

THE ROYALIST RISING IN KENT, A.D. 1648.

BY COLONEL GEORGE COLOMB, F.S.A.

“IF a universal discontent and murmuring of the three nations, and almost as general a detestation of both Parliament and Army, and a most passionate desire that all their follies and madness might be forgotten in restoring the King to all they had taken from him, and in settling that blessed Government they had deprived themselves of, could have contributed to his Majesty’s recovery, never people were better disposed to erect and repair again the building they had so maliciously thrown and pulled down.”\*

These are the words of Lord Clarendon. They refer to the period of which I am about to speak. Has he overstated facts? I think not. If his statement were false, a bloody page in history would not have been written. It has been for some time the fashion to glorify that celebrated body called the Long Parliament. Many and loud have been the hymns chanted in its praise; much Scriptural language was used in its debates. It is supposed to have been essentially Protestant. Could men so sincerely religious, as its members professed to be, do any real harm?

Let us hear what Sir Roger Twysden says in his journal, printed in the papers of this Society.†

\* Clarendon, Hist., book xii.

† ‘Archæologia Cantiana,’ vol. iv. p. 195.

“God of His mercy grant,” says he, “that, for the future, England may never see perpetuity added to the two Houses of Parliament, nor Committees to manage the justice of the kingdom, and sit judges of men’s liberties, estates, and fortunes; admitting not the law for their rule, but their own arbitrary, ambiguous, revocable, disputable ordinances and orders.”

Hear another testimony from this County:—

“The two Houses” (says a *Declaration of many thousands of the City of Canterbury and County of Kent*, 1647) “have sat seven years to hatch cockatrices and vipers. They have filled the kingdom with serpents, bloodthirsty soldiers, extortionary committees, sequestrators, excise men; all the rogues and scum of the kingdom have been set on to torment and vex the people, to rob them, and to eat the bread out of their mouths. . . . They have suppressed the true Protestant religion, suffered all kinds of heresies and errors in the kingdom, have imprisoned, or at least silenced, all the orthodox clergy, taken away the livelihood of many thousand families, and robbed the fatherless and the widow.”

I could produce still stronger evidence, in support of Clarendon, but I think this may suffice.

One of the Committees of which Sir Roger does not say much good is the Committee\* of Kent. In

\* The following appears to be one of the earliest lists of the Committee of Kent. It is that of 1648. I found it amongst some pamphlets (vol. vi.) in the possession of the Earl of Essex at Cassiobury:—

Sir Thos. Walsingham.  
 Sir Anthony Weldon.  
 Sir John Sedley.  
 Sir Edward Hales.  
 Sir Humphry Tufton.

Sir Henry Heyman.  
 Sir Michael Livesey.  
 Sir Henry Vane, Jun.  
 Sir Edward Scot.  
 Sir Edward Bois.

every county a certain number of deputy-lieutenants, known to be warm partizans of the Parliament, reigned supreme. In Kent, it appears that at last none but the most determined adherents of the Parliament remained to do business. And their business appears to have been, to do entirely what they pleased, provided the interests of the Parliament were furthered at all hazards.

On Christmas-day, 1647, their power received a

Sir William Brooke.

Sir Peter Wroth.

Sir George Sondes.

Sir John Honywood.

Sir James Oxenden.

Sir Richard Hardress.

Augustine Skinner.

Richard Lee, Esq.

Thos. Selliard, Esq.

John Bois, Jun., Esq.

Thos. Blount, Esq.

For the city of Rochester the

Mayor for the time being,

Richard Lee, Esq.

The Mayor of Tenterden

for the time being, Will.

Boys.

Will. James.

Mark Dixwell.

Henry Stamford.

Sir Will. Mann.

Sir Edward Masters.

John Nut.

Thos. Courthorpe.

Avery Savaine.

It is probable that many of these, though nominated by the Parliament, never took any active part in the proceedings. Several new names were subsequently added.

The following signatures appear at different times, and are those of the most diligent of the Committee, though some of them, as for instance Sir Richard Hardress, subsequently joined the King's party.

In 1643:—Richard Hardress, Michael Livesey, Mark Dixwell, Anthony Weldon, John Bois, Thos. Seyliard, Thos. Dykes, R. Vaughan (clerk).

9th March, 1647:—John Rivers, Thomas Seyliard, Augustine Skinner, Thos. Plumer, William Kenrick, Lambarde Godfrey, John Bix.

29th June, 1648:—Augustine Skinner, John Brown, Lambarde Godfrey, J. Wistroe, W. Kenrick.

29th March, 1649:—Thos. Broadnax, Richard Porter, Lambarde Godfrey.

temporary check. All observance of Christmas was contrary to the ordinances of Parliament, for all superstitious festivals had been abolished. About Christmas 1647, no doubt the people of Kent, like their fellows elsewhere, began to think sadly and bitterly of former and freer times. Their apprehensions for the future were probably at this date increased, by the behaviour of the Houses towards the King, who was now confined in the Isle of Wight, though not yet closely imprisoned. The committee and mayor, on Christmas-day, 1647, opposed an attempted celebration of divine service at Canterbury, and tried to make the people open their shops. The result was a riot, which ended in the seizure of the defences of the city by an anti-Parliament mob, the cry being raised "For God, King Charles, and Kent!" Some gentlemen at last succeeded in pacifying the incensed people, and according to Carter\*—who I think adheres very strictly to the truth—agreed with the Mayor and Committee of Kent that no revenge should be taken. But within a week, fortified by the commands of Parliament,† the Committee came into

\* *Matthew Carter's True Relation*, pp. 1 to 4, Colchester, 1789.

† *A Perfect Diurnal of some passages in Parliament and daily proceedings of the Army under his Ex<sup>ty</sup>. Sir T. Fairfax*. (Thursday, Dec. 30th, '47). "A letter this day out of Kent from some of the Committee of the said County acquainting the House with the great riot that was at Canterbury on Saturday last. The House hereupon ordered that the order for examining and committing of churchwardens that countenance malignant ministers to preach be forthwith printed. They further ordered that the business of the riot at Canterbury be referred to the examination and consideration of a Committee." (Friday, January 7th). "A letter was read from the Committee of Kent acquainting the House that the insurrection and tumult at Canterbury was now quieted, and the principal actors thereof in custody. The House ordered that a letter of thanks signed by Mr. Speaker be

Canterbury in state, with an immense force to back them, pulled off the gates, made what they called "a convenient breach in the walls"—about fifty yards in width\*—and after a searching enquiry, which lasted about a fortnight, sent the gentlemen who had quieted the people to Leeds Castle, at that time used as a prison for "Malignants," as the loyal party were termed. They also made a long report of their proceedings, in which they recommended that the gentlemen before-mentioned, † as well as a good many other inferior persons, should be brought to "*condign* punishment." The Committee at the same time hinted, that as the people of Kent were in general malignant (*i. e.* loyal to their distressed King) a court of war would be the most satisfactory tribunal to refer the business to.

But, in the meantime, the Parliament had discovered a method of making it high treason to attempt to assist the King in his misfortunes. They ordered a special commission, of *oyer and terminer*, to go down to Canterbury, to try the Christmas delinquents for their lives. "There are some fat lads in the trap," says a Parliamentarian Diurnal, "whose estates will help to bear part of the charges."

sent from the House to the Committee of Kent for their great care and pains in suppressing the said tumult; they further ordered that a commission of *oyer and terminer* should be issued out for the trial of the said chief mutineers at Canterbury.

\* The precise spot appears to have been about 200 yards south of the West Gate; or at least it is so indicated in a view of Canterbury, dated 1738, with this note, "a breach 50 yards or so made in the walls to admit Cromwell's forces." With the matter, of course, Cromwell had nothing whatever to do.

† Sir Wm. Mann, Francis Lovelace, Alderman Sabine, Dudley Wiles (Wild?) and several other gentlemen. See *True Relation*, p. 5.

This special assize was not held till the 11th of May. Several of the Committee were on the bench.

“At the impannelling of the jury,” says a Royalist pamphlet, “Judge Wild gave them a charge, so abominable and bloodthirsty, that the people were ready to destroy him.”

But the grand jury ignored the bill, and when pressed again, brought in a second *ignoramus*.

The court adjourned, receiving the thanks of Parliament for what it had attempted to do.\*

But the grand jury, emboldened by this victory, composed, upon the spot, a petition to Parliament which to my mind was worthy of “UNCONQUERED KENT,” and of a people whose ancestors always claimed the right to march in the van of the English army. Though well known, the petition of 1648 will bear quoting:—

\* “Report was this day made to the House of Commons, from the Commissioners sent down into Kent for the trial of mutineers, that, the Grand Jury refusing to find the bill, the Commissioners had adjourned the Court to another time. The Commissioners employed upon the business had the thanks of the House given them.

“The Committee of Kent had likewise the thanks of the House given them.

“The House also ordered that the Committee of the County of Kent should still proceed to the further examination of the ryot, to the end the chief offenders may be brought to condign punishment.”

“An ordinance was this day, Tuesday, May 16th, read in the House of Commons for punishing defaulters of musters in the County of Kent, which was assented unto, and ordered to be read to the Lords for their concurrence.

“(May 22nd, 1648). A letter received from Rochester, about shooting off guns in the night and seizing the magazine, referred to the Derby House. 600 horse called back, that were designed thither.” See *Perfect Diurnal*, 15th to 22nd May, 1648.

## THE PETITION OF KENT, 1648.

The Humble Petition of the Knights, Gentry, Clergy, and Commonalty of the County of Kent, subscribed by the Grand Jury, on Thursday, 11th May, 1648, at a Sessions of the Judges upon a Special Commission of *Oyer and Terminer*, held at the Castle of Canterbury, in the said County,

Sheweth,—

That the deep sense of our own miseries, and a fellow feeling of the discontents of other counties exposed to the like sufferings, prevaileth with us thus humbly to present to your honours these our ardent desires.

(1.) That our most gracious Sovereign Lord King Charles may, with all speed, be admitted in safety and honour, to treat with his two Houses of Parliament for the perfect settling of the peace, both of Church and Commonwealth, as also of his own just rights, together with those of the Parliament.

(2.) That for prevention and removal of the manifold inconveniences occasioned by the continuance of the present army, under the command of the Lord Fairfax, their arrears may be forthwith audited, and they disbanded.

(3.) That according to the fundamental Constitution of this Commonwealth we may, for the future, be governed and judged by the English subjects' undoubted birth-right, the known and established laws of the kingdom, and not otherwise.

(4.) That according to the Petition of Right, our property may not be invaded by any taxes or impositions whatsoever; and particularly the heavy burthen of the Excise\* may no longer be continued or hereafter imposed upon us.

All which our earnest desires we humbly recommend to your most serious considerations, not doubting of that speedy satisfaction therein which the case requires, and we humbly expect. Whereby we may hope to see (what otherwise we cannot but despair of) a speedy and happy end to those pressures and distempers, whose continuance will inevitably ruin both ourselves and posterities. Your timely prevention whereof, by a mutual

\* All the necessaries of life, as well as all articles of wearing apparel, were taxed by the Excise.

agreement of what we here propose in order thereunto, will oblige us ever to pray.\*

The effect produced by this document was electric. It started with the signatures of 200 gentlemen of Kent; in a few days 20,000 names had been affixed to it. The Petitioners were to assemble at Rochester, on the Prince of Wales's birthday, the 29th of May, and proceed thence to Blackheath. It was soon arranged that other counties would join them. The Parliament pronounced the Petition "feigned," "scandalous," and "seditious." The Committee of Kent condemned it by proclamation, and at once mustered forces to suppress it. An Order, made at their General Meeting in Maidstone, on May 16th, 1648, was published by the Deputy Lieutenants and other authorities of the County, requiring all persons not to concern themselves in signing or presenting any such Petition. The ministers of all parishes were enjoined to read this Order to their several congregations on the Lord's Day next following.† Sir Anthony Weldon said that he would not walk across the street of Rochester to save one soul from ruin that subscribed the petition;

\* I cannot find any copy of the Petition with signatures attached. From Rushworth's 'Historical Collections,' part 4, vol. ii., p. 1134, and other sources, we learn that among the leaders of the movement were Sir Gamaliel Dudley, Sir Geo. Lisle, Sir Wm. Compton, Sir Robt. Tracy, Col. Leigh, Sir Jno. Many, Sir Jas. Hales, Sir Wm. Many, Sir Richd. Hardress, Col. Washington, Col. L'Estrange, Col. Hacker; Sir Anthony Aucher, of Bishopsbourne; Sir Wm. Brockman, of Beechborough; Sir T. Colepeper, of St. Stephen's; Darrell, of Scotney Castle; Sir Thos. Godfrey, of Heppington; Edward Hales, of Tunstal; Anthony and Francis Hammond, of St. Alban's Court; Fras. Lovelace; Sir Henry and Sir Thomas Palmer, of Beaksbourne; Sir Thos. Peyton, of Knowlton; Mr. Jas. Dorrell, Mr. George Newman, and Mr. Whelton.

† Newton's 'History of Maidstone,' p. 144.

and it was proposed, by Beales, to hang up two of the petitioners in every parish.

The men of Kent thus provoked, determined to *march* to Westminster with the Petition in one hand, and the sword in the other. The fleet in the Downs caught the loyal infection—put Vice-Admiral Rainsborough and most of the officers on shore, and declared for King Charles and Kent.\*

The following, from the pen of a sympathiser with Parliament and Committee, gives some idea of the excited state of the County:—

SAD NEWS FROM KENT.

*Letter from Chatham, May 24th.*

“Gentlemen and soldiers coming in for the signing of the petition; gatherings at Maidstone and other places. They will have the King come to London, and a treaty; and the Army of the Sectaries (as they call them) disbanded. A letter from Rainsborough, to the Parliament, opened and returned to him again. They stop passengers, and examine them, but let them go without hurt. They put all the soldiers out of the county, except only such as comply with them. Most all the horsemen in the county, and all the troops, have gone to join them. The train-bands too cold to oppose them. They intend to rendezvous at Blackheath, and the Committee know not what to do, or where to sit in safety.

\* \* \* \* \*

Oh, sir, that God would move all men’s hearts to peace, and that we could learn to lay aside all malice and self-seeking, and sue and seek God for peace, and labour together in love for the glory of God, the propagation of the Gospel, and the amity of the kingdom, and the end of the treaties and ordinances, and the solemn league and covenant.

“At least 1000 in Rochester risen; much powder in the ships; the Sovereign near; if some speedy course be not taken it may be too late.”

\* In Rushworth’s ‘Hist. Coll.’ pt. 4, vol. ii., p. 1147, we read of “five revolting ships.”

The Royalists, having mustered a force of about one thousand horse, and five or six thousand foot, chose for their General, Edward Hales, Esq., and for Lieutenant General, Sir Thomas Peyton, bart.\*

In a few days every magazine of arms was seized, and all the Castles, except Dover and Queenborough. The Parliament made some insincere attempts to conciliate the people, but finding at last that nothing but the objects specified in the Petition would content them, the Houses voted:—" *That they do leave the whole business to the General.*"

To those who believe that "might is right," this vote of the Parliament ought to be remembered as highly satisfactory. I doubt if the natives of this County, on mature reflection, will ever be brought to approve it any more than their ancestors did. "*They do leave the whole business to the General!*" What did that mean? It meant that Kent, loyal and once free, driven by tyrannical treatment into bold resistance, was to be handed over to the sword. Fair Kent was to be mapped out for vengeful slaughter. For the General was Fairfax, at the head of that fine professional army which, unfortunately, reaped all its glory on English fields, and not against a foreign foe.

Nearly 10,000 men of Kent, with such arms as they could procure, rose up to guard their Constitutional Petition, and carry it to the doors of the Houses.

Some of them, in advance of the rest, reached Blackheath on the 29th of May, afterwards a day of some note. There they found the Lord General Fairfax, heading about 7000 horse and foot.

The Royalist leaders sent on a messenger, to say that they desired a pass for ten of their number, to

\* Newton's 'History of Maidstone,' p. 144.

present the Petition, and that the main body would meantime lie at a distance.

Fairfax, slighting the messenger, replied by a trumpeter of his own, in a letter addressed to Sir Tho. Peyton, dated "Blackheath, May 30, 1648."

An answer, to Fairfax's reply, was sent from Rochester, dated May 31st, 1648, and signed by Phil. Childs (major), and Edward Hales. In it they say, "We have taken up arms to defend ourselves; we invade not your right, but stand firm to secure our own." (Rushworth, 'Hist. Coll.,' page 1134.)

The "War Correspondent" begins to appear on the scene, telling us why the Royalist reply was dated from Rochester.

"The Kentish men," says *Bloody News from Kent*, "forced back from Deptford, Greenwich, and Blackheath, went to Rochester, and crossed the Bridge. The whole resolved not to fight, but to hold the passes."

The spirit which animated the veteran troops of Fairfax was more cheerful.

"Every man," says a Parliamentary diurnal, "is *three* men in courage. God appears when man forsakes. . . . The Kentish men are but ciphers in this business. Our soldiers hope their estates will not prove ciphers."

Newton says that "Fairfax, with four regiments of horse and three of foot, with some other troops, marched to Eltham, where they lay in the fields all night. Next day they mustered on Crayford Heath, and one wing marched through Dartford to attack the Royalists, under Major Child, who had fortified the Bridge at Northfleet, and was prepared to defend it with about 600 men. Here, Husbands charging them with his veteran soldiers, the newly-raised and untrained men of Kent were forced to give way. This Parlia-

mentary leader then marched forward till he was three miles beyond Gravesend, when he received orders to join the main force of the Parliamentary Army, at Malling," whither Fairfax had marched from Meopham.

On the 1st of June, the proscribed and menaced petitioners, to the number of 6000 or 7000, assembled on the high ground, between Aylesford and Rochester. "The foot were ill-armed," says an unsympathising pamphleteer, "and whole files rode in a rude and uncouth manner."

They received a newly-appointed General heartily. The Earl of Norwich, who was no soldier, appears to have had little idea of the imminent danger of his new-born, though high-spirited, army.

From Malling, Fairfax marched upon Maidstone with his whole force. Sir J. Mayney and Sir Wm. Brockman were stationed there, in command of about 1000 Royalist horse and foot.

On the 1st of June, reconnoitring at Farleigh Bridge, two miles from the town, and finding that the river was but slightly guarded, Fairfax essayed to cross, and easily got over. With a strong party he fell upon the town, ere those who were in it knew of his approach. At the entrance of the town, near the place where the Workhouse then stood, some slight fortifications had been cast up; these, however, gave but little interruption to the assailants, so that, about seven o'clock in the evening, the Parliamentary forces began to attack the town.\* The streets and houses had all been lined by the Royalists, and case-shot was placed in every street. Fairfax, therefore, met with such resolute opposition that he was forced to gain each street inch by inch, and the engagement lasted for

\* Herbert's 'Memoirs of Two Last Years of King Charles I.,' p. 51.

nearly five hours, almost until midnight. Retreating, fighting step by step, the Royalists reached the Churchyard, whence they were at last driven into the Church itself, where, after a long fight, they were obliged to make the best terms they could.\*

The defence of this unfortified, unprepared town was, according to Fairfax, more desperate than anything he had yet experienced. I think that it possibly moderated his military ardour, though it did not seem to move his compassion, as it might have done. His letter to the Parliament is full of piety and gratitude to the Giver of all good things.

“I have sent Colonel Rich,” says he, “to relieve Dover, where I hope we shall find the same presence of God as hitherto hath been. My prayer to the Lord is, that His great mercy may be further improved to His glory, and this kingdom’s good.”

While Maidstone was fiercely assaulted, the General of the Petitioners was at Rochester, and a large number of his forces were scattered about in different villages. Such as had not been dispersed, or cut off, assembled at Rochester on the 2nd of June, and full of useless fury, went part of the way towards Maidstone to relieve it; but, learning that it was certainly and irrecoverably lost, they insisted on crossing Rochester bridge, and marching to Westminster with the Petition; and if their officers could not lead them, they declared they would march without them.

They marched all that night, with Lord Goring at their head, and next day arrived at Blackheath; they waited in Greenwich Park till evening, for permission to pass through the City. But the defences of London had been placed in trusty hands, by the

\* Newton’s ‘Hist. of Maidstone,’ p. 146.

clever devices of Cromwell, before he left to suppress the Welsh Royalists; and though many were the sympathisers in the City, the Petitioners were shut out. Most of them crossed into Essex, no longer Petitioners but soldiers.

Sir Richard Hardresse, who had besieged Dover Castle with about 2000 Royalists, was at length compelled to abandon the siege, by Colonel Rich, who with a large Parliamentary force came to the relief of Dover. The Royalists had prosecuted the siege so vigorously, that Sir Richard Hardresse was in possession of the Block-houses, Ordnance, Powder, Match, and other ammunition. He is said to have "made about 500 shot against the Castle."\* Upon the approach of Colonel Rich, Colonel Hewson, and Sir M. Livesey with the Parliamentary forces, the Royalists retreated to Sandwich, about the 7th of June; but, that town being unsuitable for defence, they made for Canterbury and other Castles. Against those in Canterbury, Commissary-General Ireton and Colonel Barksted were sent, with their regiments. At Faversham, however, they were met by two Commissioners with whom they agreed for the surrender of the Royalists in Canterbury on easy terms, on or about the 12th of June.†

Sir Tho. Peyton was taken near Bury St. Edmunds, and was "brought to the House and committed" on the 10th of June. Lord Goring and Sir Chas. Lucas were then in Essex, and were joined by Lord Capel and some Horse, but in a short time the Petition, which collapsed at Blackheath, found a glorious grave at Colchester.

\* Rushworth, 'Hist. Coll.' p. 1135

† Ibid., p. 1149

One who saw their struggle gives us in quaint, but touching terms, the epitaph of the men of Kent. "They rose," says he, "naked and solitary—stood so; and so fell. Their defeat was rather a surprise than a conquest. They spake firm for liberty and monarchy. Let their ashes find peace for it; their memories, honour; and let them that come after mend it."

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES.

*From the Order Book of the Council of State.*

June 22<sup>d</sup>, 1650. "That Mr Milton do go to the Committee of the Army, and desire them to send to the Council the book of examinations taken about the Risings in Essex and Kent."

June 25<sup>th</sup>, 1650. "That Mr Milton do peruse the examinations taken by the Committee of the Army concerning the insurrections in Essex, and take the heads of the same, to the end the Council may judge what is fit to be taken into consideration."

The person mentioned here is, of course, no other than the illustrious Poet. What the Committee of the Army did with these "examinations" I cannot ascertain. They were probably taken about September, 1648; and must I fear have been either destroyed or lost, as they do not appear to be preserved amongst the series known as "Royalist Composition" papers.

The following are principally extracted from "Royalist Composition" or other "Sequestration" Papers, in the State Paper Office, and may be of interest, as they shew the tenor of the examinations and informations for "delinquencies."

SIR THOS. GODFREY.—"The charge of delinquency against Sir Thos. Godfrey before the Commissioners for Compounding:—

"That the said Sir Thos. Godfrey did, with divers others, nominate and appoint Captains both of horse and foot, for to act at Dover for the knights and gentry of the County of Kent to carry on the Petition in the last insurrection in the County of Kent, and did appoint officers in the City of Dover for the Government thereof, and did issue out orders for payment of moneys to the Cavaliers of the said County, for the payment of moneys to divers of those that were against the Parlia-

ment, and for the carrying on of the King's designs against the Parliament, and did warn divers labourers with spades and mattocks for the fortifying of Canterbury against the Parliament, all which appears by the warrants under his hand. THOS. FOWLES."

A charge of delinquencies exhibited before the Commissioners for the advance of money against Sir Thomas Godfrey of Heppington, in the County of Kent. Sheweth,—That the said Sir Thos. Godfrey, with divers other gentlemen of the County of Kent, did appoint and nominate divers and several officers and captains of horse and foot, and other officers in the late insurrection in the County of Kent, against the Parliament, and did abet, maintain, and promote the late libellous and rebellious Petition, and that he, with others, issued warrants or notes in the nature of warrants for the taking of moneys for the carrying on of the war against the Parliament. And that he the said Sir Thomas Godfrey, did with others send forth their warrants to summon in men to fortify some towns or places in a warlike manner against the Parliament; and that by divers other means and ways he did endeavour to promote the King's interest and forces against the Parliament.

THOS. FOWLES,

7th Nov., 1656.

For the Commonwealth.

By the Commissioners for compounding, etc. 20th Feby., 1656. It is this day ordered that Mr Fowle do give the charges lately sent up from Commiss<sup>ns</sup> for sequestration against Sir Thos. Godfrey, and examine whether it be the same formerly laid against the said Sir Thomas, and from which he was acquitted by the late Committee of Kent; and certify what he finds to us on this day fortnight, at which time the said cause is to be heard.

*Copia Vera* Ex<sup>d</sup>.—BAYLEY.

According to your order of the 20th Feby<sup>r</sup> last, I have perused the matter of delinquencies, transmitted to the Goldsmiths' Hall, taken by the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Committee of the County of Kent against Sir Thos. Godfrey, Knt., and find the matter of delinquencies charged upon the said Sir Thos. Godfrey to be,—that the said Sir Thos. did, with divers other gentlemen of the Committee, under his hand, authorise\* and appoint divers other gentlemen of the County, under his hand, and several men to be captains and commanders, both of horse and foot, to act at Dover concerning the Government of that Town, Castle, and

\* This Warrant bears date 27th May, 1648.

Fort, and do such other things as they should think fit for dispatch of the general Petition, and did send forth orders and warrants under his hand,\* with divers others, for the payment of several sums of money to several men for and towards the carrying on of the late wicked rebellion against the Parliament, and that the said Sir Thomas Godfrey did also, by warrant under his hand, with divers others, issue forth summons to warn labourers and men with spades and mattocks, and other instruments for the fortifying and defence of the City of Canterbury, all which several acts of the said Sir Thos. Godfrey were done and acted in relation and assistance to the enemies of the Parliament in the said Rebellion, all which were returned amongst other things by the Comm<sup>rs</sup> of Kent, on or about the 25th Oct<sup>r</sup>, 1650, as taken by the former Committee, but where I cannot find, which I humbly submit.

March 4th, 1656.

THO. FOWLES.

RICHARD HARTIE.—At the C<sup>our</sup> at Maidstone, 29th March, 1649. Ord<sup>d</sup> that M<sup>r</sup> Rich<sup>d</sup> Hartie be discharged, and the present seizure of his estate taken off, in regard of the matter of charges against him do not appear to make him liable to sequestration ; † and the respective officers for sequestration are hereby required to be obedient.

THOS. BROADNAX.

RICH<sup>d</sup> PORTER.

LAMBARDE GODFREY.

W. JAMES.

GEO. DUKE.

JAS. GOSLING.—“And the said John Gosling did ride in a troop of horse with sword and pistols in Town Malling.”

BUGGINS.—“And the Lord Buggins did act as Captain of foot.”

ROB<sup>t</sup> MOORE.—“A particular charge against R. M. of Gillingham, co. of Kent.—And he did act as a Lieut. at Pickenden Heath, and did plunder butter and cheese that was going to Parl<sup>t</sup> troops.

JOHN ABEL, Prosecutor, Oct<sup>r</sup> 22<sup>d</sup>, 1651.

SCOLES.—“And he hath been from time to time a gross maligner and vilifier of the Parliament and their proceedings.”

\* This Warrant bears date 28th May, 1648.

† It seems that appeals were made in cases of sequestration to (Barons of Exchequer) Commissioners for the same (1649), John Wild and Alex. Rigby.

GEO. CODD, of Ash. Six charges by John Abel . . . . in actual arms at Seven Oak, in the said Co., in the insurrection which was in the year 1648. . . . .

(4.) And that thro' his persuasion and threatenings, divers were forced to serve, and drawn into the wicked design against the Parliament, which otherwise would not have gone, and he did use divers threatening words against many that did then refuse to join in the said insurrection.

(6.) That the said Geo. Codd hath not compounded for being in either of the two first insurrections; he did compound at an under value in money, lands, and mortgages to the value of £2000 and upwards.

JOHN ABEL, Prosecutor.

All<sup>d</sup> upon bond, 22<sup>d</sup> Oct., 1651.

THOS. FOWLE.

ROBERT MOORE "was a Lieut. at Pickenden Heath, and plundered butter and cheese going to the Parliament ships, and was Lieut. of horse, commanding a troop at Chatham and Rochester."

J. BULLFINCH.

WILLIAM COBHAM "did in a very violent manner take powder and arms out of the State's ships;" "and afterwards marched away to Colchester.

JOHN HAMDEN ("of Wilmington, co. Kent").—"The said John Hamden had a man in arms in the last rebellion in Kent, in the year 1648, at the time when, etc. Also the aforesaid Hamden did send his man to Colchester, and did continue there all the time; and after his man ran home, the aforesaid Hamden did pay his man for the time he was out, as will be proved by me,

JOHN BULLFINCH.

Allowed 5th Dec., 1651,

Upon bond, THOS. FOWLE.

GEORGE MILLES.—"John Bissett . . . . sworn and ex<sup>d</sup>, saith as follows:—That in the insurrection ag<sup>t</sup> the Parl<sup>t</sup> in this City (Canterbury), in the year 1648, he did see M<sup>r</sup> George Milles, of Canterbury, with the insurrection on horseback, armed with pistols; and as this ex<sup>to</sup> best remembers, he did see the eldest son of the said M<sup>r</sup> Milles also in arms, having one pistol."

JOHN BISSETT.

Taken before me, JOHN BROWN.

COLONEL WILLIAM BOOTHBY did betray his trust by delivering over

the whole magazine of arms left in his charge for his reg<sup>t</sup> to the King's party. "He helped the King's party with arms, men, and money."

JOHN GILES "did carry himself with much inveteracy and malice ag<sup>t</sup> the Parliament, and against all honest, godly, and well-affected people."

WILLIAM HAYES, of Cobham, Kent, "was in arms, etc.\* . . . and hath been a continual malignant vilifier, and opposer from time to time of this Parliament."

JOHN ABELL, charged with "pretending an order"—"sequestered Jas. Brandford; but said they would let him off if he could pay him moneys."

THOS. SEARE, in actual arms under the L<sup>d</sup> Goring and Esquire Hales . . . did with many others seize Major Brown at Upnor Castle—the said Major Brown was Governor thereof. J. BULFINCH.

All<sup>d</sup> upon bond. THOS. FOWLE.

Mr JOHN ROBERTS did carry away the Governor of Upnor Castle, Major Brown, to prison, and did take the Castle for the King.

\* These extracts are somewhat abridged. The informations against the Kentish delinquents usually run thus:—"At the last rising of the Kentish enemy, in the year of our Lord God 1648. At that time when the L<sup>d</sup> Goring and Esquire Hales was in arms for the late King against the Parliament." "And at that time there was many well-affected persons plundered and imprisoned for heir faithful adherence to the Parliament."

Kent Archaeological Society is a registered charity number 223382

© Kent Archaeological Society