

FURNITURE AND WOODWORK IN THE CHURCHWARDENS' ACCOUNTS, CHARING, KENT, 1590–1635

Chris Currie

On the 4th August 1590, a certain 'Mr Dios' discharged his fowling piece in the vicinity of the church at Charing, Kent. His intended target is not known but a contemporary, Robert Honeywood of Pett Place, recorded that the shot sparked a fire in the shingles of the church roof *ye day being extreme hott and ye same shingells very dry*.¹ It is unlikely that this endeared Mr. Dios to the parishioners of Charing whose efforts to rebuild and refurnish the church are recorded in the churchwardens' accounts.² They reveal the way the task was approached as well as recording later additions and alterations to the church furnishings; of particular interest to regional furniture studies are pieces still in the church today.

Situated on the Pilgrims' Way, Charing was never isolated, and being midway between Lambeth and Canterbury, the Archbishops' Palace adjacent to the church was a favoured stopover for leading clerics since Saxon times. By the sixteenth century it was a long-established market town with two annual fairs; it would not have been a cultural backwater. In the seventeenth century its population was around 500.³

The fire in the church had been intense, *ye bells in ye steeple melted*, and saving floors over the porch and turret, little of the church was left but bare walls.⁴ The nave was the responsibility of the parishioners and its structural repair was well under way by 1592; the date is recorded on a collar bracket above the chancel arch. The new roof timbers were decorated with strap-work and chequered herringbone detail, painted rather than carved. It took a further thirty years for the lessee of the rectory to discharge his obligation to repair the chancel roof. A number of 'poppy head' bench ends, likely to date from the early years of the rebuilding, echo the painted detail in the roof. Most also have carved foliate panels but three incorporate 'green men', two of typical stylised form and one with a more naturalistic face acknowledging Renaissance influence in its Medieval theme.⁵ No record for their supply has been found, making it possible they were gifts or that their provision was not the responsibility of the churchwardens. They may be referred to in a 1594 entry reading, *nails to Holt for ye standinge Deske and mending ye pew 7s. 2d*. That a pew needed mending so soon after the fire suggests the possibility that, contrary to accounts, at least one survived, but there seems little reason to question that those still in the church post date the fire. As 7s. 2d. seems a large sum for nails alone, the entry might be interpreted as relating to three separate items, i.e. nails, the standing desk and mending the pew.⁶ The standing desk is no longer in the church and it has not been possible to identify 'Holt'.

In 1594 the churchwardens also bought a chest and there is little reason to doubt it is still in the church. The entry reads *To the joiner for the church chest vi s. viii d*. Most

recorded payments for work on the church or the supply of materials at that time name individuals, so the use of 'the joiner' in this instance suggests the churchwarden was not acquainted with the maker. It is unlikely that a Charing joiner would not have been known by name. The accounts contain a number of 'ceases' (assessments for contributions for parish funds) listing townsfolk, and as parishes were the primary unit of local administration throughout this period, liability for poor relief gave strong incentive for parish officers to be familiar with all their flock. An additional charge of viiid. for *fetching the chest home* underlines the likelihood that it was made outside the town. It is unlikely that 8d. would have carried it far; a following entry records 'Bing' receiving 6d. for carrying planks into the church, and some thirty five years later it cost only 12d to have the dial for the church clock carried the seven miles from Ashford.

The oak chest measures 57½" x 21¼" x 25" tall. Whilst appearing clamp fronted it is essentially of boarded construction, the 21" wide single plank front being nailed and pegged into rebates in the stiles. The maker stopped these rebates at the lower edge of the front board, a detail that would have required extensive work with mallet and chisel. This would have been significantly more arduous than running the rebates straight through with a plough or rebate plane, but it is a feature that disguises a simple construction. In a period lacking systematic dictionaries and defined by idiosyncratic spelling, furniture historians are perhaps too eager to seek precise terminology from documentary sources, but in this instance at least, the possible anomaly of an essentially boarded chest being supplied by a joiner is mitigated by longitudinal rails mortise and tenoned between the stiles.⁷ These rails are concealed behind the front and backboards, the lower edges of which are nailed to them with the boards forming the floor of the chest resting on top. It is a hybrid construction that works quite well. The sides are joined to the stiles in the same fashion as the front and back but without the joined rail, their lower edges being nailed to the outer floorboards instead.

The top of this chest also gives an illusion of joined construction, appearing to be a single framed panel. It is in fact formed from one board of crown cut oak ¾" thick, the illusion of a frame is created by four iron straps (approximately 1⅜" wide and ⅛" thick) running around the perimeter, butted tightly together where they meet at the corners and fixed with rivets through the oak. This illusion is probably accidental as the colour of the new oak and iron would have contrasted far more than is now the case. It is likely the straps were simply intended to strengthen the top, particularly the end grain, and hinder unauthorised access by cutting through the oak. The rest of the chest is also secured by iron straps; in addition to those visible running from front to back, both around the sides and under the chest, a further pair run the length of the base, returning around the inside face of the sides. Apart from the ironwork, the only decoration on this chest is a simple scratched moulding to the outside edge of the stiles.

Early modern craftsmen were paid in a variety of ways for their work, including piecework, daily rates and agreed fixed prices.⁸ Joiners in England regularly charged for their labour alone, the client supplying timber and paying directly for other materials, specialist skills or components. As the churchwardens' accounts itemise many entries in detail, it is possible to speculate, tentatively, how long this chest took to construct. Uncertainty over what the 6s. 8d. covered means that conclusions are crude indications, justified by the infrequency with which such opportunities arise. It is unlikely the

payment included the cost of ironwork, as in 1607 when acquiring a 'poor man's box', *three locks, three keyes and chernells*,⁹ all items found on the chest, cost the churchwardens 4s. 6d.. If this amount was deducted from the total paid for the chest, less than the daily rate of 2s. 6d. for a joiner and 'his man' would have remained to construct it, without considering the remaining ironwork or timber required.¹⁰ Timber purchased by the parish broadly rises over the period from 0.6d. per foot in 1590 to 2d. per foot in 1707. It generally appears to have been oak where not otherwise specified, although some fluctuations in price might indicate other species if they do not relate to relevant quality or size of the orders. The chest would have needed at least fifty feet of oak, representing a cost of 2s. 6d. at the lowest rate, leaving 4s. 2d. for the joiner and his man, enough for just over a day and a half's labour. Given the construction of the chest this is probably achievable.¹¹ Alternatively, if the payment covered labour only, slightly over two and a half days for the joiner and his assistant would seem a reasonably comfortable work rate.

The first entry to name a joiner is '*To Kynde [later Kyne] for making ye pulpit*'. It occurs in the late 1590s. Costing over 34s., this pulpit must have been a significant piece of work, sadly, as seen below, it was re-modelled and then replaced in the 1630s, a short lifespan revealing that the Victorians were by no means alone in sweeping away the old. It has not been possible to find any evidence that Kynde was a local man; the name does not occur in any surviving Lay Subsidy, parish or probate records, but as the pre-1590 registers were lost in the fire this is by no means conclusive. If not a local man it is possible Kynde also made the chest above, unknown by name then but familiar to the churchwardens by the time of this later entry, but such a conclusion can only be speculative. Neither is it known if he was involved in making any part of the font for which the parish paid 42s. 6d. in 1599–1600, which with itemised entries for timber (9s.) nails and hinges clearly involved more than the work of a mason. Like the pulpit, it was replaced in the 1630s.

Kynde was again joiner of choice in 1601 when he was paid 13s. 9d. for five and a half days making *Eston's seate* at the rate of 2s. 6d. per day for himself and his man. The only likely Eston traceable was Thomas, married with three children and who died in 1604.¹² He features several times in the accounts buying old timbers from the church and supplying 'bards' (boards?) to the value of 15s. 10d.. Why he might have merited a seat at the expense of the parish remains unknown, but it appears to have been funded by a special collection. The materials included nails and 'charnells' costing 12d., suggesting it was an enclosed pew rather than a freestanding chair or bench. Most of the timber for *the same seate* was supplied by Stephen Large at a cost of 3s. 4d., but an additional 7d. paid to Angell Knowlden for *pannell bored* suggests a clear distinction between the material for panels (most likely to have been quartered and of the best quality) and that required elsewhere; it is noteworthy that it came from a separate supplier.

Like Kynde's work on the pulpit, Eston's seat has been swept away by later changes, leaving nothing clearly attributable to this joiner. However, within memory a number of carved fragments were on display in the church that have fallen prey to theft; fortunately they have been recorded photographically.¹³ They include a set of three carved panels, one bearing the arms of Horne and another those of the Darells; the third contains a 'Romaine' head, also linked with the Darells, and is dated 1598. As this date coincides with Kynde's activity in Charing it is tempting to speculate they are his work, although it

has been suggested that these carvings were brought to Charing from the church at Little Chart, less than three miles away, following its destruction by a flying bomb in 1945.¹⁴ Little Chart was the seat of the Darells. However, on visiting Charing in 1854 Sir Stephen Glynne noted *some ancient seats in the nave, (dated) 1592 and 1622*.¹⁵ Neither of these dates match accurately the 1598 panel or another fragment dated 1629 that was photographed alongside it in 1954 (see below), but they are close enough to consider the possibility of an error in Glynne's notes. The carvings also appear to have been in Charing when Leland Duncan visited in September 1920 and recorded all three, describing the romaine head as *a Saracen's head couped at the shoulders, bearded, wreathed about the temples and on the head a chapeau – the crest of Darell*.¹⁶ If these carvings did come from Little Chart it seems they had been taken to Charing long before 1945, or that they originated in Charing and were taken to Little Chart due to their Darell connection some time after 1920, only to return to Charing in 1945. On balance it seems likely they originated at Charing and are possibly the work of Kynde.

Named suppliers of timber in the accounts reveal much about the way the trade functioned in the area at the time. Stephen Large, a local man, supplied timber on several occasions, including 500 feet of board in one instance. His stated occupation was a *trugger*¹⁷ but he traded a wider range of woodland products than this might suggest, supplying *a shovel wood and spade wood* to the church shortly after the fire for 8d.; *setyng on the yearnies* [irons] *of them* costing a further 2d.. Supplying timber seems a logical activity to find combined with the use of underwood and smaller dimension material such products would have required. Elsewhere however, timber was sourced from locals with no obvious sign of trading it on a regular basis. Angell Knowleden, supplier of the panel board for Eston's seat, came from a yeoman family established in the town for at least two generations before him. His occupations are recorded as grocer and yeoman. His grandfather's will of 1552 had left land and, significantly, woodland, to Angell's father and uncle.¹⁸ In turn, his father's will bequeathed upwards of 36 acres equally to his five sons.¹⁹ This would suggest Angell owned at least seven acres (possibly more, as at least one brother had died before 1600), by no means a substantial holding, but one likely to include woodland and access to timber. Nicholas Baldock supplied *ii hundred of borde* to the church in 1591 and came from a similar background to Knowlden, being a husbandman from a Charing family of two generations at least. He served terms as a churchwarden and seems to have specialised in growing hemp.²⁰ No records indicate that trading timber was a significant source of income for him.

Instances of timber being purchased from similar sources can be seen elsewhere, as in the Chamberlains' Accounts for Woodstock, Oxfordshire, where townsmen with no obvious connection to the timber trade are recorded selling timber, board and plank to the town council.²¹ In an age when timber was regularly hewn, sawn or cleft where it had stood, it is unsurprising that landholders, free of the need for specialised handling and milling equipment deemed essential today, should have regarded the trees on their land in the same light as any other crop. They could harvest and convert it using their own labour or that of local sawyers, like William Bayly hired to saw timber for Charing's bell in 1609, then retain it for their own use or sell it to meet local demand in much the same way as their other produce.

In 1624 the church purchased a communion table for 12s.. This is probably the table

currently in the Lady Chapel that was found in the vestry in the nineteenth century. It measures 51" x 26" x 30" tall on 4½" legs, the frame being elm and the mitre-framed top oak. Traces of red pigment remain on the frame which is fairly crude in both proportions and the execution of its carving. No maker is named and its purchase occurred twenty-five years after Kynde's final mention and six before William Amiss, the next named joiner, appears. Either may have made it, however, having formerly been mentioned by name more than once it is unlikely Kynde would have become anonymous in this instance, and the table bears little resemblance, either stylistically or in competence of workmanship, to later work by Amiss. Also in the town around the time was *Robert Coossens of Charing, joiner*²² who could have made the table, but an additional carriage charge of 6d. suggests that, like the chest above, it originated outside the town but not beyond the area. Timber for the table is not itemised in the account and because 12s. (around five days work for the joiner and his man) is a generous amount for labour alone, it is likely to have been included in the price.

The church had a communion table prior to 1624 as a carpet had been purchased for one in 1605, whether this later one was a replacement or addition is unclear. Further expenditure on a carpet for 'the' communion table in 1633 and 1637 suggest the former or, that at least by then, the church had just one again. Pre-dating Laud's appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury, it seems unlikely the purchase of this table reflects a change from table-wise to altar-wise position. However, given Charing's proximity to Canterbury it is likely Laud's influence would have been felt swiftly and the acquisition of the altar carpet at the start of his Primacy in 1633 is perhaps more than coincidence.²³ In 1630 the accounts first record work by William Amiss [also Ames, Amys] who spent two days altering Kynde's pulpit. He received 3s. 1 ½d. per day for himself and his man for this work, roughly a 25% increase on the rate paid to Kynde in 1599 which is slightly better than suggested inflation in food prices over the period.²⁴ The reason for the short lifespan of Kynde's pulpit is unclear. The chancel roof had finally been replaced by 1620 (the date recorded on a tie beam at the eastern end), and may still have been causing changes to the arrangement of the church a decade later. Alternatively, Sir Edward Dering was controversially undertaking work to the Brent Chapel at this time with repercussions for the rest of the church. Sir Nicholas Gilbourne, lessee of the Archbishop's Palace, had written to Dering in 1629 complaining that he could not *well conceive who may lawfully deface or pluck down any part of the church, which is no parte of the chapple*.²⁵ It seems he was particularly concerned for seats *so longe ago built at myne own charge, and wherein I and my family have satt so many years together*; a plea that might explain why no mention of the bench ends above can be found in the accounts. The ensuing difference between Dering and Gilbourne was such that Sir Nathaniel Brent felt obliged to try and reconcile them later that year.²⁶ Towards the end of 1633 a further letter from Brent reveals that by then Dering had *often been presented by the churchwardens of Charing for the decaye of their Isle* and that actions should be taken speedily to avoid complaints to the Archbishop.²⁷ These correspondences serve as reminders that many forces influenced the layout and structure of churches, which could at times become an arena for the vying egos of the local gentry. How much this influenced the alterations to Charing's pulpit remains unanswerable, but by 1630 Amiss had given it staples and nails for a valance, a seat, a coat of varnish and a new set of stairs. Whilst stairs might have

been an improvement, the vicar of the day was sufficiently attached to the old steps to purchase them from the church for 6d.

William Amiss was a Charing man. If not born there he probably had well-established connections, as a John Amis[s] had been churchwarden in 1596. A William Amiss is listed in the 'cease' taken by the churchwardens in 1631 as well as the 1664 Hearth Tax returns,²⁸ and further entries in the accounts in the 1660s confirm one was working in Charing at both dates.²⁹ The Hearth Tax did not apply to every household,³⁰ but the hearth on which William Amiss was taxed in 1664 gives some indication of his relative status amongst those taxable in the town at the time. Of thirty-five householders assessed, Amiss was one of six with just one hearth, eleven others had two, seven had three and five had four; six others had five or more, the maximum being eight. This suggests the income from his trade placed him at the lower end of those eligible to pay the tax (above the level of pauper and inhabiting a house worth over 20s. per year) but by no means amongst the towns most prosperous tradesmen. The 6d. William Amiss and seventeen others paid in the 'cease' of 1631 would seem to corroborate this suggestion of lower middling status, 34 parishioners paying less and 45 more.³¹

In 1637 Amiss was paid £5 to replace the pulpit he had remodelled seven years earlier. A significant part of this forms the current pulpit although a print of 1840 shows that it once stood considerably higher and was entered by a spiralling stair; it had been reduced to its present height by 1890.³² It shows evidence of having had appliqués within the bejewelled arches and split turnings on the framework. The work is neat and competently executed, whilst perhaps not keenly advanced in style, it suggests a well-trained hand, eye for proportion and understanding of contemporary fashion; it is not a crude rural interpretation.

A carved panel bearing the initials 'R.D.I. [JJ]' and dated 1629 is no longer in the church but an image survives in the National Monuments Record of England.³³ When Leland Duncan recorded this carving in the South Transept in 1920 he described it as having the initials of Sir Robert Darell and his second wife Jane.³⁴ The carved roundels on it are identical to those on the pulpit making it undoubtedly a remnant of Amiss' earlier work, though it seems unlikely to be one of the *ii new peeces* he supplied for the earlier pulpit costing 8d. in the accounts for 1630.

Later references to Amiss in the accounts include 9s. for work in the vicarage and mending the church gate in 1663 and £1 13s. 6d. for a *frame for the Kings Armes* in 1664. Royal arms bearing the date 1716 still hang in the church and show evidence of overpainting with the date 1685, the accession of James II, also visible. The suggestion has been made, and challenged, that the original arms might have been still earlier and a rare example of those of Charles I,³⁵ although being quite plain the surviving frame seems unlikely to be that supplied by Amiss.

In 1635 another *cheist with three lockes and keys to remaine to the church* was purchased for 20s.; no maker is named. It seems to have remained there to this day. It is made from an assortment of hardwoods, the framed front having elm muntins and bottom rail, whereas the styles, top rail and panels are of walnut. The walnut is of mediocre quality and contains a great deal of sapwood. It has undergone a certain amount of restoration and it is possible that the elm members are replacements, however, the carving on the muntins appears consistent with that on the stiles. If original, these

timbers would have contrasted somewhat eccentrically when new unless, like the communion table, they were once painted. The remainder of the chest is of boarded construction. The top is fashioned from two planks of crown cut oak nailed to bearers either end, and the sides are each also of two oak boards with the grain running horizontally and the joints strengthened with iron straps. The floor of the chest is formed from two boards running lengthways, one of walnut the other chestnut; the back has been replaced. At 56" x 22" x 26" high, the dimensions are very similar to the earlier chest. The hybrid joined/boarded construction is sound but hardly the highest quality and betrays an element of economy; the front is conceivably the work of a different hand, if not workshop, to the rest but the similarity between the walnut baseboard and panels suggests they have always been together. Like the communion table the carving on this chest is stiff and crudely cut in comparison with the pulpit, suggesting it is not the work of Amiss. The stylistic influences are similar but the carving on the pulpit is more accomplished, as is the overall quality of its construction. The 20s. paid for this chest included locks and keys, and there being no separate entry for timber it would seem to have been bought 'by the great', with the price representing the complete item. If 3s. is deducted for timber and 4s. 6d. (the sum paid by the church for three locks, keys and 'cherrnells' for the 'poor man's box' in 1607) is taken as a guide to the value of the ironwork, the joiner would have received approximately 12s. 6d. for his labour, roughly four days work for him and an assistant at the rate paid to Amiss in 1620. Like the earlier chest and the communion table there is a separate entry of 18d. for delivery. Barring a substantial increase in carriage costs this would suggest that it was made further afield than the earlier pieces whose delivery cost 6d. and 8d. respectively. The churchwardens' accounts from Charing disclose much about the provision of woodwork for the church over the period they cover. They link surviving woodwork with documentary evidence for date of purchase, cost, source of materials and potential or known suppliers. They might not reveal a distinctive Kentish style but they do confirm some styles that were in Kent at the time. Their full transcription and study would probably reveal a great deal more. These accounts are by no means unique; scores survive across the country, a resource largely untapped by furniture historians and potentially of great relevance to regional studies. Much of the furniture covered by such accounts will have disappeared, yet as Charing proves, some is still there and should be recorded. The loss of the carved fragments from Charing would suggest that recording would be better undertaken sooner rather than later. Viewed together, the furniture and woodwork recorded in Charing might also suggest some broader subtleties about the way it was commissioned and marketed at the time. The sample is small, but it is worthy of note that when 'fixtures' were purchased craftsmen usually appear to have been known to the churchwardens and named in the account; they were generally paid a daily rate for labour with materials being supplied by the church and separately itemised. By contrast the two chests and communion table were supplied anonymously and with the exception of the ironwork on the earlier chest, the prices paid would seem to be for the complete item. The addition of carriage costs suggests the churchwardens sourced this moveable furniture beyond the town from joiners other than those favoured for bespoke work in the church. An introspective culture of interdependency has been seen as an essential factor in the way early modern small towns functioned, making the 'outsourcing' of these items slightly

surprising, particularly in the case of local man William Amiss being overlooked for the chest in 1635 yet known to be working in the church several years before and after. Clearly, many mundane explanations of little significance are possible; Amiss may have been otherwise engaged or unwell in 1635. Yet it is worth considering the possibility that market forces gave the churchwardens incentive to look elsewhere. The trend observed allows the scenario that by the early seventeenth century the churchwardens of Charing were able to buy furniture, like the chests and table, at competitive prices from suppliers specialising in making or marketing such items. Regular demand would have made tables and chests particularly suitable for producing repeatedly, possibly speculatively, with an efficiency of familiarity, for marketing over a wide area at prices local joiners, like Amiss, would have been unable or unwilling to match on a one off basis.¹⁶ The same would not be so of bespoke fitted work where the local man would have an advantage. Conceivably, joiners like Amiss concentrated on such bespoke projects, or combined them with their own specialities that filled a niche in the market.

A great deal of conjecture is required to make such a visualisation from the sample above, and it is offered as a speculative model that might stand or fall in the light of continuing studies. Should it stand in Charing it is unlikely to be a universal model. Markets undoubtedly varied considerably from area to area, being influenced by factors like density of population, quality of communication and transport, and the intensity of local tradition. Such factors make the questions this model raises highly relevant to our understanding of regional furniture styles. The structure and complexity of markets and the incentives or restraints that influenced buyers to set their horizons when looking to purchase are factors that will have helped delineate regions over which styles spread themselves. Such regions are likely to have been sensitive to time, social status of the buyer and the item in question. Prior to the eighteenth century there are few records from which they might be discerned, but churchwardens' accounts are one source awaiting greater exploitation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am particularly indebted to Sarah Pearson and Pat Winzar of Charing for generously sharing their knowledge and work on the town's past. Their help enabled a far more detailed study than would otherwise have been possible.

ABBREVIATIONS

CKS – Centre For Kentish Studies
 NA – National Archives
 NMR – National Monuments Record

REFERENCES

- 1 Grove, L., R., A., 'The Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, Charing', *About Charing*, Kent County Council (1984). P9.
- 2 CKS P78 5/1/1–2. The accounts commence in August 1590, the fire presumably destroying earlier records. They were transcribed into a notebook by Leland L. Duncan in 1920, now in the library of the Kent Archaeological Society and accessible online at [www.kentarchaeology.org.uk/Research/Libr/MIs./](http://www.kentarchaeology.org.uk/Research/Libr/MIs/)

CharingNotes/01.htm . Duncan's transcripts have been the main source for this study although some details have been checked against the original document and more thorough transcripts kindly provided by Pat Winzar of Charing, both of which contain detail omitted by Duncan.

3 'The Compton Census 1676', Kent Archaeological Society Vol. XVII (1960). P.168. Charing is listed as having 304 communicants in 1674. A suggested ratio of four children to six adults would give a likely total of around 504 at that date.

4 *Charing – the Parish and the Church*, Charing and District Local History Society, Charing Parochial Church Council (1992).

5 A fourth 'green man' once in the church and clearly from the same series, can be seen at the National Monument Record: AA54/1207.

6 In 1607 three locks, three keys and hinges for the poor man's box cost only 4s. 6d.

7 Also of relevance to terminology is the observation that both this ostensibly boarded chest supplied by a joiner and the boarded chest with a framed panel front discussed below are clearly described as 'chests' in the accounts. See Sleep, J., 'Chests, Coffers and Trunks in East Anglia, 1650–1730: a Step Towards Definition', *Regional Furniture*, Vol. XVIII (2004).

8 Airs, M., *The Tudor and Jacobean Country House: a Building History*. Sutton (1995) p57. Colvin H. M., (ed), *The History of the Kings Works, Vol III (Part 1) 1485–1660*, HMSO (1975), Chapter 2.

9 'Chernells' and 'charnalls' both occur in the accounts, the term would seem to refer to hinges in each instance.

10 Shortly after the chest was purchased 'Kyne ye joyner' was paid 2s. 6d. per day for himself and 'his man' for work in the church. This rate rises to around 3s. 1½d. by 1630, a similar amount to that being paid by the churchwardens at Strood, Kent in 1631–2. 'Churchwarden's Accounts from Strood and Bethersden', Kent Archaeological Society Vol V.

11 Rose, W., *The Village Carpenter*, C.U.P (1937). p39. Rose states that in the late nineteenth century the construction of a maids travelling chest was considered a good day's work. This included preparing all the timber by hand, dovetailing the corners and fitting lock and handles.

12 Pat Winzar, Charing, pers. comm..

13 NMR AA54/1205–10.

14 Sarah Pearson and Pat Winzar, Charing. pers. comm. John Darell married Anne Horne (daughter of Robert Horne, bishop of Winchester) in 1567. This would seem to strengthen the Little Chart association, although the family also had strong links with Charing. Another fragment, photographed at the same time, depicts a 'green man' clearly carved by the same hand as the Charing bench ends discussed above. If this also came from Little Chart it would suggest that the same craftsman was working in both churches.

15 Grove, *About Charing* p.11.

16 www.kentarchaeology.org.uk/Research/Libr/MIs/MIsCharing/01.htm

17 CKS QM/RLv/29. Kent Quarter Sessions 1594.

18 CKS PRC32/25/22. Will of Andrew Knowlden, 1552/3.

19 CKS PRC32/35/185. Will of Robert Knowlden, 1585.

20 CKS PRC32/45/261. Will of Nicholas Baldocke, 1622.

21 Maslen, M. (ed) *Woodstock Chamberlains Accounts 1609–50*, Oxfordshire Record Society, Vol. 58 (1993). pp.25, 133 and 158 for examples.

22 CKS QM/SRc/1617/64. Coossens was ordered to appear before the Quarter Sessions in July 1617 and to be of good behaviour towards Alice Seward, spinster.

23 Halsall, P., 'Archbishop William Laud: Visitation Articles, 1635', *Modern History Sourcebook*, <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1635laud.html>. It is worthy of note that the church also purchased a new stone font in 1633. Laud's visitation articles of 1635 specified churches should have 'a font of stone, set up in the usual place; a convenient and decent Communion Table, with a carpet of silk or other stuff...'. The carpet bought at Charing in 1637 is specified as being of green broad cloth.

24 Brenner, Y. S., 'The Inflation of Prices in England, 1551–1650'. *Economic History Review*, 15 (1962).

25 CKS U275/C1/2. Dering Manuscripts.

26 CKS U275/C1/5 Dering Manuscripts.

27 CKS U350/C2/21 Dering Manuscripts

28 NA E179/127/732, f1.

29 Pat Winzar. pers comm. It has not been possible to establish if there might have been two generations of

Amiss joiners. A William Amys, married to Elizabeth, was buried in October 1653; they had four children, two of whom survived. This might have been the joiner working in the 1630s and father (or other relative) of the 'Goodman' Amys recorded working in the 1660s; alternatively, there may have been another William working throughout the period. 'Goodman' was frequently used as a respectful salutation at the time and the Hearth Tax returns clearly list this later Amiss as being a William. No wills or inventories that might clarify the situation have been found but both 'cease' and Hearth Tax suggest there was only one adult male Amiss in the town at their respective dates.

30 Clark, P. and Hosking, J., *Population Estimates of English Small Towns 1550-1851*, Revised Edition, Leicester (1993), p.vi. A figure of around 35% of exempt households is suggested as a median although up to 80% is not unknown.

31 Assessed at less than Amiss were fifteen on 2d. and nineteen on 4d.. The highest assessments were Sir Nicholas Gilbourne (lessee of the Archbishop's Palace) and Sir Robert Honeywood (whose record of the fire is quoted above) at 30s..

32 Charing – A Pictorial Past, Charing History Society, (2005). p68, 69.

33 NMR AA54/1205.

34 www.kentarchaeology.org.uk/Research/Libr/MIs/MIsCharing/01.htm

35 Grove, *About Charing*, p10.

36 The possibility that common items like chests and tables are likely to also have been widely available second hand should also be raised whilst considering factors that might have influenced the competitiveness of joiners. It is an issue that has often been overlooked and one that is likely to be difficult to study. It lies beyond the scope of this article.



1. The painted nave roof, Charing, Kent, dated 1592



2. Bench end 'Speak no Evil' Charing, Kent, after 1590



3. Bench end 'Hear no Evil' Charing, Kent, after 1590



4. Oak chest, Charing, Kent, 1594



5. Communion table, oak and elm, Charing, Kent, 1624

John Musgrave	3	Thomas Don
Edward Cayler	3	Francis Sire
James Eddgar	5	Edward A
Richard Knorro	2	John Lang
Middow Pardon	2	Henry J
Richard Edder	1	Edward M
John Soutiker	2	Abraham
John Philpot	1	William
William Amiss	1	William
Simon Goodhinge	2	Richard S
William Surchurst	2	Henry J
The Summe	5-6	Richard M
In the Borough of Wole		Richard S
Richard Drobbs Wytholder		John J
Thomas Finsale	10	Francis
Middow Mow	1	Robert

6. Extract from the hearth tax return for Charing, Kent, 1664,
including the entry for William Amiss



7. Pulpit by William Amiss, Charing, Kent, 1637



8. Chest, walnut, elm and oak, Charing, Kent, 1635