THE REGICIDES OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

BY ROBERT GIBBS, AYLESBURY.

No district in the kingdom could have suffered more from the calamities and hardships consequent upon the civil wars of the seventeenth century than that in which Buckinghamshire is situated. With stations of the King's army at Buckingham, Winslow, Bicester, Thame, Brackley, Brill, Haddenham, and adjacent places, and the Parliamentary forces quartered at Aylesbury, Hartwell, Wing, Bierton, Waddesdon, Leighton, Wendover, Missenden, Amersham, and Chesham, this usually peaceful county of ours must have been a scene of continued anarchy, confusion, and bloodshed. Discontent and dissatisfaction were observable as early as the year 1635, and it was evident that a rupture between the King and the Parliament would result. Preparations for the struggle were advancing on both sides, but the actual commencement of the conflict must be dated from August, 1642, when the Royal standard was hoisted at Nottingham. The sword was then drawn, and in almost every shire hostile factions were warring against each other, and the kingdom was distracted from one end to the other. We cannot, after so long a period has elapsed, bring our minds to contemplate the sufferings of the great body of the people during the period of fourteen years of internecine warfare. So far as actual pecuniary losses were sustained, the farmers in most cases were the greatest sufferers. Ever liable to the raids of the military in their marauding expeditions, they were unceremoniously deprived of their horses, cattle, and farm produce for the pressing exigences of the troops. Roundheads and Cavaliers in turn pillaged them, generally in a very tyrannical and arbitrary manner, and without compensation; in other cases under specious promises of payment, never to be fulfilled. The rights of property were not in the least respected, and the sanctity of the homes and hearths of an innocent population was ruthlessly invaded by a rude, licentious, and mischievous soldiery.*

* Mr. Payne, of Walton Grove, Aylesbury, preserves an ancient family manuscript, which gives an account of the losses sustained during the civil wars, by Ralph Rolls, a farmer, who at that period resided at Garsington, in Oxfordshire. This Mr. Rolls was an ancestor of the family of the same

Seven years elapsed between the raising of the Royal standard and the King's execution. During that period power had drifted and found its way into irresponsible hands. At the outbreak of the war the King had to contend with opponents, at its close, with enemies. The former struggled for the liberties of their country; the latter thirsted for the blood of their Sovereign, and their thirst was satiated. The King is said to have grieved over the fall of John Hampden in the early part of the struggle; he may have had great reason to do so. Who knows but that the knell which heralded forth the news of the death of Hampden did not prematurely tell of the downfall of the King? Had Hampden survived we should not have found him a member of the "High Court of Justice"; he would not have lurked about the Painted Chamber, or been seen in Westminster Hall during the King's trial; nor would his name have been attached to the warrant for the destruction of the King. Hampden would have taken no part or lot in these proceedings, the records of which form the blackest pages of our nation's history; had he maintained that authority at one time accorded him, his voice would have been raised in favour of saving the King from so ignominious a death, and the nation from the odium consequent thereon; he would have maintained the resolve made when he first entered into the struggle for national liberty :—

"Against my King I never fight,
But for my King and country's right."

---

name who were subsequently, and for some three or four generations, settled at Bicester, also of the Rolls', Payne's, and one branch of the Gibbs' families of Aylesbury. The narrative describes how that poor farmer Rolls was deprived by the Cavaliers of all his horses save one; this last he hid in the barton. Some troopers coming into the yard, the hidden horse, by way of recognition, gave a friendly neigh, thus innocently betraying both himself and his master, and Ralph lost his last horse. The account goes on to state how that the soldiery wilfully destroyed the seed corn, so that next year Farmer Rolls' land was left in fallow and waste. So avaricious were the soldiers that it was requisite to secrete the daily food of the family from their clutches: the bacon was suspended by a rope and hidden in the well, the top of the well being turfed over. The children, in turns, watched whilst the family took their meals, lest by an unexpected visit they might run the risk of being deprived of their food.

* * * *

Ralph's situation rendered him a prey
To each marauding force that came that way;
They seized his cattle, poultry, hogs, and sheep,
Without concealment, nothing could he keep.

The Restoration brought with it a sad day of retribution to those who had been concerned in the trial and execution of the King. Doubtless Charles, long before he regained his throne, meditated revenge on the murderers of his father, and had resolved on the destruction of the surviving regicides. Twelve years passed between the King's death and the Restoration. In the meantime many of those who had taken part in the trial and execution had died, and others had left the country for safety.

No sooner was Charles firmly seated on the throne, than preparations were made for the trials of the regicides. Those who were dead even did not escape his vengeance, and as regarded them he allowed his feelings to overcome his judgment by ordering the mouldering remains of some to be dragged from their graves and publicly exposed on the gallows. The names of the deceased regicides were included in the Act of Attainder, in consequence of which their estates were forfeited and their families rendered destitute and helpless. Those who survived foresaw the fate which awaited them, and they made good their escape to distant parts. Even if they succeeded in so doing, it was but to lead a life of misery, uncertainty, and degradation, in constant dread of being surprised and taken into custody by the King's emissaries, as the most diligent search was instituted to bring them to trial and punishment, no matter to what part of the world they had absconded.

Regicidal feelings must have held great sway in Buckinghamshire. Amongst those who took part in the King's trial, or were otherwise concerned in his death, the names of more than thirty will be found who were either directly or indirectly connected with Bucks or Buckinghamshire families, and it is doubtful even if in that large number the list has been exhausted. With such an array of "delinquents," the notice of each individual must necessarily be brief.

Sir John D'Anvers.—He was father to the wife of Robert, Viscount Purbeck, eldest son and heir to John Villiers, brother of the great Duke of Buckingham and Baron of Stoke Poges. Sir John D'Anvers was also further connected with Buckinghamshire by his mother being a member of the Latimer family, and she, after the

death of her first husband, remarried Sir Edmund Carey, third son of Henry, Lord Hunsdon. Sir John represented Oxford in the two last Parliaments of Charles I., and was an avowed enemy to that monarch. At the outbreak of the war he accepted a commission as colonel in the army, but never distinguished himself in the field. He regularly attended the King's trial, and his name is attached to the warrant for beheading the King. He died during the Commonwealth, neglected and in contempt. At the Restoration his name was inserted in the Act, excepting him from pardon as if living, by which all his property was lost to his heir.

Oliver Cromwell.—The connections of this remarkable man with Buckinghamshire are well known. He was closely allied both with the Russells of Chequers and the Hampdens of Great Hampden. Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Sir Francis Russell, the third Baronet, married Henry, the fourth son of the Protector; whilst Sir John Russell, the fourth Baronet, and son of Sir Francis, married Frances, the youngest daughter of Cromwell. Cromwell was also a cousin to John Hampden, the patriot, by the marriage of Elizabeth, second daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell, with William Hampden, Esq., of Great Hampden. More details of Oliver Cromwell and his Buckinghamshire connections are not needed in this paper.

That Cromwell took a very active part in the destruction of the King is not denied; his name stands first in the list of Commissioners present on the first day of the trial, and his signature holds a prominent place in the King's death-warrant, it being placed next but one to that of John Bradshaw, the president. It is even said that Cromwell made a jest of the solemn proceeding, and when he added his name to the death-warrant playfully besmeared with his pen the face of Harry Martin, who was standing near him.

Cromwell died peaceably in his bed two years before the Restoration. He was elected Protector, December 12th, 1653, and inaugurated again with more state on June 20th, 1657; he died on the 3rd September, 1658, worn out by excessive fatigue of mind and body, and was buried with more than regal pomp in Westminster Abbey. Charles II., looking upon him as an instigator

in the murder of his father, wreaked his vengeance upon the putrid carcase. Cromwell's body was dragged from its grave, and with others exposed on the gallows at Tyburn from sunrise to sunset, and then buried at the foot of the gallows, his head set on a pole, and exhibited on the top of Westminster Hall—a proceeding causing a greater punishment to the living than the dead, and more degrading to the author of it than to the victims. This gross outrage on public decency gave great and general offence.

THOMAS CHALLONER.—The Challoners were a Yorkshire family. Sir Thomas Challoner, Knt., was tutor to Henry, Prince of Wales, and he was a learned author. He married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir William Fleetwood, Recorder of London, by whom he had several children. Sir Thomas had granted to him in fee the manor of Steeple Claydon. Thomas Challoner, the regicide, was his son; he was born at Steeple Claydon. He took part in the trial and signed the death-warrant of the King, was attainted, and the Claydon estate forfeited. He died at Middleburgh in 1661, it is said of poison. Challoner, who joined in Waller's plot, and who was executed for his complicity in it, was also of this family.

Challoner had a dispute with King Charles I. respecting some alum works in Yorkshire which he had discovered, and to which the King granted him the sole patent; but his Majesty afterwards giving a moiety to some one else, Challoner interested himself on the side of the Parliament, and in revenge became one of the King's judges. He was no Puritan, but was full of his jokes and tricks; was a good scholar, wrote nothing but an anonymous and witty pamphlet on the discovery of Moses' tomb, which set all the rabbis of the assembly to work, and it was a long time before the sham was detected. There is some doubt as to the cause of his death, which is confused with that of his brother. It was James who died in the Isle of Man, and it may be assumed that it was James, and not Thomas, who died by poison.

JAMES CHALLONER.—He was brother to Thomas, and he embarked in the same unfortunate affair. He sat as one of the King's judges in the Painted Chamber on five

occasions, but he did not sign the death-warrant. At one time of his life he was governor of the Isle of Man, under General Fairfax, was of a literary turn, and employed his leisure time whilst there in procuring materials for the history of that little kingdom. On his return to England he mixed in all the busy scenes preceding the Restoration, and having declared for the interests of the Parliament in opposition to that of the army, he was imprisoned by General Fleetwood. In the matter of his implication in the King's trial, his life was spared, but his estates were confiscated, leaving him a prey to poverty and wretchedness, under which calamity he sunk. "At the time of the Restoration he was keeping the castle of the Isle of Man, where he had a prettie wench that was his concubine. When the news was brought to him that some one was come to the castle to demaund it for his majestie, he spake to his girle to make him a posset, into which he putte, out of a paper he had, some poyson, which, in a very short time, made him very sick. Within three hours he died." This is from "Aubrey's Lives," and the account is given as referring to Thomas Challoner, with a note that "'twas James Challoner that dyed in the Isle of Man."

JOHN DESBOROUGH.—He married Anna, Oliver Cromwell's sister. Obtaining a commission in the Parliamentary army, under the patronage of his brother-in-law, he rose to be a colonel. He was named one of the commissioners of the High Court of Justice, but he wholly declined to sit as one of the King's judges. He was not mentioned in the Clause of Pains and Penalties extending to life, yet he was considered so dangerous a character that it was with difficulty his life and liberty could be preserved, and during the remainder of a long existence he was always watched with peculiar jealousy by the Government. He is thought to have resided the last few years of his life in Essex, as he died in the neighbourhood of Chelmsford; this is probable, as he was the owner of the manor of Trimnells, near that town.

THOMAS LORD FAIRFAX.—He was father-in-law to the witty and profligate Duke of Buckingham, by the marriage of his only child to that nobleman; he was also related to the Sheffields, Dukes of Buckingham. His successful military exploits during the civil war on the

part of the Parliament are matters of history, and he was advanced to the rank of general. Noble describes him as "a regicide, for such undoubtedly, in every sense, he must be pronounced, though he did not give sentence nor sign the warrant for the King's execution." He had no affection for the Protector Cromwell, indeed they were on bad terms for years, and for Richard Cromwell he had great contempt. There is no doubt but that he favoured the Restoration, and it is not easy to reconcile his conduct at the death of King Charles, for it is suspected that he not only assisted in bringing the King to trial and judgment, but that he also knew the warrant was signed and the hour appointed to put his majesty to death. He was a patron of the fine arts, and one who also understood them. He died in November, 1671, aged sixty years. The vast properties the family had acquired in America were lost by that revolution which cut off the united provinces from the mother country in the last century.

Colonel George Fleetwood.—The Fleetwoods were originally a Lancashire family. Thomas Fleetwood, Esq., purchased the manor of Chalfont St. Giles, in 1564. He was Master of the Mint, served the office of High Sheriff for Bucks, and was afterwards elected a knight of that shire. Colonel George Fleetwood was a descendant of his; he was son of Sir William Fleetwood, knight, cupbearer to James I. and Charles I., and comptroller of Woodstock Park. George, the regicide, was one of the members for Bucks, a colonel in the Parliamentary army, and was selected by Cromwell as one of his lords. Never was a family more divided than the Fleetwoods at this period; the eldest branch were strict Roman Catholics, others remained steadfast to the Church of England, whilst George and his youngest brother became wild enthusiasts. George Fleetwood took part in the King's trial, and signed the death-warrant. At the Restoration, he was tried with other regicides, and pleaded guilty. As he confessed with sorrow and tears, his life was saved, and he was afterwards, through the influence of friends and the feeling of respect towards his venerable father, released from the Tower of London, but had to quit the country. He retired to New England. His grief was only a pretence, as he afterwards avowed his principles, glorying in the "good old cause." By his con-

viction his manor of the Vache, in Chalfont, with other properties, were forfeited to the Crown, and the King bestowed the Vache upon his brother, the Duke of York. Colonel Fleetwood died in America. He was connected with the Cromwell family by the marriage of his brother Charles with Bridget, daughter of the Protector, widow of Henry Ireton.

WILLIAM GOFFE.—Goffe was another connection of the Cromwells', as he married Whalley's daughter. He was present during the whole trial in Westminster Hall, and he signed the warrant for the execution of the King. He was the son of the rector of Stanmer, in Sussex; he sat for Yarmouth in 1654, and for Hampshire in 1656, and was one of Cromwell's lords. On Oliver's death, Goffe signed the order for proclaiming Richard Cromwell, and remained attached to this feeble protector. At the Restoration, Goffe fled to America, and remained there. His wife's fidelity and affection to him during his expatriation are remarkably displayed in her letters.

THOMAS, LORD GREY.—He was descended from Thomas, Lord Grey, who was attainted in 1603, being at that time in possession of the Manor of Bletchley. The subject of this notice was son of the second Lord Grey of Groby. He was returned a Member of the Long Parliament; joined the Parliamentary army; had the command of Leicestershire and of the associated Midland Counties, and was appointed Governor of Leicester, where a strong garrison was placed. In August, 1643, the Earl of Essex was ordered to relieve and secure Gloucester, and Lord Grey, to show his respect to his superior officer, marched to that nobleman's rendezvous at Aylesbury at the head of a large body of forces belonging to the associated counties, and a number of volunteers to augment the Earl's forces for the expedition. Lord Grey was one of the most active opponents of the King during the war. He attended the King's trial on each day, and added his name to the death-warrant. He died of the gout just preceding the Reformation, and escaped the ill fate which attended so many of the other regicides.

ROBERT HAMMOND.—He was a colonel in the Parliamentary army, and he had the custody of the King at Carisbrooke Castle, in the Isle of Wight; he was the

owner of the Manor of Willen, Stony Stratford, which he purchased about the year 1657, which passed to his daughters. It was sold by them under an Act of Parliament to Dr. Busby, the celebrated master of Westminster School.

Hammond married Mary, the sixth and youngest daughter of John Hampden, the patriot. After the King's death he, with Cromwell, visited Ireland, and Hammond settled at Dublin with the title of a Parliamentary Commissioner. He died in Ireland in October, 1654, his death having been occasioned by a violent fever. He was buried with great pomp at Dublin. His widow remarried Sir John Hobart, of Blickling, Bart., an ancestor of the Earls of Buckinghamshire.

Lieutenant-General Thomas Hammond, another regicide, whose name was included in the Act of Attainder, was uncle to Colonel Robert Hammond. This Thomas Hammond died before the Restoration.

Sir James Harrington.—He was of Merton, Oxfordshire; he married Catherine, daughter of Sir Marmaduke Dayrell, of Fulmer. Sir James was knighted by King Charles I. in 1628; he was of good descent and of great abilities, but they always bordered on the romantic. He sat in the Long Parliament, and became one of the Committee for Middlesex, his sentiments of government always bearing to a Republican system. In 1658, the name of Sir James stands enrolled in the Burgesswick of Wycombe. Sir James was named one of the King's judges; compassion or some other motive prevented his frequent attendance, but he was at Westminster Hall on the 23rd January, and on the same day was in the Painted Chamber; he did not again attend the trial, and he also refused to sign the fatal warrant. The Republicans had great faith in him, and with Thomas Challoner he was appointed joint Master of the Mint. At the Restoration he fell into disgrace, was deprived of his knighthood, and not permitted to receive any benefit from his estates; and was further made liable to any punishment the Legislature should think proper to inflict on him. To soften the rigour of his fate, he strove to find amusement in travel, spending much of his time on the Continent. His wife was one of the beauties of the period, and greatly admired for her personal and mental

charms. His grandchildren squandered the estate, and came to poverty, and the Manor of Fulmer was eventually purchased by Judge Jeffreys, known as the bloody judge.

CORNELIUS HOLLAND.—Holland was a native of Colchester, and was said to have been a serving man to Sir Henry Vane. He procured a seat in the Long Parliament for New Windsor, and upon the establishment of the Commonwealth was made one of the Council of State. Few from so small beginnings possessed such considerable grants as did Holland. He obtained the Creslow estate, near Whitchurch, for twenty-one years, at £20 a-year rental, worth then some £1600 or £1800 per annum. His name is frequently met with in connection with other estates in Buckinghamshire, and is mostly associated with the act of destroying churches. He has the credit of demolishing the church of East Claydon, which was rebuilt after the Restoration; also the church of Creslow. That of Granborough also fell under his hands.

Cole says that "from a scullion in the Royal Kitchen he rose up to be clerk of it; afterwards had a place in the Green Cloth, and from picking the King's purse, and a sop in the dripping pan, the Devil entered into him, and prompted him to betray and condemn his master, and having murdered the possessor, cast the heir out of the vineyard. Judas was but a type of him, *Cornelius* the original! The rogue, reeking in royal blood, enriched with plunder, was invested with a good share of that authority which he fought against, and wrested from his master, friend, and sovereign. Granborough, infamous for his birth, ought to have some mark of his power and zeal." The writer ascribes to him the destruction of the chancels of Winslow, Addington, and East Claydon, as well as of this at Granborough. At the Restoration he was excepted absolutely both as to life and estate. Happily for himself he escaped, but a very narrow escape it was, as he and his pursuers were both in Colchester at the same time, and he was by favour of a friend secretly conveyed out of the town. He afterwards got an opportunity to leave the country and join his fellow exiles at Lausanne, in Switzerland, where he ended his days in exile and its consequent wretchedness.

Sir Richard Ingoldsby.—The Ingoldsbys were an ancient Buckinghamshire family, seated at Lenborough. Sir Richard Ingoldsby was second son of Sir Richard Ingoldsby, of Lenborough, by Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Oliver Cromwell, so that Ingoldsby the regicide, was cousin to Oliver the Protector; Ingoldsby was also cousin to Hampden the patriot, and he held a captaincy in Hampden's regiment. In 1644 he was taken prisoner by the King's officers, and on regaining his liberty was raised to the rank of Colonel. His near connections with Cromwell and Hampden caused him to be held in much confidence by the Parliament. The extraordinary explanation he gave of his signature to the warrant for the execution of the King saved him from the fate of the other regicides, and recommended him to favour under the restored King. He declared that Cromwell forced him to sign the warrant, he, Ingoldsby, making all the resistance in his power. The document was not discovered until years after, when it was found that Ingoldsby's signature had every appearance of genuineness, and further, that his seal was attached in the usual and regular manner. Whatever might have been his real sentiments, he certainly experienced more lenity from the Government than any other of the regicides. He seems to have made terms with the King, as he was instituted a Knight of the Bath by Charles II. on his coronation, and served in the Parliaments of 1661, 1679, and 1680, as member for Aylesbury; he had previously been one of the Knights of the Shire of Bucks. He resided at Waldridge, in Dinton; married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir George Croke, Knight Just., K.B., she having previously been the widow of Thomas Lee, Esq., of Hartwell. Ingoldsby died on the 9th of September, 1685, and was buried at Hartwell church.

Henry Ireton.—Ireton was one of the most active agents in accomplishing the death of the King, never being absent from any public or private sitting of the High Court of Justice. He was the son of German Ireton, Esq., of Attenton, in the county of Nottingham; he was a student at the Middle Temple, but was never called to the Bar. In 1647 he married Bridget, the eldest daughter of Oliver Cromwell, by which marriage his union with Cromwell was rendered closer and more

intimate. He was also a kinsman, and close friend and neighbour of Col. Hutchinson. Mrs. Hutchinson speaks of him as a very grave, serious, religious person. Ireton died in Ireland, of the plague, in 1657. His remains were brought to England, and laid in great state at Somerset House, and then interred with much funeral pomp in Westminster Abbey. At the Restoration the remains were exhumed, and after being indecently exposed upon a gibbet at Tyburn, the trunk was buried there, and the head set upon a pole.

JOHN JONES.—"He was a pretended gentleman of Wales, a recruiter of the Long Parliament, and a colonel; Governor of the Isle of Anglesea; one of the Commissioners of Parliament for the government of Ireland, and one of the 'other House,' that is, the House of Lords, belonging to Cromwell." Such is Wood's description of him. Jones married Jane, widow of Roger Whitson; she was one of Oliver Cromwell's sisters. By this marriage Colonel Jones was also related to the Bekes of Haddenham. His connection with the trial and execution of the King cost him his life, as he was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Charing Cross, in October, 1660, at the same time as Scott, Scrope, and Clements.*

COLONEL ROBERT LILBURNE.—Lilburne was a brother of the famous John Lilburne; he married Margaret, daughter of Henry Beke, Esq., of Haddenham, in this county. Mr. Beke had another daughter, who became the wife of George Franklin, Esq., also of Haddenham. Of Robert Lilburne, Anthony Wood says, "that being Puritanically educated he sided with the rest against His Majesty, in the beginning of the rebellion, and being thorough paced to Oliver's interest, was by him advanced to be a colonel of horse, some time before the murder of King Charles I., and therefore he thought he could do no less than to requite him with having a hand in it." Afterwards he was made Major-General of the North of England, and Commander-in-Chief of all the Parlia-

* The details of the execution of these unfortunate gentlemen are truly sickening; they were subjected to appalling cruelty. So horrified was the executioner with the task he had undertaken, that he could not complete it, and when Col. Jones' turn came he gave him over to his boy first to hang him, or partly so, and afterwards to hack the body to pieces.

mentary forces in Scotland. On His Majesty's restoration, he surrendered himself upon proclamation, was attainted, and committed prisoner during life. Colonel Lilburne spent the remainder of his days in close confinement in St. Nicholas Island, near Plymouth, in Devonshire, where he died in August 1665, aged fifty-two years.

Henry Martin.—He was son and heir of Sir Henry Martin, Knight, and he was born at Stoke Poges in Bucks, where his father was a copyholder. Martin's character for morality was very indifferent; he married a wife for her riches, but was for some time parted from her; he was certainly no Puritan, but noted for his "wenching." He was once chosen as one of the Knights of the Shire for Bucks. He was an incomparable wit for repartees, and even made a joke at his conviction on the charge of being a regicide. He was one of those who was absolutely excepted both as to life and property; but he had the prudence to surrender in obedience to the proclamation of the Parliament, and was brought to trial on the 10th October, 1660, and convicted. He petitioned for mercy, and referring to his surrender, he said "he had never obeyed any proclamation before this, and hoped that he should not be hanged for taking the King's word now." By great intercession his life was spared. He was made a prisoner first in the Tower, afterwards at Windsor, and eventually for twenty years in Chepstow Castle, where he died suddenly in 1681, in his seventy-eighth year. His wife relieved him out of her jointure during his imprisonment, still at last he was reduced to such a state of wretched poverty and abjectness, both in spirits and fortune, that he was glad to receive a cup of ale from any one who would give it him.

Sir Thomas Mauleverer.—Sir Thomas was of a Yorkshire family, and was eldest son of Sir Richard Mauleverer, High Sheriff of Yorkshire; his mother, before her marriage with Sir Richard, had been the widow of Sir Henry, second son of Lord Wharton of Winchendon and Wooburn. Sir Thomas Mauleverer's daughter was married to Thomas Sco 11of Aylesbury, the attorney whose name so often appears amongst the acts of the regicides. Sir Thomas being appointed one of the King's judges, attended the trial every day with one exception, and he

signed the warrant for putting the King to death. He was created a Baronet in 1641 by Charles I., but became the opponent to the King in the earliest part of the civil war, and raised two regiments of foot and one of horse for the use of the Parliament. He died soon after the execution of the King; his father Sir Richard outlived him, and at the Restoration, notwithstanding Sir Thomas the son was attainted, the King confirmed the title, and permitted the estate to remain in Sir Richard's possession in reward for his loyalty and the dangers he had submitted to in consequence of his attachment to the Royal cause.

Simon Mayne.—He resided at Dinton Hall, near Aylesbury, and succeeded to the Dinton estate on the death of his father in 1617. Mayne was a county magistrate, and soon became conspicuous in public affairs. He declared for the Parliament, and began his career as a republican. He was elected a member for Aylesbury in the Long Parliament; he sat in the Painted Chamber as one of the members of the High Court of Justice, and took part in the King's trial almost every day of its continuance; his name is signed to the King's death-warrant. During the Protectorate he continued to be one of the Committee for Bucks. In compliance with the proclamation he surrendered, but being excepted by name, was tried with others at the Old Bailey in October, 1660. At first he pleaded not guilty, but afterwards modified his plea, and the jury returned a verdict of guilty against him. His defence was weak and undeserving consideration. He remained in confinement in the Tower until the next year, when he died, and his body was removed to Dinton and buried there on the 18th of April, 1661, he being forty-nine years of age.

Herbert Morley.—The Morleys and the Trevors were related, and several of their family held the names of Morley-Trevor. A John Morley-Trevor subsequently married a daughter of Sir Thomas Frankland. The Trevors took the name of Hampden, Robert Trevor, afterwards Hampden, being the first Lord Viscount Hampden. Herbert Morley early distinguished himself as an opposer of the King; entered the army, and was made a colonel. He joined the King's enemies and sat on the trial, but only attended on three occasions, nor did he sign the death-warrant. Previous to the Restoration

he openly declared his satisfaction in what Monk did, and he was received to favour by Charles II. He died after a very unquiet life, in peace. His property descended to the Trevor family, now represented by the Hobarts. He is supposed to have been far from amiable, or acting upon the principles of generosity, as he acquired the name of "Plunder Master of Surrey."

Isaac Penington.—The Peningtons and the Penns were related by marriage—William Penn having married the daughter-in-law of Isaac Penington. Isaac Penington was an alderman, and served the office of Sheriff of London in 1638, was Member of Parliament for the City in 1640, and Lord Mayor in 1642. The Peningtons resided at Chalfont, and had possessed land there as early as the year 1559. Isaac Penington, who was so often persecuted, and cruelly imprisoned in Aylesbury Gaol, was the eldest son of the Lord Mayor. Alderman Penington was one of the nineteen regicides who, *relying on the word of a King*, came in before the expiration of the forty days. Penington with thirteen others was committed to the Tower of London, over which he once ruled as an honourable and executive governor. He was cruelly used during his imprisonment by Sir John Robinson the lieutenant. Penington's estates were forfeited, and a part of them granted to George, Bishop of Worcester, on petition, and a part to the Duke of Grafton. Penington, although he took part in the King's trial, did not sign the death-warrant; he was committed a close prisoner to the Tower, and never obtained his release, but died there, and the State papers of December 19th, 1661, contain a "Warrant to Sir John Robinson, Lieutenant of the Tower, to deliver the corpse of Isaac Penington, who died in prison there, to his relations."

Owen Rowe.—Owen Rowe was descended from Sir Thomas Rowe, who was Lord Mayor of London in 1568. Rowe was excepted out of the Bill of Indemnity both as to life and estate, though he surrendered himself in compliance to the order of the Parliament. He was arraigned at the Old Bailey on the 10th of October, 1660, and was convicted. Though judgment was passed upon him, no execution followed, but he was sent back to the Tower, where he died in 1661; he was buried at Hackney; he married a daughter of Thomas Scott, the Member of

Parliament for Aylesbury, and another of the regicides.

HUGH PETERS.—"Mr. Hugh Peters being full of distraction and confusion in his judgment for some certain hours on his deathbed, yet it pleased the Lord a little before he departed this life to work a great dispensation in him, declaring that he had an earnest desire in his lifetime to promote the work of Jesus Christ, so he desired the like now at his death, that the good spirit of King Jesus might reign in the hearts of all his people and subjects; upon uttering which words, he immediately changed, and crying, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,' gave up the ghost, ending his days at Brickhill." This extraordinary statement is from the "Weekly Post," of August 16th, 1659, and is not easily reconciled with the fact that the notorious Hugh Peters, who rode triumphing when King Charles I. was brought into captivity into London, was, after trial and condemnation, executed at Charing Cross, on the 16th of October, 1660, as a regicide. Peters' connection with Great Brickhill was occasioned by his having a nephew as rector there. In some dispute respecting a presentation to that rectory the matter devolved upon Peters to arrange. He made short work of the business, by setting aside the right of the patron, Mr. Fountaine, to present, and discarding the claims of the Rev. Robert Hockwell, the rightful rector, instituted the Rev. William Peirce—Peirce being Peters' nephew. The rumour of the death of Peters in 1659, at Great Brickhill, is supposed to have merely been a ruse, purposely circulated in order that he might avoid apprehension and the fate which certainly awaited him. Peters was a Cornishman, born at Fowey, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. Noble speaks of him as "the most infamous reptile that ever pretended to preach the Gospel." One of the witnesses at Peters' trial swore that the prisoner took an active part in the arrangement of the execution of the King, and that, fearing a resistance at the last moment, Peters ordered staples to be fixed to the scaffold wherewith to bind the King if necessary; indeed, some have gone so far as to suggest that he was the actual executioner; this, however, is not correct, and Peters, in his defence at his trial, brought a witness who stated that he was confined to his chamber

by sickness at the time the execution took place. It is somewhat inexplicable that Noble, although he assiduously looks up a list of 130 regicides, and gives an account of their lives, trials, deaths, etc., is altogether silent on Peters, and does not refer to his case, although he was one of the most prominent amongst the regicides; this must have been an oversight. Being a preacher Peters' name does not occur in the list of commissioners for the trial of the King.

Thomas Scott.—Scott was an attorney at Aylesbury, and had previously been a brewer at Bridewell, London. He was distantly connected with the Lees, of Burston, and the Pakingtons, of Aylesbury. He once resided at Little Marlow. Sir John Pakington's Aylesbury estates were surrendered to Scott in payment of a fine of £5,000, of which sum Sir John was mulcted by the Parliament for having exerted himself with great zeal as a Royalist. Scott, in conjunction with Simon Mayne, represented Aylesbury in Parliament in 1640, as successors to Sir John Pakington and Ralph Verney, Esq. In the Parliaments of 1654, 1656-8-9, he represented Wycombe; in 1651 he was made High Steward of that borough. Scott was one of the champions for putting the King to death, was present at the trial with the exception of two days, and assisted in the judgment, but he appears to have been almost the last to affix his name to the death-warrant. He was excepted from the Act of Grace, and attempted to escape to France, but was seized on his passage, plundered, and set on shore in Hampshire. He made a second attempt, and landed in Flanders, but fell into the hands of the King's agents, by whom under some pretext he was liberated. Eventually he surrendered to obtain benefit of the Act, was brought to England, tried at the Old Bailey on the 12th August, 1660, and found guilty. On the 17th of October following he was executed at Charing Cross; he attempted to make a speech in his last moments in extenuation of his treason, but the Sheriff interrupted him, and would not allow him; however, he made a long prayer, expressing assurance of future happiness, and said that "God had called him forth as a public spectacle, to some of shame and reproach, to others as a comfort, and to the Divine Majesty as a witness, who had served him with all faithfulness in his public employment, declared the cause

in which he had been engaged was not to be repented of, and gave thanks for the grace which had influenced him ; mentioning with much fervour a manifestation of the Divine presence 'in his dark chamber that morning,'" and ended with a supplication "that he might confirm the testimony of the will of his Creator, and submit himself thereto."

RICHARD SALWAY.—We meet with the name of Richard Salway in connection with the family troubles of Sir John Pakington, of Aylesbury. Salway was an active adherent with Thomas Scott, the lawyer member for Aylesbury, and one of the active regicides. Salway was one of the Council of State, to which he was elected in 1659. Sir John Pakington was fined £7670 by the Parliament for his attachment to Royalty. Sir John presented a petition for mitigation, setting forth the great losses he had sustained by the demolition of his house and property. The inhabitants of Aylesbury denied they had demolished his house; they also denied all complicity with Scott and Salway. Salway reported that Sir John had paid £3500, and a compromise was made upon a further payment of £1500 being made. By another indenture, Heydon's Hill, Aylesbury Market House, and all other houses for the use of the market and fairs, stalls and customs to the same belonging, and the fairs and town, with all tradings, etc., were granted by Sir John Pakington and Dame Dorothy, his wife, to Thomas Scott and Richard Salway.

ADRIAN SCROPE.—Scrope was connected with Buckinghamshire by marriage into the family of the Wallers, the poet's sister being his wife. Scrope, or Scroope, was descended from the ancient family of that name. When his brother-in-law Waller was in trouble, he interceded with the Parliament to permit his return to England. In his own troubles he found no friend to save his life. He was tried with other regicides, convicted of being concerned in the trial and execution of the King, and sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. The sentence was carried out at Charing Cross, in the usual barbarous manner, in October, 1660, at the same time that Scott, Clement, and Jones were executed.

SIDNEY.—Algernon Sidney was the second surviving son of Robert, second Earl of Leicester; he represented Amersham in Parliament in the reign of Charles II.

When his father went as Ambassador to Denmark in 1632, he took his son Algernon with him; and, four years after, he likewise accompanied his father on his embassy to France. His first entrance upon public life was in 1641, when, upon the breaking out of the Rebellion in Ireland, he went over to that country, of which his father was then Lord-Lieutenant, and commanded a troop of horse in the Earl's regiment. Both he and his elder brother, the Lord Viscount Lisle, distinguished themselves by their gallantry in the campaigns of that and the following year. Returning to England in August, 1643, the two brothers, who professed to be on their way to the King at Oxford, were seized as they landed in Lancashire, by order of the Parliament; an incident which lost them the favour of Charles, who believed that their capture was of their own contrivance. On this they both joined the Parliamentary party, and Algernon received a commission as captain of a troop of horse in the regiment of the Earl of Manchester. In April, 1645, Fairfax raised him to the rank of colonel, and gave him a regiment; and in 1646, his brother, Lord Lisle, having become Lieutenant-General of Ireland, he was made Lieutenant-General of the Horse in that kingdom and Governor of Dublin. He acted as one of the judges at the trial of the King, although he was not present when the sentence was passed, nor did he sign the warrant for the execution. On the establishment of the Protectorate, however, he retired from public affairs, and he appears to have continued to reside at the family seat at Penshurst, in Kent, and at other places in the country, during the government of Cromwell and his son. But on the restoration of the Long Parliament, in May, 1659, Sidney again came forward, and on the thirteenth of that month was nominated one of the Council of State. He was sent the same year to Denmark to negotiate a peace between that country and Sweden, and was absent when the King returned. Whilst at Denmark, he made some observations as to the execution of Charles I., which were reported to the King. Finding the antipathy of the King so great he dare not return home, but resided at various places abroad. In France he openly favoured a plan for the establishment of a Republic in England. In 1677, a pardon and permission for him to return home

were obtained from Charles II., on the plea that he was anxiously desirous to see his aged father once more before he died. The Earl died that same year, and, although he had never approved of the course his son had taken, left him a legacy of £5,100.

When the Rye House Plot was announced, in June, 1683, Sidney was immediately arrested, along with his friend Lord Russell, and committed to the Tower on a charge of high treason. He was brought up to the bar of the King's Bench to plead on the 7th of November, and his trial took place on the 21st, before Sir George Jeffreys, who had been lately promoted to the place of Lord Chief Justice. Jeffreys exhibited little of his wonted coarseness and passion on this occasion, but his demeanour was very determined and inflexible, and he bore down every objection of the prisoner with an authority that nothing could shake or impress. The only evidence in support of the principal facts charged was Lord Howard of Escrick, who had, according to his own account, been a party to the plot, and now came to swear away the lives of his associates in order to save his own; and as the law of high treason required two witnesses to prove the crime, the other was supplied by bringing forward a manuscript found among Sidney's papers, and asserted, no doubt with truth, to be his handwriting, which it was pretended contained an avowal and defence of principles the same, or of the same nature, with those involved in the alleged plot. He was found guilty, and being again brought up on the 26th, was sentenced to be put to death after the manner of execution then enjoined by law in cases of high treason. He twice petitioned the King for pardon, but all that could be obtained for him was the remission of the degrading and brutal parts of the sentence; and on Friday, the 7th of December, he was beheaded on Tower Hill. No one ever suffered with more firmness, or with less parade. He did not even address the people; but, when asked to speak, replied that he had made peace with God, and had nothing to say to man.

The attainder of Sidney was reversed after the Revolution by the seventh private act of the first session of the first Parliament of William and Mary, the preamble of which declared that Sidney had been most unjustly and wrongfully convicted and attainted.

TEMPLE.—Sir Peter Temple, Bart., was son and heir of Sir Thomas Temple, of Stowe, by Hester, daughter of Miles Sandys, of Latimer, the lady who had so many descendants. King Charles I. knighted Sir Peter in 1641, and he represented the town of Buckingham in the last two Parliaments of that sovereign, and went with his party all their lengths both in the Parliament and in the army. He was a colonel in the army up to the time of the King's death, when he declined serving any longer. He fell into great embarrassment in his fortune. Sir Peter married twice. By his second wife he had Sir Richard Temple, his successor, ancestor of the Dukes of Buckingham, and two daughters, Frances and Hester, one of whom was a busy woman and a great politician. The three brothers of Sir Peter were all warm Parliamentarians. Colonel Sir John Temple was one of the Commissioners for Munster; Thomas Temple, LL.D., was voted by Parliament "to be put into a parsonage;" and Miles, the youngest, much distinguished himself in the army.

PETER TEMPLE. — Peter Temple was a relation, and probably a near one, to Sir Peter Temple, Bart. He was one of the King's judges, and only omitted two attendances during the whole time; he also signed the death-warrant. He was excepted out of the Act of Indemnity, surrendered, and was tried with his relative, James Temple. Being convicted, and asked why sentence should not be passed, he pleaded the proclamation; he was sentenced to death. No execution followed, but he remained a prisoner until his death.

JAMES TEMPLE. — James Temple was a relative of the two former of the same name. He was a Sussex gentleman; but when we are assured that Hester Temple saw seven hundred descendants, their identity is not very easily ascertained. James Temple obtained a seat in the Long Parliament; he sat in the Painted Chamber on eight occasions, and attended the King's trial every day, and added his name to the death-warrant. He was brought to trial October 16th, 1660, with Peter Temple, and convicted; but his life was spared to him, and he was suffered to remain in the Tower, where he is supposed to have died.

VALENTINE WAUTON.—He was better known as Colonel

Wauton; he was present at all the sittings of the Court in Westminster Hall during the King's trial, and his name appears on the warrant for the King's death. Wauton was of an ancient Huntingdonshire family; he married Margaret, sister of Oliver Cromwell, and thus his connection with Buckinghamshire. His second wife was a daughter of Mr. Pym, of Brill, and widow of one Austin of that place. He was one of the Republican Council of State installed immediately after the King's death, which was composed of twenty regicides out of forty-one members. His name is found in all the Councils till the year 1653. He was one of the fifty-one persons wholly excepted from the Indemnity Act. The close of his life was spent in Flanders under a feigned name, and in the disguise of a gardener. He died there in 1661. Just before his death he discovered himself to his attendants, and desired that his relations in England might be apprised of his decease.

Edward Whalley.—Whalley's mother was aunt to the Protector, so that Whalley was Oliver's cousin. He early distinguished himself in the service of the Parliament, particularly at the battle of Naseby, for which he was voted by Parliament to be a colonel of horse; and for his brilliant services at Banbury, which place he took by storm, Parliament gave him the thanks of the House, and £100 to purchase two horses. Cromwell confided to him the person of the King. He was an abject tool of Cromwell's, who employed him to carry all the petitions of the army to Parliament, to prepare them for the tragic death of the King. The restoration of monarchy becoming a certainty, he saw the danger of his situation, and retired to the Continent. One hundred pounds were offered for his apprehension if taken dead or alive, as it was reported he had returned to England. He managed to reach Lucerne, in Switzerland; but feeling himself unsafe, and too much exposed to the chances of being arrested, he privately wandered about for some years a wretched exile. He died in a foreign clime, but when or where is not known.

Thomas Wogan.—Wogan was of a very knightly family. He went late into the Parliament service; in 1648 he was a captain under Colonel Horton, and distinguished himself in the victory obtained by him over Major-General Langhorn, in Wales, one of the most

important in its consequences during the war, for which, as a reward, the Parliament ordered that he should have his arrears audited, and as a further one, for his gallantry, he was to partake in the distribution with others who had fought and obtained the battle; he was highly extolled for the conduct he had shown in keeping steady to the Parliament interest when his former superior officer, Langhorn, had deserted to the King; and I suppose it was in consequence of this that he obtained a colonel's commission.

He was appointed one of the King's judges, and he sat in the Painted Chamber, January 18th and 26th, and in Westminster Hall the 22nd, 23rd, and 29th, and signed the warrant for execution, so that he was implicated as far in this nefarious wickedness as he well could be.

Very soon afterwards he was sent off to Ireland, and became governor of Duncannon; he was, however, taken prisoner by Colonel Zauchy, but was soon liberated, and continued in the service of the usurpers. At the Restoration he was included in the exception of the Bill of Indemnity, but he had prudently retired to the continent; where or how he spent the last years of his life is entirely unknown. Wogan's connection with Buckinghamshire is very slight. There was a Captain Edward Wogan, who was employed in the Parliament service, but revolting from it became a colonel in the service of King Charles II.; he was a brave, dauntless man. Going into Scotland that nation secured and meant to surrender him, but after long and tedious delays, he had the good fortune to persuade the keeper to join him and escape abroad; ever after he was active, persevering, and venturous in the Royal interest, coming over secretly when necessary, and returning to the exiled monarch to speak of his success; he died at the English Court at Brussels, much lamented, in 1653. One of this family was William Wogan, Esq., of Ealing, Co. Middlesex, whose portrait is in the possession of Mr. E. R. Baynes, of Stone Croft, in the parish of Stone, a descendant on the female side. He was set down for a knight of the Royal Oak, his estate being valued at £600 a year.

Other names might be added to this long catalogue, but their connexions with this county are so slight as scarcely to be traced.