THE RUISLIP, NORTHWOOD AND EASTCOTE
LOCAL HISTORY SOCIETY

= =

Bulletin

SEPTEMBER 1976

Members who have been attached to the Society for some years may well wonder what happened to the Bulletin usually issued in April. At the time it should have gone to press I had very little material so your Committee agreed to postpone this year's issue until the Autumn when it was hoped sufficient articles of interest would be available. It has ensured that a really bumper edition is now at hand and all members will be given their Bulletins at the September meeting. My thanks to all contributors, old and new, and I hope that all members will enjoy a thoroughly enlightening and interesting time in perusing the various items.

The Committee hopes that the programme for the coming season arranged by Mr. Bob Bedford will continue to interest members. It is not at all an easy job to make up a well-balanced programme each year and ideas from members will be appreciated.

The Summer Outings were enjoyed by those who were able to participate and others who were able to join in our own local "Dig" in the Manor Farm Complex. A few members attended the 2nd Local History Conference at the Harrow College of Further Education at Hatch End on 6th March 1976, the theme being "Archaeology in Local History". Members might like to make a note that next year's Conference will be held on 5th March 1977, the theme being "Urban and Suburban Growth". I can thoroughly recommend these Conferences as it enables members of all the local Societies to meet and exchange views and ideas plus seeing some very fine exhibitions. Further details will be announced in the New Year but anyone requiring information on this subject can contact Mr. R.G. Edwards, - phone 866-4288. The Committee will endeavour to suggest some possible venues for for Outings during the Summer of 1977 but always welcomes ideas from members. We remain a relatively small Society and we would like to welcome as many new members as possible so do bring a friend to sample a Meeting. Mrs. Eileen Bowlt has been very active and started a small Research Group which has already been working under her guidance. She would welcome further members. There is still a surprising amount still to be investigated in the area.

Other Societies in the surrounding districts have been very busy during past years producing booklets, photographing their whole areas and helping to preserve old buuldings etc. We would hope that members of the Ruislip Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society will not let the grass grow under their feet.

In October last year Mr. R.G. Edwards, who was the original Secretary of the Society, and in fact was responsible with the late Mr. Clifford Morrell, for the inception of the Society had to finally retire as such. Miss Jane Snowden nobly stepped in for a couple of years and then Mr. Edwards tried to take over again but pressures of work forced him to resign. However, as most members should know by now, Mrs, Jean Bedford has taken on this most onerous post and we wish her well.

Those of us who live in the Borough of Hillingdon are very fortunate as it was decided to set up various Conservation Areas throughout the Borough to protect buildings, trees, riverside walks, field paths, etc. for future generations. Mr. Bob Bedford is Secretary of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and Mr. Ron Edwards, Chairman of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area. Already certain improvements have been made at the suggestions of these Committees and the Eastcote Conservation Group plan a small exhibition in Eastcote Library in the Autumn. If members notice any items that they feel need taking care of within these Conservation Areas these Committees will be glad to hear from members of the public.

DOREEN L. EDWARDS.
(Hon. Edit.)

Dear Editor,

In the light of Mrs. Bowlt's very interesting history "Workhouses and the Poor Law", the following rather scrappy notes may also be of interest:

One of the objects of the 1834 Amendment Act was the reduction of expenditure by substitution for outrelief a spell in a Workhouse. Outrelief was not prohibited though, and one may assume that many old cases of outrelief continued under the new Act.

As Mrs. Bowlt indicated, the intention behind Poor Relief was good, but the system of farming lent itself to abuse, particularly if the bidder by a miscalculation had offered too high a rent, or was greedy.

The Guardians were elected annually from among the larger ratepayers, and took office at the beginning of April. Uniformity of practice was aimed at by the oversight of Commissioners in London, of which body Ewin Chadwick was the first secretary.

Emigration of paupers was provided for under the Act, but the practice of paying all expenses out of the Poor Rate was discouraged by the Commission, even when the Local Board was willing. There were no doubt charitable bodies who could be approached to assist suitable emigrants.

Mentally deficient paupers were sometimes sent great distances to an asylum of which the Board approved, with expenses met from the rate.

When numbers justified, school mistresses were employed to teach the children. Teachers generally lived in and if "graduates" of the National School Society, could receive as much as £20 a year. Need for religious training was generally recognised, and children were catechised and given bibles.

Inmates were segregated into 7 groups according to sex and age. How complete the segregation was I do not know, but I was old enough in 1914 to sense the feeling of shame and almost despair when old couples who had shared a bed for perhaps 40 or 50 years were forced by poverty to go into the Workhouse and be seperated while still alive. I knew of no cases personally, but heard the gossip of Mrs. Morgan who came twice a week to "do" for my grandmother, who was blind.

As a tailpiece: I have a letter addressed to Mr. Bottle, Leeds, Kent -

Leeds Parish

to the United Parishes of Coxheath Workhouse

Jan. 31st 1823			£ s. d.
To 9 Paupers 5 weeks each)	48 weeks)		
Thos. Morgan 2 weeks)	at 2/2)		5. 4. -.
Maria Barden 1 week)			
	Equal parts		2. 9. 5½.
Feb. 25 Settled E. Thompson			£7.13. 5½.

I cannot solve the problem of the Equal Parts. Any suggestions Mrs. Bowlt?

Yours sincerely,

(signed) E.A. CHING

A SIDE-KICK FROM POSTAL HISTORY

The student of postal history is concerned to find out from the various marks found on a postal packet the conditions operating at the time of its carriage. Much of the material comes from solicitors' letters and merchants' houses, but occasionally, especially in the days before envelopes came into use, a letter comes on to the market which throws light on an item of social history or arouses an interest in a subject which has nothing to do with the Post. These are the subjects, which, arising from my collection, I call "side-kicks".

++

"A POST-MARK WHICH STOPPED A HANGING!"

This med 19th century Glasgow duplex postmark is knows to collectors as the "Madeline Smith", a name given it by the Scottish Postmark Group. A dealer once advertised it with the words quoted above, This naturally aroused my interest.

Very few English people seem to remember having heard of Madeline, though this could not have been said of the newspaper readers of Britain on July 10th 1857, for on the previous day Madeline had been set free after a trial for murder lasting 9 days at the Edinburgh Assizes.

The whole story would take too long to tell, so those who relish a murder story must read it for themselves. The following account will perhaps suffice to show whether the advertiser was justified in his claim.

Madeline Hamilton Smith, who was aged 21 years at the time of her trial, was the oldest daughter of a prosperous architect living in Glasgow. Some two years earlier she had fallen madly in love with Pierre Emil L'Angelier, a relatively impecunious Channel Islander. After plans to elope with him had failed, she became his mistress, in May of the year 1856; later he blamed her for allowing it to happen! By the end of the year her passion had cooled and realising that L'Angelier would never be acceptable to her father as a son-in-law, she responded to the approaches of a rich neighbour, a Mr. Minnoch, and even accepted his proposal of marriage.

Alas for Madeline, L'Angelier was not willing to be thrown aside. He not only refused to return her letters, but threatened to show them to her father.

Madeline possessed beauty, vivacity and an adventurous spirit, but Mr. Smith was a true Victorian father, and she was terrified of his knowing of her fall from virtue, so she pretended to a return of passion for L'Angelier, no doubt hoping thereby to gain possession of her letters.

On Monday, March 23rd 1857, L'Angelier died, after severe pain and vomiting, proved to have been caused by a dose of about 200 grains (nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ oz.) of arsenic. In the evidence he was said to have suffered similar pains on the nights of the 19th and 22nd February.

Madeline's letters were found and she was arrested and charged "with administering arsenic, or other poison to Pierre Emil L'Angelier on two occasions in February with intent to murder him, and, on an occasion in March, by means of poison, murdering him." The Prosecution chose the 19th and 22nd of February and the 22nd of March as the operative dates.

Madeline had quite openly purchased arsenic on three occasions, the 21st of February and the 6th and 18th March. She was accompanied by a girl friend on the second occasion. She bought it, she said, for washing her face, as she had read that it was useful as a cosmetic.

Five hundred letters, about 200 of them from Madeline, and 300 envelopes, some containing more than one letter, were found in L'Angelier's rooms. Seventy-seven, about 60 of them from Madeline, were produced during the trial. Most of the envelopes carried the Glasgow duplex mark. Madeline, like many ladies in those days of rapid regular postal service, merely put the day and not the date on her letters. It was found necessary to call in Mr. Rowland Hill McDonald (surely a man destined for the Post Office) Comptroller at Glasgow, to identify postmarks on various of the letters, and the Lord Justice Clerk (the Rt. Hon. John Hope) urged upon the Post Office authorities the desirability of having postmarks more legibly impressed on letters.

The Lord Chief Justice Clerk also criticised the Prosecution for irregularities connected with the collection of the letters. The letters and envelopes had not been numbered thus making them even less reliable as evidence. In his summing up he said "One important letter was only dated 'Wednesday', while the postmark was not legible, and it was only from its contents they could ascertain the date, if it could be ascertained; but most of the letters even if they were not in their envelopes were of such a nature as to make the precise date of comparatively little consequence, unless the letters at the close, the dates of which were sufficiently ascertained from their contents."

Although Madeline had been with L'Angelier on the evening of his first illness and had given him a cup of cocoa, the Prosecution could not prove that she was in possession of arsenic at that time. Neither could they prove that she had been with him just prior to his second illness or death, though at that time she would evidently have possessed arsenic. L'Angelier had said nothing at any time to throw any suspicion on Madeline, and it was difficult to believe that he could have taken such a large dose of gritty powder, even in cocoa, without noticing it.

The Defence claimed that the two illnesses could have been biliousness and that L'Angelier had committed suicide, though there was no evidence that he had purchased arsenic at any time.

The verdict of the 15-men jury (remember this was Scotland) was:

> "The Jury find the panel (prisoner) not guilty of the first charge in the indictment by a majority; of the second charge, not proven; and by a majority, find the third charge not proven."

The verdict was a popular one and the courtroom rang with applause.

After her release Madeline moved in London, where she was twice married, but neither time to Mr. Minnoch. She died in America in 1928.

Perhaps the following anecdote contains a measure of truth:

> Mr. George du Maurier, when at a soiree given by a Mrs. Hora in London, declared that Madeline Smith's beauty should not have saved her from the scaffold. He did not know that his hostess's maiden name was Madeline Hamilton Smith.

E.A. CHING.

Another side-kick from Postal History:

A MOST UNHAPPY QUEEN

In my collection of items relating to the Post is a letter, or more accurately five-eighths of a letter. On the front, which fortunately is complete, is a mark reading "To be Delivered by 10 Sund. Morn." This mark, of which there are four varieties known, appears on letters posted in the London Twopenny Post, late enough on a Saturday night to be delivered in the Country Area of the post on Sunday morning. They appear to have been used during the first three decades of the 19th century, and it has been suggested that it was to protect the P.O. of the charge that their duties prevented postmen from attending the morning church service. Other marks show that the letter was handed in to the Receiving House in Black Moor Street (demolished when Kingsway was constructed) at 7 o'clock at night on the 11th November 1820, and that a charge of 3d had been made to cover the "country" delivery. These are the marks which make the letter attractive to the student of postal history.

The letter is addressed to:

Her Most Gracious Majesty Caroline,
Queen Consort of England,
Brandenburgh House.

and someone has written across one side (clear of the address and postmarks thankfully)

"Radical Preston
the Shoemaker."

As I have said part of the letter is missing; but the following remains; I have put brackets round words and letters which I have supplied:

Drury Lane
Nov 11th 1820

Thomas Pre(ston)

P.S. I beg permission to state that I experience great surp(rise) as being at a loss to guess the reason why no notice has yet been take(n of the) Loyal Address I sent to your Majesty although I have three several (times) written (to Al)derman Wood on the subject from whom at least I exp(ected a) communication on that head!

What a picture this conjures up. Radical Preston, a well known character? and what a character; no doubt hoping for Royal patronage he was not to be put off easily. What a pity we do not know the outcome of his persistence. We can guess at it however, for the Queen died on the 7th August following.

I thought I knew a bit about the Queen, but I knew nothing of Brandenburgh House, the location of which would have been of some interest postally. That mine of London topographical information, the late Harold P. Clunn, supplied the following: Built by Sir Nicholas Crispe (an eminent London merchant and one of the Farmers of the Customs) early in the reign of Charles I, at a cost of £23,000. It stood near the river, about a quarter of a mile east of the present Hammersmith bridge. In 1792 it was sold to the Margrave of Brandenburgh-Anspach, who died in 1806. Many alterations were made mnd it was named Brandenburgh House. Less than a year after the death of Queen Caroline, it was sold by auction, pulled down, and a large factory was built on the site.

Clunn does not say when the Queen moved into the house, and it was in my efforts to find out that I learned more about the Queen and realised the tragedy of her married life. The Encyclopedia Britannica does her less than justice in its short account. A well documented account, up to 1811 only, can be found in Christopher Hibberts "George IV, Prince of Wales". This makes it clear, I think, that, tactless and uncouth as she undoubtedly was, her behaviour was largely a reaction to the shameful way in which she was treated by the Prince. He could be brilliant, charming, kind and generous beyond his means; at the same time he was self-indulgent where food, drink and mistresses were concerned and seemed at times a compulsive spender, buying in hundreds or dozens when his need was for two or three. His debts were a continuing national scandal from which the King periodically extricated him. It was these debts which forced him into marriage with Princess Caroline of Brunswick, a first cousin on her mother's side. It seemed almost as if he chose hastily, sulkily and petulantly as a peevish protest against having to choose any wife at all. He had married Mrs. Fitzherbert secretly (and illegally) in 1785, a devout Roman Catholic who would not consent to being his mistress. By 1795 he had tired of her (temporarily) and the Countess of Jersey reigned as his mistress. Most people who knew the Princess considered her quite unsuitable for George and the English Court. He had made only casual enquiries about her and no one warned him of his mistake.

Mrs. Harcourt who chaperoned the Princess on her journey to England said that she was always contented and always in a good humour, showing such pleasant, unaffected joy at the idea of her prospect in life, that it does one's heart good to see anybody so happy.

Disembarking at Gravesend she was taken to Greenwich where, after being kept waiting for an hour or so, Lady Jersey (!) turned up to escort her to London. Caroline had heard from her mother, silly woman, that Lady Jersey was the Prince's mistress and had been advised by others not to show any resentment of the Prince's weakness in this respect. But this was a bad start, made worse perhaps when Lady Jersey criticised Caroline's dress and made her change her muslin gown and blue satin petticoat for a less becoming white dress, also remarking that the Princess, whose cheeks were naturally rosy, ought to use rouge to bring them to life. The princess was 24 years of age.

Her first meeting with the Prince was no more furtunate, his behaviour towards her resulted in her remarking "My God; does the Prince always act like this? I think he is very fat and he's nothing like as handsome as his portrait."

They were married about a week later. The Prince was partially drunk at the service and by the time night came when he went to the bedroom he fell insensible into the fireplace where he remained all night and where she left him. By the morning he had recovered enough to climb into bed with her.

Princess Charlotte was born on the 7th January 1796, and that was that, as far as Caroline was concerned. In later years when accused of adultery she said that she had only committed it once, with Mrs. Fitzherbert's husband!

Some newspapers and the general public took her side, the 'Times' condemning the vices of her unjust husband and his most disgraceful connections, and the 'Morning Chronicle' reporting that everyone pitied her and execrated him. If she appeared in public crowds cheered her. This of course did not help her relationship with the Prince whose dislike turned to positive hatred.

The King would not agree to a formal separation but did agree to her having a small house in the country (near Blackheath); she was however to retain her apartments in Carlton House, the Prince's residence. Having kept her almost a prisoner in Carlton House for over two years, even forbidding her a two days holiday in the country, because no doubt, of fear of what she might say about him, she spoke her mind freely and coarsely, He then did his best to avoid her and lessen any possible influence she might have on little Charlotte.

Her behaviour was rash enough to encourage the Prince to apply for a divorce. A Committee of the Privy Council sat in judgment. It may be significant that Lady Douglas who was probably the most damaging of the witnesses against the Princess, afterwards received an annuity of £200 which was still being paid at the time of George's death in 1830. Some of the other witnesses against Caroline were people who had been in the Prince's service at some time. Caroline's doctors and some of her servants supported her. The case rested on whether a child in her household was hers or had been adopted as she claimed. The Commissioners were pleased to say that they were satisfied that she had not been pregnant in 1802, that the child was in fact the son of Samuel and Sophia Austin, and was born in Brownlow Street Hospital.

None of this has anything to do with Brandenburgh House of course but may explain why she went to the continent in 1814. She was accused of adultery with Bergami, her Italian footman, and came home in 1820 to face trial before the House of Lords. The 'Observer' championed her cause and, possibly because of public feeling, the case was dropped. It was at this time that she occupied Brandenburgh House.

To conclude, the Prince successfully excluded Caroline from his Coronation in July 1821, and it is thought that this may have contributed to her death in the following month.

E.A. CHING.

==========

ADAM CLARKE - at one time a resident of Haydon Hall, Eastcote

Adam Clarke had been three times President of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, in 1801, 1814 and 1822. His scholarship was not only employed to Theological Commentaries and suchlike publications, but was extensively used in the interests of the State when he was selected to serve on the Committee to investigate the old Public Records System and to recommend improvements. In this sphere of duty he distinguished himself, and in addition to the appreciation of the House of Commons (which had appointed him to edit the findings of the enquiry) he received the personal friendship of Royalty, H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex was a constant visitor to his home.

Eastcote Methodist Church set at the junction of Pamela Gardens with Field End Road has a brass tablet set in the wall of the vestibule dated 1916, and reset in 1960 from the demolished building of 1848, recording Adam Clarke's association with Eastcote between the years 1824 and 1832.

FRED RACKSTRAW

DIGGING DEEPER INTO THE ARCHIVES

(For some of the material in this article I am grateful for the assistance of Jean Kirkwood, friend and Archivist of the Windsor Circuit; and to the Methodist Archives Centre.)

For several years now my excursions to different parts of the country have been made more interesting by the discovery of tit-bits of information concerning that great Theological scholarrevered on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, and to whom we at Eastcote Methodist Church owe so much - Adam Clarke.

First, at the Methodist New Room in The Horsefair, Bristol, where Adam Clarke and John Wesley met for the very first time. Adam was only twenty-two years of age. Their meeting is recorded on one of the famous "Tablets". See it if ever you are in Bristol.

Later, at Trowbridge in the Bradford-on-Avon Circuit. This was Adam's first Circuit appointment and Edward Dyer their Historian describes their new Minister in these words. "On September 27th 1782, a young man of fine countenance came to Mr. Knapp's the first house he had entered as an Itinerant Minister. His name was Adam Clarke, from a village in Coleraine, Ireland. Mr. Wesley had sent him from Kingswood School to fill a vacancy. He had a commanding voice; his eloquence was like a torrent and crowds of hearers followed him throughout the Circuit."

It was in Trowbridge that Adam met Mary Cooke a Class Leader with 17 females on her Class-roll. After leaving Trowbridge and travelling in Norfolk, Suffolk, East Cornwall, and then the Channel Isles, he returned to Trowbridge to marry and take away their 'principal' conductress of the Prayer meeting, Miss Mary Cooke'. This was in 1788.

Later still, when visiting my daughter and family at Windsor I found more associations with Adam Clarke:- the Methodist Conference records show that in the last year of his life 'he be appointed a Supernumerary Minister on the Windsor Circuit'.

It has all made fascinating and compulsive reading.

Previous to 1811, London was divided into two Methodist Circuits. LONDON EAST and LONDON WEST. In 1811 Brentford Circuit was created, but within two years the name was changed to the Hammersmith Circuit. The circuit in 1813 comprised, Harrow, Wandsworth, Walham Green, Croydon, Mitcham, Kensington, Twickenham and Brentford. A list follows of places "at one time or another under the care of the Circuit" and includes "EASTCOTT, WINDSOR and PINNER". Windsor by the mid 1920s was head of it's circuit, and EASCOTE appears on the Circuit plans between 1830-35. The Windsor minister preached once a quarter, the remaining Services being filled in by Local Preachers from Hammersmith and St. Albans. Pinner and Denham Methodists shared the Services of these Local Preachers.

In "The Life of Adam Clarke, LL.D.", by the Rev. Samuel Dunn, published by Tegg in 1863; a copy of which is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, there is a good picture of Adam Clarke, and another of Haydon Hall. On page 113 of this book ..... "at Haydon Hall he turned a large stable and coach house into a chapel ..... and have got a Sunday School of four score children. We have preaching every Sabbath, and a far brighter prospect than we ever had at Millbrook". According to an article in the Methodist Magazine 1827 - "At Haydon Hall Eastcott, the family residence of Dr. Clarke, a house on his premises and fitted up at his expense was opened up for religious worship on 19th November 1826. The Chapel was constructed and opened 11th March 1827, by Dr. Clarke." (Note that this Church was on his premises, and not to be confused with the one built in 1848 on the old site of Chapel Hill).

Another "Account of the life of Adam Clarke" edited by his son Rev. J.B.B. Clarke, states that Dr. Clarke was stationer in the Hinde Street Circuit when he took up residence at Haydon Hall.

Presumably, Conference did not consult his feelings when it put him down as "Supernumerary" in 1831, which hurt him deeply. In a letter to his daughter, dated 31st July 1832 he said, "Today I am finally set down Supernumerary for Windsor with this

> "N.B. Though Dr. Clarke is set down Supernumerary for Windsor he is not bound to that Circuit but is most respectfully and affectionately requested to visit all parts of our Connexion, and labour according to his strength and convenience".

So I have a roving commission".

There seems to be no reference on the old Plans of the Windsor Circuit to Dr. Adam Clarke so it is likely that he died before the Printer could place his name on as "Supernumerary".

As you may know, he was taken ill on a Preaching appointment in Bayswater, London. A horse messenger was sent to convey the news to his wife, and Mary took horse and coach to be with him when he died of Cholera on 26th August 1832.

FRED RACKSTRAW

(Pastoral Sub-Committee Secretary)

==========

WORKING ON THE GRAND UNION CANAL - 1912-1914

Recently a neighbour of ours, Mr. Edwards aged 80, came to our house and allowed us to tape record some of his reminiscences of life on the Grand Union Canal before the First World War. He was born in Marylebone where he attended St. Mark's Church School. After leaving in 1910 he spent two years doing odd jobs, which included working at Bleriot's factory in Long Acre where the "air navigator" made lamps for the early cars.

He was sixteen when he went to work for the firm of Meades which operated steam tugs on the Grand Union Canal. They worked from Paddington Basin and had two tugs, the "Antelope" and the "Buffalo", big, wide boats which towed barges full of London refuse out to Slough and returned laden with sand and gravel for roads and building.

Among the many other boats starting out from Paddington, Mr. Edwards remembers "the Princess" belonging to Dickinsons of the Paper Mills at Croxley Green and the horse drawn boats of Fellows, Morton & Clayton which made the long journey to Manchester which involved passing through ninety locks, the first and deepest of which was at Denham, called "Denham Deep Water". When going through long tunnels with no tow path the horses had to be led over the top while the men lay on their backs on top of the cabin and propelled the boat by walking with their feet on the tunnel roof. This was something which Mr. Edwards on his steam tug never had to do, but he occasionally helped men on the narrow boats and says that it was very easy.

The route taken by the "Antelope" and "Buffalo" on which he normally worked, lay through Kensal Green, Willesden, Alperton, the Greenford Turns and along Greenford Straight to Ballsbridge. At that point there was a turn off to the left

leading to Brentford, but the Meades' tugs continued past Hayes, Harmondsworth, West Drayton and Yiewsley, through the New Cut near Langley on to a dead end at Slough.

A mate and two others crewed the tugs, but the narrow boats often had whole families living aboard. Many of them were beautifully decorated mainly with castles and roses which Mr. Edwards says were painted by a firm at Tring. The living quarters on the tugs were very comfortable and seem to have had folding furniture similar to that found in modern caravans. A coal-burning stove provided warmth and cooking facilities. The men slept on board after tying up for the night.

Mr. Edwards does not remember having any specific time off, but went home occasionally. He was paid 27/- a week which was considered a good wage at the time.

Refuse from the London streets was brought to Paddington and emptied down chutes on to the boats. The men made money by "totting", sorting the rubbish and selling anything that was worthwhile. It seems that quite a number of silver spoons used to be thrown away inadvertently and fetched a good price.

Once the refuse was sorted the tugs set out, usually between 4.30 and 5.00 a.m., each one pulling seven or eight barges laden with fifty tons apiece. Speed was of no particular importance, but the narrow boats were supposed to give way to the wide tugs. On one occasion Dickinson's boat "The Princess" met "The Antelope" at Mitre Bridge, which carries Scrubbs Lane across the Grand Union Canal near Kensal Green Cemetry. The men on "The Antelope" saw her coming and tooted, but she came on regardless and the two met right under Mitre Bridge at the narrowest point. "The Antelope" was wedged into the side and a whole day was wasted getting free.

The refuse was unloaded gradually along the route. Bones went to a glue factory near Greenford where "The stench was terrible" and road sweepings were put out along the tow path for neighbouring farmers to spread upon their fields. Sabey's gravel pits lay between Hayes and Yiewsley and there were brickfields at Iver and Langley and market gardens on the other bank. As barges were emptied of their refuse they were filled with sand and gravel from Sabey's pits for the return journey.

While aboard the crew fed cheaply and well living mainly off the canal and its banks. A great many fish were eaten. Freshwater fish with its rather earthy taste seems to have been more popular in the early days of this century than it is now. Five miles from West Drayton on the way to Slough were private fishing grounds filled with pike, tench, perch and dace. The tugs were ordered to coast slowly along this stretch, but it was a simple matter to stir up the water sufficiently to disturb the fish and bring them to the surface where they were easily caught. Lines were left out overnight to catch eels and in addition each boat carried an eel spear twelve to fifteen feet long with five prongs. When tired of fish, bacon could be bought cheaply from the Bacon factory at Langley. Rabbits were snared during overnight stops and mushrooms collected during the early mornings. An occasional duck was poached from a farm near Southall which had literally hundreds of ducks swimming on the canal. A seven pound weight was slipped on to a rope which had a noose at one end. When a bird was caught in the noose the weight was slipped down to hold the duck under water until it had been towed under the bridge and out of sight of the farmer, where it was retrieved and made ready for the pot.

Sometimes Mandrake roots were to be seen growing in the banks where soil had been washed away. The Mandrake has a male and female root vaguely human in shape and is a plant surrounded by superstition. It was thought to emit a shriek when pulled from the ground, causing the man pulling it to collapse. In rural areas in former times it was often tied to a dog's tail so that only the dog and not a human being

would be affected. However, the root has sedative properties and Mr. Edwards, who does not appear to have been superstitious remembers digging up the roots and selling them to Gilrays, a Herbalist in Homer Street, Marylebone, sometimes for half-a-crown and sometimes for five shillings. These mandrakes must have been garden escapes as the plant does not grow wild in this country.

As an initiation to the canal, Mr. Edwards remembers being siezed, stripped, smothered with grease and thrown overboard near Ballsbridge. He was left to run along the tow path for four or five miles before being allowed back on board.

Among other memories, Mr. Edwards recalled that the Powder Boat used to run through the Regent's Canal on its way from Enfield to Birmingham. No fires were allowed on board and tea had to be brewed at Lock-keeper's cottages. Despite these precautions one boat did blow up near the zoo and a great piece of iron still marks the spot.

Mr. Edwards' life on the Canal ended in 1914 when he went in the Army. Although he tried to get into Inland Water Transport he was put into the Infantry. After the war he worked as a mechanic on London Transport buses until his retirement.

EILEEN M. BOWLT.

==========

HISTORIC NOTE ON THE GRAND JUNCTION CANAL

FOUNDATION

The Grand Junction Canal was built to provide a direct and short route between London and Birmingham. The "Canal Age" had begun in 1761, with the opening of the Earl of Bridgewater's Canal between Worsley and Manchester. During the next thirty years a network of canals covered the Midlands, but Birmingham, the most important and fast-developing industrial town, had only a circuitous link (via the Oxford Canal) with London, its principal market.

The Grand Junction was proposed in April 1792, to join Braunston on the Oxford Canal with the Thames near Brentford. The scheme was backed by the Marquis of Buckingham and James Barnes, engineer of the Oxford Canal carried out the initial survey.

Two routes were proposed for the southern end of the new canal, one through Watford, Ruislip, Harrow, Southall and Hanwell, the other via Rickmansworth, Denham, Uxbridge and Harlington to Southall. A general meeting at Northampton in October 1792 adopted the latter route with a branch to Watford, thus Ruislip was by-passed.

The new canal unlike some existing ones was to be built large enough to take Thames and Trent barges. The specifications were 42½ft. wide at the top, 28ft. wide at the bottom and 4½ft, in depth. Locks were to be 14½ft. wide and 80ft. long.

The Act for the Grand Junction Canal received the Royal Assent on 30th April 1793 and the Brentford-Uxbridge section was opened on the 2rd November 1794. Aqueducts had to be built across the Colne at Cowley and Denham. The entire main route was 90½ miles long with 121 locks.

BRANCH TO PADDINGTON

It was quickly seen that a canal nearer London than Brentford would improve trade and work began on an extension to Paddington late in 1796. It was not completed until 1801 because of lengthy negotiations with the Bishop of London over land in the Paddington area.

RUISLIP RESERVOIR

The opening of the Paddington canal showed the need for new water supplies and as this could not be obtained from the River Colne because of agreements with Millers on its banks, a reservoir was suggested for Ruislip. The Enclosure of the Commons was about to take place and the Company had to negotiate with several different bodies for its land. When the Enclosure Map was published in 1806 the Grand Junction Canal Company had been granted an area of 39 acres lying between Copse Wood and Park Wood and 16 acres to one side, plus a slice of Park Wood. £2,316 or roughly £40 an acre had been paid.

The Reservoir was never very suitable for its purpose and ceased to be used as a Canal Feeder after 1851 when the Welsh Harp was built.

BRANCH TO SLOUGH

A branch to Slough was first mooted in 1878 with a view to opening up new brickfields for the London Market. The branch was opened in 1882. Many wharves were established in the Iver and Langley area and sand and gravel extraction industries opened up alongside the brickfields.

GRAND UNION CANAL COMPANY LTD.

The Grand Junction Canal Co., bought up the Old Union and Grand Union Companies in 1893 and after the First World War there was some question of a merger with the Warwick Canals. In 1929 a new combined company came into being which included the Regent's Canal (opened 1820) called the Grand Union Canal Co. Ltd.

EILEEN M. BOWLT.

==========

THE RESEARCH GROUP

A group of about ten poople has been meeting once a month in the Library to research into local history and has begun to construct a map of the Manor of Ruislip as it was in 1565. The basis for the work is the Terrier made in that year on behalf of King's College, Cambridge.

The Terrier divides the Manor into three parts, Westcote (modern Ruislip), Eastcote and Northwood and describes the land street by street and field by field, naming each tenant and giving the exact position of his holding. For example:

> "In Burye Street" - "JOHN SANDERS, gentleman, holds by copyhold a messuage with an orchard and three closes of meadow and pasture adjacent, containing 8 acres and lying between the Vicaridge to the North and James Osmond's cottage and New Street (North section Sharps Lane) to the South: as appears by a lease dated 1 May, 4 Edward VI. (1550)."

The common fields of Westcote and Eastcote were divided into Shotts, in which the tenants held sellions or strips of about one acre.

Taking a scale of 1 sq.in. to the acre and cutting pieces of paper the size of each holding, our researchers have fixed the Westcote holdings with reasonable accuracy as far south as the common fields (south of Brickwall Lane and Wood Lane). It was pleasing to see that irregularly shaped parcels of land interlocked remarkably well in Bates Field (Ruislip Golf Course) and Withy Crofts (land surrounded by Wood Lane, Ickenham Road and the High Street).

Northwood which is difficult to map because the bearings are often given as N.E. & S.W. would be complete if our researcher could bring herself to cheat by moving the Watford parish boundary.

The northern part of Eastcote is finished, but more juggling is required towards the Pinner boundary before the jigsaw will fit together.

We have just begun on the common fields which almost certainly will be the most difficult part and involves some field work in trying to find remnants of old boundaries.

Recently (May 1976) we traced the old hawthorn and oak hedge which bounded Marlpit Field on the North. Starting from the corner of Brickwall Lane and High Street we found layered hawthorn hedge with very large trunks in several gardens in Brickwall Lane, namely numbers 12, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30 and 32. The hawthorn hedge then continued diagonally across the back of Green Walk. It can be seen in the garden of No.13 Green Walk and lines up with the old oak at the bend in the garden of No.21. From there another oak can be seen in the garden of No.3 West Way. At this point the hawthorn hedge is missing, but another oak is in line outside No.34 Park Way and there is an old stump at the corner of Accacia Avenue and Park Way. Just beyond this point the Eastern boundary of Marlpit Field leads off to the right, marked by a footpath.

It was fascinating for us to be able to discover so many traces of an old hedge, in such a built-up area.

EILEEN M. BOWLT.

++

At the Research Group meetings during the Winter I have been working on a collection of documents, 55 in all, in the possession of the Ruislip Village Trust, relating to the land now occupied by numbers 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 High Street, Ruislip (Bookmarcus and the 4 cottages). The documents cover the period 1761 to 1965, and despite the complications of the splitting of the property, sublettings and considerable lack of clarity in definition, it has been possible to establish a rough chronology.

The documents include attested abstracts of marriages and baptisms from parish registers, solicitors' accounts, bills and receipts, a will, conveyances, leases and records of manorial procedure. Surprisingly, the last person recorded as having been formally 'admitted tenant' was Mrs. Ann Batchelor of Uxbridge on 13 February 1895. This was the last of a series of rapid changes in ownership, which began on 17 November 1894 when William Mason died intestate. On 29 January 1895 Richard Martin was declared by the manorial court to be his customary heir. On 9 February he surrendered the Property to Mrs. Batchelor.

The varied nature of the documents is both interesting in itself and provides insight into a greater range of topics than the central question of the changing ownership of '4 new built Copyhold Messuages, Cottages or Tenements lately erected by the said Orlando Stone and now in the several occupations of Benjamin Watkins, the Widow Young William Bell and one unoccupied and all that large yard adjoining and also fronting the Highway with the Woodhouse or Leantoo ..... and the Chimney of the unoccupied Messuage which chimney stood in a small Carpenters Shop' (Deed of Covenant dated 15 July 1839 between Orlando Stone Esq. and Mr. Daniel Page, blacksmith).

Daniel Page died in 1876 aged 68. His gravestone can be seen in St. Martin's churchyard, immediately to the left of the West Door, next to that of his parents William and Elizabeth and his sister Ann. He had been admitted tenant at 'the Court Leet General Court Baron and Customary Court of the Right Worshipful George Thackeray Doctor of Divinity Provost of the Kings College of Blessed Mary and Saint Nicholas of Cambridge and the Scholars of the same College Lords of the said Manor' on Tuesday 6 October 1840. The document goes on to record his purchase of the copyhold for £205. Another item is a bill to him for £3.5s. which details 8 items from 'Clerk attending at Ruislip to take Particulars of the Land Purchased' (6/8d) to 'Paid Stamp and Paper for surrender' (£1.1s). It was receipted on 5 November 1840 by the clerk to Mr. Walford, presumably the Robert Crook Walford of Uxbridge, Gent. who witnessed the Deed of Covenant quoted above.

William Page, also a blacksmith, died on 10 April 1846, leaving part of the property which he had acquired in 1793, to his son Daniel, who then owned all of it. Daniel's will, dated 10 August 1874 appointed William Mason and Edwin Ewer, both farmers of Ruislip as trustees for sale. The abstract of their title as trustees dated 7 July 1876 provides much useful information as it traces the title to the property from the admission of John Brice as customary tenant on 3 May 1774. The money raised by the sale in 1876 was to be held in trust for Daniel's nephew Henry Baldwin and niece Ann Batchelor. It is not clear exactly what happened, though William Mason certainly acquired part of the property, which passed indirectly to Ann Batchelor in 1895 as has been described.

The earliest documents are dated 1805. The admission of Elizabeth Newman widow as tenant took place on 3 June. She had been granted probate on 16 May of her husband Thomas's will made in 1789, of which she was the sole beneficiary, inheriting not only the land but 'all household goods, Furniture, Plate, China and Linen, Ready Moneys, Book dbets'. Thomas, a baker, had been admitted tenant on 8 May 1761.

Included with the collection of documents are some parish register extracts. Thomas married Elizabeth Gristerd, also of Ruislip, on 30 November 1779 in St. Martin's, where their 2 children were baptised: Susannah on 23 July 1780 and John on 11 August 1782. John also became a baker, but there is no evidence in the documents that there was a baker's shop in the property. Under the terms of his father's will he would have inherited 'all that Copyhold Messuage or Tenement' on his mother's death, but on 20 December 1813 he and Elizabeth both resigned their rights to Thomas Hurry Riches of Uxbridge, Gentleman. One of the details of this document is the agreement to pay £100 to Elizabeth Sabine 'the natural sister of John and Susanna Newman'. Elizabeth Newman was buried at Denham on 9 September 1821. Susanna married James Garner of Ickenham, also a baker. Her brother John was buried at Denham on 24 August 1823, and on 30 August 1825 William Seymour of Ruislip, Shoemaker, swore before a Justice of the Peace 'that he knew and was acquainted with John Newman late of Ruislip aforesaid deceased from his Childhood until the time of his decease and that to the best of this Deponent's knowledge and belief the said John Newman was never married and died a Batchelor'. There may have been some problem about the property at this time. All the register extracts I have quoted are dated 1825, and another item is Susanna Garner's deposition dated

5 September that she had often heard her parents say that the mortgage her father had taken out on the property with Mrs. Rebecca Blount of Uxbridge, of £100, had been paid off. It may have been a question of establishing ownership, as Susanna's admission as tenant in April 1824 on the surrender of Thomas Hurry Riches was followed by her husband's covenant to surrender the copyhold to William Franklin in September 1825. Franklin sold it to Orlando Stone in 1832.

This has been a sketchy and partial picture. I have not described the 20th Century history of the property, which came to the Ruislip Village Trust in September 1931. The last document is the lease of the shop to W.J. Knights in 1965, when it became a bookshop. I have as yet not had time to unravel the financial side of all these transactions, nor to use other sources to explain some of the areas of confusion, particularly the details of how the property was subdivided.

JANE SNOWDEN.

MANOR FARM, RUISLIP

Interim report on an excavation of the outer earthwork at Manor Farm

In April and May this year members of the Society carried out an excavation of the large earthwork which runs east and west 72 m. to the north of the Manor Farm House. At a point 26 m. from the eastern boundary fence a trench was taken out to an average depth of 1.5 metres across the ditch from north to south. The objective of the dig was to establish if possible the age and use of this substantial earthwork which extends in an arc from Bury Street in the west to gardens to the rear of houses in Pinn Way in the east and could possibly continue through to Eastcote Road.

The excavation has yielded pottery, some domestic animal bones and worked and unworked flints and has also revealed a ditch section which seems to indicate at least three stages of development.

Gordon J. Copley in his Archaeology of South East England has indicated that the earthwork complex around Manor Farm is typical 11th C. Normal Castle Mound and Bailey and it appears possible that the large ditch was originally an outer defensive rampart conforming in lay out to similar 11th C. 'protected' villages in S.E. England.

The Scientific dating of the excavated pottery is now taking place and this together with identification of pollen spores taken from earth samples at selected levels it is hoped will enable the possible date of the earthwork construction to be verified. The worked flints and 'wasters' found in the ditch are apparently of an early Neolithic culture (c. 2500 BC) and appear to indicate fabrication of these artificats on site and therefore poses the possibility of a prehistoric community in the vicinity.

An exhibition of Maps, photographs and finds will be placed in the Ruislip Library later this year and a full report will be completed when available material has been dated and conclusions established.

R.A. BEDFORD.

MEDIEVAL KILN AT POTTER STREET HILL, PINNER

" "The name Potter Street on the border between Ruislip and Pinner parishes suggests the manufacture of pots, but there is no known documentary evidence for this", wrote Dr. D.F.K. Kiddle in 1974 (Ph.D. thesis, London University).

In his book "Pinner in the Vale" (1957), Edwin Ware noted that Potter Street Hill included the double dip known as the porridge pot ... "There are earthworks along the road including Grims Dyke; a high embankment carrying s small stream at an unnatural level in the Porridge Pot and a large pond with raised banks, of the type known as "Caesar's ponds, at the top of the hill."

T ere are a number of large well-spaced modern houses on the N.E. side of Potter Street Hill but the point known as the Porridge Pot where the stream crosses the road has remained a meadow unbuilt upon. In the Spring of last year developers drove a cutting to form the foundations of an access road into this field in which it is intended to build several houses. A local resident, Mr. Jeffkins, quickly noticed that the exposed surface was liberally sprinkled with pieces of grey, unglazed pottery. This was a very keen observation since the pottery being unglazed could so easily have been mistaken for bits of stone. Closer searching revealed what was apparently the cross section of a pit or trench just below the field surface on both sides of the developer's cutting. The pit was full of broken grey pottery. The London Museum was notified and the site visited by Miss ALISON LAWS, Assistant Archeological Officer for the West London area. Samples of pottery were quickly identified as medieval with a tentative date of 1300 ± 50 A.D. Following this Miss Laws wrote:

"

THE MUSEUM OF LONDON

MEDIEVAL KILN AT POTTER STREET HILL, PINNER, MIDDX.

Following the discovery of sherds of Medieval pottery, a brief rescue excavation was carried out on the above site with the kind permission of the developers, Crest Homes, during the last two weeks of June, 1975. Building excavations for the construction of a roadway onto the site had disturbed features of medieval date and a great quantity of pottery was visible in the sections of the roadway cutting.

After the topsoil and disturbed pottery had been removed, it was soon realised that much of the deposit containing the pottery had already been removed from the site by machine, but in the area to the north of the roadway it was possible to uncover all that remained of one of the kilns. Below c. 15 cm. of topsoil and cutting into the natural deposits of pebble gravel and London clay, was an oval feature with a diameter of c. 2.50 m. on its longest axis. The upper filling which was c. 50 cm. in depth contained a thick deposit of soil, clay and pottery sherds. Beneath this the surface of the clay was burnt orange, of soft consistency, and contained pottery sherds and a sprinkling of chalk (thought to have been used in the firing of the kiln to produce a reducing atmosphere). Two flue channels became apparent at this stage cutting into the hard baked clay and the area thought to be the stoke hole also contained a considerable quantity of chalk.

It is intended to publish a short report in 'The London Archaeologist' as soon as possible in order that the finds should be made known. This will consist of a brief report on the investigation and illustrations of the various pottery forms. At a later stage a full report will be published

in the Transactions of the London & MiddleseX Archaelogical Society. Work on the pottery is being carried out by the West London Archaelogical Field Group at 232 High Street, Brentford, on Tuesday and Thursday evenings from 7.30 p.m. - 10.00 p.m. and 9.30 a.m. - 5.00 p.m. on Sundays. Anyone interested in helping in this work will be most welcome. The Field Group is also involved in a scheme for watching building sites in West Middlesex and once again, help is needed in this work.

On initial investigation, it appears that the pottery from the kiln forms a homogeneous group. The range of pottery forms from the kiln is considerable but the fabric always is a hard grey ware containing large numbers of small flint grits. As nearly all the vessels appear to be wasters, it is assumed that the very small percentage of red ware present accidentally acquired an oxidised fabric in the firing. The forms include jars and bowls with applied decoration, jugs with slashed and thumb impressed handles and thumb pressed bases. Fragments of at least two curfews (fire covers) have also been found. Although a considerable amount of research will be needed before the distribution and date of this material is fully realised, it is known to have been found on other sites in Middlesex, at Elstree, the More near Rickmansworth, and from the medieval manor house site at Northolt. It is generally thought on these sites to date to the second half of the 13th century. Previous to the discovery of this kiln, it was thought that the bulk of this type of pottery was produced in Hertfordshire. The find is of considerable importance and will certainly add greatly to our knowledge of the pottery of this period.

Alison Laws 20.7.75 "

The amount of material excavated was vast and has been sufficient to keep several workers of the West London Archeological Field Group busy in washing, marking and sorting the boxes and boxes of pieces of pottery every Sunday, and Tuesday and Thursday evenings for the last six months. No whole vessels were found and so well was everything mixed up that it seems unlikely that any vessels will be reconstructed. However, from the fragments of rims, bases, spouts and handles, it appears that a large range of pots, bowls and jugs were produced. Work on the pottery is expected to carry on for a long time yet, but an interim report on the Pinner Kiln Pottery as it is now called, is to be given at a Conference on London Kilns in April. Incidentally some of the Pinner Kiln pottery that was excavated from the Northolt Manor site (before it was known where it was made) can be seen in Gunnersbury Park Museum, Acton.

There remains the question of the possible link between the name Potter Street and the one time existence of a pottery. It now seems almost too obvious that the name survived long after all memory and trace of the workings disappeared. But 600-700 years is a long time and names have a habit of changing, so could it be that a Mr. Potter lived near here, quite coincidentally, at a much later date. Amazingly, it now appears highly likely that the name does indeed recall this former industry. Dr. Kiddle has found a reference to the name in 1454 just over 100 years later than the pottery. If the name has survived these last 500 years it seems reasonable to suppose that it existed over another two or three life times.

COLIN BOWLT.