

ENCLOSURE ACTS AND AWARDS COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX

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

Wherever possible, place names have been given in their generally accepted *modern* forms. All acts in the official return¹ are included. Those in Dr. Slater's lists,² as including open field arable, are in list A. Those not in Dr. Slater's list presumably relate to meadow and waste alone. These are in list B. The 1836³ Act authorised the enclosure of open field alone, though it was frequently used to carry out the enclosure of open lands of other classes.⁴ Unless evidence to the contrary is available it is assumed here that the Act was properly applied, so that enclosures under it are of common field. These are in list C. This Act was extended in 1840, to cover lammass lands, etc., and enclosures carried out under the 1836 and 1840 Acts are listed in list D.

The General Act of 1845⁵ authorised enclosure of lands other than common pastures by provisional order alone. This provision remained in force until the sixth amending Act,⁷ with an exceptional clause in favour of enclosures actually in progress in 1852. So for some ten years from 1845 proposed enclosures not including the waste of a manor were not submitted to Parliament for approval. After 1852 all enclosures required statutory authorisation, and this was given in the annual General Act; Lists E and F cover enclosures in those two classes. The data have been obtained from the various official blue books,⁸ from the Enclosure Commissioners' annual reports, and from the Ministry of Agriculture memorandum for awards from 1893 onwards.¹⁰ Enclosures by agreement listed in list G must be a very small proportion of these actually carried out. They are the ones of which formal written record survives either in the Public Record Office, or among the county records. It has not been possible to classify them like the others, into enclosures containing common field, and those consisting of common pasture and meadow, etc.

1. P.P. (H.C.) 399, 1914.
2. *The English Peasantry*, 1908, App. 2.
3. 6 and 7 Wm. IV, c. 115 (1836).
4. G. W. Cooke, *Enclosures and Rights of Common*, 1864, p. 84.
5. 3 and 4 Vic., c. 31 (1840).
6. 6 and 7 Vic., c. 118 (1845).
7. 15 and 16 Vic., c. 39 (1852).
8. P.P. above cited, also P.P.s 455 (1893) and 50 (1904).
9. No. 702/LG.
10. Such local lists as are available have been consulted, and the dates have been checked by various gentlemen whose help is acknowledged elsewhere.

CONTRACTIONS USED.

- H. Enrolled copy of award has plan attached.
Ch. Award enrolled on Chancery Close Roll in Public Records Office.
C.P. Award enrolled on Common Pleas Recovery Roll in Public Record Office.

- C.R. Award enrolled among County Records in custody of Clerk of the Peace.
- D. of L. Award enrolled among records of Duchy of Lancaster in Duchy Office.
- E.K.R. Award enrolled on Exchequer of Pleas Plea Rolls in Public Record Office.
- E.P. Award enrolled on Exchequer of Pleas Plea Rolls in Public Record Office.
- (L.) Lordship or Liberty.
- (M.) Manor.
- n.s. (Area) not specified.
- (P.) Parish.
- R.D.M. Statutory Registry of Deeds, Red Lion Square, W.C.1, later removed to Bournemouth. Most of its records are now with the Middlesex County Council.

Middlesex Field Systems and Early Enclosure Movements

MIDDLESEX FIELD SYSTEMS.

MIDDLESEX, as Professor Gray's map¹ shows, lies wholly outside the midland area formerly owned, occupied, and farmed under the two- and three-field systems. Like its neighbouring counties of the lower Thames basin, Middlesex formerly displayed in its open field structure certain peculiarities which are well worth investigation. It is not surprising to find the region showing features distinctly reminiscent of open field structure in Kent, as well as others resembling rather those commonly associated with open field arrangements in East Anglia, and still others again having some points of resemblance to the usages of the English Midlands. On the face of things it would appear that one should include in this last class last-named the fact that in this county the normal unit of villein tenure was the virgate. But the Middlesex virgate was a very different affair from its midland namesake, situated more or less evenly in two or three extensive open fields. The Middlesex virgate consisted of scattered strips dispersed throughout several, sometimes a great many furlongs, "fields," shots, or crofts. This is, of course, the main point of resemblance between field systems in this county and those in Kent and East Anglia.

Professor Gray² thinks that there is a clear contrast in field systems between townships in the eastern and those in the western half of the county. In Dr. Slater's³ lists, of the 26 enclosure acts (those including common field) passed during the 18th and 19th centuries, only two of the acts noted relate to

the eastern half of the county. These are the acts for Edmonton and Enfield. The latter of these, to which Dr. Slater has ascribed the enclosure of 1,231 acres of land "open field and some waste," Professor Gray has proved cannot possibly have included more than some 500 acres of open field land at the most. Elsewhere Professor Gray⁴ quotes a terrier of 2 Jac. I, 1604-5, which proves clearly that though Edmonton had an open field system then, it was by no means a regular one. There were about a dozen fields, all of small area, and only one of these was shared among any considerable number of tenants. Each tenant's holdings in the different "fields" were quite unequal, and in every respect, save that the land was after all, open field arable of a kind, the structure of the place was utterly unlike that of any of the "typical" open field villages in the Midlands. Professor Gray found earlier evidence against the existence of the two- or three-field systems in this county. He examined data of 4 John, 1202-3, for East Greenford, others about the same time for Laleham, others again of 1299 for Sutton, of 1593 for Harlesden (in Willesden), of 2 Jac. I, 1604-5, for Cold Kennington (Kempton Park). All these similarly show numerous unequal fields or furlongs, and irregular distribution of holdings among them. Corbett's pioneer study, *Elizabethan Village Surveys*,⁵ includes references to but one such survey for a Middlesex manor. This belongs to Ruislip, 1565. Corbet says generally of all the surveys examined, including presumably this one, "the fields are often numerous, sometimes more than half a dozen, and of every variety of area."

In the effort to investigate this point still further, Professor Gray examined a series of local *inquisitiones post mortem* of the late 13th and early 14th centuries, looking for the phrase that (a third of the demesne) "is worth nothing, because it lies fallow." The only such inquisition he noted was one for Little Greenford,⁶ which contributes the curious information that here a third of the land lay fallow every year (so that apparently there was a three-field system, or at any rate a three-course rotation), but that nevertheless it was very far from worthless. (*Quaere*: Whether this implies that the grazing upon the fallows was a manorial right, not a communal one? Analogies for this could be found in the manorial right of fold course in East Anglia.)

By way of contrast with field systems of this kind is that

referred to in a most interesting terrier of Feltham in 2 Jac. I,⁷ 1604-5. This shows a three-field system of a kind, with a rough equality of each tenant's holding between field and field. Professor Gray considers, only to dismiss it, the possibility that "midland habits were creeping down the Thames." Or again, he suggests⁸ reasonably enough that both in Middlesex and in Surrey the midland and Kentish systems came into contact, and that in general midland traits characterised the resultant hybrid in Middlesex, Kentish ones the system developing in Surrey. These hybrid systems are quite plainly seen in both counties, they are somewhat difficult to follow, and it is impossible to say very much of value about them until a good deal more research has been undertaken.⁹

A third factor which must be taken into account in attempting to trace the history of field systems in this county, although it is still uncertain what weight must be given to it, is the high proportion of the land, especially of the hilly land in this county which was reclaimed quite late from a waste condition in the great local forests. At first no doubt here as elsewhere such assarting as there was, was largely a matter of enclosing small widely scattered parcels. Then if some of the tiny settlements spreading out into the still remaining waste arranged their agrarian affairs more or less after the Kentish plan (the settlements being those of Kentish settlers), while others, established by pioneers who were moving south-east, planned theirs rather after the midland model, then a good deal which is otherwise inexplicable about early Middlesex field systems becomes fairly easily understandable.

EARLY ENCLOSURE IN MIDDLESEX.

Middlesex is one of the few counties not under the midland open field systems which retained any great area of open field arable land until the era of parliamentary enclosure.¹⁰ It may well be that the admixture of midland usages referred to above conditioned the survival of open fields in this area to so remarkably late a period. Despite Dr. Slater's remark as to the obscurity of the enclosure history of the county,¹¹ there are some few casual references to it by various writers, and I think the principal ones of these are noted below. The county says Professor Gray¹² appears in the Lansdowne transcripts of the *Domesday of Inclosures*, 1517, with 1.52 per cent. enclosure, though only in a few brief London references. Apparently the

Chancery returns or some of them for the county still exist in the Public Record Office, awaiting an editor. The places mentioned in the Lansdowne transcripts are Dalston, Blackheath, "Danserlane," London Field, etc.¹³ All the enclosures are relatively small, and the total area recorded is but 281 a., a percentage of but some 0.3 of the county area. Evidently then Professor Gray's figures are based upon the consultation of the Chancery returns. No doubt a great part of this represents small grazing enclosures, such as one would expect to find in the immediate neighbourhood of any large town. Much more interesting than the Lansdowne transcript is the extract from Holinshed¹⁴ which Mr. Leadam prints:—"This yeare the citizens of London finding themselves greued with the inclosures of the common fields about Islington, Hoxton, Shorditch, and other places neer to the citie whereby they could not be suffered to exercise their bowes, nor other pastimes in those fields as before time they had bene accustomed, assembled themselves on a morning and went with spades and shouels vnto the same fields, and there, like diligent workmen, so bestirred themselves that within a short space al the hedges about those townes were cast downe, and the ditches filled. The king's counsell comming to the graie friers to vnderstand what was meant by this dooing were so answered by the maior and counsell of the citie, that the matter was dissembled: and so when the workmen had done their worke, they came home in a quiet maner, and the fields were never after hedged." It seems as though the protests of the London citizens may have been to some purpose. At any rate the county was not included in those to which the Depopulation Act of 1536 was to apply.¹⁵ Presumably then enclosure had been checked for the time. Leland visited the county in 1538-44,¹⁶ and found it largely in champion near Staines, but more in severalty near Uxbridge. His references are:—I passed over the Tamise (Thames) by Staines-bridge, and thens most by champai(ne) and corne ground . . . pasture to (H)ampton Courte 6 miles. And about half a myle a this syd it is Hampton village on the Thamise side. . . . From London to New Brentford 8 miles . . . Brentford to Hundeslawe (Hounslow) 2 miles . . . Hundeslaw to Longforde a V miles . . . al the grounde from a mile or more a this side Langford to Colebrok bridge is al low pasture grounde . . . From Hagmondesham (Amersham, Bucks.), to Uxbridge a 9 miles by goodly enclosyd grownd, of a graveley soyle havynge woods, medowes, pasture,

and corne to Great Hellindon (Hillingdon) . . . From Uxbridge to Southole (Southall) . . . Thens to Acton a praty thrwgh the fayre 4 miles, Thens. to Maribone-broke (Marylebone Brook) . . . To London 2 miles. Tusser¹⁷ notes as a peculiarity of Middlesex agriculture in Elizabethan times the local rotation, barley, wheat or rye, fallow, instead of the usual wheat or rye, barley, fallow:—

But drink before bread corn with Middlesex men,
Then lay on more compas, and fallow again.

I am not farmer enough to judge whether this was a sign of unusually bad husbandry, even for open field management, or whether it was in some way peculiarly well suited to Middlesex conditions. Tusser does not say this rotation applied especially to Middlesex champion or to several, or to both alike.

From other sources it is known that very considerable enclosure was taking place in the county about this time. Professor Gray¹⁸ notes that this must have been mainly in the western half of the county, since, as noted above, the eastern half remained largely open until the era of parliamentary enclosure. Harlesden in Willesden¹⁹ was partly enclosed by 1593. A survey of Edgware in 1597²⁰ shows the place as entirely enclosed by then. Middlesex, like the neighbouring counties, Essex, Hertfordshire, and Surrey, was exempted from the operation of the last Depopulation Act,²¹ passed in the year last-named, and according to the evidence of a contemporary "*thereby no Inconvenience in y^e stat found.*"²² A survey of Edmonton in the same year again shows the place as in the main already enclosed. One of Feltham in 2 Jac. I, 1604-5,²³ shows considerable enclosure, but definite traces of three-field usages still remaining. Cold Kennington in the same year had a system reminiscent of that in the Midlands. Professor Gray²⁴ considers Feltham to be the nearest approach to a "midland" open field village in western Middlesex in Jacobean times, and he notes the error in Dr. Slater's ascription of a three-field system to Cowley and Hillingdon in this area at the time of the enclosure in 1795.

Miss Leonard's very valuable essay²⁵ on the enclosure of open fields in the 17th century contains one very interesting reference to 17th century enclosures in this county. The Privy Council referred to the county justices in the 1630's the question whether depopulation was or was not being caused by enclosures made

from the open fields in order that houses might be built to serve the growing villages of Chelsea and Kensington. The justices reported that there were these enclosures, and gave an indication of their modest extent, but left the council to decide whether or not these constituted an offence under 35 Eliz. c. 6 (1581) or otherwise. The 1581 Act is of course, the well-known one forbidding all enclosures within three miles of London, the forerunner of all modern acts for commons preservation.

Little seems to be known of Middlesex enclosures in the 17th century. By 1675 when Ogilby issued his *Britannia*, on which Professor Gonner²⁶ based his estimates of the percentage of open land enclosed and that still remaining in each of the counties of England, Middlesex seems to have been almost entirely enclosed. At any rate if the percentage of open road is a fair indication of the percentage of open land generally, this county is 33rd of the 37 counties listed in order of open land still remaining, with open land about 11 per cent., and enclosure about 89 per cent. Evelyn,²⁷ in 1676, speaks of Enfield Chase as still open, and is scandalised at the existence of so large a tract of unused land so near London:—"in the compass of 25 miles, yet within 14 of London, there is not an house, barne, church, or building besides three lodges . . . and few inclosures, the rest a solitarie desert." There are a few other odd references to Enfield Chase in Celia Fiennes' *Journal*, and in Defoe's *Tour* about this same time. On numerous occasions during the 18th century it was proposed to enclose the Chase. Especially this was suggested about 1760.²⁸ Actually the enclosure was not undertaken until 1801. Marshall says²⁹:—"The sums of money (not to mention the fortunes) which have lately been expended in the improvement of Enfield Chase are too well known, and will, it is to be feared, throw a damp on the further improvement of the Royal Wastes; a matter of some importance to these kingdoms. But how easily, and with what certainty, might these wastes be improved? The wood upon most of them is doubly sufficient to make the necessary improvement (by grub-felling and sod-burning or summer fallowing). . . . The Royal Forests at present afford little benefit to the community; but are no doubt capable of affording great national advantage. . . ." Apparently the only other extensive area still remaining open in the latter part of the 17th century was about Finchley. On the strength of these facts Professor Gonner

suggests³⁰ that an extensive area in the north of the county must have been enclosed after the time of Evelyn and Ogilby, and that there must have been extensive non-parliamentary enclosures in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Mr. Fussell's³¹ essay on Middlesex agriculture contains few references to the history of enclosure, but has the suggestive remark that by the 18th century "The Middlesex fields were like gardens, and the farmers half gardeners" (supplying, of course, the enormous markets of London). The two Board of Agriculture reports³² on this county are both composed by professional surveyors. Both comment on the large areas of waste still remaining in the county. Foot speaks of "many thousands," Middleton more specifically, though perhaps not with a great deal more real accuracy, of c. 17,000 acres. According to Foot the commons were a nuisance to the public, and almost worthless to those entitled to common right. Middleton says they were a positive injury to the public, since they offered free firing and a free run for pigs and poultry, so that shiftless persons flocked thither in great numbers. Moreover the commons were notoriously the resort of "gipsies, strollers, loose persons, . . . footpads, and highwaymen." There are a few scanty references to Middlesex commons in Eden's³³ book. Ealing had one of 70 acres, on which the parish paupers were employed at a weekly wage of sixpence each for tobacco. At Ealing the poorhouse was built on the common, "in an airy situation on gravelly soil." Foot has also a little to say of the lammas meadows on the Middlesex side of the Lea. These were divided into allotments of two or three acres, but their value was diminished by their lack of drainage. The common arable fields, however, he describes as at once extensive and well-tilled.³⁴ Exactly what had happened to the other earlier Middlesex common fields it is difficult to say. Dr. Slater³⁵ thinks that many of them had been converted, largely by agreement, into market gardens, and dairy farms. If so, and if Professor Gray is right in his belief that they had never existed on a very large scale, clearly a good deal of Middlesex enclosure in the 17th and 18th centuries, and perhaps much earlier, must have consisted of improvement more or less directly from the waste.

One cannot leave even a cursory account of Middlesex open fields, commons, and enclosures, without a brief reference to the Act of 1545, 37 Hen. VIII, c. 2, which has been styled the first English enclosure Act. This concerns Hounslow Heath.

In spirit, though not in form, it anticipates the private enclosure Acts of the 18th century. It recites that the king might justly approve the waste there (under the Statute of Merton),³⁷ but nevertheless orders the appointment of commissioners who are to set out to every inhabitant a portion of the Heath either as a copyhold in perpetuity, or on a twenty-one years lease.

PARLIAMENTARY ENCLOSURE IN MIDDLESEX.

As the lists show (Lists A-G), Middlesex parliamentary enclosures are neither early nor numerous. List A—Acts including some proportion of open field arable—includes 25 acts ranging in date from Ruislip, 1769, to Northolt, 1825, with 1813 as the peak year, having seven Acts. It will be seen that most local acts include some proportion of open arable field. There are but 9 in all (List B), relating to pasture and waste alone. From what has been said above, however, it will be clear that the proportion of open field in the acts listed in A is probably a small one. Middlesex enclosures under the 1836 and 1840 General Acts (Lists C and D) are but two in all, and later enclosures under the General Acts of 1845 *et seq.* are still more remarkably low, with but one inclosure involving open field arable (List E), and two relating to waste alone (List F). No doubt there would have been many more such enclosures in later years but for the activities of the Commons Preservation Society, which for the last seventy or eighty years has kept a watchful eye upon all attempts to enclose commons, especially, of course, those near London and other large towns. An attempt to enclose Hampstead Heath was defeated in Parliament as early as 1829, and eventually in order to safeguard the public against any future effort, the manorial rights were bought in 1868 by the Metropolitan Board of Works,³⁸ after a lengthy dispute as to the commoners' rights. London Fields, Hackney Downs, and Hackney Marshes, the Tudor efforts to enclose which have been dealt with above, were "regulated" in 1872-93, after the buying out of the manorial rights. It is noteworthy, however, that unlike most "commons" near London, these are really not common pastures at all, but lammas lands. Another interesting survival of lammas lands in Middlesex is that of the 250 acres still remaining at Tottenham. Surviving commons are much more frequently found, especially near London. Fuller details will be found in Lord Eversley's book already referred to. Here it will be sufficient to note the 353

acres of Staines Moor, regulated under the Metropolitan Commons Act of 1866, Hampstead Heath and Hackney Marshes already referred to, a fragment of Hounslow Heath some 270 acres in extent, secured in other ways, and Hadley 174 a., and Stanmore 147 a., still remaining legally in their original condition, without any special protective legislation.

Probably the special protective legislation, early and late, for the preservation of open lands near London is largely responsible for the solitary rather doubtful enclosure by agreement noted in List G.

I have wondered whether the gaps in the list of awards enrolled might be accounted for by the fact that Middlesex, like each of the three Ridings of Yorkshire, but unlike every other English county, has a statutory Registry of Deeds. This was set up under Act in 1708.³⁹ In the Ridings it is the exception rather than the rule to find an enclosure award executed under a private Act enrolled, as is usual in most counties, with the clerk of the peace. Instead the awards are normally enrolled in the registries at Wakefield, Beverley, and Northallerton. Inquiry has shown, however that few Middlesex awards are enrolled in the Middlesex Registry in Red Lion Square. Presumably, therefore, such awards as are not recorded here should be sought for in enrolled copies in the records of various manorial courts. It is perhaps significant in this connection that the manorial organisation seems to have survived quite late in the county, and in this county as in few others an enclosure act often relates to the manor of X rather than to X township or parish.

1. H. Gray, *English Field Systems*, Cambridge, Mass., 1915.
2. Op. cit., p. 381.
3. G. Slater, *The English Peasantry*, 1907, pp. 287-8.
4. Op. cit., p. 551.
5. In *Trans. R. Hist. S.*, N.S., Vol. XI, 1897, p. 71.
6. Op. cit., p. 396.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 552.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 402.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 417.
10. Gray, op. cit., p. 404; *Vide atque*, Slater, op. cit., p. 218.
11. It is remarkable that (enclosure Acts) should cover so large a part of the area of the county—19·7 per cent., *Ibid.*, loc. cit.
12. In *Trans. R. Hist. S.*, N.S., Vol. XIV, 1900, p. 238.
13. All indexed by Mr. Leadam under London and Suburbs, *Trans. R. Hist. S.* N.S., Vol. VI, 1892, p. 296-7; VIII, 1894, pp. 251-6.
14. *Chronicle* edn. of 1808, Vol. 3, p. 399, Anno Dom. 1513, An. Reg. 5.
15. 27 Hen. VIII, c. 22 (1536).
16. *Itinerary*, 1538-44, ed. Miss L. Toulmin Smith, 1907, Vol. I, pp. 106-7; Vol. II, pp. 113-4.
17. *Five Hundreth Pointes*, 1573 edn., reprint of 1931, p. 113.

18. *Op. cit.*, p. 381.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 383.
20. Prof. R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem*, 1912, p. 772.
21. 39 Eliz., c. 2 (1597).
22. *A Consideration of the Cause in Question*, Cott. MSS. Tit. F, IV, f. 319; in Cunningham, *English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*, App. II.
23. Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 551.
24. *Op. cit.*, p. 287.
25. In *Trans. R. Hist. S.*, N.S., Vol. XIX, 1905, p. 108.
26. Gonner, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
27. *Journal*, 2nd June, 1676.
28. Quoting *Letters of the First Earl of Malmesbury*, 1870, p. 144.
29. Marshall, *Rural Economy of Yorkshire*, 1788, Vol. I, pp. 317, 322.
30. *Op. cit.*, p. 251.
31. In *Ministry of Agriculture Journal*, Jan., 1937, p. 947.
32. P. Foot, *General View*, 1794; and J. Middleton, *General View*, 1807. There was also a report of 1793, T. Baird, *General View*, on which was based Middleton's earlier *General View*, 1798.
33. Sir F. M. Eden, *State of the Poor*, 1797, Reprint of 1928, p. 239.
34. *Op. cit.*, p. 72.
35. *Op. cit.*, p. 218.
36. T. E. Scrutton, *Commons and Common Fields*, 1887, p. 95.
37. Stat. Merton II, 20 Hen. VII, c. 4 (1235).
38. G. Shaw Lefevre, (Lord Eversley), *English Commons and Forests*, 1894, pp. 47-57, and still more, pp. 366-8.
39. 7 Anne, c. 20 (1708).

II. MIDDLESEX ENCLOSURE ACTS AND AWARDS.

Date of Act.	Place(s).	Approx. area as est. in Act.	Date of award.	Award enrolled.
<i>A. Enclosures by private Act of lands including any proportion of open field arable.</i>				
1774	Laleham (M.) Indexed as partly in Surrey. Here counted as wholly in Middlesex. No area is specified in the Act, that given is from the award. There is a detailed account of this enclosure in Hammond, <i>op. cit.</i> , p. 364, with notes also of the abortive petition of 1767 and an abstract of the 1774 Act.	n.s.	1803	C.P. 43 Geo. III 1803*
1780	Ickenham	n.s.	1781	C.R.
1789	Stanwell and Hammonds <i>als.</i> Shipcott (Ms.) in Stanwell (P.) There is another Stanwell in Slater. I hope I have not confused two separate enclosures. The award figure is 2126 a. There is an account of this enclosure, with an abstract of the Act, and details of abortive petition of 1766 in Hammond, <i>op. cit.</i> , p. 378.	3000	1792	C.P. 32 Geo. III 1792

Date of Act.	Place(s).	Approx. area as est. in Act.	Date of award.	Award enrolled.
1795	Hillingdon and Cowley Original award is with Uxbridge U.D.C.	n.s.	1796	?
1799	Teddington, <i>als.</i> Toddington <i>als.</i> Tettington <i>als.</i> Tuddington, <i>recte</i> Teddington).	883	1800	Ch. 40 Geo. III 1799- 1800*
1800	Hanworth and Kempton (Ms.) in Hanworth, Feltham and Sunbury Act not 1801 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . There was, however, an amending Act in 1801. Two awards not three as in <i>Blue Books</i> . Half <i>Blue</i> <i>Book</i> entries say 1803, other half 1802. The later is correct.	3200	1803 1803 1802 1803	C.R. C.R.
1800	Edmonton	1231	1804	R.D.M.
1801	Enfield Not in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . Award with the D. of L. is a duplicate. There is also among the Duchy records an extract (lib. 4, p. 198) and sundry miscellaneous papers.	3540	1806	R.D.M.
1803	Harrow Amending Act, 1806.	n.s.	1817	C.P. 58 Geo. III 1818*
1804	Ruislip <i>als.</i> Riselip (<i>recte</i> Ruislip) .. Amending awards concerning corn rents, 1878 and 1898 in C.R. The latter is enrolled in 1900 (Ministry of Agriculture).	n.s.	1814	E.P. 55 Geo. III 1815**
1805	Harmondsworth Not Harmendsworth and 1700 a. as in Slater. Amending Act, 1816.	3000	1819	?
1809	Hayes <i>als.</i> Hesse (<i>recte</i> Heese) and waste lands of Hayes and Nor- wood (Ms.), Yeading, Southall, Frogmore, Norwood Green, etc.	2000	1814	C.R.
1809	Ashford <i>als.</i> Echelford (<i>recte</i> Ashford)	1200	1811	C.R.
1811	Hampton	n.s.	1827	C.P. 7 and 8 Geo. IV 1827
1812	Hillingdon Not 1400 a. as in Slater.	3600	1825	C.R.
1813	East Bedfont with Hatton, Pates, and Cranford (Ms.) in East Bedfont	1300	1817	C.R.

Date of Act.	Place(s).	Approx. area as est. in Act.	Date of award.	Award enrolled.
1813	Heston, Hounslow, Syon, Twickenham, and Twickenham Rectory (Ms.) in Isleworth, Heston and Twickenham Not 2470 a. as in Slater. Amending Act, 1818.	7870	1818	C.R.
1813	Greenford	640	1816	C.R.
1813	Hanwell	350	1816	C.R.
1813	Great Stanmore	216	1839	C.R.
1815	Cricklewood, Kensall Green, Harlesden Green, etc., in Willesden Amending awards concerning corn rents, 1839, 1840, 1845, 1848, 1858, 1859 in C.R.	560	1823	C.R.
1818	Cranford	395	1820	C.R.
1819	Harlington, Hepiston, and Dawley (Ms.) in Harlington	820	1821	C.R.
1824	West Drayton	n.s.	?	?
1824	Northolt <i>als. (et recte)</i> Northall	n.s.	1835	C.R.
<i>B. Enclosures by private Act of lands including no proportion of open field arable.</i>				
1769	West Wood or West Coat Common in St. Catharine End (M.) in Ryslip <i>als. (et recte)</i> Ruislip)	?	1770	C.P. 10 Geo. III 1770
1771	Stanwell	?	1792	Said to be in P.R.O. but not traced there
1777	Enfield Chase Not listed in Deputy Keeper's 1866 Report. Public Act. ? <i>Quaere</i> whether open fields included.	?	1777	D. of L.
1777	St. Leonard's (P.), Shoreditch .. Public Act. ? <i>Quaere</i> whether open fields included.	?	?	?
1806	Chiswick	68	?	?
1811	Bibsworth and Finchley Friern (Ms.) in Finchley	900	1816	C.R.
1811	Harefield	700	1813	R.D.M.
1813	Hornsey and Brownswood (Ms.) in Hornsey Two awards, or ? is it award executed 1815, enrolled 1816	400	1815 1816	C.R. C.R.

Date of Act.	Place(s).	Approx. area as est. in Act.	Date of award.	Award enrolled.
1814	Chertsey and Laleham Chertsey is in Surrey, Laleham in Middlesex. I am therefore reckoning this Act under both counties.	165	? ?	
1814	Chiswick	40	? ?	
<i>C. Enclosures, mainly of open field under the General Act of 1836.</i>				
1836	Staines In <i>Blue Book</i> of 1904 as 1849. ? Enrolled 1849	?	1845	C.R.
1836	Shepperton	?	1842	C.R.
<i>D. Enclosures, mainly of waste alone, under the General Act of 1840.</i>				
NIL				
<i>E. Enclosures under the General Acts of 1845 et seq. of lands including any proportion of open field arable.</i>				
(i) By Provisional Order alone, without specific parliamentary confirmation.				
NIL				
(ii) By Provisional Order confirmed in pursuance of Annual General Act.				
1845 and				
1848	Littleton Award cannot be 1841 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> . One return says award 1850, another 1851.	625	1850	C.R.
<i>F. Enclosures under the General Acts of 1845 et. seq. of lands including waste alone.</i>				
1845 and				
1851	Edgwarebury Not in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .	58	1854	C.R.
1858	Shepperton Award cannot be 1842 as in 1904 <i>Blue Book</i> .	120	1862	C.R.
<i>G. Enclosures by private agreement enrolled in County or national records.</i>				
Date of agmt.				
?	South Mimms I can find nothing about this except the reference in Deputy Keeper's 1866 <i>Report</i> , and put it here as a pure guess. It is indexed under Deeds of Exchange.	?	1781	D. of L. Lib. 3 p. 504

NOTES.

All these are private Acts except Enfield Chase and St. Leonards, Shore-ditch, 1777, which are public Acts. Laleham, 1774, and Chertsey and Laleham, 1814, are indexed as in Surrey and Middlesex. Actually Laleham is in Middlesex, Chertsey in Surrey, so the act first named is reckoned under Middlesex only, the second act under both counties. An amending act was passed for Harrow (1803), 1806.

For assistance in checking the lists of acts and awards which form Part II of my study I am indebted to C. W. Radcliffe, Esq., Clerk of the Peace for the County of Middlesex, to Miss T. Cameron, County Clerk of the Records, and to R. Haigh, Esq., Superintendent of the Middlesex Registry of Deeds, formerly of Red Lion Street, Holborn, and now of Marsham Court, Bourne-mouth. I have also the pleasant duty of acknowledging my indebtedness to the Houblon-Norman Research Trustees whose help has enabled me to spend my time upon agrarian history at the expense of other less interesting but more remunerative pursuits.

Despite all my care it is certain that the work must still have errors and omissions. I shall be very grateful to any reader who will be so good as to send me *c/o* Balliol College, Oxford a postcard note of such. Errors so noted will be corrected, omissions supplied and the assistance properly acknowledged if ever my work appears, as it is hoped that eventually it may, in a single volume covering the whole country.

W. E. TATE.