GS in Hildesheim; Neubürger...Hannover, in 1655 now “aus Hildesheim”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Hermannsburg/Bergen/Sülze</td>
<td>Hans Otto</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 4982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Soltau</td>
<td>Claws Isernhagen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657-1680</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Martin Franckenberg</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as “aus Braunschweig” and GS; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, as S in 1658 when marries Sophia Maria Huntemann, still alive in 1680 as RatsS when daughter marries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Gifhorn</td>
<td>Jürgen Wöhler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married as GS in 1658 and probably the Gifhorn HS-m whose daughter married in 1700; probably related to 1631 Gifhorn/Celle GS-m Hans Wöhler, 1647 Hann GS Bernd Wöhler, 1672 BS GS Ditrich Wöhler, 1680 Hann GS Kurd Wehler, 1730 Fallersleben GS Andreas Wöhler, and Ilse Wohlers, a Gifhorn widow who married in 1643 Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels and then who remarried Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Uelzen/Lüneburg</td>
<td>Antonius Stauffen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Bürgerbuch der Stadt Uelzen...1601-1737, he's listed as &quot;aus Lüneburg&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Walkenried/Wolfen</td>
<td>Henning Meienberg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 115 Alt, Nr. 03 Celle Br. 61A, nr. 3765; Köneke's Eicklingen-mentions him there at 1666 and possibly 1669 unless that was now Andreas Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Hans Schmitt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as aus Nienburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Sibbesse/Hildesheim</td>
<td>Henrich Paland</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Kopfsteuerbeschreibung des Hochstifts Hildesheim von 1664 via hannover-l; there is a Tile Paland in Hönze that is a S, according to the same 1664 doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Vinzenz Bauermeister</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; a daughter was born in 1667, and he died on the latter date; Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannove, lists him as aus Peine in 1665 and being married to Katharina Behrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666-1669</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Johann Krüger</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Married in first year; possibly related to 1676 Bodenteich GS Christian Krüger, 1678 Uelzen/Hankenbuettel GS Hinrich Krüger, and 1683 Wittingen/Bodenteich HS-m Peter Krüger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666-1673</td>
<td>Gifhorn</td>
<td>Andreas Öelman</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Married in 1666 when a S-m to widow of Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette who is also widow of Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels; dead by 1696 when son, Marten, 1696 Gifhorn HS-m, marries; his daughter marries RS M.Berndt Runge in Braunschweig; related to 1636 Wolfenb. PA and RS Hans Öhlman?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Christoffer Lange</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle; Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667-1676</td>
<td>Hannover/Celle</td>
<td>Wilhelm/ (Michel) Hase</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle in 1676, listed as Fstl. RS-M; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as GS “aus Osterwald”in 1667; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, listed as RS in 1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Stollberg/Meißen</td>
<td>Hans Richter</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Plön</td>
<td>Richert Knute</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td><a href="http://www.riecken-online.de/greve-at/b-at.pdf">http://www.riecken-online.de/greve-at/b-at.pdf</a> , son gets married this year to a woman in Eutin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668-1706</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Johann Königken (Köneke)</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Married Catharina Ötzmans (Oetzmann), widow of Moritz Meyer (unknown trade) in 1668, died in latter year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Burgwedel</td>
<td>Hennig Wöstehaun</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Bardehle's Erbregister der Vogtei Burgwedel von 1669, Kurtzreiser; now/&quot;nunc Heincke Wilhelm Kücker&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location/Office</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Burgwedel</td>
<td>Hinrich Stallman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Bardehle's Erbregister der Vogtei Burgwedel von 1669, guide doesn't specify which is GS-m and which is GS-gesell; the master is also a Kurtzreiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Burgwedel</td>
<td>Johan Hinrich Gudekuss</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Bardehle's Erbregister der Vogtei Burgwedel von 1669, guide doesn't specify which is GS-m and which is GS-gesell; the master is also a Kurtzreiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1669]-1689</td>
<td>Winzlar</td>
<td>Fritz Pollman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung...Calenberg-Göttingen 1689 vol 4; was 50 years old (assuming 30 at mastership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669-[1690]</td>
<td>Röttgesbüttel</td>
<td>Simon Knupper</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn shows him as S in 1678; NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung, son, the 1690 Röttgesbüttel GS-m Heinrich Knupper, gets married when he's dead and cites him as a master then; shows up in Erbregister des Amtes Gifhorn von 1669; possibly related to 1694 Sülfeld HS Henning Knupper (unless Henning = Heinrich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670-1689</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jobst Hunteman</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lief. As GS-m, Band 1, 2. Lief. as GS marries Marg. Pröve; S in 1689 Kopfsteuerbeschreibung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670-1695</td>
<td>Wittingen/Amt Knesebeck</td>
<td>Jürgen Hupe [Hupen]</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Pacht, Zins, Dienstregister des Amtes Knesebeck aus dem 16. und 17. JH.; NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; daughter married in 1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1704</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Andreas Knoepp (Knop)</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Lieferung, GS when marries Ilsabe Walbaum in 1671, 1682 remarries Emerentz Fueßen, whose father Henning lives in Celle, 1695 remarries Cath. Dorothe. Bolman, whose father X. Bolman is GS in Idensen; Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen...1689, cited as S; 1689 Hannover Kopfsteuerbeschreibung as GS; Cal. Br. 15, nr. 2227, HS in 1699; cited as GS-m in 1704 NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, when his widow remarries Conrad Schomburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672-1689</td>
<td>BS/Hannover</td>
<td>Berndt (Berend) Runge</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year, RS auf dem Marstalle; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 2. Lieferung, dead vor 1707 when daughter marries; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1681, vol. 1, Hann-Neustadt; first child (daughter) b. 1680, another daughter born in 1689; RS-meister; PA 1673-1689; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1689, listed under only 1672, as GS; if M. Bernh.Runge, Artillery Smith in NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol2, then dead by 1707 when a daughter marries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1673]-1689</td>
<td>Wunstorf</td>
<td>Aschen Brage</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung...Calenberg-Göttingen 1689 vol 4; was 46 years old (assuming 30 at mastership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Henrich Peckel</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as aus Braunschweig and as a RS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674-1691</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Heinrich Biester</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv Hannover B8398k, 1674-1683, he gets fined by guild alof; Was also fstl. RS; Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, a daughter born in 1691; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as GS “aus Grasdorf” in 1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674-1694</td>
<td>Ahnsbeck/Beedenbostel</td>
<td>Jürgen Eltzen</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; daughter married in 1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-1695</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Hinrich Wilcke</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; daughter married in 1695; Register und Kataster der Ämter Gifhorn, listed as S in 1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-1707</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jeremias Keyser</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689; Cal.Br.8, nr.915, 1706-7; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as S “aus Norderheims” in 1675; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, his widow remarries in 1717 and is also cited as a HS-m and WaffenS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Bodenteich</td>
<td>Christian Krüger</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; dead by 1676, which is when widow remarries; possibly related to 1666 Ebstorf GS Johann Krüger, 1678-1699 Uelzen/Hankenbuettel GS Hinrich Krüger and 1683 Wittingen/Bodenteich HS-m Peter Krüger?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Hannover/Eldagsen</td>
<td>Reinhard Wildt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as “aus Eldagsen”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1699</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Reinhard Wilcken</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as being S and becoming Burgher in 1676; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; he married possible second wife the first year in 1680 and died on the latter year, 1699; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, GS who marries Doroth.Marg. Soltmann whose father M. Jürgen is KupferS in 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676-1708</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Hans Brandes</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land: Band 1, 1. Lieferung, and dead father was Meister Tile in Peine, he married Cath. Marg. Koch, the widow of M. Heinrich Günter, GS-m; Band 2, vol 2, daughter marries and cited as GS-m when dead in 1717, when 2 daughters marry; 1689 Hannover Kopfsteuerbeschreibung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Bockholt</td>
<td>Hans Brocks</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Hans Lange Lüdde</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677-1681</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Hans Langelüddeke, jr</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Wernigerode</td>
<td>Michael Krell</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678-1699</td>
<td>Uelzen/Hankenbüttel</td>
<td>Hinrich Krüger</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678-1707</td>
<td>Braunschweig</td>
<td>Arend Falke (Falcke)</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Bücken</td>
<td>Hans von Wohlde</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679-1701</td>
<td>Egeln/Gifhorn</td>
<td>Hieronymus Meyer</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Langenhagen</td>
<td>Arend Tägetmeyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Kurd Wehler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover; possibly related to 1631 Gifhorn/Celle GS-m Hans Wöhler, 1647 GS Bernd Wöhler, 1658 Gifhorn GS/HS-m Jürgen Wöhler, 1672 BS GS Ditrich Wöhler, 1730 Fallersleben GS Andreas Wöhler, and to Ilse Wohlers, a Gifhorn widow who married in 1643 Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels and then who remarried Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645, and then remarries S-m (who afterwards becomes a GS-m) Andreas Öelman in 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Martin Hohmeyer</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as GS im Ratstall, “aus Husum, Krs Nienburg”; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, as GS-m; who marries Anna Huntemann, who was the widow of M. Heinrich Packeler (possibly the Henrich Peckel of 1674 and aus BS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Pattensen</td>
<td>Heinrich Westphalen</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, son Berendt married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682-1713</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Heinrich Meyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf, married in first year, died vor latter date; son Hans Meyer, GS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683-1703[1717]</td>
<td>Winninghausen</td>
<td>Heinrich Schomburg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung as GS and HS; one son married in 1703, who has to be [1703] Winninghausen HS Otto Schomburg, and is dead by another's son marriage in 1717, who is Grossgoltern GS Johann Albr. Schomburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Hannover/Northeim</td>
<td>(Gerberding)/Frederich Meyer</td>
<td>[GS]</td>
<td>Cal. Br. 23 Nr. 265, GS Gerberding's widow marries S-geselle Fr. Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684-1689</td>
<td>Wunstorf</td>
<td>Hans Dietrich Höppener</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung...Calenberg-Göttingen 1689 vol 4; was 35 years old (assuming 30 at mastership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684-1704</td>
<td>Schwwicheld/Stift Hildesheim</td>
<td>Hans Kuntze</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2; daughter married in 1704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B (cont.)

1685  Kloster Mariental  Hans Struff  GS  
Wolfenb. 11 Alt Mart Nr. 461, deals with 9 year trade deal

1686  Pattensen  Jürgen Andreas Westphalen  GS-m  
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung and 2. Lieferung, in Band 1 married Justina Heckenberg, whose father M. Paul Heckenberg is GS in Hannover

1686-1689  Hannover  Paul Heckenberg  GS-m  
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, daughter Justina Heckenberg marries J. Westphalen; 1689 Kopfsteuerbeschreibung; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 2. Lieferung, dead by 1709 when daughter marries

1686-[1695]  Gehrden  Ernst Mestwerk  GS  
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 5. Lieferung; widow remarried in 1695

1687-1708  Hänigsen/Celle/Hannover  Johan/Jürgen Mollman (Moltman)  GS  
NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung, married in 1687 and listed then as Hänigsen GS Jürgen Moltman; Hann.74 Celle, nr. 1044/1 as HS Johan (and Jürgen) Mollman (and Moltman) of Hannover/Blumelage in 1695; probably is the same guy as 1708 Celle HS Jürgen Mohltman and 1695 Hannover HS Johan Mollman. Assuming so: [Celle GS 3 list] from 1695-1703; for 1708 HS, Hann. 93, nr. 2932

[1688]  Burgdorf  Johan Ludolff Segelken  GS-m  
NS Trauregister Celler Land, 3. Lieferung; widow remarried in 1688

1688  Walsrode  Hans Sengstacke  GS-m  
NS Trauregister Celler Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year, dead vor 1698 when son married

1689  Amt Meinersen  Peter Schunter  GS-m  
NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; GS bei fstl. Amt, married in 1689

1689  Hannover  Hans Schmidt  GS-m  
Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689

1689  Engelbostel/Amt Langenhagen  Hans Hackrott  GS  
Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Town/County</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Engelbostel/Amt Langenhangen</td>
<td>Tönnies Deicke</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Klein Buchholtz/Hannover</td>
<td>Peter zur Heyde</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3, in vol. 2 cited as Reitknecht in Hannover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Herrenhausen/Amt Langenhangen</td>
<td>Hans Wolkenhauser</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Amedorf/Amt Neustadt</td>
<td>Harmen Schmidt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Lutter/Amt Neustadt</td>
<td>Hans-Jürgen Hase</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Wölpe</td>
<td>Harmen Dreyer</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Amt Wölpe</td>
<td>Johann Schmidt</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Garbsen</td>
<td>Thomas Bruncke</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Neustadt am Rübenberge</td>
<td>Hinrich Rehr</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Neustadt am Rübenberge</td>
<td>Baltzer Vorpage</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-1695</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jobst Unversagt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen und Grubenhagen v. 1689 vol.2, S-gesell; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as “aus Anderten”, GS in 1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-1700</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Heinrich Traurnicht/Trurnicht</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, GS when marries Marg. Cath. Schütte in 1689, in 1700 remarry and is GS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-1705</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Kord Lipman (Cord Lippmann)</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; he died this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Benstorf/Amt Lauenstein</td>
<td>Hans Ernst Ties</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 5. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Röttgesbüttel</td>
<td>Heinrich Knupper</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married in 1690; dead father was 1669 Röttgesbüttel GS-m Simon Knupper, brother/self, 1694 Sülfeld HS Henning Knupper, gets married in 1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Uelzen</td>
<td>Johann Daniel Niestadt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 6359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690-1720</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Kurd Potthast</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover in 1691, listed as &quot;aus Gronau&quot;; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung as Johan Cord Potthost, daughter married Johan Cort Brandes, GS, in 1720, Potthost's also the (new) Schmiedeamtsvorsteher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1691]-1747</td>
<td>Everode/Hochstift</td>
<td>Hermann Hagemann</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td><a href="http://list.genealogy.net/mm/archiv/hannover-l/2004-03/2004-03f.html">http://list.genealogy.net/mm/archiv/hannover-l/2004-03/2004-03f.html</a>, born in 1661 so 1691 is estimation of mastership; was apparently married 3 times, had 12 children, and was catholic, possibly converted in 1687 (to marry his wife?); possibly related to 1706 Uelzen GS Johann Hagemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Ebstorf/Bienenbüttel</td>
<td>Heinrich Vastenauer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Hinrich Fricke</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jobst Dietrich Ohen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as aus Eldagsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Steffan Died. Segelken</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1693]</td>
<td>Wittingen</td>
<td>Hinrich Klinge</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694-[1760]</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Christoph Kaiser</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf; married in first and dead vor latter date, father Hans Kaiser, S in Salzhausen (Solthusen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Idensen</td>
<td>X. Bolman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, daughter married this year to M. Andreas Knoep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Gehrden</td>
<td>Melchior Wehrmacher</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 5. Lieferung; marries Mestwerk's widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696-1697</td>
<td>Weddingen</td>
<td>Jobst Schmidt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 8N XII Nr. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Source/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696-1721</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jobst Stoltze (Stolze/Stolte)</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, fstl. RS and Hof-S; m. 1696 first wife and m. 1721 third wife (J. Tute's widow); NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, listed as GS-m in 1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Sarstedt/Burgwedel</td>
<td>Michel Peters</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Cord Koch</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813; related to 1721 BS HS Daniel Koch and 1730 Fallersleben GS Jürgen Koch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697-1731</td>
<td>Golste/Natendorf</td>
<td>Harm Amsfeld</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Natendorf...1698-1875, born in 1668?, marries a wife Dorothea Linne in 1697 and d. 1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Walsrode</td>
<td>Jürgen Bartelß</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Bothfeld</td>
<td>Johann Siegmann</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; a son was born in this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698-1718</td>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>Hans Sternberg</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, daughter marries in 1718; probably related to 1730 Linden HS-m Carl Sternberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Hermannsburg/Münden “Niederhäsener Bauerschaft”</td>
<td>Hektor Luers aus Sprakensehl</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 5001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Börry</td>
<td>Ernst Lüdeke</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699-1719</td>
<td>Börry</td>
<td>Berend Grefenmeyer/Grevemeyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; daughter married in 1719 and he is cited as NN(no name), GS; in 1713, a M. Berend Grefenmeyer, S, marries Anna Ilsabe Wullenweber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Wahnhausen/Münden</td>
<td>Johan Kyck</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Conr. Eberhart Peckel</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship/Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702-35</td>
<td>Frenke</td>
<td>Johan Hinrich Läge</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; daughter married in 1722 and another daughter married in 1735, and a son, Hans Jürgen, is married in 1735 too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-25</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Hans Meyer</td>
<td>Hann. 74 Oldenstadt, nr. 579 as 1703; Wittegen/Bodenteich HS; Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf, b.1684, m. 1707, died in 1725; related to Hannigsbüttel GS Johann Ernst Meyer? Related to Rehburg GS-m Johann Meyer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704-08</td>
<td>Beedenbostel/Ummern</td>
<td>Jacob Ebel zu Dedenhausen</td>
<td>Celle Br. 61A, nr. 368; related to Hannigsbüttel GS Johann Ernst Meyer? Related to Rehburg GS-m Johann Meyer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704-28</td>
<td>Deinsen/Marienhagen</td>
<td>Hans Hoyer</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung as GS; daughter married in 1724; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung as GS-m; son, Fried. Phil. married in 1728 to Anna Cath. Hilmer, widow of Harm Volmers; related to the various Hoyers? Related to 1740 Ricklingen GS Jürgen Chrn. Heuer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Holtensen bei Weetzen/ Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Christoph Sievers</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year; probably related to 1716 Bredenbeck Hans Sievers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706-36</td>
<td>Uelzen</td>
<td>Johann Hagemann</td>
<td>Bürgerbuch der Stadt Uelzen...1601-1737, he's listed as witness for someone in 1706; probably same guy as Uelzen GS witness X Hagemann in 1736; probably related to [1691] Everode GS Hermann Hagemann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Langenhangen</td>
<td>Thomas Brandt</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Albert Schaffmann</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; a daughter was born this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707-27</td>
<td>Springe</td>
<td>Johann Jacob Kuntze</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Himbergen, married in 1707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707-39</td>
<td>Weste</td>
<td>Christoffer Hinrich Kaiser</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Natendorf, Amt Ebstorf</td>
<td>Jürgen Lostödter</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Hildesheim</td>
<td>Dietrich Henning Röhe</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; son who gets married is 1729 Banteln GS Johann Henning Röhe; possibly related to [1719] Northen HS Joachim Rühe, 1739 Hann HS Ernst Casp. Rühe, 1750 Northen HS Chrp. Heinrich Rühe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Holzminden</td>
<td>Dieter Manegold</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 23 N Nr. 1/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Gümmern</td>
<td>Johan Henrich Büsche</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung, son marries in 1731; probably related to 1737 Wettbergen GS Hans Herman Buschen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Uelzen/Salzwedel</td>
<td>Johann Heinrich Grüne</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Bürgerbuch der Stadt Uelzen...1601-1737, he's listed as &quot;aus Salzwedel&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712-1739</td>
<td>Bienenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Hinrich Niestadt/Neustadt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Natendorf...1698-1875, GS and m. 1712, m. to Catharina Burmeister, d. 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Daniel Hinrich Ralves</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2; married widow of Hinr. Jul. Schwartz this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Hannigsbüttel</td>
<td>Johann Ernst Meyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn; related to Rehburg GS-m Johann Meyer? related to Ebstorf GS-m Hans Meyer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Hannigsbüttel [Hankenbüttel?]</td>
<td>Otto Befer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Hannigsbüttel [Hankenbüttel?]</td>
<td>Heinrich Wilhelm Thies</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Bredenbeck</td>
<td>Hans Sievers</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung; probably related to 1705 Holtensen GS-m Christoph Sievers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Hans Ölfke/Olveken, jr</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Location/Parish</td>
<td>Name/Title</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Notes/Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Großgoltern/ Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Johann Albr. Schomburg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year; father, who is dead by 1717 is Winninghausen GS/HS Heinrich Schomburg; brother presumably is 1703 Winninghausen HS Otto Schomburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Eimbeckhausen</td>
<td>Chrp. Andreas Steiffer</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717-1737</td>
<td>Wettbergen</td>
<td>Jost Herman Schatze (Schütze)</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, records are faulty- dead vor daughter marries in 1733 but alive when son marries in 1734; highly likely to be same [1717] Wettbergen HS Jobst Harmen Schütz. If so: NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, daughter marries in 1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717-1737</td>
<td>Groß Hilligsfeld</td>
<td>Hans Heinrich Wiegers</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717-1737</td>
<td>Sehldé</td>
<td>Hans Harm Cöllmann</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Schliekum/Gross Escherde</td>
<td>Hans Jahns</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719-1720</td>
<td>Einbeck/Alexanderstift</td>
<td>Christian Mettge</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Hann. 81 Nr. 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719-1739</td>
<td>Wennigsen</td>
<td>Hans Henrich Mage</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung, son marries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Langreder</td>
<td>Erich Daniel Bleidießel</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B (cont.)

1720-1723 Hannover Johan Cort Brandes GS-m
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, married in 1720 and is probably HS who (re)married in 1723, his now dead father (1720) Hans had been the Schmiedeamtsvorsteher; related to 1744 Langenhagen GS Johan Heinrich Brandes?

1721 Nettelrede Johan Chrp. Möller GS
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year, also cited as HS

1721-1768 Natendorf Jürgen Friedrich Lohstöter/Loßtöter GS
Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Natendorf...1698-1875, m. in 1721 and d. 1768

1723 Wennigsen Johan Herman Knocke GS
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung; probably related to 1732 Hastenbeck GS-m Hennig Knocke

[1725]-1741 Rehburg Johann Meyer GS-m
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; married in 1726 and remarried in 1741; related to Hannigsbüttel GS Johann Ernst Meyer?; related to Ebstorf GS-m Hans Meyer? Same as 1725-1727 Wolfenb. Fstl. PA/RS/CurS Johann Meyer?

1727-1728 Wolfenb./Hedeper Heinrich Gottfried Giesecke GS-m
Wolfenb. 34 N Nr. 2195

[1728]-1748 Münchhagen Johan Diet. Schrader GS-m
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2; daughter married this year; probably is related to 1720 Hann/Linden GS Hinrich Ernst Schrader

[1729]-1749 Hannover/"Enkirch" Michael Herrmann GS
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, son married this year

[1729]-1749 Helstorf Ernst Chrp. Grauers GS-m
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; son married this year

[1729]-1749 Höber Hans Hinrich Lau GS
Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Himbergen, son Johann Christoph, S, married this year

1729 Banteln Johann Henning Röhe GS
NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married in 1729; is son of [1709] Hildesheim GS Dietrich Henning Röhe; possibly related to [1719] Northen HS Joachim Rühe, 1739 Hann HS Ernst Casp. Rühe, and 1750 Northen HS Chrp. Heinrich Rühe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Andreas Wöhler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn; probably related to 1631 Gifhorn/Celle GS-m Hans Wöhler, 1647 Hann GS Bernd Wöhler, 1658 Gifhorn GS/HS-m Jürgen Wöhler, 1672 BS GS Ditrich Wöhler, 1680 Hann GS Kurt Wehler, and to Ilse Wohlers, a Gifhorn widow who married in 1643 Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels and then who remarried Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645, and then remarry S-m (who afterwards becomes a GS-m) Andreas Oelman in 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Jürgen Lorentz Koch</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn; related to 1697 Verden GS Cord Koch and 1721 BS HS Daniel Koch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Hans Jac. Meyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-1741</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Niclaus Bertram</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731-1738</td>
<td>Kirchdorf</td>
<td>Johan Harm Wilmer</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung, first as GS and then for second marriage in 1738 is GS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Bredenbeck</td>
<td>Johann Heinrich Meine</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year, also cited as HS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732-1734</td>
<td>Hastenbeck</td>
<td>Hennig Knocke</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; daughter married in 1732 and another daughter married in 1734 when Hennig is cited as Henni and as a S; probably related to 1723 Wennigsen GS Johan Herman Knocke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732-1752</td>
<td>Dahlenburg</td>
<td>Jürgen Christoph Sander</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Himbergen; daughter married this year to J.C.Kaiser, GS gesell; may be related to 1732 Hann kgl. PA Johann Bruno Sander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Brunninghausen</td>
<td>Hinrich Christ Krite</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Uelzen</td>
<td>X Weger (Wäger)</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Bürgerbuch der Stadt Uelzen...1601-1737, listed as witness by last name only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Johann Ötzmann</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf, married in 1736; father of 1763 Ebstorf GS Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Ötzmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Amt Osterholz</td>
<td>Johan Friedrich Bode</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung, listed as GS and PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Wettbergen</td>
<td>Hans Herman Buschen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, was widower; may be related to [1711] Guemmer GS-m Johann Henrich Buesche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Levin Henrich Wedekind</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year, also cited as HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Wunstorf</td>
<td>Hinrich Chrp. Schmidt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739-1741</td>
<td>Helmstedt/Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Johann Michael Buehlert</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Wolfenb. 7 Alt Nachtrag Nr. 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>Ricklingen</td>
<td>Jürgen Chrn. Heuer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung; related to the various Hoyers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1742</td>
<td>Rohde</td>
<td>Heinrich Schönfeldt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1742</td>
<td>Heiligendorf</td>
<td>Günter Böfingk</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Register und Kataster der Ämpter Gifhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Langenhangen</td>
<td>Johan Heinrich Brandes</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year; probably related to 1720 Hann GS/HS Johan Cordt Brandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Gestorf</td>
<td>Otto Hinrich Evers</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Ronnenberg</td>
<td>Johan Herman Röhler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Lüttow</td>
<td>Albrecht aus Boizenburg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Hann. 9G, nr. 773, GS bill for Pferdekuren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Nienhagen/Celle</td>
<td>Hinrich Ebeling</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Hann. 74 Celle, nr. 1081/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Hülsede</td>
<td>Casper Henrich Bake</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Hallerberg</td>
<td>Jürgen Storrie</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Hann. 88 A, nr. 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Dahlenburg</td>
<td>Johann Christopher Kaiser</td>
<td>GS-geselle</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Himbergen; married this year, is also son of C.H.Kaiser in Weste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Friedrich Christian Meyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf, married in this year; grandson of Hans Meyer, GS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Heitlingen</td>
<td>Johann Levin Bremer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; was married this year in Hannover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Ötzmann</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf, married in this year; son of 1736 Ebstorf GS-m Johann Ötzmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Braunschweig city archive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Henningen Muller</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Herman Awst</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Paul Stack</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Curdtten v. BS</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Poppendike</td>
<td>Hansen aus Poppendike</td>
<td>GS gesell</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/ Sickte</td>
<td>Julius von Sickte</td>
<td>GS M-gesell</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Westphalen</td>
<td>Staß aus Westphalen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Lüneburg</td>
<td>Carsten von Lüneburg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Sarstedt</td>
<td>Curdt Berndes</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Graßleben</td>
<td>Heineken Brandes</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Schöningen</td>
<td>Andreassen Wolebeer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Woltingeroda</td>
<td>Heinrichen v. Woltingeroda</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Groningen</td>
<td>Hansen v. Groningen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Rodewolde</td>
<td>Heineken Lose</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Stadthagen</td>
<td>Aschen v. Stadthagen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Jerrheim</td>
<td>Aschen v. Jerrheim</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Ußlar</td>
<td>Nolten v. Ußlar</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Hildesheim</td>
<td>Hans v. Hildesheim</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Hildesheim</td>
<td>Curd v. Hildesheim</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Königslutter</td>
<td>Heinrich v. Königslutter</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Saltzdetfurd</td>
<td>Heinrich v. Saltzdetfurd</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Horneburg</td>
<td>Thomas v. Horneburg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Vimmelschen</td>
<td>Henning Benem</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Newburg</td>
<td>Curden v. Newburg</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; non-guild GS in complaints by BS guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Sander Borchers</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Bartolt Budeler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Gercke Büdelar</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Budeler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Jacob Cords</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Herman Dichten</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Gangeleven</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Moritz Gangeleven</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Simon Haufort</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Heinemans</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Michel Heinemans</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>[Heinrich Holstein]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Meister Thomas Horneman</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Meister Jürgen vor dem Magnus Thor</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Cordt Knickers</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Karsten Koch</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Arndt Lindeman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Gerke Lindeman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Meister Ludeke</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Meister Hans Maul</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Jacob Medthoff</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Christoff Meyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Herman Muller</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Bartoldt N.</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Zacharias Pape</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Pluick</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Jürgen Roer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Ruter</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Frantz Sander</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Cort Schiren</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Schiren</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Sander Schmedt</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Landmark</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Hans Scholsche</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Christoffer Spanauß</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Herman Ulrichs</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>BS/Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Steffan Weise</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv B IV 10 C #528; Celle Br. 59, nr. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Nicolaus Albers</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1G, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Baltzar Becker</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 Geselle, Frau + Hanß Hansen, Pf.knecht bei Baltzar Becker; Deutsche Inschriften: BS 1529-1671, cites him in a 1661 group art piece in St.Michaelis along with Heinrich Knicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>(Ernst Becker) widow</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Becker</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, has 1 daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Jürgen Behre</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Burchert Behren [Borchard Behre]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G and 1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ditrich Behrrns [Dietrich Behrenß]</td>
<td>GS-m</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1Lj and 1F in 1671 and 1 G and 1 F by 1687; NS Trauregister Celler Land, 3. Lieferung; married this year, 1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Jacob Behre [Behren]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Cordt Blancke</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1G and 1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Adrian Brakman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Braukman</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hanß Camlade</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1G and 1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Johann Freise</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1Lj and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Gereker</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2Lj and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Herlingk</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Johann Hohmann</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2 Lj and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Holste</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F + Hanß Koch, S geselle bei Heinrich Holste; probably related to 1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Samuel Jordan</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1630]-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Baltzar Junge</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F; Deutsche Inscriften Braunschweig 1529-1671, he's listed as living at his house since 1630, and being a member of the S guild from 1667-1684, according to Fuhse's Schmiede book and Meier's Hausbuch (bd.2, fol. 88r), wife was Anna Getels, and house was decorated with horse-shoe, hammer, and tongs/Zange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hanß Knicker</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2 G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heinrich Knicker GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 Lj and 1 F; Deutsche Inschriften: BS, 1529-1671, a 1661 art group piece in St.Michaelis lists him along with Baltzar Becker

Jobst Knicker GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F

Hans Koch [Hanß Köchy] GS Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, listed under 1687 but not 1672, 1 F

(Heinrich Köchies) GS widow Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687

Michael Köching [Köchingk] GS Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1G and 1 F

Dieterich Kravel [Krawell] GS Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F

Christian Krause [Kruse] GS Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1G and 1 F in 1672 and 2 G and 1 F by 1687

Behrend Meyer GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2 G and 1 F

Hanß Meyer GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F

Hanß Meyer GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G and 1 F

Hanß Meyer GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 Lj and 1 F

Hennig Meier GS Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G and 1 F; Deutsche Inschriften: BS 1529-1671, lists a messingschild of his from 1663
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Melchior Meyer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2 G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Curdt Möller</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Oldenböstel</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G, 1 F, 1 Lj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Ölekerß</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 Lj and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Michel Rasche</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 Lj and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hanß Jurgen Regener</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Andreis Rodebraeck</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672-1689</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Bernd Runge</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G, [see above, 1689 comes from other sources when he's in Hannover and no longer in BS; dead by 1707]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Andreas Schaffer</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Thiele Schieren [Tile Schiren]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G, [see above, 1689 comes from other sources when he's in Hannover and no longer in BS; dead by 1707]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>(Tile Schiren)</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ernst Schmedt [Schmidt]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Jürgen Schneider</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engelcke Schnellen</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Barwardt Schridden</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 2 G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Cord Ulrichs [[Cordt Ullrichß]]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hans Vaddrian</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G and 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hans Welle</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 Lj and 1 F in 1672, 1 G and 1 F by 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Brandt Werthman [Wehrtman]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hans Wilken [[Hanß Wilckens]]</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 G, 2 Lj, 1 F (his son is his geselle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ditrich Wöhler</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F; probably related to various other Wöhlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-2</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Martin Wolters</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672, 1 F; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, is listed as HS-m who is dead by 1707 when his daughter marries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Wulff</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Braunschweiges Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, 1 F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B (cont.)

**Special notes:**
Age and time estimations: I estimated twenty years of age for when a child of either sex married, and I approximated thirty years of age to be when large-smiths would have attained their mastership.

**Notes on locations (based on size and industry during the late seventeenth century):**
Bigger cities, court towns: Celle, Hannover, Braunschweig (BS), Wolfenbüttel, Hildesheim, Lüneburg.
Smaller cities, regional trade centers: Ebstorf, Gifhorn, Uelzen, Verden, Fallersleben, Wittingen.
Everything else is a small town, a village, or in the countryside.
Small towns that undergo a change during the eighteenth century and become regional trade centers (i.e. that consistently have between 1-3 Grobschmiede at any given time plus 1-2 other smiths): Pattensen, Weste, Wennigsen, Hankenburg, Bienenbüttel, Springe.

Locations omitted: I did not use the state archives in Stade, Aurich, and Oldenburg. I also did not look at registers for areas outside of Calenburg and Celle, meaning that the southern part of Lower Saxony (around Göttingen and the Harz) is excluded from coverage here as are the northwestern and northern regions.
### Appendix C: Equine Veterinary Practitioners in Lower Saxony, 1524-1764

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Years</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sources and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Sebastian Schmidt</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Hannover Chronik, ed. Klaus Mlynek, Waldemar R. Röhrbein, Dieter Brosius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527-1566</td>
<td>Braunschweig</td>
<td>Ebeling Roier</td>
<td>HS and WaffenS</td>
<td>Deutsche Inschriften Braunschweig 1529-1671, cites him as a HS/WaffenS but the writing itself refers to the smith's guild, apparently left a will too which names his wife as Ursula, since 1527 was on the Rat der Altenwiek, 1535-1552 he was Bruchkämmerer [Spruchkammer], 1552-1560 he was Bürgermeister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>Bergedorf (Hamburg)</td>
<td>Wilhelm Bentz</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Zeitschrift f/ NS Familienkunde, Nummer 1, 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-1607</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Hannover</td>
<td>Hans Holste</td>
<td>RS und HausS; PA</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 281, 1571-2; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, 1607; Wolfenb. 5 Urk Nr. 204, listed as ZeugS in 1591; probably related to 1687 BS GS Heinrich Holste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Heinrich Sommerbeck</td>
<td>PA and RS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 230; 3 Al, nr. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Celle</td>
<td>Hans von Zelle</td>
<td>PA and HS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577-1587</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Hans Scheide</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Quedlinburg</td>
<td>Hans Koch aus Quedlinburg</td>
<td>KlepperS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 4 Alt 19, nr. 988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580-1588</td>
<td>Hildesheim</td>
<td>Martin Smedt</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Wolfb. 2 B Alt 584a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582-1589</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Sanderfort</td>
<td>Hans Albrecht Freneke v. Sanderfort</td>
<td>PA und reisigen S</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 374, 1589; Wolfb. Stift Halberstadt..., nr. 24, 1582 as Hans Albrecht v. Francke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Franz Homann</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Staatsarchiv Wolf. 2 Alt Findbuch 18141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1652</td>
<td>Fallersleben</td>
<td>Henning Höper</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung, as HS when daughter married in 1652; Celle Br 61a, nr. 4063, GS in 1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Matthias Meye</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Christoffer Tribbe</td>
<td>Hg Magnus'</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list], Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Hans Arekenbarch</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list], Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628-1635</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Tonnes Detmer</td>
<td>Fstl. Gn. RS</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, [Tonnie Wetmer, died by wife's remarriage in 1635]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629-1667</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Riepke (Ribke) Sanders</td>
<td>RS; Fstl. RS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]: Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, daughter married in 1667 and he died before sometime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Wolff Scheller</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, daughter married this year; he's dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Hans Öhlman</td>
<td>PA and RS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 536; probably related to 1666 Gifhorn GS-m Andreas Öelman and 1696 Gifhorn HS-m Marten Öelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636-1640</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Hitzacker</td>
<td>Heinrich Ohnsin (Unsinn)</td>
<td>PA and RS; fdl. RS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 536; Celle Br. 58 Nr. 904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Daniel Meinecke</td>
<td>PA-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, daughter married this year to a Quartiermeister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Heinrich Studuwa (Studwag)</td>
<td>PA and RS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Heinrich Busin</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Wolfb. Kammer bei Amt Lichtenberg, nr. 2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Hannover/Nettlingen</td>
<td>Tile Eckerman</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, lists him as “aus Nettlingen”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C (cont.)

1640-1660 BS Hans Knicker HS Deutsche Inschriften Braunschweig 1529-1671, 1652-1660; 1640 based on Glasscheibe of his showing two men under a tree shoeing a horse, the Knicker Wappen show two crossed scythe blades

1643-1645 Gifhorn Hans Leppels HS-m NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married in 1643 to a widow, Ilse Wöhlers, who remarries Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645

1645-1666 Gifhorn Andreas Hustette (Hustet) HS NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married in 1645 to multi-widow Ilse Woehlers/etc, who remarries S-m (who afterwards becomes a GS-m) Andreas Öelman in 1666

1645-1671 Gifhorn Dietrich Bremer HS-m NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married in 1645, Meister and Burgher by 1649 when remarries, alive when one daughter marries in 1671 but dead by another daughter's marriage in 1679

1647-1655 Wolfenb./Harz Ebert Leiba RS (Hof-RS) Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 536, alive in first doc (1647) but recently dead in 1655 doc

[1648]-1660 Uelzen/Dannenbrg Juergen Schmidt HS/PCur Celle Br. 58, nr. 1078

1649 Fallersleben Niclas Regulier RS NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year, RS des Freiherrn Benedict v. Horn, Schwedischen Obristleutnant

1650 Hannover Paschen Menecke PA NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 2. Lieferung, married this year to Doroth. Wostmann

1650 Dannenberg Hans Kordes HS Buergerbuch der Stadt Dannenberg (1894); probably related to 1594 BS/Wolfenb. GS Jacob Cords, 1670 Dannenberg HS Johann Dieterich Cordes and 1748 Dannenberg HS Johann Wilhelm Kordes

1650 Verden Jost X FahnenS Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650-1663</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Andreas</td>
<td>Apotheker mit HK</td>
<td>Celle Br. 57, nr. 6[#8], Apotheker, HK, and horse sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1667</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Gerd Laue (Lauwe)</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813; see Hannover 1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>Jacob Suerbigk (Suerbut)</td>
<td>HS-m; RS</td>
<td>Celle Br. 93, nr. 214; [Herzer, 9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652-1677</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Asche Meinike</td>
<td>Fstl. RA Celle</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, daughter married in 1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartwig Ruprecht</td>
<td>RS; Fstl. RS Celle</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, married in 1652 and 1662, left a widow Christina Kamman who remarried in 1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Dannenberg</td>
<td>Heinrich Bollkopf</td>
<td>HS/PCur</td>
<td>Celle Br. 58, nr. 1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>Heinrich Haste</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Gandersheim</td>
<td>Hans Behme</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 536, Ebert Leiba is the dead RS that Behme is successor to/inheritor from Wolfb. Kammer-Kasse, nr. 1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655-1666</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Hans Petermann</td>
<td>RS-m</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658-1666</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Friedrich Baarß</td>
<td>Fstl. RS Celle</td>
<td>Wolfb. 3 Alt, nr. 536; Wolfb. Kammer-Kasse, nr. 1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658-1700</td>
<td>Gifhorn</td>
<td>Jürgen Wöhler</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; probably married as GS in 1658 and is the Gifhorn HS whose daughter married in 1700; probably related to 1631 Gifhorn/Celle GS-m Hans Wöhler, 1647 Hann GS Bernd Wöhler, 1672 BS GS Ditrich Wöhler, 1680 Hann GS Kurd Wehler, 1730 Fallersleben GS Andreas Wöhler, and Ilse Wohlers, a Gifhorn widow who married in 1643 Gifhorn HS-m Hans Leppels and then who remarried Gifhorn HS Andreas Hustette in 1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Hans Pingeling</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]- Hann. 70 Nr. 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>(Reitschmied des Marstalls)</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>WOlfb. Kammer-Kasse, nr. 4103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Arnold Ludwig v. Haxhausen</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Celle Br. 44, nr. 144, SM knowledge and experience includes HK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667-1676</td>
<td>Hannover/Celle</td>
<td>Wilhelm/(Michel) Hase</td>
<td>Fstl. RS-m</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle in 1676; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as GS &quot;aus Osterwald&quot; in 1667, in NS Trauregister Band 1, 2. Lieferung, RS in 1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Dannenberg</td>
<td>Johann Dieterich Cordes</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Bürgerbuch der Stadt Dannenberg (1894); probably related to 1594 BS/Wolfenb. GS Jacob Cords, 1650 Dannenberg HS Hans Kordes and 1748 Dannenberg HS Johann Wilhelm Kordes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Girdt Leiba (Gerd Leyba)</td>
<td>RS-m and ZeugS</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv Hannover B8398k; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, widow remarries in 1685 to Friedrich Thiele, RS and PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1672</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Martin Wolters</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>Braunschweig's Bürger und Gewerbe Verzeichnis 1671 as GS; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 as GS; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, is listed as HS-m who is dead by 1707 when his daughter marries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Hans Deneke (Denecken)</td>
<td>RA, PA</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv H I, #1 [reprint 1942]; RA (1671; 1672), PA (1687), Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, pp. 83 and 214; under Sonstige Gewerbetreibende/special privilege basically; has wife in 1672 and 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-[1704]</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Andreas Knoepp (Knop)</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen...1689, cited as S; Cal. Br. 15, nr. 2227, HS in 1699; cited as GS-m in 1704 NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, when widow remarries Conrad Schomborg; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, GS when marries Ilsabe Walbaum in 1671, 1682 remarries Emerentz Fueßen, whose father Henning lives in Celle, 1695 remarries Cath. Doroth. Bolman, whose father X. Bolman is GS in Idensen; Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Fürstentümer Calenberg-Göttingen...1689, cited as S; 1689 Hannover Kopfsteuerbeschreibung as GS; Cal. Br. 15, nr. 2227, HS in 1699; cited as GS-m in 1704 NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, when his widow remarries Conrad Schomburg; HS authored/signed letter; Hann-Neustadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation/Specialties</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672-1689</td>
<td>BS/Hannover</td>
<td>Berndt (Berend) Runge</td>
<td>RS-m; PA</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year, RS auf dem Marstall; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-181, Hann-Neustadt; first child (daughter) b. 1680, another daughter born in 1689; Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 168, listed under only 1672, as GS; if M. Bernh.Runge, Artillery Smith in NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol2, then dead by 1707 when a daughter marries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Henrich Peckel</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as aus Braunschweig and as GS, RS des Generalleutnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674-1691</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Heinrich Biester</td>
<td>fstl. RS</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv Hannover B8398k, 1674-1683, he gets fined by guild alot; Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, a daughter born in 1691; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as GS “aus Grasdorf” in 1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675-1707</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jeremias Keyser</td>
<td>HS-m and WaffenS-m</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689; Cal.Br.8, nr.915, 1706-7, GS; Die Neubürger und Brauer der Altstadt Hannover, listed as S “aus Northeim” in 1675; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, his widow remaries in 1717 and is also cited as a HS-m and WaffenS-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Jürgen Schultze</td>
<td>HS-m Celle</td>
<td>Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle; probably related to 1703 Celle HS Ernest Schultze, 1714 Celle HS Heinrich Schultze, and 1750 Hajen FahnenS Henrich Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Herzberg/Celle</td>
<td>Balthasar Honeman</td>
<td>RS; Fstl. RS-M</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle, Herzberg's daughter married this year, he's dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Fallsleben</td>
<td>Friederich Schröder</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813 [Celle GS 3 list]; Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle as HS-m; Hann. 93, nr. 293, as 1708 Celle HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677-1711</td>
<td>Verden</td>
<td>X Ölfke</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813 [Celle GS 3 list]; Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle as HS-m; Hann. 93, nr. 293, as 1708 Celle HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677-1723</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Johann Gößel</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813 [Celle GS 3 list]; Kaufmann's NS Trauregister Celler Land/Stadt Celle as HS-m; Hann. 93, nr. 293, as 1708 Celle HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677-1723</td>
<td>Wolfsburg</td>
<td>Jacob Jordan</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1698</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Hermann Jürgen Meine [Harmen Jürgen Meyne]</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year, father M. Herman Meine, HS, dead vor 1681; also oddly enough in NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung, as married this year, also that his widow remarries, Jürgen Friedrich Allfelt, GS, in 1698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Barthold Jürgen Stapelberg</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list], PA am Schloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Aschen</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>Christoph Henrich Thomsen</td>
<td>HS/PA</td>
<td>[Herzer reprint], HS/PA identity via oath for Marstall smiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683-1703</td>
<td>Winninghausen/ Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Heinrich Schomburg</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung as GS and HS; one son married in 1703, who has to be [1703] Winninghausen HS Otto Schomburg, and is dead by another's son marriage in 1717, who is Grossgoltern GS Johann Albr. Schomburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683-1704</td>
<td>Wittingen/Bodenteich</td>
<td>Peter Krüger</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>Hann. 74 Oldenstadt, nr. 579; possibly related to 1666 Ebstorf GS Johann Krüger, 1678 Uelzen/Hankenbuettel GS Hinrich Krüger and 1676 Bodenteich GS Christian Krüger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Mariental</td>
<td>Hans Struff</td>
<td>HS and GS</td>
<td>Wolfb. 11 Alt Mart, nr. 461, HS and GS at cloister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685-1687</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Friedrich Thiele</td>
<td>fstl. RS and PA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, m.1685 to Cath. Elisab. Gevers/[Geters], widow of Gerd Leyba (Hof-S, Hann-Neu), Thiele d. 1687; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, cited as HofS and dead by 1687 when widow remarries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Jobst Becker</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, has wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Gabriell Perdthauer</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Medefind's Kopfsteuerbeschreibungen der Stadt BS von 1672 und 1687, has wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Isernhagen</td>
<td>Berend Kelle</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Gifhorn</td>
<td>Dieterich Ruprecht</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1687]-1707</td>
<td>Hemmendorf</td>
<td>X Schuster</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687-1708</td>
<td>Celle/Hannover/Blumelage</td>
<td>Johan/Jürgen Mollman (Moltman)</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung, married in 1687 and listed then as Hänigsen GS Jürgen Moltman; Hann.74 Celle, nr. 1044/1 as HS Johan (and Jürgen) Mollman (and Moltman) of Hannover/Blumelage in 1695; probably is the same guy as 1708 Celle HS Jürgen Mohltman and 1695 Hannover HS Johan Mollman. Assuming so: [Celle GS 3 list] from 1695-1703; for 1708 HS, Hann. 93, nr. 2932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Stemmen/Amt Blumenau</td>
<td>Hans Wehrhan</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung...Calenberg-Göttingen 1689 vol 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Stemmen/Amt Blumenau</td>
<td>Johann Ottman</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung...Calenberg-Göttingen 1689 vol 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Wiedensahl</td>
<td>Nicolaus Schlier</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung...Calenberg-Göttingen 1689 vol 4, FahnenS unter den Erbprinzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Heinrich Lücke</td>
<td>PA-m</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Johann Harbort Meineke</td>
<td>fJl.RA</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-[1694]</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Detmer</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Kopfsteuerbeschreibung der Alt und Neustadt Hannover 1689, as “des Herrn PA”; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, widow, Anna Christina Stegmann remarries in 1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Gifhorn</td>
<td>Hans Jürgen Bremer</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year, son of deceased M.Dieterich Bremer, HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Leveste</td>
<td>Hans Heinrich Schonen</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 5. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Major Courselon</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“Mons.” X. Borcherding</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, m. X. Mensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694-[1698]</td>
<td>Sülfeld</td>
<td>Henning Knupper</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year and widow remarried in the latter year, father was 1669 Röttgesbüttel GS-m Simon Knupper and brother (unless himself/an early Henning Knupper) was 1690 Röttgesbüttel GS-m Heinrich Knupper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1694]-1714</td>
<td>Brullsen</td>
<td>Cord Mundt</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Ludolf Memeken (Meineke)</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>Hann.74 Celle, nr. 1044/1; [Celle GS 3 list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Hann.74 Celle, nr. 1044/1, HS referenced; Hann-Neustadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Hinrich Frantz</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, first child (son) born in 1695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1695-1707  Hannover  Hans Rolfs  kurfstl. RS  Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, m. 1695; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, married again in 1707

1695-1718  Hannover  Hermann Osterhagen  kurfstl./kgl. RS  Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, listed as kgl. RS when son Johan Hinrich marries; kurfstl. RS in 1695, was fstl. Reitknecht in 1684; kgl. RS in 1718

1695-1723  Celle  Johann Huck  HS  [Celle GS 3 list]; Hann. 93, nr. 2932 as 1708 HS Johann Guck(?)

1696  Gifhorn  Marten Öelman  HS-m  NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year, son of deceased Gifhorn GS-m Andreas Öelman; related to 1636 Wolfenb. PA and RS Hans Öhlma?

[1696]-1716  Rehburg  X Dietrichs  HS  NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; daughter married this year

[1696]-1716  Coppenbrügge  Harmen Lages  HS-m  NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year

1696-1721  Hannover  Jobst Stoltze (Stolze/Stolte)  fstl. RS and Hof-S  Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, fstl. RS and Hof-S; m. 1696 first wife and m. 1721 third wife (J. Tute's widow); NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, listed as GS-m in 1710

1696-1721  Hannover  Johann Tute (Thute/Toute)  kgl. PA; RA  Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, as d.1721 and kgl. PA; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 1. Lieferung, as PA who marries Anna Cath. Heper in 1696; Band 2, vol 2, dead by 1748 when son marries, also cited as RA

1697  Hannover  Gerd Laue (Lauwe) (jr?)  RS  Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; see Verden 1650-1667; m. 1697, RS des Prinzen Ernst August

1697  Helmstedt/Wolfsburg  Johan Andreas Winter  HS  NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1697-1698</td>
<td>Niedersachsen</td>
<td>(via) Hg Georg Wilhelm</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Celle Br. 65, nr. 189, referred to as prof. witness in Pferdhandel Verord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Groß Oesingen</td>
<td>Hans Heinrich Tieß</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Laforge</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Gifhorn</td>
<td>Hieronymous Meyer</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year possibly for second time if he's also the GS in Egeln/Halberstadt who married in 1679, is Bürger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Eduard Groon (Groen)</td>
<td>fstl. Engl.RS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 2. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Leveste</td>
<td>Friederich Wilhelm Beeckman</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 1, 5. Lieferung, FahnenS and Dragoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Niendorf</td>
<td>Jochen Schrader</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Celler Land, 4. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Heinrich Francke</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, marries in 1699, RS bei Graf v. Platen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1699]-[1741]</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Carl Andreas Hoyer</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Hann. 107B, nr. 165; [Celle GS 3 list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1700]-1720</td>
<td>Eime</td>
<td>Barthold Hinrich Grobe</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1700s?]-1734</td>
<td>Mühlhausen/etc</td>
<td>Johann Andreas Machlep</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Hann. 9H, nr. 81, treason case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Wolfenb./Lautenthal</td>
<td>Hans Jürgen Wileke</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Wolfb. Stadt Lautenthal, 26 A N, nr. 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1702]-1744</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Albrecht Borcherding</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, b. 1672 [1702 is estimate for married/master]-d. 1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-1725</td>
<td>Wittingen/Bodenteich/Ebstorf</td>
<td>Hans Meyer</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Hann. 74 Oldenstadt, nr. 579; Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf as GS-m, b.1684, m. 1707, died in 1725; related to Hannigsbüttel GS Johann Ernst Meyer? Related to Rehburg GS-m Johann Meyer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Großgoltern/Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Eggert Schubbert</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; widow remarried in 1703, cited as S; cited as GS and HS when his two sons marry in 1717 and 1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-1708</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Ernest Schultze</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; Hann. 93, nr. 2932; probably related to 1676 Celle HS Jürgen Schultze, 1714 Celle HS Heinrich Schultze and 1750 Hajan FahnenS Henrich Schultze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-1708</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Jürgen Friedrich Ahlfeldt</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; Hann. 93, nr. 2932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-1718</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Wilhelm Drösemeyer</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; Hann. 93, nr. 2932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707-1737</td>
<td>Weste</td>
<td>Christoffer Hinrich Kaiser</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Himbergen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Moringen/Clausthal</td>
<td>Hans Witten</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>Cal. Br. 2 Nr. 1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708-1709</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Hans Heinrich Ritter</td>
<td>kgl. RS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, m. vor 1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-1730</td>
<td>Winninghausen/ Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Otto Schomburg</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, daughter marries in 1730; is presumably 1683/1703 Winninghausen GS Heinrich Schomburg's son who married in 1703 and who thus is then brother to 1717 Grossgoltern GS Johann Albr. Schomburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713-1733</td>
<td>Eime</td>
<td>Barthold Hinrich Gerber</td>
<td>FahnenS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Albrecht Düvel</td>
<td>kurfstl.RS/RS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812 as kurfstl. RS; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, as RS bei Herzog Ernst August; m. 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Heinrich Schultze</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>[Celle GS 3 list]; probably related to 1676 Celle HS Jürgen Schultze, 1703 Celle HS Heinrich Schultze and 1750 Hajan FahnenS Henrich Schultze (same guy?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1714-1753</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Franz Joachim Berg</td>
<td>kgl. PA</td>
<td>Hann. 9G, nr. 64, whole file is on him, is cited as “Arznei-schmidt” as well; Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, d. 1753; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, one daughter marries in 1748 to Eberhart Ernst Tuhte, son of Johan Tuhte, RA; a son became PA and (two) daughters married a PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Eberhart Otten</td>
<td>HS-m and WaffenS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, marries widow of M. Jeremias Kayser, is dead by 1727 when his widow Anna Cath. Weber remarries again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1717]-1737</td>
<td>Wettbergen</td>
<td>Jobst Harmen Schütze (Schatze)</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, daughter marries in 1737; highly likely to be the [1717] 1733/1734 Wettbergen GS-m Jost Herman Schatz. If so: NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, records are faulty- dead vor daughter marries in 1733 but alive when son marries in 1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718-1720</td>
<td>Hameln</td>
<td>Asmus Clevin</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Cal. Br. 15, nr. 760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1719]-1739</td>
<td>Pattensen</td>
<td>Barthold Henning Bange</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1719]-1739</td>
<td>Northen</td>
<td>Joachim Rühe</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, his son, 1739 Hann HS Ernst Casp. Rühe, is married in 1739; possibly related to [1709] Hildesheim GS-m Dietrich Henning Röhe, 1729 Banteln GS Johann Henning Röhe, and 1750 Northen HS Chrpf. Heinrich Rühe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720-1723</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johan Cordt Brandes</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, HS “jetzt Pächter a. d. Neuen Haus vor der Eilenriede”, possibly is also GS who married in 1720; possibly is related to 1744 Langenhangen GS Johan Heinrich Brandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Nettelrede</td>
<td>Johan Chrp. Möller</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Johann Wilhelm Aschermann</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv H1, #2, lives in Schmiede-Krug; in Adress-Calendar under “Reit-Knechte”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Heinrich Nolte</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv H1, #2, lives around Niclaus Damm; listed under “Gutschen-Stall Bediente”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Daniel Koch</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv H1, #2, CS for trips; listed under “Gutschen-Stall Bediente”; related to 1730 Fallersleben GS Juergen Lorentz Koch and 1697 Verden Cord Koch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-777</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Jürgen Schick (Schickert)</td>
<td>kgl. RS and HS</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2; married first wife in 1722, d. 1777, kgl. RS and HS im Marstall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723-743</td>
<td>Wagenzelle</td>
<td>Hinrich Wolkenhauer</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; son married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-744</td>
<td>Coppenbrügge</td>
<td>Heinrich Andr. Neiber</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-744</td>
<td>Engelbostel</td>
<td>Jost Deike</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-744</td>
<td>Hajen</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Kayser</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; son, Frantz Wilhelm, S, married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Langenhagen</td>
<td>Constant Gottfried Bauernsteiner</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year, also cited as Reuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Gross Lobke</td>
<td>Daniel Herman Wolters</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Wolfenb.</td>
<td>Johann Meyer</td>
<td>Fstl. PA, RS, CurS Hann. 9G, nr. 64, 1725-7, cites self as Reit-und Cur-Schmidt; probably same person as [1725] Rehburg GS-m Johann Meyer, and if so: NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; married in 1726 and remarried in 1741; related to Hannigsbuettel GS Johann Ernst Meyer?; related to Ebstorf GS-m Hans Meyer?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1725]-1746 HAJEN Chr. Engelke HS NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; daughter married this year and another daughter married in 1746, when Chrn. is cited as S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Bückeburg</td>
<td>Johann Heinrich Harrier</td>
<td>VA Bueckb. Alte Regierungsregistratur M, nr. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Elze</td>
<td>Wulbrand Heinrich Meyer</td>
<td>HS-m NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, married Anna Cath. Weber, double-widow of Otte(n) and Kayser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Eime</td>
<td>Hans Hinrich Meysold</td>
<td>HS NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; widower who remarried this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1728]-1748 Neustadt am Rübenberge Jürgen Reher HS-m NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; daughter married this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johan Joachim Bramsche</td>
<td>HS-m NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, married this year to a “Joh. Fried. Quittenbaum” whose father was Johan Quittenbaum, a Kaufmann, Bramsche's father is also cited as “M. Johan Arend”, a HS and GS who is dead by now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>Carl Sternberg</td>
<td>HS-m NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung; probably related to [1698] Linden GS-m Hans Sternberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Dannenberg/Salzwedel</td>
<td>Diederich Christian Lagemann</td>
<td>HS Buergerbuch der Stadt Dannenberg (1894), HS am 28. Dez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1730]-1750 Vahlbruch Herman Giesemann HS NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; son married this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>Nicol. Westphale</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>Bredenbeck (HS-m)</td>
<td>Johann Heinrich Meine</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year, cited as GS-m too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Harburg</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Hann. 74 Harburg, nr. 1586, referenced in 25. Okt rotzig letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Döhren</td>
<td>Hans Jürgen Witte</td>
<td>HS and WaffS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 4. Lieferung, dead by latter date when widow remarries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732-1783</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Bruno Sander</td>
<td>kgl. PA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, married Marg. Elis. Berg in 1732; married in 1732 and d.1783; may be related to [1732] Dahlenburg GS-m Juergen Christoph Sander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733-1734</td>
<td>Holtensen bei Weetzen/ Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Conrad Pauling</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year, remarried the second year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Bredenbeck (HS-m)</td>
<td>Just Wilhelm Hesse</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Dannenberg (HS-m)</td>
<td>Andreas Domine</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Buergerbuch der Stadt Dannenberg (1894), HS am 8.Juni ; (later also Rademacher am 26.Juni 1752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Hann. 74 Harburg, nr. 1586, mentioned in 26. Aug Croix de Tirechapelle letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Bantorf/ Amt Calenberg</td>
<td>Cord Hinrich Bruns</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Hann. 147, nr. 3, PA mentioned in bill; Neuhaus (Bremen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Amt Osterholz</td>
<td>Johan Friedrich Bode</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung, listed as GS and PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Celle</td>
<td>Levin Henrich Wedekind</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year, also cited as GS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C (cont.)

[1738]-1781 Hannover Albrecht Ernst Tute (Ernst Eberhard Tute) kgl. PA Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812; NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, vol 2, as Eberhart Ernst Tuhte he marries Dor. Fried. Berg in 1748, at which point his father Johan Tuhte, RA, is dead; son of J. Tute; b.1708 [1738 estimate for master], m. F.J.Berg's daughter in 1748, d. 1781

1739 Hannover Ernst Casp. Rühe HS, AmtsHS NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, married in 1739; [1719] Northen HS Joachim Rühe is his father; possibly related to [1709] Hildesheim GS-m Dietrich Henning Röhe, 1729 Banteln GS Johann Henning Röhe, and 1750 Northen HS Chr. Heinrich Rühe

1740 BS Heinrich Andreas Krauel HS-m und WaffS-m BS Stadtarchiv GVIII A, nr. 448, v. I, I don't know which mastership was gained first but he earned both separately

1740-1741 Wunstorf Chrn. Conr. Schmidt HS-m NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; married first year and remarried

1741 BS Johann Frantz [Hans Frantz] Köchy HS-m und WaffS-m BS Stadtarchiv GVIII A, nr. 448, v. I, I don't know which mastership was gained first but he earned both separately

1741 BS Johann Nicolaus Krauell HS-m und WaffS-m BS Stadtarchiv GVIII A, nr. 448, v. I, I don't know which mastership was gained first but he earned both separately

1741 Knigge/ Brandenburg Hennig Berghahn HS NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 8. Lieferung; married this year

1742 Hannover Rudolph George Carol Wiesel PA NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 1. Lieferung, married this year

1743 Verden/Jeddingen Christoph Gebhard Rörs HS Neubürger der Stadt Verden von 1569-1813, “HS aud Jeddingen” but now a Burgher in Verden
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Eime</td>
<td>Herman Ernst Freund</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 11. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Dahlenburg</td>
<td>Hans Peter Wehrs</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Himbergen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Hagen</td>
<td>Johan Jürgen Judenherzog</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; married this year to Hchrn. Engelke, S ,daughter Marie Marg., is also cited as son of a dead S, Johan Jürgen of Hesslingen/Amt Schaumberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Lüttow/Mecklenburg</td>
<td>Albrecht aus Boizenburg</td>
<td>GS, PCur</td>
<td>Hann. 9G, nr. 773, GS bill covering Pferdekuren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Everloh</td>
<td>Johan Chr. Lüke</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>Wülfingen</td>
<td>Hans Jürgen Klencke</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung, widower remarries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Neustadt am Rübenberge</td>
<td>Heinrich Jürgen Rehr</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 6. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747-1749</td>
<td>Helmstedt/Blankenburg</td>
<td>Johann Andreas Knopf</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Staatsarchiv Wolf. 2 Alt Findbuch 12865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Wunstorf</td>
<td>Johan Eberhart Schröder</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 5. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Dannenberg</td>
<td>Johann Wilhelm Kordes</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Buergerbuch der Stadt Dannenberg (1894), HS am 30. Jan (HS family business in mid/late 18th cen and in mid-late 17th cen); probably related to 1594 BS/Wolfenb. GS Jacob Cords, 1650 Dannenberg HS Hans Kordes and 1670 Dannenberg HS Johann Dieterich Cordes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748-1749</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Michael Dietrich Roden</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, PA im Leibgarde-Rgt; d. vor 1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Jacob Wiesel</td>
<td>kgl. PA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, d. 1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Johann Christian Schiere</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>BS Stadtarchiv A 448, v.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Hildesheim</td>
<td>Kord Engelkehn zu Gross Duengen</td>
<td>VA/KHt</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>Lenthe</td>
<td>Harm Chrn. Börstling</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Degersen</td>
<td>Hans Henrich Balke</td>
<td>HS and WaffS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, Band 2, 9. Lieferung; marries widow of Hans Henr. Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Hajen</td>
<td>Dieterich Andr. Giesemann</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; married this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Hajen</td>
<td>Henrich Schultze</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>NS Trauregister Calenberger Land, 12. Lieferung; married this year and is also a Reuter; probably related to 1676 Celle HS Jürgen Schultze, 1703 Celle HS Ernest Schultze and 1714 Celle HS Heinrich Schultze (same guy?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Ludwig Helmann</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Garnison-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1690-1811, PA and Reuter in Rgt.Hammerstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Georg Johann Berg</td>
<td>kgl. PA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, b. 1720 [1750 estimate for when married/master]-d. 1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Christian Arens</td>
<td>kgl.RS (FahnenS)</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, m. in 1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Hanstedt</td>
<td>Peter Lohse</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Hanstedt I; married in first year, d. in latter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Ebstorf</td>
<td>Joachim Eppers</td>
<td>FahnenS</td>
<td>Die Familien und Einwohner des Kirchspiels Ebstorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>Dannenberg</td>
<td>Ludwig Diederich</td>
<td>HS-m</td>
<td>Buergerbuch der Stadt Dannenberg (1894), HS-meister am 10.Juli (HS family business in later 18th and 19th cen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757-1784</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Johann Adam Kersting</td>
<td>Ober-Hof-RA</td>
<td>Schloss-Kirchenbuch Hannover, 1680-1812, b.1727 [1757 estimate for married/master]-d.1784; reformed church member; author of hippological book?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations:
- THK: Heilkunde (tier)
- HK: Heilkunde (pferd)
- PC: Pferdecur
- PA: Pferdearzt
- VA: Vieharzt
- RA: Rossarzt
- RS: Reitschmied
- CS: Curschmied
- KS: Kurschmied
- HS: Hufschmied
- GS: Grobschmied
- S: Schmied
- K.Ht: Kuhhirt
- SM: Stallmeister
- GM: Gestutmeister
- RM: Reitmeister [Ritt]
- RK: Reitkunst
- V.Schn: Viehschneider
- S.Schn: Schwein-schneider
Appendix C (cont.)

**Special notes:**
Age and time estimations- I estimated twenty years of age for when a GS's child (either sex) married; and I approximated thirty years of age to be when large-smiths would have attained their mastership, and thus when they would have married.

**Notes about locations (based on size and industry during the late seventeenth century):**
Smaller towns, regional trading centers- Ebstorf, Gifhorn (technically also a former court), Uelzen, Bodenteich, Helmstedt (also technically a court town), Fallersleben, Wittingen, Verden.
Everything else is a small town, a village, or is located in the country-side.

Locations omitted- I did not use the state archives in Stade, Aurich, and Oldenburg. I also did not look at registers for areas outside of Calenburg (north) and Celle, meaning that the southern part of Niedersachsen (around Göttingen and the Harz) is excluded from coverage here as are the northwestern and northern regions.
Appendix D: Equine Populations in Braunschweig-Lüneburg, 1535-1770

Given the particular utility of this Appendix as a digital document that can be easily modified to allow for speedy comparative work, it does not represent well in a fixed medium. Please see the supplemental file Appendix D deposit.xls.
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