

The Name and Family Barham

By Sydney Pay Barham



The Name and Family of Barham

By Sydney Pay Barhame

Contents

PART ONE – THE BARHAMS OF BARHAM AND TESTON

Chapter 1	<i>Unavailable*</i>	
Chapter 2	<i>Unavailable*</i>	
Chapter 3	<i>Unavailable*</i>	
Chapter 4	Reginald Fitzurse	Page 4
Chapter 5	Fitzurse and De Bereham	Page 6
Chapter 6	The De Berhams of Barham and Teston	Page 8
Chapter 7	The De Berhams at Sissinghurst	Page 10
Chapter 8	Richard De Berham Sheriff of Kent	Page 12
Chapter 9	The Successors of Richard the Sheriff	Page 14
Chapter 10	The Barhams Leave Sissinghurst	Page 15
Chapter 11	The Last of the Barhams of Teston	Page 18
Chapter 12	The Last of the Barhams of Barham	Page 20

PART TWO – THE BARHAMS OF WADHURST

Chapter 13	Connecting links	Page 25
Chapter 14	Early Days at Wadhurst	Page 27
Chapter 15	John of Bivelham and the Barhams of Snape and Scragoak	Page 29
Chapter 16	Nicholas Barham of Wadhurst and His Three Sons	Page 32
Chapter 17	Nicholas Barham of Chillington Manor	Page 33
Chapter 18	John Barham the Ironmaster	Page 37
Chapter 19	The Sons of John Barham the Ironmaster	Page 39
Chapter 20	John Barham of Faircrouch	Page 40
Chapter 21	The Barhams at Boughton Monchelsea	Page 41
Chapter 22	The Children of John Barham of Faircrouch	Page 42
Chapter 23	Barhams of the Dispersion	Page 44
Chapter 24	John Barham - the First of Shoemiths	Page 46
Chapter 25	John Barham - the Second of Shoemiths	Page 48
Chapter 26	John Barham - the Third of Shoemiths	Page 50

PART ONE – THE BARHAMS OF BARHAM AND TESTON

CHAPTER 4 REGINALD FITZURSE

Reginald FitzUrse held the manors afterwards known as Barham Court in Barham and Barham Court in Teston, both in Kent, as well as estates in Northamptonshire and Leicestershire. It appears to have been the policy of the Normans Kings that their Barons and Knights should have their land widely scattered.

Reginald was a Knight Attendant upon Henry II, the first of the Plantagenet Monarchs. His surname in Norman French signifies "Bear's Son" and is doubtless derived from the "ourse:, or "urso" - "bear", of the age of the conquest. The representation of the murder of Becket, painted on the wood, which forms part of the tomb of Henry IV in Canterbury Cathedral, shows FitzUrse with the figures of bears on his surcoat. The original painting is much faded but a copy is displayed at the scene of the murder at the transept of martyrdom.

In 1170, two years after he had inherited the manor of Willerton, FitzUrse took part in the assassination of the archbishop. Thomas Becket, formerly Chancellor, and a close friend of Henry II, who had made him Archbishop of Canterbury, was now involved in a violent quarrel with the King; over matters in which he believed that the rights of the Church, and in particular the See of Canterbury were in danger. Some hasty words with the King, then in his French dominions, indicated four knights of his household to under- take the removal of Becket. They were Reginald FitzUrse, Hugh de Moreville, William De Tracey, and Richard le Breton; FitzUrse being their leader. He by the way appears to have owed some allegiances to Thomas before the latter became Archbishop.

The conspirators crossed over to England, and gathered at Saltwood Castle, near Hythe. Saltwood was a possession of the Archbishop, but it had been usurped by Randolph de Brock, another of Becket's enemies. De Brock although privy to the plot did not take any part in the assassination. The visitor to the castle today is shown the ruins of the Hall in which it is believed the Knights met in the darkness and secrecy to make their plans. On the 29th of December, the Knights and their men rode forth from Saltwood to Canterbury, and sought out the Archbishop in his palace adjacent to the Cathedral. Bitter words and recriminations were exchanged in a fruitless interview. Later in the day the Knights again approached the palace with their weapons under their cloaks. The monks, anxious for their own safety as well as for their master, endeavoured to drag Becket through the cloisters into the sanctuary of the cathedral. He resisted, but they succeeded in getting him into the Northwest Transept, which is still known as the Martyrdom. They bolted the door behind them, but the Archbishop commanded it to be unbolted, lest the House of God be made a fortress. He began to make his way up the steps into the choir, where vespers were being sung, but as the knights burst in, he turned to meet them.

There was an altercation and a struggle in the gloom of the Transept. FitzUrse called Becket "Traitor!", and Becket retorted with "Pander". The knights endeavoured in vain to drag the Archbishop out of the church. FitzUrse struck the first blow, a glancing one which injured the arm of an attendant monk. Tracey followed, and Le Breton smote the Archbishop's skull with such violence that his sword was shattered on the stone of the pavement. Becket fell to the ground and was dispatched. The fourth knight, de Moreville, who had not struck a blow, was keeping back the townspeople who were pouring in from the knave. After the deed, the knights rushed out of the cathedral, waving their swords and shouting, "King's Men...King's Men". They pillaged the palace, and rode away to South Malling, near Lewes, where he had a manor. From thence they withdrew to Yorkshire, and took refuge in de Moreville's castle at Knaresborough.

At first, horror at the crime was mainly incited by the sacrilege committed in the Cathedral. The monks were not altogether sorry to be rid of the masterful Archbishop, of whose piety they might have had some doubt. When, however, the body of Becket was found to be clad with garments of haircloth beneath the archbishop's robes they were at length

convinced by this evidence of his sanctity, that their Archbishop had indeed been one of themselves.

Soon the fame of the miracles wrought at the tomb of St. Thomas spread throughout England and Christendom, and brought thousands of pilgrims annually to pay their devotions and make their offerings at the shrine, which was first housed in the crypt, and then more splendidly in the Trinity Chapel behind the high altar.

The reputation of the Saint and Martyr lasted for over three centuries, until at length another Henry, Henry VIII, destroyed the shrine, and confiscated its accumulated riches and as far as lay in his power, blotted out the name and fame of the murdered archbishop. A lively account of these events can be read in Dean Stanley's "Historical Memorials of Canterbury Cathedral."

Henry II performed a public penance at the tomb of St. Thomas; but what is the fate of the murderers themselves, and Reginald FitzUrse in particular? As the glory of the martyr grew with the years, the characters of punishment of the assassins were depicted in ever darker colours. It appears however, that their crime was regarded primarily as an offence against the Church, to be visited with spiritual rather than temporal penalties. The King himself could hardly avenge a murder which had been committed on his behalf, and at his instigation. The guilty knights were excommunicated by the Pope; in itself a heavy punishment in the 12th century. Later it is said they were sent to the Pope for judgement, and by him were ordered to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. There, according to one story, they all died, and were buried at a place called the Black Mountain. Another more probable tradition asserts that FitzUrse either did not go to Palestine or that he returned thence alive, and passed over subsequently to Ireland. There he changed his name to Mayham which is said to signify Son of the Bear in the Erse language. It is a fact that many of the Anglo-Norman adventurers who fought to win from Henry the title of Lord of Ireland remained in that country to found families which in time merged into the native population. As the saying goes, "they became more Irish than the Irish". Religion was not then the dividing factor, which it became after the Reformation. Some corroboration of this tradition of the fate of FitzUrse is afforded by a statement of the Elizabethan poet Edmund Spenser, who filled an official post in Ireland. In his "View of the State of Ireland" he says, "The McMahons in the North were anciently English, to which descended of the FitzUrses, which was a noble family in England, and the same appeared by the significance of their Irish names. Likewise the McSweeneys, now in Ulster, were recently of the Veres in England, but they themselves had a hatred of the English, and so disguised their names".

The clan of the McMahons, whether or not descended from Reginald FitzUrse lived on for many centuries in Ireland. They remained faithful to the Roman Catholic faith, and the cause of the Stuarts. At the revolution of 1688 members of the clan followed James II into exile in France, and eventually became French citizens. Marshall McMahon (1808-1893), descendent of the exiles, and so perhaps of FitzUrse, was a great soldier who fought in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, especially the communist insurrection that followed it. He served as President of the French republic from 1873-1879. It is said that the name and family of FitzUrse survived at Willerton in Somerset throughout the later Middle Ages until with the lapse of time, the Norman "FitzUrse" became in plain English Fisher.

CHAPTER 5 FITZURSE AND DE BEREHAM

After this long digression on the crime and the fate of Reginald FitzUrse, I must now discuss the relationship, if any, between him and the de Berhams. After his disgrace, he is said to have divided his manor of Willerton between his brother, and the Knights of the Order of St. John; while his manors in Kent, at Barham and Teston passed to another member or members of the family, the de Barhams, his kinsmen. Both of our Kentish historians Phillipot and Hasted refer to this latter transaction. I'll quote here their words. In his account of the parish of Barham, Phillipot writes:

"The old family of FitzUrse were formerly lords of this manor, and resolved into the name of de Berham after such time as one of them called Randall FitzUrse, being a ring leader of three other cavaliers of the King's Court, impiously assassinated Archbishop Becket, the fact being so barbarous in the estimate of those times that, flying to Ireland he abandoned the name of FitzUrse, and took that of McMahan. Certainly as he was the actor, and therefore more stained than the rest; so was he much more culpable because he held this manor at Barham, in the See of Canterbury, for his services as half the Knights fee, yet did not his name, de Berham, vanish from this place, but still was enforced and multiplied into many descendants, from whence issued gentlemen of prime and eminent note in this track, until lately that fate which shuffles both families and Kingdoms into disorder and oblivion hath torn this manor now from this name."

Concerning Teston, which he spells Terston, the same author says,

"Barham Court in this parish represents to our remembrance that it was once the mansion of ancient remembrance of the noble and illustrious family of Barham. This name was in times of very reverent inscription written "FitzUrse". Randall FitzUrse was one of the four who were concerned in the assassination of that turbulent and ambitious prelate, Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. The manner of taking him carried with it so deformed an aspect in those times which were wholly consecrated and offered up to superstitious adoration of his memory, and protracted so black a character on those who were interested in his extra-judicial ruin, that Randall FitzUrse fled into Ireland, and there altered his name to McMahan, which in Irish imports as much as 'The Son of the Bear'. Upon his recess, Robert de Berham his kinsman entered on his estates here in Teston."

Hasted's 'Survey of Kent' tells a similar story in more prosaic language. Of Barham it says:

"The manor and seat of Barham Court, situated near the Church, in Henry II's time was held to the Archbishop by Knight's service by Sir Randall FitzUrse, who was one of the four Knights belonging to the King's Household who murdered the Archbishop in 1170, after perpetrating which, Sir Randall fled to Ireland and changed his name to McMahan. One of his relations took possession of this estate and assumed the name of Barham from it."

Hasted's statement concerning Teston is as follows:

"Teston House, formerly known by the name of Berham Court, was once the mansion or residence of the family of Berham, usually called Barham, whose original name was FitzUrse. Randall FitzUrse was one of those four Knights belonging to Henry II's household, said by historians to have been of eminent for their birth, who undertook to murder Archbishop Thomas Becket. After this Randall FitzUrse fled into Ireland. Upon his flight Robert de Berham, his kinsman entered on his estate in this parish."

I assume that the relative who succeeded to Barham Court in Barham is the same person as Robert de Berham the kinsman who succeeded to Barham Court in Teston. Apparently Phillipot in some other document is more explicit as to the nature of the kinship. In an article entitled 'Ironworks on the County of Sussex' published in vol II 1849 of the Sussex

Archaeological Collections, the Sussex antiquarian, Mark Anthony Lower says of the forbear of the Barham's of Wadhurst that he was a descendent according to the Kentish genealogician Phillipot from Robert de Berham, son of Richard FitzUrse, and brother of the murderer of Thomas Becket. It is vain to speculate the amount of truth that may underlay these old stories, but I think there can be little doubt that a connection of some sort with FitzUrse was a tradition of the de Berhams of the Middle Ages, and not as Mr FitzGerald-Uniacke suggests merely a typically Elizabethan flourish. There is some support by the fact that the coat of arms borne by widely separated branches of the Barham family always included the three bears, as if looking back to FitzUrse, the 'Son of a Bear'.

It was about the middle of the twelfth century that the noble and knightly families were choosing their distinctive coat of arms, and this is approximately the period which according to tradition de Berham was displacing FitzUrse. The wearing of a distinctive device on the shield and surcoat had a practical purpose in proclaiming the identity of the Knight when clad in armour on the battlefield or in the lists at a tournament. The devices were simple at first, but they became more complicated when armorial bearings came to be used to declare descent or intermarriage. In time the learned science of heraldry was developed with rigid rules of procedure and a jargon of technical terms. I have mentioned in a picture of the murder of Thomas Becket displayed in Canterbury Cathedral that Reginald FitzUrse displays the figures of bears on his surcoat with obvious reference to his name. That the de Berhams had bears emblazoned on their coat of arms seems to indicate that they claimed some sort of affiliation with the FitzUrse family, but as I have said in section 2 of these notes, the first syllable of the name of Barham itself goes back to old English personal name meaning bear. So, it is just possible that the descendents of Wulnoth de Bereham may have taken their token animal from the name of their parent village, that is if they were English enough to understand its significance. I must leave my readers to choose which explanation pleases them best.

In heraldic language the arms of the de Berhams are thus described: "Argent, three bears passant, sable; muzzled or." In plain English this means: On a shield with a silver or white background, three black bears in a walking posture, wearing golden muzzles." In some accounts the colour of the muzzles is 'gules', that is red.

I shall relate in due course the Wadhurst Barhams and their descendents, including the late Sir George Barham, that have some devices, technically known as differences added to the simple arms of the de Berhams, but always they display three black muzzled bears. The arms of the de Berhams and the Barhams are shown in a rough sketch prefixed to these notes.

CHAPTER SIX THE De BERHAMS OF BARHAM AND TESTON

Our story of the de Berhams begins with Robert, who in the latter part of the 12th century was in possession of two manors called Barham, or Barham Court, one situated in the parish of Barham near Canterbury; the other in the parish of Teston, on the Medway near Maidstone. Whether this man was a descendant of Wulnoth de Bereham who appears among the Knights of the Archbishop in the monks Domesday, a century before; or whether he owed his estates to his kinship with the banished FitzUrse is a question that must remain unanswered. I think that Robert de Berham must have been a newcomer to Teston, and that he bought his name with him from his original home in Barham and applied it to his manor. Unlike its namesake at Barham, Barham Court at Teston had no connection with the Archbishop of Canterbury. It had owed the overlordship of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, and after his disgrace had passed to other overlords, including the Priory of Christ Church in Canterbury. At a later date the Tudor Queen Mary granted the overlordship of this, and many other estates in Kent, to her famous, or infamous Attorney General, Sir John Baker of Sissinghurst, whose acquaintance we shall make when we hear the story of the Barhams of that place.

Robert de Berham remains a shadowy figure. The next bearer of the name we can identify, and who heads the line in Mr. FitzGerald Uniacke's article, is Warine de Berham. He appears as party to a fine dated 15th July in the 5th year of King John, 1203. Under the feudal system, a fine had not its modern significance of monetary penalty, but it meant the settlement - FINIS- of a legal case or claim. The fine was a legal device taking the form of a fictitious lawsuit to effect the conveyance of land in circumstances in which the current system made the transaction difficult. A tripartite document was drawn up, one part being held by each of the parties, while the third part, or foot, a note on the terms of the settlement, was entered for record purposes. Feet or fines are a useful source of information for historians. The fine in question concerns sixty acres of land at Hammis, that is the present village of Ham near Sandwich, held at one eighth of a Knight's fee which was then conveyed from Robert de Ham to Warine de Berham. In a return made to the Sheriff of Kent in 1210, the same Warine de Berham is shown as holding from the Archbishop by Knights Service, lands in Barham of half a Knights fee. These lands were of course those of Barham Court. Warine de Berham may have been the son or grandson of the original Robert.

Next in succession was Warine's son, Gilbert de Berham. Gilbert took to wife Lucy, the daughter of Thomas de Ocholt. By her he had three sons- Henry, Warine, and a second Gilbert. The elder Gilbert and his wife were parties to several fines in respect to lands at Barham and the neighbourhood between 1246 and 1249, during the reign of Henry III. He died before 25th July 1255, for at that date his widow had married again. A charter which is unfortunately undated in the archives of Canterbury Cathedral testifies that Gislibitus -Gilbert- son of Warine de Berham granted of the Prior and Convent of Christ Church the rent charge upon lands at Barham, for lights and other uses at the alter of the Blessed Mary in the nave of the Church, that is, of the Cathedral, which was served by the monks of the Priory of Christ Church. The witnesses to this Charter include Thomas de Ocholt, Gilbert's father-in-law; Ralph de Berham, a kinsman otherwise unknown, and Robert de Ham, whose name we have already met. This pious donation was perhaps an act of expiation for a tragedy in which Gilbert de Berham, or his son of the same name had been involved. He had been so unfortunate as to kill his neighbour, Richard de Tappington, with a lance in a joust. Tappington Hall, which will be familiar to every reader of the Ingoldsby Legends, is a pleasant old residence standing near the village of Denton on the road from Folkestone to Canterbury. Many centuries after Gilbert's time this place by turn of fate came into possession of the author of the legends - Richard Harris Barham, of whom more hereafter. Jousts and tournaments were regarded with great disfavour by Henry III, and it appears that proceedings were begun against Gilbert for the involuntary homicide. However, an entry in the patent rolls for the 28th year of the King - 1243-1244 recorded the granting to him on the condition that he made his peace with the relatives of the victim, and an injunction to the Sheriff to return any of his goods that were taken away.

Gilbert was succeeded by his son, Henry de Berham, who paid an aid on the lands he had inherited from his father at Barham on the occasion of the knighting of Prince Edward, afterwards Edward I, in 1254. Ten years later Henry de Berham was found taking part in a barons war between Henry III under Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, as did also Richard de Berham, whom Mr. Fitzgerald Uniacke thinks may have been Henry's nephew. The revolt, after its initial success was put down after the battle of Evesham in 1265, but it does not appear that Henry de Berham suffered any penalty for his part in the rebellion. He lived on until the beginning of the reign of Edward I, dying sometime before 1276.

CHAPTER 7 THE DE BERHAMS AT SISSINGHURST

The heir of Henry de Berham, a second Henry, was a minor at the time of his father's death, and was admitted to his lands on the 1st of July 1279, when he performed homage and swore allegiance to his Overlord, Archbishop Peckham at Cranbrook. This is the first recorded contact between the family and Cranbrook, where during the later Middle Ages we find them in possession of the Manor of Sissinghurst. This manor was represented by the residence known as Sissinghurst Castle was situated near the Eastern border of the far flung parish of Cranbrook, about a mile from the hamlet of Milkhouse St. which about the middle of the last century borrowed the name of the manor, and is now known officially as Sissinghurst, and has an ecclesiastical parish of the same name.

The manor of Sissinghurst, originally Saxonhurst or something like that was held by the Saxonhurst family at least as late as the first half of the reign of Henry III, for in the 20th year of that King 1235-1236, John de Saxonhurst paid a feudal aid on the occasion of the marriage of the King's sister Isabella to the Emperor Frederick II. Presumably the de Saxonhurst line terminated in a daughter, who conveyed the manor of Sissinghurst together with the two dependant manors of Copton and Stone to the de Barham family by marriage. I do not know when this marriage took place but as Sissinghurst owned the Archbishop as Overlord, and as the second Henry performed homage to him at Cranbrook in 1279, it was possible that it was his father -the first Henry - who married the de Saxonhurst heiress.

The settlement of the de Berhams in Cranbrook coincided with town's rise in prosperity. Like other places in the Weald, it had been originally no more than a den - that is a woodland pasture for swine, appertaining to some manor situated in some more opulent part of the country. As such it had not been deemed worthy of a separate notice in the Conqueror's Domesday Book. Nevertheless it had a church at that time, for this together with other Wealden churches is mentioned in the Domesday of the Monks, but by 1289 it had become of sufficient importance for Archbishop Peckham who held the vows of the parish church of St. Dunstan to obtain a charter from King Edward I for the establishment of a market there. Peckham, a Franciscan Friar who became the Archbishop of Canterbury (1279-1292) and who derived his name from his birthplace, Petcham - now Patcham near Brighton; appears to have taken a special interest in Cranbrook. The fortune of the town was assured when in 1337 in pursuance of his policy of nurturing the ancient industry of croft-weaving, invited Flemish weavers to settle in the Weald to teach the inhabitants the improved art of manufacturing broadcloth. As a result of the King's policy, Cranbrook in the later Middle Ages and the Tudor period became a prosperous centre of the broadcloth industry.

There is a gap of nearly a half of a century between 1279 when the second Henry attained his majority and 1324 when we find reference to the third Henry de Berham, so we cannot be sure whether this Henry was a son or grandson of the second of the name. In the interval between the two Henrys we have to make room for a John de Berham who FitzGerald-Uniacke does not mention in his article, but whom Phillipot actually makes a great-grandson of the original Robert de Berham and the inheritor of the estate at Teston, a chronological impossibility. According to Hasted as well as Phillipot, this John de Berham was created a Public Notary of the Diocese of Canterbury. It appears that the Prior of the Christ Church, Henry de Eastry, equivalent in modern times to the Dean of Canterbury, had petitioned the Pope for the authority to create notaries for the dispatch of Church business and on receiving such authority had in about 1309 appointed three men to the office one of whom was John de Berham of the Diocese of Canterbury. The appointment seems to have been one of some honour, but for some reason that seems to have escaped us, the authority had been received through certain foreign potentates. The King, Edward II, resented this intermeddling of foreigners as an affront to his Royal Prerogative and about 1320 forbade the notaries to exercise their office within his realm.

Leaving this dubious John, we return to Henry de Berham, third of the name, Lord of Barham, Teston, and Sissinghurst. He was a person of distinction, for it is recorded that he was summoned as a Homo ad Armour - Man at Arms or Knight - to attend the great council of the Magnates of the Realm, held at Westminster in May 1324, during the brief period in which

Edward appeared to have gained the upper hand in his struggle with the nobles. Three years after the holding of his great council, the unfortunate King was deposed, and murdered. The honours of Henry de Barham were increased during the reign of his son and successor Edward III. In 1339 he was commissioned by the Prior of Christ Church Canterbury to receive waifs and strays, the chattel of felons, and treasure trove pertaining to the Chapter. In the 20th year of Edward III (1346-47) Henry de Berham paid feudal aids to the King on the occasion of the Knighting of his eldest son Edward the Black Prince in respect of half a knight's fee which he held of the Arch-bishop in Barham, as also of his other lands in Kent, including his estate in Cranbrook. In 1349 according to the Christ Church Registers Henry was appointed Custos, or churchwarden of the church of St. Dunstan in Cranbrook. It was about this time that the practice began of appointing laymen to look after the temporal affairs of the parish churches in England. In 1352 Henry purchased from Queen Phillipa for 100 the custody of the lands of the deceased William de Lonaford in Sussex by which he acquired the feudal right of wardship merrage over the son and heir during his minority; a source of profit as I have explained above. Henry de Berham, third of the name, died about 1365, and his inheritance passed to his son Richard. He also left two daughters.

CHAPTER EIGHT RICHARD DE BARHAM SHERIFF of KENT

With Richard, the fortunes of the medieval de Berhams reached their highest level; yet he came to his inheritance in a distressful time. It was a period of time of decline into the Hundred Years War, in which the Plantagenet Kings were contending to the Crown of France. The victories of the Black Prince at Crecy and Poitiers were in fact in the past; the Prince himself was stricken with a mortal illness and his father Edward III had fallen into the dotage. There followed the troubled reign of Richard II; the Peasants Revolt, the struggle of the King with his Nobles, his deposition and murder, the seizure of the Throne by the House of Lancaster, and the battles of Henry IV with the rebellious English Earls and Welshmen. Richard de Berham lived through the brief victorious years of Henry V, but he did not survive to witness the bursting of the bubble of Continental dominion under Henry's feeble son.

Sissinghurst was Richard de Berham's usual place of residence and he married a Cranbrook woman, Constance Gibbon. The Gibbons, Gybbons, or Gibbons were a family dispersed through the Weald, with branches in Cranbrook, Hawkhurst, Benenden and Rolvenden. Some at least of the members of these were clothiers and amassed a wealth from that industry. A Gibbon founded a free school at Benenden and another left a benefaction to the parish of Hawkhurst. Edward Gibbon, the historian of the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire' was a descendant of the Gibbons of Rolvenden, whose seat was the 'Hole' now known as 'Hole Park', and the residence of some of the modern Barhams.

In 1381 when his Royal namesake was newly upon the throne, Richard was appointed a Commissioner of the Peace, which was roughly equivalent to a modern J.P. or Magistrate. This was the years of the Peasant's Revolt, in which Watt Tyler lead his band of Kentish rebels to London, and fell by the sword of Lord Mayor Walworth. Two years later in 1383 Richard received from the King a commission of Oya and Termina, by which persons of note, especially in times of insurrection were given some of the powers of judges to hear and give sentence in certain classes of offence. In 1385 when invasion from France was feared, he was made Commissioner of the Array, and was thus given command of the local militia. His crowning honour came in the 14th year of Richard II (1390-91), when he was appointed Sheriff of Kent. He kept his year of sheralty at Barham Court in Teston, presumably on account of its accessibility and nearness to Maidstone, for Sissinghurst was hidden in a remote part of the Weald, where such roads as existed were practically impassable in winter. Service under the deposed King did not debar Richard from office under the House of Lancaster. He was Commissioner of Array again in 1403, 1405, and 1407 when Henry IV was contending with rebellions in the north and in Wales. He filled the office for the last time in 1418, while Henry V was pursuing his career of conquest in France. Besides his manors in Barham, Teston, and Cranbrook, Richard de Berham held estates elsewhere in Kent. In 1409-10 his name occurs in a fine concerning the manors Tremhatch and Sherlond, the former in Charing and the latter in Pluckley. Phillipot says that he also held a manor called 'Pope's Hall' in Coldred near Dover but I can find no confirmation of this in Hasted's 'Survey'. When a subsidy was imposed on the lay persons in the last year of Henry IV 1412-13, Richard was recorded as holding lands and rents in Kent worth £40 a year beyond reprises, i.e. after deduction of payments due. This sum may appear trifling to modern ears but it must be remembered that the value of money was vastly greater in those days. Richard must have died soon after 1418 but the date of his death and of the succession of his heir is unknown. He was most likely buried in Cranbrook parish church but if he ever had a memorial in brass or stone in that building no trace remains.

The church itself in truth is a memorial to Richard de Berham. Mr. C.C.R. Pyle in his booklet 'The Parish Church of St. Dunstan, Cranbrook', published by the Cranbrook and Sissinghurst Local History Society, says that one of the first results of the increased prosperity of the town was the rebuilding of the church which began about the middle of the 14th century, and was completed about the middle of the 16th. He adds that the tower, south porch, chancel arch and part of the north aisle were the first portions to be rebuilt, this part of the work having being finished in 1425. On the west front of the tower are four shields, two on either side of a niche now empty, which no doubt held a statue of the Virgin Mary or some Saint. The first shield on the right hand side of the niche displays the three bears that are on

the arms of the de Berhams. The second shield on the right shows the armorial bearings of the family of the de Bettenhams. The first shield on the left side of the niche combines the arms of the See of Canterbury with those of Henry Chichelley, who was Archbishop from 1414-1443. There has been some uncertainty about the identity of the second shield on the left but Mr. Pyle now says they represent Benedicta, the second wife of Stephen De Bettenham, and they quarter the arms of Attowne of Throwley the family of the lady's first husband, with those of Detling, her own family

The de Bettenhams were a contemporary Cranbrook family who appear to have derived their name from the manor at Bettenham, now represented by Bettenham farm, on the eastern border of the parish, and adjoining the lands that were once held by the de Berhams of Sissinghurst. The region nearby was formerly known as Bettenham's Wood, and the name persisted in that of the present Bettenham's Wood Farm. The house in which I am now writing stands in what was formerly called Bedlam Field, said to be a corruption of Bettenhams Field, although it is far distant from the parent manor.

Stephen de Bettenham who died in 1415 left directions in his will that he should be buried in the south porch of Cranbrook church by the side of Helouise, his first wife, who was of the family of Bakers, later to replace the de Berhams at Sissinghurst.

I conclude that Richard de Berham and his neighbour Stephen de Bettenham were the principal patrons of the first stage of the rebuilding of St. Dunstan's and that after Stephen had been buried in the newly completed south porch the work was continued by his widow Benedicta, who herself was a lady of means. When the tower was erected the names of the families chiefly concerned, together with those of the archbishop of the time were carved in the West front where they are still to be seen defying the years and the elements. The arms of Chichelley are at a higher level than the others so that there is a vacant space immediately to the left of the niche. It has been suggested that this space was intended for the arms of some other benefactor which were never added or that the shield may have been removed for religious or political reasons. My own opinion is that the arms of the archbishop under whose auspices the work on the tower was completed were raised above the level of the lay gentry out of respect for his ecclesiastical office. His shield is on the left of the central niche but it should be remembered that heraldry looks at things from the viewpoint of the wearer of the shield, so that the left hand of the beholder is the dexter or right side, the side of honour, for the wearer. If so, the archbishop takes the first place and Richard de Berham second. A view of the west front of the church showing the niche and the shields forms the frontispiece to these notes.

If Richard was in fact buried in the parish church he was not the first of the family to be so interred. In a paper on the history of St. Dunstons read before the Kent Archaeological Society in 1873 by Rev. T.A. Carr, a former vicar, it is stated that there is in existence a will of Elise de Berham, in which the testator desires his body to be buried in Cranbrook Church, and bequeathed the sum of one mark (13/4d) to every altar in the church, 1/8d to the Chaplain of the parish. The will is dated 6th April 1381, so that this otherwise unknown de Berham was a contemporary of Richard de Berham, and presumably also resident at Sissinghurst. It was about this time that the territorial 'de' was dropped from the family name, henceforth we may use the plain Berham, or a little later, Barham.

CHAPTER NINE: THE SUCCESSORS OF RICHARD THE SHERIFF

After the passing of Richard, the light of the Berhams becomes somewhat dim, and the evidence about the succession is conflicting. 'Villarae Cantianum', the survey based upon material collected by John Phillipot, which was published by his son in 1659, states that on a roll kept in the exchequer wherein is mentioned all of these things of this county who paid respective aid in the fourth year of Henry IV, at the marriage of Blanche, that monarchs daughter, there is a recital of Nicholas Berham who contributed a supply for his lands at Terston (Teston). The fourth year of Henry IV was 1402-03 at which period Richard was alive and residing at Sissinghurst. We might therefore suppose that Nicholas was his son and that the Teston estate had been made over to him during his fathers' lifetime. But the same John Phillipot, who was an industrious genealogist, and who carried out a heraldic visitation of Kent in 1619-21 has left a manuscript pedigree of the family which makes no mention of Nicholas. It says that the son and heir of Richard was John Berham, who in turn was the father of Henricus Dominus de Berham of Teston and Sissinghurst. The story is further complicated by a pedigree in the possession of the Courtland family of Wiley in Ticehurst, which states that the Richard the sheriff had a son and heir John Berham, who had as his son Nicholas Berham, of Barham Court Teston, and that this Nicholas was the father of Henry who was Lord of Barham, Teston, and Sissinghurst. Mr FitzGerald-Uniacke thinks that both these pedigrees are defective, and that the correct order of Richard's descendants is:

1. Nicholas
2. John
3. Henry

I am not competent to judge whether this reconstruction is right or wrong, and so I will pass over the dubious Nicholas to John Berham, who has left a more substantial trace of his existence.

John Berham must have been a person of some eminence for his name is included in a commission dated 1st May 1434, which was addressed to the Archbishop and some other country magnates instructing them to take an oath of certain Knights, Esquires, and men of influence and substance, that they would not wittingly receive, cherish, hold in household, nay maintain pillors, robbers, oppressors of the people, manslayers, felons, outlaws, ravishers of women and the law, or any other misdoers. This commission is eloquent of the disorders of the realm under the weak reign of Henry VI, and of the evil effects of the Hundred Years War now entering upon its inglorious last phase, the number of ruffians at large and the willingness of many of the gentry to give them harbourage and employment. The name of John Berham occurs in the commission next to that of John Bettenham, son of Stephen whose shield is displayed on the tower of Cranbrook Church, but the name of Bettenham was fated to disappear from the parish, for John left three daughters and no sons. The disorders of the realm culminated in the insurrection of the men of Kent under the leadership of Jack Kade in 1450, which had a political background involving some of the Kentish gentry, and serving as a prelude to the War of the Roses. Now Phillipot says in the account of Bettenham in his Villariae Cantianum that in the 12th year of Henry VI (1433-34) a number of gentlemen of prime rank in this county, who included John Berham and John Bettenham, were summoned to appear before Robert Poignings and John Perry to disclaim the title of the House of York. As the conflict between Lancaster and York did not open until 1455, by which year John Berham was no more, it appears that Phillipot has confused these summons with the commission mentioned previously. It is quite possible however that the Government of Henry had reason at a later date to suspect the loyalty of the Berham family, and others of the Kentish family, as the county was believed to be Yorkist in sympathy.

John Berham died in 1442; his will extant, and in it he directs that his body is to be buried in the church of St. Dunstan, Cranbrook, before the altar of the Blessed Mary. Mr. Pyle believes that before the reformation of the Lady Chapel the north chancel, which today is blocked by the organ. Here therefore the body of John Berham was laid to rest, but no memorial now marks the spot.

CHAPTER TEN THE BARHAMS LEAVE SISSINGHURST

John Berham was succeeded by his son, or grandson, Henry, to whom Phillipot gives the imposing title of Lord of Barham, Teston and Sissinghurst. He married, probably about 1476, Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Colpepper of Oxenhoath in West Peckham, and had by her two sons, Thomas and John. The Colpeppers, or Culpeppers, were a widespread Kentish family, members of which held Bedgebury and Goudhurst, and are commemorated by tombs in Goudhurst church.

Richard, his only son died before him, left three daughters, Elizabeth, Margaret and Joyce. The Oxenhoath estate however did not fall to the lot of Elizabeth, wife of Henry Berham, but to Margaret, married to a William Cotton. The third sister, or half sister - Joyce, married Edmund Howard, a younger and impecunious son of Thomas Howard, second Duke of Norfolk, She must have been very much younger than her sisters, for although Elizabeth appears to have been born about 1450, Joyce had the melancholy honour of being the mother of Catherine Howard, the young lady who became the fifth wife of Henry VIII, and she was beheaded for infidelity to her Royal Husband in 1542. Thus Henry Berham, had he lived long enough might have boasted the dangerous distinction of being the King's uncle by marriage.

He did not live so long, but references in official records show that he was still alive in 1492, his wife being then aged 42. Henry Berham and John Berham were named in 'The Gentles of Kent', a list of the county gentry compiled at some period during the reign of Henry VII which lasted from 1485-1509; but towards the end of that reign Henry Berham, or it may have been his son Thomas, had begun to divest himself of his lands in Cranbrook.

At the beginning of the Tudor age the old order of English society was changing, and the change was making itself felt in Cranbrook, as elsewhere. During the Wars of the Roses many great names of feudal nobility were extinguished on the battlefield or the scaffold, and a new nobility of the Court had filled the gaps. Wealth and influence had come to the merchants and manufacturing classes, such as the clothiers of Cranbrook, who had amassed money, acquired estates, and aspired to enter the ranks of the gentry. It was the money of the rich clothiers which made possible the further enlargement and beautifying of the parish church, which continued up to the Reformation.

Besides the owners of the Cloth Halls there were two families that were rising into prominence in Cranbrook, and overshadowing such older families as the Barhams and the Bettenhams. There was the family of Roberts, originally Rookhurst of Scottish descent, the members of which had been long resident in the neighbouring parishes, but who finally settled at Glassenbury, which they inherited by marriage, and where their descendants in an indirect line still dwell. Walter Roberts incurred the displeasure of Richard III for having given shelter to his enemy John Guildford of Hampstead. His lands were forfeited, but he regained them after Richard was slain at Bosworth Field in 1485. Enjoying the favour of the Tudors, he and his successors took the lead in the life of the parish, and kept it for many generations. The Roberts family however does not concern us here.

The other leading family at Cranbrook was that of the Bakers. To judge by their name the Bakers were of plebeian origin. They had been settled in the parish as early as the reign of Edward III, for in the 44th year of that monarch 1370-1371, Thomas Baker had been sued for trespass by the Prior of Christ Church Canterbury for having felled timber in a drough, den, or swine pasture, on the Prior's land at Cranbrook. It was to another Thomas Baker - presumably a descendant of this man, that Henry Berham, or his son, sold a portion of the manor of Sissinghurst, with the two smaller dependant manors of Copton and stone. The sale must have taken place before 1498, as Thomas Baker was dead, and his will had been proved by that year.

Although the Barhams - I use henceforth the modern form of the name retained for some time the remainder of the Sissinghurst estate, including the manor house, they appear

to have retired to the old home at Barham Court Teston. They were somewhat obscure persons, living quietly, and out of the public eye, so that there is a scarcity of facts and dates concerning them.

Thomas Barham, who succeeded his father Henry (probably about the end of the fifteenth century) resided at Teston. He married Elizabeth, the daughter of John Orchar of Otterden, an obscure village on the North Downs above Charing. The Orchars were an ancient family, formerly residing at the manor, of Lossenden in Ewenden. Thomas and Elizabeth had two sons, James and John, and a daughter Catherine. It was probably during the lifetime of Thomas Barham that the rest of the Sissinghurst estate, including the manor House was sold to Sir John Baker, grandson of the first purchaser. Mr. Pyle in his notes 'The Chapel of the Holy Trinity, Milkhouse', says that the final sale to Sir John Baker took place in 1533.

This Sir John Baker had a distinguished career in the legal profession and in the service of the crown. He had been recorder of the City of London, a member of Parliament, Speaker of the House of Commons, Attorney General, and Chancellor of the Exchequer under Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary, but his fame had been blighted by the part he took in the persecution of the Protestants under Queen Mary, which earned for him the nickname, Bloody Baker. There is little doubt that his cruelty has been greatly exaggerated, as for instance by the tale that he caused heretics to be imprisoned, and starved to death in the room above the south porch of Cranbrook Church, which still goes by the name of Baker's Gaol. Probably he did no more than what he considered his duty as a legal officer of the Crown, in carrying out the repressive policy of the Queen, who shares with him the sanguinary adjective. His zeal for the Catholic religion had not prevented him from profiting by the spoliation of the church lands under Henry VIII and Edward VI. For instance he had purchased the building and endowments of the Chapel of Holy Trinity in Milkhouse Street, a chapel of ease that had been erected for the benefit of the inhabitants 'of the hamlet at about the time of the first rebuilding of the parish church, probably in great part from the resources of the Berhams and Bettenhams. It with other similar chapels and chancerys had been suppressed under Edward, and the material sold for the benefit of the Crown. It is not recorded that Sir John had made any restitution when the Catholic religion was re-established by Queen Mary.

Sir John Baker had acquired many other manors, including that of Teston, and had thus become the feudal overlord of the Barhams of Barham Court. I would not however suggest that he used any undue pressure to secure possession of Sissinghurst.

It was well for Sir John, but not for his reputation, that he died about the same time as Queen Mary (1558). Tradition tells that he was on his way to arrest a fresh batch of heretics at Cranbrook, when at the spot still called Baker's Cross, he heard the church bells ringing for the accession of Elizabeth, and knew that his reign of terror was over.

The wildest legends have been gathered about the memory of Sir John Baker, who has in fact been given the character of a Bluebeard. Foolish tales of this sort have been repeated by modern writers who should have known better. Sir John was honourably interred in the family vaults of St. Dunstan's. He was succeeded at Sissinghurst by his son Richard, who entertained Elizabeth during her progress through the Weald in 1573, and was knighted by her.

Before resuming the thread of the story of the Barhams, I will briefly recount the vicissitudes of their former home at Sissinghurst. When Sir John Baker had acquired the whole of the Sissinghurst estate, demolished the old manor house of the Saxonhursts and Berhams, he built himself a splendid new mansion in the Tudor style. Nothing of this remains today, but the great outer gate house, which opened on to the courtyard; a brick-work tower crowned with conical caps, through which access was afforded to the main quadrangle; and two detached buildings, one of which is known as the Priests House, for of course Sissinghurst had its private chapel and chaplain. The principal chambers surrounded the main quadrangle, but they were largely timber framed structures, and have completely vanished.

The whole was surrounded by a moat, a portion of which remains, and stood in a spacious park, which has long since been disparked. The present carriageway which leaves the main road a short distance from the village of Sissinghurst is a comparatively modern construction. The original entrance was from the Staplehurst road, and is represented today by a farm known as 'The Horse Race'.

Sissinghurst remained in the possession of the descendants of Sir John Baker until nearly the end of the seventeenth century. Later on it passed to a family named Mann, and then to the Cornwallis family of Linton. In 1756 the government leased it to house French prisoners captured in the seven years war. It is from this occupation that it owes its present title of Sissinghurst Castle though it was never in any true sense a castle. Subsequently the parish of Cranbrook hired it as a workhouse, the able bodied paupers being set to work on the surrounding farmland. It ceased to be employed in the this purpose when the Union Workhouse was built about 1836, but the parish trustees continued for some years to hold and farm the land, and their stewardship was so successful that when the castle was finally given up, they had earned the parish sufficient money to enable the present Vestry Hall to be built at the market place in 1859.

By this time Sir John's mansion was in a sad state of dilapidation. Everything had been demolished except the brickwork structure aforesaid, and these were in use as farm buildings and labourers dwellings. Outside the gatehouse a substantial modern residence had been erected for the farmer. In my youth it was possible to visit the tower, which had been restored by a member of the Cornwallis family. It stood isolated in a vegetable garden where once the great quadrangle had been. Visitors would be admitted by the woman who inhabited the lower rooms. She would conduct them to a large upper chamber, where stood an antique writing table, with innumerable secret drawers which the custodian would display. On the wall hung grim portraits of the Tudor monarchs, painted on wood, which for all I know may have dated from the days of the Bakers. One could then ascend to the leads by one of the turret stairs. The roof commanded a view of the surrounding woods and farmland, once the park of the manor house.

In 1930 Sissinghurst Castle was purchased by Lady Nicholson (nee Sackville-West, the poet and authoress) and restored what was left of the structure as a residence for herself and Sir Harold Nicholson. The great upper room in the tower, where once the writing table stood, became Lady Nicholson's study. She and her husband surrounded the castle with beautiful gardens, open to the public. Lady Nicholson, who was of the Sackvilles of Knole, Sevenoaks, claimed descentance from Sir John Baker. She died in 1962. It is understood that the place will eventually become the property of the National Trust.

CHAPTER ELEVEN THE LAST OF THE BARHAMS OF TESTON

James, the elder son of Thomas Barham resided at Barham Court Teston. Some time before 1540 he married Mary, the second daughter of Sir Goddard Oxenbridge, of Brede Place, near the village of Brede in Sussex. Sir Goddard is a more interesting character than his son in law. His tomb and effigy, which bear the date 1537, are to be seen in the Oxenbridge chapel in the parish church of Brede. He died in 1531. A gruesome legend attaches to this gentleman. He is alleged to have been devourer of infants, who, when at length he was overpowered by the outraged villagers, was sawn in half with a wooden saw at a spot still called the Groaning Bridge. The tale appears to be one of a number that was circulated by smugglers in order to scare away the curious from Brede Place, which when it fell on evil days became a convenient hiding place for contraband goods, since it stood on what was formerly a tidal creek.

Another of Sir Goddard's daughters, so sister-in-law to James Barham of Teston, became lady in waiting to Catherine Parr, the sixth and last wife of Henry VIII, and was later governess to the Princess Elizabeth.

Sir Goddard's second wife, the mother of Mary, and mother-in-law of James Barham, had been formerly married to John Pelham, of the illustrious family of the Pelhams of Loughton, near Lewes, and possessed as her dower, the manor of Bivelham, which we will hear of again in connection with the Barhams of Wadhurst.

The marriage between James and Mary was not the first alliance between the Barhams and Oxenbridges, for a pedigree of the latter family records that Anne, daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Oxenbridge (died 1512), married her second husband, Eustace Barham of Teston. I know nothing more of this Eustace.

Only one incident in the career of James Barham is recorded in history, and that is a creditable one. He was one of the many gentlemen who came to the help of John Stroud, a preacher of the gospel at Cranbrook. The story is told by William Tarbutt in his Annals of Cranbrook Church. John Stroud had been Vicar of Yalding, where he gave offence to certain of his parishioners by the manner of his preaching, which appears to have been of a Puritan complexion. He had trouble with the Bishop of Rochester, and about 1575 he gave up living at Yalding, and came to Cranbrook as assistant preacher to Richard Fletcher, the first protestant vicar of the parish. Here also he encountered opposition from a section of the parishioners who were sufficiently influential to prevail upon the Archbishop of Canterbury to suspend his licence to preach. There was widespread support for the cause of John Stroud, and petitions for the removal of the suspension were signed by the ministers of several of the neighbouring parishes, and by many of the landowners of west Kent, among whom Tarbutt enumerates Barham of Teston, who must have been James Barham with whom we are concerned. The petitioners were successful, and John Stroud was allowed to continue his preaching at Cranbrook until 1582, when he was cut off by the plague.

James and Mary Barham had three sons, Thomas, James and Henry, and three daughters. He died intestate in 1584, and was buried at Teston, his eldest son Thomas being granted administration of the estate a year later.

With this Thomas we reach the last male heir of the Barhams of Barham Court in Teston. He had been born in 1542, and in 1577, he had married Anne, the daughter of Sir Nicholas Heron of Croyden. His only surviving child, an heiress also named Anne, was baptised in the Church at Teston on 26th February 1578. We have now reached the period when the newly instituted parish registers make it possible to give more accurate dates, but the dating for the historian has been complicated by the reform of the calendar, which was carried out in 1752. Before that reform the year was reckoned to begin on the Lady Day, 25th March, so that dates falling between 1st January and that day were assigned to the previous year. Thus the date of Anne's baptism which was registered as 26th February 1578 would in

our reckoning be 26th February 1579. To avoid misunderstanding, the date can be written as above, 26th February, 1578-9.

Thomas Barham died in London on 21st February 1616-7, possessed of a considerable estate, the greater part of which was held of Sir Henry Baker of Sissinghurst, as of his manors at Teston, West Barming and Yalding, with 150 acres of Woodland at Ditton held of the Royal Manor of Boxley. I have already mentioned that the manors acquired by Sir John Baker made him and his successors feudal overlords of the Teston family, but feudal ties were growing of less significance. Thomas Barham's estates were passed at his death to his daughter Anne. By his will he left small annuities to his two brothers - £30 per year upon lands at Yalding to James, who was buried at that village in 1630, and £20 per year to Henry. The will made no mention of any nephews, and it is probable that both James and Henry were without male heirs.

In 1618 Henry Barham brought an action against the husband of Anne, claiming a life interest in the lands at Yalding and Brenchley, under a lease alleged to have been granted in 1565 by Henry Neville, Lord Abergervenny, 'in regard of divers years faithful service done under the said lord by James Barham, father of the os client.' I do not know what was the outcome of this action, or the nature of the services rendered by James Barham to Henry Neville, who was the ancestor of the present Marquis of Abergervenny of Erich Castle.

Anne Barham, sometime before the death of her father had been married to Sir Oliver Botelor of Sharnebrook in Bedfordshire. The Bottelors, or Butlers, derived their name from an ancestor, who had been cup bearer to King John. Sir Oliver and the Lady Anne, his wife, took possession of Barham Court in Teston on the death of Thomas Barham. With the death of Anne on 1639, the house passed finally from the de Berham, or Barham family, who held it continuously for over four centuries.

Sir William Bottelor, Anne's son was created a Baronet by Charles I, and suffered for his loyalty to the King in the struggle with parliament. He was imprisoned for a time by the Roundheads, and his house at Barham Court was broken open and plundered. He raised a regiment for the Royalist Cause, and died fighting for the King at Cropredy Bridge in 1644. Barham Court remained in the possession of the Bottelors until 1772, when it passed by will to a member of the Bouverie family, descended from a Flemish protestant who had sought refuge in England during the reign of Elizabeth I.

This family, which owns much of Folkestone, is now represented by the Earl of Radnor. Hasted states that the old name of Barham Court had been displaced in his day by that of Teston House, but there is no doubt that the original name remains in use at the present time. Perhaps the survival of the old title is due to the fact that towards the close of the eighteenth century the house had become the residence of an admiral, Sir Charles Middleton. In 1805, the year of Trafalgar, Sir Charles had been made first Lord of the admiralty at the age of 80 years. He has been credited with much of the strategy that led to Nelson's victory. At the same time he was raised to the Peerage, and assumed the title of Lord Barham, from the name of his house, although he had no claim to Barham blood.

Lord Barham was one of the sponsors of the project of a Weald of Kent canal, to link the Medway and the Rother, a project which came to naught. He died in 1813, and his title is now extinct, but it was perpetuated in a succession of battleships, the last of which, H.M.S. Barham, was sunk in the last war (1939-45).

CHAPTER TWELVE THE LAST OF THE BARHAMS OF BARHAM

There is reason to believe that during the declining years of the Barham dynasty at Sissinghurst and Teston, a junior Branch of the family had been installed in the ancestral manor of Barham Court in Barham. The evidence is confused and contradictory, and I must ask the reader's patience whilst I endeavour to unravel it.

I have already referred to the heraldic visitations which were carried out at various dates in the reign of Henry VIII. Officers of the College of Heralds made visitations in several counties, in which they inspected the coats of arms claimed by the arms-bearing, or armoriferous families, and considered the pedigrees submitted by the heads of the families, in view to confirming genuine claims and rejecting those found to be without foundation. Now, the Barhams of Teston and Sissinghurst are not to be represented in the findings of any of the Kentish visitations, surely not because their arms and pedigrees were disallowed. They may not have wished to submit their claims to the visitors, for I do not think that there was any compulsion on them to do so. But the Barhams of Barham did not show the same reticence, and were included in the first two visitations of Kent. At the visitation of 1530-31, Bartholomew Barham of Barham claimed as his arms: 'Or; three bears passant, sable; muzzled gules.' Gules is red; sometimes the colour of the muzzles is given as gold. These are the same arms, heraldic colours apart, as those to be seen on the west front of Cranbrook Church.

Bartholomew did not name any ancestors, but said that he was married to a daughter of John Boyes of Sandwich, and had five children; John, George, James, Alice and Mildred.

At the second visitation in 1574; a more elaborate statement was submitted by John, the son of Bartholomew Barham, who was now evidently head of the family. He claimed as his armorial bearings the three black muzzled bears as before, but quartered with the arms of his wife's family, and including in chief point, a crescent. In the language of heraldry, the crescent in chief point that is at the top of the shield is the recognised difference, or distinctive sign borne on the coat of arms to indicate descent from a second son. This John had an antiquarian taste, and was interested in his family history. He it was who first betrayed a knowledge of the Fitzurse tradition. The pedigree next to the arms starts from a John Barham, descended of Reginald Fitzurse, that lived in the time of Henry II, followed by; firstly John Barham, Lord Barham by the gift of his father's last will, and married to a daughter of Oxenbridge; and secondly Bartholomew, married to Elizabeth, daughter of John Boyes. He added that his own wife was Anonna, daughter of William Giarter, apparently an error for Garten; and that he had six children; Thomas, Bartholomew, Jonathus, Mildred, Martha, and Catherine. For full measure, John appended to his statement a meagre little genealogical table, which we must presume summarised all he knew about his own ancestors. It is too vague to be of any use, although it contains one or two names that we have met before. I reproduce it here for what it is worth. *[table not available]*

The publications of the Harleian Society, in which the findings of the Visitations are reproduced, contain another pedigree of the Barhams of Barham, from an unknown source, on which the line is continued to another generation. This pedigree which records the family arms with the crescent, the difference as before, is more ambitious than the one submitted by John in 1574 but it shows no clearer light on the early days of the family. It starts from a John Berham of Berham in the County of Kent esquire, son and heir to Simon de Bereham, son and heir to John Berham, and heir to Ananas de Bereham, who lived in Anno Regno Regis E 15. As the first three Edwards each reigned for fifteen years or more, covering the period 1272-1377, we cannot suppose at what date this Ananas is supposed to have lived. The pedigree goes on to state that the John first mentioned was followed by four other Johns, each the son and heir of his father, the last of whom was Lord of Bereham by the gift of his father, and was married to the daughter of Oxenbridge. Then follow Bartholomew and John, as in the 1574 list, and lastly Thomas Bereham, of Bereham aforesaid, esquire, son and heir to, John, married to Elizabeth, daughter to Edward Merryweather of Shepherdswell in the said county, and

by her hath issue Marjorie (now living). If the reader has had the patience to pursue the foregoing paragraphs they will probably conclude that Bartholomew Barham and his successors knew rather less about their ancestors than did for instance Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke.

We now have to ask who was the parent who by his will made John Bartholomew's father, Lord of Barham? Mr FitzGerald-Uniacke quotes the genealogist Phillipot as asserting that he was the first of the Thomas Barhams who lived at Teston, and who had two sons, James his heir, and John.

As this Thomas did not succeed to his paternal estates until nearly the close of the fifteenth century, he could scarcely have had a grandson of full age in 1517, as Bartholomew is known to have been. The same author thinks it more likely that the best owner of Barham Court in Barham was the John Barham who was buried in the parish church of Cranbrook in 1442.

The date and manner of the transfer of the old Barham Manor to the junior branch of the family will have to remain uncertain, but there is no doubt about the names of the last four holders of it. They were successively John, Bartholomew, John and Thomas Barham. I have been able to garner a few facts about some of them.

The second John, who portrayed an antiquarian taste in his return to the Visitor on 1574, did not always carry out his duties under the Elizabethan Poor Law as conscientiously as he might have done. In 1573, Archbishop Parker undertook a visitation of his Diocese in which for the parish of Barham the following complaint was recorded. 'Mr. Barham will not pay the money for the poor, but is behind this two or three years, and the collectors are likely to be arrested for the money that they withhold from the parties.' It is to be presumed that he paid up his arrears.

In the same year, 1573, a certain George Barham was one of the witnesses to a covenant concerning land in Wooton, Swingfield, Denton and Barham. As Bartholomew Barham's second son was named George, this witness may have been the brother of the defaulting John. John Barham had been succeeded by his son Thomas by 1582, for in that year a certain legal document describes a piece of land as being 'Bounded on the east by the land of T. Barham, gentleman, to the north by the churchyard.' Thomas Barham was the last of the Barhams to own the ancestral estate of Barham Court in Barham, often described in the feudal past as half a knight's fee held of the Archbishop. According to the anonymous pedigree quoted above, he married Elizabeth Merryweather of Shepherdswell, and had an only child, a daughter Marjorie, but possibly he married again, for a covenant dated in the third year of James I (1605-6), contains the name of Anna, the wife of Thomas Barham, gentleman. There may have been a second daughter by this later marriage, for the register of marriage licenses of the Faculty Office of the Archbishop of Canterbury in London, records the marriage on 12th November 1633 at St. Anne's Blackfriars of George Duke of Wandsworth, and Mary Barham, age 30, daughter of Thomas Barham, gentleman of Barham Down, Kent. I surmise that the estate got into financial difficulty, for in 1594 Thomas entered into a covenant with Thomas Smith, a yeoman of Canterbury, and a gentleman named Terry, whereby he conveyed to Terry on trust the manor of Barham, with appertinances, together with 400 acres of land etc., £6 rent, and rent of 33 hens. The legal intricacies are difficult to follow, but it appears that the procedure was a contrivance to allow Smith, by a process of law, to get possession of the estate to the use of Thomas Barham. It suggests something in the nature of a mortgage. Again the 1605-6 covenant referred to above, appears to convey to one Matthew Fay and his wife two messuages six acres of land and ten of pasture in Barham, from Thomas Barham and Anna his wife, and another party. It may have been financial trouble, or the lack of male heir that finally induced Thomas Barham to dispose of his inheritance.

At the very beginning of the reign of James I, that is, soon after 1603, he sold Barham Court to the Reverend Charles Fotherby, Dean of Canterbury. From the fact that a daughter of Thomas Barham of Barham Down was married in 1633, it may be surmised that Thomas, after leaving Barham Court found a home elsewhere in the neighbourhood of his native

village.

Thus after at least 400 years the continuous history of de Berhams and Barhams comes to an end in the early years of the seventeenth century, with the two distant kinsmen, Thomas Barham of Teston, and Thomas Barham of Barham.

Barham Court in Barham remained in the possession of Dean Fotherby's descendants for about a hundred years until in the first half of the eighteenth century, it passed by marriage to the Derrings of Surrenden Derring in Pliokley.

A Postscript:

Although the story of the Barhams of the middle ages comes to an end early in the reign of James I, it is of course certain that the name is continued by many scattered descendants of the original stock. The written records are limited in the main to the individuals in the direct line of descent; eldest sons of eldest sons. In the course of centuries there must have been many younger sons who founded families, and passed on to their children the family name, but generally speaking, history and the genealogist are silent about them.

A few of these are known to us because they occupy a paragraph in the dictionary of National Biography. One such was Henry Barham, a Fellow of the Royal Society, and writer on Natural History, who lived from 1670 to 1726, and whom the dictionary describes as being a descendant of the Barhams of Barham Court, presumably in Teston. Henry Barham died in Jamaica, leaving there a son also named Henry, a doctor of medicine. The second Henry, after acquiring a considerable property by marriage, returned to England in 1740, and settled in Staines in Middlesex. He died in 1746.

The same dictionary has a note about Thomas Foster, son of James Foster who was born in Bedford in 1756. This man took the name of Thomas Foster Barham, by the authority of a private act of Parliament, and in accordance with the will of Henry Barham. Could this have been made by the son of the Dr. Henry Barham of Jamaica and Staines, who died twenty years before Thomas Foster was born. The dictionary is silent, and we are left to conjecture.

Thomas Foster-Barham is described as a musician and a miscellaneous writer. It is fairly clear that he was a man of parts, and we may guess that with the name, he also inherited the wealth of Henry Barham. He settled at Lesskinnick, near Penzance in Cornwall, and died in 1844, leaving a large family, of which four sons have gained a place in the dictionary. The eldest son, Thomas Foster-Barham M.D., was born at Hendon in 1794, and lived until 1869. He was a classical scholar as well as a physician, and had professional connections with Penzance and Exeter. He was a supporter of the Unitarian Congregation Meeting at Georges Chapel in the latter city, and subsequently conducted independent religious services at Newton Abbot. It appears that some of his father's writings were designed to confute his unorthodox views on religion.

William Foster Barham, the third son was born Meriozion, Cornwall, in 1796, and died somewhere in Kent in 1844. He is described as a poet. Charles Foster-Barham M.D. the fourth son, was born at Truro in 1804, and died there in 1884.

He was also a physician, and engaged in antiquarian and geological studies. The dictionary states that he carried out investigations into the climate of Cornwall, and the diseases of the Cornish tin-miners.

Francis Foster-Barham, the fifth son was born at Leskinnick in 1808. After studying law he turned to authorship. He became known as 'Barham the Aelist', because he devised a new and comprehensive theistic religion, which he named 'The Aelism', from Hebrew and Arabic names of God. He produced a large body of writings, which were edited after his death in 1871 by his friend Sir Isaac Pitman, the inventor of the Pitman system of Shorthand.

In February 1958 the press published a notice of the death of John Foster-Barham

M.C. eldest son of the late F.E.Foster-Barham, at the age of 64. He may well have been a grandson of ' Barham the Aelist', or one of his brothers. The line of these 'Barhams by adoption' may still be flourishing.

PART TWO - THE BARHAMS OF WADHURST

CHAPTER THIRTEEN CONNECTING LINKS

During the Tudor period when the original de Berham or Barham stock in its Kentish seats was losing its vitality, and moving to extinction, a vigorous family bearing the same name, which had established itself at Wadhurst in Sussex, was growing to wealth and influence.

Before discussing the origin of this family, and its relationship to the older line, I must refer in a little more detail to the authorities that I have been able to consult. Information about the Barhams of Wadhurst and their offshoots is more abundant and detailed than that about the senior stock. This is in part because we have reached an age when records were being kept more carefully and regularly; and in part because a modern member of the family became curious about his ancestors, and was in a position to satisfy his curiosity.

The late Sir George Barham, who in 1885 reacquired one of the ancient seats of the family in Wadhurst, had his pedigree investigated, and his right to bear the family arms confirmed by the Heralds College in 1910. An outline of this pedigree, and a copy of the armorial bearings can be consulted in volumes of 'The Landed Gentry'.

As in the foregoing sections, my most fruitful source of information has been the article on the Barhams of Shoemiths in Wadhurst, published in volume LVI of the Sussex Archaeological Collections. Two authorities whom I have drawn upon in the earlier part of this study are no longer available, at least so far as Sussex is concerned. I know of no compilations that do for Sussex what has been done for Kent by Phillipot in his *Villariae Cantianum*, and by Hasted in his 'Survey of Kent', neither have I discovered a complete account of the Heraldic Visitations of Sussex. However, some of the Barhams of Wadhurst migrated into Kent, and for these the sources named again become helpful.

Some useful information about the Barhams as Ironmasters are to be found in Ernest Straker's account of the former Iron industry in Sussex, Kent and Surrey, entitled 'Wealden Iron'. There is also the contemporary evidence provided by the series of cast iron memorial slabs in the parish church of Wadhurst. Such memorials are to be found in other churches in the ironworking districts of Sussex, but the Wadhurst collection is unrivalled. Of some thirty iron grave slabs in the church there, nine commemorate members of the Barham family. Some are elaborate examples, with inscriptions and armorial bearings, while others simply bear initials and dates. There is an excellent guide to the Parish Church of St. Peter and St. Paul Wadhurst edited by Walter H. Godfrey, F.S.A. for the Sussex Archaeological Society, and issued by the Wadhurst Parochial Church Council. This contains a list of all the memorials in the church, including those made of cast iron, with a plan showing the position of each. Also helpful is the official guide to Wadhurst, issued by the parish council which has a sketch map showing the location of many houses connected with the Barhams and other old families. The exact relationship between the Barhams of Wadhurst and the descendants of Robert de Berham in Barham and Teston can no longer be determined. A similar obscurity covers the date of their first settlement in Wadhurst, and indeed elsewhere in Sussex, where individuals of this name are recorded in early times. Here is the second gap in my story, the first being the century long gap between Wulnoth de Bereham and the aforesaid Robert.

In its account of the Barhams of Teston, Hasted's Survey states that: "There was a branch of this family that settled at Wadhurst." In a manuscript pedigree preserved at Herald's College, as quoted by Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke, John Phillipot says that John Berham, the second son of Henry Berham, Lord of Barham, Teston and Sissinghurst, by his wife Elizabeth Colpepper of Oxenhoath, was the founder of those branches of the family that settled at Wadhurst, and afterwards spread to Maidstone and Borton Monchelsea. But Phillipot's statement cannot be correct. The marriage of Henry Berham and Elizabeth Colpepper is believed to have taken place about 1470, but there were Barhams at Wadhurst before that date

Ancient charters in the possession of the Courthopes of Wylie, Ticehurst old neighbours and relatives of the Barhams show that a John Berham of Wadhurst made an

enfiefment of land in that parish before the third year of Henry VI (1424-5), so he cannot be the same as the John who was the son of the marriage contracted in 1470. There can however be no doubt that the.

Barhams of Wadhurst were related in some way to the original Kentish stock, and that the kinship was recognised on both sides. In the first place there was the common possession of the name Berham which became Barham at about the same time on both sides of the county boundary. Then there is the testimony of the coats of arms. As can still be seen in stone on the west front of St. Dunstan's Church in Cranbrook, the shield of the Barhams of Kent carried three bears, either as a reference to Fitzurse or to the place named Barham. The arms of the Barhams of Wadhurst also displayed the three bears but with the addition of a horizontal band, or fess, which was a fleur de lis between the two martlets, or legless heraldic birds. These are the arms shown on some of the Wadhurst memorials, and claimed at the Kent Visitations by the Barhams of Maidstone and Boughton Monchelsea, and they are those confirmed for Sir George Barham in 1910.

The Wadhurst arms also bore a crest, showing a stork among reeds or bullrushes. What crest if any the Kentish family displayed I do not know. The addition of the fess with fleur de lis and martlets constitutes a difference, and indicates that the owners claimed to be a branch - but a distinct one of the original family. Why this particular difference was adopted I am unable to say - it may have been arbitrary choice of the first person who aspired to the honours of the senior stock. My own guess is that the person who did so was aspiring Nicholas Barham of Chillington Manor in Maidstone, whose acquaintance we shall make at a later stage. The two versions of the family arms can be compared on the rough sketch prefixed to these notes.

At a later point in the story I shall mention certain transactions which tend to confirm that the older and newer lines were aware of one another's existence, and acknowledged their kinship.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN EARLY DAYS AT WADHURST

As I have already said the earliest known bearer of the name at Wadhurst is a John Berham who is recorded in documents belonging to the Courthopes of Wylie, a family with which the Barhams intermarried. This John Berham made an enfeoffment of land in Wadhurst called 'The Den', to a man named John Shottinghurst. This implies that he owned an estate there and to use modern parlance sublet a part of it to the person named. The transaction took place before the third year of Henry VI, that is sometime before 1424-5. Thus at the time when the Kentish Barhams were enjoying prosperity on their estates at Teston and Cranbrook, there was a landed proprietor of the same name at Wadhurst. Unfortunately for our purpose, this John Berham is an isolated phenomenon, and the records throw no light on his antecedents or his connection with later persons of the same surname.

The continuous line of descent begins with Thomas Berham, who is heard of about the middle of the same century, and who heads the pedigree drawn up for Sir George Barham 'in 1910. No doubt he was a son, grandson or other relative of the earlier John, but his exact affiliation can no longer be determined. In the nineteenth year of Henry VI, 1440-41, Thomas Berham, with Isabella his wife, was admitted to the Court of the Manor of Bivelham, to certain lands in Wadhurst held of the Lord of the Manor, Sir John Pelham, of Loughton near Lewes. The Pelhams were an illustrious family, with wide possessions in east Sussex. A Pelham is said to have captured the French King John at the battle of Poitiers in 1356, by seizing his sword buckle, hence the Pelham Buckle, to be seen on sundry inn signs in Sussex. The tomb of another Pelham in Lewes Church bears the following quaint couplet:

*What time ye French sought to have sacked Seaford,
This Pelham did repel, and back aboard.*

The manor of Bivelham lay between Wadhurst and Mayfield, and its name is perpetuated in that of the modern Bivelham Farm, about three miles south of Wadhurst town, and just within the parish of Mayfield.

About a century later another link between the Barhams in Kent and their namesakes in Sussex was forged as I have mentioned in an earlier section. The mother-in-law of James Barham of Teston had before her marriage to Sir Goddard Oxenbridge of Brede been the widow of one of the Pelhams, and held the manor of Bivelham as her dowry.

The name of Thomas Barham appears in other records concerning land at Wadhurst in 1446 and 1448. In 1447 and 1448 he was fined three times at the manor court for default of suit, presumably for failure to attend. He probably died soon after, but the Court Roll that might have recorded the death is missing. He was succeeded by his son Richard.

The name of Richard Berham first appears at a memorial court held on the 20th February 1452-53, when John Baker, and Juliana his wife, surrendered 40 acres of land to the use of Richard Berham, and Anne his wife. Anne was the daughter of John Buss of Wadhurst who had been concerned at some time with the transactions involving Richard's father. It is possible that the Baker mentioned in the records, and others of the same surname who had dealings later with Barhams in Wadhurst, belonged to the family of the Bakers of Cranbrook, who are to purchase Sissinghurst. Thomas Baker, who began that purchase, held land in Sussex, and was a benefactor to several East Sussex churches.

To return to Richard Berham, in 1454 he was appointed 'Proposetus', or Reeve of the manor - presumably the manor of Bivelham, and in that capacity would have been responsible for collecting rents and dues. The statement of accounts that he submitted for the following year is still in existence; his name appears frequently in the rolls of the manor, between 1453 and 1470. In 1472 Anne's father died and

some of his lands passed to his daughter and her husband. Richard himself died not long after, before the 27th January 1479-80. He left two sons, distinguished by their places of residence, as Nicholas of Wadhurst, and John of Bivelham.

On the 2nd January 1470-71, Sir John Pelham, Lord of the manor of Bivelham, signed a will, the witnesses of which included Henry and John Berham. Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke suggests that this Henry may have been the Henry Lord of Barham, Teston and Sissinghurst, and the other witness either a brother of Henry, or the aforesaid John of Bivelham. If this was in fact the case, we should have another link between the Kent and Sussex Barhams.

With Richard and John, the sons of Richard Berham, we reach a parting of the ways. They headed two branches of the family, which had very different destinies. The descendants of the elder - Nicholas of Wadhurst, ranged widely over Kent and Sussex, and some of them achieved wealth and distinction in the law, and in the iron industry. The descendants of John of Bivelham remained in and about Wadhurst, and were content, as it seems, to live the lives of country gentlemen, or yeoman farmers. As their story is simpler, I will begin with the members of the junior branch. From now on I will use the name in its modern form - Barham.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN JOHN OF BIVELHAM and THE BARHAMS OF SNAPE AND SCRAGOAK

John, the younger son of Richard Barham, was the ancestor of the Barhams whose chief place of residence was Snape in Wadhurst. Snape, which was probably the manor house of Bivelham, is situated in a secluded valley, about a mile and a quarter to the South-west of the parish church. At a short distance from Snape is another old house called Scragoak, which also was the home of members of the family, presumably descended, like those of Snape from John of Bivelham. Lands which afterwards formed part of the Snape estate were confirmed in the possession of John Barham in 1480.

William Barham, probably John's son, was admitted to the possession of the same lands in 1522, and his son and heir, probably another John, was admitted to them in 1579. The second John Barham, who succeeded to the land in 1579, formed an important connection by marrying Mary, the daughter of George Courthope. This Courthope, whose home was at Wylie, near the town of Wadhurst, but within the borders of the parish of Ticehurst, was a member of a family, Kentish in origin, which was well distributed in both Kent and Sussex. Some of the Courthopes were to be found at this time at Cranbrook where they were the clothiers, and resided in a large house at Goddards Green, then known as 'Wards'. The tomb of Alexander Courthope, who died in 1608, is still to be seen in the churchyard at Cranbrook, and the worn figures of his sixteen children can faintly be discerned upon it. His grandson Peter, as a portrait of the Parliament of the Civil War, purchased the estate of Danning, near Hurstpierpoint in Sussex, confiscated from a Royalist nobleman, and his descendants under the name of Campion live there still.

A branch of this family to which George Courthope belonged had resided in Wadhurst for some time, and they had acquired the Wylie estate by marriage in 1513. Courthopes have remained at Wylie until this day, the last male of the line, Lord Courthope of Wylie having died in 1955. Pedigrees and papers in the possession of this family contain much information about the Barhams of Wadhurst, which was employed by Mr FitzGerald-Uniacke for his article. The Courthope arms, three stars with wavy rays, surrounding a fess, or horizontal band, appear on some of the Barham monuments, where one might have expected to find the family's own arms. Has there perhaps a doubt in some minds as to the right to display the ancient arms of the de Berhams, even with the difference? It is a fact that no arms or pedigrees of the Barhams living in Wadhurst appear in the Heraldic Visitations of Sussex in 1530, and 1683-84, the only one whose results I have been able to consult. On the other hand the younger members, who migrated to Maidstone, and elsewhere in Kent, had successful careers there, did not hesitate to display their own coats of arms, for some time before their kinsmen followed their example

John Barham and Mary Courthope had more than one son, but the youngest, David is the only one of whom I know anything. There is however a memorial slab in the Parish church which displays no less than six shields with the Courthope Stars, which bears the date 1617, and the initials W.B., for William Barham, perhaps an elder brother of David. A daughter Mary married into the senior line of the Wadhurst Barhams in 1615.

David Barham was a minor, aged 16, in 1597, the year presumably of his father's death, and was under the guardianship of his maternal uncle, William Courthope. His portion of the estate included Snape, of which he built the older part of the existing house in 1617. He became churchwarden of the parish church in 1621, and the following year he married Helen, daughter of William Fowl, of Lightlands in the neighbouring parish of Frant. The Fowls were ironmasters, and owned a furnace and residence at Riverhall, just within the boundaries of Wadhurst. Later on they became further intermarried with the new Barhams. David Barham died possessed of Snape on 18th February 1643-44, and is buried in the south aisle of the parish church, under a decorative iron slab, which bears the arms of the Courthopes, his mother's family. The same slab carries the initials A.B., and the date, 1688, commemorating his daughter-in-law Anne. One other initial in the church bearing the Courthope arms has the initials I. B., and the date 1657; it is for John Barham, otherwise unknown, possibly a brother of David.

David Barham had two sons, William and David, and at least one daughter Helen, spelt Hellen on her memorial. She became the wife of Joseph Dunmoll, and died in 1651. The Dunmolls, who had other links with the Barhams, were a local family of some standing, with memorials in the parish church. On the north stall of the chancel there is a marble effigy of Mary Dunmoll who died in the same year as Helen.

William Barham, the elder son of the first David, succeeded to his father's freehold land in Wadhurst and Ticehurst. David Barham junior, who had been baptised in Wadhurst in 1629, was a minor at the time of his father's death, but was presented as heir to his copyhold lands at a court of the manor of Bivelham in 1644, his elder brother William being appointed guardian during his minority. As David, the second, inherited Snape, it appears that this house was on the copyhold part of the manor, which by custom fell to the younger son, copyhold being a somewhat inferior form of tenure to freehold. David Barham junior had a son Thomas and a daughter Anne. Anne, who died unmarried in 1675, at the early age of twenty is described in the Wadhurst burial register as "Anne, daughter of Mr. David and Anne Barham of Snape". This girl has an iron memorial slab, bearing two shields, one with the arms of the Wadhurst Barhams, and the other with an unidentified coat-of-arms. The latter may be that of her mother's the name of which is unknown. The date of the death of the younger David is not known, and he has no memorial, which is more surprising, as the initials of his wife, A.B., and the year of her death 1688, appear on the memorial of her father-in-law, the elder David, who died more than 40 years before. The clouded end to the younger David may be due to the fact that he got into difficulties, presumably financial, for in 1680 he surrendered his lands in Bivelham and Snape to his first cousin, William Barham, of Scragoak.

This William Barham is not to be confused with his namesake, the William who was David's elder brother and guardian, and about whom nothing further is known. As he was first cousin to the younger David, he must have been a son of a brother of the first David. He died on the 6th November 1701, aged 80 years, and so he will have been born in 1621. The date and age are to be read on his memorial of cast iron, which describes him as Mr. William Barham, of Scragoak; the memorial, a large one, occupies a place of honour on the north side of the chancel, facing the altar. As well as the inscription, it bears two decorated shields; each displaying the original Barham arms, three bears, without the difference of a fess, fleur de lis, and martlets. A photograph of William Barham's memorial will be found in "Footpaths of the Kent-Sussex border", by J.Braddock, opposite page 29, and a view of the house of Scragoak in "Wealdan Iron" page 289.

William Barham was a man of substance. The existing house of Scragoak bears the date 1678, although a part may be older, so that the owner rebuilt or extended it in that year. It is not certain that William was married. Another memorial in the parish church bears the initials N.B., and the date 1658. It is said in the Wadhurst Church guide to mark the interment of Mary Barham of Scragoak. This memorial is adorned with five shields, each displaying the Courthope stars, which suggests that Mary Barham was the Descendant of John Barham and Mary Courthope. If she was not William's wife, she may have been his sister.

We must return to the unfortunate David Barham, who had been obliged to surrender his estate to his cousin William in 1680. He had a son Thomas, of whom we know nothing except that he had sons, of whom the eldest, named William, was born in 1691, and had Mr. William Barham of Scragoak as his Godfather. Mr. William, wishing to restore the fortunes of his namesake, made a will in 1697, bearing then 67 years of age and presumably childless, by which he settled the lost lands of Snape on his Godson and kinsman, William Barham, the first son of Thomas, son of his kinsman David Barham, late of Snape, deceased. William, the legatee was still a minor at his benefactor's death, and did not come into his inheritance until 1712, but he was unable to maintain it. In 1721, after a mere nine years of ownership, he surrendered Snape and other lands to John Dunmoll, a distant kinsman by marriage. William Barham lived on until 1764, and died without issue. Neither he nor his father have any memorial in the parish church, unless it be the initials W.B. which have been cut on the grave slab of the first David Barham.

Thus the house of Snape passed out of the hands of the Barhams probably

after a century or more of possession, and it is probable that Scragoak was lost also. In an article on the ironworks of Sussex, published in Vol. II of Sussex Archaeological Collections, the antiquarian Mark Anthony Lower says that the 'Snape-Scragoak' line of the Barhams terminated with Nicholas Barham, who died in the parish workhouse in 1788, aged 82 years. He adds that the representative of these once distinguished families living at Wadhurst at the time of writing, (1849), was Nicholas Barham, a wheelwright. FitzGerald-Uniacke, writing in 1913 says that Henry Barham, of Stonegate in Ticehurst, was the third son of Nicholas Barham, of 'Whitegates', in Wadhurst, claiming to be a direct descendant of Thomas, a younger brother of the last William Barham to own Snape. Mr. Straker, in his book 'Wealdan Iron', published in 1931, refers to the Messrs. Barham as the owners of a blacksmith's forge at 'Stonegate', Ticehurst, and it is interesting to note that the possession of Snape returned to a bearer of the family name in 1885, when the house and estate were purchased as a residence by the late Sir George Barham, but its tenure has again proved impermanent, for Snape and its dependant family have recently been sold by Sir George's grandson. The family had ceased to live in the house, which had been occupied for some time by an institution.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN NICHOLAS BARHAM OF WADHURST AND HIS THREE SONS

From the story of the rise decline and fall of the descendants of John Barham of Bivelham, I have now to return to the end of the fifteenth century in order to describe the more varied fortunes of the children of his brother, Nicholas. Nicholas Barham of Wadhurst, the elder son of Richard and Anne Barham, was invested with certain lands in Wadhurst by a charter dated in the seventh year of Henry VII, (1491-92), which was witnessed by a certain William Barham, otherwise unknown. The same Nicholas was concerned in transactions regarding land in Lamberhurst and Yalding in 1492 and 1494 respectively. Also concerned in these dealings was Thomas Baker, who may have been the Thomas Baker of Cranbrook, who bought a portion of the manor of Sissinghurst from the Barhams of Teston about this time. As already mentioned the Bakers are known to have held lands in east Sussex, and Thomas Baker of Cranbrook made a will in 1494, the year of the Yalding transaction. Nicholas served as a churchwarden at Wadhurst, and was a man of position. In 1499, at a court in the manor of Mayfield, from which he held lands, he and eleven others, were appointed as jurors to hold an Inquisition on behalf of the Lord of the Manor, concerning payments for pannage, the feeding of swine on oak and beech massed in the woodlands. He left three sons, distinguished by their places of residence:

1. Richard, of 'Browns'.
2. John, of 'Woodland , and 'Butts'
3. William of 'Stailreig'

Of the three sons, Richard is notable as the father of Nicholas Barham of Chillington Manor, Maidstone; Queen's Sergeant under Elizabeth I. John became an ironmaster, and the first of a line of ironmasters in Wadhurst, although many of his descendants set up house elsewhere, as at Maidstone and Boughton Monchelsea in Kent, and East Hoathly and Lindfield in Sussex, and London.

The descendants of William soon left Wadhurst, and scattered widely in east Sussex. One family settled at 'Delvern', in Westfield, and another ultimately reached Battle. It was from the latter family that Sir George Barham established his descent. I will ask my readers to follow me as I try to unfold the story of these men, and some of their progeny.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN NICHOLAS BARHAM OF CHILLINGTON MANOR

Richard Barham appears to have inherited 'Browns' from his father. It consisted of a house and thirty acres of freehold land, but I have been unable to identify it on the ordnance map. By his wife Alice, a Sussex lady, Richard had a son, to whom was given his grandfather's name of Nicholas. As far as my information extends he was the only son. Nicholas Barham the younger adopted the legal profession, and had a highly successful career in it, which ended however untimely. He was admitted to Gray's Inn in 1540, and was called to the Bar in 1542. He severed his connection with Wadhurst in 1548 by selling Browns to his uncle John Barham the ironmaster, and became associated thereafter with Maidstone.

Nicholas is one of the few to bear the family name who have a notice in the 'Dictionary of National Biography', which amplifies the brief account given by Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke. He is also mentioned by Phillipot and Hasted in their descriptions of the county town of Kent. There are in addition a few items of authentic information to be gathered from Maidstone records, a selection of records in the possession of the corporation, which was published in 1926. These entries show that the two older historians have sometimes been in error, and have caused me to revise my own account in some respects. There were already Barhams living in Maidstone when Nicholas settled there. The records show that a David Barham owned a house and a garden in the town in 1548. There was also a freeholder and freeman of the town named Richard Barham, who became Mayor in 1571, and who appears as a witness in one of two documents concerning Nicholas. Whether these men were offshoots of the old Teston stock, or distant relatives of the Wadhurst Barhams I am unable to say.

The early years of Nicholas Barham of Maidstone coincided with a time of humiliation for the county town. At the beginning of the reign of Mary Tudor 1554, Sir Thomas Wyatt of Allington Castle headed an unsuccessful revolt against the Queen, which led to his execution as a traitor, and the forfeiture of his lands. According to Phillipot and Hasted, one of his followers named George Maplesden owned the manor of 'Dygons' - sometimes written 'Bygons' - in Maidstone, which was forfeited to the Crown in consequence to the rebellion. Soon after it is said, 'Dygons' was granted to Nicholas Barham, presumably for a money payment, as he can scarcely have had opportunity to render the Queen service. The old house of Dygons is situated in Nightrider Street, and now serves as the vicarage to All Saints Church.

The Maplesden family had been long established in Maidstone. A Peter Maplesden had been the owner of Chillington Manor, near the old chapel of St. Faith. Although Peter may not have been involved in the Wyatt rebellion, he seems to have suffered financially, for he mortgaged the manor for £490 to one Peter Short. On the 25th September 1562, Robert, John, and George, the sons and coheirs of Peter Maplesden sold Chillington Manor to Nicholas Barham for the sum of £500. Beside the manor house, the estate comprised three tenements, a shop, four barns, sixty acres of land and the Chapel of St. Faith with its churchyard. One of the witnesses to the indenture of sale was the Richard Barham who was subsequently to become mayor. This is the account of the acquisition of Chillington as it is recorded in the documents of the borough, and is doubtless authentic, but Phillipot and Hasted, give a different story. They say that Chillington, like Dygons, had belonged to the George Maplesden who was implicated in the Wyatt uprising, and that it had been forfeited also, and afterwards granted to Sir Walter Henley who sold his interest in it to Nicholas Barham. This Walter Henley did in fact own land in Maidstone, and was a member of a family that had grown wealthy through the cloth trade at Cranbrook and entered the ranks of the county gentry. However he may have acquired the two manors Nicholas Barham had now become firmly established in Maidstone. He rebuilt or added to the old house of Chillington which today houses the Maidstone museum. Its great hall and long gallery remain much as they were in his day, but the original building has been flanked on either side by wings added in the last century. Modern embellishments also with the names and arms of Nicholas Barham and his son Arthur, together with those of the Maplesdens and other owners of Chillington, carved in stone or displayed in the windows. On the shields of

both father and son, the arms of the Wadhurst Barhams are combined with the family arms of their wives.

The year 1562, in which he Purchased Chillington manor, was an important one in the career of Nicholas Barham. For their support of Wyatt's insurrection, the people of Maidstone had been punished by the forfeiture of the municipal privileges granted to them by the charter of Edward VI in 1548, and by the loss of their right to send representatives to Parliament. These rights and privileges were restored by a new charter granted by Elizabeth I in the second year of her reign, 1559. In 1562, the mayor, jurates and commonality of the town appointed Nicholas Barham recorder (legal adviser), and town clerk, and determined that a yearly fee of 20 Shillings should be paid to "Master Nicholas Barham, the Councillor to the Town". The amount seemed ludicrous, but it is in line with those granted to the other officers of the corporation. The mayor himself was to receive only £5 a year, together with certain allowances in kind. In the case of Nicholas the sum was probably in the nature of a retaining fee. In the Chamberlain's account of 1561-62, we read, "Item, paid to John Beale, for his expenses at London, for our town, three days at two shillings per day, and for Mr. Barham's fee, 6/8d; in all 12/8d. Item paid for the carriage of a letter to Mr, Barham to London, 2/-."

Maidstone was represented for the first time after the restoration of the franchise at the Parliament of 1563. The representatives chosen were, Nicholas Barham Esquire, and Henry Fisher, gentleman, two worthy and discreet burgesses, as they are described in the document declaring their election, one of the witnesses to which was Richard Barham, later to be mayor. This Parliament was however the only one to be attended by Nicholas. He was in fact launched upon a wider career in his own, profession.

In 1567 Nicholas Barham was made Sergeant-at-law, a superior class of barrister now extinct, from which it was customary to select the judges. In this capacity he conducted the case for the Crown in the trial of Thomas Howard, Fourth Duke of Norfolk, and Higford his secretary, after the unsuccessful plot to replace Elizabeth by Mary Queen of Scots. Both were convicted and the Duke was subsequently beheaded for High Treason. Nicholas was rewarded next year -1573 with the Honorary Title of Queen's Sergeant. He is said to have been a very able lawyer and of much service to the Government, but with a reputation for unscrupulousness in his methods of extracting information. He is alleged to have used the rack to obtain evidence against the Duke from his agent, Bannister.

Perhaps it was to celebrate his advancement that the Corporation made the gift to their Recorder which is entered in the Chamberlain's accounts for 1567-68 "Item for two capons and a turkey, given to Mr. Sergeant Barham, 4/6d." He was also accorded an honourable place in the parish church. In 1570 Nicholas caused five pews to be erected at the east end of the south aisle of All Saint's, and the Town Council granted him exclusive use of these pews, and one other, for himself and his family. In return he undertook to repair and maintain the great window above the pews, presumably the easternmost window of the south aisle. He was only four in family, but he must have supported a considerable household to be able to occupy six pews.

At the second Heraldic Visitation of Kent in 1574, Nicholas Barham registered his coat-of-arms which was that of the Wadhurst Barhams; the three bears supplemented by the fess, fleur-de-lis and martlets, and as a crest the stork in the bulrushes. He can hardly be said to have recorded a pedigree, for he contented himself with the naming of his father, Richard Barham of 'Browns'. I am inclined to suspect that it was his newly acquired honours which entitled him to enrol himself among the arms-bearing gentry. Perhaps his acquaintance with the venerable family at Teston whose surname he shared suggested the adoption of their time honoured armorial bearings with the addition of the difference as an admission that his claim to common descent was not without doubt. We have seen that in Wadhurst the Barhams showed a preference for the insignature of the Courthopes, as if either they had not heard of Nicholas' coat-of-arms, or were suspicious of it. Three only of the Barham memorials at Wadhurst display these arms in full with the difference and crest; old Mr. William Barham of Scragoak boldly claims the three bears undifferenced, and as if to underline his claim, has them repeated twice on his slab.

Nicholas Barham was clearly marked up for a seat on the judge's bench, but his career was cut short by death. At the Oxford Assizes in 1577, he conducted the prosecution of a Roman Catholic bookseller for alleged sedition. The bookseller was convicted, and sentenced to lose both his ears, but fate avenged him. From the crowded courthouse of this, the Black Assize, an epidemic of gaol-fever broke out which carried off many victims, including the Queen's Sergeant. Nicholas Barham died on the 25th July 1577.

On the day before his death Nicholas signed his will, in which he appointed as his executors his wife, and Thomas Barham of Teston, a further indication that the kinship between the two families was recognised on both sides. A year before - in 1576 - the two families had been associated in the drawing up of a tripartite deed of settlement between Nicholas Barham of Chillington, James Barham of Teston, and Thomas, James' son and heir. The two principals were extensive landowners, and it is quite likely that they had interests, and perhaps boundaries in common.

At his death Nicholas was possessed of large estates. In addition to Chillington Manor, his principal restage in Maidstone, and 'Dygons', he owned quarries, the locations unknown, perhaps at Boughton, Springfield Grove, the manor of Hall Place in Barming, Lee Park in Boxley, Copthall, and other lands in Cobham, and houses and lands in Charing, Egerton, Ludstone and Nurstead. Nicholas went further afield for a wife than had been the custom of his tribe, for he married a Cheshire lady, Mary Holt, who survived until 1597. On the occasion of a subsidy in 1585 'Widow Barham' was assessed at £3 on lands. There were two children, Arthur and Margaret. Both were married in their father's lifetime, Margaret in 1564 to a legal gentleman Peter Knott of Gray's Inn at St. Andrew's Holborn; and Arthur in 1574 to Jane, a daughter of Richard Chamber of Charing.

The arms and pedigree of Arthur Barham, the heir, were registered at the fourth Visitation of Kent, in 1619-1621. At that time he appeared to have three sons, Nicholas, Richard and Edward, and one or two daughters. A daughter Anne was married to Throwley in 1634. There is no clue to the destiny of the other children. At the fifth Visitation of Kent in 1638, the name of Barham does not appear.

After his accession to his father's property, Arthur Barham became involved in a dispute with the Corporation, respecting the right of the latter to the use of the Old Chapel of St. Faith. During the Middle Ages Maidstone had possessed in addition to the parish church, a 'free Chapel', dedicated to St. Faith, on the site of modern church of that name adjoining Chillington Manor. This chapel with its churchyard had been appropriated to the Crown at the Reformation, and had subsequently been purchased by the Town. The Corporation had then sold it to the Maplesdens, who owned the neighbouring Chillington estate, but with the reservation that the town should retain the right to use part of the churchyard for interments, and the chapel for funeral services. The building, with its acre of land, came to the possession of Nicholas Barham with the rest of the change in property. The right to the corporation had apparently been disregarded, for it is recorded later that a slaughter house had been erected on part of the burying ground, and that Mr. Sergeant Barham had laid out a great part thereof and impaled it for burial, and his wife in his absence at the term laid it open again. Apparently the Queen's Sergeant wished to appropriate the plot as a family burial ground, but his wife disapproved, and took the opportunity of her husband's absence in London on professional business to remove the fence. However that may be, the corporation drew the attention of the heir on his accession to the terms of the original agreement, whereupon we learn, Arthur Barham, upon the view of the original grant from the town wherein the reservation was made, "did tear and rent the same in pieces". Nevertheless he was persuaded or compelled to sign a document in 1578, in which he recognised the right of the Town to use the remains of the chapel, and part of the land for burials.

Some time after his encounter with the Corporation, but at a date which can no longer be determined, Arthur Barham sold both Chillington and Dygons to Henry Hall, a gentleman of Wye. The sale certainly took place before 1610, for in that year the Corporation were again in dispute with the new owner of Chillington about the right to use the churchyard of St. Faith, and there was litigation with the latter Hall, on the same subject in 1625. I am unable to

say what induced Arthur Barham to dispose of his inheritance, and where he made his home after doing so. In fact he passes out of history.

This abruptly ends the story of Richard Barham of 'Browns', and of his famous son and obscure grandson, but there is a curious postscript to the chronicle of the Queen's Sergeant. In the Archives of the Corporation of Hastings there is preserved a letter of legal advice, addressed to Lord Cobham, the Warden of the Cinque Ports, which is concerned with the right to wreckage on the coast between Hastings and Pevensey. This letter bears the signature of Nicholas Barham, and it has been assumed that this was the Nicholas Barham of Chillington Manor, but as the letter is dated 1599, more than 20 years after the death of the Queen's Sergeant, either it must have been dictated by his ghost, or we must assume that there was more than one Nicholas Barham in the law. This is a reminder that there may have been far more Barhams of high or low degree, than we have any record of. There was in fact another Nicholas Barham living in Maidstone in 1598, but he was a draper, and his name appears in a list of Freemen of the Town in that year. Commenting on the Hastings letter, the 'Dictionary of National Biography remarks, "that the Barhams were a numerous tribe in Kent and Sussex, and that Nicholas was a favourite name amongst them."

Although it does not properly belong to my subject, I will conclude this section with a brief note of the subsequent history St. Faith, which had proved a bone of contention between and the Barhams and their successors.

According to Hasted the old building was used as a place of worship by Protestant refugees from the Low Countries, until Archbishop Lord dispersed the congregation in 1634. After being closed for a time it was again used for worship by a congregation of Presbyterian dissenters, who continued to meet there until 1735, when they built for themselves a Meeting House off Earl Street, the present Unitarian Church, whose congregation dates from the ejection of 1662. Hasted adds that at the date of writing, (the latter part of the 18th century,) part of the old chapel was in occupation as a dwelling house, and the rest as a boarding school for young ladies, after it had had served for some time as an assembly room.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN JOHN BARHAM THE IRONMASTER

I now return to Wadhurst to pick up the trail of the second of the three sons of the first Nicholas Barham of that place. This was John Barham, of 'Woodland' and 'Butts', ironmaker, as he is described in his will. He was born towards the close of the 15th century, and his principal place of residence was the house or mansion of 'Great Butts'. This house, or its successor is still to be seen near the hamlet of Cowsly Wood, about a mile north-east of Wadhurst, on the road to Lamberhurst. I have been unable to identify Woodland on the modern map. Presumably it also was in the neighbourhood of Cowsly Wood. It had a house, for John Barham refers to it in his will as "a mansion". He had purchased the estates of Woodland and Butts, comprising 280 acres, from William Waller, of Groombridge. In 1543, Parliament granted a subsidy to Henry VIII, who was threatened with war by France and Scotland, and the assessment made on John Barham for the purpose of the subsidy showed that at the time, he was by far the wealthiest inhabitant of Wadhurst. Five years later he added to his estate by purchasing 'Browns' from his nephew Nicholas, afterwards the Queen's Sergeant, of Chillington Manor.

John Barham was known as 'The Iron Man', and iron was the main source of his wealth. Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke says that he was the first and most successful of the Sussex ironmasters. Opportunity had offered itself, and he seized upon it. John was born at a time when the ancient iron producing industry of the Weald was undergoing a revolution which made it a great industry, bringing wealth to some, and employment to many. To provide a background to the story of John Barham, 'The Iron Man', and his successors, I will give a brief account of this revolution, the material for which on the most part being drawn from Mr. E. Straker's valuable monograph, 'Wealden Iron'.

From Roman times, and indeed still earlier ages, iron had been extracted from the ore, ore carbonate, to be found in the clays and sands of the Weald, in Sussex, Kent and Surrey by the comparatively simple, but laborious and inefficient process known as 'blooming', a process similar in some respects to charcoal burning, which is still practised by some African tribesmen. The ore, which was called 'mye', was dug from shallow pits generally in the formation known as the Wadhurst Clay. A pile of mye and charcoal was built upon a hearth, and covered with a layer of clay, provided with vent-holes. The pile was set on fire, and heat was maintained by means of bellows operated by hand or some simple form of water power, until the ore, or some of it had been reduced to metallic iron. When the operation was complete the pile was broken up, the product, a spongy lump or 'bloom' of iron mixed with cinder, was extracted. The bloom had then to be beaten upon an anvil until the cinder had been removed, leaving a mass of malleable iron, which was in fact wrought iron.

Towards the close of the fifteenth century a more efficient method of iron smelting, which had been invented on the continent, was introduced from France to England. The new method required the erection of a tall chimney like furnace, a blast furnace, which was charged with a mixture of mye and charcoal, and fired. A strong blast of air was maintained by a pair of huge bellows generated by water-power, and the temperature so obtained would melt the iron completely from the ore. The molten iron, and the lighter slag which floated on the surface of the iron, were drawn off at separate openings. The 'metal so produced was cast iron which could be run into moulds to form a variety of articles, 'such as, fire backs, which are to be found on the open hearths of old houses and in antique dealers shops; and especially cannon and cannonballs. This iron however was too brittle to be worked until it had undergone a further process which converted it into wrought iron. For this, the 'bars', or ingots of cast iron known as 'sows' were reheated in a forge and beaten on an anvil by heavy hammers, which like the bellows were operated by water-power. Sometimes the furnace and forge were worked together, but often they were separate undertakings. The new blast furnaces were much more efficient than 'the old style bloomery, in extracting the maximum amount of metal from the ore, but far more capital was required for the building and maintenance of the furnaces, and for the damming of streams to make 'hammer-ponds' needed for the supply of water-power. The Weald was well suited to the development of the new industry for besides possessing ore in abundance; it had a wealth of timber for conversion to charcoal, and innumerable streamlets and gills to feed the hammer-ponds.

Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke quotes Mark Anthony Lower 'The Ironworks of County Sussex', in Sussex Archaeological Collections, Vol. II, for the tradition that John Barham, the ironmaster, built the celebrated furnace between Lamberhurst and Bayham Abbey, which is said to have provided the railings around St. Paul's Cathedral, and which later received the title of 'Gloucester Furnace', but Mr. Straker was unable to find any evidence to support this tradition. He says that the first owners of the Gloucester Furnace were a family of the name of Collin, and that the connection with the Barhams was indirect only, a sister-in-law of one of them being married to William Benge, who rebuilt the furnace in 1695. I shall deal with this matter in its appropriate place. It appears that the original John Barham operated forges, and not furnaces, and that his activities began about 1521, in which year he purchased from Humphrey Lukenall the two forges of 'Rooklands' and 'Verage' with the neighbouring 'Bartley Mill', a corn-grinding water-mill.

The two forges which remained Barham property for the rest of their active life were situated between the parishes of Wadhurst and Frant, and about two miles east of Frant Village in a deep and romantic valley, through which flows one of the headwaters of the river Teise. The woods of Bayham Abbey rise steeply above the valley, and the names of the forges are perpetuated in the names of 'Brookland Wood' and 'Verage Wood " but no traces of them or their hammer-ponds remain. The pond bay of the Brookland forge is believed to have been destroyed when the Tonbridge to Hastings Railway was constructed. Bartley Mill is still in existence, but today it is only a farmhouse.

John Barham, the owner of Brookland and Verage forges, died sometime before 19th June 1555, the date on which his will was proved. In his will, he left his wife an annuity upon lands in Lamberhurst, and some rights of residence in the Woodlands House. He had five sons; Nicholas, John of Faircrouch, Thomas of Boughton Monchelsea, Richard of Lamberhurst Mill and Wateringbury, and Robert of Lamberhurst. There was also a daughter Alice.

CHAPTER NINETEEN THE SONS OF JOHN BARHAM THE IRONMASTER

Nicholas, the eldest son of John and Thomasine Barham, inherited his father's original estate of Woodland and Butts, but not the two forges of Brookland and Verage, which together with Bartley Mill fell 'to the lot of the second son - John. There seems to have been a family tradition that when there are two or more sons, the ironworks should go to the second, as if there was something slightly undignified about an industrial vocation. The younger sons, if any, went away to seek their fortunes elsewhere. Thus Thomas, the third son of the elder John, migrated to Boughton Monchelsea in Kent, and there founded a family. I shall have more to say about him and his brother John, the second ironmaster in subsequent sections. Now I must return to Nicholas, the elder son and heir.

Nicholas resided at the paternal mansion of 'Great Butts'. When Parliament granted the Queen a subsidy in 1571, he was assessed for the purpose on lands at Cowsley Wood, of an annual value of £8. Let me remind the reader again that the present value of money cannot be applied to figures such as these. He died sometime before 1599, leaving two sons, John and Nicholas. John, the elder of the two brothers inherited 'Great Butts', and had as his son and heir a third Nicholas. This Nicholas linked himself with a distant kinsman of Bivelham and Snape, and with the Courthopes of Wylie, by marrying Mary, the daughter John Barham of Bivelham and Mary Courthope. The lady was a widow, and the marriage took place in St. Clement's Hastings in 1615. John, the only son of this marriage, died in 1697, aged 80 years, leaving as his heir yet another John, who remained at 'Great Butts' until 1713, when he sold what was left of his inheritance, lived henceforth in obscurity, and died in 1732, aged 75. Obscurity here probably signifies poverty, for the fortunes of the Wadhurst Barhams were fading during the 18th century. Emily Lower wrote that the mansion of 'Great Butts' disappeared, and had been replaced by a miserable little house. As I have never been close to the modern house I cannot say whether this description still applies, but the appearance of the neat white gate and drive do not suggest abject poverty.

I will round off this section by setting down what little information I possess about the two younger sons of the first ironmaster. The fourth son of John and Thomasine Barham, Richard, of Lamberhurst Mill and Wateringbury, was a clothier by trade. It is odd that he should have adopted this form of livelihood, for the clothiers and ironmasters were rivals in their demand for fuel and water-power, and there was hostility between them. I imagine that it was in Wateringbury that Richard set up in business as a clothier. He obtained his property in Lamberhurst in 1579, when he purchased Lamberhurst Mill, together with a place called 'Whiskets' from his Younger Robert, to whom his father had bequeathed them. He also possessed lands and tenements in Maidstone, but these he sold to his brother John. About 1582 he married the daughter of maltster of Woldram in Kent. Richard Barham died in 1602. His descendants were still living at 'Whiskets Farm' in 1715. 'Whiskets and 'Whiskets Wood' lie to the south of the village of Lamberhurst, in that portion of the parish that was formerly reckoned to the County of Sussex.

Robert, the fifth and youngest son of the ironmaster was last heard of in a will proved in 1595. I do not know what became of him after he sold his inheritance in Lamberhurst to his brother. Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke is unable to trace any of his descendants.

From these obscure gentlemen, I will now return to the more interesting stories of their brothers, John and Thomas.

CHAPTER 20 JOHN BARHAM OF FAIRCROUCH

There were in succession five owners of the forges of Brookland and Verage, all of them who bore the name of John. I say owners rather than operators, as it is by no means certain that the present John, son of the first iron master took any active part in the work or management of the forges. He is described in his will as "...Of the town of Wadhurst, Yeoman...", "yeoman being usually taken to imply a farmer who owns his own land but who is somewhat below the rank of gentleman.

John Barham succeeded to the possession of the two forges under the will of his father, which was proved in 1555, but in a list of the owners of the ironworks drawn up in 1547, he is shown as having two forges, in other men's hand, probably he leased them. He also inherited Browns and all the other lands that were purchased by his father from Nicholas Barham of Chillington Manor. Faircrouch, where he had his residence is not far from the present Wadhurst Railway Station. John Barham's estates were considerable, for at the subsidy voted to Elizabeth in her first year (1558-59), he was assessed on lands of an annual value of £15, whereas his elder brother's lands at Woodland and Butts were assessed at £8 only in the subsidy of 1571, at which, by the way, this John Barham was a 'Cessor' presumably an assessor.

John of Faircrouch married Alice, the daughter of Richard Istead, of 'The Moat', Mayfield. This was apparently a marriage into another ironmaster's family, as one or two forges stood in the name of Istead in the 1574 list of ironworks. John and Alice had a large family, six sons, Nicholas, John, Thomas, Richard, William, and Arthur; and three daughters, Dorothy, Alice, and Johanne. He died in 1583 as his will was signed and proved in that year.

As we run lightly over these dates we forget the revolutionary nature of the years they denote. Within the space of twenty years, England had been successively Catholic, but in revolt of the Pope under Henry VIII, Protestant under Edward VI, Catholic and obedient to the Pope under Mary, and finally Protestant under Elizabeth I. There is no sign that John, or any other of his kin refused to follow the tide. They were not of the stuff of which martyrs are made, yet at Warbleden, barely ten miles from Wadhurst as the crow flies there was an Ironmaster who died for the reformed faith under Queen Mary. Richard Woodman was burnt at the stake at Lewes in 1557. John Barham may very well have known him.

Under John Barham's will, 'Browns' and his other lands in Wadhurst went to Nicholas, his eldest son; but John, his second son, inherited the two forges. Before passing to the next generation however I must denote a little space to Thomas, the younger brother of John Barham of Faircrouch.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE THE BARHAMS AT BOUGHTON MONCHELSEA

To Thomas, his third son, John Barham the ironmaster of 'Woodland and 'Butts' bequeathed lands in Pembury and Tonbridge. Thomas Barham however migrated to Boughton Monchelsea in Kent, where we find him and his family residing at 'East Hall, a house situated under the brow of a hill on the side of the parish nearest to Chart Sutton. I am ignorant of the reasons that induced him to choose this place, unless its proximity to Maidstone and his famous kinsman, Nicholas Barham of Chillington Manor, have something to do with it.

Thomas took a wife from a family of the neighbourhood, Mildred, the daughter of Thomas Frankland of East Sutton. When he married her, the lady was a widow, having been the wife of George Roberts of 'Moatlands' in Brenchley, who died in 1562 or 1563, and was the kindred of the Roberts of Glassenbury in Cranbrook; the only link, and at that a remote one, between the names of Barham and Roberts. Thomas Barham had three sons, Robert, Thomas and Richard, and a daughter Mildred. He was the executor, or overseer, of the will of his brother of Faircrouch in 1583, and outlived him by several years, dying in 1595.

I need only trouble the reader with a note on the elder son, Robert, who succeeded his father at East Hall. This man was a civil servant - a treasury official - who held the post of Controller of the Pipe'; that is to say he had the custody of the pipe-roll, on which were entered the accounts, rendered annually by the sheriffs of several counties. He married in January 1594, and I should imagine that his bride Susanna brought with her a substantial dowry, as her father, Thomas Sarr, had recently purchased an estate in Norton, near Faversham. Robert Barham considered himself of sufficient dignity to make the return of his arms and pedigree at the Visitation of Kent in 1619, which he indicated with his kinship with the late Nicholas Barham of Chillington, the Queen's Sergeant, of whom he was in fact the second cousin. At this date he had a family of six sons and eight daughters. In 1621 his eldest son, also named Robert, was fortunate enough to secure in marriage Katherine, the third daughter of Sir Robert Filmer of East Sutton Place. At his marriage his father settled upon him an estate of 300 acres, which he had purchased in the parishes of Guestling and Westfield in Sussex. This Katherine, the wife of Robert Barham, can boast of a portrait in the parish church of East Sutton, where there is a very fine brass showing the figure of Sir Robert Filmer, and his lady, and of his nine sons and five daughters, all of whom are named. Katherine is one of these named figures, but of course the accuracy of the likeness cannot be guaranteed. The Filmers were ardent Royalists at the time of the Civil War, and it is probable that some of the younger generation of Barhams were involved with them.

A report on the movements of suspected Royalists drawn up by Cromwell's Secret Service, and dated 31st December 1656, includes the name of Edward Barham, who it is stated had travelled from St. Andrew's Holborn to East Sutton. Affra, one of the daughters of Robert Barham senior, had married a man from St. Andrew's in 1633, and may have been the suspected Edward's aunt. After this notice the Barhams of Boughton Monchelsea fade completely out of the picture.

How many families were founded by the numerous offspring of the 'Controller of the Pipe' ? Where are their descendants now?

CHAPTER 22 THE CHILDREN OF JOHN BARHAM OF FAIRCROUCH

We must now return to Wadhurst where as I have already said John Barham of Faircrouch, the second owner of Brookland and Verage forges, died in 1583, leaving a family of six sons and three daughters. In accordance with what seems to have been the family custom, the eldest son inherited the principal part of the estate, the second son received the iron works, and the junior members were expected to seek their fortunes elsewhere, with some financial provisions. So we find that John's eldest son, who had been born in 1559, and given the now traditional name of Nicholas, inherited 'Browns' and all the other lands purchased by his grandfather from his illustrious namesake, Nicholas of Chillington Manor. He made affinity with the Courthope family by marrying the daughter of the first George Courthope of Wylie, and thus became the brother in law of John Barham of the junior line of Bivelham and Snape. There was but one child of the marriage, a daughter Anne. Nicholas lived to an advanced age and was buried at Wadhurst on the 13th Feb. 1644-45, as Mr. Nicholas Barham of Lambkin Corner.

Lambkin or Lambkin Corner, which is not marked on modern maps, lay about a mile north west of the town of Wadhurst, so far as I can ascertain. There is no memorial either in stone or iron in the parish church to this man. Hasted, in his account of Meopham in the 'Survey of Kent', shows a faint light on the fate of Anne, Nicholas Barham's only child. In 1606 she was married to a gentleman named Haslim, of Meopham Court, who died in 1628, leaving her with a twelve year old son, who had been christened Barham. A year or two later, Anne took a second husband, a Capt. Courthope of Northfleet, not Wylie. To secure the future of Anne and Barham Haslim, her son, her father and Frances Courthope leased the manor and parsonage of Meopham from the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, to be held during the lifetime of the mother and son. But then came the Civil War and the Deans and Chapters ceased to exist for the time being. The sequestered lands were surveyed to the Government in 1649 and it was found that the manor house and its appertinances were let at the "yearly rent of £36, with the entertainment made to the receiver, £2 yearly; and a further sum of £100 every seventh year, which premises were worth, besides the improved value of £200:16:6d, and that the lessee was bound to repair the buildings and the chancel of the parish church. One wonders whether Anne and her son Barham, if they were still alive, were allowed to continue in the peaceful occupation of the manor and parsonage of Meopham, but the curtain falls on their future. The findings of the Commonwealth Surveyor throw some light on the relative value of money in those days.

As I have said, the forges at Brookland and Verage were left by John Barham of Faircrouch to his second son, John. The terms of the bequest were peculiar. John was to receive £30 to make up the £100 promised, all lands in Frant, and certain of the freehold and copyhold lands in Wadhurst, including Bartley Mill, with the tools and implements belonging to the Brookland forge. The executor, who was Thomas Barham of Boughton Monchelsea was to have the Verage forge, and all the Verage lands except at Underwater and Bartley Mills for five years from the testator's decease. This John the younger was not to get full possession of the forges until about 1588, but he was dead, and his will proved by 1591, his ownership must have been very brief, and in fact he may never have resided upon his Wadhurst property, for he is known as John Barham of Maidstone. Perhaps he had been attracted to the county town by the fame of his kinsman, the Queen's Sergeant.

Elizabeth, John Barham's wife, was the daughter of David Willard, a noted ironmaster, who operated furnaces and forges in the Tonbridge and Rotherfield districts. In company with other ironmasters, he erected a furnace at Brede, in East Sussex, in spite of the opposition of the townspeople of Hastings, Winchelsea, and Rye, who were anxious about the possible curtailment of the supply of timber for export.

At his untimely death, John Barham of Maidstone left his widow three younger children and a fourth unborn. John, his only son, afterwards known as John Barham of Shoemiths, was three years old at the time of his father's death. The three other children were girls - Alice, Elizabeth, and Margaret all born in Maidstone, and baptized in the church of All Saint's of that town.

By his will, John Barham of Maidstone left £100 to each of his three daughters and to his son all the houses, lands, and woods he owned in Kent and Sussex. These included "two houses in the town of Maidstone, in one of which I now dwell." He bequeathed 40/- to the poor of Maidstone, 20/- to the poor of Tonbridge, and 20/- to the poor of Wadhurst. He left his brother in law, Edmund Willard, who was his executor, the residue of all his goods and chattels and stock of iron, coal, (i.e. charcoal), sows (iron ingots) etc., with the behest that he should pay his debts and legacies and employ the surplus towards "the advancement in living and honest Godly and virtuous bring up " of his children. The boy John was to be under the guardianship of his uncle Edmund until he was 24. Elizabeth, John Barham's widow, married again, to a gentleman of Sellinge in Kent named Henry Hart. The daughters appear to have accompanied her to Sellinge and to have found husbands in the neighbourhood. There seems to be a reference to this John Barham and his bequest in the memorandum reproduced in Maidstone records, which says that "John Barham, late of Maidstone, yeoman, deceased," at or about the time of his going into France with Sir John Leverton, which was about nine years past, " did make his last will and testament in writing and amongst diverse other legacies to give and bequeath to the poor of Maidstone, the aforesaid sum of good and lawful money of England, to be paid within a certain time of his death, which money, the day of writing hereof" (which was the 24th day of June 1598), was not paid by the executors". If the two Johns were in fact one and the same I surmise that there was some dispute as to the amount of the legacy -£2 or £5, and that the executors hesitated to pay. They must have agreed eventually to pay the larger sum, for a list of gifts to the town and poor drawn up in 1618 includes the item, "By Barham - £5:5:10d."

CHAPTER 23 BARHAMS OF THE DISPERSION

The four younger sons of John Barham of Faircrouch all scattered widely from their native parish. Thomas Barham, the 3rd son, was bequeathed by his father all the lands and tenements in Maidstone, which he bought from his brother Richard, the clothier of Wateringbury, together with the sum of £200 to be paid to him at the age of 24. He settled first at Maidstone and then moved to London, where he established himself in business. In his will drawn up in 1603, describes himself as "citizen, teller, and Chandler of London". He may be the Thomas Barham who is mentioned in the municipal records of Maidstone on the 1st of Nov. 1600. "Thomas Barham of the Waterside, leaving the town, is to continue a free man, paying 3/4d yearly at the Lady Day and Michealmas". As a freeholder and freeman, although an absentee, he was appointed to the common council of the town in 1605. He had little to say in the appointment for it was the rule that any person being a freeholder and freeman of the town who refused to serve on the common council when chosen was to forfeit 20/-.

Thomas Barham had two sons, Thomas and Josia, and a daughter Mary, all born in Maidstone, and baptized in the parish church of All Saints. We get a glimpse of Josias, who became a farmer at Dallington in Sussex, in the deposition books of the Archdeaconry of Lewes, where his name is recorded as a witness on 16th June 1629, "Josias Barham of Dallington, yeoman, where lived six years, born in Maidstone, aged 29".

The fourth and fifth sons, Richard and William, went west. Each had been left by his father property in Wadhurst, and the sum of £300. Richard Barham married a young heiress of Lindfield, Benet, or Benedicta Taylor, probably at Waldron in 1594. The young couple removed to Lindfield, where they lived and died, Benet in 1649 and Richard in 1651. Their posterity continued to reside at Beadle's Hill near Lindfield for several generations. Beadle's Hill, which appears on modern maps as "Bedeles", is a short distance from Hayward's Heath, a new town, which overshadows, and almost absorbed the old village of Lindfield. There is a record of the marriage in 1621 of Richard Barham of Lindfield, he then being aged 25. Nathaniel Barham, the great grandson of Richard and Benet, died in 1792, possessed of property at Linfield, East Hoathley, Broadwater and Mayfield. I found no memorials bearing the name of Barham in the parish church of Lindfield. Whether there are any in the crowded church yards I was unable to discover. William Barham sold his Wadhurst property in 1610, and with the proceeds and his legacy of £300 made a place for himself at Icefields, a village lying between Lewes and Uckfield, and at no great distance from Lindfield. Here he soon gained a favourable reputation, for when Parliament granted a subsidy to James I in 1620, William Barham was appointed assessor for the hundred of Loxfield-Dorset, which includes Isfield; and again in 1628, for grudgery granted to Charles I, when he acted as assessor to Isfield. By 1642 he had become settled at East Hoathly, some four or five miles from Isfield, for in that year he contributed as a resident in the parish to the Irish Benevolence. Benevolence was a polite name for a forced loan or contribution. In the previous year a savage rebellion had broken out in Ulster, and the benevolence had been demanded to assist in its suppression. The same year, 1642, saw the fatal opening of the Civil War.

William Barham was to know little of the war, for he died in 1643, leaving all his lands and tenements in East Hoathly to his eldest son Nicholas. That he was a man of substance and impressed himself upon his parish is witnessed by the fact that Barham House still stands near the village of East Hoathley to perpetuate the family name. I confess that I was long puzzled to account for the naming of this house, since none of the Barhams in Wadhurst had named their homes after themselves. I have to thank Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke's article for the solution of this, as well as many other problems. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there were no memorials to the members of the family in the parish church of East Hoathly. Nicholas of East Hoathly died in 1681. much more interesting character is his younger brother Arthur. Arthur Barham was baptized at Buxtead, four miles from Isfield, on the 22nd Nov. 1618. I can't account for the choice of Buxsead for the ceremony. He had been destined for a legal career, but on the death of his father he sold his law books and repaired to Cambridge, where he studied divinity, and took the Holy Orders. It was the time of the Civil War and clearly the Rev. Arthur Barham had Puritan sympathies. On leaving the

university he was appointed lecturer or preacher at St. Helen's Bishopgate in the City of London. At St. Helen's he ministered throughout the period of the Commonwealth, no doubt conducting services in the Presbyterian manner. One of the publications of the Harleian Society reproduces the registers of the church at this period. They refer to Arthur Barham as "Our Minister", and records between 1651 and 1653 the baptisms of five of his children, and the burials of two of them. Trouble came to Arthur Barham at the Restoration, when in common with many other clergy men, he refused to conform to the Book of Common Prayer, and in 1662, he was ejected from his living under the Bartholomew Act. He retired with his family to Hackney, where he carried on ministry of some sort, perhaps at an illegal Presbyterian Conventicle. Hackney was a place of refuge for dissenters from London. The New Gravel Pit Chapel, now the Hackney Unitarian Church, started as one such meeting place in 1668. It is quite possible that the Rev. Arthur Barham knew something about its founders. In 1665, while he was still living in Hackney, his wife Mary died, and was allowed burial at St. Helen's. "This is Mary, wife of Arthur Barham, Minister of Hackney, and the Church before the Death." So runs the entry in the Burial Register. But in the same year, 1665, the passing of the Five Mile Act prohibited clergymen from residing within five miles of an incorporated town, and so Arthur Barham was compelled to leave Hackney, and his family, and retire to Sussex. I can't affirm that he took refuge with his brother in East Hoathley, but it seems probable, although his father had left some property at Fletching, near Uckfield.

In 1672, Charles I issued a declaration of indulgence, which relieved dissenters of some of their disabilities. Thereupon Arthur took out a license to preach in his own parish. When his brother Nicholas died in 1681, he was granted administration of his goods. After the revolution of 1688, Arthur Barham returned to London, and spent the remaining two years of his life at the home of his son in law, a book seller. He died 6th March 1691-92, and was buried in his old church of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, where the register records "1691 March 10th. Mr. Arthur Barham, clerk, in the south aisle of the church, over against the pulpit." Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke quotes the following tribute to his character, from the Annals of St. Helen's Bishopsgate, by the Rev. J.E. Cox, DD. He was a sincere Godly, humble man, with a mild peaceful disposition, and was generally liked by all those who knew him.

I will conclude this section by noting what little is known of the rest of the children of John Barham of Faircrouch. To his sixth and youngest son, who like his clergyman nephew was named Arthur, he left £240, and some lands in Wadhurst. Arthur appears to have sold these lands in 1604. Before that date he married Mary Kellyn of Morehall, in Linfield near Battle. It is to be supposed that he made his home near there. On passing through Linfield recently I noticed that Morehall is now a country club. John's three daughters, Dorethy, Alice, and Johane, were each left £100, to be paid to them at age 21, or marriage. In 1585, Alice married Edward Maplesden of 'Cheamilly' in Marden, Kent, and one of her sons George, a lawyer, of the Middle Temple, married a niece of Robert Barham of Boughton Monchelsea, who was 'Controller of the Pipe'.

CHAPTER 24 JOHN BARHAM - THE FIRST OF THE SHOESMITHS

John Barham was only three years old when his father died at Maidstone in 1591. As already stated, he inherited the forges of Brookland and Verage, and was placed under the guardianship of his uncle, Edmund Willard until he could attain the age of 24. During the long period of his minority it is to be presumed that his uncle managed the property for him, and either worked the forges himself or leased them to an operator. At any rate, when John became of full age in 1611, he received the undertaking in good working order and proceeded to operate the forges himself. He also made his home in Wadhurst. He was however still a freeholder of Maidstone, and as such was liable to service on the Common Council. There is what I take to be a reference to him in the municipal records in 1635, where it noted that, "Certain persons, including John Barham heretofore elected to be the Common Council, are hereby discharged on that behalf."

In 1610, a year before becoming his own master, John Barham then aged 23, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Dunmoll. The Dunmolls, a Wadhurst family, were connected by marriage with the Barhams of Snape, and years afterwards a member of the same family was to take over the Snape estate when the last owner had surrendered possession. John Dunmoll has a cast iron memorial slab in Wadhurst Church which bears the date 1625. On her mother's side Elizabeth was descended from the Fowls of Riverhall in Frant, an iron working family. The marriage took place not at Wadhurst, but in London, at St. Saviours, Southwark, now Southwark Cathedral. John's uncle Thomas Barham was already established in the city as a tallow chandler. On attaining full age, John Barham purchased the estate of 'Shoemiths', comprising 140 acres for £1000 from another member of the Fowl family, William Fowl of Lightlands; his wife's uncle, who is presumably the same William Fowl whose daughter became the wife of David Barham of Snape in 1622. These opulent families were well intermixed, and money and lands were added to money and lands.

The Shoemiths estate adjoined the Brookland and Verage forges and Bartley Mill, which had been Barham property for nearly a century. The existing house called 'Great Shoemiths' was built or rebuilt by John Barham in 1630. A traveller along the beautiful road that leads through the woodlands in Bayham Abbey, from Hood Green in Lamberhurst to Bell's Yew Green in Frant has on his left a deep and thickly wooded valley through which runs the stream that supplied the power to the forges, and turned the wheel of the Bartley Mill. All the woods on the south side of the byway, and the fields beyond belong to the Shoemiths estate, but Great Shoemiths itself, although it was within earshot of the hammers, is hidden from the road by a dip in the ground. Its position is marked by a commanding knoll of trees, where the farmhouse that has succeeded to the Bartley Mill is plainly visible.

Views of Great Shoemiths are included in Mr. Fitzgerald-Uniacke's article and in 'Footpaths of the Kent Sussex Border' by J. Bradock. The house is a long one of two stories, partly built of local sandstone, with a tiled roof, and a massive chimney stack. From an inventory taken in 1724 we learn that it contained, among other rooms, a hall, great parlour, little parlour, study, great parlour chamber, little chamber, nursery, play closet, garret over the nursery, chamber over the bake house, and banqueting house, (presumably a grand dining room). The bedroom over the grand parlour had painted panels, one of which represented Cleopatra with the fatal asp at her breast. 'Great Shoemiths' became the home of three generations of Barhams and was to witness the final collapse of the family fortune.

By the building of his house, John Barham demonstrated that he was not going to be an absentee landowner, but that he would personally oversee the work of his forges. That he was recognized to be a man of wealth is shown by the fact that he was offered a Knighthood on the occasion of the coronation of Charles I, who ascended the throne in 1625. The Stuart Kings were in constant need of money and the conferring of titles was a convenient means of getting fees and payments. The honour was declined by John Barham as well as George Courthope and others of Sussex gentry. In 1631, when the King was endeavouring to govern without Parliament, the Commissioners for Knighthood Compositions recorded John Barham as one of those who had not agreed to pay their fines for not attending

the King's coronation. I do not know whether the King's Commissioners succeeded on this occasion in getting money from the master of Shoemsmiths.

John Barham had already had a brush with the law. The iron industry was unpopular on more than one count. It was alleged that by its demands on the woodlands of the Weald for charcoal to feed the furnaces and forges, it was depleting the stock of standing timber, which was essential for domestic and industrial purposes, and for export. The threat to the timber supply was probably exaggerated, but legislation was passed to conserve it. Another count against the ironmasters was the damage done to the roads of the Weald by the transport of heavy oxen drawn loads of mye (ore) to the furnaces, and of sows (cast-iron), to the forges. An Act of 1597 required the ironmasters within the Weald to pay a highway rate, and in addition to mending the roadway during the summer months with cinders, etc., in proportion to the loads carried, or in lieu, to pay an extra rate. In 1629 John Barham and four other defendants were indicted at Lewes Quarter Sessions for non-compliance with this Act. The charge against John Barham was that he caused 45 tons of iron sows to be carried from the furnaces of Snape and Cowshoply to his Verage forge without laying the required cinders. I am ignorant of the outcome of this case.

John Barham, the first of Shoemsmiths, died in Feb., of 1640, aged 53. His wife had died a year or two before him. Neither has any memorial in the parish church. They left surviving four sons and three daughters; three sons having died in infancy. To the eldest son Stephen, his father bequeathed all his property in Maidstone, which included a house called 'The Cider Mill', with a garden orchard, and the underwood growing at Verage. This last no doubt a valuable asset in view of the demand for charcoal. The second son, John, received the house and estate of Shoemsmiths, and the two forges. To each of the two younger sons, who were minors at the time of their father's death, he left £400 to be paid to them when they became 21, with the desire that "...they be bound out to honest and able masters, to learn such good trades as my overseers should see fit". The elder daughter Dorothy was already married and living at Wortling, and so she got nothing more than her dowry. The younger girl Elizabeth, a minor was to receive £400 at the age of 21, or at her marriage.

Although the inheritance of Stephen, the eldest son, was mainly in Maidstone, he seems to have resided at Wadhurst where he died in 1673, aged 53 years, leaving three sons and two daughters. A grandson of his, named Nicholas, was living at Speldhurst in 1727, when he acted as administrator for the will of the third and last John Barham of Shoemsmiths - his father's first cousin.

Nicholas, the third son of the surviving sons of John Barham, went to London with his legacy, but he died at the early age of 25. He described himself in his will as of St. Saviour's Southwark, where his father had been married.

William, the youngest son seems never to have left Wadhurst. At the time he made his will he appears to have been living at Riverhall, a residence of the ironworking Fowls but he was buried at Wadhurst on 30th Jan. 1701-02 as Mr. William Barham of Shoemsmiths, age 72. Thus he died within a few months of the other Mr. William Barham, the veteran of Scragoak, who has the memorial of cast iron in the parish church, but unlike his namesake, has no memorial.

CHAPTER 25 JOHN BARHAM - THE SECOND OF THE SHOESMITHS

John Barham, the second, had been born in 1617 and was consequently a young man of 23 when, at the death of his father in 1640, he became the owner of the house and estate of Shoesmiths, and the forges and mill. He extended his activities by purchasing a furnace near Scragoak, which was to be known as Scragoak, or Snape Furnace. Although situated near the two residences of the Barhams of Bivelham there is no evidence that they owned or operated this furnace, which was in the possession of the Maunser family when John Barham acquired it. A Christopher Maunser had married a Mildred Barham in 1526, both otherwise unknown. John Barham's marriage, which took place in the year preceding his father's death, was very much an inter-family affair. The bride was Elizabeth, the young daughter of his kinsman and contemporary, Nicholas Barham of 'Great Butts', and his wife Mary, who was herself a member of the family of Barhams of Bivelham and Snape. The marriage however did not prove to be fruitful, for it produced only four children, of whom 2 died in infancy.

The first child was born in 1641 but did not survive his first year. The second boy, also named John, was born in 1642 or 43. The date is uncertain because baptismal registers were laxly kept during the Civil War. This son lived to be the heir. A daughter was born in 1645, but she did not long survive her second birthday. In 1648, a second daughter was on the way, but before her birth John Barham was seized with a sudden illness, and died on the 5th Dec. at age 31, after being the owner of Shoesmiths and forges for less than nine years. His untimely fate recalls that of his grandfather, John Barham of Maidstone. Sickness prostrated John Barham before he had drawn up his last testament. On the day before his death, he made what was called an uncapatory will, that is he made a verbal statement of his dispositions in the presence of witnesses. He gave his wife to hold his estate until his son reached the age of 21, and thereafter to enjoy one third of it for the rest of her life. To each of his brothers Stephen, Nicholas, and William, he left £20, and the same sum to each of his two sisters, after his son became 21. To each of his servants he bequeathed 20/-, and to his goodwife Sharp, who tended him in his sickness, 10/-. He directed his wife to see to the upbringing of his brother William, for he was still only 19. There was no provision for his daughter Elizabeth, for she was not born until some months after her father's death.

There is a singular fact that John Barham, the second of Shoesmiths, is the only son of the ironmasters of his family to have a memorial of cast iron in the parish church. It lies on the south side of the chancel, opposite the memorial of William Barham of Scragoak, and is one on the most elaborate of its kind. Its inscription in raised letters reads

*"Here Lieth the Body of John Barham, of Shoesmiths, Gent.,
Who died the Fifth Day of December 1648. T.G."*

I conjecture that "T.G." were the initials of the artist who designed the memorial. On a raised plate beneath the inscription are the Barham Arms, on a shield, surmounted by a helmet bearing the crest of a stork in the reeds. The arms are those claimed by Nicholas Barham of Chillington, and Robert of Boughton Monchelsea, at the Visitations of Kent, for it is the ancient three bears supplemented by the fess, fluer-de-lis and martlets. This appears to be the first occasion on which a member of the family in Wadhurst has made public display of the coat of arms on a memorial.

In 1653 John Barham's widow gave his children a stepfather by marrying Gregory Dyne, a gentleman of Wadhurst. We may pause to consider these domestic happenings against the background of English history. John Barham came into his inheritance in the year that saw the summoning of the Long Parliament. During his brief tenure of Shoesmiths the first part of the Civil War had been fought, and Parliament had won. As he lay dying, Charles I was in captivity, and a few weeks after his death, the King was beheaded in Whitehall. To all appearance the Barhams of Wadhurst played no part in the struggle between King and Parliament, and their activities had never included the casting of ordnance. Did they secretly incline to the side of Parliament? I do not know, but it appears that their allies the Courthopes did. George Courthope sat in two of the Commonwealth Parliaments, in 1656, as one of the two members for the County of Sussex, and in 1659, as one of the two representatives for

East Grinstead. His distant kinsman Peter Courthope of Cranbrook enjoyed the favour of Parliament, and was able to acquire the sequestered estate of Danning in Hurstpierpoint on easy terms.

CHAPTER 26 JOHN BARHAM - THE THIRD OF SHOESMITHS

John Barham became of age in 1663 or 1664, and was the third, and last in line to own the Shoesmiths estate. It is not certain whether the forges and furnaces were in operation at that date. In 1664, when there was a war with Holland, and a revival of the Wealdan Iron industry, lists were drawn up of the establishments at work. There is no mention in any of these lists of either Brookland or Verage forges, although the furnace at Snape is recorded. Mr. Straker thinks that this is a reference to the furnace at Snape or Scragoak purchased by the second John Barham. This furnace is stated to have been in ruins before 1663, but could have been rebuilt and set to work again. It appears that the Barhams' forges and furnaces ceased to operate before the end of the 17th century. However the master of Shoesmiths owned ample lands, and enjoyed a corresponding income, even if the ancestral ironworks no longer contributed to it.

John Barham was over fifty years of age when on the 14th Feb. 1694-95 he married Lucy, daughter of John Chauntler of Lofton, near Lewes. His wife was a Wadhurst lady and the marriage was an ill omen to Shoesmiths. Mistress Lucy is described as a very subtle ill-tempered woman, of whom her elderly husband was much afraid. It is fair to state however that this unfavourable character was imputed to her by those who were aggrieved by the disposal of the estate at John Barham's death. Lucy had a sister, a half sister and nephew who comes into our story.

John Barham celebrated his belated marriage by repairs or additions to Great Shoesmiths, and one of the gables bears the date 1695, and the initials "B.J.L.", for Barham, John and Lucy. A daughter was born to whom on the 6th March 1695-96 the family name of Elizabeth was given. In the following year, as if he had a premonition that there would be no male heir, her father made a will, bequeathing his personal estate, after payment of certain legacies, and the whole of his real estate in Wadhurst, Ticehurst, Frant, and Yalding, to his daughter, and her heirs; and in default of heirs to his dear and well beloved wife, Lucy Barham, who was named the sole executor of his will. In 1699 however his wife presented him with a son, who was Christened John on 16th May of that year, but he died the following August.

I have already written of Faircrouch, which had been the home of the second of the ironmasters. It is to be presumed that it remained in the possession of the family after their headquarters became Great Shoesmiths, but we hear nothing of it until 1692, when it was purchased by William Bengé, a gentleman of Wadhurst, who had married Diana Chauntler, John Barham's sister in law. This man had acquired the old furnace of Lamberhurst, and in 1695 he rebuilt it, and enlarged it, making it the most extensive establishment of its kind in the Weald. In fact it became so famous that it was visited by Princess Anne, afterwards Queen Anne, during her stay at Tunbridge Wells, and was named the Gloucester Furnace, in honour of her son, the Duke of Gloucester, who had he lived would have been the King of England. But William Bengé had over strained his resources, and in 1696, he had to mortgage Faircrouch and other lands to John Barham. The enterprise failed, John Barham fore-closed and so Faircrouch returned to the Barham hands for a time. Gloucester Furnace passed to other ownership and was worked with such success that an operator who died in 1752 is said to have amassed a fortune of £30,000. There is a tradition, which cannot however be substantiated, that the railings around St. Paul's Cathedral were cast here. According to Hasted it was the only furnace in Kent still at work in 1782.

Wealth brought honours to John Barham. In the 14th year of William III (1701-02), he served as Sheriff of the County of Sussex, but he was now advancing in years, and all his hopes and affections were now focused on Elizabeth, his only surviving child. He had arranged a special match for her, for she was to be married to a Baronet, Sir Walter Clarke of 'Ratten', Willingdon, near Eastbourne, but there was to be no wedding at Great Shoesmiths and no lady Elizabeth. She was stricken with consumption and died on 20th September 1712, at the age of 16. Grief at the loss of his daughter seemed to have dejected John Barham wholly to the influence of his wife, who under the terms of his will, which he didn't amend, was now his sole heiress and executrix, and indeed is said to have executed deeds

conveying to his wife power to dispose of his whole estate, personal and real, for, we are told, she had such advantage over her husband that he would not deny what she desired, and did persuade the said John Barham to settle his estate as she would have it. Lucy, for her part made her own testamentary dispositions.

Four years after the death of Elizabeth, John Barham lost his domineering wife. Lucy Barham was buried at Wadhurst on 2nd October 1716. The old man was now quite alone. He lived on for a few more years, and died on the 10th March 1723, aged over 80 years. He had outlived two other veteran kinsmen, his uncle William, who died in 1702, aged 72, and Mr. William Barham of Scragoak, who died in 1701, aged 80. There was litigation over John Barham's will, which was not proved until 1727, nearly four years after his decease. The administration of his estate was granted to Nicholas Barham, of Speldhurst, his second cousin, and grandson of his father's elder brother Stephen, an indication of the low estate to which remnant of the Barhams in Wadhurst had fallen.

By the dispositions of the late Lucy Barham, the greater part of her husbands' property fell to George Eagles of Uckfield, her nephew, being the son of her half brother. The fortunate but undeserving beneficiary, then 39 years of age received Great Shoemiths, and the rest of the Shoemiths estate with Snape Wood, Brooklands, Well Wood, and Newlands, Bartley Mill and Verage, Lambkin Corner, Noble's Gate, and Tuckinghurst, other farms in Yalding. Faircrouch, Buckhurst Wood, and other land mortgaged to John Barham by William Bengé went to John Eagles a half brother of George. I give these names and places as quoted by Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke but not all of them can be identified on the modern map.

This willing away of the Barham estates to comparative strangers was an act of injustice to the remaining members of the family, and in particular to Nicholas Fowl of Riverhall, who is described as the heir-at-law, being the grandson of John Barham's only surviving sister, Elizabeth, who had married one of the Fowls of Riverhall, a cousin in 1666.

Nicholas Fowl, and other interested parties who may have received some personal legacies, and made no attempt to attack the settlement, but Thomas White, a son in law of the same Elizabeth was not satisfied, and filed a Bill of Complaint against George Eagles and other legatees, in the answer to which George Eagles furnished an inventory of the furniture and effects of Great Shoemiths, and an abstract of the title, and other deeds relating to the estate. Mr. FitzGerald-Uniacke quotes some items from the inventory, which includes: "Silver plate, valued at £109:17:9d, and £160:4:0d in cash in the house at the time of the decease." I assume that the complainant did not win his case.

It should be added that the aspirations on Lucy Barham's character and actions are largely derived from Thomas White's allegations and may be unduly biased against the lady. Mrs. Lucy's machinations did not rob the parish of John Barham's benefaction. He bequeathed the sum of £5 a year to the instruction in reading of five children of the parish, whose parents were not of the ability; and 12 2d loaves to be distributed every Sunday after evening service to 12 poor persons, who receive no relief from the parish. Presumably an endowment was established which brought in between £10 and £11 a year, representing a much greater sum today. The education endowment has I believe been augmented by modern representatives of the family, but I do not know what, if anything has taken place at the distribution of the 2d loaves of bread. Particulars of the charity are to be read on the monument of John Barham, his wife, son and daughter, which is displayed on the south wall of the chancel of the Wadhurst parish church. This is no crudely lettered slab of cast iron, the work of some local craftsman, but an elaborate marble tablet, with composite columns and curved pediment, and a shield on urn between leaping cherubs, signed by a London sculptor, but the colours have been banished by time. This imposing monument informs the reader that it was erected with the utmost gratitude and respects to the memories of the deceased by George Eagles, of Shoemiths, Kent. Anno Dom. 1730, but the fact is that Lucy Barham set aside in her will the sum of £300 for the purpose of a memorial, with an endowment of £5 a year for keeping it in repair, and the inscription legible.

It would be pleasant if we could record that George Eagles, Gent. showed his gratitude and respect by making a good use of his fortune, but we are told he squandered it,

and at his death in 1752, he left the property to Alexander Courthope of Horsmonden, and other trustees, for the payment of his debts, etc. The estate which was estimated to be worth £7,000, and to bring in more than £200 a year, was sold to Charles Pratt, who was afterwards created Attorney General, and Baron Camden, the ancestors of the present Marquis Camden of Bayham Abbey. Great Shoesmiths, so long a home of the iron working Barhams, now forms part of the Bayham Abbey estate, and is inhabited by a tenant farmer. Local tradition asserts that the old house is haunted, which it well deserves to be.

The 18th century saw the decline and fall of the Barhams of Wadhurst. All the representatives seem to have been aged and childless men, or poor relations, fallen on evil times. The family seat fell into the hands of strangers; Snape, Scragoak, Great Butts, Faircrouch, and lastly Great Shoesmiths. William Barham gave up Snape and died in 1721, without children. His godfather of Scragoak, had died in 1701. aged 80 and probably childless. A John Barham sold Great Butts in 1713 and lived in obscurity until his death in 1732, at the age of 75. Faircrouch had been sold in 1792, and although it returned for a time to the possession of a member of the family, it was lost with the rest of the Shoesmiths estate when John Barham, the last of his line died in 1724. There are vague reports of other descendants ending their lives in the workhouse, or earning their lives as blacksmiths.

It has been said that the decay of the Wealden iron industry was the cause of the impoverishment of such families as the Barhams of Wadhurst. The most flourishing period of the industry was in the 16th century, under the Tudor Monarchs, there after its fortunes fluctuated and towards the end of the 17th century were in decline. A long succession of dry summers in the early part of the 18th century robbed the furnaces and forges of their water power, by lowering the level of the hammer ponds. The iron works of the Weald, which depended upon charcoal for their fuel, were unable to compete with the iron furnaces of the Midlands, where coke had been introduced as a fuel in 1735. They struggled on in diminishing numbers throughout the century, and by the end of it they were nearly extinct. The last works to survive were at Ashburnham in Sussex, where the furnaces were blown out at about 1810, and the forge abandoned in 1812.

I am doubtful however whether the decline in fortunes of the Wadhurst Barhams is to be linked with that of the Wealden iron. It is noteworthy that of the six John Barhams who owned the forges, each was a second son, except the two who were surviving male children. I do not know whether this was due to coincidence or family prejudice, as if the iron works were regarded of secondary importance to the ownership of the land. It was quite certain that the last John Barham of Shoesmiths, with his ample estates, was independent financially of his forges, and if he had a vigorous male heir, the fortune of his line could have contained for a further generation at least. It may be that the decline of the Barhams at Wadhurst was due to failing stamina, and the lack of young blood. There was young blood in some branches of the family, but not at Sissinghurst.