

# Rural Middlesex under the Commonwealth :

A Study based principally upon the Parliamentary Surveys  
of the Royal Estates.

---

## Part II.

### THE ECONOMY OF THE RURAL ESTATES IN MIDDLESEX \*

BY

SIDNEY J. MADGE, M.Sc. (Econ.), F.S.A.

(*Hon. Editor.*)

---

#### CONTENTS :

- I.—THE ECONOMY OF THE MANOR OF HALLIFORD IN MIDDLESEX,  
AS DESCRIBED IN THE PARLIAMENTARY SURVEY OF  
SEPTEMBER, 1650.
- II.—THE ECONOMY OF THE RURAL ESTATES OF THE CROWN  
IN MIDDLESEX, OTHER THAN THE MANOR OF HALLIFORD,  
AS DESCRIBED IN THE PARLIAMENTARY SURVEYS,  
1649-1659.
- III.—STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF THE RURAL SURVEYS OF  
MIDDLESEX.

---

\* In order to economise space in printing Part II., much condensation has been necessary; the only survey, therefore, which is printed in full is that of Halliford Manor (P.S. 29), abstracts of the remainder being given instead. References and footnotes are also omitted, as well as the following entire sections:—

- (i.) The materials for Revealing the Economic Structure of Middlesex Manors during the Interregnum.
- (ii.) List of Rural Surveys of Middlesex and their duplicates.
- (iii.) Leases and other Documents quoted in the Parliamentary Surveys.
- (iv.) Sources of Middlesex Land Tenures.
- (v.) Manorial and other references.
- (vi.) The Manor of Halliford in its historical setting.
- (vii.) The Survey of the Manor of Halliford 1650, in *facsimile* (twelve photostats).

The writer wishes to express his gratitude for very generous assistance in facilitating research given by Mr. C. H. Jenkinson, M.A., F.S.A., Mr. C. S. B. Buckland, and the staff of the P.R.O., and Mr. A. J. Ellis, M.A., and the staff of the British Museum; also for much kindly criticism and encouragement by Dr. Hubert Hall, F.S.A. and Mr. H. E. Malden, M.A., and for excellent photographs taken by Mr. H. R. Marchant. Mr. Lennard's admirable study of the Parliamentary Surveys of Northants (Oxf. Studies in Social and Legal History, Vol. V. 1916) has also been of the greatest value.

# I.—THE ECONOMY OF THE MANOR OF HALLIFORD IN MIDDLESEX, AS DESCRIBED IN THE PARLIAMENTARY SURVEY OF 1650.\*

In order to appreciate fully the significance of the social conditions existing in rural Middlesex during the Commonwealth, in so far as they are revealed in the surveys drawn up by the Parliamentary Commissioners for the county, it will be necessary, first, to ascertain the economic structure of a single manor at a definite date, secondly, to interpret that manorial structure in the light of history,† and thirdly, to discover the range of economic variation in the remaining manors. And since we need to take a simple case for our "Standard of reference," we cannot do better than examine the manorial structure of Halliford in 1650. For the survey is complete in itself and has never been published, while the date is the same as that of the *Manor of Grafton in Northamptonshire*, so that the two surveys may be compared in regard to their essential details, viz., the statistical data in regard to valuations, the character of the leases, and the evidence concerning mediæval survivals and modern tendencies. Moreover, in Halliford, we have a particular instance of an ancient manor, originally monastic (part of the possessions of Westminster), and subsequently monarchical (being attached to the Honor of Hampton Court), which provides ample opportunities for historical research.

The survey in question (P.S. 29) is a beautifully written document of 13 folios, containing a statement of the Customary Rents (based on leases reaching back to the days of Elizabeth); a new valuation (based on existing conditions); a new rental of Freehold

---

\* P.S. Mx. No. 29, Sept. 1650. Duplicate in Land Rev. Off. Misc. Bks., Vol. 288, ff. 15-27.

† The section dealing with "The Economy of the Manor of Halliford in its historical setting," is omitted for lack of space. It comprises (a) The Antiquity of the Manor; (b) Insufficiency of early economic data; (c) The Extent of 1380; (d) The Rental of 1445; (e) The Survey of 1633; (f) The Manor since the Survey of 1650.

Tenants in the two parishes of Sunbury and Shepperton (wherein were situated the two portions of the Manor, Upper and Lower Halliford); an estimate of "Improved Rents" (based on the new valuation, assuming the expiry of old leases); a list of the fields (showing the size and value of the holdings, and the nature of their cultivation); a valuation of the timber upon the estate; and an abstract of the leases, and their covenants, justifying the decision of the Trustees in regard to the "Immediate Tenant."

A duplicate of this survey, of contemporary date, has been found among the Land Revenue Office records, and this has been carefully collated with the original in the Augmentation Office series. The differences are for the most part trivial, consisting chiefly of variation in spelling (some five hundred instances), of abbreviations or extensions, with occasional omissions, substitutions or additions. Thus, the manor is called "Halford al's Hollowford," and the parishes are spelt "Sunberry" and "Supardton" ("Shuperdton"); while the reference to "Charles Stuart late Kinge of England" (f. 1) is followed by "and by him assigned to his late Queene for part of her Joynture" (dup. f. 15). Similarly the signatures of the four Surveyors vary in the two copies, and the endorsement "Ex: p'Will Webb Suprvis: Gen<sup>l</sup> 1650," occurs only in the duplicate (f. 24). The survey given below is P.S. 29, transcribed in full from the Augmentation Office document, the divisions being added by the writer:—

(i.) THE ENDORSEMENT. (*P.S. 29. Folio 13 dorso.*)

There are two endorsements, one on the front cover (dating from c. 1760): "Manor of Halford. [No.] 29"; the other, dating from 1650, being as follows (f. 13d.):—" [No.] 543, Hallowford, Midlesex. Rec<sup>d</sup> this 7<sup>th</sup>: of Octobr 1650. Transmitted to the Sveyor G'rall the same day. Returned the 9<sup>th</sup> of octobr. [Ralph] Baldwin." The duplicate has no endorsement.

(ii.) THE TITLE. (*Folio 1.*)

The title, which is arranged in the form of an inverted triangle (Part I., Plate 1), shows that the survey refers to the manor of

Halliford and its appurtenances, formerly in the possession of Queen Henrietta, and now surveyed (Sept., 1650) by authority of a Commission "grounded" upon the Act of 16th July, 1649. It is preceded by the marginal caption: "Midd' Maner' de Halford al's Hallowford cu' Jur' membr' et p'tinen'." The duplicate (f. 15) substitutes "or Late belonging to," in the place of "ye Relict of," and omits "Lands" near the end of the title, which is given thus in the original:—

"A Survey of the Mannor of Halford als. Hallowford wth their Rights members and appurtences lyeinge and beinge in the p'ish of Shypardton in the County of Midd' Late p'cell of ye possessions of Henriette Marie ye Relict of Charles Stuart late Kinge of England made and taken by vs whose names are heivrnto subscribed in the Moneth of September 1650 By vertue of a Comission grounded vppon an Act of the Com'ons of England in Parliam<sup>t</sup> assembled for sale of the Hono<sup>rs</sup> Manno<sup>rs</sup> & Lands heirtofore belonginge to ye Late Kinge Queene and Prince vnder ye Hands and scales of five or more of the Trustees in the said Act named and apoynted."

(iii.) THE CUSTOMARY RENTS. (*Folios 1/2.*)

The survey begins with a statement of the "Rents of Assize" payable by the Freeholders of Upper and Lower Halliford (£4 16s. 8½d. in the Sunbury portion of the Manor, and £4 14s. 7d. in the Shepperton section, making a total of £9 11s. 3½d. per annum). These "Customary Quitt Rents," fixed by "fine certayne," were due from the tenants by equal payments (approximately) on March 25th and September 29th yearly. In addition, the manorial valuation included the Court Leet and Court Baron royalties, fines and perquisites, which, taking one year with another, were worth £3 13s. 4d. ; so that the total of the rents and profits of the manor came to £13 4s. 7½d. The duplicate (f. 16) records "Ishues," "discents," and "Wayefes." The amounts

in this section, which should be compared with the "Improved" rents shown below (see xviii. "abstract"), are thus stated:—

"The Rents of Assize or Customary Quitt Rents due from the ffeehold Tenants (in Vpp Halford) of the Mannor of Halford al's Hallowford holden by fine certayne accordinge to the Custome of the Mannor and payable at Mich'as and Lady day are p' ann' . . . . . iiij li. xvjs. viij d. ob.

"The Rents of Assize or Customary Quitt Rentes due from the ffeehold Tenants (in Lower Halford) of the Mannor aforesaid holden by fine Certaine accordinge to ye Custome of the Mannor. and payable at Mich'as & Lady Day are p' ann' . . . . . iiij li. xiiij s. vij d.

"The Court Lecte and Court Baron Royalties fowlinge fines Am'ciates: Issues fines vppon Alienac'on and discent Heriotts Reliefes Wayfes Estrayes felons goods and all other p'fitts and Perquisitts to the Lord of tha'foresaid Mannor app'tcininge and belonginge wee estimate to bee worth Comunibus annis. . . . . lxxiiij s. iiij d.

"S'm Totall of tha 'foresaid Rents of Assize and other p'fittes and p'quisites belonginge to the Royalty of thaforesd Mannor are p' ann' . . . . . xiiij li. iiij s. vij d. ob.

(iv.) THE MANOR HOUSE. (*Folio 3.*)

Details concerning the Manor House of Halliford are given next, from which it appears that the structure, of timber and "flemish Walle," was in bad repair at the time; having one storey only, containing six chambers above a hall, kitchen, buttery, larder, washhouse and brewhouse. The outbuildings consisted of a range of "meane Thatcht houses, a barn, dovehouse and house of office"; the grounds comprised two gardens, a couple of yards, and "some other plotts." The tenant, Wm. Westbrooke, who had recently built an addition to the house, was the son of Joan Sharpe (administratrix of the former leaseholder, Robert Sharpe) whose rights in the property had lately been assigned to him. Lysons states that he held "a farm called Halford." In the presentment of the Jury of the Hundred (22nd Oct.,

1650 ; Lambeth Surveys, vol 12, ff. 173/175, Shepperton parish) this reference occurs : " Wee have w<sup>th</sup>in our said parish A ffarme formerlye belonging to the Queene now In the occupac'on of William Westbrooke the tythes of w<sup>ch</sup> ffarme are worth twentye pounds p' ann' out of w<sup>ch</sup> Is allowed to the Mynister Sixteene Shillings a yeare." The Manor House and adjacent premises occupied 10 acres, being worth £8 per annum in all, which gives an average of 16s. per acre (twice the average value of arable land, and 1s. 6d. less than that of pasture land). The record runs thus :—

" All that Messuage Tenem<sup>t</sup> or Mannor house com'only called or knowne by the name of Halford al's Hallowford scituate Lyeinge and beinge in the p'ish of Shupardton in the County aforesaid built with Tymber and flemish Walle consistinge of one Halle Wainscotted one Kitchen one Washhouse and Buttery and one Larder and a Brew-house and over the same 6 Chambers and one Barne Thatcht contayninge 7 Bay Alsoe one Rainge of meane Thatcht houses contayninge 7 small Bay Alsoe one Dove house meanly stored and a house of office thervnto adioyninge Alsoe 2 yardes 2 garden plotts and some other plotts of ground w<sup>th</sup> the sight of the house cont' by estimacon 10 acres nowe in the occupac'on of Wm Westbrooke w<sup>ch</sup> together w<sup>th</sup> the house is worth p' ann'

10 Acres.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, viij *li*.

" Memorand part of the said house is much out of Repaire the other part was built this yeare by the Tenant Wm: Westbrooke."

(v.) THE FIELDS. (*Folios 3/7.*)

The fields follow the description of the Manor House. First come the arable lands, next the closes (of pasture and of meadow) then the common meadow, the Aits in the River Thames, the Pasture of Ley, and lastly the Waste—fourteen lots, altogether varying in size from 1 acre to 46 (total 185 acres), in average value

from 5s. to 30s. per acre (and total value £119 13s. 4d.). Some of the holdings are "pieces or parcels" of land, abutting on others in Northfield, Stadbury and elsewhere, showing that the open-field system of mediæval days was still in existence; but on the other hand, as will presently be shown, the size of the holdings has increased, and there are fewer individual pieces of ground. Boundaries are given in every instance. Thus we find Creame Close, Upper (and Lower) Deane close, East Field, Halliford Manor House, "Thomas Harts Eight" (probably a mistake for "Thames Harts Ait," as a survey of 1633 appears to suggest), the Highway, Hoc Bridge (Close and Lane), Nowoodes, Stadbury Meade, Sunbury Meade, Ten Acres (in Sunbury Field), Thames River (and Close), Mr. Townland's land, Twenty acres piece, the Westerne fferis, Windmill Field (Mill and Lane)—twenty-two boundaries being indicated for the fourteen holdings, showing clearly that they lie together in a compact and convenient form, as in modern agricultural holdings. The proportion of arable to meadow and pasture, definitely assigned as such, was 110 to 62, *i.e.*, 1.77 to 1.

(vi.) THE ARABLE LANDS. (*Folios* 3/4.)

The arable pieces of land lying in the open fields bear various names. Excluding the piece referred to later (Section vii.) lying in "Hoc Close," which comes in the survey between the first and second entries given below, there were three pieces definitely assigned to arable cultivation. One of them was known as the 46 acre piece, another as the 20 acre piece, and the third as "part Eastfeild." Thus, two of them were twenty acres in extent (and it may be noted that this was approximately the size also of the arable piece in "Hoc Close"), while the other appears to be an enlargement of the "40 acre piece" of arable land mentioned in the survey of 1633. This seems to point to a system of "20 acre pieces" of arable ground. The value of the three pieces ranged from £8 to £18 8s. od., the total being £34 8s. od., and the average per acre 8s. The description of these lands in the survey is as follows:—

"All that peice or p'cell of arrable Land com'only called

or knowne by the name of the 46 acre peice Lyeinge in the Northfeild from th'abovesaid house bounded south and East and North on a Lane called the Hoe Lane and West on the Land of Mr. Townlands Contayninge by estimacon 46 acres and is worth p'ann' each acre *viijs* In all : 46 Acres  
Ann<sup>l</sup> value, xviiiij *li. viijs.*"

Then follows the entry concerning "Hoe Close (*see vii.*), after which we have two more pieces of arable land situated near Upper and Lower Deane Close and the Manor House :—

" All that peice or parcell of arrable Land com'only called or knowne by the name of the 20 acres peice abuttinge East on Sunbury Meade and abuttinge north on the Lower end of the Deane Close contayninge by estimac'on 20 acres and is worth per ann' each acre *viijs* In all : 20 Acres 00 Roods.  
Ann<sup>l</sup> value, viij *li.*

" All that peice or parcell of arrable Land com'only called or knowne by the name of pte Eastfeild abuttinge East on the River Thames and on the Vpper Deane on the north and on the house on the West contayninge by estimac'on 20<sup>tie</sup> acres and is worth per ann' each acre *viijs* In all . . .  
20 Acres: 00 Roods:  
Ann<sup>l</sup> value, viij *li.*"

(vii.) THE MIXED INCLOSURE : ARABLE AND MEADOW.

(*Folios 4/5.*)

The enclosures of arable, meadow and pasture follow next in the survey. These are five in number, including "Hoe Close," which, undivided in 1633, now consisted of two portions. Three of these closes, very small ones, were utilised for pasture; the fourth, of 20 acres (like the pieces of arable land), was a close of meadow; the fifth, 26 acres in extent, was divided in the proportion of 24 acres arable (in the upper part) and 2 acres meadow (in the lower part). These two portions were separately valued, though lying in the same close, and for the purpose of this study they will be regarded as a united, though mixed, enclosure.



The arable portion, in common with the arable pieces already described, was worth 8s. per acre, neither more nor less ; and it is clear, therefore, that its situation, within enclosed land, did not operate in its favour sufficiently to enhance its value. This portion described in the original survey (folio 4) is as follows :—

“ All that peice or p’cell of arrable Land Com’only called or knowne by the name of the Hoe Close abuttinge on a peice of ground called 10 acres Lyeinge in Sunbery feild on the north side abuttinge East on Hoebridge and Hoe Lane on ye west contayninge by estimac’on 24 acres and is worth per ann’ each acre *viii*s. In all . . . 24 Acres : 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, ix *li*. xijs.”

At the lower end of the same close, formerly in arable cultivation like the remainder, lay the two acres of meadow, each acre being worth 8s. no longer, but £1 ; so that the value of this portion was now 2½ times greater than it had formerly been, and 2½ times greater, therefore, than any single acre in the upper part of the close. The meadow land portion is thus described (*folio 5*) :—

“ All that peice or parcell of Meadowe ground com’only called or knowne by the name of Hoe Close Lyeinge and beinge at the Lower end of tha’foresaid 24 acre peece and heretofore part of that abuttinge north on the 10 acres Lyeinge in Sunbery feild and on Hoebridge on the East contayninge by estimac’on 2 acres and is worth per ann’ each acre *xx*s. In all . . . 02 Acres 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, xls.”

(viii.) THE INCLOSURE OF MEADOW. (*Folio 6.*)

The only close of meadow was one 20 acres in extent, the fourth holding of that size in the manor. Its value per acre was £1 10s., the highest of all, being 50 per cent. above that of the meadow land in the divided “ Hoe Close,” and nearly four times the value

of the arable land. "Thames Close" is thus referred to in the survey :—

"All that peice or parcell of Inclosed Meadowe ground Com'only called or knowne by the name of Thames Close & adioyninge on the Thames on the West and south and Creame close on the north and East contayninge by estimac'on on 20<sup>tie</sup> acres and is worth per ann' each acre xxxs. In all . . . 20 Acres: 00 Roods.  
Ann<sup>l</sup> value, xxx li."

(ix.) THE INCLOSURES OF PASTURE.

(*Folios 5/6.*)

Three small closes of Pasture ranged from 4 to 8 acres in extent, two of them being of the same size. In value, the prices ranged between 10s. and 23s. 4d. per acre, all three fields being differently rated; the average works out at 17s. 6d. per acre per annum. For some reason, the land of highest value was now near Windmill Hill, and this fact is borne out by the discovery that even the waste land (which was known as "Windmill feild": see xiii.) had doubled in value in the past seventeen years. In the duplicate (f. 20) the rate per acre for the third close has been altered from "xxiiij<sup>s</sup>," but in the original the reference to these closes is as follows :—

"All that Close of pasture ground com'only called or knowne by the name of the Vpper Deane Close abuttinge on the house on the southwest and on the Lower Deane on the north east Lyeing betweene the Lane on the Eastfeild contayninge by estimac'on fower acres and is worth per ann' each acre xs. In all . . . 04 Acres: 00 Roods.  
Ann<sup>l</sup> value, xls."

"All that Close of Pasture com'only called or knowne by the name of Lower Deane abuttinge East on Hoc bridge and west on Vpper Deane close Lyeing betweene the High way

and the 20<sup>th</sup> acres peice contayninge by estimac'on fower  
acres and is worth per ann' each acre xiijs iiij<sup>d</sup> In all . . .

04 Acres 00 Roods :

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, liijs iiij<sup>d</sup>

" All that Close of pasture ground com'only called or  
knowne by the name of Creame close abuttinge on Windmill  
Hill on y<sup>e</sup> east and Thames Close on the west and Windmill  
Lane on y<sup>e</sup> north contayninge by estimac'on 8 acres and  
is worth per ann' each each (sic) acre xxiijs iiij<sup>d</sup>. In all  
. . . .

08 Acres 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, ix. li. vjs. viij<sup>d</sup>."

(x.) THE INCLOSURE OF " PASTURE OR LEAZOW GROUND."

(Folio 7.)

Within the manor lay a single holding of pasture or ley, one of the few cases in which such inclosures are mentioned in the Middlesex surveys. " Leaze is an unmown grass field stocked through spring and summer," states the *Century Dictionary* (IV. 3391, " Lease " ; quoting the *Edinburgh Review*, CXLV. 129). It is, therefore, equivalent to the " feedings " referred to at Enfield and elsewhere. In the present instance, we might suspect the existence of a close since the acreage exactly agrees with two of the three inclosures of pasture already mentioned, and its average value per acre, although higher than that of the first close and below that of the third, is exactly equal to that of the second close, viz., 13s. 4d. ; but the certainty in this case arises from the fact that " Nowoods," as this piece is called, is recorded in the 1633 survey as " a close of Meadowe called Noward," evidently of old standing. In the duplicate (f. 21) the name has been corrected from " Norwoods," but lower down it occurs again, this time remaining unaltered. The reference in the original survey (f. 7) to this particular holding reads thus :—

" All that peice or parcell of pasture or Leazow ground  
com'only called Nowoods abuttinge on the River Thames  
on y<sup>e</sup> south and on East feild on y<sup>e</sup> north and Windmill

feild on y<sup>e</sup> west contayninge by estimac'on fower acres and is worth per ann' *xiijs. iiij<sup>d</sup>*. In all : 04 Acr : 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, *liijs. iiij<sup>d</sup>*."

(xi.) THE COMMON MEADOW.

(*Folio 6.*)

The Common Meadow (Stadbury Meade), like the Inclosed Meadow and two arable holdings, also had an area of 20 acres. As its annual value was £20, its average value per acre was no more than 20s., an amount equal to that of the meadow land in the divided "Hoe Close," but only one half of the average value per acre of "Thames Close." Stadbury Meade is described as follows :—

"All that peice or p'cell of Meadowe ground Lyeinge in the Com'on Meadowe called Stadbury meade abuttinge south East and West on the River Thames and north on a peice of ground called the Westernne fierris cont' by estimac'on 20 acres and is worth per ann' each acre *xx<sup>s</sup>*. In all . . .

20 Acres : 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, *xx li*.

(xii.) THE AITS IN THE THAMES.

(*Folio 7.*)

Two Aits are recorded ; they are both small, the total value being but £4 10s. In each case the average value per acre works out at 30s., and is thus comparable to the highest price for enclosed meadow land within the manor. The duplicate (f. 21) speaks of "Stodbury eight," but the record in the original survey stands thus :—

"All that Eight Lyeinge in the River Thames Com'only called or knowne by the name of Stadbury Eight abuttinge East on Thomas Harts Eight and north west and south incompassed about w<sup>th</sup> the River Thames Contayninge by estimac'on one acre and is worth per ann' . . .

01 Acres 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, *xxx<sup>s</sup>*

“ One other Eight Lyeinge on the south East side of tha'aboves<sup>d</sup> Eight in the River of Thames incompassed about as above—contayning by estimac'on 2 acres and is worth per ann' each acre xxx<sup>s</sup>. In all . . .

02 Acres : 00 Roods.

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, lx<sup>s</sup>.

(xiii.) THE WASTE.

(Folio 7.)

One piece of waste land alone existed in the manor, and its value was no more than 5s. per acre, or £2 10s. in all. In extent it represented just 5 per cent. of the area of the entire manor. The reference is as follows :—

“ All that peice or parcell of Course ground com'only called or knowne by the name of Windmill feild adioyninge on the River Thames on ye south and Creame close on the west & nowoodes cont' by est: 10 acr' & is worth p'ann' each acre vs. In all . . .

10 Acr<sup>es</sup>: 00 Roods :

Ann<sup>l</sup> value, ls.''

(xiv.) THE TOTAL ACREAGE.

(Folio 7.)

At the conclusion of the list of fields and their areas comes a single line :—

“ The Totall number of Acres are 185 Acr<sup>es</sup> 00 Roods.”

This total ignores the 10 acres of the site and grounds of the Manor House, so that the total area of the manor really amounts to 195 acres. The separate values are not summed up ; they amount to £119 13s. 4d. in the case of the fields, and adding £8 for the Manor House, the total thus reaches £127 13s. 4d.

(xv.) THE TIMBER ON THE ESTATE.

(Folio 8.)

Under the terms of the lease made in Jan. 1637, the “ great Trees Woods Underwoods Mynes and Quarryes ” had been reserved. The trees surveyed in 1650 were evidently small, and

were neither varied nor valuable, for 500 or more elm trees were only worth about 2s. 4d. each. Accordingly the Commissioners decided not to add this amount in the total valuation of the manor, under the Covenants attached to the lease. The reference in this case reads :—

“Memor<sup>d</sup>: wee finde vppon the p<sup>r</sup>misses 500<sup>d</sup> and odd small Elme Trees w<sup>ch</sup> wee value to bee worth 58 <sup>li</sup> 11<sup>s</sup>0<sup>d</sup> But wee doe not bringe them to accompt because wee finde them not sufficient to maintayne y<sup>e</sup> Bootes.”

(xvi.) THE LEASES, 1599/1650.

(*Folio* 8.)

An interesting portion of the survey is the record of transmission of leases, beginning with a grant to Geo. Christopher on 12th July, 1599, and followed by another to Rob. Sharpe (26th Jan., 1637/8)—the former for 30 years (from 1624 to 1654), and the latter for 18 years (to expire on 29th Sept. 1672). Consequently there was an unexpired lease of 22 years at the time of the survey. In both leases the rent was £18 6s. 8d., payable half yearly in March and September, but in the second lease reservation was made of great trees, mines and quarries. The record shows the means by which Wm. Westbrooke became the “Immediate Tenant,” in succession to his mother Joan Sharpe, wife of Robert (the second lessee) and formerly the wife of Thos. Harrison, the preceding tenant of Halliford. There is some variation in the phraseology of the duplicate (f. 22) : for example, “before pirticularly,” “Quarryes of the premises,” “end and tearme.” The total of the rents agrees in both copies, but the individual items are short by  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. This is due in both cases to omission in item 3 (correctly £8 15s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.). The following is the reference in the original document :—

“Wee finde that the Late Queene by Indenture bareing date the 26th day of January in the 13<sup>th</sup> yeare of the Raigne of the Late Kinge did Demise grant and to farme Lett vnto Robert Sharpe of Hallowford in y<sup>e</sup> County of Midd’ gent All

the Scite and Manc'on house of the Mannor of Hallowford w<sup>th</sup> the Orchards gardens stables Edifices and Backsides to the same app'teininge And all and singuler tha'foremenc'oned p'cell of Land afore p'ticularly menc'oned w<sup>th</sup> there and eu'y of there app'ten'cs (Except all great Trees Woods Vnderwoods Mynes and Quarryes) To have and to hold the p'misses vnto the said Rovert Sharpe his Executors and assignes (To com'ence at Mich'as 1654) for and duringe the full terme of 18 yeares w<sup>ch</sup> was after a former Lease granted by Queene Eliz: to one George Christopher for xxx<sup>tie</sup> yeares Yeildinge and payinge to the Queene her heires and Successors the yearly rent or sum'e of xviiij<sup>li</sup>. vjs viij<sup>d</sup>. (That is to say) The ffrecholders of Hether Halford iiij<sup>li</sup> xvjs. iiij<sup>d</sup> ob. The Tennantes of Vpp' Halford iiij<sup>li</sup> xiiij<sup>s</sup> vij<sup>d</sup>. And the farmor of the Scite and Lands viij<sup>li</sup> xvs viij<sup>d</sup>. at Mich'as and Lady day by equall porc'ons Tha'foresaid Robert Sharpe died and Left Joane his wife administratrix who possessed the said p'misses and afterwards sold all her Right title Interest and terme of yeares yet to come and vnexpired in tha'bovesaid p'misses to Wm. Westbrooke her sonn whoe is the Imediate Tenant and hath yet to come 22 yeares of the xxix<sup>th</sup> day of September. See y<sup>t</sup>. the p'sent Rent is xviiij<sup>li</sup> vjs viij<sup>d</sup>. And the Improvm<sup>t</sup> after the end expirac'on or other determinac'on of tha'foresaid Lease is . . .

Redd' xviiij<sup>li</sup> vjs viij<sup>d</sup>  
Ann<sup>l</sup> Imp'm<sup>t</sup>, cxxij<sup>li</sup> xjs iij<sup>d</sup> ob."

(xvii.) THE COVENANTS OF THE LEASE.

(Folio 9.)

There are seven covenants attached to the lease: first, to maintain the premises; second, to safeguard the five "boots" (viz., "Cartboote," "Fireboote," "Hedgboote," "Houseboote," and "Ploughboote"); third, to grow timber; fourth, to collect the rents annually; fifth, to sustain the steward or other officials during their visits; sixth, to levy fines, and deliver a new rental; seventh, to avoid non-payment of rent. The duplicate (f. 23)

correctly records "the feast of the translac'on of Kinge Edward" (whereas the original names Edward *the Sixth* in the place of Edward *the Confessor*), but varies the phraseology of the final covenant. In the original survey the Covenants are recorded in the following terms:—

"The Lessee Covenants w<sup>th</sup> the Queene well and sufficiently to Repaire support susteine scoure Clense and Maintayne the houses Edifices buildinges hedges ditches Inclosures Shoares Banckes and Walles of the p<sup>r</sup>misses and in the end of the said terme soe well & sufficiently repayred ye same shall soe Leaue and yeild vpp.

The Lessee is to have Competent and sufficient Houseboote Hedgboote fireboote plough boote and Cartboote and the same to bee dispended vppon the p<sup>r</sup>misses and not elsewhere.

The Lessee is alsoe to have Tymber growinge on the Woods and Lands of the p<sup>r</sup>miss' and not elsewhere for and towards the Repa'con of the houses and Edifices by the appoyntm<sup>t</sup> of the Queenes Steward.

"The Lessee Covenants w<sup>th</sup> the Lessor to collect and deliver a true and p<sup>r</sup>fect accompt of the Rents and p<sup>r</sup>fitts of the said Mannor at a Certaine day by him Limitedt betwene the feast of the Translac'on of Kinge Edward the Sixt and all St<sup>es</sup> eu'ye yeare durence the said terme.

"The Lessee is to find and p<sup>r</sup>vide for the Steward of the said Mannor and for others comeinge to the Court and to Survey the said Mannor at 4 Tymes of the yeare( durence the said terme of 18 yeares )meate Drinck sufficient Lodging Hey Oates and strawe for there horses for & durence the space of 2 days and 3 nights eu'y tyme or turne.

Alsoe the Lessee his Exec<sup>rs</sup> and assignes to gather and Levy all fines Issues and am<sup>c</sup>iam<sup>tes</sup> Viewes of ffranck pledge and all other Courts there heild yerely at his and there owne Costs and Charges accordinge to ye Estreats to him d<sup>d</sup> and thereof give an accompt and deliver a new Rentall



Containeing all Rents and services therevnto belonginge cu'y 3 yeares durance the said terme.

And in Case the Rent or any part thereof happen to bee behinde by the space of 40<sup>te</sup> dayes after any of thaforesaid Dayes of Paym<sup>t</sup> the Lease to bee Vtterly voyd."

(xviii.) ABSTRACT OF THE SURVEY VALUATION, 1650.

(Folio 10.)

A summary of the old and new valuations of the manor follows the statement of leases and their covenants. The total of £140 17s. 11½d. is made up of the following items, collected from the various folios :—

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Fol. 1—I. Rents : (a) Upper Halliford	4	16	8½			
(b) Lower Halliford	4	14	7			
Fol. 2—II. Manorial Fines, etc. . .	3	13	4			
Fol. 2 . . . . . 1st Total . .				13	4	7½
Fol. 3—III. Lands : (a) Manor House, etc.	8	0	0			
Fol. 7 . . . . . (b) Fourteen valuations.	119	13	4			
Fol. 7 . . . . . 2nd Total . .				127	13	4
Fol. 10 . . . . . GRAND TOTAL . .				£140	17	11½

The " Present Rent " is the Customary Rent found in the leases of 1599 and 1637 (and recorded as such in the " marriage jointure " of Queen Henrietta in 1628). Its component parts were three in number (Fol. 8) :—

(a) Rent from Freeholders : Upper Halliford . .	4	14	7
(b) " " " Lower Halliford . .	4	16	4½
(c) " " Farmer of Scite and Lands . .	8	15	8½
Folios 8 and 10 . . . . . TOTAL . .	£18	6	8

The amount under (c) includes the  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. which is omitted from the corresponding item in folio 8.

Subtracting the "present" or "Lease Rent" of £18 6s. 8d. from the total valuation of the Manor, viz., £140 17s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., we find the estimated "Future Improvement" (on the expiration of the lease 22 years hence, *i.e.*, in September, 1652) to be no less than £122 11s. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., which is equal to an increase in value of 668.5 per cent. The signatures of the four surveyors which follow are varied in the duplicate (f. 26) where two of the spellings are given as "Brasbridg" and "Bradnoll." In the original survey (f. 10) the Abstract appears thus:—

"An Abstract of the p<sup>r</sup>sent Rent and future Improv<sup>m</sup>tes: are as followeth

"The p <sup>r</sup> sent Rent is p <sup>r</sup> ann'	xviii <sup>li</sup> . vj. <sup>s</sup> viij. <sup>d</sup>
"The future Improv <sup>m</sup> t is p <sup>r</sup> ann'	Cxxij <sup>li</sup> . xj. <sup>s</sup> iij. <sup>d</sup> ob'.
"S <sup>m</sup> Totall of the p <sup>r</sup> sent Rent & } future Improv <sup>t</sup> : is p <sup>r</sup> ann'	Cxl. <sup>li</sup> xvij. <sup>s</sup> xj. <sup>d</sup> ob'.
"Raphe Baldwyn	Rowland Brasbridge
"Ric Heiwood	John Brudenall."

(xix.) RENTAL OF THE MANOR IN 1650.

(Folios 11/12.)

The last two folios of the survey contain a new rental of the manor. The names of freehold tenants are given both at Upper and Lower Halliford, but there appears to have been no Copy holders in either portion of the manor. In the upper section, situated within Sunbury parish, where the holdings were 18 in number, the rents amounted to £4 19s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in 1650; in the lower section, within Shepperton parish, where the holdings numbered 11, the rents were less, viz., £4 16s. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. The holdings, 29 in number, were in the hands of members of 17 families, and one only of the tenures stood in the name of a woman. Very small were the rents, ranging from 4d. to £2 13s. 4d.; and they varied considerably, for hardly two rents were alike, with the exception of four at 6d., three at 8d., and two each at 4d., 2s., and 14s.

Altogether, there were 10 payments of less than a shilling (*i.e.*, one-third of the holdings) and 21 out of the 29 for less than 10s., while two only of the remaining eight exceeded £1. In the duplicate (f. 25) the word "Rentroll" has been erased, and instead of "ye ffreehold Ten'ants" we have "the ffree and Cobby Holder Tennants," but no instances of Copyholders are given in the lists of "halford al's Hollowford." In the original the heading reads:—

"A Rentall of the Quittrents and Custumary Rents of the Mannor of Halford al's Hallowford in the County of Midd' due from ye ffreehold Ten'ants & payable to ye Lord of the Mannor at Mich'as and Lady Day."

(xx.) LIST OF FREEHOLDERS OF LOWER HALLIFORD, IN THE PARISH OF SHEPPERTON, 1650.

(Folio 11.)

In the list which follows, the eleven holdings (all of which surround the manor house) are seen to be in the hands of six families. The rents, varying from 6d. to £2 13s. 4d., average 8s. 9d. each, more than 50 per cent. higher than the figure for Upper Halliford. It is probable, though not certain, that the names were intended to read downwards: if read across, "the same" (line 2) would refer to Francis Vaughan, but in the second instance (line 5) the reference would be to Hy. Collins definitely. Variations in the duplicate (f. 25) include "Mathew Ravenor" (line 1) and "Edward Buck Land (line 3).

*"The Freehold Ten'ants of Netherhalford.*

	s.	d.		s.	d.
The Lady Vaughan	liij.	iiij.	Martyn Ravener ..	xij.	
Francis Vaughan ...	x.	viiij.	The same... ..	ij.	iiij.
Edward Buckland		vj.	Geo. Poole, Esqr... ..		vj.
Henry Collins ..	x.		Henry Collins ..		viiij.
The same .. ..		vj.	Will'm Vincent ..	v.	
Henry Collins ye younger..	..	..	..	..	x. ob.'
					S'm iiij. <sup>li</sup> xvj. <sup>s</sup> iiij. <sup>d</sup> ob."

(xxi.) LIST OF FREEHOLDERS OF UPPER HALLIFORD, IN THE  
PARISH OF SUNBURY, 1650.

(Folio 11/12.)

In this part of the manor there are only four instances of persons having more than one holding. Edward Buckland, moreover, is the only freeholder in both portions of the manor ; his rent here is *not indicated*, but by subtracting the items from the total, it would appear to be 5s. 6½d. The other rents were mostly small, ranging from 4d. to 20s. 1d., the average being 5s. 6d. (or 3s. 3d. below that of Lower Halliford). One of the holdings belonged to the Churchwardens of Sunbury. There is again some doubt as to the correct way of reading the list, the entries relating to Lughton (lines 4, 5) suggesting that it should be downwards, but those referring to Draper (line 1) and especially Dayry (line 9) suggest that the proper method is to read across. The variations in the duplicate (ff. 25, 26) are: "Myles Downe" (line 2), "Thomas Bayly" (line 7), "The Church Wardens of Simbury" (line 8), while the last entry (line 9) is given as "Robert Dayrie" and "Rob't Dairye." Buckland's rent is omitted in both copies. The list given in the original reads as follows:—

*"The ffreehold Ten'ants of Vpper Halford.*

	s.	d.		s.	d.
John Drap' .. ..	xvij.	iiij.	John Drap' .. ..	iiij.	
Miles Downe .. ..		iiij.	John Rogers .. ..	xiiij.	
Thomas Ellis .. ..	vj.		David Child .. ..	xiiij.	
James Turbane .. ..	ij.		Thomas Lughton .. ..	xx.	
Henry Holloway .. ..	vj.	viiij.	Thomas Lughton .. ..	xx.	j.
Arthur Snell .. ..		xvj.	Tho. Buckland .. ..		viiij.
Thomas Bayle .. ..		vj.	Edward Buckland .. ..	—	—
The Churchw'dens			Arthur Snell .. ..		ij.
of Sunbery .. ..		iiij.	The same Rob't		
Rob't Dayry .. ..	ij.	vj.	Dayry .. ..		viiij.

S'm iiij<sup>li</sup>. xix<sup>s</sup>. vij<sup>d</sup>. ob.' "

(xxii.) THE TOTAL OF THE MANORIAL RENTAL, 1650.  
(Folio 12.)

The final statement in the survey gives the total of the Rental in this form :—

“ S'm Totall' .. .. ix<sup>li</sup>. xv<sup>s</sup>. xj<sup>d</sup>. ob.' q'z.”

The duplicate (f. 26) likewise agrees :—

“ Sum Totall: .. .. ix<sup>li</sup>.: xv<sup>s</sup>.: xj<sup>d</sup>.: ob. qr.”

Both copies, however, are slightly inaccurate, for the account should be £9 16s. as shown by the addition of the two separate totals :—

Fol. 11—Netherhalford Freeholders..	..	..	£4	16	4½
Fol. 12—Vpper Halford Freeholders	..	..	£4	19	7½
TOTAL .. ..					
£9 16 0					

(xxiii.) THE TOTAL AREA SURVEYED IN 1650.

Summarising the evidence, we obtain the following results (the average for meadow, combining 3 and 4, is 24s. 9d.) :—

	Area.	Annual Value.			Average	
		A.	£	s.	per Acre	
1. House and Premises..	.. 10	.. 8	0	0	.. 16/-	
2. Arable .. ..	.. 86	.. 34	8	0	.. 8/-	
3. Arable and Meadow ..	.. 26	.. 11	12	0	.. 8/11	
4. Meadow .. ..	.. 40	.. 50	0	0	.. 25/-	
5. Pasture .. ..	.. 16	.. 14	0	0	.. 17/6	
6. Pasture and Leazow..	.. 4	.. 2	13	4	.. 13¼	
7. Aits .. ..	.. 3	.. 4	10	0	.. 30/-	
8. Waste .. ..	.. 10	.. 2	10	0	.. 5/-	
TOTALS ..		A 195	£127	13	4	.. 13/1

## II.—THE ECONOMY OF THE RURAL ESTATES OF THE CROWN IN MIDDLESEX, OTHER THAN THE MANOR OF HALLIFORD, AS DESCRIBED IN THE PARLIAMENTARY SURVEYS, 1649-1659.

So far, we have examined in detail the survey of a single manor, that of Halliford, and by a comparison of the evidence in regard to leases and other features at different periods of time, we have endeavoured to reveal the economy of the manor in the light of history.\* The next step will be to analyse the surveys of the remaining estates of the Crown in rural Middlesex, the whole of which have been transcribed for this purpose. Useful as such a course would undoubtedly be, the expense of printing is too great to permit the remaining surveys to be given in full, as we have done in the case of Halliford. Fortunately, it is unnecessary as well, since the parliamentary surveys of the county are constructed on a more or less uniform plan, which enables one to note variations in detail with comparative ease. A series of abstracts, instead of the full transcription, will, therefore, be given, illustrating the economy of the other Royal Estates, so that a comparison may be made which will enable one to decide whether, in the first place, the conditions described at Halliford, were usual or the reverse, and whether, in the next, the range of economic variation in the county was great or small. This method of analytical abstraction is more adequate for the present purpose than that of statistical statement, for the latter is open to the objection that the revealed results might represent either the existence of a uniform type of economic structure throughout the series, or a theoretical uniformity artificially produced by a balance sharply struck between widely diverging economic organisations.

---

\* The historical portion is omitted. See footnote above, page 404.

## (i.) CHELSEA PLACE AND THE MANOR OF CHELSEA.

*(P.S. 7. June 1652.)*

The document, in this particular case, is not a survey at all, but a copy (23rd June, 1652) of the existing lease (26th June, 1638) granted to James, Marquis of Hamilton. It is endorsed (f. 26d) : " A copie of the Graunt of Chelsey place and Manour vnto James Marqueisse of Hamilton xiiij.<sup>to</sup> Car. Midlesex." The heading is (f. 1) : " 12<sup>o</sup> pars. 14 Caroli m'm 8<sup>o</sup>.", the date being given at the close (f. 26) : " Westm' xxvj.<sup>o</sup> die Junij xiiij<sup>o</sup> Caroli," an attestation in regard to the correctness of the copy being made by Lewis Lewis, Jn. Caser, and Jn. Page. Former leases " for life " are quoted, but as the present grant, at a yearly rent of £10, is " for ever," the Commissioners respected the intentions of King Charles, and the property remained " in private possession." The following abstract in translation is taken from the original grant (Pat. Roll 2807, dated 26th June, 14 Chas. I., pt. 12, No. 6) :—

" The King to all, etc. Whereas King James by letters patent dated 11 April 4 James I (A.D. 1606) sold granted and to farm let to Margaret, Countess of Nottingham, then wife of Charles, Earl of Nottingham, for life the house and mansion called Chelsey Place with the gardens and other appurtenances and all that manor of Chelsea, both in the county of Middlesex, late parcel of the possessions of Katherine late Queen of England, and afterwards of John Duke of Northumberland, all the houses, hereditaments, etc., in Chelsea aforesaid thereto belonging, and whereas by letters patent dated 14 November 7 Charles I (A.D. 1609) the said King made a similar grant of the same premises to James Howard, esquire, son of the said Earl and Countess of Nottingham to hold immediately after the death of the said Margaret for a term of 40 years. Know that we have given and granted to James, Marquis of Hamilton his heirs and assigns all that our house and mansion aforesaid called Chelsea Place with the yards and gardens aforesaid and

other its appurtenances in our county of Middlesex and all that our manor of Chelsea, in the same county, late parcel of the lands of Katherine late Queen of England and afterwards parcel of the possessions of John late Duke of Northumberland, and all our houses, buildings, barns, apple orchards, gardens, lands, meadows, pastures, advowsons, churches, wards, marriages, knights fees, woods, underwoods, rents, views of frankpledge, Courts Leet, Courts Baron and all things which to Courts Leet, Courts Baron and views of frankpledge belong or pertain, liberties, franchises, services, hereditaments, profits, commodities and emoluments whatsoever with their appurtenances situate, lying and being in Chelsea aforesaid and elsewhere wheresoever to the said manor in any way belonging or pertaining and also the reversion and reversions whatsoever and also all rents and yearly profits whatsoever reserved upon the premises or any part of the same. To have, hold and enjoy the said premises to the sole and proper use and behoof of the said James, Marquis of Hamilton, his heirs and assigns for ever of us as of our manor of East Greenwich by fealty in free and common socage and not in chief nor by knights service, paying therefor yearly £10.

Witness the King at Westminster.

By writ of Privy Seal."

(ii.) CHELSEA COLLEGE.

(P.S. 8. May, 1652. Duplicate, Land Rev. Off., Misc. Bks., Vol. 288, ff. 99-104.)

This is the first of the rural surveys and it is endorsed (f. 5d) as follows :—

"The Colledge of King James in Chelsey Midd'. Rec<sup>d</sup> this 26<sup>th</sup> of May. Transmitted to y<sup>e</sup> Srveyor the same day. (Wm.) Dawgs."

Letters of Incorporation (8 May, 1610) are cited for building "Chelsey Colledge otherwise the Colledge of King James in



Chelsey neere London." The property, which is described as "of the foundac'on of the said King James of England," is now styled "parcel of the possessions of Charles Stuart late King of England." As in the case of Chelsea Manor (No. i. above), the period of the grant was "for ever"; but owing to the discontinuance of the Corporation (a Provost or President and 20 Fellows), and "the Premises not being employed to the use they were given," the Commissioners "conceive the same to be in the present possession of the Commonwealth," and therefore they decided that "the foundac'on is determined." Thus the period embraced by the term "for ever" lasted in this case exactly 42 years.

Details follow in respect to the valuations of the property. Under the terms of the lease, the rent payable was £2 7s. 4d. at Michaelmas and Lady Day. As the new valuation came to £69 10s., there was an "Improvement" of £67 2s. 8d. per annum, equal to 2837 per cent., the details being as follows :—

Holdings.	Area.	Rent. (1610)	Ann. Value. (1652)
1. Mansion, etc. ..	1	—	30 0 0
2. Thamesshott ( <i>a</i> ) ..	19	1 3 4	23 15 0
3. Stonybridge ( <i>m</i> ) ..	5	1 0 0	12 0 0
4. Three Acres ( <i>a</i> ) ..	3	4 0	3 15 0
TOTALS .. ..	28	£2 7 4	£69 10 0

The "Capitall Messuage," situated on (2) consisted of a building of brick and tile (130 ft. by 33 ft., four storeys high), with yards, garden and outbuilding, and 1 acre of ground. The land consisted of a close of meadow and 22 acres of arable, the mansion and ploughed land being situated in "A Comon feild" called "Eastfeild." The proportion of arable to meadow, therefore, was  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 as compared with  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 at Halliford, while the comparative average per acre values in the two places were, for arable, 25s. and 8s., and for meadow 48s. and 24s. 9d. This enhanced value is clearly due to favourable situation in respect

to the metropolis. There was no timber on the estate. Henry Austen occupied the close of meadow in 1652.

(iii.) EDMONTON MANOR. (*P.S.* 16, *June*, 1650.)

(The Survey of Edmonton is printed in "Mx. and Herts. N. & Q." 1897, III. pp. 20-22, and 88-89; by C. E. B. Bowles.)

The manor of Edmonton, described as "late P'cell of the Possessions, or Late belonging to Henrietta Maria the Relict of Charles Stuart late Kinge of England," was surveyed in June, 1650, the document being endorsed (f. 13d): "Edmonton Mannor; nup' Car. regis. Midl'x. Recd this 19<sup>th</sup> of June, 1650. Transmitted to the s'rveyor G'rall the same day. Returned the 21<sup>th</sup> of June. (Ralph) Baldwine." The boundaries of the Manor (f. 8) show that it "Lyeth intermingled, w<sup>th</sup> the Mannor of Willobies, and the Mannor of Deepehams, heretofore belonging to ye Deane and Chapter of Paules." The Customs of the Manor, presented by the Jury impanelled as a Court of Survey (ff. 7/8) deal with licences from the Lord or Steward, post mortem charges, inclosures, bridges and pound, the Haywards and the officers of the Court. The chief points that emerge are:—

1. Licences were required from Copy holders (the amounts being arbitrary) who let their premises for more than three years, or cut down timber on their grounds, 2d. being paid as a rule for each tree cut, but nothing when the timber was used for the upkeep of their premises.

2. Postmortem charges in the case of Copyhold tenants (the fines being "certain") amounted to 10s. for Marsh lands, 6s. pasture, and 3s. 4d. for arable or wood, a year's quit-rent being deducted. Fines upon alienation of lands were also fixed and not arbitrary. These charges were collected by the bailiff. When copyholders died intestate the lands and tenements came to the youngest sons, according to ancient usage. On the death of freeholders, the next in succession paid a year's quit-rent. Heriots were demanded from the "Hemstalls" or Haywards of

the Marsh, two each being due from Jn. Uxley, Esq., and Rob. Marsh, Gent., and one each from six others, viz., Jn. Wilde, ffelix Clarke, Mr. Marscoll, and "The widdow Martyn."

3. Inclosures of any parcel of Common Field Land required the joint consent of the whole of the tenants of the manor.

4. Common bridges on the waste (2 horse and 5 foot), as well as the Common Pound in the manor, were maintained and repaired by the Lord. For this the Commissioners allowed £5 3s. 6d.

5. The usual officers of the manor were the Steward and the Bailiff: the fee of the former for keeping the Courts Leet and Baron every Whit Tuesday was 40s., the Lord permitting the Bailiff to spend £5 on the Court Dinner; the latter received £5 per annum for his services. These payments were disallowed by the Commissioners.

The Rents of Assize or Customary Quit Rents due from Freeholders are given as £7 15s., those of the Copyholders being £77 11s. 6d., making a total of £84 14s. 6d. (fo. 1), a slightly incorrect result (see below). The Court fines, etc., amounted to £111 7s. 10d., taking one year with another, so that after allowing £5 3s. 6d. for the Bridges and Pound, "the Profits Remaining out of the Manor" came to £106 4s. 4d. The net result, therefore, was £183 5s. 10d. per annum. A new Rental is given in the Survey (ff. 3/6), and this is accompanied by a copy (pinned in and now marked ff. 9/12, but originally a separate booklet) endorsed: "Edmonton Rentroule 1650. Ded in by Mr. Holiday himselfe 7<sup>th</sup> Septemb' 1652." In this Rental are representatives of 102 families, the holdings including 14 of women, 9 of whom are widows. In 4 cases the "heires" are mentioned, in 2 other cases the guardians are named, but in only one instance does a joint holding occur. "Peacocke Feild" is the only piece of land indicated by name, for this survey differs from others in that the various holdings within the manor are not separately named and valued. Its incompleteness is clear from the fact that no reference to acreage, Leases and "Improved Values" appears in it.

There is a Memorandum (f. 2) respecting the timber on the waste. Comparing Edmonton and Halliford Manors we get these results :

Timber.	Edmonton.	Halliford.
1. Number of trees ..	217 .. ..	" 500 odd."
2. Kind of trees ..	Oak, Elm, Ash, and Walnut.	Elm (small)
3. Value of trees ..	£140 .. ..	£58 11s.
4. Average per tree ..	12s. 10 <sup>s</sup> 8d.	About 2s. 4d.

A summary of the Rental, arranged in "Wardes," may be presented in the following form :—

Ward.	Freeholders.			Copyholders.			Totals.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1. Berry Streete ..	13	2½		23	14	9	24	7	11½
2. Southstreete ..	1	9	10	5	18	2	7	8	0
3. fforestreete ..	4	8	0	15	9	10	19	17	10
4. Church Streete ..	11	10		31	18	9	32	10	7
5. Hadley .. ..	10	1½		—			10	1½	
TOTALS ..	£7	13	0	£77	1	6	£84	14	6

The holdings of the Freeholders were, in the above order, 22, 17, 12, 9 and 14, or 74 in all ; those of the Copyholders were, in the same order, 38, 18, 11 and 24, or 91 ; so that the total number of holdings came to 165, among 102 families (a well distributed result), Hadley containing 14, Fore Street 23, Church Street 33, South Street 35, and "Berrie Streete" 60. The arithmetic is slightly inaccurate, for on checking the addition, the total of the Copyholders in South Street came to £5 18s. 3d. making the result £84 14s. 7d. Reference to the duplicate attached to the Survey showed that this addition was correct (ff. 10. 10d), although the duplicate itself, curiously enough, had an undetected error of its own, since Ralph Johnson's amount was given as 1s. 8d. instead of 8d. among the South Street Copyholders (the total of that section agreeing notwithstanding with folio 3). *The amount should, therefore, be £84 14s. 7d.* The range of the

rents is remarkable, for there are 59 separate amounts (and in 36 cases no two are alike), extending from a minimum of 1d. to a maximum of 18s. 4d. The three favourite amounts were 2d., 4d. and 6d., the Rental exhibiting 19 instances of the first, 11 of the second and 13 of the third, after which come 7 holdings at 2s. 6d., and 6 each at 3d. and 1s. 8d. Altogether, 63 were valued at less than 1s., and 101 out of 165 at less than half a crown, while the number of rents at 5s. or more did not exceed 29, those above 10s. being only 6 in number. The average values of the holdings were, in the case of the Freeholders, 2s. 1d. (against 6s. 9d. at Halliford), Copyholders 16s. 11d., and in both cases combined only 10s. 3½d. Edmonton was thus "the poor man's" Manor.

## (iv.) ENFIELD PARK AND CROSBY'S LODGE.

(P.S. 18. April, 1650.)

(Duplicate in Land Rev. Office, Misc. Bks., Vol. 288, ff. 167-178.)

The first of the lengthy series of Enfield surveys to be completed was that relating to the "Impaled Pasture Ground" called "Old Enfeild Parke." It is endorsed (f. 11d): "Enfeild M. Park nup' Car. regis. Midd'. Recd this 4<sup>th</sup> of Aprill 1650. Transmitted to the Surveyor G'ral the same day. Returned the 5<sup>t</sup> of Aprill. (Ralph) Baldwine." The duplicate endorsement is similar, but it is marked with the numbers 2 above and 17 below, and in addition is described as "Enfeild Parke belong<sup>g</sup> to ye Dutchie of Lancast<sup>r</sup>. The boundaries (f. 1) show that the ground lay in the parishes of Enfield and Edmonton, in the following proportions (f. 1):—

Parish.	Acres.	Roods.	Poles.
1. Enfield .. ..	478	3	25
2. Edmonton .. ..	74	0	15
	—	—	—
TOTAL .. ..	553	0	0
	—	—	—

The whole of the land was tithe free. The lease (29th July, 1622) is referred to in No. vi. below: from it is derived (f. 9) "Charles Crosby his Patent" (15th Sept., 1636), which, in consideration of the sum of £400, gave him the office of Under-keeper for life (within the lives of the Earl of Salisbury and his son, Viscount Cranborne) of "Enfield old Parke," and of the "Lodge and Deere." The property consisted of a Lodge, tenement and garden, a close outside the Park, and woodland and pasture within. The Lodge, "scittuate in the Parke near Enfeild townce," and occupied by Charles Crosby, was a building "in reasonable good repaire," built of "Tymber and flemish walle covered with Tyle," with two Courts, two gardens, and an orchard ("reasonable well planted"), together with several "thatcht" outbuildings. The tenement, small and uninhabited, was built "sitley wth timber and earthen wales," with a "Barne fframe vncovered" adjoining. The piece of "Impaled ground," called the "Hopp garden," was "well and convenientlie planted." Summarising the details of annual value we get:—

	Area.			Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
1. Houses and premises ..	—	—	—	12	0	0
2. Right of Common ..	—	—	—	20	0	0
3. Pasture Ground ..	525	2	22	311	10	0
4. Woodland .. ..	27	1	18			
TOTAL .. ..	A553	0	0	£343	10	6

The arithmetic is again at fault, for the total is obviously 6d. in excess of the correct amount, but it is repeated in folios 3 and 6, and the duplicate agrees with this total. The acreage includes the close (3 R. 34 P.), the "Hopp Garden" (1 A. 3. R. 36 P.), and the Lodge ground and gardens. In valuing the ground, 100 acres are regarded as "Best Sort," and, therefore, worth 17s. per acre (£85), while the remainder is considered to be worth only 10s. per acre (£226 10s.). Taking the whole 553 acres "one with another," they are valued at 12s. per acre, which

amounts to an under-estimate of £20 6s. In this survey the "benefitt and Right of Common" in Enfield Chace, "beinge not stinted," is definitely assessed and included in the total. The two coppice, "Hell groue" (probably Hill Grove) and "Middle groue" were valued at £141 17s., but the former, at 50s. an acre, was over-valued by 6s. 4½d., while the latter, at £13 6s. 8d. per acre (6 acres 3 roods in all) was worth more than five times as much as the former. Altogether, the coppice, 27 acres 1 rood 18 poles in extent, work out at an average of £5 3s. 9½d. "ye Soyle beinge valued in ye Parke." The older trees of oak and hornbeam, some of great size, were 7,093 in number; these, together with an unspecified number of small trees of hornbeam, whitethorn and maple, were valued at £1,762 2s. 6d. On the average, the trees were worth about 4s. 6d. each. The average values ranged from 1s. 6d. for "lopt Pollards of Hornebeame," and 3s. for "old oaken Dotrills," to 13s. 4d. for "old Oaken trees," and even £2 for 225 "great old oaken trees"; but the 54 trees that stood in Hamers Wood Grove, valued at 3s. a tree, and said to be worth £7 2s. in all, were clearly under-valued to the extent of £1. In addition to these trees there were 397 "marked for the Vse of the Navie," and accordingly not valued in the schedule. The value of the "Small Game of Conneys" is stated to be £15, and that of the 50 "Deere of severall sorts" (said to be "as often in Enfeild Chace" as in the Park) £45.

(v) ENFIELD CHACE LODGES.

(P.S. 20. Sept., 1650.)

(There are three duplicates of this Survey:—(1) Land Rev. Off., Misc. Bks., vol. 288, ff. 179-189; (2) Duchy of Lanc., No. 45, ff. 9; (3) Duchy of Lanc., No. 7 (11.), ff. 11d-13d.)

This is a Survey, of which several duplicates exist, the original being endorsed (f. 10d.): "Three Lodges, &c.; in Enfeild nup. Car. Regis. Midd; Rec<sup>d</sup> this 6<sup>th</sup> of Septembr 1650. Transmitted to the Srveyor G'all the same day. Returned the 18<sup>th</sup> of Septemb. (Ralph) Baldwine." The first duplicate, which is marked

" No. 3 " at the top, and " No. 52, R: Abstr." at the foot, contains at f. 187 a note on the Commons adjoining, not found in P.S. 20 :—

" I suppose that the Com'on of pasture to (t)hese respective Lodges formerly belonging can not conveniently bee disposed of, Till the whole chace be Surveyed, As also Care must bee taken about the Game of Conyes herein menc'oned. Ex<sup>d</sup> p' Will. Webb Sup'vsr Gen<sup>ll</sup> 1650."

The property surveyed consisted of three Lodges, occupied by the underkeepers, with pieces of meadow or pasture, together with rights of Common within the Chase. While Morris and Potter held their offices " during pleasure " only, " Dighton's Patent " supported his claim (f. 9) to be underkeeper for life (within the lives of the Earl of Salisbury and his son, Viscount Cranborne). Potter's Lodge, " scituate in the middle of Endfeild Chace," was a brick and tile structure of three storeys, with outbuildings and a small garden plot ; the whole worth £25. Samuel Norris' Lodge was of " Tymber and flemish walle " covered with tile, one storey and a garret high with the usual outbuildings and a garden planted with fruit ; annual value £7. Wm. Dighton's Lodge, also worth £7, was situated " wth in one myle of Endfeild Towne," being constructed of brick, timber and " flemish wall," of similar height to the last, with various buildings adjoining, and an orchard and garden " meanly planted." The particulars of the survey, summarised, are as follows :—

	Area.			Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
1. Lodges and premises ..	—	—	—	39	0	0
2. Rights of Common ..	—	—	—	16	13	4
3. Meadow Land ..	22	0	32	22	3	0
4. Pasture Ground ..	159	0	24	103	15	8
<b>TOTAL</b> ..	<b>181</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>£181</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>

Divided according to Lodges, Potter's came first in size, being 85 acres 1 rood 6 poles, valued at £86 5s.; next came Dighton's, 58 acres 18 poles in extent, worth £50 5s.; and lastly, Norris',



the area of which was 37 acres 3 roods 32 poles, and the value per annum £45 2s. *There are, however, some arithmetical mistakes to note.* For example, the total of "yearly values" is recorded as C<sub>iiij</sub><sup>xx</sup>.j<sup>li</sup>.ijs. (£181 2s.), and this again in the duplicate (f. 13d) becomes £125 2s. The area, too, is incorrect in the case of Potter's second pasture (f. 2), which is 8 poles short, since the description states 62 acres 31 poles, and the marginal summary only 62 acres 23 poles, by confusion with the item above it; but the duplicates are correct on this point. The valuation is sometimes at fault, for there is deficiency in two cases (Norris' pasture, f. 4, undervalued by 2d., and Dighton's meadow, f. 5, by 1s.), and excess in three others (Potter's first meadow, f. 2, being overvalued by 1s., and his second by 2d.—a series of parallel mistakes; also Dighton's pasture is 1s. 0½d. out). Dighton's meadow is correctly given in the survey (f. 6) and in one of the duplicates (f. 185), but the figures are reversed in another (f. 13d), and thus read "23 poles" instead of 32. Norris' meadow, rated at "xxs" per acre in the survey (f. 4) and in one duplicate (f. 183), has been misread as 25s. in two others (f. 4 and f. 12d). The net result of these mistakes amounts to this, that *the totals given above should be corrected to 181 acres 1 rood 24 poles and £181 10s. 11½d. respectively.*)

The average value of meadow is stated to be £1 per acre, compared with £2 8s. at Chelsea, and £1 4s. 9d. at Halliford. The average value in the case of pasture ranges from 11s. 4d. to 16s. 8d., being 13s. 0½d. on the whole acreage, compared with 12s. in the survey of Enfield Park, and 17s. 6d. at Halliford. The smaller value at Enfield would, of course, be due to the larger quantity of pasture land available, but even then the average value is more than 10 per cent. below that of Grafton Manor, Northants, surveyed in the same year. The rights of Common are again definitely valued, "being not stinted" in connection with any of the Lodges. The gross value of the timber amounted to £284 2s. for 1,470 trees or more, the average here being about 4s. a tree, although "One great Oake Tree we value at Cs." There was also a great beech, some newly planted elm and ash

trees, and numbers of oak, hornbeam, whitethorn and maple trees. The largest specified number of trees is found in Dighton's Lodge (735, worth £128 9s.), but although Potter's Lodge contained 73 fewer their value was £2 11s. more. Norris' Lodge had only 33 trees, but in their case the average value was 15s. per tree. The Conies were valued at £22 13s. 4d., being £10 for those belonging to Potter's Lodge, £6 13s. 4d. at Dighton's Lodge, and £6 at "Mr. Norris his Lodge although they Lye w<sup>th</sup>out the Rayle." There were no deer.

(vi.) ENFIELD MANOR AND CHACE.

(P.S. 17 combined with 17A(b). Oct., 1650.)

(Duplicate, Duchy of Lanc., No. 7 (11.), ff. 1-10d.)

This Survey has been accidentally divided into two parts, each with its separate cover, and (owing to the interpolation of a survey relating to a portion of Enfield Chase made in 1658) each with a different name. A careful examination led to the discovery that the two parts were once united at the top, so as to form a complete survey. The title appears in the first part, and the endorsement in the second (f. 23d): "The Manour & Chace of Enfeild in ye countie of Middlesex. Rec<sup>d</sup> this last of October 1650. Transmitted to the Surveyor G'ral the same day. (Ralph) Baldwin." Inserted within the cover will be found (f. 1) the Petition of the Chace Borderers, already printed (Part I. pp. 293-294), with the endorsement of Col. Wm. Webb, 20th November, 1650. The claims of the Borderers are fully set out on folios 3 and 18, and allowed (f. 20). The "Verdict of the Jury," impanelled as a Court of Survey, is dated 29th August, 1650. It deals with the Customs of the Manor, which, briefly, are these (ff. 20/22):—

1. The "dwellers in ancient howses" in Enfield, Edmonton, Hadley and South Mimms have long had unstinted rights of Common and pasture in the Chace: they "keepe what Com'onable Cattle they are able to lay on."
2. The Commoners pay 2s. a load for "decayed and dotard trees," and others felled by authority of the woodward.

3. The Tenants pay nothing for the old rotten wood, or the "Crabbs" or "Accornes" picked up beneath the trees, or for the "spray bush or Shannell of y<sup>e</sup> Browsewood" left for the deer.
4. The inhabitants drive the chase once a year for stray horses or colts, upon warning given by the Woodward or Bailiff.
5. Copyholders are allowed timber ("of late noe Tymber"), with clay, sand and "Gravill," for repairing their premises.
6. They pay nothing for "Bushes Stakes & eathers," cut down to repair the fences bordering upon the Chase.
7. Tenants have all trees adjoining "soe neare their groundes that a horse with a Pack could not goe betweene."  
(Instances of this occur in the survey, the average distance being regarded as seven feet.)
8. They gather "Browsewood" free "every Georges day," that being "y<sup>e</sup> View day"; and are allowed annually (after the "flee wood" and the keepers' wood has been delivered) sufficient "Browsewood" for their "fewell," at 8d. a load.
9. Tenants plant trees (which they may lop or fell) on the waste "for y<sup>e</sup> shelter & safeguard of their houses."
10. The Court Baron meets in "y<sup>e</sup> old accustomed place" twice a year, and tenants perform their suit and service there.
11. The fines "upon decent," alienation or surrender, are "certain," two years' Quit Rent being paid for the last two, and one year's rent for hereditary succession to Freehold or Copyhold lands.

The orders of the Committee for Removing Obstructions are recorded (ff. 2d, 3d), the claim of Wm. Wakefield in connection with Edmonton Glebe (already printed, Part I., p. 292) being allowed: in the survey of the Chase in 1658, a portion is set apart to meet this claim (f. 1). Folio 4 is headed: "Here begins the Cottages and Tenem<sup>tes</sup> built vppon y<sup>e</sup> Chase w<sup>th</sup>out Leave or Licence of the Lord of the Mannor." This is followed by a list

of others built upon the Waste "without the chase." Altogether, there were 34, of which 19 were within the chase, together with a windmill, cowhouse, carthouse, pesthouse, "workhouse," and barn. Six buildings are described as "new," and although a piece of ground is mentioned as being attached to 18 of the tenements, in only five cases is the size of the ground referred to. The value of each cottage was about 10s. Crosby's tenement and ground, together with the "old Pond" and its barn, are placed in this section. A memorandum on folio 9 (repeated on f. 11) states that all the cottages thus built without leave "pay noe Rent for ye same," except in six cases of Copyholds viz. :—

Names.	Lives.	Rent.	Improvement.
1. Alice Gunyon ..	2 (?)	4d.	19 8
2. Rob. Cadell ..	1	2s. 6d.	4 17 6
3. Jn. Cooke ..	1 (?)	4s.	1 16 0
4. Eliz. Archer ..	2	6d.	15 6
5. Stephen Bower ..	3	6d.	1 9 6
6. Geo. Hurst ..	2	?	10 0
TOTALS .. ..		7s. 10d.	£10 6 2

Nos. 1 and 2 were on the Chase (rent 2s. 10d.); the remainder were on the waste outside. Crosby's holding was also by lease "for Life" (see No. iv. above). The duplicate omits No. 4 and erroneously gives the rent of No. 3 as £1 4s. The Pesthouse and its garden plot were valued at 13s. 4d., but although the inhabitants of Enfield took the ground out of the Chase "wee doe not bringe it to accompt because it is kept for the aforesaid purpose." Bower's "Lives" are stated to be in existence, but Hurst's "Lives are Dead." Of Allen Bryan it is recorded that he "would make nothinge to vs" in reference to his claim. The leases referred to in this survey are for the following periods:—

- (1) *For 21 years (1641/1662)*: Edw. Noell, in connection with Edmonton Glebe, and Chase firewood. The rent was £5 "and two cappons or ffive shillings" in lieu of them.

(2) *For 51 years (1632/1683)*: Jn. Witheringes, for Camelot Moat and New pond, the rent being £1 5s., showing an "improvement" in 1650 (when it was held by Chas. Crosby) of £7; but a further reference, in the survey of the premises during 1658, showed the "Improvement" to be estimated at £4 15s. only (the annual value being estimated at £8 5s. in 1650, and £6 in 1658). It is rare to find a re-valuation by the Commissioners, but when it occurs, as at Hampton Court, the values are reduced; in the present case, the reduction amounts to 27 per cent. on the 1650 figures, and this is due in large measure to the political risk attached.

(3) "*For 2 Lives,*" without Rent, in the case of the Earl of Salisbury and his son, Viscount Cranborne, upon whom the offices of the chase were bestowed 29th July, 1622, viz., master of the game ("feewood," 30 loads, p. a.), Master Forester and Keeper of the three Baileys, Ranger (fee, £9 2s. 6d. and 30 loads p.a.), and Keeper of the three Lodges and the walks (fee, £6 1s. 8d. each Lodge); also those of Enfield Park, viz., Master of the Game, the Palership, and Keepership of the Lodges (fees not specified); together with the offices of steward of the Manor (£5 p.a.), Bailiff (5 marks p.a.), and Woodward and Keeper of the woods and Chace (fee, 4d. a day, and 30 loads of firewood annually). It was under the terms of this Grant that the underkeepers held their posts, viz. :—

(a) "*Crosby's Pattent*": 15th September, 1636, for life, in consideration of £400, the covenant being recorded on the survey. (See No. iv. above.)

(b) "*Butcher's Pattent*": 3rd May, 1637, Deputy Keeper of the Woods of the manor and Chace (fees, 4d. per day, 5 marks and 30 loads of firewood per annum.)

(c) "*Dighton's Pattent*": Underkeeper of the Chace, c. 1637, "fore Life." (See No. v. above.)

(d) "*Norris' Claim*": Underkeeper "during pleasure"; no indenture shown.

(e) "*Potter's Claim*": As in (d). (See No. v. above.)

The Covenants connected with the Leases differ very little. Thus (1) the Earl of Salisbury agrees (29th July, 1622) to maintain all buildings, bridges, gates, pales, posts, rails, passages, "plat-inges, pooles and ponds," in the park and Chase. He also agrees (2) that Jn. Butcher, the Deputy Keeper, shall enjoy all the specified "ffees & proffits" (3rd May, 1637); and again (3) that Chas. Crosby's office of Underkeeper (15th Sept., 1636) shall be ratified either at the death of the Earl, or the coming of age of his son, Viscount Cranborne, with the proviso that, upon giving six months' notice of termination, the £400 "consideration money" shall be returned to Crosby "at y<sup>e</sup> Mansion house of Hatfield." Similarly, (4) Jn. Witheringes covenants (as Lessee, 2nd March, 1632), to repair the buildings, and to "scoure purge and cleanse y<sup>e</sup> ponds and watercourses."

The property involved in the survey consisted of the following:—

1. Houses and premises:—	Area.			Ann. Val.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
(a) Within the Chase ..	18	0	0	44	9	2
(b) On the waste ..	5	0	0	18	7	8
2. Pasture Land .. ..	7,904	0	0	4,742	8	0
TOTALS .. ..	7,927	0	0	£4,805	4	10

The whole of the pasture is valued at 12s. per acre, compared with 17s. 6d. at Halliford, and the only higher value mentioned is 15s. for a piece of ground belong to Crosby's holding, but the nature of the cultivation is not shown. The "tymber trees" in the chase, "besides what is Market for y<sup>e</sup> vse of the Navy," consisted of 2,500 trees, worth each £1, or £2,500 in all. In addition, the "Hornbeame and other Wood" was valued at £12,500; and the small trees standing on the Waste were estimated to be worth £13. The total, therefore, of the wood came to £15,013. The "Deare" in the chase, "of all sorts and Kinde," numbered 150, and these, at £1 each, were worth £150.

The Customary Rents (f. 1) are stated to amount to £50 1s. 11½d. but as the Freholders pay £9 1s. 11½d. (£9 13s. 7½d. on f. 12,)

and the Copyholders £10 10s., while the fines and profits are £30. the total should be £49 11s. 11½d. There are other errors on folio 12 :—

	Recorded.	Corrected.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Present Rents .. ..	1 12 6	1 12 10
Rents of Assize, etc. ..	50 1 11½	49 11 11½
Present and Future Improvements .. ..	61 16 10	62 16 10
TOTALS .. ..	£113 11 3½	£114 1 7½

The Rental which accompanies the survey (ff. 13/16) contains 161 items (59 Freeholds, 67 Copyholds and 35 "New" Copyholds) relating to 103 families; and of these 13 refer to women's holdings, three widows included. The rents vary from ½d. to £1 17s. 7d.; of these 101 are less than 1s., and only 31 are above half a crown. There are altogether 60 different rents, the commonest being 2d. in 18 cases, 1d. in 16 others, 6d. in 15 instances, and 4d. in 13 more; with the exception of 3d. (9 entries), no other amount has more than five instances. It is difficult to reconcile the lists of Freeholders in the various copies, for one of them has 126 names under "Freeholders" and 35 "New Copyholders," while the original appears to have its total valuations mixed :—

	Recorded Totals.	Corrected.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Freeholds .. ..	9 1 11½	5 13 11½
Copyholds .. ..	10 10 0	13 17 0
TOTALS .. ..	£19 11 11½	£19 10 11½

The Survey folios have evidently been disturbed since they were written and arranged in 1650.

(vii.) ENFIELD LAMMAS GROUND.

(P.S. 19. May, 1657.)

This is a survey of a piece of meadow land lying in "a Com'on Meade" called Mill Marsh, and a note (f. 1) states that "ye

p<sup>r</sup>mises are p<sup>r</sup>cell of y<sup>e</sup> p<sup>r</sup>mises Comprahended in a Lease heretofore returned in y<sup>e</sup> Survey of y<sup>e</sup> Mannor of Theobalds in the County of Hartfford." It is written on smaller paper than usual, 12½ by 11½ inches, and bears the endorsement (f. 2d) : " Enfeild Mead. Rec<sup>d</sup> the 10<sup>th</sup> of June 1657. Transmitted to the Surveyor G<sup>r</sup>all the same day." Being " Lammas Land " (like that at Hampton), it was occupied in common by the individual holders of strips within " Enfeild Meade," but about August 1st annually (the time of Lammas, or harvest) it was thrown open by custom for the purpose of common pasturage. One Lease is mentioned, viz., that of Jn. Jennings (2nd April, 1638), in connection with the manor of Theobalds, the reserved rent for this and other parcels contained in the lease, being £9 13s. 8d., " w<sup>ch</sup> Rent hath binn Sould w<sup>th</sup> the other things Surveyed." The boundaries of the property are given on folio 1, and a note, partly erased, but referring to the inclusion of this survey in the series, has already been printed (Part I., p. 290). As the meadow was only one acre in extent, its value was placed at £1 per annum.

(viii.) ENFIELD CHASE.

(P.S. 17A/z and 17AA/RR, " Plott " Letters : A/z and AA/WW.  
Present List arranged according to " Plott."

Oct. and Nov., 1658.)

This series of Parliamentary surveys is very badly confused at the Record Office, owing to the use of two methods of alphabetical marking. Internally, the surveys agree with the lettering of a " Plott " preserved in the Bodleian Library ; externally, they are marked with *capital letters which disagree in every single instance with those marked in the " Plott."* As the references are given in the reproduction of the drawing published by Robinson in 1823, the present classification is based on the arrangement of " Plott Letters." In the Calendar of 1847, where the P.S. letters are recorded in full, there are 44 entries (marked as above) ; but the items then overlooked or undiscovered are now indicated by small letters thus : 17 NN (a.b.c.d.e.). There are thus 57



documents relating to the survey of Enfield Chase in 1658. These are arranged in the present list in three sections : (i.) those which bear no " Plott references " (P.S. 17 I.J.K.NN.) ; (ii.) those agreeing with the " Plott references A/Z " ; (iii.) those agreeing with the additional " Plott references AA/WW." Uniformity has at length been secured. All the 1658 surveys were made by Jn. Boynton (" Baynton in the Act), Hugh Webbe, Edm. Rolfe (" Major Rolph " in the Act), and Nic. Gunton, four of the Commissioners named in the Act of 30th August, 1654 (confirmed 26th June, 1657), relating to the survey and sale of the four chases or forests of Ashdown, Sx., Enfield, Mx., Needwood, Staffs., and Ringswood, Gloucestershire. The covers of these surveys are invariably marked (c. 1760), " Parcels of Enfield Chase," but the original endorsements are on the back of the last folio, and for the most part agree with the specimen already printed. The surveys are headed alike, each referring to the " Late Dischased Chase of Enfeild," and throughout they conform to a type, blanks being left for particulars of measurement or valuation that were afterwards filled in. Also it is clear that at one time they were differently arranged, for the surveys dated 27th October, 1658, are separately numbered from 1 to 13. Forty-four of the surveys (and probably it was intended that all should have this) record a clause concerning the premises being " Tyth free " ; forty-three have similar clauses relating to the fencing of the property (the boundaries being very carefully indicated) by the purchaser ; twenty-five have a third clause specifying the " wood and trees " belonging to the parcel. Two surveys contain reservations ; in one case the reference is to " a passage for Water from a Cunduite there to a message com'only called or knowne by the name of the Blewe howse w<sup>th</sup> Liberty for the Owners or Tenn'tes of the said Messuage to Amend the same as need shall require " ; in the other case a note states that " Camelot Moat with the way leading from the same into Camelot way through this parcell, is noe part of this parcell though lying within the same."

The five surveys fastened together and marked 17 NN are of a different type, for they relate to the Commons assigned to Enfield and "Old Parke," Edmonton, South Mimms and Hadley. Moreover, they contain in each case four memoranda, viz., (1) that the purchasers of the timber may cut and carry it away between 3rd November, 1658 and 2nd November, 1659; (2) that the trees consist of "Hornebeames Beeches Maples and Such like wood with some Oakes" (a formula which occurs throughout these surveys of 1658); (3) that reservation is made of all trees growing within two poles of Borderers' houses, or "soe neere theire severall Grounds that an horse with a pack cannot goe betwixt (which wee estimate to be seaven feete from the said grounds)"; and that (4) bushes growing on the Commons are reserved for Commoners. The areas of these Commons are not given in the Surveys, but Robinson's History of Enfield indicates six of them, ranging from 31 acres 1 rood 30 poles to 1,522 acres 1 rood 30 poles (Enfield Common), the total area being 4,807 acres 3 roods 33 poles. Summarising the evidence in regard to area, we find the surveys record a total of 3,500 acres 6 roods 26 poles. If to this we add the supplementary areas which Robinson alone gives, viz., 4,402 acres 2 roods 33 poles, we arrive at a total of 7,904 acres 1 rood 19 poles (which agrees with the area of pasture indicated in No. vi. above). The value of the wood comes to £2,254 12s. (of which the "Third Part" to be sold for the use of the army, amounted to £751 10s. 8d.). The "timber trees" were valued at £6,979 12s. (the "Third Part" of which was estimated to be worth £2,326 os. 8d.). Care must be taken in dealing with the statistics compiled from these surveys to avoid "double reckoning," since the ground has already been surveyed in No. vi. above.

(ix.) HAMPTON COURT HONOR AND MANOR.

(*Five Surveys, viz., P.S. 30/31 (October 1650) : P.S. 32 (April 1653) : P.S. 33 (January 1650/1) : P.S. 34 [June 1650]*).

(P.S. 31 is a duplicate of P.S. 30, excepting the Rental. P.S. 32 is printed in Law's "Hist. of Hampton Court," II. 1888,

2nd edit. 1898, App. A. pp. 258-271; but an Abstract appeared earlier in Sir Hy. Cole's "Handbook to Hampton Court," rev. ed. 1884, App. E. pp. 128-131.)

The Abstracts given so far have been made as complete as possible, in order to exhibit the scope of each survey in turn; but now that a sufficiently detailed account has been given, a briefer analysis will follow, dealing with particular points of importance in each of the surveys that remain. This procedure is rendered imperative in the case of Hampton, because the survey of 1653 (P.S. 32) is already in print.

The leases date from 1603, and are usually for a term of years. Two of them are for single lives (1628 and 1640), one for two lives (c. 1610), two for three lives (1603 and 1636), and one for one year only, granted by the Commissioners to the occupier (and "Discoverer") of Conduit Close (1650) at a rent of £1 per annum. The Rents of Assize, etc., are recorded in P.S. 30. Freeholders (by fine "certain") paid £7, and Copyholders (by fine "Vn-Certaine") £15 7s. 3d.; adding the Court fines and profits, £5 13s. 4d., the total amounts to £21 7s. 7d. (not 9d. as in f. 1). The "Improvement" at the expiration of the leases, is estimated at £42 16s. 4d., since the annual value is placed at £64 4s. 1d. In the Rental attached, 8 Freeholds and 56 Copyholds are recorded, making 64 holdings distributed among 54 families. Four of the seven women holders are widows. The amounts are omitted in 14 cases; the remaining rents vary from 1d. to £3 os. 6d. The total recorded is £15 17s. 5d., but only £8 13s. 8½d. is actually entered in the rental, and this is proportioned among the following places:—

	Freeholds.			Copyholds.			Total.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Feltham .. ..	—	—	—	4	5	7½	4	5	7½
Hampton .. ..	0	2	2	7	2½	—	9	4½	—
Hampton Wick ..	—	—	—	2	15	7	2	15	7
Heston .. ..	—	—	—	19	11½	—	19	11½	—
Kingston .. ..	—	—	—	5	4	—	5	4	—
<i>Omitted</i> .. ..	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	1	6½
<b>TOTAL</b> .. ..	<u>£0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>£8</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8½</u>	<u>£15</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>



The annual value of P.S. 32 alone is stated (f. 22) to be £1,204 os. 4d., but the addition of the items recorded falls short of this amount by exactly £35; the gross value £10,765 19s. 9d. is correctly stated. In the printed copy the annual value is by an error given as £120 os. 4d. The wood and trees were valued in 1653 at £1,203 5s., and the deer (of which there were 298, worth £1 each on the average) at £298. In 1650 there were 319 trees on the waste, 84 in the King's Mead, and 232 in the Hare Warren; they were chiefly of oak and elm, and their value, as a whole, amounted to £218 15s. 8d. The grass in the King's Mead alone was worth £100. In 1653 the trees are not specifically indicated, but the value of the wood (including £50 for the Hare Warren and £10 for the King's Mead) came to £1,203 5s.

(x.) ISLINGTON WOODS AND THE SPITTLE HOUSE.

(P.S. 45 (a) and 45 (b), within one cover: the first dated September, 1650, the second without date [? September, 1650.])

The property included in the first of these surveys consists of two parcels of woodland called "Hibery Woods" and "Little St. John's Wood," the survey of "Great St. John's Wood" being included under Marylebone (No. xi. below). The woods were held under a lease of 1596, the period of 60 years not commencing until September, 1625. As the rent was £4 11s. 8d. the "Improvement" amounted to £55 1s. 8d. :—

	Area.			Rent.			Annual Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1. Hibery Woods ..	43	2	16	2	11	8	36	6	8
2. Little St. John's Wood	35	0	0	2	0	0	23	6	8
TOTALS .. ..	78	2	16	4	11	8	59	13	4

A note states that the value is estimated on the basis of improvement "by Plowinge and Stockinge vpp and Convertinge into Tillage." The trees numbered 371, being worth on the average 8s. each, or £148 8s. altogether. Under the lease reservation was made of all great "Tymber Trees," with sufficient "Stadles in

cu'y acre," as well as "all such faire Saplings of Oakes apt and fitt to make Tymber." The covenants named in the lease are three in number: firstly, to keep the hedges and ditches in good repair; secondly, to attend to the "boots" or reparations (Carteboote, Hedgeboote, Paleboote, and Stileboote), as we find in the lease of Halliford; and thirdly, to pay the rent punctually.

The "Spittle House" was situated "neere the Road leadinge from London lyeinge betweene Highgate and Holloway," the ground being two roods in extent, worth £9 per annum. It was built of "Tymber and flemish wall," covered with "Tyle and newly whitewasht," having a kitchen and room adjoining, with two other rooms at the south end and two chambers above, all the rooms being small. The orchard and garden were "very well planted," the position being such that the "said house standeth on a pleasant Hill in a good Ayre." An undated grant "for life" is quoted, but as the lessee (John Herbert, "chirurgion") was now dead, the decision of the Commissioners in regard to the premises is stated in the usual formula—"wee returne it in possession to the State."

(xi.) MARYLEBONE WOODS AND THE PARK TRACKWAY.

(P.S. 56, January, 1649, and P.S. 57, March, 1650.

Duplicate of P.S. 56 in Land Rev. Off., Misc. Bks.,

Vol. 288, pp. 33-36.)

The woods surveyed in P.S. 32 comprise "Great St. John's Wood," bounded in 1649 by the lands of the Earl of "Licester," Lord "Camden" and Mr. "ffossett," also by Calcott Wood, Lissett Greene, Paddington Hill, Marylebone Parke and "Kilburnes Abbey." These woods were divided into four sections, originally comprised in a grant of 1594 for 40 years:—

	Area.			Rent.			Ann. Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1. Moiety of Woods ..	254	0	0	13	9	0	84	13	4
2. One-eighth ..	63	1	0	3	7	3	22	1	0
3. One-eighth ..	63	1	0	3	7	3	22	1	0
4. One-quarter ..	126	0	0	6	17	2	37	16	0
5. Calcott Lane ..	2	0	0						
TOTALS ..	A 508	2	0	£27	0	8	£167	1	4

Excepting the lane, the whole of the ground was woodland, the average value of which varied from 6s. per acre (No. 4), to 6s. 8d. (No. 1) and 7s. (Nos. 2 and 3), the lane being valued at 5s. per acre. The total is given as 1s. in excess of the above. It will be noticed that Nos. 2 and 3 are under-valued to the extent of 1s. 9d. each. The "Improvement" recorded is £140 1s. 8d (corrected, it works out at £140 4s. 2d.) which is equal to an increase of 777 per cent. upon the old lease rent in existence in 1649. The oak trees, reserved under the terms of the original grant, numbered 2,000, which at 4s. each, came to £400. One interesting note (f. 6) may be recorded here:—"Memorand' we haue beene enformed by the neere Inhabitants, that in the yeares 1644 and 1645 when there was a great scarsitic of Coale in London, the greatest part of all the vnderwoods standinge vpon the ground was carried away by the poore people of London, and other adiacent places: And that for many Yeares togethater Mr. Holgate payd the Rent, and made noe Reprisalls for the same but Leave it to youre considerac'ons." This is followed, but only in the duplicate (f. 36) by: "Ex<sup>d</sup>. p'J: Phelips Audit<sup>r</sup>."

The second survey, which refers to "a Certaine peice, way, or Track of ground Lyeinge and being in Marybone Parke" mentions two orders from the Trustees and the Committee for Removing Obstructions, authorising the making of a "Reprize," which, based on measurements of 330 poles length and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  breadth (an area, therefore, of 5 acres 25 poles), is stated to be worth £6 17s. 6d., or 26s. 8d. approximately per acre.

#### (xii.) THE RIVER THAMES AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.

(P. S. 90. April, 1659.)

The survey in question relates to an area external to the county of Middlesex, since it concerns the River Thames, and all "streams, rivers, and brooks" running thereinto, between "Stainesbridge and Cirencester town" (ff. 3 and 5); but as it is included in the series of Parliamentary Surveys for Middlesex, it may be considered here. The reference is to "the office of the

Water Bayliffe of the whole water of Thames," with the fees, privileges and emoluments. Two leases are mentioned, one granting the office of Bailiff for two lives (28th November, 1627), with a note that Jn. Thorp was alive on 26th April, 1659, aged about 32; the other, granting the fines and profits for 21 years (9th April, 1627), with a note in this case stating that the lease "hath ben expired about 10 yeares now last past," *i.e.*, 25th March, 1649. Taking one year with another the values of the office and the separate fines were as follows:—

	Old Rent.	Ann. Value.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1. Office of Bailiff .. ..	—	16 10 0
2. Fines, etc. .. ..	6 0 0	7 10 0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTALS .. ..	£6 0 0	£24 0 0
	<hr/>	<hr/>

The "Improvement" in this case amounts to £18, or three times as much as the existing rent.

(xiii) TWICKENHAM MANOR AND ORLEANS HOUSE.

(*P.S.* 95, *September*, 1650, and *P.S.* 96, *December*, 1650.)

(Duplicates of *P.S.* 95 and 96 will be found in the *Land. Rev. Off.*, *Misc. Bks.*, Vol. 288, ff. 37-50 and 51-58.)

These two surveys are among the most interesting in the series, because of the details given in connection with the mansions, and the various cherry gardens and orchards. The Freehold Tenants of the manor paid £1 4s. 7d. in equal portions at Lady Day and Michaelmas; they held their lands by "Fine Certaine," the tenure of the Copyholders (whose rents amounted to £8 16s. 3d.) being by "Fine Vncertayne." The rents, therefore, came to £10 os. 10d., to which must be added £9 19s. 2d. for Court Baron fines and profits, making a total of £20 per annum (ff. 1 and 9). A grant in reversion for 50 years is quoted (10th December, 1602), leasing the Manor House (from 25th March, 1632), at a rent of £2, and the lands (from 29th September, 1625), at a rent of £6 13s. As in the case of Halliford, exception is made of "all great Trees Woodes Vnderwoods Mynes and Quarries." The



new "Annual Value" of £123 9s. shows an "Improvement" of £58 in the case of the Manor House, and £36 16s. in that of the lands. The covenants to the lease are four in number, and of the usual type, viz. (1) to repair the buildings; (2) to provide Cartboote, Fireboote, Hedgeboote, "Housboote" and Ploughboote; (3) to grow timber for repairing buildings, by assignment of the steward or other official; and (4) to pay the rent punctually. The Customs of the manor include the following:—

- (1) Copyholders pay variable fines for licences to let their Copyholds for more than three years.
- (2) Freeholders "dicing seized of an Estate" pay one year's Quit Rent for a Release.
- (3) Customary Tenants dying intestate, "the Eldest sonne doth Inherit that w<sup>ch</sup> the ffather dieth seized of."

A new Rental of the manor is given on folios 11 and 12. From this we find that the rents of the Freeholders came to £1 4s. 7d., and those of the Copyholders to £8 16s. 3d., a total of £10 os. 10d (the actual amount recorded, however, comes to 4d. less in the case of the Copyholders, so that the corrected total should be £10 os. 6d.) The holdings of the Freeholders (13) and of the Copyholders (36), number 49, and these are distributed among 44 families, five women being included, two of whom are widows. There are joint holdings in four cases out of 49, and there are separate holdings in the names of the Churchwardens of Twickenham, and the Almshouse of "Houndslow." The rents range over 32 separate amounts, the lowest being 1d., and the highest £2 15s. 2d. There were six at 6d., and five at 2s. 6d., and while 21 of the 49 paid less than 1s., in only five cases did the payments exceed 10s. The valuations may be summed up thus:—

	Area.			Ann. Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
1. Manor House and Premises	2	2	0	60	0	0
2. Arable .. .. .	2	0	0	8	16	0
3. Meadow .. .. .	8	2	0		5	0
4. Meadow and Wood ..	7	1	0	7	2	0

	Area.			Ann. Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
5. Pasture .. ..	16	3	9	21	11	0
6. Pasture and Wood ..	21	1	30	19	14	0
7. Woodlands .. ..	3	3	12	1	11	0
TOTALS .. ..	A62	1	11	£118	19	0

The total recorded in the survey is 3 roods 32 poles, short of the added amounts indicated above. On Folio 8d is given a list of the fields connected with the lease of 1602, showing that out of a total of 48 acres 2 roods, the arable amounted to 14 acres, the meadow to 17 acres 2 roods, the pasture to 14 acres, and the "pasture and leys" to 3 acres. The trees growing on the manor in 1650 numbered 1446, and after "Deducting some for the Bootes" the remainder was valued at £50 11s. 4d.

The second survey, P.S. 96, refers to the messuage known in later days as Orleans House, and it is of interest because of its description of "that pleasant and delightful Tenement" situated "in the midst of two Curious Compleat gardens," with "Curious & pleasant Gravily Walks & flowers of all sorts & kindes not onely Rare for pleasure but exceedinge p'fitable for use." Cherry, peach, quince, "Figg" and Mulberry trees are indicated in the gardens, the first named being classified as "Duke," "May" and "Hart" cherries, "standinge very thick in Rainges in a Comely Manner and betweene every Tree a goosberry Bush." One of the kitchen gardens is described as a "peice of ground Lyeinge betweene y<sup>e</sup> River Thames & the first above menc'oned garden beinge very plentifully planted w<sup>th</sup> Cabidges Turnippes and Carretts & many other like Creatures."

Andrew Pitcarne's lease (5th June, 1638) is recorded; it is for 15 years, to commence 29th September, 1652, at a rent of £3 for the messuage and 53 acres of land, the "Trees Woods Vnderwoods, Mynes and Quarryes" being reserved, as at Halliford. As the new valuation amounts to £141 9s., there is seen to be an "Improvement" of £138 9s. per annum, almost a

fifty-fold increase in the twelve years. Three covenants are attached to the lease, viz., (1) a covenant for "Reparac'ons"; (2) another providing for Cartboote, Fireboote, Hedgboote, Housboote and Ploughboote, as at Halliford, and (3) a final covenant for prompt payment of the rent. As to the lands, these consist almost entirely of strips (with one close) of arable, nine being in East Field, four in Kidney Field, three in Witton Field, and other pieces in Hither and Further South Field and in Twickenham "More." The acreage and valuation, summarised, are as follows:—

	Area.			Ann. Value,		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
1. Houses and Premises ..	20	2	0	121	0	0
2. Arable .. ..	30	3	0	18	9	0
3. Meadow .. ..	2	0	0	2	0	0
TOTALS .. ..	A53	1	0	£141	9	0

The specified trees on the estate were 221 in number. They were small in size, consisting of "Elme and Ash," each worth about 5s., the total amount (about £55) being omitted. This amount is so small that the Commissioners decide, just as they did at Halliford, that "wee doe not bringe them to accompt because they are not sufficient to mayntayne the Bootes."

### III.—STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF THE RURAL SURVEYS OF MIDDLESEX 1649-1659.

In conclusion, we may now collect the chief statistical results of our examination of the Parliamentary Surveys of the rural Estates of the Crown in Middlesex. It is, however, necessary to bear in mind that there are definite limitations to the statistical tables which are given below. For, as Mr. Leonard so well shows, in connection with his examination of the Northamptonshire surveys, "it is so easy to suppose that figures prove more than they do," and he adds, "the road which leads from statistical information to historical truth is hard to find and difficult to traverse, and all short cuts are perilous." Nevertheless, if it be remembered, first, that the figures as a whole only refer to Crown Lands (ignoring those in private ownership), secondly that the reference is restricted to the county of Middlesex, and thirdly, that special defects attach to individual tables, the statistical information may be utilised as a material for economic history, and thus compared with the results attained by Mr. Lennard's careful study of the Northamptonshire evidence.

TABLE I. THE TOTAL AREA SURVEYED.

The first table shows the total amount of land of all kinds, including the manor of Halliford, described in the preceding surveys :—

	Area.			Ann. Value.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
1. Houses and Premises ..	92	2	13	506	0	2
2. Arable .. ..	166	3	0	99	0	0
3. Meadow .. ..	216	3	32	239	0	0
4. Meadow and Wood..	7	1	0	7	5	0
5. Pasture .. ..	9,362	2	9	5,721	15	8
6. Pasture and Leazow ..	4	0	0	2	13	4
7. Pasture and Wood ..	574	1	30	331	4	0
8. Lammas Land (partial pasture).	1	0	0	1	0	0
9. Wood .. ..	588	3	28	227	15	8

10. <i>Miscellaneous</i> :—				Area.			Ann. Value.		
				A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
(a)	Aits	..	..	4	1	0	8	10	0
(b)	Waste	..	..	390	0	0	82	10	0
(c)	Ways	..	..	7	0	25	7	7	6
TOTALS .. ..				411,415	3	17	£7,234	1	4

The special defects connected with this table are two in number : (1) As the surveys were prepared with a view to "speedy sales" there is not always a precise description of the freeholds and copyholds ; and (2) there is a doubt, which the surveys do not set at rest, in regard to common pasture rights, for only in a few cases, as at Enfield (P.S. 18, value of common rights £20 ; ditto P.S. 20, value £16 13s. 4d.) are they definitely valued and included. This doubt, therefore, envelopes the statistics, as it does in Northants, both in regard to the value of the various kinds of land as well as to the proportions existing between them. Agreement here is reached with Mr. Lennard that "it is far from easy to use the figures as a basis for comparison."

TABLE II. THE LENGTH OF THE LEASES.

Leases.	Eliz.	Jas. I.	Chas. I.	Common-Wealth.	Total.
" For Ever "	—	1	1	—	2
1 Life	—	2	8	—	10
2 Lives	1	2	4	—	7
3 „	—	1	2	—	3
1 to 10 years	—	—	—	2	2
11 to 20 „	—	—	2	—	2
21 to 30 „	2	1	2	—	5
31 to 40 „	2	—	—	—	2
41 to 50 ..	1	—	1	—	2
51 to 60 „	1	—	1	—	2
TOTALS ..	7	7	21	2	37

From this Table it will be seen that the tendency was to increase the number of leases according to lives rather than for terms of years, especially during the reign of Chas. I. The Commonwealth leases were for one year only.

TABLE III. AVERAGE VALUES PER ACRE.

	Area.			Ann. Value.			Average Values :		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.	Per Acre.	Highest.	Lowest.
Arable	.. 166	3	0	99	0	0	11/10½	25/-	8/-
Meadow	.. 216	3	32	239	0	0	22/-	48/-	16/-
Pasture	.. 9362	2	9	5,721	15	8	12/2½	30/-	6/2½
Wood	.. 588	3	28	227	15	8	7/9	16/8	6/-
Waste	.. 390	0	0	82	10	0	4/3	5/-	4/2½

This table summarises the evidence contained in the surveys in regard to the value of the different kinds of lands, in so far as they are separately valued. These figures, like those for Northamptonshire, are perhaps the most satisfactory for the purposes of economic history of all the statistical data revealed by the surveys. Yet even these relative values may be misinterpreted, since their variation may be due, not merely to the general condition of the market for specific agricultural commodities, but to local differences of soil, climate or agricultural policy. Gregory King's estimate for England and Wales in 1696 places the average value of arable, and of meadow and pasture combined, at 5s. 10d. and 9s. respectively. In Northants where the three kinds in the order named are worth on the average 4s. 6d., 17s. 11d., and 14s. 6d., the pasture has a value three times greater than that of arable. In Middlesex, where the arable and pasture are practically of equal value, the former is 2½ times as valuable as in Northants, but the pasture averages nearly half a crown less than it does in the latter county. The range of variation between the highest and lowest averages was much less in Middlesex than it was in Northants.

TABLE IV. THE SIZE OF HOLDINGS.

<i>Below 100 Acres.</i>				<i>Above 100 Acres.</i>			
Under 1 acre	..	..	10	101 to 150 acres	..	..	3
1 acre only	..	..	12	151 to 200	..	..	1
1½ to 5 acres	..	..	45	201 to 400	..	..	4
6 to 10	..	..	16	401 to 600	..	..	1
11 to 25	..	..	15	7904	..	..	1
26 to 50	..	..	6				—
51 to 100	..	..	4	TOTAL	..	..	118
							—

The majority of the holdings were quite small, 38 per cent. of the total being under five acres, and 57 per cent. below ten acres. Enfield Chase (7,904 acres) by 1658 was divided into more than 50 portions, the largest of which was 1,522 acres 1 rood 30 poles, and the smallest 1 rood. In Northamptonshire just over 50 per cent. of the holdings ranged in size from 15 to 100 acres, whereas in Middlesex the percentage was less than 20 per cent. On the other hand the holdings of more than 100 acres formed 11 per cent. of the total in Northants, and only 3 per cent. less in Middlesex.

One interesting fact emerges from the study of these important surveys, and that is, the remarkable variety of conditions that existed during the Commonwealth, notwithstanding that all the estates surveyed were in the possession of the Crown and within a single county. This variety shows itself in the range of the rents, and the size of the holdings, in the average values of the acres, in the proportions of arable to meadow, and of meadow to pasture, in the length of the leases, and even in the alternative practices of succession in the line of the eldest and the youngest sons—as at Twickenham and Edmonton respectively.