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WELCOME TO THE PATRIOT 106!
Alas, we no longer have the services of Roy Bailey to edit the newsletter, so you will notice a change in style. I do not have Roy’s command of desktop publishing, so please focus on the content and forgive me for the ordinary design. I hope that you enjoy reading it. If you know of anyone who would enjoy being our newsletter editor, please contact a member of the committee to nominate them.
Dr Beth Rogers, Chair (and reluctant editor😊)
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THE OTHER HAMPDEN HOUSE

New member Dr Amy C. Simes from North Carolina kindly sent this photo to us. Amy lived in this Hampden House from 1967-1975, and is currently writing a memoir about her years growing up there. Amy’s father was the Academic Dean and Admin VP for the college. The house is on the Hampden-Sydney college campus (founded 1775), and was built sometime between 1825 and 1858. After the Simes family moved out in 1975, Hampden House US was converted into the College Alumni House with guestrooms, serving graduates of the College and hosting special events. (Typically, an alumni house is where the alumni relations of the university are managed.) Located across from the football stadium at the entrance to the College where Old College buildings once stood, Hampden House is open to the public most days and on special weekends.

THE MEN OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE MARCH ON LONDON

Historians record that, following the King’s thwarted attempt, on 4th January 1642, to arrest the five members and their flight to the City of London, that two petitions were brought to London from Buckinghamshire: One addressed to Parliament and the other to the King. However, the exact details vary from account to account. Whilst there is broad agreement about the wording and timing of the petitions, we still do not know who organised them, who signed them or the names of the delegates who presented them to Parliament and the King.

Lord Nugent stated, in his biography of Hampden, that the Buckinghamshire petition was presented to both Houses of Parliament on the 12th January by about “four thousand freeholders who had ridden up from their county, each with a copy of the late protestation [the Grand Remonstrance] worn in his hat, to show their affection to the cause of Parliament, and the person of Hampden, their representative.”
In his book Hampden’s England, John Drinkwater reported that on the 11th January “a great deputation of Buckinghamshire men reached London with a petition to the King protesting against the treatment of John Hampden.” Drinkwater adds that there were “four thousand of them mounted” and that that the Commons advised them to limit their delegation taking the petition in support of Hampden to ten people.
Hugh Ross Williamson in his biography of Hampden is more equivocal, saying that at a meeting of Parliament, on 10th January in the Grocer’s Hall…

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
Hampden announced that “several thousand of his constituents were on their way to London with two petitions” and asked Parliament’s permission that they might be allowed to “approach” Parliament.

Cicely Wedgwood informs us in her book The King’s War that “A thousand horsemen rode in from Buckinghamshire, John Hampden’s country, declaring that they would live and die for Parliament.” A little later she refers to this as “rising of John Hampden’s tenants.” Unfortunately, she does reference her source for these statements. In his Life of John Hampden: The Patriot, John Adair agrees that, when the five members who had returned to Westminster from their hiding place in the City, on the 11th January, that a petition was delivered “which had been carried to London by about five thousand inhabitants of Buckinghamshire, wearing the Grand Remonstrance as a badge in their hats.” Most recently, Ian Beckett, in his book Wanton Troopers, mentions that “Bucks became the first county to petition parliament on Hampden’s behalf with a reputed five to six thousand ‘freeholders’, representing his ‘countrymen and neighbours’, accompanying two petitions – to peers and MPs – to Westminster ‘riding three on three’ on 11th January.” These slightly different versions of events appear to derive from accounts written by two contemporary witnesses. Both accounts were however published posthumously, long after the Restoration.

- In his journal entry for January 12th 1642, Bulstrode White洛克e MP for Great Marlowe recorded that following the attempt by King Charles to arrest the five members in the House of Commons that “divers Buckinghamshire men came up with a petition to the King, for Mr Hampden, their knight of the shire (whereof he was not altogether ignorant beforehand): they pray that Hampden and the rest that lie under the burden of accusation may enjoy their just privileges.”
- Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, a fellow MP and a royalist, wrote in his History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars that “Some Buckinghamshire men, who were said to be at the Door [of the House of Commons] with a petition ….. with a train of several thousand men, were called in; who delivered their petition in the name of the inhabitants of the County of Buckingham (sic), and it is said brought to the Town by six thousand men.” This petition was addressed to Parliament, pledging their support and begging that Popish lords and bishops should now be excluded [from Parliament] and evil counsellors punished.
- Clarendon also records that the Buckinghamshire men carried a petition addressed to the King in support of “Mr Hampden”, and those who were accused with him. According to Clarendon, the Commons advised that only six or eight of the petitioners should present the petition to the King. The petitioners then went to the House of Lords where they were similarly well received. It is significant that Clarendon notes that it is “from this day [the 11th January 1642] we may reasonably date the levying of War in England.”

Organising a petition in rural Buckinghamshire and delivering it to London in the six or seven days between 4th to the 11th January would, even now, be no mean feat. Were copies of the petition taken physically across the county for signature? The raising of four to six thousand horsemen men in such a short space of time is hard to comprehend. It is even more extraordinary when one considers that this was done in mid-winter, when the condition of the roads would have been at their worst.

Even today, calculating the number of people in a crowd is often difficult. It is not unusual for the organisers of a demonstration to disagree with the police about the size of a crowd. After such a long passage of time it is foolish to believe that we can improve upon the figures of four to six thousand mentioned by Nugent and Clarendon. The entire population of Buckinghamshire in the 1630s has been estimated at between 55,000 and 65,000. How are we to make sense of the accounts of four to six thousand horsemen riding with the petitions? These figures are hard to take at face value when one considers that half of the population would have been female and at least another third would be too old or too young to ride to London, even if they owned or could borrow a horse. Nevertheless, Cicely Wedgwood’s figure of just one thousand riders, whilst more plausible, does not align with Clarendon’s report of “it is said … six thousand men”.

Whatever we conclude about the numbers involved, the petitions were remarkable and indicate not only the high regard in which John Hampden was held but also the efficient political machine that he could rely on in his home county.
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THE MEN OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE MARCH ON LONDON CONTINUED...

John Hampden was on the committee that levied a weekly tax of £420 on Buckinghamshire. According to documents owned by the Rose family, who are descended from the Rose family mentioned as taxpayers, the Earl of Essex in Thame was to be paid money by the landowners of Haddenham, but the garrison at Aylesbury also wanted horses and men for the army. Labourers were sent to Aylesbury with turf and hay. Oats, beans, other “victuals” and timber were also sent. In June/July 1643, 80 men and horses from Captain Draper’s regiment and 80 men and horses from Captain Buller’s regiment were given free quarter for 24 days at 1s 6d per day – a total cost of £288. There were dozens of other occasions when Parliamentary troops were billeted in the village. In 1644, Joseph Hodges gave 13s 6d relief for some maimed soldiers. In all, it seems that the war placed a huge financial burden on the village. Although technically the money was repayable, and some items accrued interest, it must have been very hard to keep meeting the demands made by both Thame and Aylesbury.

HADDENHAM U3A MEETING

On March 24th, our Chair Dr Beth Rogers gave a talk to Haddenham U3A about John Hampden, Rebel or Patriot. An enthusiastic audience of 35 attendees gave up a sunny afternoon to listen to our Chair’s personalised presentation on the life of the Patriot. Audience members posed a number of questions, and they were particularly interested in the deprivations wreaked on Haddenham during the Civil War (see item on the left). Attendees were very complimentary about the interest level generated by the talk and several bought books from the stall.

Based on Haddenham in the Civil War on http://www.bucksas.org.uk/
KING CHARLES THE MARTYR AND THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS

On Saturday June 10th, Dr Andrew Lacey, who is a history tutor at both the University of Cambridge and Oxford Institutes of Continuing Education, shared his research on the religious differences contributing to the causes of the Civil War and the cult of King Charles as an Anglican martyr after the Civil War. He traced back Charles’ views to a love of classicism. James 1 had been brought up a Presbyterian, but he was keen to escape it and sponsor classical art and architecture, such as the Whitehall Banqueting House with its tribute to his God-ordained monarchy in the ceiling.

James and Charles enjoyed the hierarchy and order of classical architecture. They also enjoyed the classics in the masque (court-based entertainment), and Andrew illustrated this with a painting including Charles as Apollo, Henrietta Maria as Diana and the Duke of Buckingham as Mercury. This followed through into a love of ceremony in the church – paintings, statues, vestments, liturgy and candles. Of course, the Puritans were horrified by such “Popery”. They designed very plain chapels, without stained glass, altar table, statues or ornaments. The word of God as given by the minister was the focus of worship, as indicated by the very large pulpits in Puritan chapels.

In addition to this, there was a theological difference. Followers of John Calvin believed that God had predestined some to be saved, “the elect”, and some would continue in their sins and be punished in hell. Dutch theologian Jacob Arminius argued that the election of a God of Love was not predetermined, but an election of believers. Christians must make their own way in a continual struggle for salvation, helped by church liturgy. Archbishop Laud, appointed by Charles, was an Arminian. Calvinists saw the Arminian supporters as closet Catholics. Besides their belief in preserving monarchy, Royalists believed that they were fighting for a tolerant Church. Some Parliamentarians were fighting to rid the earth of the anti-Christ. Religious dogma was so entrenched on both sides that moderates did not know which side to choose.

After Charles’ execution, within weeks a book had been published promoting him as a martyr. Miracles were attributed to his blood in England and Scotland. Religious dogma was so entrenched on both sides that moderates did not know which side to choose.

After Charles’ execution, within weeks a book had been published promoting him as a martyr. Miracles were attributed to his blood in England and Scotland. Religious dogma was so entrenched on both sides that moderates did not know which side to choose.

The book challenges much that we believe that we know about Hampden’s life and legacy and is a useful corrective. I am however doubtful about some of the statements made and conclusions drawn: For example, was Baldwyn de Hampden ever the Earl of Buckinghamshire? Had the Norman’s lost power by the eleventh century (they had only arrived in 1066)? The Prestwood Ship Money Monument is surely surmounted by a Celtic and not a Maltese Cross. Where is the proof that the monument was erected in 1893 rather than the 1863?

In describing the aftermath of Hampden’s death, the author mentions that the Earl of Essex was forced to retreat from Thame; his army ragged, diseased, starving and unable to defend itself. It would have been helpful to have had a description of the condition of both Hampden’s regiment and the civilian population left in Thame and the surrounding villages. Fortunately, there is a well-researched account in M C Barres Baker’s book ‘The Siege of Reading, April 1643’. There are other odd omissions: Whilst the reference to the Hampden Clubs formed in the industrial cities of the North of England, the Peterloo Massacre or the Clubs’ national petition calling for universal male suffrage. The Women’s Tax Resistance League’s engagement with Hampden’s legacy is also ignored.

The author points out, that there has been no biography of Hampden published since John Adair’s in 1976, and he acknowledges that this book is not a biography. The book will cause many who believe that they have a good understanding of Hampden’s life to reflect upon the sources that we have traditionally relied upon: Did he really die in Thame or elsewhere, and was the title of Patriae Pater simply a literary flourish bestowed upon him by the Earl of Clarendon years after his death?
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The stated aim of the book is to examine the flawed historiography of the Battle of Chalgrove and expose the myths surrounding Hampden’s funeral, burial and the supposed exhumation of Hampden’s body by Lord Nugent in the nineteenth century. It also addresses the “dubious” histories of the English Civil War that surfaced in the nineteenth century, and the manipulation of Hampden’s political legacy in the eighteenth century, particularly in the American colonies. We should be extremely grateful to the author for bringing together insights and anecdotes gleaned from his extensive original research and his involvement with Civil War re-enacting.

BETH ROGERS
On March 28th 2023, members of the John Hampden Society joined the parishioners of Great Hampden for the Pentecost service. The brass floor plaques of the Hampden family were on display for us (see photos). Afterwards, Reverend Deiniol Heywood gave a talk about the planned refurbishments to the Church. The Church aims to offer Sunday services, weddings and baptisms, musical events, a space for spiritual retreats and cultural events, and education events that make the most of the church’s special historical connection with John Hampden the Patriot.

The Church is raising money to improve the sound system, lighting, heating, stabilising the floor tiles, redecoration and opening up of the chancel space. It is in this chancel space that educational events could take place. This might be a good place for the new plaque for John Hampden requested at the AGM. Members might like to consider what sort of plaque they think is appropriate (but please note that ultimately the church authorities have to approve our ideas). Wood, brass or stone? What shape? What wording? Should we also support an information board outside for walkers and visitors to the House? Please send your thoughts to thechairman@johnhampden.org

Members may be interested in a study day on the new research on the Parliaments 1640-1660 organised by the Cromwell Association. It is on October 14th in Huntingdon. Full information is on their website.