

FARNBOROUGH MANOR IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES.

BY M. F. BOND, M.A.

IN Volume LVII of *Archæologia Cantiana* (1944) there was printed the earliest of a series of Court Rolls belonging to the manor of Farnborough, Kent, and now kept at Beaumont College, Old Windsor. Since then the late Mr. H. W. Knocker, F.S.A., of Westerham most kindly allowed me to read and transcribe a number of letters and other documents connected with the manor then in his possession.¹ Difficulties in the narrative that was pieced together from these sources have been overcome as the result of a search in the archives of the Duchy of Lancaster very kindly made by the Chief Clerk of the Duchy, Mr. R. Somerville (by whose permission I transcribed various Duchy records).

It is impossible to print the court rolls and other MSS. *in extenso*, but since they have a certain general interest some notes on their contents are offered here. They illustrate the tenacity of manorialism and the concern of eighteenth century gentry for their manorial rights. The MSS. themselves also provide evidence of place names and of families supplementing the two existing works on local history: *Farnborough and its Surroundings* by J. Harland Blandford (1912), published by E. Clarke & Sons Ltd., and the *Parish Registers of Farnborough Kent (1538-1812)* by Henry Wilson.

The Manor of Farnborough had been a fee of the Dukes of Lancaster in the Middle Ages.² From 1485 the manorial descent followed the crown, and the manor was accordingly administered by the office of the Duchy of Lancaster. Its exact extent, however, was not entirely clear. A Parliamentary Survey made in July 1652 included five townships within the liberty of the Court Leet: Farnborough, Chelsfield, West Wickham, St. Paul's Cray, and Keston. This omitted, perhaps for lack of evidence, the neighbouring village of Lullingstone which had been included in 1408 and appeared again in 1676 and later. Most of the manorial estates were in Farnborough, but there was at

¹ My debt of gratitude to this great authority on Kentish manors has been considerable. Shortly before his death Mr. Knocker very kindly read my transcripts of the Farnborough rolls and made some valuable suggestions on their interpretation. I would also like to express my thanks to Miss Irene Churchill, D.Phil., F.S.A., Assistant Librarian at Lambeth Palace, for generous help and encouragement.

² Hasted, *Kent*, Vol. I, 1778 (pp. 113-4) notes the main stages in the descent. Simon de Montfort held the manor of Farnborough until his death in 1266. Then it was seized and given to Edmund Earl of Lancaster. It was entailed by Henry IV on his son and his heirs, but Edward IV annexed it to himself and his heirs.

least one piece of land in St. Paul's Cray and, also, Court Lodge in Chelsfield.

The income from the manor was appreciable. The rents due from cottages and plots of land amounted to £1 16s. 2d. (in 1652); a century later, in 1789, the rents were £1 16s. 10d. An average of £5 16s. 8d. was said to be produced by court fines, pickage, package and stallage at Farnborough Fair and by stray windfalls, such as the stolen mare forfeit to the King in 1617. The fines included the sums of money due to the lord on the death of tenants and on the alienation of their property. These varied greatly and occurred spasmodically: there was £42 19s. 6d. in 1737, but only £3 3s. in 1747 and £11 11s. in 1755. The total income does not seem to have amounted to more than £10 a year on the average, but this would have to be multiplied by about 5 to reach 1939 price levels and by still more to-day. The fines recorded in 1737 were rather more than the income of the country parson "passing rich on £40 a year."

In addition, the possession of a manor brought a certain dignity in the county, and some customary manorial rights summarized in the leases as "Commons Wastes Heaths Furzes Moors and Marshes and Void Ground."¹ It was thought in 1816 that it would be impossible to assert a right of Free Warren since in order to do that it had first to be proved what were the demesnes in the reign of Edward I, an impossible task for the Duchy lawyers! Moreover Non-User for a considerable length of time was bound to defeat any claim to this right.² If exerted, this right gave the lord sole and exclusive power of killing beasts and fowls of warren. The lessees seem to have insisted on their right to hunt and fish within the properties of the local land-owners as well as over manorial wastes and commons. It was decided, also in 1816, that the lord could not cut the trees on the waste, but at the same time it was pointed out that the legal ownership of the waste and commons by every lord of the manor would, in Farnborough, as elsewhere, prove valuable if enclosure took place. Then the lord would receive an equivalent in enclosed land for the amount of waste in the unenclosed village.

There were thus a number of rights vested in the lord together with some claims that might seem at least arguable to a lord or his lessee. Accordingly the manor exchanged hands for quite considerable sums. In 1765 Francis Russell of the Duchy Office paid £40 as a fine on taking up the lease at a yearly rent of 13s. 10d. and managed later to sell the lease to Mr. Walpole for £100. The whole manor was sold in 1823 to John Ward for £1,560.

The manor indeed seems to have been largely a piece of property to

¹ *Book of Grants 1818-1823*, fo. 217. Duchy of Lancaster archives.

² See *Cases and Opinions 1812-1824*, fo. 91 following, Opinion relating to the Manor of Farnborough. Duchy of Lancaster archives.

be traded in search of profit ; a simple cash nexus bound the lord and the peasants. For example, Francis Russell¹ soon after his original lease of the manor from the Duchy wrote to a potential purchaser, Thomas Nuthall, in 1766 :

Dutchy Office Wedny Morning

DEAR SIR,

It seems strange that the Owner of an Estate should not be able to show it to a Purchaser,—But this is my Case,—Mr Wynne of Farnborough, near the George Inn, has acted for many years past as Bailiff of the Manor and has received the Rents,—I presume he can shew you the Extent of it as he has liv'd in the parish of Farnborough from his Infancy,—Sir John Dyke has of late years set up a Right to the Royalty of his farm within the parish of Farnborough called Farnborough Hall, and as Farnborough Hall farm is undoubtedly within the parish and Lordship of Farnboro' and no mention of any such place as a manor, is made in the Survey of Oliver Cromwell, I do conclude that Farnborough Hall is not a distinct Manor of itself and that Sir John Dyke has no other Right to the Royalty therof than any other Owner of Lands within the parish have over them.

I am

mt truly yrs

FRAS. RUSSELL

To Thos. Nuthall Esqr
Crosby Square.

Mr. Russell was clearly more cognisant of manorial rights and income than of the local extent and appearance of the manor. The final purchaser was not Mr. Nuthall but the Hon. Thomas Walpole, M.P. (b. 1727, d. 1803)² whose father, the 1st Baron Walpole, was brother to the famous Prime Minister, Sir Robert Walpole, 1st Earl of Orford.

The Sir John Dyke mentioned in the letter was Sir John Dixon Dyke who succeeded to the Dyke baronetcy in 1756 and died in 1810. He was a local magnate of importance who lived at Lullingstone Castle and owned nearly the whole of the village there as well as the castle and

¹ Francis Russell appears to no great advantage in the history of Farnborough but in fact he was a man of ability and even eminence. His father had been Town Clerk of Basingstoke. Francis Russell became Receiver of the Duchy in the South parts in 1763, and in 1775 was made Surveyor of Lands and Woods in the South parts of the Duchy. It is thought he also acted for a time as Deputy Clerk of Council. He did much to reform and resuscitate the Duchy and seems to have earned amply the important post he gained when he left the Duchy Office, of Solicitor to the Board of Control for India.

² Hasted (op. cit.) seems to confuse two members of the Walpole family. He says that in 1766 Sir Edward Walpole, Knight of the Bath, obtained a grant of the manor under the seal of the Duchy Court. There is no record of this, and W. H. Ireland is obviously correct in saying that the Hon. Thomas Walpole gained the grant. (*History of the County of Kent*, 1830, p. 494.)

manor of Eynsford-cum-Southcourt, also in Kent. Sir John had considerably improved his estates and seemed determined to extract every possible penny of income from them. His farm of Farnborough Hall was extensive. It was described in a private Act of Parliament passed in 1756 as "All that capital messuage and farm called Farnborough Hall with its appurtenances, and 350 acres of arable pasture and woodland within the parish of Farnborough, and all that messuage with its appurtenances and 175 acres of arable, pasture and woodland in the same parish." Since the lord of the manor of Farnborough had no local house or farm Sir John probably seemed to the villagers to be the "squire," and it must have been galling for him to lack in Farnborough the dignity of "Lord of the Manor" which he in fact possessed in Lullingstone. Moreover, his lordship in Lullingstone was affected by the claim of the lord of the manor of Farnborough to paramountcy over the lords of the manors of Keston, Chelsfield, West Wickham and Lullingstone. (Paramountcy in English law signified that the inferior lordships had once been granted out of the superior and formed together with it an "honour." The paramount lord then received feudal profits from the inferior lords.) Thus both at home and in the neighbouring country the lord of the manor of Farnborough was a continual source of annoyance to the Dykes. Sir John, therefore, initiated a counter-attack on the Farnborough Manor.

An opportunity had already presented itself. In the manorial court of 6 August 1737 the jurors had presented that John Fisher late of Croydon,¹ had died about February 1735 in possession of the George Inn and 29 acres belonging to the manor of Farnborough, which in the absence of heirs, consequently escheated to the King as lord of the manor of Farnborough. Immediately three claimants appeared for the property. John Broome, Esq., reported the escheat to the Treasury and claimed it as its "discoverer." William Lamman, an agent of the Manorial Steward, John Crawford, claimed it for himself (or his master?) as "discoverer" to the Chancellor of the Duchy. But also Mr. John Dyke (as he then was) claimed the escheat as Lord of the Manor—not of Farnborough, nor of Lullingstone, but of the manor which he himself appears to have invented, of Farnborough Hall. Whilst Broome and Lamman pursued their suits in London and spent a great deal of money on them, John Dyke simply installed some new tenants in the George Inn and collected the rents for himself. He continued to profit from the Inn since Lamman and Broome despaired of any conclusion to the case in the Duchy Court and seem to have agreed with John Dyke to retire from the case, no doubt for a

¹ The book of *Cases and Opinions* 1763-1801 in the Duchy archives includes the "general story of John Fisher." He was an orphan left by some unknown person in a fish basket on Fish Street Hill where he was found and brought up by the parish. At his death he was quite prosperous, owning several scattered properties as well as his Inn.

consideration. The Manorial Court continued to present an escheat, a second time on 1 August 1749 and a third on 20 May 1755 without achieving anything at all.

This unscrupulous method of acquiring lordship and income is referred to in a letter written by Francis Russell to the new lessee, Mr. Walpole. He also excuses himself rather oddly for what may have been his over-anxiety to sell :

DEAR SIR,

I own my letter to you savor'd of a Request to borrow Money, but I did not mean it ; for I have a rich Brother in Hampshire who all ways supplys me if I want—I have no Connections at Farnboro' and therefore [*sic*] the manor is of no use to me, or I assure you a much greater Sum than I ask shd not tempt me to sell it—The Attorney Genl has given his opinion about the George Inn and Meadow Land in Favour of the Crown and the Duchy Court have ordered a Prosecution—If the Crown recover the Estate, the Lessee of the manor will have a Preference to a Lease of them—I do not mention this as a Temptation to you, but merely for Information—I did not mean to desire you to agree for the manor at a moment's Warning ; but I wish you could consider it and give me your answer in a Fortnight.

I beg pardon for being troublesome & with many Thanks for your obliging Proffer of money, remain

very truly yours

FRAS RUSSELL

To the Honble Mr Walpole
new Broad Street
London.

The Duchy Court¹ made an order which was served on Sir John Dyke personally threatening an action in the Court to recover possession unless Sir John showed good cause to the contrary. Sir John presumably did refrain from pursuing his claim, for there is no record of further action, although in succeeding generations his family remained hostile to the manor of Farnborough and its lessees.²

In 1787 the manor was leased to James Bond esq. at a yearly rent of 20s. He too had difficulty in acquiring his rightful income ; he

¹ The Court of Duchy Chamber, a court held by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster from about 1485. It exercised an equitable jurisdiction in cases concerning lands which were parcel of the Duchy. The Court has never been abolished but it has not sat since 1835. (Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, Vol. I, 3rd ed., pp. 114-17.)

² That it took over 30 years to settle the escheat of the George Inn is an example not only of the law's delays in the eighteenth century but of the ineffective and easy-going ways of the Duchy. Mr. A. L. Rowse makes a parallel comment in *Tudor Cornwall*, (pp. 50-1) when he observes that "The long dormancy of the Duchy (of Cornwall) in the Crown from 1547 to 1603 meant much slackening in administrative efficiency."

could not get the original papers from the steward who had held the previous court, nor any payments from West Wickham or Keston. This time another local gentleman entered the lists against the manorial lord. Sir John Farnaby of Wickham Court¹ seems to have disputed but to have been forced to concede the right of the lord to hunt and fish within the manor. He writes to a friend that Mr. Bond's behaviour was "perfectly Canded and Genteel," but he obviously found the existence of a lord of the manor irritating. Mr. Bond passed his interest to Thomas Cope esq. of Kennington Lane, Bexley, in 1789, and a lease was granted to Mr. Cope for 31 years on 4 January 1812. This he assigned on 19 December 1812 to John Bridge esq. who held it in 1823.

The Manor had been put up for sale on 7 August 1789 by Christie's but was not sold,² and so the leasing from the Duchy continued. On 29 August 1823, however, Messrs. Drivers in Bartholomew Lane succeeded in selling the manor for £1,560 to John Ward esq. of Holwood House, Kent. This sale was unusual, since the Duchy usually retained its properties and until recently had lacked power to sell. An Act of Parliament of 48 Geo. III, however, had given to the Duchy the right to dispose of manors without lands, or with very small quantities, in order to improve Crown Revenues. The Duchy authorities considered the Farnborough lands of little consequence because their properties were intermixed as has been seen with those of private persons, and their rights had to be exercised consequently over the lands of others. However, the manor even when sold retained a tenuous connection with the Crown. John Bridge had granted the manor in fee to John Ward for £710 5s. 6d. and had then surrendered it to the Duchy. Thereupon the Duchy granted Farnborough to Mr. Ward "to hold of His Own Heirs and Successors in right of Our said Duchy of Our Manor of Enfield in our County of Middlesex in free and common Socage freed and discharged of and from all payments of Rents to be rendered and paid."

There was thus a new lord. Immediately the local gentry took alarm. Sir John Dyke had died in 1810 and had been succeeded by his eldest son, Sir Thomas, 4th baronet, who had died in 1813, leaving his younger brother Sir Percival Hart Dyke (*d.* 1846) as owner of Farnborough Hall and lord of the manor of Lullingstone. Sir Percival wrote to a family friend and adviser, George Austen of Sevenoaks :

MY DR AUSTEN

I have found from your Brother yesterday that there was no probability of your being at Maidstone during the Assizes, indeed

¹ Sir John Farnaby had married the heiress of Wickham Court. He was a Lieutenant-Colonel in the 2nd Regiment of Life Guards.

² Messrs. Christie, Manson and Woods tell me that the catalogue of this sale included in this series of documents is extremely interesting, as there is no copy of it in their records (which are otherwise complete). The British Museum lacks a copy also.

if you had, I should not have seen you, for instead of being on the G. Jury I am confined here with a swelled face.. I wanted to have asked you a few questions on a subject that Sir John Farnaby mentioned to me on the last Bromley Bench day, & when he enquired if either Sir Thomas or myself had seen or heard from you. I mean Mr Ward, late purchaser of the Dutchy Manor of Farnboro' More or less he claims, I hear, over us all, & therefore what is the interest of one, applies to 3 or 4 of us. He lately sent a *verbal* message to Sir Thomas thro Staples, to this effect, to enable him to get his Park fence to his satisfaction he wants several acres of my brothers Land, & which he proposed to buy, mentioning as a *Bonus*, a release from the claims he had over us, & he has received no answer as yet, he has asked Staples for a reply & who has promised to see him next monday. At all events we are not desirous of selling under an *assumed right* on his part, which we have, *as yet* always resisted. Sir Charles certainly expressed himself as desirous of sifting it to *the bottom*, we should be willing to do the same, but we must not *ruffle* his *paramount Lordship*, lest he should in the end establish his claim & annoy us. If you have any more enquiries on the subject & can give me any information perhaps it may be for all our advantages, in which case I shall thank you for a line directed to me at Lullingstone. Pray make my best respects to Mrs G.A. & believe me

Yours very sincerely

P. HART DYKE

Preston Hall

Tues.

Mr. Austen however did not produce any helpful information. He replied :

“ . . . It appears to me that this is a very important question for the Lords of those Manors over whom this paramount right is claimed & that it woud be well for them to come to some understg with each other before the Claim is submitted to them & to have it properly investigated. . . . I agree with you that it will not be prudent to resist the Claim unless you can be well satisfied you can gain success—At all events it is right that the Claim should be investigated & it would be better to do it in a friendly way.”

As a result of this temperate and not very encouraging reply Sir Percival demanded that Mr. Ward should state his claims in writing, and in the absence of any further record it seems that they were conceded.

From the history of the lords of the manor we may now turn to the evidence provided by the court rolls as to the working of the manorial

courts. Unfortunately the series of rolls is not complete. The Commissioners who were sent in 1652 to Farnborough in order to enquire into the nature and extent of the property of the late king, then annexed by the Commonwealth, noted that the Courts Leet had been kept regularly but that the "three Weeks Courts" had been discontinued for above 9 or 10 years past. Great confusion prevailed, as the "late Steward of the aforesaid Manor and Liberty was one Lewis who about 9 or 10 years last past went from thence to Oxford to the late King and carried with him the Books and Court Rolls of the aforesaid Liberty."

From that date onwards there were frequent references in the Duchy records to the lack of rolls for Farnborough Manor. At the time of the 1816 lease all the rolls had disappeared, both those of a date prior to 1652 and those of a later date. Only the 1408 roll could be produced, an example, as the Attorney General commented, of "a great neglect as to the rights of the Manor" (*Opinion relating to the Manor of Farnborough in Kent*, 1816). By 1823 the post-1652 rolls had been recovered and were in the hands of the lessee, but the rolls of 1618 and earlier were missing. It was thought that John Crawford when steward of the manor had appropriated many of the Duchy's records in order to sell them. The agent, Lamman, probably aided him, for in 1763 Mrs. Lamman, his widow, said she had sold a sack full of rolls and other documents to a paper and glue manufacturer! Nothing further is known of the history of the rolls until in recent years their present owner, Mr. Brian Tolhurst, found them in a London lawyer's office, saved them from destruction and deposited them at Beaumont College.

Of these rolls the earliest (of 1408) has been printed. Next in date are the Court Leet rolls for 15 April 1617, 6 October 1617, 23 October 1618, 21 October 1619, 17 October 1620 and 9 October 1621. These reveal the usual working of the Court Leet (or as it is entitled here, "Curia Visus Franci Plegii"). A notable feature is that although the liberty stretched to five townships, only two paid their "cert money" and that reluctantly. Few offences were reserved for this court, most being obviously dealt with at the 3-weekly court. A certain ditch in Farnborough, however, running through Thomas Hall's land, had been left unscoured and was a public nuisance (23 October 1618). It was to be cleansed by the next court under penalty of 10s. The perquisites of the court were augmented by a mare brought by "a certain Roger Fillwoade . . . within the Jurisdiction of this View of Frankpledge" which he had stolen, "worth three pound and not more." Fillwoade had then fled, leaving the mare to be seized by the bailliff as forfeit to the king. (A further horse, this time a stray, was seized in 1716.) In addition rents were regularly paid for the manor of Chelsfield (held by military service), and for various parcels

of land : Chacotte farm in Chelsfield, 3 "dayworks"¹ of land on the north of the churchyard, Lamphawe, 5 cottages, one holding and one holding on the waste.

The existing series of rolls then has a gap until 1663. From that date records survive until 1758 of a court combining both the Leet and the Court Baron ; it met at ever increasing intervals. It was now called "Visus Franci plegii cum Curia" and was held before the Steward whose name was enrolled at the head of the entries. (Francis Heath, 1663-5, 1670-3 ; Bernard Powell, 1676 ; John Bennett, 1697 ; Nathaniel Brand, Deputy, 1700-20 ; Thomas Bennett, 1731, 1746-58 ; John Crawford, 1738.) In this court excuses for non-attendance were heard first ; the twelve jurors were sworn, and after a list of all residents had been called over, the absentees were fined. These fines increased in number. In 1663 there were 10 and in 1664, 14, whereas in 1720 there were 32 and in 1737, 27. (After the last date there were no more fines and no excuses.) The absentees totalled about 40 at most courts but there is no means of telling how many attended the court, since only the twelve jurors were named.² Whole villages tended to absent themselves, and so, in 1670, the parishes of Paul's Cray and West Wickham were fined 6d. each—hardly a deterrent to absence !³

As a judicial body the court acted with truly rustic slowness. For example, on 2nd May 1663 Edmund Cole was presented for not keeping the public pathway in repair which led to Ludgate Stile by Alsedears, Three Acres, Whissen's Lands, Westfield and Huttocks. He was ordered to repair it before Michaelmas 1663 under penalty of 40d. fine. The path, however, was still obstructed in 1664, so the fine was increased to £4. The obstruction and consequently the penalty remained unaltered in 1665. In 1666, Joseph Bate, presumably Cole's successor, was held responsible and he was to clear the path before Midsummer's day under penalty of £12 which was to be levied immediately after Midsummer's day if the way was not cleared, from Bate's "goods and chattels," "in determinacione omnium." This was done, and a bye-law was made in 1697 providing for a penalty of £5 if the way was obstructed. The village triumphed, but only after amazing delay.

Similar lethargy was revealed in the courts action against Thomas Norton, Esq. His father, Gravely Norton, had enclosed and encroached on a piece of waste belonging to the manor. A cottage was built upon his, but no action was taken until in 1697 when Thomas Norton,

¹ Land for which a rent of one man's work three days a week on his lord's demesne had been exacted.

² At the assessment for the poor-rate, however, in 1717, 45 inhabitants of Farnborough were assessed. *Farnborough and its Surroundings*. J. H. Blandford, pp. 19 ff.

³ In 1821 the population figures and number of dwellings respectively were : Farnborough, 553 and 91 ; Chelsfield, 756 and 128 ; St. Paul's Cray, 364 and 72 ; Lullingstone, 41 and 5 ; West Wickham, 555 and 86 ; Keston, 252 and 50.

encouraged no doubt by his father's success, encroached on the manorial waste called Chelsfield Green by placing a fence on the east side of it. The 1697 court ordered the removal of the fence and the laying open of both enclosures under the penalties respectively of £5 and 30s. In 1700 fresh penalties of £5 and 40s. were levied, and in 1707 further similar fines were levied and more threatened. These seem to have been effective.

The townships were as recalcitrant as private persons. In 1663 the inhabitants of Farnborough had not repaired their town well. They were ordered to do so before Michaelmas following under penalty of 40d. fine. They did not comply, and in 1664 a fine of £4 was threatened. Then again, there was no common pound for cattle in 1700; one was still lacking in 1731.

In many cases, however, the court controlled details of local life with some success. Small encroachments on waste were removed, ditches were scoured, rights of way defined, stiles replaced and the yoking of hogs enforced (in this case the yoke was a frame of wood attached to the neck of the animal to prevent it from creeping under a fence or gate). Further agricultural business of a non-legal character was also probably conducted but not recorded. The registering of transfers of copyhold land was still one of the most important functions of the manorial court, and eventually, apart from the election of the village officers, became the only business of the court. Rents were probably brought to the court, although their receipt was only recorded in 1823.

The last stage in the history of the manor is represented by the unique court of 19 October 1823. On the roll everything is reminiscent of a seventeenth century "Steward's Guide." The full title is given: Court Leet with the Court Baron; the Steward and Bailiff were present; 12 jurors for the Court Baron were sworn and 3 suitors for the Court Leet. The hayward, borsholder, ale-conner and affeerers were elected. The inhabitants of all seven townships were absent and were fined, being "affeered" by the 2 affeerers. Six encroachments on the waste were presented; an admission was enrolled and £3 17s. 6d. in rents received. This elaborate court, however, seems to have been the last; no further rolls are known to exist, and so remarkable a piece of antiquarianism serves fittingly as the close of the history of an ancient institution.

DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF DOCUMENTS.

1. Court Roll, 1408. Single membrane, written on one side.
2. Court Roll, 25 April 1617, 6 October 1617, 23 October 1618, 7 October 1620, 9 October 1621. Single membrane written closely on both sides.
3. Court Roll. Two membranes joined in single roll. Written on one side. English extracts from the following roll. 1663-5.

4. Court Roll, 2 May 1663, 5 April 1664, 29 April 1665, 31 March 1666. Three large membranes. Frayed and in parts illegible.
 5. Court Roll. Extracts in English from 1666 roll.
 6. Court Roll, 24 October 1670, 4 April 1673. One sheet of paper folded into two pages, written on all four sides.
 7. Court Roll, 20 October 1697, 23 September 1700, 7 October 1707, 1 May 1716. One membrane written closely on both sides.
 8. Court Roll, 23 August 1720, 7 June 1731. Written on one side.
 9. Court Roll, 6 August 1737. Single membrane, written on one side.
 10. Copy of Admission of Thomas Mitchell. 12 August 1737.
 11. Copy of Admission of Allen Dilly. 21 November 1738.
 12. Memorandum concerning the previous admission.
 13. Memorandum concerning admissions of John Hareston, 2 May 1663, of William Styles, 1 November 1732 and of William Wynne, 11 November 1746.
 14. Memorandum concerning surrender of Thomas Styles, 11 November 1746.
 15. Court Roll, 11 August 1747, 1 August 1749, 20 May 1755. Two membranes written on both sides.
 16. Court Roll, 19 October 1823. Written on both sides.
- All the above rolls are the property of Brian Tolhurst, Esq., and are now kept at Beaumont College, Old Windsor.
- It seems likely that no other courts than those recorded above were held between 1663 and 1755, and it is certain that there were no intervening courts between those entered on the same roll.
17. Copy. Parliamentary Survey. 21 June 1652.¹
 18. Copy. Crown Lease to Francis Russell. 30 April 1765.
 19. Order relating to the escheated lands made in the Chamber of the Duchy of Lancaster. 14 March 1767. Copy.
 20. Printed Auction particulars. 7 May 1789.
 21. Printed Auction particulars. 29 August 1823.
 22. Letter, Francis Russell to Thomas Nuthall. 28 May 1766.
 23. Letter, Francis Russell to Hon. Thomas Walpole. 17 February 1767.
 24. Letter, Sir John Farnaby to Francis Austen. n.d.
 25. Letter, Sir Percival Hart Dyke to George Austen. n.d.

¹ The original of this is in the Public Records Office—Exchequer, Augmentation Office, Parliamentary Surveys, Kent, No. 24.

26. Copy, Letter, George Austen to Sir Percival Hart Dyke. 18 March 1824.

27. Letter, Sir Percival Hart Dyke to George Austen. ? April 1824.
Nos. 17-27 were loaned by the late H. W. Knocker, Esq., to the writer.

Reference should also be made to the records in the Duchy Office ; especially to :

28. *Cases and Opinions*, 1763-1801, fo. 131 following. Opinion relating to the Manor of Farnborough in Kent. 15 November 1766. (A complete account of the escheat of the George Inn.)

29. *Cases and Opinions*, 1812-1824, fo. 91. Opinion relating to the Manor of Farnborough. 6 May 1816. (John Bridge had sought a clear statement of his privileges as lessee.)