

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Cambridge Antiquarian Society,

JULY 1939—DECEMBER 1942



VOLUME XL

Cambridge :

Published for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society

By BOWES & BOWES

1944

Price Twenty Shillings net.

CAMBRIDGE
ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY
PROCEEDINGS

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Cambridge Antiquarian Society,

JULY 1939-DECEMBER 1942



VOL. XL

CAMBRIDGE
PUBLISHED FOR THE CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY
By BOWES & BOWES
1944

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers and Council of the Society, 1942-43	v
List of Illustrations	ix
Report of the Council and Summary of Accounts for the year 1939	xi
Report of the Council and Summary of Accounts for the year 1940	xvii
Report of the Council and Summary of Accounts for the year 1941	xxiii
Report of the Council and Summary of Accounts for the year 1942	xxviii
John Mortlock III, 'Master of the Town of Cambridge', 1755-1816.	
By H. M. CAM, Litt.D.	1
A Marriage Register at Queens' College, Cambridge. By Rev.	
J. F. WILLIAMS, M.A., F.S.A.	13
Extracts from Sawston Parish Register: A Supplementary Note	
by J. H. BULLOCK, M.A.	21
Local Character in the Ancient Architecture of Cambridgeshire.	
by T. D. ATKINSON	24
Cambridgeshire Field Systems, with a Hand-list of Cambridgeshire	
Enclosure Acts and Awards. By W. E. TATE, F.R.Hist.S. . .	56

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL, 1942-43

PRESIDENT

L. C. G. CLARKE, M.A., F.S.A.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Miss CATHERINE E. PARSONS.

J. H. BULLOCK, M.A.

DISNEY PROFESSOR OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Prof. D. A. E. GARROD, M.A., D.Sc., F.S.A.

CURATOR OF UNIVERSITY MUSEUM OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND OF ETHNOLOGY

T. T. PATERSON, M.A., Ph.D.

ORDINARY MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

C. F. TEBBUTT.

C. W. PHILLIPS, M.A., LL.B., F.S.A.

H. C. HUGHES, M.A., F.R.I.B.A.

G. B. BOWES, M.A.

Prof. ELLIS H. MINNS, Litt.D., F.B.A., F.S.A.

G. H. S. BUSHNELL, M.A., F.S.A.

Miss H. M. CAM, M.A., D.Litt.

The Rev. M. P. CHARLESWORTH, M.A., F.S.A.

A. W. CLAPHAM, P.S.A.

Lord FAIRHAVEN.

Miss M. A. MURRAY, D.Sc.

The Rev. F. M. YGLESIAS, M.A.

Prof. J. H. HUTTON, D.Sc., C.I.E.

TREASURER

Miss Z. M. SCRUBY, M.B., B.S., D.P.H.

SECRETARY AND EDITOR

Miss M. M. O'REILLY, M.A.

DIRECTOR OF EXCAVATIONS

T. C. LETHBRIDGE, M.A., F.S.A.

EXCURSION SECRETARY

Miss Z. M. SCRUBY, M.B., B.S., D.P.H.

HON. AUDITORS

H. H. BRINDLEY, M.A., F.S.A.

Col. L. TEBBUTT, J.P.







LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

		PAGE
Fig. 1	Map of Cambridge	29
2	Cambridge, St Benet's steeple, as restored by Dr F. J. Allen	32
3	Teversham Church, stepped parapet	32
4	Map of Central England, principal area of octagonal steeple	34
5	Cambridge, Holy Sepulchre Church, old polygonal bell-chamber	36
6	Cambridge, St Botolph's Church	37
7	Ely Cathedral, construction of Lantern	38
8	Needham Market Church, nave roof	39
9	Cambridge, St John's College Library	40
10	Landbeach Church roof	42
11	Willingham Church nave roof	42
12	Cambridge, Stourbridge Chapel	43
13	Cambridge, Jesus College Chapel arches	45
14	Lead templates at March Church	45
15	Cambridge, Pargetting at Wrestlers Inn	47
16	Patterns of Pargetting	47
17	Cambridge, King's College Old Gateway, outside	50
18	The same, inside	51
19	Cambridge, St John's College Gateway	52
20	Cambridge, Trinity College, Hall of Michaelhouse	53
21	Cambridge, Peterhouse, west end of Chapel	54

PLATES

[All the Plates, as a war-time necessity, are to be found following page 48]

- I Willingham Church: Steeple
Over Church Steeple
- II Haslingfield Church: Steeple
- III Cambridge: Church of St Peter in the Borough
Snailwell Church

- IV Ely Cathedral: West Tower
- V Sutton-in-the-Isle Steeple
Swaffham Prior: the two Towers
Swaffham Prior: St Cyriac's Tower
- VI Melbourn Church
Burwell Church
- VII Cambridge: Holy Trinity Church
- VIII Soham Church
- IX Norwich Cathedral: part of Tower
- X Cambridge: Great St Mary's Church Steeple
- XI Whittlesey Church
- XII Leverington Church
- XIII Ely: Prior's House: Roof of Hall
Wall-piece of Roof
- XIV March: Church of St Wendreda: Nave Roof
- XV Haslingfield Church: Nave Roof
- XVI Cambridge: Hall of Trinity College
- XVII Histon Church
- XVIII Ely: Prior's House: Audit Room
Ely: Prior's House: Plan
- XIX Cambridge: Pembroke College

CAMBRIDGESHIRE FIELD SYSTEMS

WITH A HAND-LIST OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE ENCLOSURE ACTS AND AWARDS

By W. E. TATE, F.R.HIST.S.

(This paper is Part IV of "A Hand-List of English Enclosure Acts and Awards", now in process of publication in county instalments)

PART I

CAMBRIDGESHIRE FIELD SYSTEMS

ACCORDING to the data set forth in Professor Gray's¹ pioneer study, Cambridgeshire proper lies very largely within the midland area formerly cultivated under the two- and three-field systems. A small portion of the county along the eastern boundary, he says, is outside this open-field region. The whole of the Isle of Ely and an extensive area in the north of the county proper also lies outside the sphere of open-field agriculture.

Dr and Mrs Orwin,² whose later researches have very considerably modified Professor Gray's conclusions as to the extent of open-field conditions elsewhere, are in general agreement with him as to the wide prevalence of open fields throughout the county, and they note that the only extensive area of Cambridgeshire where it seems that open fields were never widely distributed was the fenland district of the extreme north. Even in the Isle of Ely, which Professor Gray thought showed no traces whatever of open field, Dr and Mrs Orwin have found undoubted evidence of its existence round Ely city.

So far as can be ascertained, Cambridgeshire was early essentially a county of three-field agriculture.³ In this the shire was unlike some of its neighbours, where the two-field system evolved into a three-field scheme in quite late historic times. Not, of course, that at any time three-field agriculture was entirely supreme in the county. At Litlington⁴ the change from two-field husbandry to that of three fields can be dated as somewhere between 11 Ed. III (1337-8) and 29 Hen. VIII (1537-8). Altogether Professor Gray has noted in Cambridgeshire particulars of the agricultural condition of twenty-seven townships. Four⁵ of these were in two fields each: Abington (qu. Great Abington, Little Abington, or Abington Pigotts), 4 John (1202-3), Bosworth (Boxworth), *ante* 15th century and 2 Ed. III (1328-9), Litlington, 2 Ed. III (1328-9), and Tadlow, 3 Hen. III

¹ *English Field Systems*, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A. 1915, frontispiece and p. 63.

² *The Open Fields*, 1938, pp. 60, 65, 66.

³ Gray, *op. cit.* p. 70.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 75.

⁵ At times ranging from 4 John (1202-3) to 15 Ed. III (1341-2).

(1218-19). No less than twenty-three¹ of them were each in three fields. The list runs: Barnwell, *temp.* Ric. II (1377-99), "Beche" (Reach or more probably Landbeach and/or Waterbeach), *temp.* Ed. I (1272-1307), Chesterton, 42 Hen. III (1257-8), Chippenham, *ante* 1387, Cottenham, 4 John (1202-3) and 12 Hen. III (1227-8), Downham, 1278, Fen Ditton, 30 Ed. III (1356-7), Foxton, 16th century, Gamlingay, 1601, Grantchester,² 9 Ed. III (1335-6), Harlton, 16th century, Haslingfield, 16th century, Hinxton, 16th century, Litlington, 29 Hen. VIII (1537-8), Littleport, 1278, "Lyndon" (qu. Linton or a manor of Haddenham), 1278, Madingley, 10 Ed. III (1336-7), Shudy Camps, 3 Hen. III (1218-19), Swaffham Prior, 1566, Thriplow, 1278, Whaddon, 15 Ed. III (1341-2), Wilburton, 1278, and Willingham, 1278 and 15th century. Mr Leadam³ thought that an enclosure of 60 acres at Longstowe in 1690 strongly suggested the existence of a three-field system there. Rampton in 1754 was in four fields.⁴ To Gray's instances Mr L. F. Salzman has added others.

I am obliged to him for permission to reprint the two following paragraphs from the Cambridgeshire *Victoria County History*. It will be seen that he gives all the data in Gray, with one note of correction and many additions, and that he arranges the villages named topographically, so as to make his description much easier to follow than that of Gray.

Cambridgeshire lay in the midland area of England of which the agricultural economics were dominated by the open-field system. Thus in an extent of the manor of Quy⁵ in 1317 it is definitely stated that "there are 200 acres of arable land, of which none is in severalty". In many other instances the same fact is implied, though occasionally there seem to have been blocks of enclosed arable from an early date.⁶ By the middle of the 13th century the three-field system was predominant in the greater part of the county. There is definite evidence of this round Cambridge, at Barnwell, Chesterton, Coton,⁷ Madingley, Grantchester and Fen Ditton, farther east at Bottisham (Northfield, Whytefeld, Stonyfeld),⁸ Swaffham Prior, and Chippenham, on the borders of Suffolk; in the south at Shudy Camps, Castle Camps,⁹ Linton,¹⁰ Balsham,¹¹ Hinxton, Thriplow and Foxton. In the neighbourhood of Ely, three fields are found at

¹ At times ranging from 1202-3 to 1601.

² Wrongly identified by Gray as Gransden.

³ *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.* N.S. vol. VIII (1894), p. 303.

⁴ Dr J. A. Venn. *Foundations of Agricultural Economics*, 2nd ed. 1933, pp. 36-8, reproduces the map of this date, and offers some interesting notes on its main features. He says incorrectly, however, that the date of the subsequent enclosure is not recorded. Actually the place was enclosed in 1839, and so duly appears in List A *infra*.

⁵ Chan. Inq. p.m. Edw. II, file 57, no. 25.

⁶ E.g. at Marchford (now known as March), in 1360, in a close, 10 acres of land: *ibid.* Edw. III, file 155, no. 15.

⁷ In 1271, 80 acres, of which 53 can be sown yearly: Chan. Inq. p.m. Hen. III, file 42, no. 2.

⁸ Hailstone, *Hist. of Bottisham*, C.A.S. 8vo Publ. No. XIV (1873), pp. 334-5.

⁹ Chan. Inq. p.m. Edw. III, file 28, no. 17.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* Hen. III, file 42, no. 6.

¹¹ *Ibid.* file 41, no. 20.

Witcham (North, South and East fields),¹ Downham, Littleport, Wilburton, Cottenham and Willingham: at Strettham in 1277 the acres of demesne were distributed between Estfeld 41, Northfeld 32½, Westfeld 16, Suthfeld 158, and Hay 180,² which suggests an original division of the arable between three fields, with the later addition of two large tracts of reclaimed land. That such extensions of arable were made is shown by the demesnes of Doddington,³ where 242½ acres lay in ten named parcels, ranging from 9 acres to 52, and 89½ acres were entered as "of new assart" in Stockinghoue, Brechoue, Hochoue, and Suthythehoue. Where the demesne arable lay thus in many parcels, as at Fen Ditton, and Horningsea⁴, Balsham,⁵ and Little Gransden,⁶ it is probable that most of these represent enclosures, as opposed to strips in the common fields. This is borne out by the description of the demesne of Hardwick:⁷ in Haydole 17½ acres: in Hotefeld in various parcels 52 acres 3 roods. . . in the field called Tenakres 26½ acres; in Utfeld 17 acres 1 rood, and in the same field in various parcels 14½ acres. Here there seems to be a clear distinction between arable in blocks and in scattered strips: but the three-field rotation was no doubt followed, as at Great Shelford in 1384, although the demesne arable lay in ten different blocks, 130 acres were sown with various kinds of corn and 65½ acres lay fallow against the next year.⁸

In the south-west corner of the county we find a block of manors in which the two-field system existed: Bassingbourn,⁹ Litlington, Steeple Morden,¹⁰ Abington Pigotts, Tadlow, and Clopton;¹¹ but in Whaddon on the east, and Gamlingay on the north of this group the three-field system was practised. Farther north Boxworth certainly and Elsworth¹² apparently followed the two-field system. So, rather surprisingly, did Milton, where, in 1349, of 100 acres of arable "there are sown this year with winter corn 20 acres and with Lent corn 33 acres 1 rood, and the rest lies fallow and then is worth nothing, as it lies in common for the cattle".¹³ Burrough Green¹⁴ (Borough Green) on the south-east edge of the county, and Leverington¹⁵ in the extreme north, also belong to this group.

Other scraps of information which I have come across in the course of my reading are as follows: "Beche" (Waterbeach)¹⁶ was in three fields in the middle of the twelfth century. Burgh (Borough Green)¹⁷ was in two fields in 1334. By 1615 it was in at least six, possibly seven, apparently very unequal in their areas. Landbeach¹⁸ seems to have been in four fields, of areas respectively 121, 303, 232 and 259 acres in 1549.

¹ Egerton MS. 3047, fol. 67 v.

² Cott. MS. Claud C. XI, fol. 43 v.

³ *Ibid.* fol. 61. At Tydd the virgaters were allowed to take in land from the sea and marsh without paying extra rent, but no reduction of rent was made if part of their land was destroyed by the sea: *ibid.* fol. 87 v.

⁴ *Ibid.* fol. 115.

⁵ *Ibid.* fol. 121.

⁶ *Ibid.* fol. 149.

⁷ *Ibid.* fol. 145.

⁸ Mins. Accts. (P.R.O.), 1133, no. 6.

⁹ Chan. Inq. p.m. Hen. III, file 37, no. 13.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* Edw. I, file 5, no. 6.

¹¹ *Ibid.* Hen. III, file 34, no. 13.

¹² Radulfus tenet xi seliones in uno campo et in alio v: *Cart. Mon. Ram.* (Rolls Series), III, 248.

¹³ Chan. Inq. p.m. Edw. III, file 101, no. 7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* file 39, no. 10.

¹⁵ Esch. Accts. (35-6 Edw. III), file 8, no. 24.

¹⁶ Clay, *History of Waterbeach*, C.A.S. 1859, p. 85.

¹⁷ Palmer, *History of Borough Green*, C.A.S. 1939, pp. 10, 139.

¹⁸ Clay, *History of Landbeach*, C.A.S. 1861, pp. 28-9.

Concerning the management of these open fields, as also regarding the importance of the common pasture, there is a fair amount of evidence available. The following instances are also taken from the *V.C.H.*¹ On the three Crowland manors, Cottenham, Dry Drayton and Oakington, the tenant of every hide had the right to graze on the common 6 oxen, 2 horses, 6 cows, 80 sheep and 15 geese. This would give a total of 90 horses, 540 cows and oxen, 3600 sheep and 675 geese on, apparently, not more than 5500 acres. Every tenant would not make full use of his rights, but many exceeded their stint: in 1285, for instance, the Prior of Swavesey, who held one hide at Dry Drayton, had put 120 cattle and 600 sheep on the commons, and others had followed his example. In addition to the waste, the open fields, after the crops had been carried in, or when lying fallow, were commonable, and here the stock not only picked up food but helped to manure the ground. It is interesting to find many instances in the county of the manorial right of foldage, which Professor Gray² described very elaborately with special reference to Norfolk and Suffolk, and which Dr Slater regarded as almost peculiar to Cambridgeshire. At Stretham, for instance, even the scanty sheep of the "analepimen" or "underseths" (the landless tenants of the villeins) had to lie in the Bishop's fold. At Ditton Camois (Wood Ditton) in 1290 "everyone having sheep must put them in the lord's fold, of which the clear profit is 13s. 4d.", and at Linton in 1272 there was pasture for sheep on the fallow, whereof the fold was worth 20s. An account for 1306 shows 13 acres at Ely and 7 at Lindon (*recte* Lyndon, a hamlet of Haddenham) dinged "with the fold" against 48 and 32 "with carts":³ but at Kennett 57 acres were manured by the fold and 29 with carts. There is an interesting later reference to this same custom at Stretham in Archdeacon Cunningham's work cited below.

Concerning the management of the commons in a group of parishes lying near the junction of the Ouse and the Cam, there is a great mass of information in Dr Cunningham's study.⁴ The places mentioned are: Cottenham, Haddenham, Stretham, Little Thetford, Waterbeach and Willingham. In this area pasture farming was the main pursuit, and the commoners, e.g. those of Haddenham, like their fellows in the rather similar district in the Isle of Axholme (Lincs), were at once numerous, highly organized, very litigious and most tenacious of their

¹ *V.C.H. Cambs.*, vol. II, now in the Press, and references there cited.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 316, 325-9, 341-4; Slater, *op. cit.* pp. 82-4.

³ There is to be found in Clay, *History of Landbeach*, pp. 28-9, a very interesting account of the four flocks of Landbeach in 1549. They knew the bounds of their walks so well that they even refrained from crossing another flock's territory when they were being driven to graze on the stubble of the arable fields(!).

⁴ *Common Rights at Cottenham and Stretham*, ed. Dr W. Cunningham, *R. Hist. S.*, Camden Series, vol. x (1910), pp. 169-296.

rights.¹ Disputes between lords and tenants were generally settled either by arbitration, the award being confirmed by Chancery decree, or by commission issuing from the Court of Exchequer. The village communities also took very practical measures for the regulation and management of the commons. At Willingham, the fen reeves' accounts survive in part from Elizabethan times;² at Stretham, in the seventeenth century, regulations were issued by the court leet, and in the same period at both Stretham and Little Thetford the commoners were empowered to make by-laws for the regulation of their cow pastures. The Stretham fen reeves were managing their work efficiently at any rate as late as 1794; the twenty-four democratically elected "order makers" of Cottenham governed their petty republic until the enclosure of 1842.

At Cottenham³ an agreement between the lord of the manor and the "substancialist inhabitants" at Easter, 1580, provided for the relinquishment of the lord's right of agistment on the common fields of the parish, in return for the allotment to him and his tenants of a sheep walk in severalty for 2000 sheep. The agreement was contested in 1583, and another agreement embodied in an award of 1585. More litigation followed in 1596, and an award drawn up then was confirmed by Chancery decree in 1597. There was still more litigation in the 1660's, and in 1669 the 1596 award was once more confirmed. In various tithe disputes between the commoners and successive rectors, in 1623-5, in 1780, in 1810 and in 1821 "the award of 1596 proved to be the corner-stone of village economy". As to disputes at Stretham and Little Thetford the records printed by Dr Cunningham are very interesting. The two townships intercommoned (Little Thetford was actually a chapelry of Stretham), and the lord of the manor of Stretham was at feud with his tenants. Disputes of long standing led to legal proceedings in 1597, and an Exchequer commission was granted in 1647. It gave the lord 100 acres in the fen in exchange for his surrender of all rights in an area of 1600 acres of fen, and brought to an end the intercommoning of the two townships. Subsequent amending orders were issued in 1609, 1614 and 1622. Various other feudal obligations were remitted or lightened by the award.⁴ At Willingham the lord of the manor, who had acquired the estate in 1601, very shortly quarrelled with his tenants concerning enclosure. After they had "unlawfully, ryotously, routeously, and in forcible manner" pulled down his fences, an award was made under which he was allowed to enclose upon certain conditions. The award was to have been confirmed by Chancery decree, but this does not seem to have been carried out. Here also as part of the settlement certain feudal services were remitted in 1611.⁵

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 177. Dr Cunningham's note, p. 182: "Compare also the customs of Whittlesea, W. Nelson, *Lex Maneriorum*, Ap. 79."

² *Ibid.* p. 182.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 177, 182.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 184.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 184-5.

At Waterbeach the settlement was much later. In 1740 the lord of the manor entered into an agreement with the commoners to give up his right to agist cattle in return for a payment of two shillings by each commoner, a proper stint of the pasture was arranged, and measures were taken for the election of fen reeves. The agreement was confirmed by act in 1740, and an amending Act was passed in 1790.¹ Apparently there were rather similar acts for Chatteris in 1773, 1783, 1793 (Gooch, *op. cit.* p. 77). I have been able to find little about this.

The documents to our purpose printed by Archdeacon Cunningham are: for Cottenham,² the agreement of 1596 and the orders of 1639, for Stretham,³ extracts from the decree of 1607, separate orders for Stretham, and for Little Thetford, 1609, Presentments of the Leet 1614, Orders and By-laws of the Leet 1614, and Orders and By-laws made by the Inhabitants 1622, all of which form a mine of information as to how the open-field village managed its affairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

EARLY ENCLOSURE IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE

Concerning enclosure in Cambridgeshire generally Archdeacon Cunningham⁴ suggests that there was the less motive in this district than in others for landowners to convert from arable to pasture in the sixteenth century, because "the Colleges at Cambridge offered a convenient market for food stuffs, both corn and dairy produce. . . . The corn rent act. . . served to maintain their revenues as the value of money fell."

However this may be, like most three-field counties—but to a greater extent than most—Cambridgeshire in general remained open until a very late period.⁵ An exceptionally early enclosure is revealed by a petition of 1414, which asserts that at Chesterton, after an enclosure by Barnwell Abbey, no houses were left standing except for "a sheepcote or a barn" and such-like things.⁶

The county does not appear in the original returns of the Commission of 1517, but fortunately some abstracts of the presentments

¹ *Ibid.* p. 185. The Acts are not indexed in the appended lists. They are 14 Geo. II, c. 24 and 30 Geo. III, c. 74.

² *Ibid.* pp. 193–229 and 230–45 respectively.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 253–9, 261–2, 263–4, 265–6, 267–74, 275–87 respectively.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 175. The act referred to is 15 Eliz. c. 6 (1572).

⁵ Gray, *op. cit.* p. 137 footnote.

⁶ *Rot. Parl.* iv, 60: "And also they seiden that ther was made gret wast in the same Maner of Chestreton, of Housyng, that is to saye, of Halles and of Chambres, and othere houses of office that were necessarie in the same Man, and none housynge left standynge ther on, but yif it were a Shepecote or a Berne or a Swynesty, and a fewe houses byside to putte in Bestes."

have been preserved in the Lansdowne MSS. These are the basis of Mr Leadam's printed text.¹ Apparently the existing return is very incomplete. It relates to but five of the seventeen Hundreds in the shire, and there is other evidence suggesting the incompleteness of the return as it now stands. Brief as it is, however, it has some features of special interest. It is noteworthy that in this county some of the commissioners are themselves returned as enclosers, a fact which seems to show that here, at any rate, the Commission was honest and impartial. 1422 acres in all are returned as enclosed in the Hundreds of "Armyngford" (Armingford), Cheveley, "Chel-lerton", i.e. Chesterton, "Stowe", i.e. Longstowe, and "Wheteley" (Wetherley). The total acreage affected is some 1.39 per cent of the Hundreds named, and about 0.2 per cent of the gross area of the shire. The nine places named are: Cheveyley (Cheveley), Childerley, Cottenham (Cottenham), East Hatley, Gamlingay, Long Stowe (Longstowe), Malton (now a hamlet of Orwell), "Shingey" (Shingay) and "Steeple-nourden" (Steeple Morden). From other sources² it is known that Clopton³ was enclosed in 1520, and Odsey⁴ converted in 1515-18.

Presumably enclosure was fairly active throughout the county in the early sixteenth century. At any rate Cambridgeshire was among the fourteen counties to which it was enacted that the 1536⁵ depopulation act should apply. Leland visited the county, like many others, during his journey throughout the country a few years later,⁶ but he tells us relatively little of its agrarian condition. "From Cambridge to Eltesle (Eltisley) village al by champayne countrey 8 miles (then to St Neots, Hunts)... A mile from Eltesle is the *limes* of Cambridge-shire... From Cambridge to Hauston (Hauxton) milles 3 miles. Thens vij miles to Reiston (Royston), and 4 miles a this side Reiston over a broket and by a mille side. Al this 10 mile champayne without enclosier and barein of wood... The market at Reiston on the wennesday is mervelusly frequentid, espetially with corne..." The county seems to have been relatively little affected by the agrarian disturbances of 1549, though a long list of grievances in the shire includes⁷ ploughing up certain balks and cutways in the fields. Cambridgeshire is the only county, apart from Warwickshire, for which any of the 1549 enclosure returns are preserved. Those relating to Cambridge town have been known for some time. On the strength of these Lord Justice Scrutton⁸ notes that a number of offenders were

¹ *Ibid.* N.S. vols. VI, VII, VIII, 1892-4.

² Dr Palmer's study cited below, p. 370, referring to his essay, *Proc. C.A.S.* xxxiii (1933), p. 48.

³ *V.C.H.* vol. II, now in the Press, footnote and references there cited.

⁴ Miss H. M. Leonard in *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.*, N.S. vol. XIX (1905), p. 124, footnote.

⁵ 27 Hen. VIII, c. 22. Slater, *op. cit.* pp. 324-5; Leonard, *op. cit.* p. 124.

⁶ *Itinerary*, c. 1525-43, ed. Miss L. T. Smith, 1907, vol. I, pp. 327-8.

⁷ Curtler, *op. cit.* p. 94.

⁸ Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, vol. II, pp. 38-40, and *Commons and Common Fields*, 1887, p. 87.

presented in Cambridge itself, where fences had been pulled down in Barnwell. He quotes the contemporary doggerel ballad on the question:

For Cambridge bailiffs truly
Give ill example to the country;
Their commons likewise to engross
And from poor men it to enclose.

The recently discovered returns¹ relate to enclosures at Ely, Downham and Littleport. They mention the three places above referred to, also Chettisham and Stuntney, and record a total area enclosed and converted to pasture of c. 547 acres.

Apparently the process of enclosure continued throughout Elizabethan times. Archdeacon Cunningham's study above cited² contains evidence of fairly extensive enclosure (probably mainly of pasture), at Cottenham in the sixty years before 1596. Some of this was confirmed (at the price of the laying open again of certain lands which had been wrongfully enclosed), and some further modest enclosures were authorised. To balance the accounts the tenants agreed to pay their lord £300, and those persons making enclosures surrendered sheep pasture rights on the remaining open land.

At the same time there was going on a good deal of reclamation from the waste. In some villages the community was so strong that land so secured by approvement was not taken into individual ownership, but was laid out in selions and furlongs and added to the open arable fields. This seems to have happened at Coton,³ where an (undated) Elizabethan survey shows very little waste left, but a series of field names on the outskirts of the open fields suggests recent approvement for the purpose of adding to their area. Tusser⁴ considers Cambridgeshire a typical open field county, and refers to its husbandry thus:

In Cambridgeshire forward, to Lincolnshire way,
the champion maketh his fallow in May.

Again in his celebrated *Comparison between Champion Countrie and Severall*:

By Cambridge a towne I doo knowe,
where many good husbands doo dwell;
Whose losses by losels doth showe,
more here than is needfull to tell:
Determine at court what they shall,
performed is nothing at all.

¹ Dr W. M. Palmer in *Trans. Cambs. and Hunts. Archaeolog. Soc.* vol. v, pt. vi (1934-5), pp. 369-84.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 196-205.

³ W. J. Corbett, "Elizabethan Village Surveys", in *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.* N.S., vol. xi, 1897, p. 69.

⁴ *Five Hundred Pointes of Good Husbandrie*, English Dialect Society Reprint of 1878, pp. 99 and 143. losels = wastrels.

The champion robbeth by night,
 and prowleth and filcheth by day:
 Himselfe and his beast out of sight,
 both spoileth and maketh away
 Not only thy grasse but thy corne,
 both after, and er it be shorne.

It seems that the enclosure movement locally had not been entirely checked by the earlier efforts. Evidence for this view is found in the fact that Cambridgeshire is one of the twenty-five counties to which it was ordered that the last depopulation act should apply.¹ Probably there was relatively little enclosure in the county during the next century. The shire does not appear at all in the enclosure returns of 1607, or in the list of compositions 1628-31.² The literary evidence, too, is unanimous in describing the shire as champion and fruitful in the south and fenny in the north.³ Statements to much the same effect appear at intervals for more than a century.⁴

The topographical writers give a little incidental information as to the extent of enclosure, and still more material from which such information may reasonably be inferred. Camden⁵ speaks of the upland as "laid out into corne fields", Morden⁶ says that the county is "abounding in Corn of all sorts, chiefly Barley", Defoe⁷ confirms Morden's account. The eighteenth-century topographers make similar statements. Douglas⁸ in 1729 talks of the saffron country between Saffron Walden and Cambridge as "an open level country with few enclosures".

By Ogilby's⁹ time some 60 per cent of the roads throughout the county were still unenclosed, so presumably at least this proportion of the county area was in open field or common. Cambridgeshire is fourth of the thirty-seven counties listed by Professor Gonner in order of open land still remaining in 1675, and the only counties having any higher proportion, and this only a slightly higher figure, are its neighbours Huntingdonshire, Rutland and Lincolnshire. One of Ogilby's routes through the county is fairly identifiable¹⁰ with a route described by Leland from Cambridge to Eltisley. Apparently the condition of the land had not changed a great deal in the 140 years elapsing between Leland's journeys and Ogilby's. It has been

¹ 39 Eliz. c. 2 (1597), Slater, *The English Peasantry...*, 1907, App. D, p. 328.

² Gonner, *op. cit.* p. 167.

³ E. F. Gay, "The Midland Revolt", in *Trans. R. Hist. Soc. N.S.*, vol. XVIII (1904).

⁴ E.g. in *The Geographical Description... of 1615*; Speed's *Theatre*, 1656 (written 1653), and the *Dictionary Urbanicum...*, 1704.

⁵ *Britannia*, ed. 1637, p. 485.

⁶ R. Morden, *New Description...*, 1701, p. 13.

⁷ *Tour*, 1724-6, Everyman edn. of 1928, pp. 77-8.

⁸ In *Phil. Trans.* vol. xxxv (1729), p. 566, cited in *V.C.H. loc. cit.*

⁹ *Britannia*, 1679; Gonner, *op. cit.* p. 173.

¹⁰ Gonner, *op. cit.* p. 170, footnote.

suggested that Roger North's¹ remarks on enclosure and depopulation may apply especially to Cambridgeshire, the county he knew best. From what has been said above, it will be clear that this seems doubtful in the extreme, but I reproduce his text for what it is worth. "It is another very great destruction of people as well as an impedient to the recruit of them that gentlemen of late years have taken up a humour of destroying their Tenements and cottages whereby they make it impossible that mankind should inhabit upon their estates. This is done sometimes barefaced because the charge of repairing is so great, and if an house be ruinous they will not be at the cost of rebuilding and repairing it, and cast their lands into great farms, which are managed with less housing and oft times for improvement as it is called, which is done by buying in all freeholds, copyholds, and tenement(s), that have common, and which harboured many husbandry (*sic*) and labouring families, and then enclosing the commons and fields, turning the managery from tillage to grazing."

About the same time Celia Fiennes² was travelling through the county. She describes the country from Littlebury (Essex) to Cambridge as entirely open, and makes no mention of enclosures in her description of the view from the "Hogmogoge Hills". She speaks of "good Enclosure" however, in her description of the country between Cambridge and Huntingdon.

About the middle of the seventeenth century there was serious trouble in the county concerning the drainage and enclosure of the fens.³ The celebrated Cornelius Vermuyden entered into negotiations for draining the Cambridgeshire fens before undertaking his much-debated project in the Isle of Axholme. Altogether some 36,000 acres were drained and enclosed about 1637 by a body of undertakers headed by the Earl of Bedford. A verse of the time put it so:

For they do mean all fens to, drain and waters overmaster;
All will be dry, and we must die, 'cause Essex calves want pasture.

During the Commonwealth again there were serious disturbances on the Bedford Level, near Swaffham and Bottisham, in August 1653. Fifty people came by night and threw in the dyke "making very high and insolent speeches". Again in 1656 a certain James Mawe and his son were involved in enclosure riots, the commoners swearing that they would "defend their commons with their swords".

The general conclusion is then that such part of the county as ever was in open field tended to remain so until a late period.⁴ The marsh

¹ *Discourse of the Poor* (published 1753, but written, of course, much earlier), pp. 57, 65; Miss Leonard, *op. cit.* p. 100, footnote.

² *Through England on a Side-Saddle* (c. 1695), 1889, pp. 48-9.

³ Scrutton, *op. cit.* p. 107.

⁴ Slater, *op. cit.* p. 206, speaks of "much of the land as fen", and "a great deal" of the cultivable part never passing through the common field system.

area was largely drained and enclosed in the seventeenth century. It was the extensive survival of open field in the area which gave Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire their unenviable reputation as (at the end of the eighteenth century) "the Bœotia of agriculture".¹

In the early and middle parts of the eighteenth century there seems to be little evidence of agricultural progress in the county. Robert Morden, the antiquarian vicar of Landbeach 1759-84, left a note concerning the commons of his parish which gives a good idea of their condition in the middle of the eighteenth century. They were on land which was superior in quality to that of the open fields, but because of its common state was very unproductive. Lambs had to be sent to a great distance for shelter during the winter, and cows to be succoured on hay and fodder brought from other villages. "An inclosure of a considerable part at least of these commons would be highly beneficial, and will, I shall hope, be soon adopted by those who are wise enough to discover their own interest therein."² A proposal of 1739³ to grow hemp in that part of the county where the soil was of little use for anything else seems to have been put into practice, as the county reporter eighty years later speaks of the crop as being "largely grown". Young is too disgusted with the county to treat of it in any great detail in his *Eastern Tour*, though he refers to it several times. Eden, for some reason which I do not understand, omits the county altogether from his *State of the Poor*⁴, and the 1816 *Report on the Condition of Agriculture*, while it contains much as to rural distress, says nothing as to any alleged relation between rural poverty and the survival of open fields and commons. So there is little detailed information to be obtained as to the agrarian condition of the county until the issue of the Board of Agriculture *Reports*. There were two of these, one in 1794, and one in 1811.⁵

Both are full of complaint as to the agricultural state of the shire. Vancouver, in 1794, estimates the county area as 440,000 acres (actually it is 554,000), and calculates that three-fourths of the gross area (including eight-ninths of the arable land) are open. He deals in some detail with ninety-eight parishes, of which eighty-three were still open, fifteen enclosed. The *V.C.H.* thus summarizes his findings: Vancouver considers that no improvement is possible until the intermixed strips "dispersed in the common open fields" are brought together into compact holdings. Enclosure appears "to be indispensably necessary" and urgent. "I have made it my particular care", he writes, "to mix and converse with the yeomanry of the county, and in their sedate and sober moments, to possess myself fully of their experience, and local knowledge, and finally to ascertain

¹ Lord Ernle, *English Farming Past and Present*, 1917, p. 241.

² Fussell, *op. cit.* p. 355.

³ Clay, *History of Landbeach*, C.A.S. 1861, pp. 29-30.

⁴ 1797, Reprint of 1928.

⁵ C. Vancouver, *General View...*, 1794, pp. 193, 195, 47, 53, 147, 196, 111-12, 115, 204, ix, 294; Rev. W. Gooch, *General View...*, 1811, pp. viii, 56, 2.

the general sentiment as to this important innovation upon the establishment of ages."

In some places people are doubtful: thus at Teversham the idea of enclosing is "not all relished". In other places, "the most thinking farmers are very much in favour of the laying of the intermixed property together in the open fields". Vancouver is emphatic in showing how the facts spoke for themselves, as a comparison of the enclosed parish of Childerley with the unenclosed parish of Hardwicke *recte* Hardwick shows. Both parishes consist "of a perfectly similar soil", but their yields in bushels per acre are very different:

Crop	Childerley (Enclosed)	Hardwick (Unenclosed)
Wheat	24	16
Barley	36	18
Oats	36	18
Peas and beans	20	8

Nor does the advantage end with increased yields, for the enclosed parishes are exempt from the rot among their sheep. The heavy mortality of sheep on unenclosed ground is attributed to the want of drainage on the arable open fields, "upon which the sheep are by necessity obliged to feed". The ravages of the rot are particularly great, and had possibly been exceptional in 1793. At Eltisley 700 sheep died (out of 1000): at Croxton 1000 (out of 1400): at Gamlingay 340 (out of 1200).

Want of enclosure is also felt in the highland common which "in severalty" would be doubled in value, while the half-yearly meadow land, "dispersed through the hollows of the open fields", would even more than double in value "by proper draining and being put into severalty".

Gooch, in 1811, says that enormous enclosures have taken place since Vancouver's time: over 60,000 acres in 1806. It is clear that extensive areas were enclosed in this county by private agreement, as well as those covered by Act of Parliament. However, Gooch's report shows that "most of the arable husbandry of this country is still foreign to the present practice in the best cultivated countries". Many people still believe that the older methods were the best, and "this bigotry" is widely spread. But something has certainly been done to redeem the county "from the imputation it has so long lain under, of being the worse cultivated in England". By 1806 the open-field is "much lessened" and a great part of "the waste and unimproved fen, half-yearly meadow, highland common, fen or moor common, sheep-walk, heath" has become enclosed arable pasture. In the case of open-field conversion, the total rental has more than doubled: on other lands it has trebled at least.

Both men go into great detail concerning commons, open fields, and enclosures—more so I think than any other couple of reporters.

Both reports are well worth a detailed examination. Vancouver, the author of the first one, was an American—a well-known agricultural writer of the day. He reported also on Essex, and in later years on Devonshire and Hampshire, and he wrote on the drainage of the Fens. Marshall styles him a man of “spirit and indefatigable industry”, acquainted with “rural pursuits”. Gooch was apparently the rector (? vicar) of Whatfield, Suffolk.

To take a few instances, more or less at random, of the information they afford: at Dullingham¹ the shackage of the open fields was worth perhaps £25 p.a., but the damage done to the crops by the exercise of the right was many times this amount. At Weston Coville² the enclosure had been an enormous benefit. Occupiers made a handsome living on lands rented at half-a-guinea an acre, which in their open state had yielded a bare subsistence when rented at half-a-crown. Burwell³ was in a déplorable situation and its enclosure was much overdue. At Great Wilbraham⁴ open land was worth 8s. per acre, severalty 20s. At Fulbourn⁵ the selions were in general of three roods, half-an-acre, one rood, or half a rood “the expence and great inconvenience of which is inconceivable”. At Trumpington⁶ as at Fulbourn, Little Abington, etc., if not enclosure, at least the laying together of intermixed lands was urgently needed. At Balsham and Duxford⁷ the same change, and suppression of the right of sheepwalk were “the only foundation upon which any improvement can be made”. At Pampisford⁸ Vancouver describes a very interesting but uneconomical grazing custom on the meadow. The meadow land was commonable from the end of Hay Harvest until Lady Day “with a bite on Easter Sunday” from 6 a.m. to the close of morning service. When Easter fell late, this meant that all prospects of a hay harvest were utterly destroyed. At Barrington⁹ “the obstinacy of some of the farmers in this parish has defeated the very laudable and spirited exertions of a very industrious and intelligent young man, by stopping the passage of the water in the leading drains, into which his hollow drains in the open field discharged their water. His drains in consequence have blown up, and a considerable expence has been incurred to produce only a modifying disappointment. They have also served him with notice to refrain at his peril from the cultivation of turnips in the open field”. At Milton¹⁰ the breed of sheep “would in the event of an enclosure be greatly improved”. At Leverington¹¹ the intermixture of property in the fen is the principal bar to improvement by drainage.

In general Vancouver was for immediate enclosure. A few of his correspondents were less emphatic on the point. Mr Stone¹² of

¹ Vancouver, *op. cit.* p. 22.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 40.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 65, 74.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 132.

² *Ibid.* pp. 23-4.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 48-9.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 67.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 186.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 36-7.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 53, 57.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 99.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 169.

Leverington protests to the Board concerning the fashion in which the poor are being cheated of their common rights¹ but is still convinced that on the whole enclosures are more than justified. Certainly they increase population. Rents and produce are both vastly increased on enclosure.² His summary of arguments for enclosure appears elsewhere.³

Gooch was as wholeheartedly for enclosure as his predecessor had been. In his preface⁴ he explains that he can chronicle little of good concerning the agriculture of the county, since it has not yet had time to recover from the effects "of the old impoverishing system". Average rents he estimated at 7s. to 15s. open field, 15s. to 25s. enclosure, with much higher rents in some new enclosures.⁵ He gives a number of instances, mostly taken from Young, of increases of rent on enclosure from 100 % to 300 %. This is despite the fact that after enclosure the course followed has often been still the old three-course shift.⁶ In his chapter vi he reprints the Cambridgeshire answers to Howlett's well-known queries of 1780 concerning the effects of enclosure. About half of them bear out his thesis, but the rector of Abington Pigotts was convinced that while the wheat production had increased slightly other crops had certainly not. The curate of March blamed enclosure for a fourpenny rise in the price per pound of butter. James Barker of Swaffham Bulbeck reported a 50 % decrease in wheat production. The Rev. R. Heighton of Longstowe noted a diminution in every kind of produce, and the Rev. T. Brown of Conington who reported "less wheat and every kind of grain, decreasing population, fewer calves by half, fewer sheep by half, fewer cows by half," said also "enclosures will be the ruin and destruction of this country".

Gooch finds difficulty in explaining away all these instances, and he offsets them by adding a number of later examples mostly drawn from *Annals* or from his own observation. At March⁷ a common right before enclosure let for £7 p.a., but the allotment in lieu of it let for £20. Here by decree of 1667 each common-right cottage had 9 acres laid to it, and this was preserved as a condition of enclosure. However, twenty families which had hired rights were ruined, and "reduced to day labour or to emigrate". At Wimblington⁸ a common right had let for £1. The 14 acres allotment in lieu fetched £20. Here the cottage families lost their employment as at March. At Dodington⁹ the Rectory had advanced from £22. 10s. p.a. *temp.* Hen. VIII to £2000 in 1794, to £4800 in 1813 by drainage and enclosure. At Little Wilbraham¹⁰ an almost worthless common had been increased in value from 1s.-20s. per acre. Two acres had been allotted to each cottage. Land had increased in value from 6s. titheable to 16s.

¹ *Ibid.* p. 175.

² *Ibid.* pp. 195-6.

³ Appendix, p. x.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. vii.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 32-5.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 38.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 65-6.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 66-7.

⁹ *Ibid.* p. 67.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 67-9.

tithé free. Here no one occupying more than 20 acres of land could exercise a common right—if he owned it he must let it. At Great Wilbraham population had increased and rents doubled. At Swaffham Bulbeck¹ rents were much advanced and the vicarage improved,² at Longstowe³ rents doubled and population increased. Here the compensation allotted to the poor had been inadequate. At Carlton⁴ rents had increased threefold, and the cottagers were more prosperous. For rights worth £10 they had received allotments worth £50. At Conington⁵ the rector still adhered to his opinion of 1780. He was convinced that proprietors had not gained 5 % p.a. on their capital outlay in enclosing. He was quite disinterested in his opposition and admitted that his benefice had been considerably improved by the change. At Milton⁶ rents had increased from 10s. to 20s.—25s. At Barrington a green of 15 or 16 acres had been left for the poor. Rents had increased from 5s. or 6s. to 20s. At Chatteris⁷ the poor had been shabbily used. A clause in the act required them to prove their rights, and many were unable to do so. After enclosure the value of the toftsteads had risen however from £110 to £700, and the parish made much more prosperous.

At Harston and Hauxton⁸ the allotments made to the cottages had either been laid together as larger plots for the landlords, or had been sold in order to pay the expenses of enclosure. At Abington Pigotts⁹ the poor had suffered badly. Before enclosure there were no poor and no poor rates, and the parishioners had been “forced to find out an old woman to take 6*d.*, a week, in order to escape being rated in aid of other parishes”. Now the rates were 2*s.* 6*d.* Guilden Morden,¹⁰ when Young wrote, was in process of enclosure. “The poor are greatly alarmed and view the steps taken for enclosure with terror.”

There was some reason for the suspicion of enclosure. Gooch¹¹ names a local impropiator who was convinced that the tithé was more profitable than any allotment (though three of his colleagues disagreed with him). He names Mr Darnton of Babraham who thought the laying of land into severalty could well be accomplished without the incurring of unreasonable expenses in fencing, and Mr Pemberton¹² of Cambridge who believed in letting from 3 to 5 acres to each of his cottagers, and who thought that at each enclosure every cottager should have a piece of meadow and a patch of arable, while a common pasture should remain for the poor generally.

At Soham¹³ there was a rich common of 200 acres belonging to the poor, and giving each a common right for three cows or two horses. No one was eligible to have a right if he owned or occupied land to

¹ *Ibid.* p. 69.² *Ibid.* p. 70.³ *Ibid.* pp. 70–1.⁴ *Ibid.* p. 71.⁵ *Ibid.* p. 73.⁶ *Ibid.* p. 75.⁷ *Ibid.* p. 76.⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 82–3.⁹ *Ibid.* p. 83.¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 84.¹¹ *Ibid.* pp. 91–2.¹² *Ibid.* p. 92.¹³ Vancouver, *op. cit.* pp. 136–7.

the value of £4 p.a. A horse common here was "depastured under a decree from the Court of Exchequer".

Many landlords had followed the example set at Weston Colville¹ and attached substantial plots of land to their cottages. At Chatteris the poor had formerly been allowed to build cottages on the waste and had been much benefited by the indulgence. This "was a great encouragement to industry and good morals, for a young couple who intended marrying were frugal and saving, in order to have money enough to provide their habitation. Some of these cottages cost no more than £7 or £8 to £10 or £15, but they had had a marvellous effect in fostering industry and self-respect. Given a cow as well as a cottage such families might well be benefited much more. It was regrettable that the commoners had abolished the practice. There were other benevolent landlords and agents who honestly tried to help the poor. Custance, a local land agent, was one, Mr Tharp of Chippenham,² who allowed his mill to grind one day a week free of toll, was another. Lord Hardwicke, who offered a premium for the best cottage garden on his estate, was still another.

Finally³ Gooch sums up in favour of enclosure on the very reasonable ground that if it were not valuable it would never have been adopted under the conditions of heavy and unreasonable expense and delay with which it was often accompanied. From the point of view of population and productivity, the improvement of the breed of stock and the amelioration of the condition of the poor it was more than justified. There were two great obstacles to improvement in the county,⁴ "in the uplands the expense of enclosures, in the fen clashing interests", and until these had been properly dealt with the county would never be in a satisfactory condition agriculturally.

But more still remained to be done. In 1822, when William Cobbett⁵ travelled along the Old North Road from Royston to Huntingdon, much of the country was still treeless and hedgeless, full of "those very ugly things, common fields", and looking "bleak and comfortless" to the eye. Still later, in 1830, between Cambridge and St Ives, Cobbett again saw "open unfenced fields". "Immediately upon quitting Royston you come along, for a considerable distance, with enclosed fields on the left and open common fields on the right. The fields on the left seem to have been enclosed by Act of Parliament, and they certainly are the most beautiful tract of *fields* that I ever saw. Their extent may be from ten to thirty acres each. Divided by quick-set hedges exceedingly well planted and raised." The country from Cambridge to St Ives was "generally stiff land and some of it not very good". Cambridgeshire was coming into line with

¹ Gooch, *op. cit.* pp. 293-4.

² *Ibid.* pp. 294-5.

³ *Ibid.* p. 94.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 297.

⁵ *Rural Rides*, Everyman edn. of 1941, vol. I, pp. 80-2, vol. II, p. 236.

the rest of the English plain by 1847, when Samuel Jonas¹ declared that "few counties, if any, have improved more in cultivation than Cambridgeshire has lately done".

"All the open common-fields have been enclosed (with the exception of five or six parishes), and instead of a system of cropping, so exhausting to the land as a fallow and two white-straw crops in succession, with other men's flocks of sheep eating up your food and preventing improvement, we now see the land farmed on the four-course system, the best that can be adopted, unless on very fine land."

Probably the enclosure was needed in this county as badly as anywhere. One of the few well-authenticated accounts of a serious attempt to modernize open-field technique without enclosure² is given by the first reporter. At the village of Stretham the inhabitants had appointed a field reeve with authority to make much-needed drains. Their fellows at Teversham however were so emphatically opposed to progress that, when one of their number made a new and complete system of drainage for his land, they purposely stopped up his main drain, so that his drains burst, and swamped his land. At Teversham the reporters explain as the reason for the survival of open field cultivation, "the inhabitants being averse to innovation". They might well be so if the consequence of enclosure in the county was usually that mentioned by Mr Curtler³ concerning a local parish (unidentified) where enclosure in 1843 resulted in the demolition of forty-three cottages in order to double the size of a 200-acre farm.

SURVIVALS OF OPEN FIELDS IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE

Despite the exhortations of the reporters, a fairly extensive area of land in Cambridgeshire remained open until well into the twentieth century. The official return of 1874⁴ (notoriously very inaccurate, however) credits the county with the possession in this year of 13,000 acres of open land, 7000 acres being open field and 6000 acres being pasture and waste. Hildersham remained open until 1883-9, and when at last it was enclosed, fairly considerable allotments were made for recreation, field gardens, etc.⁵ There was in this parish an interesting survival of the manorial right of sheep-walk, such as formerly had existed in East Anglia, and which is dealt with above.⁶

Vancouver in 1793 gives detailed accounts of ninety-eight Cambridgeshire parishes, eighty-three of which were open, and only fifteen enclosed.⁷ Of these fifteen, only two (3) were enclosed by Act

¹ In *Journ. Roy. Agric. Soc.* vol. VII (1847), p. 35.

² Quoted in Scrutton, *op. cit.* p. 117.

³ *The Enclosure . . . of Our Land*, 1920, p. 226.

⁴ *P.P. (H.C.)*, 85 (1874).

⁵ Shaw Lefevre, *English Commons and Forests*, 1894, p. 373.

⁶ Described briefly in Slater, *op. cit.* p. 82.

⁷ Quoted by Slater, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-11. This figure excludes Badlington (H.) in Chippenham. The arabic figures are my corrections of Dr Slater's.

of-Parliament, so the remaining thirteen (12) must have been enclosed at some time or other before 1793 by non-Parliamentary means. They are Arrington, Childerley, Chippenham, Hatley St George, Leverington, Newton (I. of E.),¹ Outwell, Tadlow, Tid (*recte* Tydd) St Giles, Upwell-cum-Welney, and Wisbech St Mary, plus a parish which Slater omits, and which I have failed to trace since I cannot balance his account. It must be Shingay, Wimpole, Boxworth or Upwell I think. In this county as elsewhere Dr Slater endeavoured to follow the history of those parishes in the former group for which no subsequent enclosure Act could be traced, and which, therefore, since presumably they were all enclosed by 1907, must have been enclosed by non-Parliamentary means. There are, says Dr Slater, of the eighty-three parishes referred to, seventy-four (77) for which enclosure acts exist. So apparently there are nine (6)² which were enclosed by non-Parliamentary methods in the late eighteenth or in the nineteenth century. These places are Babraham, (Boxworth), (Downham), Ely, Littleport, (Lolworth), Madingley, Over and Soham. The lists below give Parliamentary enclosures of lands including open arable for Boxworth, Lolworth and Downham. The tithe in most of these parishes, as generally elsewhere throughout the country, was "apportioned" in the 1840's, and tithe maps of this period survive for all of them except Over. Three of the remaining seven parishes, Babraham, Ely and Madingley, were completely enclosed before the date of tithe commutation. When the tithe maps were drawn up, considerable areas of open land remained at Downham (some 450 acres), Littleport (a remnant—a mere 40 acres), Lolworth (800 acres, although Vancouver fifty years earlier had credited the place with only 650 acres), and Soham (1100 acres compared with Vancouver's 1200 acres); Lolworth, says Dr Slater, remained open until the time of the Crimean War, when it was enclosed "by the agreement of the owners" (actually under the 1836 Act). Study of the tithe maps gives the names also of seven parishes not mentioned by Vancouver and not having Parliamentary enclosures, but known to have been enclosed before the date of tithe apportionment. All of these Dr Slater supposes to be non-Parliamentary enclosures taking place at some time unknown but ante tithe commutation. His reasoning is confirmed so far as Borough Green and Westley Waterless are concerned by the data which will be found set forth below. Horseheath is not mentioned by Vancouver, but its tithe award shows it to have been almost half in open fields in the 1840's. So apparently of these ten (8) parishes, all open in 1793, four (2) were completely enclosed before the date of tithe commutation, five were enclosed in part after the date of tithe commutation, and one was enclosed at some date unknown.

¹ A scrap of common field at Newton survived until 1850.

² Miss E. M. Hampson in *Proc. C.A.S.* (1931), p. 143, says ten.

Summarizing and correcting Dr Slater's lists we obtain these figures:

<i>Parliamentary Enclosures</i> ¹	122
<i>Non-Parliamentary Enclosures, viz.</i>	
<i>Ante 1793</i> ²	12
<i>Post 1793</i> ³ , but <i>ante</i> tithe commutation	6
At some date unknown ⁴ but <i>ante</i> tithe commutation	7
<i>Post</i> tithe ⁵ commutation	3
	28
<i>Data entirely lacking for</i> ⁶	1
Wrongly reckoned in Cambs. ⁷	1
Total, agricultural parishes in Cambridgeshire, c. 1907 when Slater wrote	152

¹ Slater's 118 plus Boxworth, Lolworth, Downham, and Little Gransden.

² Slater's 13 including Chippenham and one place (not two) which Slater reckons but does not name.

³ Slater's 9 minus Boxworth, Downham, Lolworth.

⁴ Slater's 9 minus Borough Green and Westley Waterless.

⁵ Slater's 5 minus Lolworth and Downham but including Littleport.

⁶ Slater's 2 minus Little Gransden.

⁷ Stanground?.

It is, of course, with the Parliamentary enclosures of lands including open field arable (122 at least), that the lists below are mainly concerned. They may perhaps serve as a basis for rather more accurate statistics as to the history of enclosure in the county than any so far published. Mr Curtler¹ has already summarized the various statistics available.

Enclosures as percentage of the County area

1517 (Dr Gay)	0.2 per cent	
1607 (Dr Gay)	Nil	
1700—1870 (Prof. Gonner)	38.4 per cent	{ (Common fields 34.5 per cent) (Common pasture, etc. 3.9 per cent)
1700—recent times (Dr Slater)	36.3 per cent	(Common fields and some waste)

It may not be off the point here to quote from Lord Justice Scrutton's book,² concerning the proposed enclosure of Over in 1836. It will be seen that he suggests that the opposition aroused by the Over proposals may well have some influence upon the terms not only of the 1836 General Act, but also upon those of subsequent enclosure legislation.

In 1836 an Act "for facilitating the enclosure of open and arable fields in England and Wales" was introduced into the Commons, and passed the House with little, if any, discussion. Some interest, however, was taken in enclosures, for on 18 May, the third reading

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 189.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 156-7.

of the Over Inclosure Bill coming on,¹ its rejection was moved by Doctor Bowring as "another encroachment on the remaining rights and privileges of the poor", who were said to be unanimously opposed to it. It was urged that the poor could have allotments worth more than their rights of common, and that the only opposition to the Bill proceeded from two cattle-jobbers, who were in the habit of turning 200 or 300 cattle on the common at a time to the injury of the poor inhabitants.² But the vigorous language of Mr Hume, who said that the Bill would deprive the poor of the right of feeding their cattle and sheep, and was a downright robbery, prevailed, and the Over Bill was thrown out by a majority of four. The General Bill, however, excited no discussion till it reached the Lords: there some opposition arose from the misunderstanding that the Bill dealt with wastes and commons, and hopes were expressed that the wastes near large towns would be preserved for the comfort and benefit of their inhabitants. Lord Holland said: "It had been a matter of surprise to all foreigners and indeed a reproach to this country that though its laws and institutions were formed on proper and liberal grounds, yet there were no places provided for the healthy exercise and recreation of the people."³ Lord Ellenborough agreed: "It was extremely desirable that the people should have some open spaces to which they might resort for healthy recreation. It was much better for them to have such places left open to them, than to be shut out and left no other resource than the alehouse." When the Bill returned to the Commons it was attacked by members, who confounded commons with common fields, as "materially affecting the rights and enjoyments of the people",⁴ but the opposition was small, and the Bill passed. (He continues with a description of the main terms of the Bill.) The Over Bill, we may remark in passing, disappeared for the session only. Another Bill for the enclosure of Over was introduced in the next session, this time duly passed into law⁵ and is listed below. It does not seem to be known how its terms differed from those of its predecessors.

The outstanding feature of the list of Cambridgeshire Acts including open-field arable is,⁶ I think, the lateness of the movement in this county. The first Act is dated 1770, and there are only three before 1796, by which time the movement for Parliamentary enclosure in many counties was half completed. Similarly Cambridgeshire is one of the few counties having much enclosure by private Act after c. 1830. Altogether it has twenty-six such Acts after 1830. There are many counties without any. The list of enclosures by private Act⁷ brings out very clearly how largely the enclosure movement locally was concerned with open-field land. There are but

¹ Hansard, 33, 1064.

² *Ibid.* 1226.

³ The Act is 7 Wm. IV and 1 Vic: c. xv, List B, *infra*.

⁶ List A, *infra*.

² *Ibid.* 35, 1026.

⁴ *Ibid.* 35, 1271.

⁷ List B, *infra*.

thirteen Acts in this list to 101 in the first one. And, like the Acts in the former class, these show how enclosure here began late and finished late. The first Act is not until 1791 and the last is 1846. There are no less than three Acts after the 1836 General Act. Because of lack of evidence it is difficult to generalize about these, but it seems clear that many of them concern relatively small areas of common. It seems clear too that a high proportion of them, including the few which cover extensive areas, concern not Cambridgeshire proper but the Isle of Ely. The list of enclosures under the General Act of 1836¹ seems curiously short, considering that here we have a county in general of small proprietors and of late enclosure. Probably the fact is explained by the number of late enclosures in List A. Apparently the Cambridgeshire proprietors showed a reluctance to use the early General Acts and preferred the old process of enclosure by special private Act. This is especially remarkable in view of the fact that the county had so many enclosures under the later (*post* 1845, etc.) General Acts. The list of enclosures of waste, etc., under the 1840 Act²—NIL—shows much what one would expect. Presumably by 1840 there was little open waste left to enclose. The tables of enclosures of common field and of lands other than common field under the General Acts of 1845 *et seq.* again show what might have been expected. Cambridgeshire is one of the few counties where the *post* 1845 enclosures³ were mainly arable. List E includes ten enclosures, covering more than 8000 acres, list F only three enclosures, covering only some 1500 acres. In the former class all save one are in the present administrative county; only one is in the Isle of Ely. In the latter class all without exception are in the Isle of Ely, and none in the present administrative county of Cambridge. The last list—of enclosures by private agreement⁴—demonstrates how little land is recorded as having been enclosed in the county in this fashion, though from what has been said above⁵ it is quite clear that there must have been in later years fairly extensive enclosures made in this manner, and not formally recorded in agreement or award. It is reasonable enough to suppose that extensive enclosures of this type may have been made in earlier times too. This, however, is a matter upon which information is at present lacking, and which can be cleared up only by further local research.

¹ List C.

² List D.

³ Lists E and F.

⁴ List G.

⁵ *Supra*, pp. 62, 63, 67, 73.

PART II

ENCLOSURE ACTS AND AWARDS: COUNTY OF CAMBRIDGE

ALL Acts in the official Return¹ are included here. Those in Dr Slater's statement,² as including open-field arable, are in List A. Those not in Dr Slater's tables presumably relate to meadow and waste alone. These are in List B. The 1836 Act³ authorized the enclosure of open field alone, though it was frequently used to carry out the enclosure of open lands of other classes.⁴ Unless evidence to the contrary is available, it is assumed here that the Act was properly applied, so that enclosures under it are of common field. These are in List C. This Act was extended in 1840⁵ to cover Lammas lands etc., and enclosures under the 1836 and 1840 Acts are stated in List D.

The General Act of 1845⁶ authorized enclosure of lands other than common pastures by Provisional Order alone. This provision remained in force until the sixth amending Act,⁷ with an exceptional clause in favour of enclosures actually in progress in 1852. So for some ten years from 1845 proposed enclosures not including the waste of a manor were not submitted to Parliament for approval. After 1852 all enclosures required statutory authorization, and this was given in the annual General Act. Lists E and F cover enclosures in these two classes. The data have been obtained from the various official *Blue Books*,⁸ from the Enclosure Commissioners' Annual Reports, and from the Ministry of Agriculture Memorandum for Awards from 1893 onwards.⁹ Enclosures by agreement listed in List G must be a very small proportion of those actually carried out. They are the ones of which formal written record survives either in the Public Record Office or among the County Records.¹⁰ It has not been possible to classify them, like the others, into enclosures containing common fields and those consisting of common pasture and meadow, etc.

¹ *P.P. (H.C.)*, 399 (1814).

² *The English Peasantry . . .*, 1908, App. 2.

³ 6 & 7 Wm. IV, c. 115 (1836).

⁴ Cooke, *Enclosures and Rights of Common*, 1864, p. 84.

⁵ 3 & 4 Vic. c. 31 (1840).

⁶ 8 & 9 Vic. c. 118 (1845).

⁷ 15 & 16 Vic. c. 39 (1852).

⁸ *P.P.* above cited; also *P.P.s.* 455 (1893) and 50 (1904).

⁹ No. 702/L.G.

¹⁰ Such local lists as are available have been consulted, and the data have been checked by various gentlemen whose help is acknowledged elsewhere.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

- * Enrolled copy of Award has a plan attached to or deposited with it.
 † Indicates a photostat copy of official plan given to the County by Col. Tebbutt since 1939.
 C.P. Award enrolled on Common Pleas Recovery Roll in Public Record Office.
 C.R. Award enrolled among County Records in custody of the Clerk of the Peace.
 H. Hamlet.
 I.E. Isle of Ely.
 K.B. Award enrolled on King's Bench Plea Rolls in Public Record Office.
 n.s. Not stated.
 P. Parish.
 T. Township.

ENCLOSURE ACTS AND AWARDS

[The spelling of the place-names in column (2) is the generally accepted present-day form. Mistakes or errors in spelling or obvious inaccuracies, however caused, in Slater's volume or in the *Blue Books* are ignored. In column (3) the figures, if any, before the diagonal are those of the Act; those after it in most cases are those of the actual Awards. Where figures are not given in the Awards or are not totalled up in the schedules those in square brackets represent the actual acreage of the parish. It is, however, quite impossible to give these figures for comparison in the Isle of Ely parishes owing to the large amount of fenland not accounted for.]

A. ENCLOSURES BY PRIVATE ACT OF LANDS
INCLUDING OPEN-FIELD ARABLE

Date of Act (1)	Place(s) (2)	Approx. area (3)	Date of award (4)	Award enrolled (5)
1770	Abington Pigotts	1000/[1237]	?	?
	There is no trace of this Award in County Records. Parish belonged almost entirely to one owner, so possibly award never enrolled.			
1775	Knapwell	1100/1082	1776	C.R.*
1777	Weston Colville	1970/1927	1778	C.R.
	Both County and Parish Plans are lost. Gooch says 1936 a.			
1796	Barrington	2500/2158	1800	C.R.*
	Vancouver says 1630 a., Gooch says 2000 a. and 2034 a.			
1797	Great Wilbraham	(2300)/[2921]	1801	C.R.†
	Act not 38 Geo. III as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Area given in Act includes old enclosures. Gooch says 2800 a. and 2400 a.			
1797	Little Wilbraham	1600/[1990]	1801	C.R.†
	Gooch says 1800 a. and 1970 a.			
1798	Harston, Hauxton, Little Shelford and Newton	1400	?	C.R.*
	Award is a copy and it is impossible to separate particulars. Gooch says 1800 a.			
1798	Longstowe (Long Stowe)	1400/[1544]	1800	C.R.
	Area given in Act includes old enclosures. Gooch says 1500 a. and 1000 a.			

Date of Act (1)	Place(s) (2)	Approx. area (3)	Date of award (4)	Award enrolled (5)
1798	Swaffham Bulbeck	4000/[4110]	1801	C.R.
	Area given in Act includes old enclosures. Gooch says 3260 a.			
1799	Carlton-cum-Willingham	1500/[2415]	1800	C.R.†
	Area given in Act includes old enclosures. Gooch says c. 1050 a. <i>nett.</i> and 1100 <i>nett.</i>			
1799	Grantchester and Coton	n.s./2120	1803	C.R.*
	Vancouver says open land in G. c. 1000 a., in C. 690 a. Gooch says 1500 a.			
1799	Pampisford	2000/[1607]	1801	C.R.*
	Gooch says 1240 a.			
1800	Milton	1550/1142	1802	C.R.*
	Gooch says 1378 a. and 1300 a.			
1800	Guilden Morden	2500/2547	1804	C.R.
1800	Elsworth	3900/3755	1803	C.R.†
	Gooch says 3700 a. and 3456 a.			
1800	Conington	1500/1451	1804	C.R.†
1801	Balsham	4000/3123	1806	C.R.†
1801	Great Abington	1560/1532	1804	C.R.†
1801	Bassingbourn	3500/3216	1806	C.R.*
	Excluding hamlet of Kneesworth, see C. 1837. Vancouver says total open area in two places 2240 a.			
1801	Histon (Saint Andrew and Saint Etheldred) and Impington	n.s./[3896]	1806	C.R.*
1801	Little Abington	1350/1263	1807	C.R.†
1801	Bottisham	4000/5696	1808	C.R.*
1801	Trumpington	2000/2211	1809	C.R.*
	Record plan is called an "unofficial" one.			
1802	Horningsea	1450/1570	1810	C.R.†
	Area given in Act includes old enclosures, c. 300 a. in Vancouver's time.			
1802	Sawston	1040/1817	1811	C.R.*
	Vancouver says 1600 a.			
1802	Graveley	1500/1558	1805	C.R.†
	The 1558 acres includes roads.			
1802	Cambridge, Saint Giles	1200	1805	C.R.*
	One of the two Cambridge "fields".			
1803	Fen Ditton	1400/1821	1817	C.R.†
1804	Manea	900	1810	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Award cannot be 1799 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .			
1805	Snailwell (Act, Snalewell)	1680/[2034]	1806	C.R.
	Area given by Vancouver.			
1805	Swaffham Prior (T.)	n.s./5206	1814	C.R.*
1806	Dullingham	n.s./[3387]	1810	C.R.*
1806	Fulbourn (T.)	n.s./5123	1814	C.R.*
	Amending Act passed 1808.			

Date of Act (1)	Place(s) (2)	Approx. area (3)	Date of award (4)	Award enrolled (5)
1806	Cherry Hinton (Hinton)	n.s./1997	1810	C.R.†
1806	Kirtling and Ashley-cum-Silverley	5000/[5351]	1815	C.P.*; C.R.†
	Area 3000 acres according to Slater (possibly Kirtling only). 13 fields in A. cum C. according to Vancouver. K. is, I take it, his "Catlidge".			
1807	Landbeach	n.s./2151	1813	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 1800 a.			
1807	Steeple Morden	n.s./3755	1816	C.R.*
	Vancouver says 2200 a.			
1807	Cambridge, Saint Andrew the Less, otherwise Barnwell	n.s.	1811	C.R.*
	Award not 1801 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . This is the other of the two Cambridge "fields".			
	Area of part only of open fields 1000 a. according to Vancouver, also Coldham common and an extensive moor.			
1808	Harlton	1100/[1261]	1811	C.P.*; C.R.†
1808	Gamlingay (with Waresley, Hunts)	[2000]	?	C.R. (Hunts)
	This Act deals with Waresley almost entirely. It only "allots" land in the parish of Gamlingay.			
1808	Girton	n.s./1639	1814	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 1400 a.			
1809	Dry Drayton	n.s./2352	1811	C.R.*
	Vancouver says more than 1900 a.			
1809	Fordham	n.s./4050	1820	C.R.*
1809	Bourn	n.s./4011	1820	C.R.*
1809	West Wrattling	n.s./3441	1813	C.R.†
	Act not 47 Geo. III as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .			
1809	Whittlesford	2000/1919	1815	C.R.†
1809	Chatteris	n.s.	1819	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Vancouver says c. 350 a. open field.			
1810	Haslingfield	n.s./2487	1820	C.R.*
1810	Ickleton	n.s./2639	1814	C.R.*
	There were five open fields here, according to Vancouver.			
1810	Teversham	n.s./1187	1815	C.R.*
1810	Kingston	n.s./1149	1815	C.R.*
1811	Croxton	1200/1877	1818	C.R.*
1811	Longstanton All Saints	n.s./1877	1816	C.R.*
1811	Shepreth	1000/[1318]	1823	C.R.*
	Vancouver says 640 a.			
1811	Great Eversden and Little Eversden	n.s./1298	1814	C.R.*
1811	Brinkley	n.s./1423	1816	C.R.*
1812	Toft	n.s./1258	1815	C.R.*
1812	Stapleford	1400/1780	1814	C.R.*
1812	West Wickham	n.s./2937	1822	C.R.*

Date of Act (1)	Place(s) (2)	Approx. area (3)	Date of award (4)	Award enrolled (5)
1813	Waterbeach	n.s./4863	1818	C.R.*
	Vancouver does not give area of open fields, but says commons c. 1852½ a.			
1813	Little Shelford	1200/1177	1815	C.R.*
1813	Kennett	n.s./1400	1823	C.R.*
1813	Wood Ditton (Woodditton)	n.s./4901	1823	C.R.*
	Earlier Award enrolled in 1819 seems to have been cancelled and not acted upon.			
1813	Longstanton Saint Michael	n.s./[?]	1816	C.R.*
	Act not 43 Geo. III as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . 847 acres in Award.			
1813	Little Gransden	n.s./1863	1826	C.R.*
	Not Great Cransden as in Slater. Great G. is in Hunts.			
1813	Meldreth, Melbourn and Whaddon	n.s./2410	1820	C.R.*
1814	Stetchworth	n.s./2814	1820	C.R.*
	This is Vancouver's "Stackworth".			
1814	Burwell	n.s./2701	1817	C.R.*
1815	Papworth Everard	n.s./1090	1826	C.R.*
1820	Hinxton	n.s./1506	1833	C.R.*
1822	Duxford Saint John and Saint Peter	2500/3173	1830	C.R.*
1825	Doddington, and Wimblington (H.) in parish of D. and Manea (H.) in parish of Coveney	290	1834	C.R. (I.E.)*
1826	Foxton	1585/1692	1830	C.R.*
	Slater says 1586 acres.			
1828	Litlington	1686/2100	1830	C.R.*
1829	Wentworth	990	1830	C.R. (I.E.)*
1830	Caxton	1500/[2242]	1835	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 700-800 a.			
1833	Oakington	n.s./[1692]	1834	C.R.*
1834	Great Shelford	n.s./2212	1835	C.R.*
	Land is allotted for protection of Nine Wells Watercourse (Hobson's Water).			
1835	Stretham	n.s./	1837	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Clerk of the Peace's list says "no open fields". See below 1844.			
1836	Hardwick	n.s./1389	1837	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 900 a.			
1838	Orwell	n.s./2023	1837	C.R.*
1838	Sutton	n.s.	1840	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Vancouver says 4 fields, 700 a.			
1838	Swavesey	n.s./3822	1840	C.R.*
1838	Linton	3732/3717	1840	C.R.*
1838	Witcham	n.s.	1840	C.R. (I.E.)*
1838	Chesterton	n.s./2656	1840	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 1900 a.			
1838	Fen Drayton	1500/1444	1841	C.R.*

Date of Act (1)	Place(s) (2)	Approx. area (3)	Date of award (4)	Award enrolled (5)
1839	Stow-cum-Quy	n.s./1882	1840	C.R.*
1839	Melbourn and Meldreth	n.s./4567	1842	C.R.*
	This Award mostly concerned with Melbourn.			
1839	Barton	n.s./1772	1840	C.R.*
	Vancouver says 900 a.			
1839	Comberton	n.s./1882	1840	C.R.*
1839	Rampton	1100/1295	1840	C.R.*
	Area given in Act includes old enclosures.			
1840	Whittlesey Saint Mary and Saint Andrew	n.s.	1844	C.R. (I.E.)*
	1550 a. open field, 2400 a. pasture etc., 20,000 a. fen according to Vancouver. Amended by 4 & 5 Vict. (1841).			
1840	Thriplow	n.s./2439	1846	C.R.*
	2110 a. (Vancouver).			
1840	Wicken	n.s./2962	1849	C.R.*
1841	Gamlingay	n.s./2384	1848	C.R.*
	See 1808 above. Vancouver says area open c. 1580 a.			
1842	Cheveley	n.s./2491	1844	C.R.*
1842	Cottenham	n.s./6296	1847	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 4200 a.			
1843	Haddenham	n.s./[8925]	1847 1851	C.R. (I.E.)* supplementary C.R. (I.E.)*
	Clerk of the Peace's list says "no open arable". I think it is wrong. Vancouver says there were 4 fields in each of the 4 townships of the parish. Total open area he gives as c. 3680 a.			
1844	Thetford (H.) in Stretham (P.)	n.s.	1856	C.R. (I.E.)*
	See above 1835. Vancouver says 650 a. in T. and S. excluding fen.			
1844	Fowlmere (<i>prius</i> Foulmire)	2111/2212	1850	C.R.*
1846	Willingham	n.s./4531	1873	C.R.*

**B. ENCLOSURES BY PRIVATE ACT OF LAND
NOT INCLUDING OPEN-FIELD ARABLE**

1791	Wimblington	n.s./[7727]	1805	C.R. (I.E.)*
	A public Act. Not 1790 as in Clerk of Peace's list. 800 a. Gooch.			
1791	Chippenham	2146/[4301]	?	?
	No Award in County Records; but a plan listed. The 4301 acres includes a park of 400 acres and a good deal of fen land still uncultivated. According to Gooch 2240 a. were open field arable. 3440 a. Gooch.			
1792	March (T.) or (H.) in Dod-dington	n.s./3400	1805	C.R. (I.E.)*
	A public Act. Amending Act passed in 1810. Area given is from Gooch.			

Date of Act (1)	Place(s) (2)	Approx. area (3)	Date of award (4)	Award enrolled (5)
1793	Chatteris	n.s.	?	? (I.E.)
	There is no trace of this award in C.R. See 1809 above. Vancouver says also 300 a. common and 3500 a. fen, 1500 a. (or 500 a.?) now under cultivation, and the rest to be broken up under statute in a rotation.			
1801	Cambridge, Saint Thomas's or Pembroke Leys	40	1803	C.R.
	Parts of parishes of Saint Botolph, Saint Andrew the Great, Saint Benedict and Saint Mary the Less enclosed for the site of Downing College. Cf. the Downing College Site Act of same year. There is plan at Downing College. and copy in University Library.			
1806	Witchford	500	1813	C.R. (I.E.)* and K.B. 1840*
1808	Gamlingay	n.s.	?	?
	There is no trace of this Award in C.R.			
1811	Cambridge, Coe Fen Leys, in the parish of Saint Mary the Less	27	1817	C.R.*
	Now site of Leys School.			
1833	Wisbech Saint Mary .	n.s.	1835	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Act not 1831-2 as in Clerk of the Peace's list.			
1838	Elm	195	(Not dated)	
	The Award never signed by Commissioners nor deposited with Clerk of the Peace. It is in custody of Messrs Welchman and Dewing, solicitors, Wisbech.			
1837	Over	n.s./3572	1840	C.R.*
1841	Leverington, Tydd Saint Giles and Outwell in Wisbech Barton	723	1843	C.R. (I.E.)*

C. ENCLOSURES OF OPEN FIELDS, ETC. UNDER
6 & 7 WM. IV, c. 115

1837	Kneesworth (H. of Bassingbourn)	? /230	1842	C.R.*
1837	Boxworth	c. 900/732	1843	C.R.*
	Area c. 800 a. open field, taken from Slater's't ext.			
1837	Lolworth	c. 800/938	1848	C.R.*
	Area of c. 800 a. taken from Slater's text, 938 a. from actual schedule. Area of parish 1100 acres. Vancouver says c. 700 a.			
1837	Whaddon	? /1471	1841	C.R.*
	See also A. 1813 for an earlier enclosure of part of parish.			

D. ENCLOSURES OF LANDS OTHER THAN OPEN-FIELD ARABLE
UNDER 3 & 4 VIC. C. 31

Nil

E. ENCLOSURES UNDER THE GENERAL ACTS OF 1845 *et seq.*
OF LANDS INCLUDING OPEN-FIELD ARABLE

(i) *By Provisional Order not needing specific Parliamentary Sanction*

				Ministry of Agriculture and:
1845	Isleham	1370	1854	C.R.*
1845	Downham	510	1850	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Omitted from 1904 and 1914 <i>Blue Books</i> . Area 450 a. open field from Slater's text.			

(ii) *By Provisional Order confirmed in pursuance of Annual General Act*

1845 and:

1848	Caldecote	747/[948]	1854	C.R.*
1850	Mepal	442	1854	C.R. (I.E.)*
	This is Vancouver's "Maypole". He says 603 a. Award handed over in 1919 by Cambs. County Council to I.E. County Council.			
1851	Newton (by Cambridge)	876/[994]	1854	C.R.*
	1041 acres according to Slater.			
1847	Wilburton	780	1855	? C.R.(I.E.)*
	Not in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Vancouver says 600 a. in 4 open fields.			
1855	Westwick (H.) in Oakington (P.)	217	1856	C.R.*
1858	Shudy Camps, Castle Camps and Bartlow	1037	1863	C.R.*
	Actual area of these three parishes is very much greater than this. Vancouver is vague as to the area of open land in Bartlow, which he treats with Linton. See Shudy Camps and Castle Camps. The open fields alone he estimates at respectively 600 a. and 300 a.			
1864	Eltisley	1490	1868	C.R.*
	Vancouver says c. 900 a.			
1883	Hildersham	1164/[1511]	1889	C.R.*
	1174 acres according to Slater.			

F. ENCLOSURES UNDER THE GENERAL ACTS OF 1845 *et seq.*
OF LANDS NOT INCLUDING OPEN-FIELD ARABLE

(i) *By Provisional Order not needing specific Parliamentary Sanction*

Nil

(ii) *By Provisional Order confirmed in pursuance of Annual General Act*

1846	Newton (remaining commons)	165	1849	C.R. (I.E.)*
	Supplementary Award			
1848	Benwick (H.) in Doddington	66	1858	C.R. (I.E.)*
1857	Grunty Fen, being parts of Ely St Mary, Witchford, Wentworth, Haddenham, Wilburton, Stretham and Thetford (H.)	1328	1861	C.R. (I.E.)*

Another copy of Grunty Fen Enclosure Award is in custody of Clerk of the Cambridgeshire County Council.

For an account of the Grunty Fen enclosure see Curtler, *Enclosure... of our Land*, 1920, pp. 320-1, abstracting an interesting account of Grunty Fen and its enclosure by Albert Pell, "The Making of the Land in England", *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England*, Vol. x, 1899, reprinted also in *The Reminiscences of Albert Pell*, London, John Murray, 1908.

G. ENCLOSURE BY PRIVATE AGREEMENT FORMALLY ENROLLED
IN COUNTY OR NATIONAL RECORDSDate of
Agreement

? Littleport (open fields and commons) 345/c. 40? K.B. 1840*

See *Report of Deputy Keeper of Public Records* 27, p. 9. Vancouver seems to say 450 a. open field and much fen. 345 a. given by Slater from Vancouver, 40 a. as surviving temp. Tithe Map.

Chippenham is said to have been enclosed in 1790. Burrough (Borough) Green and Westley Waterless were enclosed by private agreement in 1793-4. A detailed account of the proceedings has been printed (Dr W. M. Palmer, C.A.S. 8vo Publ. vol. LIV, pp. 154-6). Three commissioners were appointed, but apparently no formal award was executed since the proceedings were largely in the nature of the surrender of common rights in exchange for the allotment of land, and the exchange of scattered strips for consolidated estates. The lord of both villages and the principal promoter of the exchange was the Earl of Aylesford, the other chief proprietors were various bodies corporate, Cambridge Colleges, etc. These of course could not execute conveyances so the exchanges were not properly assured, and a special confirmatory Act had to be passed in 1814-15 (54 Geo. III). From this it appears that in his exchanges with these corporate bodies the earl had done fairly well for himself, having exchanged 101 acres for 174½ acres plus common right. However, the 174½ acres had been in no less than 136 separate parcels, and apparently the earl covered the expenses of enclosure, so perhaps the exchanges were not so inequitable as might appear at first sight.

I am obliged to Mr J. H. Bullock for the following list of Cambridgeshire parishes for which there are no eighteenth- or nineteenth-century Acts known to exist. Probably most of these are old enclosures (i.e. *ante* 1700), but one or two may be non-Parliamentary enclosures of the eighteenth century. They were mostly one-owner parishes: Arrington; Babraham; Childerley; Croydon-cum-Clopton; Hatley St George and East Hatley; Landwade (very small); Madingley; Papworth Agnes; Tadlow; Wendy; Wimpole. Fen parishes such as Soham and Thorney were obviously in an entirely different category. Odsey Hamlet in Guilden Morden seems also to be old enclosure (Vancouver, 84).

NOTES

In the 1914 *Blue Book* the Isle of Ely, marked (I.E.) in our Lists, is included in Cambridgeshire; in that of 1904 it is entered separately. The Acts for Wimblington (B. 1791) and for March (B. 1792) are Public Acts. There are amending Acts for Fulbourn (A. 1806) passed in 1809, for March, etc. passed in 1810, and for Whittlesey (A. 1840) passed in 1841. Castle Camps, Gamlingay (A. 1808) is included in

the Act for Waresley, Hunts, Shudy Camps and Bartlow (E. 1858) are indexed in both Cambs and Essex; in this paper they are reckoned as wholly in Cambs, only a very small detached portion of Bartlow being in Essex. Stanground with Farcet (1801) is indexed as in Cambs and Hunts. North Stanground is in I. of E., South Stanground and Farcet are in Hunts. This is omitted here and reckoned in Hunts. Everton in Everton cum Tebworth (1802), indexed as in Cambs, Beds and Hunts, is omitted here and included in Beds for similar reasons.

It only remains for me to conclude with a note of apology and one of acknowledgement. Both the text (Part I) and the lists (Part II) are my preliminary drafts, though I have spent much time upon them. If any user of the work is able to supply notes of any omissions or inaccuracies I shall be very grateful indeed to have his assistance. Such help will be properly acknowledged if and when the complete work appears, as it is hoped that eventually it will.

Whatever value the work possesses in its present form is largely due to help of this kind already received from Dr B. F. C. Atkinson of the Cambridge University Library, Mr J. H. Bullock, M.A., Mr L. F. Salzman, M.A., F.S.A., of the *Victoria County History*, Mr Ashley Tabrum, Clerk of the Peace for the Administrative County of-Cambridge, Col. Louis Tebbutt, Mr R. F. G. Thurlow, Clerk of the Peace for the Isle of Ely, and Dr J. A. Venn, F.S.A., President of Queens' College, to whom I am very much indebted for their interest and assistance. I owe particular thanks to Mr Salzman, who has allowed me to reprint one or two complete passages from his articles in the Cambridgeshire *V.C.H.* (as yet unpublished) and to Mr Bullock, who has repeatedly been through my MS. and checked areas, dates and plans for me. I am also obliged to the Leverhulme Research Trustees and their Secretary, Dr L. Haden Guest, M.P., for the help which has enabled me to complete this instalment of my work. I shall be grateful to any reader who is able to furnish me with further notes of omissions or corrections.

W. E. TATE

275 HAMIL ROAD,

BURSLEM, STOKE ON TRENT

INDEX TO PARISHES ENCLOSED

Abington, Great	A. 1801	Fen Drayton	A. 1838	Osdey. <i>See</i> pp. 62, 85
Abington, Little	A. 1801	Fordham	A. 1809	Orwell. <i>See also</i> p. 62
Abington Pigotts	A. 1770	Fowlmere	A. 1844	Outwell
Arrington. <i>See</i> p. 85		Foxton	A. 1826	Over
Ashley	A. 1808	Fulbourn	A. 1806	<i>See also</i> pp. 73, 74-5
Babraham. <i>See</i> p. 85		Gamlingay	A. 1808; A. 1841;	Pampisford
Balsham	A. 1801	<i>See also</i> p. 62	B. 1808	Papworth Agnes. <i>See</i> p. 85
Barrington	A. 1796	Girton	A. 1808	Papworth Everard
Bartlow	E. 1858	Gransden, Little	A. 1813	
Barton	A. 1839	Grantchester	A. 1799	Rampton
Bassingbourn	A. 1801; C. 1837	Graveley	A. 1802	
Benwick	E. 1848	Crunty Fen	F. 1857	Sawston
Borough Green. <i>See</i> p. 85		Gulden Morden	A. 1800	Shelford, Great
Bottisham	A. 1801			Shelford, Little
Bourn	A. 1809	Haddenham	A. 1843; F. 1857	
Boxworth	C. 1837	Hardwick	A. 1836	Shepreth
Brinkley	A. 1811	Harlton	A. 1809	Shingay. <i>See</i> p.
Burwell	A. 1814	Harston	A. 1798	Shudy Camps
		Haslingfield	A. 1810	<i>See also</i> p. 86
Caldecote	E. 1845	Hatley St George. <i>See</i> p. 85	A. 1810	Snailwell
Cambridge:		Hauxton	A. 1798	Stanground with Farcet,
Barnwell	A. 1807	Hildersham	E. 1883	I. of E. and Hunts. <i>See</i> p. 86
St Thomas's Leys	B. 1801	Hinton	A. 1806	Stapleford
Coe Fen Leys	B. 1811	Hinxton	A. 1820	Steeple Morden
St Giles	A. 1802	Histon	A. 1801	<i>See also</i> p. 62
Carlton-cum-Willingham		Horningsea	A. 1802	Stetchworth
	A. 1799			Stow-cum-Quy
Castle Camps	E. 1858	Ickleton	A. 1810	Stretham
Caxton	A. 1830	Impington	A. 1801	A. 1835; A. 1844;
Chatteris	A. 1809; B. 1793	Isleham	E. 1845	F. 1857
Cherry Hinton	A. 1806			Stuntney. <i>See</i> p. 63
Chesterton	A. 1838	Kennett	A. 1813	Sutton
<i>See also</i> pp. 61, 62		Kingston	A. 1810	Swaffham Bulbeck
Chettisham. <i>See</i> p. 63		Kirtling	A. 1806	Swaffham Prior
Cheveley	A. 1842	Knapwell	A. 1775	Swavesey
Childerley. <i>See</i> p. 85		Kneesworth	C. 1837	
Chippenham	B. 1791			Tadlow. <i>See</i> p. 85
<i>See also</i> p. 85		Landbeach	A. 1807	Teversham
Clopton. <i>See</i> p. 62		Landwade. <i>See</i> p. 85		Thetford
Comberton	A. 1839	Leverington	B. 1841	A. 1844; F. 1857
Conington	A. 1800	Linton	A. 1838	Toft
Coton	A. 1799	Litlington	A. 1828	Thriplow
<i>See also</i> pp. 63, 79		Little Gransden	A. 1813	Trumpington
Cottenham	A. 1842	Littleport		A. 1801
<i>See also</i> p. 62				Tydd St Giles
Coveney	A. 1825			B. 1841
Croydon cum Clopton		Lolworth	<i>See</i> p. 63, <i>see also</i> G.	
<i>See</i> p. 85		Longstanton All Saints	C. 1837	Waresley, Hunts
Croxton	A. 1811	Longstanton St Michael	A. 1811	<i>See</i> pp. 80, 85-6
				Waterbeach
Doddington	A. 1825; B. 1792;	Longstowe	A. 1813	A. 1813
	E. 1848	<i>See also</i> p. 62	A. 1798	Wendy. <i>See</i> p. 85
Downham	E. 1845			Wentworth
<i>See also</i> p. 63		Madingley. <i>See</i> p. 85		A. 1829; F. 1857
Dry Drayton	A. 1809	Malton. <i>See</i> p. 62		Westley Waterless. <i>See</i> p. 85
Dullingham	A. 1806	Manea	A. 1804; A. 1825	West Wickham
Duxford	A. 1822	March	B. 1792	A. 1812
		Melbourn	A. 1813; A. 1839	West Wrating
East Hatley. <i>See</i> pp. 62, 85		Meldreth	A. 1813; A. 1839	A. 1809
Elm	B. 1836	Mepal	E. 1850	A. 1777
Elsworth	A. 1800	Milton	A. 1800	E. 1855
Eltisley	E. 1864			Whaddon
Ely. <i>See also</i> p. 63	F. 1857			A. 1813; C. 1837
Eversden, Great	A. 1811	Newton, Cambs	A. 1798;	Whittlesford
Eversden, Little	A. 1811		E. 1851	A. 1809
Everton, Beds. <i>See</i> p. 86		Newton, Ely	F. 1846	Whittlesey
				A. 1840
Fen Ditton	A. 1803	Oakington	A. 1833; E. 1855	Wicken
				Wilbraham, Great
				A. 1797
				Wilbraham, Little
				A. 1797
				Wilburton
				E. 1847; F. 1857
				Willingham
				A. 1848
				Wimlington
				A. 1825; B. 1791
				Wimpole. <i>See</i> p. 85
				Wisbech Barton
				B. 1841
				Wisbech St Mary
				B. 1833
				Witcham
				A. 1838
				Witchford
				B. 1806; F. 1857
				Wood Ditton
				A. 1813

APPENDIX

Vancouver's summary of the arguments for enclosure (p. 197)

It is universally acknowledged by all writers on political economy that the population of a country must ever depend upon the means which it possesses, and the proper application of those means, for subsisting its inhabitants. Britain at this time unquestionably possesses the unemployed means of subsisting in addition to her present numbers, one third more of inhabitants; that such an augmentation must be deemed politically right, there can be no question; because the internal strength, and productive labour of the nation, would be encreased. By inviting to early marriage the peasantry of the country, who under their present want of confidence, that their industry will enable them to support an infant offspring, are not allowed the gratification of an early and generous passion, which lawfully indulged, is doubtless of the highest political as well as moral consequence... That the objects for the employment of the poor, would be multiplied, there can be no doubt, when we look at the additional quantity of labour, the country will demand from a general enclosure. The fencing, draining, claying, marling, ploughing, sowing, reaping, mowing, threshing, that will be necessary to attend to, over and above what the business of the country at this time produces, are objects, which, from the employment of the poor, cannot fail creating in the most essential degree, the greatest moral and political advantages; whilst the idle objection, that in the event of a general enclosure, there would be more land thrown into pasture than there ought to be, is too weak and frivolous to deserve attention.

CONTENTS OF PROCEEDINGS

VOL. XL, JULY 1939-DECEMBER 1942

	PAGE
Report of the Council for the year 1939	v
Report of the Council for the year 1940	xi
Report of the Council for the year 1941	xvii
Report of the Council for the year 1942	xxii
John Mortlock III, 'Master of the Town of Cambridge', 1755-1816. By H. M. CAM, Litt.D.	1
A Marriage Register at Queens' College, Cambridge. By Rev. J. F. WILLIAMS, M.A., F.S.A.	13
Extracts from Sawston Parish Register: A Supplementary note by J. H. BULLOCK, M.A.	21
Local Character in the Ancient Architecture of Cambridgeshire. By T. D. ATKINSON. (With 19 Plates)	24
Cambridgeshire Field Systems. With a hand-list of Cambridgeshire Enclosure Acts and Awards. By W. E. TATE, F.R.Hist.S.	56
Index	90