

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-12877-3 - Maps, Land and Society: A History, with a Carto-Bibliography of Cambridgeshire Estate Maps,

c. 1600-1836

A. Sarah Bendall

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1696, Edward Russell, first Lord of the Admiralty and Member of Parliament for Cambridgeshire, began a sweeping series of changes to his property at Chippenham, Cambridgeshire. The result was to give him, as victor of the Battle of La Hogue, a fittingly grand estate: he created a landscaped park, bought up at least 25 cottages, demolished a number of them, reorganized the provision of common lands, and built for his tenants a row of new houses leading up to the lodge gates (Spufford, 1968). This was the first village in England to be created in such a way (Darley, 1980, 61), and was dominated by a ‘magnificent mansion’ (Lysons, 167). The culmination of the reconstructions was the drawing in 1712 of a splendid map of the new Russell estate.

The map and its context paint a picture of the man and his times. Plate 1 illustrates one of the eight sheets of one of the finest estate maps of Cambridgeshire. Drawn on parchment, this sheet is dominated by the Russell seat and shows the layout of its buildings and gardens. The house is surrounded by a wooded park, ornamented with grazing deer. To the north is shown the newly created model village: the High Street with its cottages, outbuildings, church and school, trees, gardens and adjacent plots of land. The process of the emparkment can be detected in the trees in the park which outline the former High Street and other blocked roads, the outlines of former crofts and two isolated cottages surviving in the south. The map thus accurately shows a wealth of topographical detail.

There is, however, more to discover about the map. Who made it, how and why? Heber Lands, the surveyor, mainly practised in the home counties. In Hertfordshire, he mapped estates at Chipping Barnet in 1713 for Nicholas King and at Ware in 1716 for John Evans (Walne, 1969); he drew a sketch plan of an estate at Wanstead in Essex in 1712, and of Great and Little Burstead for Sir James Lumley in 1720 (Mason, 1990, 32); and Emmanuel College, Cambridge, employed him to map its land in Clapham, Surrey, also in 1720.¹ It was not unusual for surveyors to be employed by both private and institutional landowners. No other maps for the Earl of Orford have been found, and it is not clear why or how Lands came to be employed at Chippenham. Apart from his *Short Treatise of Practical Gauging Shewing a Plain and Easie Method*, published in London by George Sawbridge in 1694, there is no surviving documentation about Lands himself, how much he was paid, what techniques he used or how he learned them. It is, however, possible to suggest that he may have been paid between three and six pence per acre, and that he most probably used a chain, plane table and local assistants to make his map. Evidence for such suppositions is provided in Chapters 4 and 5 of this book. He may well have started his career as an assistant to a surveyor, or

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-12877-3 - Maps, Land and Society: A History, with a Carto-Bibliography of Cambridgeshire Estate Maps, c. 1600-1836

A. Sarah Bendall

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

perhaps have been trained as a military engineer: he may be the Helier Lands who was nominated for duty as such in the Leeward Islands in 1696 (Porter, 1889, 136) and returned to England between 1697 and 1700 (A. S. Mason, personal communication). The maps themselves indicate that Lands was something of an artist: his Burstead map has a decorative border, scale bar, compass rose and cartouche with the Lumley arms above, and each Chippenham sheet is similarly decorated.

Who was the landowner who commissioned such a map, and why did he do so? Edward Russell, Earl of Orford, Viscount Barfleur and Baron of Shingay, was M.P. for Cambridgeshire from 1695 to 1697, after having represented Launceston (Cornwall) and Portsmouth in Parliament in turn from 1689 to 1690 and from 1690 to 1695. He was High Steward of Cambridge University from 1699 to 1727 and Lord Lieutenant of Cambridgeshire from 1715 to 1727 (*PB*, 226; *DNB*, 49, 429–31; Venn, I, 3, 499). Thus he was a notable and important local figure, who made sweeping changes to his Cambridgeshire estate and left charitable endowments to his tenants when he died in 1727 (Munby, 1967, 29). The 1712 map must have been used for practical purposes: to show the land and changes which had been made. With its use of colour, decoration, Russell coat of arms, and careful depiction of the mansion, local topography, deer park, and, on another sheet, the Lord's shepherd watching flocks on the heath, it is also a statement of the Earl's prestige and influence. It demonstrates his authority over his neighbours and tenants, his ability to create a new landscape and to employ a skilled surveyor to record it.

Estate maps, therefore, tell a story: of a landscape, its maps, their makers and the landowners who employed them. They convey information, ideas and social relationships (Harley, 1987, 35); as early as 1717, John Green said (p.154): 'the Eye will learn more in one Hour by Observation, than the Ear will benefit in a Day by Discourse ... In short, a Draught shews at once what many Words can't express.' It is only in recent years, however, that statements similar to Thrower's (1972, 1) that 'A map is a sensitive indicator of the changing thought of man, and few of his works seem to be such an excellent mirror of culture and civilization' have proliferated in the methodological literature of the history of cartography; the importance of studying maps in their wider sociological context has been emphasized by Woodward (1974) and Blakemore and Harley (1980) among others. Indeed, it has been suggested that the use of maps and their impact within society has become one half of the history of cartography (Blakemore and Harley, 1980, 102).

This book uses rural estate maps to examine further the relation between maps and the cultural and historical environment in which they were produced, viewed and used. At the same time, however, questions such as when and where a map was made, why, by and for whom, how and with what results, remain central to the history of cartography and will also be discussed. The next chapter will suggest how existing work on maps as a means of communication can be used to examine the meaning of estate maps, and following chapters study Cambridgeshire maps, map-makers and landowners in detail.

Chapter 2

ART, MAPS AND COMMUNICATION

ART AND MAPS AS MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

Messages about economic, social and cultural conditions can be communicated in a number of ways, for instance through physical signs, words, numbers and pictures. Maps can be studied as a subset of this last category, and this chapter investigates how methods of study of the relation between art and culture can be adapted to explore the interactions between maps and society.

Communication by pictures

Works of art are means of communication, and Paulson said that every one has a meaning (1975, 8). Indeed, a picture can convey both directly and indirectly a multiplicity of messages about the image which is shown and the cultural concepts upon which its production is based. In *Art and Illusion*, E. H. Gombrich quotes a statement by Ernst Kris (1972, 25): 'We have long come to realize that art is not produced in an empty space, that no artist is independent of predecessors and models, and that he no less than the scientist and philosopher is part of a specific tradition and works in a structured area of problems.' Gombrich proceeds to demonstrate that an artist encodes messages from the visible world: he cannot transcribe what he sees but what he perceives he sees, he starts from ideas and concepts which are derived from contemporary society, and he has to rely upon a vocabulary of conventional forms and representations. Thus, symbolism is inherent in all works of art (Clark, 1976, 3), which were produced by a cultural group as a stimulus to a satisfactory aesthetic experience (Munro, 1970, 9).

To interpret the imagery of a work of art and 'decode the cryptograms on the canvas', however, it is not sufficient to study the intentions of the artist; the painter's skill in suggesting must be matched by the public's skill in taking hints (Gombrich, 1972, 168 and 329). As Baxandall (1972) demonstrated for fifteenth-century Italian paintings, a work of art is the product of a social relationship between the painter and the person who asked for a picture, paid for it and used it. The experiences and perceptions of the beholder of a work of art, and his ability to interpret it, are therefore an equally important area of study.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-12877-3 - Maps, Land and Society: A History, with a Carto-Bibliography of Cambridgeshire Estate Maps,

c. 1600-1836

A. Sarah Bendall

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Art, maps and communication*

Both of these groups of people, the painter or artist and his patron or public, worked within their own contemporary, commercial, religious, perceptual and social conventions. These cultural conditions were different from those of today, and therefore to understand the messages which a work of art was intended to communicate it is necessary to use what Gombrich calls 'historical imagination' (Gombrich, 1972, 54). It is not only possible, however, to see how the forms and styles of works of art respond to social circumstances; these means of representation can also give an insight to contemporary society. As Baxandall (1972, 152) said,

A society develops its distinctive skills and habits, which have a visual aspect, since the visual sense is the main organ of experience, and these visual skills and habits become part of the medium of the painter: correspondingly, a pictorial style gives access to these visual skills and habits and, through these, to the distinctive social experience. An old picture is the record of visual activity. One has to learn to read it ...

Panofsky developed an iconographical approach to the study of works of art; his aim was to reveal the meaning hidden behind images which were used. He suggested that there were three levels of meaning, and that they were also stages of interpretation. The first level of meaning was primary or natural subject matter. This consisted of identifying 'pure forms' or artistic motifs which represented natural objects and could be understood through daily experience of similar objects. These primary-level motifs could carry secondary or conventional meaning: their arrangement could be understood as a representation of specific themes and concepts. It was at the third level of meaning, the interpretation of intrinsic meaning or content, that a work of art could be studied in its full historical context. This stage involved the establishment of relations between the philosophical, political and religious ideas in a society, and the form and content of art (Panofsky, 1939).

Baxandall (1985) further developed this way of studying art forms. He saw three-way interactions between the object which is produced, the general and specific situations of the individuals involved in its production and the cultural environment. He was particularly concerned that distinctions be made both between the general cultural environment and the specific conditions which affected commissioning and painting a picture, and also between the conditions of which the artists and their patrons or clients were conscious and those of which they were unaware. Geertz, too, was concerned with placing art in its sociological context; art is a subset of culture and 'a theory of art is thus at the same time a theory of culture'. He recommended a move from the study of signs as means of communication and codes to be deciphered, to a consideration of them as modes of thought and idiom to be interpreted (1983, 109 and 120).

In 1972, Gombrich wrote that it is possible to:

experience vicariously the very process of creation, the virtuoso's control over his medium and that awareness of essentials which makes him cut out all redundancies because he can rely on a public that will play the game and knows how to take a hint. The social context in which this happens has hardly been investigated. The artist creates his own elite, and the elite its own artists.

It is well to remember, though, that this give and take is not confined to the sacred precincts of art [paintings]. Wherever the image is used for communication, we can study that assessment of probable intention and the tests of consistency that lead to interpretation and illusion. (1972, 196)

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-12877-3 - Maps, Land and Society: A History, with a Carto-Bibliography of Cambridgeshire Estate Maps,
c. 1600-1836

A. Sarah Bendall

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Art and maps as communication*

A map is a value-laden image which is used for communication (Mitchell, 1986, 9–14). The theme of this book is to see how the work of such art historians as Gombrich, Baxandall and Panofsky can be applied to the history of cartography, to see how a map can be placed in its cultural context.

Communication by maps

As with pictures, symbols and codes on maps reflect their cultural environment; the need is to discover both the cultural, religious and political circumstances of this environment and the nature of the information to be transmitted and recorded (Delano Smith, 1989, 92). The ‘code’ of a map image can be seen as all the marks of which it is made up, such as conventional signs, written captions, place-names and the decorative elements of its design. Harley (1983, 35) said that: ‘To understand the symbolic message of a map, it is necessary to reconstruct both the code employed by the map-maker and the precise historical context in which it was used.’ Ehrensward (1987), for example, saw cartography as ‘a culturally based means of mediating environmental experience through symbolism’, and showed how the changing use of colour on maps can be a revealing indicator of cultural change. Similarly, Delano Smith (1985) stressed the need to understand the purpose and content of a map in order to begin to explain the symbols on it. She showed that there is a great variety of ways in which the cartographer has tried to convey messages to the map user; the methods, which use a combination of words, pictorial and abstract signs, do not develop in a simple way. One approach has been to regard the development of forms of representation from pictures of an object to more abstract symbolism as evolutionary. This evolution has been related to the development of the use of symbols by children (Gerber, 1984; Wood, 1977, 161), and to link pre-scientific cartography with art (Gombrich, 1982, 184; Rees, 1980, 62).

Maps, like pictures, can be read as texts (Harley, 1988a, 75; McKenzie, 1986, 34–7), even though neither present their component features in a logical sequence. This sequence, however, was considered as an essential component of ‘language’ by Robinson and Petchenik in their study of maps as a system of communication (1976, 50). Despite semantic problems, the value of the textual approach is that it focuses attention on the message and the information to be mapped (Guelke, 1977 and 1979; Head, 1984, 19). Maps are seen as social constructions rather than as mere products of a set of technical processes, and thus the effects of making and using maps in different historical societies can be examined: how have maps influenced ideas, experiences, events and issues (Harley, 1989a)? For example, it is important not to over-stress the planimetric accuracy of a map which may have been drawn to convey a message other than precise areas; it may be more useful to study such features as the general layout of a landowner’s estates, the distribution of settlements or the location of rivers and upland areas.

Maps can be seen as part of a continuum of which views, prospects and landscape paintings form a part. Both stem from fifteenth-century discoveries which enabled the expression

Art, maps and communication

of an awareness of space, of mapping in terms of coordinates and of perspective painting; artists and cartographers were aware of each other's techniques and could practise each other's art (Sack, 1986, 85–6). Schulz (1978) has shown how Jacopo de' Barbari's 1500 woodcut view of Venice was not simply drawn as a guide to the city or as a factual record of its topography: distortions in the view and its decoration provide a 'visual metaphor for the Venetian state'; the 'map' is a symbol of the city and communicates a message about its size, wealth, and political and commercial power. A few decades later in Cologne, Braun and Hogenberg's *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1573–98) combined 'mapped views' and words to describe sixteenth-century European towns, economy and society (Nuti, 1988). Alpers (1983) has demonstrated how seventeenth-century Dutch art and maps both reflect a distinctive system of conventions, metaphors, intellectual assumptions and cultural practices, and she stresses the value of investigating the similarities between these forms of representation. Likewise, both English maps and landscape painting show with similar techniques and iconography the virtues of landed property, military control, imperial might, commercial travel and tourism (Alfrey and Daniels, 1990, vii). Late seventeenth-century prospect paintings were large, six by four feet or more, and prominently displayed to impress visitors with their host's nearby and distant properties. The view would be centred on the mansion and gardens, with the prospect of the rest of the estate and its environs (Daniels, 1990). Thus Jan Siberecht's prospect of Cheveley Park, Cambridgeshire, painted in 1681 and now displayed in Belvoir Castle, fulfilled much the same role as the map of the Cheveley estate which was made nearly one hundred years later in 1775 (CHG77501).¹

Because of the differences between maps and pictures, however, the methodology of study of cartographic works must be adapted. Maps give information about invariant features of an area; elements such as lighting conditions are not important (Gombrich, 1982, 183). These features are represented by conventional signs rather than by real appearances, and, in general, the symbols are set in a framework constructed by careful surveying to attain a uniform scale (Harvey, 1980, 10). Harley (1985, 33) adapted Panofsky's iconographical approach as a basis for his examination of the reflection of culture in maps and the impact and influence which they had on society; Harley's three levels of meaning overlap and interact. At the primary level of meaning he substituted landscape features for Panofsky's natural objects, and conventional signs for artistic motifs. These signs and features can be understood irrespective of the place which they are representing, just as artistic motifs carry meaning independent from the composition of a particular picture. The spatial arrangement of signs denotes a specific place, the cartographic equivalent of Panofsky's secondary level of meaning, where factual questions are asked about a map and its practical uses. Harley's third level of meaning was reconstruction of the interpretation by groups in contemporary society of the symbolic values of images on maps. Here the combination of signs, decoration and blank spaces on maps can be seen as, for example, expressions of political power. Harley showed how these three levels can be applied to maps of many types and scales (1983, 23–31).

Thus, by adopting concepts which have been developed in the history of art, there has been an emphasis in the history of cartography on how the information shown on a map depends on the context in which it was drawn, and it is possible to start to place a map into this context.

Art and maps as communication

Communication of power

Historians of cartography have increasingly concentrated upon the message and information to be mapped; for example, they search for social forces that have structured cartography and locate the presence of power and its effects in all of map knowledge (Harley, 1989b, 2). Territoriality is a basic geographic expression of influence and power (Sack, 1986, 216). Maps define and represent territory, as is demonstrated in the study of the transformation in North America of native Indian land into Euro-American territory (Boelhower, 1988), and then in the eighteenth century, of colonial holdings into the American nation; Clarke (1988) demonstrated how the cartouches on these later maps were integral to the sheet and were powerful ideological symbols. Harley (1988b) examined maps as a form of political discourse. For example, the Spanish and Portuguese set up complex bureaucratic systems to regulate trade and knowledge about their empires, and maps became highly secret documents (Broc, 1986, 44; Harley, 1988b, 61). At the same time, however, the Portuguese were capable of producing very elaborately decorated charts which their king gave to persons he wanted to honour or impress. Despite the prohibitions and attempts to enforce secrecy, therefore, Portuguese decorative charts were made and sold all over Europe (Quinn, 1986, 247). In France, too, maps expressed power. Konvitz (1987) showed how mapping the nation between 1660 and 1848 corresponded to the same rational purpose as mapping an estate: geodetic measurement, cartographic representation of landforms and synthesis of statistics in thematic maps were all ways of claiming possession and asserting knowledge, and functioned as instruments of control.

Maps were therefore not merely passive reflections of changes in the politico-economic order in Europe (Mukerji, 1983, 129). Indeed, Mukerji (1984) demonstrated how cartographic works reinforced patterns of control in Europe; this was shown by using 12 maps and a title-page to an atlas, drawn between the Middle Ages and the end of the seventeenth century. Maps could show authority: a sixteenth-century Doge of Venice hung a *mappa mundi* and a map of Italy in the anteroom to his audience chamber. This impressed upon waiting visitors the extent of the state's dominion and the unity of the world of which it was a part (Schulz, 1987, 116). At a similar time in England, maps were displayed in the Privy Gallery at Whitehall, where courtiers had little to do other than look and be impressed by the King's knowledge of his realms, depictions of his victories and his wise patronage of the best astronomers, artists and cartographers of the age (Barber, 1985). In the seventeenth century, Samuel Pepys, a governor of Christ's Hospital, was asked:

to get some historian painter to draw a fair Table representing his Majesty and some Chief Ministers of the State, The Lord Mayor, The President and some Governors, and the Children of his Majesty's Royall Foundation: a Ship, Globes, Maps, Mathematicall Instruments, and such other things as may well express his Majesty's Royall Foundation and bounty to his Hospital.

The painting, by Antonio Verrio, was finished in 1688 and hung in the Hospital's hall (Croft-Murray, 1962, 56).

Art, maps and communication

Globes were also used to show power and, from the sixteenth century, they were increasingly frequently owned by the English landowning classes. Depictions of globes were used in decoration: in the gallery at Little Moreton Hall in Cheshire, for example, are sixteenth-century plasterwork renderings of Destiny and Fortune. Destiny holds aloft the sphere in one hand, and in the other hand she clasps a pair of open dividers; Fortune, blindfolded and balancing on a globe, is impartial, has power over the world and is also unstable (National Trust, 1986, 22).

Silences on maps could also demonstrate power. Maps which showed the authority of the landowning classes, for example, often omitted evidence of rural poverty. Thus Thomas Clay's plan of the manor of Great Bookham, Surrey, in 1614 to 1617 did not show the hovels of landless labourers (Harvey, 1966, 282). Similarly, in eighteenth-century English county atlases, the inclusion of charity schools was the only indication of the less affluent classes of English society (Harley, 1988c). Konvitz (1988) showed how the first national map survey of France, in the eighteenth century, omitted topographic detail and characteristics of landforms and settlements which made places distinctive. This concept of a uniform space influenced the design of the new administrative system in France in 1790.

The cartography of sixteenth and seventeenth-century England can be used to show an increased power of the land. Christopher Saxton, an Elizabethan surveyor, was employed by Thomas Seckford, a Master of the Court of Requests, to map the counties of England and Wales for the Queen and her government. Sheets for individual counties were engraved and printed from 1574 to 1578, and the complete atlas was published in 1579 (Tyacke and Huddy, 1980). The relative importance of patron and monarch over surveyor is demonstrated by Seckford's arms appearing on all of the sheets, the royal insignia on all except the first sheet, but Saxton's name first appearing on the 26th sheet. The presence of the royal arms shows that the maps are the Queen's, they depict her land, and her sovereignty over her kingdom as a whole and over each of its provinces. In subsequent printings of Saxton's work, however, and in later maps by Norden, Camden, Speed and Drayton, the space which is given to the royal arms is progressively reduced. There is increased attention to the land itself and a strengthened sense of local identity with it. For example, arms of local gentry and town plans appear together with the royal arms. The texts which accompany, or are accompanied by, these maps similarly move from a chronicle history of the kings of England to a chorographical description of land by locality and region, with an increased emphasis on individuals, their pedigrees and their private property (Helgerson, 1986). Similarly, the completion of the fen drainage project was marked by a map of the whole Bedford Level by the Surveyor-General, Jonas Moore. The map, produced in about 1658, had the coats of arms of members of the Company around the edge and gave an impression of the success of the drainage and of the competence and importance of the surveyor. However, only one copy of this edition is known to survive; most of the members of the Company were Cromwellians, so after 1660 there was no longer the same desire to display their identities, the coats of arms around the margins of the map were erased and the 1684 edition, with its blank spaces, is much more common (Willmoth, 1990, 132–7). Thus maps, combined with pictures and writings, helped to show the power of the land, and of those who owned it.

Estate maps and their setting

Although it is possible to demonstrate how maps were used to show the power of the land in Italy, France and England, the same was not true in the Netherlands, where maps reflected a different cultural system. Here, mapping was part of an impulse to record or describe the land, which was shared by artists, surveyors, printers and the public. The system of landownership in the Netherlands led to weak seigneurial power and a large number of very small landowners, and contemporary maps and prints reflect this. Seats were not expression of wealth and authority, and the Dutch were far more interested in being represented in portraits of themselves, their houses and the pleasures of life (Alpers, 1983, 151). For example, Rembrandt's etching 'The Goldweighers Field' of 1651 was probably drawn when he visited the country house of one of his unpaid creditors. Rembrandt showed the land, churches, towns, trees and grass, and the estate, but this last feature was added almost incidentally (Alpers, 1987, 82).

These examples show how maps, as works of art, were used as a means of communication by contemporary society. Maps, however, make abstractions from reality in a particular way, and the above examples also demonstrate that to interpret a map as a social product, a number of questions which are unique to cartographic art forms need to be asked. For example, what practical purpose did a map serve, what topographical information did it show, was it necessary to give accurate planimetric information, what was a map's history of production and publication, who were the surveyors and how did a map relate to contemporary interests in science and land measuring?

These methodological works and examples of their application, therefore, show that it can be useful to study the interaction between maps and the society which commissioned and produced them. This book shows how it is possible to adopt the iconographical, 'textual', approach, of which Harley is a major exponent, to the study of rural estate maps, and also examines the extent to which Baxandall's methodology can be adapted to the study of maps. It demonstrates how estate maps reflect and affect contemporary society, and how distinctions can be drawn between the general cultural environment and the specific conditions which affect a map's commission. It discusses who were the map-producers and map-users, how the interests of a particular patron affected the type of map which was drawn, how this particular type of map fits into contemporary cartographical developments, and how some of the requests were explicit whilst others were assumed by both patron and map-maker. At the same time, however, one must be very cautious about interpreting past cultures and inferring more about a map than was originally intended, either explicitly or implicitly.

ESTATE MAPS AND THEIR CULTURAL SETTING

Estate maps are defined as maps which were drawn primarily to show an individual's landed property (Wallis and Robinson, 1987, 97), and they are studied here to show how they can be related to their social and historical background, how they reflect this environment and contribute to its change. The extent to which they were drawn for the practical management of

Art, maps and communication

estates, to help in processes of emparking and inclosure and to settle legal disputes is investigated. Furthermore, it is shown that they also demonstrated the authority of the landowner, his class and his attitude to the land, as was suggested by Harley (1983, 37), and how they contributed to the maintenance of a social structure based on the land and played a role in the history of agrarian class relations (Harley 1988d, 284). Estate maps have been described in many places and used as sources to answer questions ranging from the nature of field systems and agricultural land use to river channel changes. An examination of these maps in relation to their cultural setting affects their use and interpretation as an historical source.

It has already been demonstrated that estate maps are usually manuscript (Baker and Butlin, 1973, 11), though some printed maps do exist, such as Peter Chassereau's map of John Fenner's estate near Ipswich, Suffolk in 1745 (Mason, 1989, 4), or, more commonly, those which accompany nineteenth-century particulars of sale. They have been drawn to depict urban, rural and industrial areas at a range of scales, but usually at three or six chains to the inch (1:3,168 or 1:6,336). The most detailed maps can show buildings such as houses, churches, inns, schools, farm buildings, pounds and windmills, parks, gardens, orchards, woodland and trees, land quality and a number of other features. The maps may be decorated with a vignette of the manor house or church, the landlord's coat of arms, animals in the park, and elaborate title cartouches, scale bars and compass roses (see, for example, Plates 1, 6 and 17a). This study shows how the type and amount of information drawn on rural estate maps varies with the reasons for their commission and the scale at which they were drawn.

Estate plans were produced by many different societies. Buisseret (1988) has investigated how the differing economic base and social structure of areas of North America gave rise to various types of map, of which the estate plan is only one example. In the Midwest, for example, settlement was preceded by a meticulous government survey, so there was no need for any individual to employ a surveyor to plot his estate, which was usually very small. In South Carolina, on the other hand, the conditions for production of estate plans were very favourable. There was no pre-existing large-scale cartographic coverage, there were prosperous tobacco and rice plantations, and the landowning population was large and educated. Many owners had links with the West Indies, where a large number of estate plans was produced. In colonial Mexico, too, estate plans were drawn to delimit property rights and territories, and many of the plans show the influence of the indigenous, Indian, iconography (Gruzinski, 1988, 61–2). They provide civil, fiscal and secular records of Indian life, and some include genealogies drawn to represent the ownership of land or houses (Glass, 1975, 36–7). In other instances, detailed cadastral registers were kept which recorded field dimensions and shape, soil type and tenure, which could be transformed into maps (Williams, 1984). Jamaica was another colonial society which produced estate maps, partly because eighteenth-century absentee proprietors resident in Great Britain were anxious to be able to picture their plantations. Demand for plans of new and restructured plantations continued well into the nineteenth century as the spread of population through Jamaica continued unabated (Higman, 1988b).

This book looks at rural estate map production in early modern England, and how the production of estate maps increased despite the continued production of many map-less surveys, which has been noted by Andrews (1985, 8) among others. It describes why estates were