

# The Leicestershire Crop Returns of 1801

By W. G. Hoskins

## I

IN the closing months of the year 1800, and the first half of 1801, the rapidly rising cost of living, as the French wars dragged on interminably, greatly agitated both Commons and Lords. Both Houses debated yet again the high price of provisions, and particularly that of grain, at length. As a result of these debates Select Committees were set up to consider the subject, which reported six times in 1800 and seven times in the first half of the following year.<sup>1</sup> It was possibly as a result of these Committees' activities that the Home Office called for returns of the acreage under crops in every parish of the kingdom in the year 1801, the information to be supplied on a printed form by the rector, vicar, or curate, as the case might be. These crop returns, made immediately after the harvest of 1801, survive for the greater part in the Public Record Office among the Home Office Papers,<sup>2</sup> where they are grouped under the various dioceses. Thus the returns for a particular county have to be extracted, sheet by sheet, from a rather miscellaneous mass, and one cannot be completely certain that one has recovered every single return that may exist.

Clearly, these returns, if they survive complete and were accurately made in the first place, would provide us with a detailed picture of arable farming all over the country in this year. Such a picture would form a most valuable corrective, or addition, to the county reports which were being made by 'surveyors' to the new Board of Agriculture and Internal Improvement, set up in 1793. Of these county reports, that of John Monk on Leicestershire, made in 1794, was one of the first.<sup>3</sup> In the summer and autumn of 1807, William Pitt toured the county and submitted a revised report, based largely on Monk's, which was published in 1809.<sup>4</sup> The crop returns of 1801, which we are now considering, fall just half-way between these two reports, and it will be interesting to see how far they bear out the necessarily impressionistic views of both Monk and

<sup>1</sup>D. G. Barnes, *A History of the English Corn Laws* (1930), 85.

<sup>2</sup>The P.R.O. reference is H.O. 67. There are 26 bundles for England and Wales, arranged under dioceses. The Leicestershire returns are to be found in H.O. 67/15, covering the diocese of Lincoln as a whole.

<sup>3</sup>John Monk, *A General View of the Agriculture of the County of Leicester* (London, 1794).

<sup>4</sup>William Pitt, *A General View, &c.* (London, 1809).

Pitt, who had no means at their disposal of discovering exact acreages under various crops as they toured the county in a limited time.

But, first of all, how complete are the surviving Leicestershire returns? And, how accurate is the information they contain for each parish? Until we have answered these two questions we cannot begin to question the findings of either Monk or Pitt.

The number of surviving returns seems to vary greatly for different parts of the country. Thus, in the large diocese of Exeter, which covered the counties of Devon and Cornwall, there appear to be only 23 extant returns for Devon (out of a possible total of 432, exclusive of the city of Exeter); while a cursory inspection suggests that the Cornish returns are fairly complete. For Leicestershire one can recover 180 separate returns from the bundles relating to the diocese of Lincoln, and if we check these against the list of ecclesiastical parishes given in Curtis's *Topographical History of the County of Leicester* (1831) we discover that some 57 remain unaccounted for.

The number of missing parishes is not in fact quite as high as this, because the returns were sometimes made from dependent chapelries of particular parishes. Thus Barrow-on-Soar parish is not among the extant returns, but its chapelry of Quorndon made a separate return, and to that extent some of the arable acreage of Barrow is accounted for. There are other instances of this also, so that we may put the acreage covered by the extant returns, conservatively, at 80 per cent. of the total area of the county. The percentage covered by the returns is not, however, likely to be appreciably greater than this. Since the returns come from all parts of the county, too, with no district unreported on, we are sure of possessing a large and completely representative sample of arable farming in Leicestershire as a whole.

A more difficult question to answer concerns the accuracy of the figures supplied by the parsons themselves, on the information of the farmers in their respective parishes. Farmers as a class have always been of a shy and retiring disposition when asked by officialdom, in any form, for precise information about their farming. If these returns of 1801 reflect this modesty to an undue degree, they are valueless as a record and the economic historian need waste no further time on them.

When we look through the meagre Devonshire returns, for example, we are impressed by the frequency with which the parson observes, as a marginal note against his figures, that 'the farmers are very unwilling' to disclose their acreages under various crops.

On seven of the twenty-three surviving returns the parson comments, in some form or other, that he is not satisfied with the figures given to him. Only one parson of the twenty-three, the rector of Dunchideock, goes out of his way to say that the returns from the farmers 'are perfect and pretty accurate'. He may be right: or he may have been a very confiding young man.

The parson was not perhaps the best man to get this information. Farmers suspected that his enquiries had something to do with tithes. Or if not that, they saw the shadow of new taxation behind the bland smile of the vicar and the innocent eye of the curate. And if there were not tithes and taxes to be suspected, farmers disliked answering questions of any kind on principle. The Devonshire returns, at any rate, are valueless except for an occasional parish historian.

In Leicestershire there is good reason to believe that the returns are substantially accurate. Only six returns out of 180 express any doubts about the figures. The curate of Breedon said: 'I find all the farmers inclined to give in less than they really have'; the parson at Ashby Folville thought the return 'as accurate as can be procured, but [it] cannot be literally depended upon'. At Catthorpe, in the extreme south of the county, there were only five occupiers of land and the total acreage under crops was returned at ninety-nine. 'The Farmers shy of answering to enquiries. The number of Acres given in here probably below the mark,' writes the rector. At Stapleton, a hamlet in the west of the county, the parson is careful to say that the return is deficient 'in a few acres' as one farmer of 100-200 acres all told 'objected to making any return'.

From two parishes, however, the parsons reply more vigorously. At Bruntingthorpe the farmers 'have not given a true statement'. They suspect the measure 'as a check to their rapacity'. The rector of Knipton made no bones about his opinion of his farmers: 'The Rector of this Parish begs leave to remark to Lord Pelham that he found the farmers much disinclined to let anything belonging to them be known for fear it might lead hereafter either to raising their rents or increasing their taxes. He further takes the liberty of observing that neither rents nor taxes in this part of England are any way proportioned to the profit the trading farmers make of their produce. There is not a class of people in England more able to pay to the exigencies of the State, or fairer objects of taxation, than the farmers whose profits are in general so considerable that, for instance, a man in the parish of Harston adjoining this parish, rents among other lands a close of nine acres, for which he pays rent 20s. per Acre'... He goes on to say that this close grew barley last year which brought in £190 clear profit above all expenses, and 'begs

leave to suggest to Lord Pelham that as there is a crafty kind of cunning in the Farmers to conceal the value of their produce or property whether any future information might not be more correctly obtained by the parochial assessors of taxes...'

Against these half-dozen doubters, however, we can set the 174 parsons who sent in returns without any reservations. And it is difficult to believe that so many could, or would, have sent in returns which are often detailed down to quarter-acres and even perches, without expressing some doubts of their validity, if they entertained them. Several parsons, indeed, went out of their way to say that their returns were 'a faithful account', 'a very accurate return', and so on.

There is another good reason for believing that concealment of crop-acreages was difficult in Leicestershire, at least on a serious scale, and that was that the arable was in any event only a small proportion in any parish, and therefore all the harder to hide. Unless the parson were in league with the farmers, he would not be likely to be deceived to any appreciable degree. The great majority of Leicestershire parishes were small—unlike those great wild parishes of isolated farms in Devon where anything could go on without check or hindrance. The Devonshire parson is not at all likely to have visited every one of the outlying farms—especially in an unpopular and unpaid job—and the farmers were hardly likely, many of them, to bother about sending him an answer; but in Leicestershire the great bulk of the farmers still lived in the villages under the parson's eye, and could be tackled on the spot: and it would not take long for the parson to look over his parish and satisfy himself about any information he might have cause to suspect. The Leicestershire returns do, therefore, impress one with their substantial accuracy, while those of Devonshire certainly do not.

Even if the returns had not been valuable for statistical purposes, the remarks made on many of them by conscientious parsons, anxious to supply any helpful information, would make them worth some study. Thus we get a good deal of comment on the effect of parliamentary enclosure in Leicestershire upon the utilisation of land. The curate of Breedon, in the north-west of the county, after remarking that 'more wheat has been grown in this neighbourhood this last year than is usually grown', goes on to say that 'within the last 30 years almost all the country north-west of Leicester to the extremity of the county has been inclosed; by which means the land is become in a higher state of cultivation than formerly; but on account of a great proportion of it being converted into pasturage much less *food* is produced than when it was generally in tillage'.



Exactly the same sentiments came from other parts of the county. At Slawston, a parish of 1481 acres,<sup>5</sup> mostly of stiff clay, there were only 139½ acres under grain crops—rather less than ten per cent of the total area—and the vicar remarks that 'In this Parish there is far too little in Tillage to support the Inhabitants'. Similarly, at Blaston, the two little parishes, with only 1,242 acres between them, had only 39¼ acres under arable. Only 2¼ of Blaston St. Giles's 902 acres were arable. 'It is observed', says the parson, 'that there is far too little Land in Tillage in most of the neighbouring Parishes to support the inhabitants thereof, & upon Enquiry I find it is a general Complaint almost everywhere'. He goes on to ask for action by the government against the forestalling of grain and the monopolising of farms.

From Kegworth, a populous village in the north of the county, full of framework-knitters, the curate had the same complaint to make. The arable here amounted to 580 acres—considerably more than the vast majority of Leicestershire parishes—but even so it was only about a quarter of the whole area of the parish (2,115 acres 'of fertile land'). Both wheat and barley were extensively grown<sup>6</sup> in 1801, but the arable acreage had 'considerably diminished since the Inclosure which took place about twenty-two years ago'. Now the parish grew 'scarcely two-thirds' of what it annually consumed of these two grain-crops.

At Redmile, in the Vale of Belvoir, we find 294 acres under arable out of about 1,733 acres, 'chiefly a fertile clay'. The rector observes that the parish had been enclosed seven or eight years earlier, and a great part of the open fields, which had grown chiefly barley and beans, had been converted to grazing. Redmile was mostly owned by the Duke of Rutland, whose Belvoir estate, according to Pitt, was worth £21,000 a year at this date.<sup>7</sup> Of this great estate—more than thirty thousand acres—much had been enclosed since 1766, and Pitt remarks on the revolutionary effect this had had on the arable farming of the Vale. 'Here the course of agriculture has since the enclosure been turned topsy-turvy, the richest land in the Vale, formerly tillage, has been laid to grass; and

<sup>5</sup>The parish acreages given here and afterwards are taken from *White's Directory* for 1863. Earlier estimates of parish areas tend to be highly erratic and at times quite wrong.

<sup>6</sup>The detailed statistics, parish by parish, of all the extant Leicestershire returns are given at the end of this paper.

<sup>7</sup>Pitt, *op. cit.*, 15. In 1883 the Duke's Leicestershire estate, which was mostly in and round the Vale of Belvoir, amounted to 30,188 acres, with a gross rent-roll of £46,241 a year (Bateman, *The Great Landowners of Great Britain*, 391). He was far and away the largest landowner in the county.

the poorer land up the hills, and the skirtings of the Vale, formerly a sheep walk, have been brought into tillage...Any land is permitted for tillage, whose staple, in the opinion of a proper judge, is not worth more than a guinea per acre; but rich deep soil, exceeding that value, is compelled to lay to grass'.<sup>8</sup> Rents had trebled since enclosure (from about six shillings an acre in the open state to eighteen shillings per acre enclosed). 'A numerous and able-bodied peasantry is here supported; no stockingers, or other manufacturers, and care taken that there shall be none...', but Pitt foresaw a fall in population when the new farms were consolidated. He also saw that less corn was raised in Belvoir than in its open state, and that 'the rejected occupier and his family must emigrate into towns, or elsewhere, for employ'.

Throughout the Vale of Belvoir the effect of enclosure had been to reduce the amount of arable considerably and to push it on to the less profitable land also; but in the parish of Thurcaston, not far from Leicester, enclosure had had a more mixed effect. Thurcaston consisted of three lordships—Thurcaston itself, enclosed in 1798; Cropston, enclosed in 1781; and Anstey, enclosed in 1761. The returns from these three places are lumped together, giving a total of 477 acres of arable out of 2,225 acres in all. Here rather more than one-fifth of the total area was under the plough. Anstey produced considerably less grain than before the enclosure. It was a very populous village, and a large part of the land, we are told, had been converted to pasture for the express purpose of producing butter, cheese, and milk for the inhabitants. On the other hand, both Thurcaston and Cropston produced more grain than before, although, at the same time, a greater acreage was now under grass. Lastly, at Lubenham, amid the rich pastures of the Welland valley, the enclosure of 1766 had dealt with 1,233½ acres, of which the greater part had necessarily been in tillage; but now (1801) there were only 200 acres under crops, *plus* 31 acres under fallow. About one-sixth of the parish was under the plough, and five-sixths under pasture. This conversion of arable to pasture had been the almost invariable effect of parliamentary enclosure in Leicestershire.

We might dispose of the other comments made by the parsons, before going on to discuss the statistical results as a whole, and the general questions that they raise. All the parsons who made any remarks at all observe that the harvest of 1801 had been a good one and 'well got in'. One or two have some interesting observations to make about the bread of the parishioners. The vicar of Sproxton,

<sup>8</sup>Pitt, *op. cit.*, 13-15.

up on the Lincolnshire border of the county, says: 'More Barley bread used in the Parish than any other sort, tho' Wheat is more used than formerly. No Oat or Rye Bread. Millers grind less corn for the Poor than they did sometime since, they sell them flour ready dressed, & even this practice seems in some measure giving way to the Bakers who sell them bread by the loaf from 2d. to a shilling. Some made of Barley, some of Wheat and some of both. Much of the land in tillage was, before the Inclosure, Heath and Moor, & in general yields but slender crops, perhaps 2 quarter of Barley per acre—some of the best land 5 or 6. The average I think cannot exceed 4 Quarters. Other grain in proportion...'

At Kegworth, 'the Bread generally eaten in this Parish is a mixture of Wheat and Barley, in proportions varying according to the respective means and inclinations of the several Inhabitants'. At Sapcote, to the south-west of Leicester, barley bread was also eaten, and the parson reported a remarkable 'instance of Generosity' on the part of the farmers of the parish. 'Last Winter', he said, 'no Grain, or very little, was carried to Market from this place. The Maltsters bid 13 sh. a strike for the good Barley. The Farmers saw that all they had would be wanted for Bread for the inhabitants, would not sell it to the Maltsters; kept it for the Inhabitants & sold it to them for 6 sh. a strike...'

Sapcote was, indeed, a good village. At the enclosure in 1778 the lord of the manor, the Rev. Thomas Frewen Turner, who was also patron of the living and rector of the parish—a 'squarson', in fact—saw to it that no one suffered by the revolution in the village economy. 'Sixteen industrious families, in humble circumstances, petitioned [him] for land to enable them each to keep a cow. He ordered a pasture close of 32 acres to be laid out for their use and about half that quantity of mowing ground for winter hay'. This they held at a reasonable rent to their very great convenience and comfort'; and even in 1810 (when Nichols's correspondent was writing) the rent had not been increased since it was fixed more than thirty years earlier. During that time not one of the cottagers renting these cow-commons ever received parish relief or had ever asked for any.

Not only that, but the village was exceptional in that not a single plough-team was laid down at the enclosure. The lord of the manor 'provided for all according to their several circumstances and took special care that no man should be disturbed by being put out of his usual way of providing for his family'. He might easily have found 'two or three capital farmers' to rent the whole estate, to his own much greater profit.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Nichols, *History (Sparkenhoe Hundred)*, 895-6. Nichols informs us that the local farmers had sold their grain at reduced prices in the scarce years of 1796 and 1800 also.

Nichols's correspondent at Sapcote is, however, quite clear that this is not how enclosure usually worked out: he gives these details in the hope that other parishes still unenclosed will emulate the excellent example set by this village. A more typical example of what happened in Leicestershire is provided by Kibworth Beauchamp, of which Eden, in *The State of the Poor*, published in 1797, gives some account.<sup>10</sup> Here some 3,600 acres had been enclosed in 1780, the rector taking one-seventh (the usual proportion) in lieu of tithes. There were many poor in 1795, but 'the rates are said to have been not one-third of their present figure before the enclosures'. People attributed this increase directly to the enclosure, for 'before the fields were enclosed they were solely applied to the production of corn; the Poor had then plenty of employment in weeding, reaping, threshing, etc., and would also collect a great deal of corn by gleaning, but... the fields being now in pasturage, the farmers have little occasion for labourers and the Poor being thereby thrown out of employment, must of course be supported by the parish'. Eden thought this explanation to be the true one: only a third or a quarter of the labour required twenty years earlier was sufficient now to perform all the farming of the parish. And the crop returns of 1801 bear out the wholesale conversion of open arable to enclosed pasture: out of 3,967 acres in the parish (which included Kibworth Harcourt and Smeeton Westerby) only 348 acres were returned as under crops—well under ten per cent. of the whole area. Before the enclosure it is probable that the arable area was about eight times as great.<sup>11</sup>

Out of the 180 returns we have, only three—for Congerstone, Glenfield and Bringhurst—relate to parishes that were still open; and a fourth—for Newbold Verdon—relates to a parish that was still partly unenclosed.

Congerstone, a small parish of 992 acres near Market Bosworth, in the west of the county, was not enclosed until 1825. The lordship must have been somewhat larger, as the parson speaks of '1,200 acres of lands which would be considerably improved by means of an inclosure'. The fields must already have been transformed, however, from the 'normal' open-field economy, as only 347½ acres are returned as under crops in 1801. Allowing for 175 acres or thereabouts of fallow (we are told that one-third lay fallow every year) there must have been nearly seven hundred acres of more or less

<sup>10</sup>Abridged edition (1928), edited by A. G. L. Rogers, 225-7.

<sup>11</sup>Examination of terriers of Leicestershire open-field farms shows that 75—80% of their acreage was usually under crops; though the percentage might be less than this where the open arable was already in a state of transition to grazing before the time of parliamentary enclosure.

permanent pasture even in this open-field lordship. The cropping of the arable, too, had changed from that of earlier centuries in some important respects. Peas and beans, sown together in one field, still accounted for all but one-half of the total under crops (160 acres out of 347 $\frac{1}{4}$ ); but wheat had taken the place of barley as the principal grain crop. In the sixteenth century, barley had covered three to five times the acreage of wheat in Leicestershire; at Congerstone in 1801 there were 104 $\frac{3}{4}$  acres of wheat and 62 of barley, sown together in the same field. Rye had disappeared altogether, and some twenty acres of oats were grown instead.

At Glenfield, just outside Leicester to the west, it is not certain what acreage we are dealing with in 1801. The township included 710 acres of land, but the parish included also the townships of Braunstone and Kirby Muxloe, a much larger area. There are good reasons for believing that we are dealing only with the township of Glenfield (though the returns for Braunstone and Kirby Muxloe do not survive separately), as it alone remained open as late as 1801. Here we have 355 acres returned as under crops, or exactly one-half the total area of the township. If one third of the whole arable lay fallow, we are left with about 180 acres of more or less permanent pasture in the open fields here also. As to the cropping we find exactly the same as at Congerstone: the bean-field covers 165 acres (a little under one-half of the sown arable), with 14 $\frac{1}{2}$  acres of oats sown in the same field; and wheat is again much more important than barley (108 acres and 67 $\frac{1}{2}$  acres respectively). Again, there is no rye. We also notice that no peas are sown. For centuries 'peas and beans' had been sown together in one of the great open fields of all Leicestershire villages: now only beans were sown at Glenfield, and in many enclosed parishes also.

At Bringhurst we are not specifically told by the parson that the parish was still open-field, but the high acreage under beans would lead one to suspect it. The parish of Bringhurst included the townships of Bringhurst (593 acres), Drayton (679 acres), and Great Easton (2,278 acres). Great Easton at least was not enclosed until 1806, and the greater part of the 1,376 acres returned as arable lay in the open fields of this township. Once again almost the whole of one open field was devoted solely to beans (653 $\frac{3}{4}$  acres), together with a small cultivation of oats; and the other field was devoted to wheat and barley (372 and 339 acres respectively).

The cropping of Newbold Verdon, partly open and partly enclosed, is more difficult to analyse. We are told that 900 acres of enclosed land were 'generally pasture', 300 acres of open fields were 'in Plough'; and there were besides this 700 acres of heath and

waste which were 'good land'. Altogether, 329 acres are returned as under cultivation but the cropping is unlike that of a true open-field. Peas and beans are only 10% or so of the total arable, wheat covers a quarter of the arable, and barley and oats are also substantial crops (see the statistical table following this paper).

Thus there had been important changes in open-field cropping in Leicestershire between the early years of the seventeenth century<sup>12</sup> and the late eighteenth, before the old system had been swept away by parliamentary authority. These changes, pending a fuller enquiry into the records of the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth, may be provisionally summarized as follows:—

- (a) the substitution of wheat for barley on a large scale in one field;
- (b) the disappearance of rye as a crop from the same field;
- (c) the disappearance, or substantial reduction, of peas in the open field, which became almost solely devoted to beans;
- (d) the increased sowing of oats in the same field, possibly as a substitute for peas; and
- (e) the steady encroachment of more or less permanent pasture ('ley ground') in the open fields themselves, a process which was already well developed in a few places even in the sixteenth century and which seems to have spread in the seventeenth.

## II

We may now consider the statistical evidence of the Leicestershire returns as a whole. The grand total of arable acreage in 1801, for the 180 places covered, is 57,259. Of this total, wheat covered a slightly larger acreage than barley (15,832 and 15,057 acres respectively), with oats a good third (14,105 acres). Rye was grown only to a negligible extent (73 acres). Peas and beans (often sown together, so that no separate totals are possible) totalled 4,882 acres, and turnips 6,564 acres. The acreage under potatoes (746) is misleading, as they were grown mostly in gardens and on odd pieces of land, and some parsons reckoned them and some did not. In any event the total acreage under potatoes was not large and it was solely a subsistence crop: none was sold off the farm.

<sup>12</sup>An examination of the farmers' inventories for 1603 shows no significant change from those of 1588 which I examined in detail in *The Leicestershire Farmer in the Sixteenth Century* (1945). I hope to deal with those of the seventeenth century and early eighteenth in similar detail on some future occasion.

If we allow that the surviving returns cover 80% of the county area—slightly more if we exclude the Charnwood district which was still largely unenclosed waste—we have a total area under crops in 1801 of about 70,000 acres, of which wheat covered nearly 28%, barley 26%, and oats slightly under 25%. These three principal grain crops accounted for nearly 79% of the arable acreage. Turnips, and peas and beans made up the rest, with about 11½% and 8½% respectively.

These figures are very different from Pitt's estimates made in the summer and autumn of 1807, and published in 1809. His analysis of the land utilization of Leicestershire can be summarized as:—

'Occasionally in tillage' ...	240,000 acres
'Permanent grass' ...	240,000 acres
<hr/>	
Total 'cultivated' ...	480,000 acres
Waste lands (Charnwood) ...	20,000 acres
Woods, roads, buildings, &c.	22,240 acres
<hr/>	
Total area of county ...	522,240 acres

Of the 240,000 acres 'occasionally in tillage', he put the various uses as follows:—

Under wheat ...	25,000 acres
Under barley ...	40,000 acres
Oats on turf, or after wheat, or on strong land instead of barley	30,000 acres
Beans ...	10,000 acres
Peas and Vetches ...	5,000 acres
Green crops (turnips, cabbages, coleseed, potatoes) ...	40,000 acres
Arable land at or under clover or artificial grass ...	85,000 acres
Fallow for wheat or barley ...	5,000 acres
<hr/>	
	240,000 acres

Even if we allow that there was some under-estimation by the Leicestershire farmers in 1801, and even if we allow that there had been some extension of the arable between 1801 and 1807 under the influence of high corn prices, we cannot make the 70,000 acres of arable in 1801 look anything like the 240,000 of 1807. The major part of the difference lies, of course, in the fact that Pitt's

figure relates to land 'occasionally in tillage', and the 1801 figures are of the acreage actually under crops in that year. It is not likely, even allowing for serious under-estimation in 1801, that the acreage under all crops exceeded 80,000.

Apart from that, it is impossible to reconcile Pitt's estimates of the various crops, based upon his impressions when touring the county, with the official statistics; and here we cannot explain away the difficulty by talking of 'under-estimation' by the farmers in 1801. There was no reason why they should falsify the returns for particular crops, even if they thought it prudent to conceal their total acreages under arable. Pitt puts all his crop-acreages far too high, but especially barley and oats. He makes the area under peas and beans at least twice as great as it really is; that under oats twice as great; that under barley twice as great. All this we can explain by saying that 'under occasional tillage' meant roughly twice as much land as that actually under tillage in any given year, which is a much more informative figure anyway. But he gets the relative order of the crops wrong; and 40,000 acres under green crops is quite inexplicable. It can hardly have exceeded 10,000 acres, even allowing for all the deficiencies of the 1801 figures.

If we accept Pitt's estimates of an uncultivated area of some 42,000 acres in 1807-9, and a total 'cultivated' area of 480,000 acres, we can only say that, at the most, one-sixth of this area was under crops (excluding grass), in any given year, and the remaining five-sixths were under grass, whether permanent or temporary; and the principal grain-crops were wheat, barley, and oats in that order of acreage, with turnips and beans a long way behind.

The proportion under grass varied to a considerable degree from parish to parish. Even the dairying districts always had some land in tillage to produce straw, and turnips and greenstuff for the cows in winter. Monk tells us that a dairy farm of 200 acres might have thirty or forty acres under grain and fodder crops. In the north and west of the county a proportion of each farm was usually kept in tillage. At Dishley—Bakewell's farm—about one quarter was arable; on the Beaumanor estate one-third was 'sometimes allowed in tillage'. On the other hand many farms in the south, east, and middle of the county had no arable at all.<sup>13</sup>

The parochial returns occasionally give statistics of the acreage under grass, or some other useful comment. At Cosby, there were 545 acres of arable (chiefly barley and oats). We are told the lordship amounted to 2,220 acres; so here we have about one-quarter

<sup>13</sup>Pitt, *op. cit.* 87; Monk, *op. cit.* 10.



under crops and three-quarters grass. In the adjoining parish of Willoughby Waterless, which we are told was enclosed in the year 1636, slightly less than one-quarter was arable: 252½ acres out of 1,100. Here oats was the biggest grain crop. At Cossington, down the valley below Leicester, well over a quarter was arable: 450 acres out of about 1,600 in the lordship. Barley was the biggest grain crop, wheat second, and oats far behind. Sileby had 546 acres arable out of some 2,000 in all, wheat being twice as important as barley.

Syston, next door to Cossington on the other side, also had more arable than the average—nearly 302 acres out of 1,700 or so, with barley the largest crop again. But up at Beeby, in the upland country to the east of the Soar valley, only 98 acres were under crops out of 1,500.

To the south-east the arable dwindled almost to nothing. On the old enclosures of Carlton Curlieu, still large grazing fields, there were only thirty acres of arable out of 1,378 in the lordship; Burton Overy, next door, had 93 arable acres out of a total area of about 1,800, and the parson observes that 'the whole lordship is unfavourable for Ploughing being a very strong Clay'. The early enclosures of Foston, Wistow, and Knaptoft similarly had almost no arable. And at Foxton the curate tells us that there were 1,755 acres in the whole lordship, of which 115½ were under crops, 25 were fallow, and the remaining 1,614½ acres were pasture. At Welham, lastly, we are told that the lordship contained about 1,000 acres of 'very high rich grazing land', and that even the 18¼ acres under plough in 1801 was 'only casual'. There were, however, about fifty acres at Welham under *woad*, which was manufactured for the dyers. The land was ploughed two years for that, then three more for wheat, oats, and barley (but chiefly oats), and after that laid down again for grazing.

There is little evidence that the war-prices had led to much re-conversion of grassland to arable. A few parsons mention it specifically, as at Church Langton where we are informed that about fifty acres of old pasture had been converted to tillage in the past twelve months, but that was an increase of only ten per cent. in the arable. The parson of Claybrook reported 'a considerable quantity of land taken into Tillage this year', and from Breedon it was reported that 'more wheat has been grown in this neighbourhood this last year than is usually grown'. But these are the only parsons to report any increase in the cultivated area: only three out of 180. There were quite probably small increases in other parishes whose parsons made no comment; but it is clear that there had been

no appreciable conversion of grassland to tillage by 1801. One suspects that there was very little even by 1814. After all, a good deal of Leicestershire land was regarded as too stiff for economic ploughing—many parsons said so—and was, in any event, producing large quantities of valuable foodstuffs in the form of cheese, butter, milk, and beef.

### III

We may comment briefly on each of the principal crops by way of conclusion. Pitt thought there were 25,000 acres under wheat in the county; my own estimate from the crop returns of 1801 would be rather under 20,000 acres, allowing that the extant returns cover four-fifths of the county. He thought the average yield was  $3\frac{1}{2}$  quarters per acre, or 28 statute bushels; but that the well-cultivated land could produce 32 bushels, while the open fields and less well-cultivated enclosures produced less than 24 bushels. Several parsons gave information on their returns as to yields in 1801. At Old Dalby the average yield was 22 bushels per acre, Syston 32 bushels, Long Clawson nearly 32, Harston only 24, Rearsby, Tugby, and East Norton 28; and at Claybrook the yields (not given) were reported to be more than 25% above the average. Probably Pitt's estimate of an average yield of 28 bushels was about right.

Barley was 'the favourite crop of grain of the Leicestershire farmer', according to Pitt, who put its acreage at 40,000, and the average yield at  $4\frac{1}{2}$  quarters to the acre, or 36 statute bushels. Six quarters were often produced by good management on good land, and seven or eight quarters were not unknown in particular instances.<sup>14</sup> My own estimate from the 1801 returns is less than one-half of Pitt's, so far as acreage goes. The returns show 15,057 acres under barley, or possibly 18,000 acres in the county as a whole.

As regards yields, the report from Old Dalby said 'a good crop', 38 bushels to the acre. Tugby and East Norton together reported 32 bushels, but at Syston an average of about 48 bushels was gathered in. At Narborough the parson gave the total yield of each crop as well as the acreage: 124 acres under wheat produced 434 quarters, an average of exactly 28 bushels per acre. 162 acres under barley produced 810 quarters, at the rate of 40 bushels to the acre; and 114 acres under oats produced 627 quarters at 44 bushels to the acre. At Cadeby, in the west, 36 bushels were reported; Harston reported 40; and Rearsby 42. These reported yields run from 32 to 48 bushels, the average being somewhere round 40. But all

<sup>14</sup>Pitt, *op. cit.* 107.

yields were above the average in 1801 and Pitt's figure of 36 bushels is again about right. Obviously the estimation of yields per acre is more likely to be accurate than estimates of acreages running into tens of thousands, even in a small county like Leicestershire. Taking the higher yield of barley into account, barley was in fact a more important crop than wheat. In an average year the 20,000 acres under wheat would produce about 560,000 bushels, while the 18,000 acres under barley would produce about 650,000 bushels.

Pitt reckoned the acreage under oats in Leicestershire at about 30,000; my own estimate for 1801 is 17,500. He thought it was the second favourite grain crop: 'being a horse county there is a great demand for oats'. The straw was also reckoned to be more valuable than any other; the cultivation simple; and the average yields higher than those of any other grain. Pitt thought the average yield was about five quarters, or 40 bushels, over and above the seed sown, but a farmer at Barrow-on-Soar had produced 88 bushels to the acre. Again, Old Dalby reported a good crop at 48 bushels to the acre; Tugby and Norton 40; Narborough 44; Cadeby 40; Harston 48; and Rearsby 44. The average yield throughout the county can be put at 44 bushels in 1801, and Pitt's 40 bushels would be good for a normal year. The total yield of oats in a normal year would therefore have been about 700,000 bushels, making it the largest crop by bulk. There were many parishes in Leicestershire where oats covered the greatest acreage of any crop, also—as, for example, at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Billesdon, Branston (by Belvoir), Bruntingthorpe, Claybrook, Eastwell, Eaton, Goadby Marwood, Harston, Hinckley, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Hugglescote, Husbands Bosworth, and several others.

Rye was a negligible crop by the end of the eighteenth century. In the sixteenth century it had been the third grain crop, covering 4 or 5 per cent. of the arable area. By 1801 there were barely a hundred acres under cultivation in the whole of Leicestershire, and the great majority of parishes grew none at all. Where it was grown it was used as early spring pasture for sheep.

Turnips constituted the fourth largest crop by acreage with rather more than 8,000 acres under cultivation in 1801. Since they were the pivot of the Agricultural Revolution of these years, it is interesting to observe that in one-third of the parishes for which returns survive their cultivation was negligible (less than ten acres grown in the whole parish) and in nineteen parishes none was grown. The two open-field townships grew no turnips, as might be expected; but seventeen enclosed parishes also grew none, even as late as 1801.

Peas and beans had been the largest crop by acreage in

Leicestershire for many generations. In the sixteenth century, and probably somewhat earlier and somewhat later, they had occupied the whole of one of the two open fields under cultivation each year. In 1801 there were perhaps 6,000 acres under the crop in the whole of Leicestershire, or well under ten per cent. of the arable acreage. In a great number of places peas and beans were sown together still and are lumped together in the returns. Wherever they are separated it is evident that peas had almost ceased to be grown. As for beans, Pitt 'took the liberty of telling some respectable farmers, that they had lost the art of growing them'. A good deal of Leicestershire was excellently suited to growing them, for they did best in a mellow, deep loam in which the county abounded; but their principal cultivation was by now confined to the remaining open fields, of which Pitt calculated there were still some eight thousand acres left.

The acreage returned under potatoes in 1801 is statistically useless. At Theddingworth, 'potatoes are cultivated... only for the use of the respective families and planted on Head-lands, in Ricksteads and small Gardins', and this was generally true of all parishes. Nearly every household, farmer or cottager, had a potato-patch, but they were rarely if ever grown as a field-crop. It is possible that by 1807 they were slowly being extended in the neighbourhood of the towns with a view to supplying the markets; but the great bulk of the crop was still being consumed on the farms and in the cottages.

The crop returns of 1801 are in general valuable records for the economic historian, despite their imperfections and deficiencies. It seems likely that for some counties they are too defective, in one way or another, to be of much use, but for many counties they will provide a substantially accurate picture of the state of arable farming at the opening of the nineteenth century, and by implication of the state of farming in general. The detailed comments of many parsons are, too, often of considerable value. In Leicestershire nearly all the open field had gone by 1801, but there may be other areas where these returns will give one precise information about the cropping of the open fields in their last phase, so different from what it had been two or three hundred years earlier. On the enclosed lands, the returns will probably throw light on a number of questions, some of which have been discussed briefly in this paper—e.g., the extent to which turnip husbandry had come in by the end of the eighteenth century, or the extent to which high war-time prices were already bringing about a reconversion of grassland to arable. Finally, they are a valuable statistical supplement to the necessarily

somewhat impressionistic picture of farming given in the county reports of the various surveyors to the new Board of Agriculture. Whether the Home Office ever made use of these figures we do not know; nor does it seem that the enquiry was ever repeated in a later year.

CROP ACREAGES IN LEICESTERSHIRE IN 1801

Place	Acreage under:										Total Arable	Remarks
	Wheat	Rye	Barley	Oats	Potatoes	Peas	Beans	Turnips				
Allextion	9	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	16			
Anstey	[See under Thurcaston]											
Asfordby	71 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	117	24	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	50 $\frac{1}{4}$	298 $\frac{3}{4}$			
Ashby-de-la-Zouch	320	0	321 $\frac{3}{4}$	433 $\frac{1}{4}$	82 $\frac{3}{4}$	9 (peas & beans)	69 $\frac{3}{4}$	1236 $\frac{1}{2}$				
Ashby Folville	54	0	60	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	0	40	12	215 $\frac{1}{2}$	Includes Barsby		
Ashby Magna	94	0	91	144 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	4	0	76 $\frac{1}{2}$	413			
Ashby Parva	34	1	40	72	3	1	3	41	195			
Aston Flamville	57	0	47	59 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	41	204 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Aylestone	126 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	134 $\frac{1}{4}$	116	10	0	13	53	453			
Barkestone	89	0	38	65	0	37 (peas & beans)	10	239				
Barlestone	63	0	68	65	0	0	0	2	198			
Barsby	[See Ashby Folville]											
Barwell	127 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	164	89 $\frac{3}{4}$	15 $\frac{1}{4}$	3	8	63	470 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Beeby	46	0	20	18	0	5	6	3	98			
Belgrave	74	4	115	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	3	27 $\frac{1}{2}$	48	375			

Belton ... ..	168	3	136	81½	10	63 (peas & beans)	42	503½	
Billesdon ... ..	71	1	28	133	3¼	2	4½	3	245¾
Birstall ... ..	17	8	81	46	8	0	15	41	216
Blaby ... ..	130	0	89	88	7	18	0	30	362
Blaston St. Giles ... ..	0	0	0	1½	½	0	¼	0	2¼
Blaston St. Michael ... ..	5	0	15	11	0	0	5	1	37
Bottesford ... ..	206¼	0	162	87¾	8	175 (peas & beans)	19¾	658¾	
Branston [by Belvoir] ... ..	17	0	99	171	5	5 (peas & beans)	108	405	
Breedon ... ..	290	0	218	123	20	81 (peas & beans)	40	772	
Bringham ... ..	372	0	339	6¼	5	0	653¾	0	1376
Brooksby ... ..	4	0	21	5	1	7	0	22	60
Broughton Astley ... ..	205¼	0	148¾	107¾	0	6½	2	72½	542¾
Bruntingthorpe ... ..	44	½	61½	91	2½	8	0	32	239½
Burrough ... ..	17¼	0	13	13	1½	0	9	3½	57½
Burton ... ..									[See under Prestwold]
Burton Overy ... ..	32	0	26	11	2	15 (peas & beans)	7	93	
Cadeby ... ..	37½	0	73½	37	3	2	0	64	217
Carlton ... ..	59	0	60	38	1	0	0	25	183
Carlton Curlieu ... ..	7	0	7	6¾	¼	0	0	9	29⅞
Castle Donington ... ..	166	0	167	142	9	0	43	54	581
Catthorpe ... ..	32	0	48	17	2	0	0	0	99
Church Langton ... ..	146	0	102	80	12	0	181	1	522
Claybrook ... ..	172¼	0	198	201¾	9¾	9¾	0	121	712½

Includes Great Easton and Drayton

Place	Acreage under:										Total Arable	Remarks
	Wheat	Rye	Barley	Oats	Potatoes	Peas	Beans	Turnips				
Cold Overton ... ..	5	0	3	9	1	0	0	0	18			
Coleorton ... ..	116	0	92	73	7	35 (peas & beans)		23	346			
Congerstone ... ..	104 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	62	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	160 (peas & beans)		0	347 $\frac{1}{4}$	Open field		
Cosby ... ..	98	0	174	176	4	22	9	62	545			
Cossington ... ..	137	0	175	36	7	1	14	80	450	6 acres under cabbages also		
Coston ... ..	32	0	20	70	1	1	1	16	141			
Cotes ... ..	[See under Prestwold]											
Cotesbach ... ..	33	0	34	34	0	3	3	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	125 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Countesthorpe ... ..	110	0	120	80	5	10	40	20	385			
Cranoë ... ..	36	0	38	2	1	8	70	0	155			
Croft ... ..	73 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	94	61	0	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	71 $\frac{1}{2}$	302 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Croxton Kerrial ... ..	81	0	313	208	2	0	29	124	757			
Dadlington ... ..	70 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	46	75	1	0	2	7	201 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Desford ... ..	74	0	150	106	5	3	0	60	398			
Diseworth ... ..	282 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	178 $\frac{1}{2}$	103 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	110 $\frac{3}{4}$ (peas & beans)		37	715 $\frac{1}{4}$			
Donington-le-heath ... ..	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	55 $\frac{1}{2}$	52	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	2	29	175 $\frac{1}{4}$			
Dunton Bassett ... ..	82 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	92 $\frac{3}{4}$	89	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	9	51	326 $\frac{1}{2}$			



Earl Shilton	...	...	...	[See under Kirkby Mallory]								
East Norton	...	...	...	[See under Tugby]								
Eastwell	...	...	...	30	0	39	103	5	4 (peas & beans)	65	246	
Eaton	...	...	...	56	0	94	191	7	11	0	123	482
Edmondthorpe	...	...	...	31	0	54	3	3	2	17	36	146
Elmesthorpe	...	...	...	69	0	42	62	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	55	228 $\frac{1}{2}$
Enderby	...	...	...	75 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	66 $\frac{1}{4}$	76 $\frac{3}{4}$	8 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	5 $\frac{1}{4}$	39 $\frac{1}{4}$	271 $\frac{1}{2}$
Fenny Drayton	...	...	...	131	0	61 $\frac{1}{2}$	93	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	0	49 $\frac{1}{2}$	337 $\frac{1}{4}$
Fleckney	...	...	...	47	0	50	41	2	22 (peas & beans)	4	166	
Foston	...	...	...	28	0	17	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	4 (peas & beans)	8 $\frac{1}{4}$	68 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Foxton	...	...	...	41	0	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	22	1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	115 $\frac{1}{2}$
Frolesworth	...	...	...	65 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	127 $\frac{1}{2}$	70	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	76 $\frac{1}{2}$	345
Garthorpe	...	...	...	29	0	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	22	0	0	6	22	103 $\frac{1}{2}$
Glenfield	...	...	...	108	0	67 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	165	0	355 Open field
Glooston	...	...	...	44	0	42	12	2	0	79	0	179
Goadby Marwood	...	...	...	45 $\frac{1}{4}$	1	55 $\frac{1}{2}$	95	8 $\frac{3}{4}$	6 $\frac{1}{4}$	4	51	266 $\frac{3}{4}$
Great Bowden	...	...	...	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	11	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	25 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	149
Great Easton	...	...	...	[See under Bringhurst]								
Great Glen	...	...	...	73 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	54 $\frac{1}{2}$	62 $\frac{1}{4}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	238 $\frac{1}{2}$
Great Stretton	...	...	...	30	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	46
Gumley	...	...	...	44	0	10	40	0	0	21	0	115
Hallaton	...	...	...	160	0	43	92	6	0	30	10	341
Harston	...	...	...	25	$\frac{1}{2}$	94 $\frac{1}{2}$	151 $\frac{1}{4}$	4	0	0	81	356 $\frac{1}{4}$

Place	Acreage under:									Total Arable	Remarks
	Wheat	Rye	Barley	Oats	Potatoes	Peas	Beans	Turnips			
Hinckley ... ..	133	0	156	185	10½	3½	10½	43	541½		
Hoby ... ..	80	0	118	49	4½	4½	9	58	322½		
Horninghold ... ..	0	0	0	18	0	0	4	4	26		
Hothorpe ... ..	27½	0	14	38	3	4	5	6	97½	Chapelry of Theddingworth	
Hoton ... ..	120	0	130	43	10	9	6	78	396		
Houghton-on-the-hill ... ..	54	0	6	77	2	2	15	1	157		
Hugglescote ... ..	59¾	0	77¼	119½	1	0	7	47¼	311¾		
Humberstone ... ..	85	1	95	38½	7	0	70	26¾	323¼		
Hungarton ... ..	82	0	27	30	0	0	13	3	155		
Husbands Bosworth ... ..	93	6½	129½	150½	1¼	8½	12½	86½	488¼		
Ibstock ... ..	146	0	264½	177½	4	0	0	115	707		
Illston ... ..	42¼	0	33½	66½	1	1½	6¾	23	174½		
Kegworth ... ..	175	0	197	98	11	1	75	23	580	9 acres under 'dills' also	
Kibworth Beauchamp ... ..	101	0	79	42	6	0	112	8	348		
Kilby ... ..	68½	0	43½	27½	0	6	22	7	174½		
Kimcote ... ..	126	0	97	195	3	17	0	77	515		

Kirby Bellars	...	...	95	0	70	22	3	6	20	31	247	
Kirkby Mallory	...	...	236½	½	356½	251½	21	0	11	190	1066½	Includes Earl Shilton
Knaptoft	...	...	5	0	4	8	0	0	0	2	19	
Knipton	...	...	38½	0	75½	99½	7	3	13	82½	318½	
Knossington	...	...	6	0	14½	12	½	0	4	5	42	
Langton	...	...	14	0	25	14	1	3½	1	6½	65	
Leicester: St. Leonard	...	...	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	
St. Margaret	...	...	1	0	2	5	26	2	4	10	50	
St. Mary	...	...	144	0	93	92	29	0	10	31	399	
Leire	...	...	48	4	37	33	4	½	0	21	147½	
Loddington	...	...	17	0	11	34	1	½	3	0	66½	
Long Clawson	...	...	186½	0	80½	140	5	5½	80½	20½	518½	
Lowesby	...	...	43	0	33	62	1	0	2	21	162	Includes Cold Newton
Lubenham	...	...	78	0	9	91	4	0	18	0	200	
Lutterworth	...	...	120	0	105	127	3	0	25	52	432	
Market Bosworth	...	...	159½	0	113	167	3	11½	22	59	535	
Market Harborough	...	...	[Negligible quantities: no fields]									
Melton Mowbray	...	...	240	0	149	193	10	9	40	59	700	
Misterton	...	...	149½	1½	246	161	0	12½	0	114½	685	
Mowsley	...	...	34	0	30	60	½	0	10	26	160½	
Muston	...	...	118	0	66	25	3	3	49	24	288	
Nailstone	...	...	147	0	244	191	3	1	1	159	746	Includes Barton-in-the-Beans and Normanton
Narborough	...	...	124	0	162	114	2	3	5	0	410	

Place	Acreage under:									Total Arable	Remarks
	Wheat	Rye	Barley	Oats	Potatoes	Peas	Beans	Turnips			
Nether Broughton ... ..	54	0	11	31	3	18 (peas & beans)		1	118		
Newbold Verdon ... ..	81½	¼	63¼	76¼	6	18½	18¼	65¼	329¼		
Newton Harcourt ... ..	85	0	39	37	1	72 (peas & beans)		4½	238½		
North Kilworth ... ..	70	3	50	50	1	6	0	40	220		
Norton-by-Twycross ... ..	154	0	92	131	0	0	0	17	394		
Oadby ... ..	43¾	¼	45¼	83¾	4½	7½	23	8¾	216¾		
Old Dalby ... ..	83	0	34	87	6	7	1	30	248		
Orton-on-the-hill ... ..	180	0	105	81	5½	0	26	27½	425		
Osbaston ... ..	51½	0	88	90	0	0	0	27½	257		
Osgathorpe ... ..	84½	0	57½	44½	5	0	8	21	220½		
Packington ... ..	197	0	267	197	8	0	4	106	779		
Peatling Magna ... ..	49½	0	57½	71	0	8	12½	31½	230		
Peckleton ... ..	120	0	239	97	7	2	0	123	588		
Plungar ... ..	33½	0	23	20	0	22 (peas & beans)		0	98½		
Potters Marston ... ..	12	0	12	13	0	0	0	8	45		
Prestwold ... ..	246	0	150	170	4	12	0	48	630	Includes Burton and Cotes	

Quorndon	...	...	...	124	0	214	50	4	0	4	92	488	
Rearsby	...	...	...	78	17	178	31	5	6	22	121	458	
Redmile	...	...	...	105	0	60	65	0	48 (peas & beans)		16	294	
Rotherby	...	...	...	49	0	48	20	3	1	22	30	173	
Saddington	...	...	...	50	0	69	24	4	5	26	36	214	
Saltby	...	...	...	128	0	247	382	1	13	20	120	911	Includes Bescaby
Sapcote	...	...	...	122	0	88	84	9 $\frac{1}{4}$	10 $\frac{1}{4}$	12 $\frac{1}{4}$	67	392 $\frac{3}{4}$	
Saxelby	...	...	...	35	0	32 $\frac{3}{4}$	67	1	4	6	14	159 $\frac{3}{4}$	Includes Shoby
Scalford	...	...	...	172	0	68	107 $\frac{3}{4}$	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	18	54	430 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Scraptoft	...	...	...	32	0	9	28	2	5	0	0	76	
Seagrave	...	...	...	268 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	135	2	21	74	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	531 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Shackerstone	...	...	...	93	0	114	63	2	0	0	14	286	
Shangton	...	...	...	17	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	37	
Sharnford	...	...	...	73	1	74	60	5	0	0	53	266	
Shawell	...	...	...	64	0	53	71	3	9	$\frac{1}{2}$	35	235 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Shearsby	...	...	...	30	0	28	60	2	0	10	13	143	
Shenton	...	...	...	112	0	65 $\frac{1}{2}$	113 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	14	6	12	323	
Sileby	...	...	...	236	0	106	73	8	0	84	39	546	
Skeffington	...	...	...	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	54 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	9	86 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Slawston	...	...	...	55 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	26	30	2	0	20	6	139 $\frac{1}{2}$	
Somerby	...	...	...	15 $\frac{1}{4}$	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	51 $\frac{3}{4}$	63 $\frac{1}{2}$	7	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	53	198 $\frac{3}{4}$	
South Croxton	...	...	...	127	2	60 $\frac{1}{2}$	54	3	1	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	26 $\frac{3}{4}$	326 $\frac{3}{4}$	
Sproxton	...	...	...	71	0	219	275	3	20	2	135	725	

Place	Acreage under:										Total Arable	Remarks
	Wheat	Rye	Barley	Oats	Potatoes	Peas	Beans	Turnips				
Stapleford ... ..	30	0	34	26	2	0	19½	13½	125			
Stapleton ... ..	71½	0	68½	67½	0	0	0	35	242½			
Stockerston ... ..	0	0	0	6	½	0	0	0	6½			
Stoke Golding ... ..	79½	0	66½	86½	8	2	5	6	253½			
Stonesby ... ..	35	0	68	58	1	0	6	44	212			
Stoney Stanton ... ..	102	0	91	39	0	25	9	26	292			
Stonton Wyville ... ..	10	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	19			
Stoughton ... ..			[See under Thurnby]									
Sutton Cheney ... ..	117	0	58½	117	0	11	27	16½	347			
Sweepstone ... ..	229	0	304	225	10	0	0	140	908			
Swinford ... ..	120	11	64	91	0	31	7	55	379			
Swithland ... ..	103	0	83	78	3	11 (peas & beans)		49½	327½			
Syston ... ..	102	¼	123	3	7	2	6	58½	301¾			
Theddingworth ... ..	19	0	42½	28½	0	1	1½	2½	85			
Thornton ... ..	95	0	103	85	0	6	12	57	358			
Thurcaston ... ..	141½	1	146	76½	8¾	23	19	61¼	477	Includes Anstey and Cropston		
Thurlaston ... ..	151	0	193	157	3	0	0	122	626			

Thurnby	...	...	...	51	0	33	44	2	1	24	24	179	Includes Stoughton		
Tugby	...	...	...	44	0	30	67	0	0	24	3	168	Includes East Norton		
Twycross	...	...	...	118½	0	104½	67	¼	0	2	27½	319½			
Twyford	...	...	...	66½	0	47½	24½	0	0	84½	15	238			
Waltham-on-the-wolds	...	...	...	74	0	100	140	4	15 (peas & beans)		103	436			
Wanlip	...	...	...	50	0	38	19	1	0	0	45	153			
Welham	...	...	...	4	0	3	10	¼	1 (peas & beans)		0	18½			
Whetstone	...	...	...	174	0	148	118	4	12	0	76	532			
Whitwick	...	...	...	307	0	179	291	14	111 (peas & beans)		43	945	Includes its Hamlets		
Willoughby Waterless	...	...	...	71	0	30½	107¼	3	9	4	27½	252¼			
Wistow	...	...	...	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6			
Witherley	...	...	...	84	0	64	104	4	8 (peas, beans, vetches)		5	269			
Worthington	...	...	...	150	0	70	60	4	100 (peas & beans)		0	384	+ 60 acres of 'dills' grown		
Wyfordby	...	...	...	18½	0	12½	23½	0	0	8½	1½	64½			
Wymeswold	...	...	...	230	0	130	187	5	95	0	30	677			
Wymondham	...	...	...	57	0	93	80	8	17 (peas & beans)		60	315			
<b>TOTALS</b>				...	...	...	15,832	73	15,057	14,105	746	4,882	6,564	57,259	
				(to nearest acre)											

NOTE.—The acreages of Bringhurst are stated to be 'According to the Customary Computed Measure which does not contain more than three Roods per Acre Chain Measure'; but they have not been translated into statute acres in the above table.