

out of £40 charity left by Mr. Tym for the poor of Bamford (Charity Commissioners 18th Report).

Thus were the Derbyshire estates, so carefully built up by the Sanders family during the 16th-18th centuries, dissipated by a distant connection; one who had no previous link with the county. A query inevitably arises here. Why did these estates pass into the Howe and Mortimer families rather than descend to John Sanders, of Mackworth, the eldest son of Samuel, the historian? Was there some family trouble between John and his brothers and sisters? Had they done so the Derbyshire lands would still be in the family to-day for he founded a distinguished line, still located in Lincolnshire, of whom one was Joseph Sanders, of Liverpool, "the father of Railways."

A FURTHER NOTE ON THOMAS SANDERS.

By F. N. FISHER.

When Oliver Cromwell died on September 4th, 1658, events began to move rapidly. Richard, the new Protector, had not the strength of his father to control the ever changing situation and in May, 1659, resignation was forced upon him. Charles II was waiting impatiently on the Continent for the call to come to England and his supporters accelerated their plans for the restoration. The first visible sign was the rising in August of Sir George Booth. The main rising was to be at Chester under the leadership of Sir George himself with simultaneous ones in neighbouring counties including Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. It is with the latter counties that we are concerned.

Lord Byron, Colonel White and others gathered a force of 120 horse in Sherwood Forest but when engaged by the county troops they were routed, many

were captured along with the colours but Colonel White and a few followers managed to escape to Derby where they arrived on market day and declared for a free parliament.¹ The date was Friday, August 12th, long to be known as White's or White Friday. The local leaders who rallied to White included Sir Henry Every, described as the chief promoter in Derbyshire, John Mundy, sheriff of the county, Philip second earl of Chesterfield, John Stanhope, Anchtell Grey and Colonel John Shalcross. Colonel Thomas Sanders immediately took command of the situation, arrested Captains Doughty and Greenwood, and appeased the mob on Nun's Green and prevailed upon them to disperse. The arrival of a troop of Major-General Lambert's horse restored the situation, the insurgents fled and many, including White, were taken prisoner. White was committed to the Tower on September 12th on a charge of treason.² Meanwhile the rising in Chester had been quelled by Lambert and Sir George Booth apprehended.

Lambert reported on the local situation in a letter to the Commissioners for Sequestration dated September 16th, 1659. He found "this county generally disaffected, and lest you should choose unfit persons for your work, I recommend Majors Thomas Wright and James Fulwood, Captains Rob. Hope, Gabriel Wayne, James Wright, and William Tomlinson, William Newton, mayor of Chesterfield, John Gisborne, alderman of Derby, and five others as commissioners, and Sam. Heathcote as clerk."³

These new commissioners were appointed and soon got to work on the task of securing the rebels and their estates, and in a letter to the Commissioners for Sequestration dated September 20th they reported that many prisoners said that they armed on the instigation of some of the commissioned officers. They also asked whether these prisoners were to be regarded as prisoners of war. The

¹ State Papers, Domestic. P.R.O.

² *ibid.*

³ Calendar of the Committee for Compounding. P.R.O.

reply, dated three days later, stated that they were to be regarded as delinquents until they acquitted themselves and that their estates were to be seized.⁴

On October 1st the county commissioners sent the evidence they had gathered against Captain Sam. Doughty "taking care to give no cause of complaint to the guilty parties." They were anxious to do their duty and averred "we shall not be deterred from duty by any discouragement." But what is more interesting is the last sentence in this letter: "We send you evidence against Colonel Thos. Sanders."⁵ How far Sanders was implicated it is hard to say but evidently he was not sufficiently involved or prudence restrained him when he saw the rising had little chance of success.

The Committee for Sequestration replied on October 3rd that they considered the depositions were enough for a charge to be preferred against Sanders and ordered his estates to be seized. They also requested the county committee to obtain and submit further evidence. Sanders would appear to have refuted the allegations against him and on November 22nd he requested publication of proofs whereon the committee enquired if there were any more witnesses to be examined.⁶

Meanwhile Edward Heming, one of the county commissioners, wrote on Oct. 5th to John Brown, a member of the sequestration committee, to the effect that Sanders and a Major Barton were traitors in neglecting their duty "at the breaking out of the rebellion at Derby." The letter proceeds, "yet since they (i.e. Sanders and Barton) come to London, I hear they very much glory, and their agents here are very much rejoiced, at which I wonder, because things here are so manifest. I have sent you deposition against Sanders, and will send more. If Sanders come off, none should suffer, for they all armed on his account. I entreat your special care in this business."⁷

Although Booth's rising failed rather lamentably yet

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ *ibid.*

⁷ *ibid.*

its indirect results in widening the breach between parliament and the army, soon to be complete, made the restoration inevitable and indeed accelerated it.

On January 14th, 1660, Major Fulwood, a county commissioner, wrote to the Commissioners for Sequestration that Sanders had given power to Captains Greenwood and Doughty to secure all the arms of the county, which action, Fulwood contended, "has discouraged many that were faithful to Parliament." He ended his letter on an ominous note: "Unless timely prevented, Parliament will lose this whole county; for since this transaction the justices have omitted to hold the sessions, and all things are at a stand."⁸

Some four days later the county committee wrote expressing the difficulties under which they laboured, but the presence of some foot quartered in Derby helped them to discharge their duty in dealing with the estates of Booth's followers. They complained that they were threatened with being sued, for the steward of Derby and the sheriff of the county had granted warrants for the arrest for debts owing to the delinquent and sequestered persons. The Commissioners for Sequestration had ordered that these debts were not to be paid and thus the steward and sheriff were acting contrary to orders. Worse happened, for in a postscript to the letter we read that a "party, by order of Mr. Prince, who was here in White's insurrection has just disarmed Captains James Fulwood, William Tomlinson (two of the commissioners) but left Captain William Broadhurst his sword."⁹

The confusion in the situation is rendered more so by a letter from the Commissioners for Sequestration to the County Committee dated January 26th, 1660, in which "Major Barton affirms that you all have been active against Parliament in their late interruption by the army, and were actually engaged with Colonel (General) Lambert on his expedition to the North. We will give

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *ibid.*

you notice when the information is made in writing, and meantime we beg you to proceed according to your instructions.”¹⁰

What the outcome of this matter was, I have been unable to discover, nor how Sanders fared until the restoration the following May. Investigation into the affairs of the others implicated has not yielded a deal of information. After a vigorous start in September by the county committee we find that as late as December there were witnesses still to be examined. These witnesses were, in many instances, reluctant to give evidence, and in the case of John Mundy were threatened with imprisonment if they did refuse to be examined.¹¹

It seems probable, from lack of evidence to the contrary, that Sanders was allowed to go to his Little Ireton home where he must have hoped for a quiet retirement. At the restoration he was included in the general indemnity and it was not until 1664 that we again hear of him.

Almost from the beginning of Charles' restoration there were strong undercurrents of discontent among non-conformists and Cromwellian ex-officers. The first open rising was in October, 1663, when some 200 of them, under arms, were surprised at Farnley Wood near Leeds. Vigorous and ruthless action was taken against them with the result that in Yorkshire alone 21 were executed.

In 1664 one Thomas Calton, of Charley, Leics., laid information about a similar plot that was afoot in Yorkshire, Staffordshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. The sheriff, George Vernon, wrote to Secretary Bennett, later and better known as the earl of Arlington, on August 10th, 1664, enclosing Calton's depositions. It appears that Calton was employed by a Captain Lockier who told him there was to be a rising in Yorkshire and sent him to James Wright, of Shirland Park, to inquire whether he would join it. Wright promised a troop of horse.

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ *ibid.*

Colonel Sanders, Majors Barton and Pryme, and Mr. Porter, of Pentrich, were implicated. A supply of arms from his house at Little Ireton was part of Sander's contribution. Thomas Palmer, of Nottingham, promised to raise a troop of horse to be in Nottingham on October 12th, and Henry Fletcher, a joiner, of Stafford, said 400 men would be mustered in Staffordshire under the command of Major Gladman, of London.¹²

The betrayal of the plot enabled the authorities to take prompt action. A letter from the earl of Devonshire to Secretary Bennett informs us that extensive enquiries, lasting four days were made with the result that Calton, Philip Wild, James Wright, Francis Shelly and Robert Hollingworth were committed to gaol to await the assizes and Sanders, Robert Porter, Thomas Goodwin and Edward Barker were granted bail.¹³

Counsel retained for the prosecution, Sir Charles Dallison, William Ellis and Nicholas Wilmot, reported from Derby on March 20th, 1664-5, to the attorney-general, Sir Geoffrey Palmer, that as Calton's was the only evidence against Wright and the other prisoners, with the exception of Wild, they were acquitted. Wild was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death but was subsequently pardoned.¹⁴ Sanders, having cleared himself once more, seems to have profited by his experiences and nearly 20 years passed by before we find him in prominence again.

The late J. C. Cox states that Sanders was placed under heavy recognisances at the restoration, a £2,000 personal bond and two sureties of £1,000 each, and goes on to quote the entry ordered to be made in the records of the Trans. sessions of 1687 freeing him from these bonds:—

“ Att the Court at Hampton Court the 18th June 1687 by the King's Most Excellent Matie and the Lords of His Maties most honble Privy Councill

¹² State Papers, Domestic. P.R.O.

¹³ Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals, 2 vols., J. C. Cox.

¹⁴ *ibid.*

“ Upon reading this day at the Boord the humble Petition of Thomas Saunders of Little Ireton . . . setting forth That on the 26th July In the 35th yeare of his late Matys reign, Hee entred into a Recognizance before Sir Henry Every barrt One of his Matys Justices of the Peace for the County of Derby of Two Thousand Pounds Penalty together with two Suretyes each of them in a Thousand pounds penalty, . . . And therefore prayinge the said recognizance may be vacated His Maty was graciously pleased to grant the Petrs request . . . ”¹⁵

From the foregoing it is obvious that recognisances were entered into on 26 July 35 Charles II which was 1683, and that Cox is in error in attributing them to the restoration. There is among the Melbourne Hall papers a deposition dated July 19th, 1683, which seems to shed light on the necessity for them:—

“ 1683 July 19. The depositions of Richard Reyner Clerk taken at Derby before us Sir Robert Coke Sir Henry Every Rev. William Fitzherbert and John Coke Esq.

“ This informant sayeth that about four years since he being at Little Ireton in the parish of Muginton at the home of Mr. Thomas Saunders he did then and there see three or four blunderbushes some whereof were new ones.

(Signed) Richard Rayner.”¹⁶

The year 1683 is significant for it was the year of the abortive Rye House Plot. On its betrayal by one of the conspirators a general scare followed, wholesale arrests were made and many, including Lord Russell and Algernon Sydney paid with their lives. How far Sanders was implicated is not apparent but because of his past record of intrigue he would certainly be a suspect.

No more is heard of Thomas Sanders until his death in 1695 which ended an interesting career.

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ MSS. of Earl Cowper at Melbourne Hall, 3 vols., H.M.C.