

The sale of produce from non-commercial gardens in late medieval and early modern England*

by Malcolm Thick

Abstract

This paper explores the question of how much private gardens contributed to the supply of vegetables and fruit available for purchase in late medieval and early modern England. After an introduction describing the sale of crops from many monastic gardens in the later Middle Ages, the paper covers the surplus traded from gardens of both rich and poor in England to the early nineteenth century. Sources used include household accounts, estate records, gardeners' contracts, market records, tithe disputes and contemporary writings on gardening. Overall quantification of the sales of surplus produce is not possible from the data so far discovered but the diverse sources of information give an impression of a significant level of trade in surplus produce of all types: cheap vegetables and fruit sold in the open markets for general consumption and luxury items, pineapples, grapes and the like emanating from stoves and hothouses of the rich.

Earlier studies by this writer and others have considered aspects of commercial gardening in England in the early modern period.¹ This paper is an attempt to assess an aspect of gardening for the market which has not previously been explored: the role of predominantly non-commercial gardens in supplying the market with produce surplus to their owners' requirements. From the earliest writings, English books on gardening linked private with commercial gardening. The pleasure of owning a garden and the benefit to be gained from consuming and selling its produce were summarized in the phrase 'pleasure and profit'. On the first page of the earliest printed English gardening book, Thomas Hill employs the phrase; it recurs in gardening books well into the eighteenth century. Although in Hill's time (the 1560s) 'profit' might have simply meant 'produce', it was acquiring its modern meaning and Hill was certainly aware of the commercial possibilities of gardens. Pleasure and profit occur

* I thank the two anonymous referees whose helpful and constructive comments are reflected in the version of the paper presented here.

¹ Malcolm Thick, 'Market gardening', in Joan Thirsk (ed.), *The agrarian history of England and Wales* [hereafter, *AHEW*], V, 1640–1750 (2 vols, 1985), II, pp. 505–32; id., *The Neat House Gardens* (1998); Maisie Brown, *The market gardens of Barnes and Mortlake* (1985); J. G. L. Burnby and A. E. Robinson, 'Now turned into fair garden plots' (*Stow*) (Edmonton Hundred Historical Society, Occ. paper, new ser. 45, 1983); F. Beavington, 'Early market gardening in Bedfordshire', *Trans. Institute of British Geographers* 37 (1965), pp. 91–100; J. M. Martin, 'The social and economic origins of the Vale of Evesham market gardening industry', *AgHR* 33 (1985), pp. 41–50.

iconographically on the engraved frontispiece of Ralph Austen's *A Treatise of Fruit Trees* in 1657 where clasped hands emerge from cartouches labelled 'profits' and 'pleasures'. The phrase is employed by Leonard Meager in 1697 and 1704, and John Lawrence hoped fruit trees 'may bring pleasure and profit' to his readers in 1727.² But in the eighteenth century the words used to describe private and business gardens became more entangled. 'Kitchen garden', hitherto signifying a vegetable and herb garden next to a private house was used by Stephen Switzer in 1727 to describe *commercial* vegetable gardens around London. Others used this term: for example, the authors of *The Practical Husbandman and Planter* of 1733 and Philip Miller in 1765.³ Here we argue that the mixing of words to describe gardens and their purpose is no accident; it reflects a consistent use of the market by 'non-commercial' gardeners and their employers, to dispose of gluts and make a little money on the side. Gardeners might slide from private into commercial gardening.

Writing of the contribution garden produce made to diet in the later middle ages, Christopher Dyer remarks: 'Documents informing us fully about horticulture, the trade in garden produce, or the consumption of vegetables and fruit are indeed scarce', but he goes on to say that a wide variety of documents *mention* gardens, if only in passing. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the rise of commercial gardening has left more records but the question of how much produce from non-market gardens came onto the market is as difficult to discern in this period as in earlier centuries. In consequence, we will often have to look obliquely at a trade that has left few direct records and decide what we can extrapolate from limited evidence. This paper will first look at late medieval gardens, taking as a case study the gardens of Norwich Cathedral Priory, and then consider private gardens up to the early nineteenth century.⁴

I

The Norwich Cathedral Priory garden accounts cover 34 of the years between 1329 and 1540. They list income received and expenditure made by the head gardener and provide an insight into the running of an institutional garden that yielded surplus produce. The last nine annual accounts are of limited interest because between the end of the fifteenth century and the Dissolution, the gardens were largely leased out and little or no produce was grown or sold by the Priory. Consequently, receipts are mostly of rents, with sales confined to fruit, nuts, and wood – the produce of trees, not annually planted crops.

² Thomas Hill, *The arte of gardening* (1608), p. 1; Leonard Meager, *The new art of gardening* (1697), A2, pp. 88, 95; id., *The compleat English gardner* (1704), A3; Ralph Austen, *A treatise of fruit trees* (1657), frontispiece. The phrase 'pleasure and profit' remained in use for some time after; in 1800 Charles Marshall considered 'the profit and pleasure to be reaped from a good garden' (Charles Marshall, *A plain and easy introduction to gardening* (1800), p. 25) and in 1910 a six-volumed work was published under the editorship of W. P. Wright with the title *Practical gardening for*

pleasure and profit: a complete guide to plant cultivation and practical gardening (1910). For Hill's attitude to sales of garden produce, see below p. 7.

³ Stephen Switzer, *The practical kitchen gardener* (1727), A1; Anon., *The practical husbandman and planter* (1733), p. 145; Philip Miller, *Gardeners kalendar* (1765), p. 145.

⁴ C. C. Dyer, 'Gardens and garden produce in the later middle ages', in C. M. Woolgar, D. Serjeantson and T. Waldron (eds), *Food in medieval England* (2013), p. 27.

Over the years when gardening was carried out by the Priory, several gardens within the monastic precinct are mentioned in the accounts. A typical monastery would have possessed at least a kitchen garden for vegetables, a physic garden for medicinal herbs, and orchards of fruit trees. At Norwich there were also areas of grass which were regularly mown for hay, bee hives yielding wax for sale (the honey never appears in the accounts and was presumably all used by the convent), areas for grazing cattle, and for chickens to run in; a nursery for fruit and timber trees and an orchard of pear and apple trees; a cherry orchard; a fair amount of standing timber, including willow trees, and other woods yielding brushwood and firewood; and fishponds containing pike and roach.

Before the period of leasing, sales from the gardens were broadly of two types: surpluses of produce raised principally for the convent and cash crops. Amongst the former were leeks, porrets, onions, garlic, beans, apples, pears, coleworts, parsley and other herbs, and nuts. The accounts also contain surpluses derived from livestock: milk, eggs, chickens, calves, and cattle. The quantity of vegetables sold varied considerably from year to year, perhaps reflecting the amounts planted or sown but more likely a reflection of variable annual yields. In some years there are no *sales* of a product but some were *purchased* for the convent, perhaps indicating a particularly bad harvest. Tree fruit were notoriously variable in yield. In 1429 apples and pears were sold for a total of £2 2s. 5½d., but in 1405 the total had been only 5s. In most years there were some spare onions to sell, but proceeds varied from nothing in some years to a magnificent £6 1s. 6d. in 1406. Good years for onions often coincided with high takings from colewort sales. On other occasions items appear as both sales and purchases in the same year, milk for instance. Here the explanation is probably that the gardeners' cows were 'dry' for part of the year.

Cash crops were grown to provide extra income. Teasels were regularly harvested and sold, in one year making over a pound for the convent. For a few years madder was raised in some quantity. Both these products were used in the important East Anglian cloth making industry. Faggots and firewood, osiers and timber were sold in many years, as on occasion were nursery trees. Payments for mowing often appear as a garden expense and hay was a regular source of income.

How big was the gardening operation? The make-up of the accounts makes any assessment difficult. Some non-gardening expenditure has to be stripped out and we are left with a profit and loss account consisting of *all* expenditure in cash on the garden and the cash income from sales.⁵ But only the *surplus* was sold, so there is an unknown amount, presumably by far the largest slice, of produce consumed each year by the convent. A further amount of outgoings and income may have been omitted because produce – including plants, seeds, and young trees – was *bartered* with other gardeners. The scale of the unknown may be judged by what is *not* in the accounts: as mentioned above, no sales of honey are recorded but wax sales totalling 9s. 7d. in 1339–40 point to many bee hives in the gardens. Roots (parsnips and carrots) and coleworts were a staple part of monastic diets, being major constituents of pottage, the main

⁵ Certain non-gardening expenses were charged to the gardener's account, presumably to hypothecate the expected surplus on the account against recurring convent expenses, such as quills, parchment, and the upkeep of monks studying at Oxford.

course of Benedictine monks' dinners. Most of those grown must have been used for home consumption because roots are never found amongst the sales, and colewarts only yield a few shillings in most years. Only occasionally do we glimpse transactions involving fowls or cattle and a single entry records expenses relating to fishponds. We can try and get an idea of the whole garden operation by the payments for labour in the gardens. From an exercise, based on the annual accounts for 1406/7, I calculate that the head gardener and the equivalent of 13 full-time workers were employed the year round, and they probably had some help from the monks. This is quite a large workforce.⁶

Trying to index prices over a long period is fraught with difficulty but the highest receipts, from onion sales in 1406–7, would roughly represent £5,800 at today's prices. Total income in 1339–40 would be equivalent to £10,380 today, say about £200 per week. Bear in mind that this figure represents only produce *surplus* to requirements, and excludes bartered transactions and also any unauthorized sales by the gardener on his own account. I conclude that the gardens were, in total, a substantial enterprise, which supplied the convent and made a small but steady contribution to the needs of the City.⁷

The long-standing connection between monasteries and gardening is a commonplace in garden history. The ninth-century plan of St Gall abbey in France, now thought to be a blueprint for an ideal abbey rather than an actual plan, sets out in detail the kitchen garden and the produce to be sown in it. A similar plan of the monastery at Canterbury from the twelfth century also survives. The Cellarer's accounts for Durham Cathedral Priory portray a picture of the gardens there in the fifteenth century not unlike the arrangements at Norwich, with many payments for seeds to stock the kitchen garden and records of produce harvested from it. Durham's gardens contained pigsties, a poultry yard, fishponds and a goose house. There was more than one orchard and the West Orchard contained a coneygarth. A cell of the Priory at Monkwearmouth also had gardens, tended in 1360 by three women on an annual salary. At Ely the monastery had extensive orchards and Glastonbury Abbey not only had gardens within its precinct but also administered gardens at eight nearby manors. Sales of surplus produce are only rarely recorded at Glastonbury but they are more frequent at Beaulieu Abbey in Hampshire, whose accounts, which exist only for the single year 1269–70, record much activity in the gardens and sales including leeks and leek seed, onions, and 5 quarters, 5 bushels of beans sold for 18s. 9d. Wax and honey were also sold.⁸ Battle Abbey

⁶ In 1406/7, excluding the head gardener's wages, £2 11s. 5d. was paid to casual workers in that year. At say 3d. a day, that works out at 1851 person-days. Excluding Sundays and say, 25 saints' days, these casual wages represent an average of 6.5 casual workers every working day. Servants' stipends were £2 15s. 10d., a figure near to the casual wage bill, so add an estimated 6.5 servants and we arrive at a notional workforce, the year round, of 13 workers under a full-time gardener plus any work done by the monks. Of the Premonstratensian order of canons in late Middle Age England, David Knowles concludes: 'while the normal heavy pastoral or agricultural work was done by labourers, garden work and

harvest help was furnished by the canons'. D. Knowles, *The religious orders in England* (3 vols, 1948–59), II, p. 237.

⁷ Gregory Clark, 'The price history of English agriculture, 1209–1914' (2003), faculty.econ.ucdavis.edu/faculty/gclark/papers/Agprice.pdf, accessed 29 June 2016; Kate Morley, Historical UK inflation rates and calculator, inflation.stephenmorley.org, accessed 29 June 2016.

⁸ Paul Mayvaert, 'The medieval monastic garden', in Elizabeth B. MacDougall (ed.), *Medieval gardens* (1986), pp. 24–53; Teresa MacLean, *English medieval gardens* (1981), pp. 203–4.

gardens produced a wide variety of fruit and vegetables and sales of apples, hemp and grass are recorded. Ely was famous for its grapes. Alicia Amherst records that: 'In 1298 as much as twenty-seven gallons of verjuice (*viridi succo*), from the grapes, were sold; and the next year, twenty-one gallons.' In the same year 109s. 8d. was received for pasture and herbage sold in the vineyard, and 25s. 3d. for fruit sold. Sales of surplus garden produce are also recorded in the records of monastic institutions at Ramsay, Abingdon, and Westminster.⁹ It is not unreasonable to conclude that many of the monastic houses in late medieval England were gardening for home consumption and selling surpluses in local markets and that a not insignificant amount of vegetables and fruit were available to the general public from these institutions.

II

Gardens owned by the higher clergy, gentry and aristocracy, as well as ordinary citizens regularly supplied a bustling market with produce in London in the mid-fourteenth century. Alicia Amherst extracted a vivid picture of this market from contemporary records:

It appears that for many years previous to 1345 the gardeners of the Earls, Barons, Bishops, and citizens of London were accustomed to sell their 'pulse, cherries, vegetables, and other wares to their trade pertaining', on a piece of ground 'opposite to the church of S. Austin near the gate of S. Paul's churchyard'. By 1345, however, this fruit and vegetable market had grown to such an extent, and had become so crowded, as to hinder 'persons passing both on foot and on horseback', and the 'scurrility, clamour, and nuisance' of the gardeners and their servants had become so obnoxious 'to the people dwelling in the houses of reputable persons there', and 'such a nuisance to the priests who are singing Matins and Mass in the church of S. Austin, and to others, both clerks and laymen, in prayers and orisons there serving God', that the Mayor and Aldermen were petitioned to interfere, and to remove the market to some more suitable place.

The result of this petition was a meeting of the Mayor and Aldermen, and an order 'given to the said gardeners and their servants, that they should no longer expose their wares aforesaid, for sale in that place, on peril which awaits the same'. The gardeners counter-petitioned, complaining that 'they cannot serve the commonalty, nor yet their masters, as they were wont to do'. After a conference with the Alderman, the market was moved to a more convenient location.¹⁰

Records of the gardens tended by this throng of gardeners are not easy to find but one such belonged to the Bishop of Ely, at his London residence in Holborn. In 1372–3 his gardener sold onions, garlic, leeks, parsley, 'herbage' and pasture for a total of 79s.¹¹ Nearby was another garden, that of the earl of Lincoln, from which, in 1295–6, produce was sold for about £11 in all. A translation of its accounts reveals sales as follows:

⁹ C. M. Woolgar, *The culture of food in England, 1200–1500* (2016), pp. 101–12; Alicia Amherst, *A history of gardening in England* (1895), pp. 1–30; MacLean,

English medieval gardens, pp. 9, 24, 26–7, 34.

¹⁰ Amherst, *History of gardening*, pp. 39–41.

¹¹ MacLean, *English medieval gardens*, p. 25.

- £9 for pears, apples, and great nuts of the garden sold
- 2s. 3d. for cherries of the garden sold
- 8s. 9¾d. for herbs and 'Jeritis' of the garden sold
- 6s. for beans of the garden sold
- 20¾d. for verjuice 'in fobis'
- 12s. 3d. for 49 gallons of verjuice of issue
- 3s. 2d. for roses sold
- 4s. 6d. for herbage of the garden
- 2s. 3d. for hemp of the garden
- 4s. 1¼ d. for onions and garlick sold
- 2s. 6d. 'for little plants [*plancettis* or *plantettis*] of the vines sold'.¹²

The two gardens at Holborn exhaust our direct evidence of sale of surplus produce from non-monastic, private, late medieval gardens but the vivid description of the bustle of the market at St Paul's and the inconvenience it caused indicates that there were many other such gardens around London selling surplus produce. Indirect confirmation comes from contemporary literary sources referring to gardens: Langland's peasants grew a variety of vegetables, and a poor widow depicted by Chaucer had a bed of 'wortes' in her yard.¹³ C. M. Woolgar remarks that 'Gardens were part of the culture of both peasant life and large institutions' in late medieval England, and Christopher Dyer has made a convincing argument for the ubiquity of vegetable gardens nationwide at this time. The frequent mention in manorial records of messuages, cottages with closes, or with curtilages, and archaeological evidence of backyards or back gardens attached to peasants' cottages leads him to the conclusion that: 'As there were about a million households in England in 1300, there must have been a similar number of gardens'. Whilst most peasants would have consumed all the produce of their vegetable gardens, there must have been occasions when a glut gave some surplus to sell. Poorer households would not have had access to preservatives – sugar or quantities of salt – or large containers for preserving fruit and vegetables and so would dispose of surpluses immediately.¹⁴ Richer households most probably would have had more surplus produce: aristocratic families moving between manors or townhouses might spend little time at a house with a productive garden in a given year, allowing the gardener to sell the produce not consumed by the family, either for the benefit of his master, as in the case of the earl of Lincoln above, or on his own account, in which case no records are likely to have been kept. Dyer points out that owners of gardens for which we have records seem to have had little difficulty obtaining seeds or young fruit trees – did these come from other private gardens?¹⁵ The overall conclusion for the late medieval period, albeit on slim evidence, must be that there was more private gardening for fruit and vegetables than hitherto has been supposed and there is good reason to think that at least some of this produce entered the market. Indeed, such surpluses probably *were* the market since no commercial market gardeners have been identified before c.1500 in England.

¹² Amherst, *History of gardening*, p. 35.

¹³ William Langland, *Piers the Plowman*, ed., F. J. Goodridge (1959), p. 89; F. N. Robinson (ed.), *The works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (1966), p. 203.

¹⁴ Woolgar, *Culture of food*, p. 102; Dyer, 'Gardens and garden produce', p. 29.

¹⁵ Dyer, 'Gardens and garden produce', p. 34.

III

At the Dissolution monastic gardens probably ceased to exist. The release of skilled gardeners from monasticism had some impact on gardening – some may have become commercial gardeners and others, gardeners to the upper classes. Gardens of the gentry and aristocracy replaced monasteries as a major source of surplus produce, especially in the countryside, but the prevalence of gardens of all sizes in London is striking. These ranged from the extensive gardens attached to institutions, for instance the many Livery Company halls, the gardens of large mansions such as those on the Strand and the houses of London merchants, to small plots behind very modest private dwellings. It is impossible to say, from the plans of these sites, whether the gardens were ornamental or productive but they had the *potential* to yield garden crops and produce a surplus.¹⁶ Over time they were built on, but new houses with gardens were erected in the suburbs.¹⁷

The sale of surplus produce from private gardens is introduced early in printed English gardening literature. Thomas Hill in the 1560s quoted with approval Varro's and Palladius' recommendation that gardens 'be placst neere to a citie, both for the commodittie of hearbs and rootes for serving to phisicke, as all other hearbes and flowers, which be profitable for the citie', whereas gardens deep in the countryside 'hinder the apte bringing of all kinds of hearbes and flowers unto the market to be solde'. William Lawson, writing before 1618, assumes that private gardens will produce surpluses for sale and John Parkinson implies this in 1629, commenting that kitchen gardens provided 'profits and pleasure' for their owners and 'content and nourishment' for the many.¹⁸

The sale of surpluses from gentry gardens in the London suburbs was well established by the 1630s. Early in the seventeenth century the Gardeners' Company of London attempted to extend its jurisdiction to those selling garden produce within a six-mile radius of London. This aroused strong opposition from gentlemen within this area who had surplus produce to sell, as was somewhat tortuously explained in 1635:

many gentlemen, merchants and others that have houses within the distance aforesaid may as well be considered to bee within the Gardeners patent [and] many of them doe of those sorts of provisions comodities and herbes bring to the marketts what is above ... their owne needs.¹⁹

In the latter part of the seventeenth century John Worlidge sought to encourage husbandmen and labourers in the countryside to create kitchen gardens for vegetables and fruit. Any farmer

¹⁶ Dorian Gerhold, *London plotted* (London Topographical Soc. 178, 2016), pp. 54–5, 59, 66–7, 81, 92, 89, 99, 101, 133–4, 206, 208–9, 232, 234. Plans showing very small houses in Bishopsgate and off Goldsmiths' Alley in 1692, all with gardens, on pp. 108–10, are particularly striking, as are those of former monastic precincts at St Bartholomew's and Greyfriars, which still had extensive gardens in 1613 and 1616, pp. 68–71.

¹⁷ John Stow mentions infilling in the late sixteenth century: off Leadenhall Street was 'a frame of three

fayre houses, set up in the year 1590 in [a] place where before was a large garden plot' (Gerhold, *London plotted*, p. 100).

¹⁸ Hill, *Arte of gardening*, p. 1; William Lawson, *A new orchard and garden* (1618), p. 2; John Parkinson, *Paradisi in sole* (1629), p. 461.

¹⁹ City of London RO, Repertories, 49, fo. 262ff, 9 July 1635. I am indebted to Dr David Marsh for this reference.

could set aside some land for a garden 'wherewith to feed his own family and furnish the market'. Likewise: 'The meanest cottager may well afford that little ground (if he hath any) that is contiguous to his tenement, for the propagation of some or other of these esculents'. But Worlidge sought to accelerate a trend that was already evident:

there is scarce a cottage in most of the *southern* parts of *England*, but hath its proportionable *garden*, so great a delight do most of men take in it; that they may not only please themselves with the view of the flowers, herbs, and trees, as they grow; but furnish themselves and their neighbours upon extraordinary occasions; as nuptials, feasts, and funerals, with the proper products of their *gardens*. It furnishes our kitchen and tables with various esculents, as well satisfying nature, as pleasing our appetites.

He comments that particular vegetables are commonly found in English gardens: of cabbages he says 'Here in England [there is] not a village without them' and 'the constant and vulgar use of them is manifest'. On several occasions he points out that new and improved varieties of vegetable have lately been raised in English kitchen gardens: turnips 'have been very much improved in *England* of late years', more varieties of peas were grown, cucumbers were more common than before.²⁰

A few years before Worlidge, the Oxford nurseryman Ralph Austen had observed:

fruit trees are profitable to the husbandman in respect of sale of the fruits, when a man has more than he can spend in his house; especially to such as live neare some great towne or city, where they are vent at pleasure.²¹

In 1670, one chapter of a book by John Smith describes in detail a 'Garden of Pleasure' where all manner of delightful foods are produced 'to serve your family ... besides the monies made at markets'. Indeed, he concludes: 'If you did know the yearly profit that does arise out of this pleasant land, you would find it sufficient overweight to all your pleasures'.²² Leonard Meager in 1697 advised that a private kitchen garden should be only as large as can be well managed with the labour available, 'and may produce a sufficiency of herbs and roots for use, and a supply for the markets'. Harvested onions not required by the household could be 'disposed of by measure, as the custom for sale is'.²³

Occasionally we have direct evidence of sales by the gentry and aristocracy. For instance in 1604 the gardener at Woolaton Hall paid over to his master five shillings he had received for the sale of parsnips.²⁴ In 1651 a correspondent of Samuel Hartlib wrote about quinces that:

a Gentleman at Prichenel in Essex, who had a tree from beyond Sea, hath the best in England, and hath made above 30 pound of a small piece of ground planted with them, as I

²⁰ John Worlidge, *Systema horti-culturae* (1700), p. 192.
pp. 5–6, 158, 168, 175, 183.

²¹ Austen, *Treatise of fruit trees*, p. 22.

²² John Smith, *England's improvement reviv'd* (1670),

²³ Meager, *New art of gardening*, pp. 88, 95.

²⁴ Mark Dawson, *Plenti and grase: food and drink in a sixteenth century household* (2009), p. 142.

have heard from his own Wife's mouth. And therefore it is by reason of our ill *Husbandry*, that we have Quinces from Flanders.²⁵

Only rarely were detailed accounts of sales from private gardens kept. There are two lists of sales made by the head gardener at Coopersale House in Essex. The earliest, probably from 1740, headed 'Re[ceive]d for things out of the garden', lists 37 sales of 15 different types of produce totalling £1 19s. 0d. Another for 1741 lists sales totalling £3 0s. 11½d. Another apparent instance of selling private garden produce is revealed by a tithe dispute in 1730. William Cox Rector of Kingsdon, a small village in Somerset, alleged that a yeoman, James Evans, was refusing to pay tithes on the produce of a large garden and orchard. He lists the produce of this as apples, pears, nectarines, plums peaches, cherries, nuts, apricots, carrots, parsnips, turnips, cabbages, potatoes, 'and other kinds of fruits and roots from time to time'. The produce reads like that of a well-ordered kitchen garden for supplying a household but William Cox claims that Evans has 'carryd off & sold' some of the vegetables and fruit and refuses to account for the sales.²⁶

An even fuller account of the range of produce a well-kept private garden might produce was provided by John King, Rector of Chelsea, who, in 1702, alleged that the late Duke and the Duchess of Beaufort had evaded tithes for years on the 15-acre garden around their house in Chelsea. The garden was, he said, 'very well planted and furnished with all sorts good fruit trees, flowers, greens and all manner of herbs plants and other garden stuff'. He goes on to list over 50 varieties of vegetables, salads, and herbs grown there. The garden, an acre of which had been at some time leased to a market gardener, was managed by William Oram who, since 1694 was said to 'yearley ... pull, gather, sell and dispose of ye said fruit, flowers, herbs, plants, garden stuff and greens which happened renewed grew and increased thereupon to ye yearly value of 250 li or thereabouts'. The Beauforts claimed that a composition for tithes had been agreed with Dr King's predecessor but King said they did not pay him this. At other times it was claimed that the whole garden was leased to Oram and that and he should pay the tithe. The Rector believed these excuses to be just delaying tactics. It is not difficult to believe the estimate of £250 for annual sales of such a diverse range of produce.²⁷

The relative rarity of records of sales from gardens in estate accounts may be because, as was probably the case at Beaufort House, head gardeners were allowed to sell produce on their own account according to their contracts. Head gardeners were commonly on annual contracts. Some, like John Hopkins, gardener to Lord Petre at Ingotstone Hall in 1704, received only an annual wage (the relatively high sum of £80 in his case), but many were paid less cash and given the right to keep the proceeds from the sale of garden surpluses. William Lawson advised in 1618, 'The house being served, fallen fruit, superfluity of hearbs, and flowers, seeds, grasses, sets, and besides all other of that fruit which your bountifull hand shall reward him

²⁵ Part of a letter from Robert Child to Samuel Hartlib, dated 1651, reproduced in *Samuel Hartlib, his legacy of husbandry* (1655), p. 18.

²⁶ Somerset Heritage Centre, DD/S/BT25/1/12; Essex RO, D/DU/363/4, fo. 97 (see appendix).

²⁷ Gloucestershire Archives, D2700/QJ5/3. Mary,

Duchess of Beaufort was a keen botanist who took great interest in her gardens. She did, however, dislike the Chelsea house and may have either leased the garden to Oram or allowed him to sell produce from it after the Duke died in 1700. Molly McCain, *Beaufort, the Duke and his Duchess, 1657-1715* (2001), pp. 103, 120-2.

withal, will much augment his wages'. John Evelyn, in a manuscript written probably in the 1690s, laying down detailed rules for the conduct of his gardener, which he also conceived as a template for other gentlemen, is cautious about allowing his gardener to sell garden ware but he reminds us of the many types of produce a gardener could potentially dispose of:

He may not dispose of any the above said fruit [i.e. all orchard fruits and nuts] nor sell any artichock, cabbages, asparagus, melons, strawberries, rasberries, wall, or standard and dwarfe fruite, roses, violets, cloves, or any greenes, or other flowers or plants, without first asking, and having leave of his Master or Mistress, nor till there be sufficient of all garden furniture for the Grounds stock and families use.²⁸

A gardener's contract at Londesborough, Yorkshire, of 1704, stipulated that, 'The gardener was allowed to take all the fruit of the gardens and orchards except for that needed by the steward or agent'. Joseph Plummer, gardener to the Freeman Family at Hammels in Hertfordshire, was, in 1716, paid a cash wage 'over and above the benefit of the fruit of the said gardens' and in the same period the gardener at Knole in Kent was told that all fruit was reserved for his Lord's use: 'And that he may have the liberty and privilege of desposing of for his own particular use all such beans, pease, cabbidges and other kitchen herbs as shall be spared over and above what is used in my lord's kitchen'.²⁹ An apparently very generous agreement seems to have been made with Cadwallider Morgan, gardener at Quickwood, one of the manors owned by William Cecil, second earl of Salisbury. When Cecil and family stayed in the house for a time in 1634 Morgan was *paid* £3 for 'Fruit brought to the table, the 3 November'. This high figure may represent a reward for producing out-of-season fruit but it implies that Morgan had the right to all sales of produce, including that supplied to his master, maybe to compensate for wages of only £5 per annum.³⁰

David Marsh has found that a succession of gardeners to the Archbishops of Canterbury had rights to sell surplus produce beginning with Francis Lovedale, the gardener for Archbishop Abbott (1611–33), who was paid 20 Nobles (£6 6s. 8d.) and received two liveries or an allowance for them. 'Hee had likewise the benefitt of all herbs, flowers and rootes, cabbages and such like things by him sowed set or planted in the garden over and above what was for my lord's owne use'. In 1705 a detailed job description was drawn up for the gardener at Lambeth Palace, which included the following:

He is to have the profit of the garden against the kitchen door, salading when the Archb[isho]p is there excepted ... He is to have the profit of the orchard next the brewhouse except fruit on trees and walls with the exception of strawberries.³¹

²⁸ Essex RO, D/DPE 26, fo. 256; Lawson, *New orchard and garden*, p. 2; John Evelyn, *Directions for the gardiner and other horticultural advice*, ed., Maggie Campbell-Culver (2009), p. 123.

²⁹ Barbara English, *The great landowners of east Yorkshire, 1530–1910* (1990), p. 223; Anne Rowe (ed.), *Garden making and the Freman family: a memoir of Hamels, 1713–1733* (Hertfordshire Record Publications,

17, 2001), pp. 43; Sally O'Halloran and Jan Woudstra, "Keeping the garden at Knolle": the gardeners of Knole in Sevenoaks, Kent, 1622–1711', *Garden Hist.* 30 (2012), pp. 34–55.

³⁰ L. M. Munby (ed.), *Early Stuart household accounts* (1986) (Herts. Rec. Soc. 2, 1986), pp. xvi, xix.

³¹ I am greatly indebted to Dr David Marsh for these references.

An engraving of Londesborough of c.1700 shows a large kitchen garden and at least 300 fruit trees, regularly spaced. There was much interest amongst the gentry and aristocracy from the late seventeenth century onwards in fruit growing: this is reflected in the ever lengthening lists of fruit trees available in nurserymen's catalogues or listed in gardening manuals, surviving bills for trees supplied, as well as views of country seats showing large orchards near the house. Despite the size of these orchards (augmented by 'wall-fruit' trained on the warm walls of kitchen gardens), it is noticeable that Lawson only includes *fallen* fruit in his proposed contract and other agreements exclude fruit altogether. There are several possible reasons for this. Fruit was high-status product when compared with root crops and cabbages, and the family may have desired all that was available. Also, fruit was preservable: apples, pears, and other hard fruits could be stored in cool, dark rooms on wooden shelves. Over time these 'conservatories' became more sophisticated, with ranks of drawers to keep the fruit in. More delicate fruit was preserved in sugar syrup. Preserved fruit (known as 'banqueting stuff') was used for desserts and was a particularly high-status food throughout this period.³²

Another reason for not giving head gardeners the right to sell fruit was that produce from private orchards could, in areas near London and other large towns, be sold with little effort to fruiterers. These professional fruit traders would buy, at a discounted market price, whole orchards of fruit, often before the crop was ripe, from both private and commercial orchards. In due course they would harvest, pack, transport, store and sell the fruit. Richard Bradley explained this process to a gentleman who had asked him for advice in the 1720s:

I know very well, that when Fruiterers go about the Country to buy Orchards of Fruit, their price is not always at this rate; for they run the hazard of loss, either by blasts or high winds; they are at the expense of gathering, carriage, and house-room to keep the fruit 'till the proper season for exposing it in the markets; and then there may be a great loss by untimely or accidental rotting of the fruit; so that their first price in the orchard cannot be above half as much as perhaps the fruit will sell for in the market.³³

This process was well established in Kent by the second half of the seventeenth century. John Boys, writing of Kentish orchards in 1813 explained: 'The sorts of apples for domestic uses are sold to fruiterers, who send them to London by the hoys, and to the North of England by the coal vessels'. A successful fruiterer relied on his skill in collection, transport, and storage of fruit, which is why the pamphlet published in 1604, *The Fruiterers Secrets*, was almost exclusively concerned with these matters.³⁴

John Hook, gardener at Brickwall House in Sussex was more fortunate than many gardeners. His contract in 1748 allowed him to sell 'such parts of the beans, pease, cabbage, carrots, parsnips etc ... as are not wanting for his master's table or use'. He was also allowed to sell 'all

³² *The husband mans fruitful orchard* (n.d., c.1618), pp. 110–11, appended to Lawson, *New orchard and garden*; J. C. Loudon, *An encyclopaedia of gardening* (1824), pp. 335–6. Richard Bradley lists 65 varieties of plums alone, in 1726; *A general treatise on husbandry and gardening* (1726), pp. 286–97.

³³ Bradley, *General treatise*, p. 353.

³⁴ Alan Everitt, 'The marketing of agricultural produce', in Joan Thirsk (ed.), *AHEW*, IV, 1500–1640 (1967), pp. 510–11; John Boys, *General view of the agriculture of Kent* (1813), p. 122; N.F., *The fruiterers secrets* (1604).

such apples, winter pears, raspberries and gooseberries' that were not wanted by the household. He was, however, 'to have no liberty of selling or disposing of any of the wall fruit, cherries or plumbs'. The 'wall fruit' was likely to have included peaches, apricots, nectarines and grapes: in other words, the choicest fruit. Such fruit might command high prices in London but the highest prices were paid for exotic fruit grown with the aid of glass and heat. In the 1770s, James Cook, a London fruiterer, complained that eight of a batch of pineapples sent to him by the earl of Dorset from his garden at Knole in Kent were bad. For the remainder he offered 4s. the pound but he was loathe to pay half a crown (2s. 6d.) a pound for the grapes he received from the same garden. Note that these were wholesale prices: the fruiterer would add his mark-up when selling from his shop in Covent Garden.³⁵

Even without the specific right to sell the best fruit, gardeners often had ample scope to make money from sales of other produce. In many cases gentry or noble families were absent from their country homes for considerable periods of the year. They may, like the Cecils, have moved to other properties, or gone to London or a major provincial town to live. The absence of the family, together with many of the servants, allowed a gardener to sell produce not required by the reduced household. In any case, allowing the gardener to sell surpluses gave him an incentive to maximize the amount and quality of his output, to the mutual benefit of himself and his master. We must also bear in mind that head gardeners, especially those employed by nobleman, sometimes embodied the merging of commercial and private gardening by combining the job of head gardener with that of commercial nurseryman. For instance John Field, long-time gardener to the earl of Bedford at Woburn, was also a partner in Brompton Park, the pre-eminent nursery garden in England, in the 1680s.³⁶

Head gardeners, and individual private gardeners in and near London may have disposed of surplus produce at Covent Garden, the principal London fruit and vegetable market in the eighteenth century, only turning up when they had produce for sale. In 1748 'chance gardeners, not having yearly stands' were charged 2s. a day for selling produce. 'Chance Gardners' and 'Higlers' paid £79 12s. in tolls in 1747, compared with the £239 4s. in total received from those with yearly stands, so roughly 25 per cent of individual gardeners' stallage came from casual sellers. But this may underestimate casual traders because a paper on the 'Present state of Covent Garden markt' and ways to improve it dated May 1748 claims that 'numbers of people supply ye market att all ye seasons with unknown quantities of Goods, subjectt to no toles, much complained by ye cuntry gardners, yearly tennants, and others paying ye market dues'.³⁷ On a much smaller scale, gardeners attended a weekly market at Billericay in the early eighteenth century. Total market tolls from gardeners ranged from nothing or 2d. or 3d. in January to well over a shilling in high summer, a pattern which may indicate that private gardeners were bringing seasonal surpluses to market.³⁸

As well as selling in the open market, head gardeners traded with each other: plants and seeds were bought and sold between one country house garden and another. Sometimes

³⁵ East Sussex RO, FRE 8087; Kent History and Library Centre, U269/E434/5. (1937), p. 252.

³⁶ English, *Great landowners*, p. 208; Gladys S. Thomson, *Life in a noble household, 1641-1700*

³⁷ London Metropolitan Archives, E/BER/CG/E10/4.

³⁸ Essex RO, D/DP M992.

prices were noted, on occasion no doubt, the transaction was a barter, and at other times the arrangement was classed as a 'gift' which was nevertheless rewarded. The accounts of the Willoughby family of Nottinghamshire in the sixteenth century record many gifts of garden produce from the gardens of other gentry.³⁹

The blurring of business and pleasure in gardening is exemplified by Richard Bradley's advice in the 1720 to a gentleman requesting suggestions for the use of a one-acre 'piece of ground, which you design to make into a garden of profit' situated near London. Bradley gives detailed advice, including likely profits of employing this plot in the raising of turkeys, chickens and ducks, fish of various sorts in ponds, an artificial rabbit warren, an orchard of a variety of fruits and kitchen garden ground. He concludes 'And you have the pleasure of enjoying all these at your own time, and in the highest perfection'. But the emphasis throughout is on selling produce in London markets as well as consuming it: each suggestion is costed, and a total net profit £46 1s. *od.* calculated if all was sold.⁴⁰

Sales by those at the bottom of the social ladder, cottagers and labourers, are particularly difficult to find but we can speculate that, especially in rural areas, 'gifts' from poor people to the local gentry may, in effect, be casual sales of garden produce. Ben Jonson in his poem in praise of Penshurst, a country house in Kent, thinks it bountiful and needing no gifts of produce. Nevertheless he laments:

But all come in, the farmer and the clown;
And no one empty-handed, to salute
Thy lord and lady, though they have no suit.
Some bring a capon, some a rural cake,
Some nuts, some apples; some that think they make
The better cheeses, bring 'em; or else send
By their ripe daughters, whom they would commend
This way to husbands; and whose baskets bear
An emblem of themselves in plum, or pear.⁴¹

The apples, nuts, plums and pears no doubt came from cottage or farmhouse gardens, as did the 'dysse of pears for a present' from a 'pore woman' delivered to Haddon Hall in 1599, the cherries brought by William Bird's wife to Naworth Castle in Cumberland in July 1612, and the melons donated to Sir Arthur Throckmorton in 1593 by a local woman. The Willoughby household accounts record many gifts – nuts, apples, strawberries, and cherries – from poor people. A dish of artichokes was among the food gifts given to Sir Edward Wise at Sydenham in 1656 and a Hereford gentlewoman received damsons, apples and quinces in 1639–40. Such gifts were rewarded by gratuities: for instance the poor woman in 1599 got *6d.* for her trouble. The Hereford gentlewoman Joyce Jeffries paid between *4d.* and a shilling for her fruit, Sir Edward Wise shelled out a shilling for various gifts of food although his accountant thought them worth *4s.* while William Bird's wife was rewarded *2s. 6d.* There may have been mixed

³⁹ Dawson, *Plenti and grase*, pp. 146–7.

⁴⁰ Bradley, *General treatise*, pp. 338–61.

⁴¹ Thomson, *Life in a noble household*, p. 255; Ben

Jonson, 'To Penshurst' in Alastair Fowler (ed.), *The county house poem* (1994), p. 55.

motives for these gifts – tenants needed to keep in with their landlords – but it is possible to see them as casual sales from the gardens of the poor because a money reward was usually given. Bear in mind that Joyce Jeffries paid 6*d.* a day plus diet for casual gardening work, so in comparison 4*d.* for quinces and a shilling for damsons are commercial transactions and William Bird's wife was handsomely rewarded.⁴²

In Norfolk, the Le Strange household's kitchen books between 1613 and 1627 record almost 1500 gifts of 126 different sorts of food from 317 people. Ordinary vegetables were not gifted but there were 78 instances of apples given, 48 of codlings, 69 of pears, and 38 of peas – one assumes early peas. Occasional gifts of more exotic fruits, such as grapes, were usually donated by wealthier households. There is no indication in the accounts that these were commercial transactions, they may have simply been part of the bonds which held society together at this time, but some of the circumstances point to commerce: at least two-thirds of the gifts elicited immediate reward; the rewards were much more than mere tips to the bringers and some seem to have been linked to the value of the gift; some of the women who made gifts specialized in certain commodities.⁴³

Encouragement to the rural poor to adopt gardening, both for their own kitchens and for the market, continued to be given into the nineteenth century. In an article on 'Cottage gardens for the poor' in 1837, it was claimed 'by means of a not very large garden, a man may obtain sufficient culinary vegetables for a moderately large family, and even have some to dispose of in other ways'.⁴⁴

Higher up the social scale, by the second half of the eighteenth century the purchasers of gardening books were, to some writers at least, assumed to be producers for the markets as well as their own households. In a book addressed to 'gentlemen of ample fortune', John Gibson in 1768 favoured apples and pears amongst tree fruit because

the trees not only thrive vigorously in many places, but also bear plentifully, the fruits are not hurt by being carried to market, and are readily sold for good price ... gentlemen cannot employ their grounds to better purpose ... so profitable as the planting of orchards.

He also thought, if a market was at hand, 'summer fruit ... bring the most money' and plums were profitable: 'Near great towns, where there is a demand and a ready sale'. Samuel Fullmer in 1781 advised digging up bulbs when they were dormant, 'for sale, or to send any distance', and also gave advice on raising Myrtle cuttings 'to those who raise them for sale'. In a much reissued book for gentleman and gardeners it is assumed that surplus produce from a kitchen

⁴² 'Haddon Hall Steward's accounts, June 1549', *J. Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Soc.* 16 (1894), pp. 60–80; Dawson, *Plenti and grase*, pp. 147, 150; Gray Todd (ed.), *Devon Household Accounts, 1627–59*, I, *Sir Richard and Lady Lucy Reynell of Forde (1627–48); John Willoughby of Leyhill (1644–6); and Sir Edward Wise of Sydenham (1655–9)* (Devon and Cornwall Rec. Soc., 38, 1995); Judith M. Spicksley (ed.), *Business and household accounts of Joyce Jeffreys, spinster of Hereford, August 1639–November 1640* (2012); Rev. George Ormsby (ed.), *Selections from the household books of the*

Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle (Surtees Soc., 68, 1877), pp. 29–32; Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Sir Arthur Throckmorton's Diary, vol. II, fo. 118. I thank Margaret Willes for the previous two references.

⁴³ Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths, *Consumption and gender in the early seventeenth-century household: the world of Alice Le Strange* (2012), pp. 72, 77–93. I thank Jon Stobart for this reference.

⁴⁴ 'On cottage gardens for the poor', in *The Floricultural Magazine*, I, no. XII (May 1837), p. 207.

garden will be sold: horseradish, 'where the large roots are designed for sale', should have their tops cut off; parsley, 'if large quantities are wanted for sale', should be sown in rows; apples, pears are 'very profitable in a family and for market; likewise walnuts 'are always profitable for sale'.⁴⁵

IV

The prosperous middle classes of early nineteenth-century London were, like the aristocracy before them, building pleasant country retreats with gardens. Catering to this demand, John Claudius Loudon turned his attention to the subject of 'A suburban villa or residence' in his *The Suburban Gardener and Villa Companion* of 1838. Loudon described suburban residences and gardens of all sizes. His largest example, the 'First-rate Suburban Garden' (a house, park and farm of between 50 and 100 acres), was an establishment of some sophistication, a cross between a hobby farm and a garden, which in the previous century had come to be called a *ferme ornée*. Although principally a place of pleasure, 'to increase the interest of a *ferme ornée*' cash crops might be tried:

the hop culture might be adopted; or apple pear, cherry, walnut, or filbert orchards might be introduced. A willow-ground would be suitable for some situations; and a coppice of ash trees for walkingsticks, crate-ware, or hop-poles, for others, and so on. Near large towns, the raising of garden crops and small fruits such as currants, gooseberries, raspberries, and strawberries etc. will form a source of interest for the cultivator of the *ferme ornée*, and one which, in some cases, may afford a little profit.

In suitable areas, amateur farmers could try growing for the market madder, woad, liquorice, rhubarb, poppy, and raising seeds for field and garden crops.⁴⁶

Loudon must have realized that he was encouraging a trend that was already well under way: the rich in the London suburbs were already gardening on a significant scale. In 1799 a detailed survey of tithable lands in the suburban parish of Ealing revealed that much land was devoted to market gardening but the gentry were also occupying a large amount of garden ground. Many of the gentry's gardens were walled: market gardens too had some or all of their land walled. Many private gardens were over an acre in extent and some were much larger. General Lassells and Edward Robert Esq. both had gardens exceeding two acres; Richard Meaux had a walled garden of 3¾ acres; and Thomas Wood esq. had one of four acres. All told, the gentry and aristocracy of Ealing occupied 85 acres of garden ground, compared with 289½ acres of commercial garden ground. Bearing in mind what Bradley thought could be done with one acre of suburban garden ground, and the size of the alleged annual sales from the fifteen-acre Beaufort House garden in Chelsea, it is highly likely that there were surpluses from many of the Ealing private gardens to sell at London markets. It may be significant that private gardens

⁴⁵ John Gibson, *The fruit gardener* (1768), pp. 25–6, 246, 270; Samuel Fullmer, *The young gardener's best companion* (1781), pp. 196, 303; Thomas Mawe and John Abercrombie, *Every man his own gardener* (1805), pp. 21,

88, 153, 675–6.

⁴⁶ John Claudius Loudon, *The suburban gardener and villa companion* (1838), pp. 623–52.

there were tithed more heavily than commercial; walled market garden ground was tithed at 20s. the acre, similar private ground attracted tithes of between 23s. and 26s. an acre.⁴⁷ Ealing was just one suburban parish. Some idea of the scale of suburban gardens at this time can be gained from examining the pioneering land-use map of London and its environs in 1800, produced by Thomas Milne. The map shows that there were many private gardens in the London suburbs, but it must be viewed with caution: Milne treated private gardens, paddocks and parks as one, so it is not possible to distinguish them.⁴⁸

The combined surpluses of private gardens in and near London was, claimed a polemical article in a gardening trade journal of 1843, having a noticeable effect on the fruit and vegetable market as a whole. 'Market gardeners have, among other evils, a just complaint, that gentlemen, aye, noblemen, send their produce to market, and with their commodities, which they can afford to sell at less than men who get their living by it, depreciate all their prices.' The editorial continued:

To us, it seems a despicable idea, that wealthy competitors should be scrambling to sell their surplus commodities, instead of distributing them among their poor neighbours ... the nobleman who sells cabbages and onions ought to be known as a dealer. He has no right to be received as a gentleman when he gets part of his income by costermongering; and no man who gets his bread by gardening, can compete with a rival to whom price is no object, and whose very act of selling appears to be an endeavour to injure an industrious class.⁴⁹

V

The conclusion must be that for many centuries non-commercial garden sales did have an impact on the market and by the nineteenth century this was considered significant. Twenty-five per cent of the market tolls from gardeners at Covent Garden in the mid-eighteenth century were from casual traders. If many of these were private gardeners, and more private gardeners traded there without paying market dues at all, then, adding in the trades in seeds and plants *between* gardeners and the rewarded 'gifts' by the poor to their social superiors, this 'non-commercial' supply of produce may have appreciably augmented the horticultural market. Similarly, if we consider the number of monastic institutions in England prior to the Dissolution, these too may have made a significant contribution to the amount of fruit and vegetables available at markets up and down the country.

In this paper we have drawn attention to an aspect of the trade in fruit and vegetables that has, prior to this, remained undescribed. This paper has drawn information from a variety of sources and covered several centuries. There is scope for more detailed research on this topic, utilizing the archives of institutions, market records, and household accounts to build up a picture of the trade in surplus produce of non-commercial gardens nationwide and perhaps, ultimately, to try and quantify it.

⁴⁷ LMA, DRO/037/A/08/001.

⁴⁸ *Thomas Milne's land use map of London and environs in 1800*, ed., G. B. G. Bull (London Topographical

Soc., 118–19, 1975–6).

⁴⁹ Editorial in *The Gardener and Practical Florist* 1 (1843), p. 2.

Appendix: A list of sales of garden produce from Coopersale Hall, Essex, c.1740.

Rec[eive]d for things out of the Garden

For Sallets	6d.	For Currants	1s.	0d.
For Cucumbers	1s. 4d.	For 2 Peaks of Beans	1s.	0d.
For 2 Peaks of Peases	1s. 0d.	For Gooseberries	3s.	0d.
For 3 Peaks of Beans	1s. 0d.	For Currants	4s.	0d.
For Collaflowers	1s. 6d.	For 4 Peaks of Beans	1s.	0d.
For 4 Peaks of Peases	1s. 0d.	For Cabbages	1s.	0d.
For 4 Peaks of Beans	1s. 4d.	For Plumes	1s.	0d.
For Cabbages	1s. 0d.	For 2 Peaks of Peases		8d.
For Cucumbers	6s. 0d.	For 4 Peaks of Beans	1s.	0d.
For Cherries	1s. 0d.	For Cabbages	1s.	0d.
For Apricocks	1s. 0d.	For Gooseberries	2s.	0d.
For 2 Peaks of Beans	8d.	For Collaflowers	1s.	0d.
For Cabbages	1s. 1d.	For Grapes	1s.	0d.
For Plumes	6d.	For Carrots	1s.	0d.
For Apricocks	6d.	For Cabbages		6d.
For 3 Peaks of Beans	1s. 0d.	For Cabbages	1s.	0d.
For 4 Peaks of Beans	1s. 0d.	Rec[eive]d	£1 19s.	0d.
For Cabbages	1s. 1d.	Disbursed as by bill	£1 0s.	3½d.
For Plumes	6d.	Remains	18s.	8½d.
For Gooseberries	1s. 0d.			

Source: Essex RO, D/DU/363/4, fo. 97.