

THE VERNEYS AND THE SEQUESTRATORS IN THE CIVIL WARS 1642-56

J. P. F. BROAD

Sir Ralph Verney's estates were in grave danger of sequestration throughout the Civil War, not because he supported the King, but because he found that he could not in conscience sign the Covenant—the instrument by which Parliament forced presbyterianism on the English. In 1643 he went into exile, leaving his lands in the hands of trustees; but a defect in one of the trust deeds led to valuable lands being nevertheless sequestered after the war was over. In this paper Dr Broad describes the acute financial difficulties this brought to a family already burdened by debt, and their ultimately successful efforts to lift the sequestration. The success was a tribute both to the courage of Lady Verney (already suffering from the cancer that was to kill her) and to the fact that obligations of kinship and friendship were still felt to override the demands of politics.

During the English Civil War both sides used sequestration (the confiscation of income from property) to coerce and penalize their opponents, particularly the local gentry. On the parliamentary side income from sequestered property was collected by the local County Committees who were the effective rulers of the English shires during the wars. Wives and dependents of those sequestered were allowed small percentages of the income for their maintenance, but that was all. The parliamentary victors later allowed owners to regain their lands on payment of a fine of twice the assessed yearly value of the property, provided they swore allegiance to parliament's religious settlement—the Covenant. This process was called Composition, and went on during and after the first Civil War. Thousands of gentry, professional, and yeoman families went through the process and the records of their compositions have been summarized in the five thick volumes of the Calendar of the Committee for Compounding. However, as often happens, the realities of power did not always follow the smooth paths of administrative convenience. The effect of

sequestration on the Verney family's lands and income provides an excellent case study of the complexities of land and finance.¹

When Sir Edmund Verney was killed while carrying King Charles' personal standard at the battle of Edgehill in October 1642, he was succeeded as head of the family by his eldest son, Sir Ralph, who was twenty eight at the time. Sir Ralph had lost his mother and grandmother in the previous two years, and had to rely on relatives and friends for advice to supplement his own experience of running the estates. He discovered that he had succeeded to estates worth £2000 a year, but that crippling family debts amounted to around £11,000, and interest payments on them accounted for more than half of the family income. His own political position was equivocal, He had opposed royal policy in 1640, like most of the parliamentary class, and remained on the parliamentary side when his father joined the King in 1642. He sat on several parliamentary Committees, and his name was added to one in October 1642, but he probably withdrew from active participation in the Long Parliament in

the summer after writing the final notes of his parliamentary diary on 27th June. He withdrew from Parliament not to change sides, but because of his principled refusal to subscribe to the Covenant, a religious oath which cemented Parliament's alliance with the Scots by making concessions to presbyterian forms of Church government. It was this that kept him away from Parliament and eventually drove him into exile in France. He retained links with many parliamentarians throughout the forties, particularly with the group around the Earl of Warwick.²

Sir Ralph had strong connections with the socially conservative and aristocratic section of the parliamentary alliance which had most importance in the early years of conflict. His religious views and exile, coupled with his father's Court connections, made him politically dubious in the more radical circles of parliamentary politics. In Buckinghamshire, the Verneys were one of the upper gentry families who formed the Country's ruling elite. However many of the heads of these leading county families were parliamentarians much involved in the prosecution of the war. Goodwin was the Parliamentary Treasurer, while John Hampden, Sir Richard Grenville and members of the Whitlocke, Bulstrode, Winwood, Temple and Ingoldsby families were all deeply involved in London. Control of the County Committee fell into the hands of a group of minor gentry, with the Theeds and Bekes playing a prominent part, while later the Committee included artisans and tradesmen. Their politics were more radical, and their deference to traditional power structures had markedly waned.³

Finally, before tracing the course of sequestration we need to have some idea of the effects of the Civil War on Buckinghamshire. The King's headquarters were in Oxford and Parliament's base was London, so for much of the Civil war north and west Buckinghamshire was in the thick of the fighting. The King's outpost was Boarstall Tower, while there were Parliamentary garrisons at Aylesbury and Newport Pagnell. In 1643 and 1644 there were numerous skirmishes and raiding parties, while

occasionally one side or another set up strong points such as the Royalist outpost at Hillesden House. Both sides tried to assert their authority by taxing the villages of the northern hundreds. Simultaneous tax demands from both survive for East Claydon in 1645-6. Military action meant impoverished farmers unable to pay their rent, and landlords whose income was therefore cut. It also meant the billeting of large numbers of troops in the county, who were paid for only long after their departure. Much of north Buckinghamshire was thus in no man's land for much of the war and lacked firm administrative control.⁴

Sequestration first threatened the Verneys in May 1643, when some of Sir Ralph's goods were seized in the London home of a Royalist, Sir Edmund Sydenham, who was an old family friend. He was able to regain them only by petitioning the Parliamentary Committee for Sequestrations.⁵ Sir Ralph was regarded with suspicion but as yet only accused of helping Royalists. However, by August 1643 Parliament had set up a Committee to carry out an earlier order to sequester the estates of "those members of the house as shall absent themselves without leave". On 15th September Sir Ralph's name was raised, but three MPs, including the committee chairman and the Speaker were able to prevent his name appearing in the first list of sequestered members. Pressure on the absent members to affirm their loyalty to Parliament were increasing, and those MPs who had not sworn the Covenant were now asked to do so.⁶

Despite his strongly Puritan beliefs, Sir Ralph retained an undying loyalty to the traditional episcopal religious order that was incompatible with the terms of the Covenant, and found himself in an impossible position. In August he made preparations for going abroad, obtaining a passport (from both sides), and lining up a merchant to ship his effects to Holland. He wrote to the chairman of Parliament's Sequestration Committee that he was going abroad "to inform my judgement in high things wherein I am yet doubting". In this and in a later letter he stressed the special nature of his exile, and denied all rumours that

he had joined the King.⁷ Before leaving he took steps to prevent his estates being seized by making a new family settlement. His lands were put into the hands of trustees to pay his accumulated debts and the annuities due to his nine siblings. The deeds were specially drawn up, possibly by Sir Orlando Bridgman, and two sets covered consecutive two year periods. Once these precautions had been taken Sir Ralph set sail for France in November 1643, accompanied by his wife and elder son Edmund.⁸

Sir Ralph remained abroad for the next ten years and during that time his estates in Buckinghamshire were run by his bailiff, William Roades, with supervision by his relatives William and John Denton, and occasionally by his brother Henry Verney. Their correspondence vividly shows the problems of landownership during the Civil War. The threat of sequestration was only one of a number of interlocking problems. The ravages of war reduced estate income to a quarter or less at times. This meant that there was no money to pay the interest on debts. Creditors were desperate for payment as it was often their main source of income. As long as Sir Ralph remained a Member of Parliament he could not be seized for debt and imprisoned. However interest payments were added to the principal of the loan which was rising at a compound rate that with 8 per cent interest rates meant that the principal doubled in eight years. The threat from sequestration was twofold. It took away the income to pay off interest and debts, and if Sir Ralph was forced to compound with Parliament, the composition fine would add at least another £2000 to the debt.

The threat of sequestration re-emerged in the summer of 1644. This time it was the Buckinghamshire County Committee at Aylesbury that began to send commissioners around to assess delinquents', i.e. Royalist lands.⁹ The lists that they produced did not include Sir Ralph, but the County Committee nevertheless included him. However William Roades was able to deflect the attack by taking the trust deed that showed "how the land is

legally belonging to Dick [Winwood] F[rancois] D[rake] and Littleton [John Denton]". As a result "the sequestration is taken off and he hopes that during the time of the deed it will not be further disturbed." The production of the deeds was minuted by the County Committee without comment.¹⁰

The threat from the County Committee was deflected by the deeds, and while Sir Ralph's political position was ambiguous it remained possible for him to extricate himself by returning to Westminster, swallowing his religious scruples, and taking the Covenant. However, his options were gradually reduced. Sharp conflicts tend to make those who try to stay neutral the butt of both sides. If King and Parliament had managed to reach a negotiated settlement Sir Ralph's position might quickly have been resolved, but after the failure of the Uxbridge negotiations early in 1645 it quickly became more precarious. On 22nd September 1645 he was voted out of the House of Commons and declared a delinquent. His friend Sir Roger Burgoyne attended the debate and reported that "absence was the only cause of it, though other things were objected against, which thanks to God were proved untrue".¹¹

The formal sequestration by Parliament had little practical effect at that time, because the County Committee had already accepted the trust deeds, and the war reduced estate income to a pittance. Yet its very ineffectiveness was the target of the more militant parliamentarians, and there were fresh resolutions for Sir Ralph's sequestration in January 1646. They were sufficiently worrying for the Verney's major creditor, cousin Francis Drake of Shardeloes, to collusively enter on his mortgage of Claydon House and grounds.¹²

When the first Civil War ended in the summer of 1646 Sir Ralph had been sequestrated by Parliament and treated as a Royalist. He was also deeper in debt because he had been unable to pay interest during the war when his estates were in no man's land and paid little rent. His creditors now demanded not just their interest, but repayment of their loans. His political

position made him very vulnerable to their demands because when excluded from Parliament, he could no longer escape legal action for debt, and the possibility of imprisonment. He was not insolvent, but his debts needed to be refinanced. The trust deeds had prevented the County Committee from siphoning off all his income, but their term ran out in 1647, and the Committee remained suspicious.

The end of the war had ambiguous effects on the Verney estates. Peace brought more prosperous and productive farming, and rents rose rapidly to return to pre-war levels in 1646 and 1647. The money was used to pay interest to some creditors, but much went to France to finance Sir Ralph's living expenses which had previously been paid on a hand-to-mouth basis by the sale of plate and repayments of debt. On the other hand, peace also enabled the County Committee to stamp its administrative authority on north Buckinghamshire much more effectively and in particular to enforce sequestration. In September 1646 Brill lands belonging to various proprietors were formally entered upon. Sir Ralph was included among the owners because there was some confusion over the trust deed covering it. Brill had been forest land at the turn of the century, but Charles I sold it off during the late sixteen twenties and Sir Edmund Verney had been one of those who invested. Tenants were now ordered to pay their Michaelmas rent to the County Committee in Aylesbury.¹³ Was this the thin edge of the wedge for the Verneys? Would the trust deeds be overturned one by one by the County Committee and gradually erode Sir Ralph's income? Even if this threat could be held off, a more severe one was becoming apparent. The refinancing of the family debt could not be done without land sales. It had been planned to sell Brill and various of Mary Verney's properties in 1642 when the war broke out. Now that the debt had grown, a more drastic sale was required but sequestration made this impossible. The trust deeds made it possible for Sir Ralph to extract income to pay the interest, sequestration prevented any land sales and so froze the existing expensive debt structure.

For these reasons it was imperative to find a way of lifting the sequestration. Sir Ralph considered making a composition with Parliament, which would have been expensive (adding at least £2000 to the debt), and would have involved taking the Covenant and so sacrificing the very principle that had driven him into exile. The only alternative was to go back to England and plead with Parliament, its committees, and the County Committee in Aylesbury, that he was no delinquent and should not have been sequestered. Sir Ralph could not do this in person because he risked imprisonment for debt in England now he was no longer an MP. Instead he sent his wife Mary to England to try to raise the sequestration, and failing that, to arrange for a Composition. When she left France in November 1646 Mary Verney was already weakened by the breast cancer from which she died four years later, and her departure was delayed several weeks by illness. Furthermore she discovered soon after reaching England that she was again pregnant. Her efforts to lift the sequestration were shrewdly masterminded by Sir Ralph's uncle Dr William Denton. Before Mary Verney left for England Denton advised him to:

inform Landlady [Mary Verney] . . . with as many names of the members you can, that you can expect the least courtesy from, for she may happily (or rather, unhappily) have to do with many committees and too may have occasion to use many friends which though they will not be fierce for you, yet if they will be but tame against you it may do well.

William Denton believed that the Earl of Warwick was the key figure to influence. Warwick's wife Eleanor had been a close friend before the war when she had been married first to Sir Henry Lee of Ditchley and then to the Earl of Sussex. These marriages had given her the code name Old Men's wife in the Verney letters, but Mary Verney quickly judged that she

hath very little power for she lives in the house like a stranger and doth not meddle with anything, only gives two parts of three of her estate for her diet. Her new husband hath not made her a penny jointure.

However Sir Ralph also had leverage on her husband through their joint membership of the Committee of Posts in 1641, and his amicable correspondence with Warwick's son, Hatton Rich when the latter was in France in September and October 1646.¹⁴

A more detailed list of political connections with an estimate of their usefulness appears in an illuminating letter Sir Ralph sent to his wife at the end of January 1647:

If Old Men's wife [Lady Warwick] will use her power and her husband's they may easily make Northumberland, Manchester and North; and perhaps more too. The Lord that lived near us at Rouen [Devonshire] by his own interest and his mother may make Salisbury, Howard and Pembroke, Old Gamester [Dr Cragg] may bring this about and perhaps fetch in Gray too. Saye you must move (by his wife and son) on your own score, and show your pedigree. Wharton, Old Men's wife may also engage by her own friendship with his mother. You must go to Lisle yourself. I think Mr Good [Sir Roger Burgoyne] and his father may do somewhat with Brown (they call cousins); Speak with him about it. Lord of Bedford may engage Trenchard. If you get Trevor (by reason of the alliance) Massam will follow him. Seldon will hear reason, therefore find a friend to tell it him. These are my guesses. Speak with Mr Good how all may be wrought and work your own will so as may best conduce to thy speedy return".

These extracts show how Sir Ralph was relying more on his own kinship ties and those of his close friends than on political groups to remove his sequestration. His equivocal political position in 1646 meant that this was his only course, yet it was one which was much more difficult to pursue in the polarized politics of 1646 than it would have been in 1640.¹⁵

Mary Verney followed a strategy devised by William Denton. He initially planned to petition the Committee of Lords and Commons for Sequestrations directly, and only then to appeal to Parliament. He changed his mind when he discovered there was a six month

backlog of cases before the Committee, which could only be short-circuited "by special favour". The County Committee at Aylesbury claimed it had no power to lift the order, and even refused to give reasons for its sequestration without a specific order from the Committee in London. As Denton wrote:

the County Committee will not take off, or rather cannot, for they sequestered you by that order and except they that made that order will revoke it, I fear it will not be taken off by them.¹⁶

The Sequestration Committee in London provided the requisite order in February 1647, and the County Committee duly sent a certificate in time for a hearing of Sir Ralph's case on 16th April. At that meeting Mary Verney suffered a major setback. John Denton wrote:

on Friday last we were before the Committee who could take no cognizance of my cause by reason of an order of 23rd March 1646 . . . so we must petition the House for the same.

That House of Commons order specifically excluded the case of "such persons as have been Members of this House" from the jurisdiction of the Committee. Perhaps the meeting had also not been carefully enough prepared, for Mary Verney protested that "half those that promised to be there were absent" and that in general it was "a trouble . . . to make friends, for truly they all expect more waiting upon than ever the King did, and will give many promises and perform nothing". The only hopeful sign was that "they all put me in hopes that we shall come off at last . . . thank God I cannot say you had any enemies".¹⁷

Mary Verney now had the even more difficult task of petitioning the House of Commons itself. Through the summer and autumn of 1647 attempts were made, with the first attempt early in June when she expected:

my petition had been read on Friday last but Sir Gilbert Gerrard waved a slight motion.

In France Sir Ralph despaired of his allies and wrote of one "tell me he is hearty for me, this shows but little affection". In June his wife

received a friendly letter from a staunch ally, Sir John Trevor, MP for Grampound, who made it clear that pressing political problems made rapid progress impossible.¹⁸

The delays were not only frustrating, but dangerous to the Verneys. As 1647 progressed, their estate income was threatened from two directions. Buckinghamshire rents rose, and although taxes remained high and the quartering of troops in the County was an expensive burden, the immediate position was far rosier than two years earlier. Yet the income was dependent on the trust deeds which stated that all estate income was needed to pay interest on the family debts. Two sets of deeds had been made in 1643, one covering the years 1643-5 while the other ran from November 1645 to November 1647. After November, the Verneys would lose the protection of the deeds and this would mean that the rent due in March 1648 would be taken, with the exception of a small proportion available for the support of dependants. Sir Ralph was so desperate to avoid this that he planned to forge a deed extending the protection for a further year. In October 1647 he wrote confidentially to his wife:

I conceive twill be your best way to send for the lease and make another by it, only date it from the 1st December 1643 and to make it for one year to begin from the expiration of the other . . . you may put my hand . . . unto it and such witnesses as were known to be of my acquaintance but are either dead or gone beyond seas since December 1643. I would send you one sealed but here is none in this place that can write a clerk like hand and if there were it would cost so much to send it by post, and should I send it by ship perhaps it might be too late. Advise with honest Doctor [Denton] about this but with no other creature whatsoever.

The deed was duly made, signed and sealed.¹⁹

In 1647 the recovery of estate income was also threatened by attempts to sequester lands in Berkshire, principally Wasing near Aldermaston, that had formed part of Mary Verney's dowry. In February all appeared well, but Mary Verney thought:

it were not amiss if you wrote to James Heron for I find he is very ready to assist you in anything in those parts. He tells me there is not any talk there of chains [sequestration]. The friends [County Committee] there are many of them my kindred, but now by common course that is no advantage.

However on 18th October a sequestration order was received at Wasing. Sir Ralph advised his wife to use her local influence, which appears to have been successful, but added that :

the surest way will be to follow the great business with all your might. Till that is done there's no quiet to be expected in our estates, nor profit to be made of them.²⁰

While the Verneys were resorting to forgery in a desperate attempt to save their position on their estates, the real reason why their Parliamentary business had got nowhere by November 1647 was becoming apparent. Mary Verney wrote:

I cannot imagine what course to take for everybody tells me that there is no hopes of doing anything in the bas [Commons] but by bribery, and where shall we get the money I vow I know not.

While she worried about the money, William Denton was deciding who should be bribed and how. On 4th November he wrote:

I do think to make my way to the Sp[ea]ker by seeing his sister-in-law my cousin, and I am told it is the best way I can take. I intend tomorrow to feel her pulse. I intend to offer her £50 if within such a time she will get the prayer of my petition granted.

A week later he explained that he had paid £40 to someone who could help with the petition, and a fortnight later Mary Verney announced that they were:

promised within a few days to have our business noticed in the House and effected there . . . I do not mean that we shall absolutely finish it there but that we shall have reference to the Lords and Commons and then I doubt not but we shall quickly dispatch it there.

Two of their most prominent supporters in the Commons were, Sir John Trevor and Mr Knightly were entertained in preparation for the event.²¹

The bribing of Speaker Lenthall, who was notoriously venal, bore fruit on 17th December 1647 in a spectacular manner. The MPs and others around him in the Lobby laughed at William Denton when he intimated that his petition and motion would be discussed that day:

because that very moment there was high and mighty expectations of Scotch and Army papers ready for reading and by the opinion of all it was not in the power of the most eminent leading man here to have promoted it singly and nakedly, but thus it was, Mr John Ash who was by order to bring in reports from Goldsmiths' Hall (our petition being in Francis Drake his hands) was moved by him and two more of us in his passage through the hall that he would sit quiet whilst Frank moved it, which he absolutely denied, but being made sensible of the business and of the equity and quick dispatch it would receive upon very easy intreaty, very much like a gentleman, undertook the deed of it and so before he sat down in the midst of his business he got it read and so it passed with some but not much regret, and yet the house was fuller (about 300) than in a long time before, such expectation there was of business.

Sir Ralph's case was referred to the Committee of Lords and Commons for Sequestrations, and, as Mary Verney wrote:

Every body tells me that there is no question but thou wilt be cleared at the Committee of Lords and Commons. In the afternoon we go about making new friends but everyone tells me we need not for our business is clear enough; but however I had rather too much than too little.

The case could have been heard in committee on Christmas Eve, but on the previous day Mary Verney wrote that:

all the Lords we can make of that Committee

are out of town, and 'tis necessary we should have as many Lords at the hearing of our business as we can get.

The committee was persuaded to delay consideration until 5th January 1648, enabling her to complete her lobbying.²²

When the case was finally discussed in committee the vote ended in Sir Ralph's favour "by eleven to three or four", but it was as well that Mary Verney and William Denton had lobbied hard. The vote did not reflect the discussion which, Denton reported, "held (mirum dicti) three hours debate". Mary Verney was adamant that

had we not six friends for every one enemy we had been cast in the business, for those that were against us were most bitter and violent and powerful.

She had worked hard lobbying kindred and friends for the victory and wrote that she had

not had all this week one minute rest going up and down amongst them and writing them . . . Old Mens wife [Lady Warwick] hath at last in some measure played her part but I put her soundly to it for I have been four or five times with her this week. Her husband was there and brought others with him whose presence did much good.

The removal of sequestration was a product of the old kinship connections and alliances of 1640. On this occasion they proved just powerful enough to fend off the rising tide of parliamentary radicalism.²³

Denton moved swiftly to turn victory in the committee to practical account by ensuring that it was enforced back in Buckinghamshire. At Aylesbury the radicals were strong enough for him to insist that William Rodes should take the Order before the County Committee only when Peter Dormer, one of the old gentry elite, was attending the meeting. Separate certificates were to be taken to the Committees in Oxfordshire and Berkshire to end matters there. Once all parties accepted that the sequestration was no longer in force Sir Ralph was able to settle his debts. Land was sold,

creditors agreed to a reduction in accumulated interest, and by 1653 the debt position was so much improved that Sir Ralph was able to return to England without fear.²⁴

The tortuous course of the Verney sequestration during the 1640s illuminates a number of aspects of the interplay of local and national policies in the English Civil War. Wartime confusion meant that several bodies invoked sequestration at different times, but while the war was being fought out in Buckinghamshire the practical effect was almost nil—loss of income due to warfare was far more important. After 1646 when rents returned to pre-war levels sequestered land was a much more attractive source of income for the County Committee who were now better organized, and had lost the income previously sent from London to pay garrisons.

For as long as the trust deeds remained in force sequestration remained a threat rather than a charge on the Verney estates. More important was the legal freeze it imposed, which prevented any reorganization of the crippling family debt burden. It was this primarily that made Mary Verney's journey to England and her extensive lobbying so vital. The success of her efforts to lift the sequestration illustrates political contrasts and tensions in the Counties and at Westminster. The Verneys used conservative parliamentarians, peers and members of upper gentry families who had frequently been family allies and kin before 1642. They were predominant within the Committee of Lords and Commons for Sequestrations, but the length of debate, and the strength and bitterness of the minority opposition, is an indication of the extent to which these conservative forces were on the defensive in 1648.

In the Buckinghamshire County Committee in Aylesbury, the position was very different. The elite county families were predominantly in national politics and left local politics to a different group of men who were consistently hostile to the Verneys. They tried to sequester Verney land long before Parliament took action, and were regarded as foes by Sir Ralph. He told his wife not to stay overnight at Ayles-

bury when journeying to Claydon, while William Denton insisted that William Roades should present the certificate of discharge from London in January 1648 only when an influential member of the old elite, Peter Dormer, was present.²⁵

This contrast between a Parliamentary committee sympathetic to an old landed family who had kinship links to many of its members, and a troublesome, often hostile local County Committee, parallels the experience of the Tufton family in Kent and Sussex. There, too, the head of the family used his wife as the main intercessor with Parliamentary committees. The radicals in the Buckinghamshire County Committee in 1648 suffered a defeat at the hands of an establishment clique of Peers entrenched in London committees. There is, however, a last twist to the story. When the Major-Generals took over in Buckinghamshire during the crisis of 1655-6, they reappointed the old County Committee men. When all Royalist gentry throughout the county and country were imprisoned on suspicion of involvement in anti-government plots, Sir Ralph was included. When a special tax, known as the Decimation, was imposed on these Royalists after their release, Sir Ralph was assessed for it. He petitioned the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, and the County Committee. On this occasion Cromwell did not refer the final decision to a London committee, but left it to the County authorities. This time Sir Ralph remained on the list of local Royalists, and was closely watched right up to the Restoration. Sir Ralph Verney's actions are an interesting indicator of changing upper gentry attitudes during the twenty years between the calling of the Long Parliament and the Restoration. Throughout the 1640s Sir Ralph continued to claim links with the Parliamentary tradition to which he had belonged from 1640-3, and used his allies in government to protect his position and estates. When Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660, Sir Ralph felt that his treatment by the governments of the Interregnum had been so outrageous that he successfully petitioned the new monarch for a baronetcy in recompense for the wrongs and ills he had suffered at the hands of Parliament.²⁶

REFERENCES

1. M. A. E Green (ed.), *Calendar of the Committee for Compounding*, 5 vols. (1889-92).
2. See J. P. F. Broad, 'Gentry Finances and the Civil War—the case of the Buckinghamshire Verneys', *Economic History Review*, 2nd series xxxii (1979) 183-200. Unless otherwise identified, quotations are from the Verney papers at Claydon House, Bucks, by kind permission of Sir Ralph Verney and Edmund Verney Esq. Those from the microfilmed collection are identified by their Reel numbers, e.g. R10, while most others are from the Estate Correspondence in the paper room.
3. Perhaps the best contemporary estimate of the wealth of the upper gentry families is to be found in Richard Grenville's notebook in Buckinghamshire County Record Office D/X2/27; A. M. Johnson, 'Buckinghamshire 1640-60: a study in county politics', unpub. MA thesis, University of Wales, Swansea 1963 provides an excellent account of the different groups during the Civil War.
4. G. Eland, *Papers from an Iron Chest* (1937) 60 and Claydon House, Estate Correspondence bundle 1640s. See J. Broad, 'Sir Ralph Verney and his Estates', unpub. D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford 1973, chapter 2. The best account of the Civil War in Buckinghamshire remains that by Sir Charles Firth, 'A Chronological Survey of the Civil War in Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, 1642-6', *Proc. Oxford Architectural & Historical Soc.*, n.s. 5 (1890) 280-92.
5. PRO SP20/1 pp. 18, 27.
6. Sir Roger Burgoyne to Sir Ralph Verney (hereafter RV), 29 Aug. 1643 R5; William Bell to RV 15 Sept. 1643 R5.
7. RV to Robert Gill, 24 Aug. 1643 R5 and passport of same date R5; RV to Robert Reynolds n.d. Nov. 1643 R5; Reynolds was chairman of the committee dealing with sequestered members, see *Commons Journal* III, 220; RV to ?[possibly the Speaker] dated 10/20 May 1644 R5.
8. Claydon deeds 1643, especially those dated 5 Sept. 1643 and 1 Nov. 1643; W. Denton to RV 30 Oct. 1643 R5.
9. See PRO SP28/205-7 especially SP28/207 pp. 392-409, a book of sequestered property in Bucks dated 17 June 1644.
10. RV to Sir Roger Burgoyne, 13/23 Sept. 1644 R6; PRO SP28/207 pp. 1-7.
11. *Commons Journal* IV, 282; Sir Roger Burgoyne to RV 24 Sept. 1645 R6.
12. Francis Drake to RV 29 Jan. 1646 R7; it is not clear whether these moves came on the floor of the House, or in the Sequestration Committee; Claydon House deeds 1645 dated 20 Dec. 1645 endorsed with a statement of formal entry dated 28 Jan 1646.
13. PRO SP28/207 pp. 289-391 esp. pp. 376-91; W. Denton to W. Roades, 22 Oct. 1646 R7.
14. W. Denton to RV 30 Sept. 1646 R7 and 28 Oct. 1646 R7; Mary Verney to RV 14 Jan. 1647 R8; Earl of Warwick to RV 5, 7, 12, 13 April 1642 R4.
15. RV to Mary Verney 31 Jan. 1647 R8.
16. W. Denton to RV 30 Sept., 8, 28, 29 Oct. 1646 R7; Mary Verney to RV 17 Dec. 1646 R7.
17. John Denton to RV 21 Apr. 1647 R7, cf. *Commons Journal* V, 120, 23 Mar. 1647; Mary Verney to RV 21 Apr. 1647 R7.
18. RV to W. Denton 20 June 1647 R7; Sir John Trevor to Mary Verney 20 July 1647 R8.
19. Claydon House deeds 1643; RV to Mary Verney 17 Oct. 1647 R8.
20. Mary Verney to RV 4 Feb. 1647 R8; RV to Mary Verney 14 Nov. 1647 and 2 Dec. 1647 R8.
21. Mary Verney to RV 11 Nov. 1647 R8, cf. J. Wake, *The Brudenells of Deene* (rev. edn. 1954) 148; W. Denton to RV 4 and 11 Nov. 1647 R8; Mary Verney to RV 25 Nov. 1647 R8.
22. Mary Verney to RV 20 and 23 Dec. 1647 R8; PRO SP20/4 p. 117 dated 24 Dec. 1647.
23. W. Denton to RV 6 Jan. 1648 R8; Mary Verney to RV 6 Jan. 1648 R8; PRO SP20/4 p. 127.
24. W. Denton to W. Roades 10 Jan. 1648 R8.
25. RV to Mary Verney 20 June 1647 R7.
26. Felix Hull (ed.), 'The Tufton Sequestration Papers', in *A Seventeenth Century Miscellany* (Kent Archaeol. Soc. Record Publications xvii, 1960) 35-67; A. M. Johnson, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 295; papers dated Mar. 1656 R14; RV to Vere Gaudy n.d. May 1656 R14, cf. Ivan Roots, 'Swordsmen and Decimators', in V. H. Parry (ed.), *The English Civil War 1642-58* (1970) esp. 82.