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Abstract

This thesis provides the first scholarly assessment of the role of Horace Vere, 1st baron Tilbury, as a major progenitor of the English and later British army. As commander of the English land forces in the Low Countries for 30 years Horace Vere made a considerable contribution to the organisation, training and discipline of the English military during their transition from a mediaeval conscript force to a highly trained, professional fighting army. Set against the backdrop of both the Dutch wars of independence and the advent of the Thirty Years War, Vere’s ‘Compendium of the Art of War’, produced between 1611 and 1614 was one of the earliest drill manuals in English. A comprehensive guide for officers and men the Compendium covered most aspects of infantry training especially regarding the use of firearms in the field but it also encompasses supply, encampment and logistical matters.

Significantly too, Vere’s long period of successful command attracted a large number of young men to serve and learn under his tutelage. Many of these men later went on to become leaders themselves during the English Civil Wars and then to establish the first permanent, standing, early modern British army with unbroken links to today’s military.

Horace Vere was also a notably pious Puritan at a time when religion loomed large and he was an active and influential supporter of many radical divines when such support
was not without its dangers and disadvantages. In addition, though Vere began life as a commoner his ascent to high command heralded the first time that someone not of noble birth actually led an officially sanctioned independent English force in the field.

Horace Vere has been overlooked for too long. This thesis redresses that omission.
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1. Introduction

This thesis will examine the life and legacy of Horace Vere, his remarkably long career as a soldier, the impact of his profound faith and modest temperament upon his military calling and how he was perceived contemporaneously. Horace Vere played an important part in the transformation of the English military from an individualistic, sharp edged metal force to a cohesive gunpowder based military. His was a significant role in the early and continuous development that led to today’s army and this remains, as it always has been, his legacy.

The objective of this thesis is to record, discuss and explain that achievement in an accessible and usable way for future scholarly use, bringing together known and previously unused material to demonstrate Horace Vere’s significant contribution to both military and social British history.

Horace Vere is important because of the influence that he had upon:

1. the English and later British military establishment,

2. the many civil war commanders who grew up in his long military shadow. A point made by David Lawrence in his 2009 book The Complete Soldier.¹

3. the beginning of meritocracy in English military service, and

4. the start of a less self-aggrandising and importuning approach to advancement, now relying on evidential ability and a modest character.

This work will discuss why Vere should be regarded as a progenitor of the early modern English army. From the start of his military career in 1590, aged 25, up until the taking of Maastricht in 1632, Horace Vere was involved in numerous military actions including seaborne assaults, impetuous charges and retreats, triumphant victories,
enervating defeats and numerous sieges as both besieger and besieged. He was wounded at least four times, including one injury that made him lame, and he played an active and leading role in military matters at a time when advances in gunpowder technology were forcing a concomitant response in battlefield management and in defensive architecture.

As commanding general of the English troops in Dutch pay for 30 years, from 1605 until his death in 1635, he had to surmount all the impossibilities of materiel and manpower supply that the age engendered, all the while remaining true to his religious faith at a time when such devotion was at best difficult and at worst dangerous. He fought no major battles as commander-in-chief and his unavoidably lengthy absences from England increased his susceptibility to the vicissitudes of early modern politics, yet Horace Vere was lauded in his day as the premier English soldier. Famous, celebrated poetically and sought after as a guide and trainer of militarily aspirant young men, his accomplishments were nevertheless largely forgotten in the maelstrom of the British Civil Wars, which is why he has remained largely overlooked, unstudied and ‘Th’ Unconsidered Soldier.

Yet, set consistently against the backdrop of the Dutch struggle for independence in the century after 1548, and the first half of the Thirty Years War, Horace consistently proved his martial and diplomatic aptitude throughout a career which lasted until he was almost 70 – a considerable age for the times.

Between 1621 and 1623 Vere held the Lower Palatinate for more than two years despite commanding a paucity of English troops. During this time, with little help, he delayed the much larger Imperial and Spanish armies who might otherwise have marched north west and overwhelmed, or severely compromised, the emergent Dutch

---


2
State. Whilst in the Palatinate he was starved of money and information, beset by
disease and suffered the deprivations of a much more numerous enemy yet he
demonstrated a singular generalship. Indeed his ability to maintain a credible force in
being at all, whilst deserted by his allies, isolated and constantly bereft of money to pay
his troops, highlights his military and management skill as well as his diplomatic
capability in a role many saw as crucial in the struggle against Catholic hegemony and
the survival of the nascent Dutch Republic. Crucially too, throughout his career as
chief of the English forces in Dutch pay, a number of later civil war leaders served
under his command, thus creating a link between Vere’s ‘art of war’ and the battles,
sieges and military organisation of the English civil wars. A link that continued on to the
creation of the post-civil war permanent standing army and ultimately to today’s
military. Horace Vere was ‘the leading English captain of his age’. An essential part of
the link between mediaeval methods of war and the first permanent, professional,
gunpowder armies in England which arose out of the civil wars and which were largely

2 William Shakespeare, Two Noble Kinsmen,1.2.31.  
3 Adam Marks, ‘England, The English and the
Thirty Years War (1618-1648)’, Unpublished Ph.D., Thesis, (St Andrews, 2012), p.70. Marks argues
that, if held, the Palatinate could split the so called Spanish Road route for troops and that whilst
Spanish and Imperial forces were engaged there they could not be deployed against the United
Provinces. A view supported by Christopher Durston, James1, (London, 1993) p.49, and by Dr
David Trim in his DNB entry for Horace.  
4 Ismini Pells, ‘Professionalism, Piety and the Tyranny of
Idleness: Life on Campaign for the English Regiments in Dutch Service, c.1585-164’, Early modern
British and Irish Seminar, Trinity hall, Cambridge, October 2012., p4  
5 Andrew Hopper, Black Tom,
Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution, (MUP, 2007)

built by men who learnt their craft in the early 1600’s under his command. Surpassing
the earlier achievements of his better known brother Francis he was, in his day, the
best known and most admired English military leader. A junior member of a cadet
branch of the noble House of De Vere and the great-nephew of John De Vere, the 16th
earl of Oxford, Horace fought exclusively in Europe, mainly in the Low Countries or in the Palatinate and almost entirely in the service and pay of the United Provinces of Holland, but he always fought in the service of the Protestant faith of which he was a devoted disciple.

He left no memoirs or diaries, but he did leave over 130 letters and other documents including his 'Compendium', one of the earliest drill manuals in English, which promulgated, re-enforced and provided a script for the ongoing evolution of gunpowder war that some call the 'Military Revolution (see below page 14). Vere’s drill manual ‘A Compendium of the Art of War under Sir Horace Vere’ written between 1610 and 1614, pre-dates the 1623 Dutch Instructions for Musters and Armes, which came to be seen as something of a standard work yet the 'Compendium', taken as a whole, covers a wider range of military matters though it concentrates principally upon the infantry. It is not a basic introduction to the art of warfare, like many other contemporary publications aimed at those contemplating or starting out on a military career. It assumes a degree of knowledge about how an army is formed (i.e. Infantry, cavalry, pikes, muskets et al, with companies, regiments etc.) and unlike some contemporary manuals contains no diagrams of the various postures and positions for holding and using the different weapons. It is a set of instructions given by Horace Vere for the guidance and observation of his officers, men who would have been familiar with these basics, instructing them how to organise and manoeuvre men en mass in battle. This was important not only because of the need for English troops to operate smoothly alongside their Dutch allies but also in order to professionalise and modernise the English military.

Vere’s faith was a major part of his life and he was a noted patron and promoter of Puritan, often radical, preachers and clerics throughout his life which underpinned, confirmed and defined his religious doctrine. Celebrated and acclaimed in his lifetime, he was given a state funeral when he died in 1635 when he was interred in Westminster Abbey in the tomb of older brother Sir Francis. During the struggle of the
Anne Curry, *The Hundred Years War*, (Oxford, 2002). p. 92. Professor Curry’s assertion that
the English army during the 100 years’ war was ‘essentially an English standing army’ is
certainly valid but my contention is that Vere’s soldiers were the beginning of a continuous force
that can be traced through the civil wars and on to today’s modern British Army.

NA, SP9/202/1. Compendium of the Art of War under Sir Horace Vere. See Appendix 1. Ibid., see
page two where the compendium says ‘An extract of Discipline of a Company of *Foot given out
by Sir Horace Vere an[no dominie] 1611 to all his captains’

United Provinces of Holland to gain and then retain their independence from Hapsburg
Spain (1548 – 1648 with a 12 year truce between 1609 and 1621) the brothers played
a leading role (between 1585 and 1635) in the continuing English military and
diplomatic involvement in that struggle. Notably, Francis and Horace were the first
commoners to lead ‘official’ English troops, i.e. those directly in the pay of the Monarch,
and Horace was the first to do so independently.

Francis has enjoyed some recent recognition and re-examination. Horace,
however, has been side-lined and largely forgotten. In part this happened because of
the enormous upset to the political, cultural and military establishment of the British
Civil Wars. Yet Horace was a significant military leader at an important time in the
development and professionalisation of the English military and it will be argued in this
thesis that he was more important than Francis, or any of his contemporaries, as a
vigoroues even vital link in the continuing chain of British commanders in Europe. This
was because of his long years of enduring influence on the large number of young
Englishmen who served under him in the early years of the Seventeenth Century, men
who later became major military and political figures on both sides during the English
Civil War. The English relationship with continental armies, especially the Dutch,
constituted ‘an apprenticeship in arms’ that lasted for over one hundred years. And
Horace was both apprentice and latterly apprentice master for forty-five of these years.
Dr. Ismini Pells calls Horace and Francis ‘the most celebrated commanders of the English forces in the Netherlands’.\(^1\) Dr Pells supports the view that Horace Vere has been largely ignored as a major influence on Civil War leaders through his military ability and, specifically, his creation and maintenance of a ‘nursery’ for developing soldiers. This nursery provided an ongoing and increasingly professional military establishment, often used by Elizabeth, James and Charles for their own purposes yet, after 1598, it was largely paid for by the United Provinces of the Netherlands.\(^2\) This was in effect a permanent, standing, English army funded by the Dutch Republic!\(^3\)

Thus trained it was they, men like Thomas Fairfax (who later married Horace’s daughter Anne), the Earls of Essex, Warwick and Peterborough, Phillip Skippon and possibly most significantly George Monck (who gained his first military experience in Horace Vere’s regiment), who reached senior positions in the parliamentarian and royalist forces and then began to establish the organisation and structure of the subsequent, and first continuous permanent, standing British army which we still see to this day. Clements Markham, who wrote the first biography of the Veres, is right to insist upon their impact and lasting impression upon succeeding generations of fighting men.\(^4\) An insistence supported by Dr Pells in her forthcoming book.\(^5\)

Yet little work, scholarly or otherwise, has been carried out to discover just what

\(^9\) Tracey Borman, ‘Sir Francis Vere in the Netherlands, a re-evaluation of his career as sergeant major-general of Elizabeth’s Troops’. Unpublished Ph.D., (University of Hull, 1997).


\(^12\) Ibid., p.77.

\(^13\) Ismini. Pells, *Philip Skippon and the British Civil Wars: The ‘Christian Centurion’* (Routledge, forthcoming). Ch.2, p.1. I am grateful to Dr. Pells for sight of an advance copy.

\(^14\) An insistence supported by Dr Pells in her forthcoming book.

\(^15\) Yet little work, scholarly or otherwise, has been carried out to discover just what
Horace Vere’s contribution to the development of the English and later British military tradition has been. There has been even less examination of Vere’s Puritan beliefs yet since his strong Protestant piety underpinned and permeated his long military career any examination of the man must consider how his faith influenced and motivated his actions and how it was perceived and received by his contemporaries.

Clement Markham’s *The Fighting Veres* is an uncritical and adoring portrayal of the two brothers which lacks scholarly rigour but up until the end of the twentieth century this work was the major, almost the sole, non-primary source of information regarding both Francis and Horace. Then in 1998 Tracey Borman produced her thesis on the military life of Francis Vere and the politico military environment in which he operated. As Borman states in her Introduction ‘*The Fighting Veres* has enjoyed a place in historiography that has remained largely unchallenged.’ Borman’s work has now superseded Markham’s almost obsequiously romantic account of the older brother and this thesis will similarly contribute a scholarly appraisal of the career of Horace.

Francis Vere was at least twenty five years old when he went to join the English contingent in the Low Countries in December 1585 after the signing of the Anglo-Dutch treaty of Nonsuch in August. But there is some doubt about the ages of the Vere brothers. No official record of their births exist but the *Biographia Britannica* entry for Francis states that he went to aid the Dutch with the Earl of Leicester in December 1585. Following the Treaty of Nonsuch Elizabeth appointed her favourite, Robert Dudley 1st Earl of Leicester, as commander of the English troops sent to assist the Dutch. Leicester was more than willing to take on the role, as he wrote in a letter of

flourished in Great Britain and Ireland From the earliest down to the present Times, Bayle ed, Vol. 6, (London, 1763). p. 406. This is in effect an early Who’s Who. It does give references, though not always with today’s academic rigour.

August 1585 to Francis Walsingham, then Elizabeth’s secretary of State. Leicester was one of the leaders of a group later called ‘political Puritans’ who wanted England to adopt a more assertively Protestant foreign policy. According to research by Hugh Dunthorne their ‘first priority was that England should involve itself openly in the wars of the Low Countries.’

The treaty of Nonsuch and Leicester’s appointment were a definite high point for this group and for Leicester who was a strong and vociferous advocate of English involvement which he justified as being a godly cause. But even before Nonsuch there had been tacit, if unofficial, support for the Dutch, not just among those with the power to promote political Puritanism at the highest level, but also amongst a ‘broad consensus’ within the country. Simon Adams has shown that there was a strong Protestant commitment amongst many of the minor nobility and gentlemen who volunteered to fight under Leicester and later commanders. A considerable number of these men, including Horace Vere, were known to have patronised leading Puritan divines, some of whom were distinctly radical and vocal in their desire to see England offering military support to the wider Protestant church in Europe. (See Ch 2 re Horace Vere’s patronage).

As a young man Horace must have been aware of some of these old soldiers returning from their adventures in Europe in the later years of the 16th century and writing plaintively of the danger to England, and to the Protestant faith, if the Dutch cause were lost and Spain should triumph. In 1597 Geoffrey Gates, citing the harsh cruelty of the Duke of Alva (and the Inquisition) as he attempted to crush the Dutch rebellion, called the Duke ‘the dreadful and renowned chieftain of the papists’ and demanded a better trained English military force able to resist the Spanish. Gates wanted an immediate improvement in military capability which he saw as the only way to
avoid the destruction and overthrow of the English church and civil liberties. In Gates’ view if persuasion or preaching could not reform the ‘evils and outrages of the wicked; then must the sword of violence be put in execution, by the hands of them that are able and skilful to ... bring to obedience the disordered multitude’. This was a

20 Adams, ‘The Protestant Cause’ p. 48. 21 Hugh Dunthorne, Britain and the Dutch Revolt 1560-1700, (Cambridge, 2013), p.25. 22 Ibid., pp. 56,57 23 Geoffrey Gates, The Defence of Military Profession, Wherein is eloquently shewed the due commendation of martial prowess, and plainly proved how necessary the exercise of armes is for this our age. (London,1579), p.13. 24 Ibid., p.10. Gates was not alone in this view. Other old soldiers wrote similar treatises, William Blandy wrote about the central role of the soldier in keeping order at home and protesting against external threats in The castell, or picture of policy shewing forth most lively, the face, body and partes of a commonwealth., (London,1581), p.12. Thomas Churchyard lauded the efforts of men who had already served or were still serving the Dutch cause and by extension the Protestant English cause too, see A lamentable, and pitifull Description of the powerful incentive for pious young men like Horace Vere since it gave them both a reason and a justification to fight. 25

Other publications which mention Horace Vere include the Biographica Britannica. The entry for Horace says that Francis took him at the end of 1583 to the service of the States of Holland when he [Horace] was then in the twentieth year of his age, (which fits, more or less, with Horace’s accepted birth date of 1565) and that Francis was then thirty-one. 26 But if this is so then Francis was born in 1552/3 and not 1560 as Clements Markham claims. 27 Francis Vere’s tomb in Westminster Abbey, and the records kept in the Abbey Library, indicate that Francis was 54 years old when he died which would suggest the earlier birthdate and one might suppose that those who buried him would have known his true age. As well, a 1583 military journey was possible, since English volunteers had been flocking to the Dutch cause since 1572, but this does not fit the generally accepted birth date for Francis. 28 Yet this ‘accepted’ date rests entirely upon Clements Markham, who is mute on his source of this information. It seems likely that the Biographia Britannica entry for Horace simply
confused the date of the treaty of Nonsuch, which was actually signed in 1585, and if so then it may also be in error about the birthdates of the Vere brothers though the date on the tomb is compelling additional evidence. And thus the possibility does exist that Horace first went to the Dutch wars seven years earlier than had previously been accepted. Borman’s thesis has shed considerable light upon Francis Vere and his career as commander of the English troops in Holland. Francis had certainly begun his martial vocation quite early, seeing service in France and Poland before embarking with the Earl of Leicester in December 1585, but Borman’s examination of Francis Vere’s early introduction to the military arts was hampered by a lack of extant specific evidence and one of her sources, Clements Markham’s *The Fighting Veres*, is sadly lacking in modern scholarly rigour. His narrative descriptions of the early years of both brothers are almost entirely bereft of any checkable references and yet, in lieu of any other source, successive generations of historians have used Markham as a major foundation when writing about either brother. Markham himself based much of his narrative on the military autobiography of Francis Vere, written between 1604 and 1609 (when Francis died) but not published until 1657. In his *Commentaries of the Divers Pieces of Service*, Francis Vere set out his military memoirs. This work is a self-

wowfull warres in Flanders (London,1578) and A generall rehearsal of warres called Churchyarde\begin{quote}
choise wherein is five hundred several services of land and sea as sieges, battrailles, skirmishes, and encounters, (London,1579).
\end{quote}


Biographica Britannica, Vol. 6, see n.18, p. 4006. 27 Clements Markham, *The Fighting Veres*. p. 22.

serving, if not entirely biased version of the martial engagements in which Francis fought, and it gives little credit for tactical or strategic success to anyone but Francis Vere himself. Markham seems to have accepted the veracity of the Commentaries without question but Dr. Borman shows that, unsurprisingly, though Francis was a skilled and brave soldier and an astute commander, he was not the infallible military genius his Commentaries suggest. What Markham does though is to highlight the prominence and success of the Vere brothers as early modern military innovators, role models and publicly acclaimed figures.

There are no extant primary sources for the childhood of the Vere siblings. Clements Markham claims that ‘old Sir William Brown’ introduced Francis, Horace and their brother Robert ‘to the art of warfare’, but he gives no further information as to who this person was. A probable candidate is the Sir William Browne, who, as an experienced soldier had gone with Leicester to the Low Countries in 1585. Browne served in the Low Countries and was made Lieutenant Governor of Flushing where he died in 1611. But this Sir William Browne was barely two years older than Francis (if we accept Francis’s 1560 birth date - though three years younger if the earlier birth date for Francis is correct) and Browne’s origins are in Derbyshire. Nevertheless all the Veres considered Sir William as a paternal influence, addressing him in letters as ‘kind father’ and concluding as ‘your most affectionate kind loving son’, an unlikely term of address for a man of a similar age. Certainly such training, drawing on the experience of older and more experienced men had always been a feature of the early life of most young men of the Veres’ class and social position. But as the complexity of warcraft grew during this period the need for those who were expected to command soldiers to have a thorough understanding of their profession became compelling.

So during this early part of his career Horace Vere found himself in the middle of the transit from warfare based upon individual combat and the longbow to the use of coordinated gunpowder weapons. These changes, sometimes dubbed the ‘Military


Revolution’, had already begun to transform warfare when Vere first took up arms and he was himself to play a role in the further development of this new style of combat, particularly with the production of his ‘Compendium’. Some discussion of the ‘Military Revolution’ as it relates to Vere and his part in the Dutch fight for independence is therefore highly relevant to this thesis.

Maurice of Nassau led the Dutch in their struggle against their erstwhile Spanish overlords from 1585 till his death in 1625 and thus was Horace Vere’s chief for 35 years. 34 Maurice understood that in the face of the experienced Spanish armies he needed to match them militarily, or at least find ways of avoiding defeat, if Dutch independence and religious freedom was to be achieved. 35 Ultimately it was this avoidance of defeat, rather than a clearly won war that forced the Spanish to accept Dutch independence. Maurice took inspiration for a new approach to military organisation from classical Rome, in what some historians consider to have been an important part of the so called ‘Military Revolution’. 36 Maurice left no stone unturned in his search for a successful re organisation of the nascent Dutch army and he ‘embraced every branch of the military art’ from engineering to drill to finances appointing Simon Stevin – formerly Maurice’s mathematics and fortifications tutor - as Quartermaster general of the army to professionalise and supervise ‘the whole machine’. 37 Vere served under Maurice’s command for 35 years until Maurice’s death in 1625, working closely with him on numerous campaigns absorbing and learning from the changes and advances that Maurice introduced and passing many of them on to his own English forces in his Compendium. 38 As part of the Dutch army Vere would not have remained
as general of the English troops for so long had he demurred. Both Vere’s example and 
the many years of involvement that he, and those he commanded, experienced under 
the Dutch shaped and developed what was the first early modern English standing army 
so that in the English civil wars and in the establishment of the army that evolved from 
them the influence of Vere persisted. This is the true measure of his importance as the 
progenitor of the modern British army.

Maurice of Nassau (14 November 1567 – 23 April 1625) was stadtholder of all the provinces of the 
Dutch Republic except for Friesland from 1585 until his death. Before he became Prince of Orange 
upon the death of his eldest half-brother Philip William in 1618, he was known as Maurice of 
Nassau. 35 Weigley, The Age of Battles, p.27. 36 Roberts, ‘The ‘Military Revolution’, 1560-1660’ in 
Rogers (ed), The ‘Military Revolution’ Debate, p.14. Roberts claims that Maurice found the 
‘inspiration’ for his changes in the structure of the Dutch infantry formations in De Re Militar (The 
Military Institutions of the Romans) written in 390 A.D by Flavius Vegetius Renatus. See Weigley, 
The Age of Battles:, pp. 5-6. Jan Glete, War and the State in Early Modern Europe; Spain, The 
Christopher Duffy, Siege Warfare, the Fortress in the early modern world 1494-1660., (London , 
1979), p. 81. 38 NA, SP9/202/1, Compendium of the Art of War under Sir Horace Vere. 

There can be no dispute that substantial changes in military thinking, 
deployment, weaponry, tactics and static defence occurred, at least in the case of the 
English, between Bosworth in 1485 and Edgehill in 1642. Discussion has arisen, and still 
does, however, when military historians describe these changes as a revolution 
spanning a much shorter time frame within the 167 years that separate these two 
battles. It is not the purpose of this thesis to consider the ‘Military Revolution’ debate in 
detail, but given that Horace Vere’s martial career spanned the final quarter of this period 
some discussion of the main aspects of the debate are relevant, especially those that 
Vere was himself involved with, namely siege warfare and the increasing use of firearms 
in battle. The term ‘Military Revolution’ refers to proposed substantial changes in military
organisation, finance, and administration between 1550 and 1660. These changes included the rapid development of handheld firearms; the use of infantry to deliver a greater and faster rate of fire; better and more effective artillery; the consequent development of new defensive structures - the so called ‘trace Italien’ construction - designed to withstand cannon bombardment using an interlocking wall protruding at angles; much larger armies using centralised training and deployment methodology; standardisation of weapons so as to facilitate common drill and training systems; and improvements in financial organisation enabling more efficient procurement and payment systems.\textsuperscript{39} The concept of a ‘Military Revolution’ was first introduced by Michael Roberts, then Professor of Modern History at Queen’s University, Belfast, in a now famous lecture given in January 1955. Roberts argued that Maurice, referring back to the methods of the Roman legions, ‘relied upon a multiplicity of small units ranged in two or three lines, and so disposed and armed as to permit the full exploitation of all types of weapon’.\textsuperscript{40} 

This new (or revised) approach to warfare was an attempt to solve the ‘perennial problem of ... how to combine missile weapons with close action; how to unite hitting power, mobility and defensive strength.’\textsuperscript{41} Collaborating with his cousins, William Louis and John, Maurice worked to increase the impact and effective power of his troops on the battlefield by enabling more of his soldiers to fire at the same time and by developing a way of producing a rolling, or continuous, system of volley firing.\textsuperscript{42}


The origins of this tactic are surveyed at length in Geoffrey Parker’s discussion of the military revolution in his (originally 1988) book \textit{The Military Revolution} in which
Parker suggests that its European birth was as the child of William Louis of Nassau ‘who saw the critical link between massed infantry firepower made available by sixteenth century technology and Roman close order drill.’

Professor Parker argues that ‘volley fire was invented twice in the sixteenth century; in Japan during the 1560’s and in the Dutch republic in the 1590’s.’ And Geoffrey Roberts considered that these reforms were later enlarged and embellished by the Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus to create an even greater offensive capability.

Thus Horace Vere, taking command of a company within the Anglo Dutch army for the first time in the mid 1590’s, would have been right at the centre of these important developments and would have wanted to adopt such new and exciting advances if only to show his Commander in Chief Maurice and his immediate boss, brother Francis, that they had chosen the right man. This was especially so since before Maurice captains and generals did not train their soldiers, who were expected to learn singly from older warriors, but Maurice’s’ close order drill needed a high degree of unit training. To be an officer in the States Army...required that one take on the duties of managing and training soldiers on a daily basis.

The implications of this new approach were profound, requiring not only a greater level of discipline in the field but an improvement in the standardisation of weapons and ammunition. This was because more precise control of the whole army, and a commonality of its tactical methodology, now became supremely important. This necessity for greater discipline on the battlefield was achieved through the introduction of coherent, coordinated and rapid manoeuvre when in action, while utilising both standardised training manuals and weaponry as the basis for detailed, refined and repetitive drill. This greater discipline was a requirement that led inevitably and inexorably to the rise of professional standing armies because of the time and money it took to train new soldiers in the precise manoeuvring needed to deliver these new tactics on the battlefield. The introduction of massed, handheld, firearms in the field had rendered the skilled archer obsolete, together with the requirement for his many years of
practice because though an accomplished archer could fire ten arrows a minute


compared to just one shot from an early sixteenth century arquebus in several minutes, untrained men could learn to use a firearm in a few hours at most compared to the ‘many years and a whole way of life... needed to produce a competent archer.’49

Nevertheless these new Maurician methods re-introduced the need for long hours of practice, as it became necessary for musket men to train together, rather than as in the past with archers, who had developed their skills in relative isolation. Such organised and massed training required homogeneous weapons systems too, if commands were to be uniform, and thus centralised and standardised control of weapons, units and armies became inevitable.50 Vere’s Compendium reinforces these points by detailing and describing not only the co-ordinated movements of the men but also the required standardisation of their weapons.

Individual regimental or company commanders many of whom were, in the late 16th century, still amateurs now needed to control their soldiers in identical ways using the same commands and needed thus to be brought under a common discipline if the army was to function as a co-operative and interdependent unit. As Roberts put it, ‘officers became not merely leaders but trainers of men [and] diligent practice in peacetime, and in winter became essential; and drill, for the first time in modern history, became the precondition of military success’.51 The new defensive methodology that had
arisen as a solution to the power of the canon to destroy medieval walls was also a major factor in Vere’s career since most of his campaigning involved him as the besieged or the besieger. Thus as much of the English civil war comprised siege warfare the experience of Vere, transmuted through the many men who served under him and later led troops in the civil war, played an important part in that conflict.

This ‘Military Revolution’ concept, refined most notably by Geoffrey Parker, describes the mutually sustaining relationship between the new professionalism needed to deliver these tactical changes and the rise of a more permanent military force nurtured and controlled by the state. 52 Parker views the ‘prodigious increase in the scale of warfare’, in particular the substantial growth in the size of armies, as a significant reason to support this aspect of Roberts’ ideas, though he expresses doubts about other facets of the theory, mainly over the length of time that these changes took to occur and his view that Spanish forces had themselves been instrumental in introducing change. But
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Parker also points out that the financial aspects of funding a large military force, an essential aspect of the Military revolution, were ‘perfected... by the Dutch’ whose troops, unlike those of the Spanish, never mutinied for lack of pay. 53

Parker summarises Robert’s ‘Military Revolution’ theory by saying ‘..even this [i.e. Parker’s] extended examination has failed to dent the basic thesis.’ 54 Simon Adams offers limited support for the idea arguing that while there was little growth in field armies within Rogers’ period up to the start of the Thirty Years War there was thereafter ‘a
dramatic increase in projected overall establishments’ which ‘may have had a revolutionary impact.\textsuperscript{55}

Roberts views have not met with uncritical acceptance. Richard W. Stewart in his study of the English Ordnance Office suggests that ‘it is too early to talk of any revolution in tactics and weaponry [in this period] such as occurred in the mid-seventeenth century.’\textsuperscript{56} Clifford J Rogers argues for marginal gain interspersed with more rapid development which he calls ‘punctuated equilibrium’ - a term he attributes to Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldridge in 1972.\textsuperscript{57} This is an argument that finds support from Russel F. Weigley who contends that ‘technological change [at least] was decidedly incremental.’\textsuperscript{58} Weigley does accept that the United Provinces, in ‘recapturing the discipline and professionalism of the legions ...share with [Gustavus Adolphus] considerable claim to ... the first modern army’.\textsuperscript{59} However John Childs rejects the term revolution unilaterally. Professor Childs argues that the changes in military materiel, organisation and structure that occurred between 1450 and 1700 were gradual, incremental and cautious - ‘evolutionary, not revolutionary’.\textsuperscript{60}

Other eminent scholars express a similar view. David J. Parrot writes of his ‘reservations about the concept of a ‘Military Revolution’ in the period 1550-1660’, focusing on what he calls ‘little evidence’ to support the idea of sudden improvements in weapons or army structure.\textsuperscript{61} However, Parrot also asserts the ‘overwhelming superiority

of the defensive’ in his discussion of strategy and tactics, citing the ‘almost total disappearance of set-piece battles in the Netherlands in favour of protracted sieges’.  

Indeed Christopher Duffy argues that the eighty years’ war of liberation in the Netherlands ‘was of first importance in the history of fortress warfare with the development of the new shapes of fortification and the elevation of the siege attack to the status of a science’. Its importance to Maurice is clear since in January 1600 he established a ‘chair of surveying and fortification at Leyden University’ to which aspirant engineers attended in some numbers. It is likely that some of Vere’s officers were among them.

The significance of fortification in the Netherlands was in direct ratio to the number of such structures since the consequence of a lost battle was thereby reduced ‘because the (many) neighbouring fortresses halt the victors and provide a refuge to the vanquished, saving them from being totally ruined’. However, geographical factors also played a major defensive role. Much of the countryside was made up of wetlands, dykes, waterways and uneven terrain which made access, investment and supply difficult for attacking armies. Even when a fortress or town was taken, holding onto it required a degree of local self-sufficiency in men and materiel beyond that of more traversable terrain where supply and re-enforcement were much easier to obtain. Horace Vere was thus active at an unusually potent time in the development of defensive works.

He was also intimately involved in the development of volley fire, that continuous, rolling barrage which allows single shot firearms to be used en masse to deliver a constant fusillade. The manoeuvre that allow this, the Countermarch, is a complicated exercise, especially when being deployed by a large number of men and particularly so when performed in the heat of battle. Only collective, continuous and well organised drill can produce an efficient action and much of the Compendium devotes itself to this very art.
The Compendium describes in close detail how the troops should be controlled
using what Vere calls *bringers up, middlemen and leaders* [my italics] whose tasks are to
organise and arrange their fellow soldiers in ranks and files.\(^6\) Crucially these are the
men who are also tasked with the Countermarch, that is taking the men who have just
fired their weapon back behind the other ranks so that they can reload their guns and

\(^6\)Ibid., p.239. \(^6\)Christopher Duffy, *Siege warfare, the Fortress in the early modern world
1494-1660.*, (London
, 1979) p. 58. By the end of the Low Countries war in 1648 almost no major settlements there
remained without these new defensive structures though the financial cost was enormous. And see
Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution. Military innovation and the rise of the West*. P.12. \(^6\)Duffy,
*Siege warfare.*, p.81. \(^6\)Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution. Military innovation and the rise of
the West*. p. 167. \(^6\)NA, SP9/202/1,’ Compendium of the Art of War under Sir Horace Vere’.

then await their turn to fire again. Geoffrey Parker ascribes Maurice’s adoption of these
tactics to the influence of Willem Lodewijk, Maurice’s old professor at Leiden who
advocated an adaption of Roman and Greek drill and manoeuvre in order to extend and
increase the firepower of the new gunpowder weaponry.\(^6\)

In the heat of a battle, as David J Parrott explains, ‘these exercises depended
less upon the officers than upon the experienced veterans, soldiers who were placed in
the ... important positions in each line... to ensure that the inexperienced recruits executed
orders and held their positions’\(^6\). These men were not officers but seasoned
veterans whose proven coolness and clear thinking in battle would calm and inspire the
newer recruits around them.

The importance of constant practice drills in ensuring complete familiarity with
the entire process is apparent and the minute detail of Vere’s Compendium is designed
to ensure this. It is thus extremely likely that these drills took place regularly throughout
the year. Vere’s compendium brought what was in effect an English standing army into
line with continental best practice honed by years of fighting alongside innovators such
as Maurice and against the Spanish tercios whose own ‘Military Revolution’ is attested by Professor Parker.  

Roger B. Manning, in his survey of the origins of the British Army, mentions the ‘Military Revolution’ on only four occasions and seemingly accepts the term as a useful time-mark in his discussions - without questioning the terminology. And since these changes did happen the debate thus hinges upon philological definitions and considerations of time. Childs’ argument that revolutions are ‘sharp, sudden events’ is itself unsatisfactory since the word ‘sudden’ can imply a different timespan depending upon the circumstances and the subject matter. Warfare is as old as human history and in such a context, 150 years may be considered ‘sudden’ whereas in the compass of an early modern historian, working in a timeframe of perhaps 300 years such a period is lengthy indeed.

It may be better to eschew either approach and simply say that these military developments were inevitable (since they happened) and that their introduction occurred where and when they did because circumstances had reached an exact confluence of technology, financial acumen, desirability, opportunity and need. To which Parker adds a geographical dimension in surveying developments outside Europe and in respect of volley fire, particularly the Japanese experience.

Maurice’s military organisational reforms were neither totally unique nor novel, and may have acquired an over significance simply because the Dutch, a previously unregarded military power, were
able to prevent the Spanish, the premier military power in Europe, from re-asserting their control and so military historians have been arguing over his contribution for some time.

Clearly though the mass use of firearms by itself opened up possibilities that were simply not available to earlier ages. This democratisation of offensive capability was then greatly enhanced if soldiers could learn to operate, in concert, at a word of command. This in turn required ‘a new standard in the training and discipline of the ordinary soldier....The army ..was [then] no longer a collection of ...individuals. It was an articulated organism of which each part responded to the impulses from above’. Indeed ‘gunpowder and all the war techniques associated with it became significant only with the existence of discipline’. There is thus a sense of inevitability about these developments given that ‘the importance of drill and discipline can hardly be denied.’

Revolution or evolution, Maurice’s innovations necessitated and spawned the publication of a growing number of complementary military manuals in Europe, demonstrating that contemporaries felt that war had changed enough to warrant their production. Vere’s ‘Compendium’ was clearly needed to help standardise troop handling amongst the English especially as Vere’s forces were part of Maurice’s army and Vere was bound to ensure that his men could operate seamlessly with others. The Compendium was thus both an acceptance and a recommendation of these new tactics and since its originator was both highly respected and applauded as a war leader its proven veracity was understood.

This understanding now included a range of subjects that were largely new - such as the co-ordinated use of firearms and the deployment of cannon on the battlefield and in sieges, as well as how to effectively make camp and feed an army for months on end. This was not simply leadership, but management and it thus became more and more important to commission officers from the ranks of the able and not just the noble.

72 Parker, The Military Revolution. Military innovation and the rise of the West .Ch 4. 73 Roberts, ‘The
British volunteers had been serving in the Netherlands since 1572 when following the initial success of the ‘Sea Beggars’ at Brill English, Welsh and Scots adventurers, together with other nationalities, began to arrive in the United Provinces to ‘strengthen the uprising’.\textsuperscript{78} In reality though, direct, official, British military involvement only became a permanent feature of the conflict from 1585 onwards and a growing number of men of noble ancestry or the sons of gentlemen volunteered to fight, many of them taking along a train of servants and retainers. Such a familial pedigree gave them a special, but sometimes awkward place in the English companies since many of these men were, in effect, supernumeraries fighting alongside the ordinary soldiers but often with one eye on an officers’ post.\textsuperscript{79} Competition for these commissioned roles, when they became available, thus grew considerably with any increase in the numbers of such young gentlemen.

But as Francis Markham observed in 1622, ‘They [gentlemen volunteers] receive no pay so they passe no musters, nor are they tied to any strictnesse of any particular dutie, but as free and noble gentlemen may bestow their houres in any honourable fashion’ and these ‘voluntaries may challenge ... the most honourable and principal places in Battell’.\textsuperscript{80} All well and good, if there were only a few such ‘gentlemen’, but a considerable headache when, as in the early years of the Dutch wars, the number of such ‘Voluntaries’ became excessive. According to Francis Markham, they often caused great disorder, being ‘foes to discipline’, unwilling to accept direction from anyone, and ‘showing neither wisdome, order nor discretion.’\textsuperscript{81}
Such behaviour was of course the antithesis of how an army must be organised if it is to have any success, especially at this time against the formidable Tercios of the Spanish army, when a new and more disciplined approach to soldiering was required.  

The problem was clearly serious because Markham goes on to add that some commanders ‘had to forbid the enlistment of any such ‘voluntaries’ without the general’s special licence.’  

The exact status of these men could also be uncertain. ‘Voluntaries’, as Francis Markham calls them, going to fight for a foreign power in a foreign land, were often ill-regarded by contemporaries, particularly if they appeared to make fighting their profession and there ‘is a strong body of evidence that [there was] prejudice against soldiers of fortune’ in the early modern period, as there is today.  

Yet’, as David Trim points out, in respect of the Dutch wars, ‘they neither thought of themselves, nor were they thought of by contemporaries, as mercenaries.’  

Dr Trim discusses this nomenclature in some detail in his 2002 thesis, making the essential point that
perceptions of war and of those who fight in them may have radically changed since
the early Seventeenth Century, but that even today there are some circumstances in
which a mercenary might be considered rather more than simply someone who goes to
war for pecuniary reasons. In the early modern period too, it is helpful to distinguish
between the ordinary soldier and the great lord whom he may have followed into
combat. The tenant, servant or retainer of a nobleman may have had little choice about
following his master into battle, whatever his own views might have been.

The Dutch Wars also threw up religious conviction as a driving force for military
service and certainly there were many who, for this reason, flocked to join the Puritan
champion Leicester when he went to the Netherlands in 1585. It is unlikely then that
many of the young men who followed him thought of themselves as mercenaries, even
though their motives may not all have been purely religious. As well, many of these
men funded themselves, so they could not be accused of fighting for money. Dr. Trim
argues plausibly that the subject of mercenaries and/or voluntaries is far too complex to
be described in simplistic terms when applied to a particular time period or conflict, and
he ends his discussion of the topic by saying ‘The bitter condemnations by
contemporaries of mercenaries were not applied to the English and Welsh soldiers in
French or Dutch service at the time and should not be now’. 86 As Adam Marks
contends ‘The consistent loyalty of many British soldiers to the Protestant cause...
imply they were more than disciplined mercenaries’. 87

Just how these men were regarded by contemporaries and how they were
expected to conduct themselves can be discerned in the writing of an exact

83 Francis Markham, *Five Decades*’ p.19. And Manning, *An Apprenticeship in arms*, p.33. 84 David J.
B. Trim, ‘Fighting ’Jacobs Wars. The Employment of English and Welsh Mercenaries’ in the
contemporary of Horace Vere, Francis Markham. He was a soldier for ‘thirtie and odd years’, a committed Calvinist and an author of some authority concerning the Dutch wars in which he served, under Francis Vere (and others) intermittently, between 1590 and 1610.88 His Five Decades of Epistles of Warfare published in 1622, gives his soldier’s insight into the structure and organisation of armies of the day. His work is a useful source of detailed information regarding the composition of early modern armies, and in particular, the ranks in use and their responsibilities. Francis Markham also suggests the three motivational imperatives and qualities he sees as being inherent in the make-up of all soldiers. These, he declares, are good fame, honour and wealth. Fame he describes as being true, properly deserved fame based upon real and substantial achievement, not stolen or ‘arrogated by power from other men’s bloody sweats’, a fame ‘which should be thrust upon the soldier rather than assumed’; it is an achievement that may be ‘reached for but not snatched’.

Honour, likewise, should not be sought but earned, according to rank, and bestowed ‘according to the pleasure of the Prince’, whilst wealth is a necessary adjunct to the soldier’s profession since it allows men to fight and be maintained as soldiers, for ‘without [wealth] a soldier can neither perform nor continue in his calling’ He also describes what he sees as the justification for war, his ultimate argument being that in the last analysis, only the sword, under God, can remedy wrongs and restore rights. He then concludes that although ‘the fittest man to make soldier is a perfit Gentleman; yet in respect multitudes compound armies, and that gentlemen are not of that infinite increase in all parts to supply them; I must affirm ...that whose great minde soever carrieth him to the imbracing of this noble profession, whatsoever his birth be; and though his imployment may rest at the lowest degree of fortune; yet... equal justice should allow him the style and title of gentleman of the company’. But crucially he goes on to say that the soldier also needs the ‘bulwarke of pietie and religion to find security in only pure and noble reasons to fight’.89
When considering military leaders Francis Markham insists that a captain (the commander of a company) should be a ‘Gentleman both of blood and qualitie’ and that his company should include ‘a full two hundred...besides the great officers’ [of the company] and that the company should be divided into two equal parts, one of pikes and one of muskets. As his deputy, the Captain appointed a lieutenant with an ‘Ensigne’ as third in command. The word Ensign can be used to describe both a flag and what is now the most junior British commissioned officer, more usually known as a

91 Ibid., p. 17.
92 Francis Markham, *Five Decades,* p. 2.

Second Lieutenant. Francis Markham gives a good description of the office of the Ensign of his time. ‘He shall be armed at all pieces from the mid-thigh upward with a fair Sword by his side, and his captain’s colours or Ensigne in his hand’. He is ‘the first great officer of a private company: [that is the first officer rank above that of sergeant] he hath the guard of his captain’s colours and therein is trusted with his honour and reputation.’ This trust centres around the care and carrying of the colours, the way in which they must be handled, and the absolute necessity of protecting and preserving them as a rallying or assembly point for the troops in his company and, Markham adds, ‘the more ragged and tattered they are, the more noble they are’.  

Below the Ensign, but still regarded as officers at that time, were three or four sergeants, several corporals and also drummers, fifers and quartermasters. As officers gained command of larger units, even whole armies, they tended to retain their own company though it might often be larger [perhaps by 50% with an extra sergeant or two] than those commanded by others. In these circumstances a Lieutenant Colonel would be appointed to command the company whilst the actual commander was away. It was frequently this, now more senior commander’s, company that traditionally held most of the young gentleman volunteers. The company was the
main building block of the infantry and it was grounded on the paternalistic, feudal idea of the Captain as the father of his troops, with the right and the duty to be both a stern disciplinarian when necessary, but also to be ‘sweete and temperate amongst them’ instructing them ‘not as men teach dogs, or Bear-wards apes with bits and blows’ but with all the ‘pleasing language that nature, art or study can produce’. Since many companies in the English forces in the United Provinces included servants, retainers or workers from his estate, such a fatherly emphasis on the role of captain fitted well with contemporary notions of societal hierarchy.

**Private Life**

Far more is known about Horace Vere’s military life than about his own private affairs the main elements of which are as follows. He remained a bachelor until 1607 when, during truce negotiations between the Dutch and the Spanish he returned to England, aged 42, to marry Mary Hoby, nee Tracy, the youngest daughter of Sir John Tracy of Toddington, Gloucestershire. Mary, a widow of 26 was born in 1581 and her first marriage, at the age of nineteen, was to William Hoby of Hailes in Gloucestershire, but he died less than three years later. This union produced two sons, both of whom died young, Philip (1617) and William (1623). Horace and Mary were married in October 1607, the same month that the now retired Francis Vere married Elizabeth Dent. Horace took Mary back to the Netherlands, via Rochester, in the summer of 1608.

Mary went on to have six children with Horace. The eldest two, Elizabeth and Mary,
were born in the United provinces. Then Katherine, Anne, Dorothy and Susan were born in London, the last two in 1616 and 1620. Since the two eldest girls had been born abroad, their English citizenship had to be affirmed by Act of parliament in 1624.  

Outstanding legal issues that concerned the will of Mary’s previous husband, Sir John Hoby, required some legal action too and in late 1608 Horace Vere wrote to [probably Sir Julius Caesar] thanking him for agreeing to assist Mary in the matter, which was due to be heard by the Lord Chancellor. Horace copied his letter to Mary’s brother, Thomas Tracy, who ‘wilbe an umble suitor to your honnor, who is able to yeald your honnor an account of the state of the business.’ Mary’s two sons from that previous marriage would no doubt also have had some interest in this disposal. Vere suggests that ‘his lordship I hope (by the means I have made to him by honourable friends of myne) will sett down sum indifferent course to be observed betwixt me and the executors that wee may not be a further trouble one to the other’. There is no extant information regarding what this ‘trouble’ may have been.  

Meanwhile, after 60 years of inconclusive warfare and with both sides in need of respite, negotiations between the Dutch and the Spanish for some sort of temporary cessation of hostilities were now well advanced and within a year of Horace’s return to the Low Countries a twelve year truce was signed, in April 1609. The truce only applied to Europe whilst in the far east, and in the Americas, the conflict between the Spanish and the Dutch continued. Less than four months later, another singularly important event occurred when on August 28 Francis Vere died. We know that Horace as well as several other veteran Low Countries English commanders were present at the

98 NA, SP14/35/13. John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 7th July 1608. 99 Markham, The Fighting Veres, p. 381. 100 This was Thomas Egerton, 1st Viscount Brackley, known as 1st Baron Ellesmere, NA, SP14/36/285, Horace Vere to (possibly Sir Julius Caesar who was Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer from 1606 to 1614. His daughter had married Francis Vere.) and to Mr Thomas Tracie 6th October 1608. I have been unable to trace the names of the executors. 102 Probably legal wrangling’s about Hailes abbey which after the suppression of the monasteries came to the Tracy family. Mary’s marriage to William Hoby may have resulted in some claim by that family

funeral, which took place the next day, though there is no record of Horace’s return to England at that time. It may have been that Francis had been ill and Horace, having heard of the illness, had simply come to visit his older brother and mentor. Clements Markham proposes that Francis died ‘suddenly’ but the presence of many old comrades and subordinates at his funeral, so soon after his death, suggests otherwise since many of them were still serving soldiers in the Low Countries. In any case with the Truce now in place, Horace and Mary would have had both opportunity and leisure to return to England where they had a house in the parish of St. Bartholomew the Great, near St Pauls and Smithfield market.

Francis left Horace a share in the Jamestown settlement in America. Jamestown, in the Colony of Virginia, was the first permanent English settlement in the Americas. It was considered a rather fashionable investment at the time and as the shares were quite widely spread there was little risk to any one individual. Investors were almost exclusively Protestant and included George Calvert, John Ogle, Edward Conway (who had married Mary Vere’s sister), Edward Cecil and Ralph Winwood. Re-investment in the colony continued and over 450 investors, including some of the London Guilds and several aristocratic women, risked over £2500 altogether in 1619/1620. Horace Vere ventured £121 but most investors chanced less than £20.

Horace’s marriage to Mary established a partnership of piety which proved to be both long lasting and influential in the number and the profile of those ‘divines’ or clerics whom the couple supported and endorsed. [see chapter 2]. Both at home in England as parish incumbents, and in the Low Countries as chaplains to Horace’s troops, Mary and Horace sponsored and promoted more than a score of these men and influenced many others. These were preachers who were often seen by senior

104 The record of Francis and Horace’s burials appear in the Westminster Abbey Burial Register in
the Abbey archives but no reference number. There is no record of the erection of monuments at this period and the actual date is not known. All arrangements would have been between Francis’ widow, who put it up as the inscription records, and the sculptor (thought to be Isaac James). The Abbey has no papers about the making of the tomb. 105 Clements Markham, *The Fighting Veres*, p. 360. Markham says the death was sudden on the [rather uncertain] grounds that Francis was conducting business at Portsmouth, where he was governor, less than two weeks before his death.

106 Clements Markham, *The Fighting Veres*, p. 381. 107 Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *The Jamestown Project*, (Harvard, 2007), p.192. 108 Adams, ‘The Protestant Cause’, p.179. 109 Ibid., p.180-181. These were men closely tied to Horace either militarily or familiarly. Ogle and Cecil served under Vere’s command. Conway was Vere’s deputy Governor in the Brill, Winwood was English agent to the States-General between 1603 and 1612 and Secretary of state and Privy Councillor from 1614 until his death in 1617. Calvert was a politician who became Secretary of State in 1619 and later converted to Catholicism. But this was almost certainly in the mid 1620’s and at the time of these investments Calvert was an aide to Robert Cecil, who was an ardent opponent of Catholicism. If Calvert had had sympathies for the Catholic Church at this time he certainly hid it well. 110 A declaration of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia: By His majesties Council for Virginia, 22 January 1620, (London, 1620).

Church of England figures as radicals, many of them having been forced to leave England in the face of the established Church’s often violent reaction to their preaching. After Horace’s death in May 1635, Mary continued to support and sponsor such men right up until her own death on Christmas Eve 1670 in her 90th year.111

Financial matters played an important part of their married life and in 1623 Mary wrote to her brother-in-law Sir Edward Conway, now the Secretary of State, regarding another business interest. This time concerning patents for making glass with sea coal that had been the prerogative of her brother Thomas and was worth £200 per annum. Mary asked for this case to be heard by the Earl Marshal in council.112 Conway accordingly wrote to the Earl Marshal about the matter in March of the same year.113

In January 1623 Horace and Mary had attended the wedding of his friend Robert Harley to Brilliana, Edward Conway’s daughter, and then suffered the loss of their youngest daughter Susan aged just 4, and barely a year later of Horace’s oldest brother, John Vere.114 John Vere had remained at home with their mother Elizabeth (nee Hardekyn) at the family home of Kirby Hall in Essex, acting as an agent for
Francis, Robert and Horace when they were away soldiering. John continued to reside in Kirby after his mother died (1617) and though he and his wife had no children of their own, John fathered an illegitimate son who was also named John. This John Vere served under Horace and rose to become Sergeant Major General under his uncle. Knighted in 1607, he died in 1631. His son Edward also joined Horace in the low countries, gained the rank of Lieutenant and died at the siege of Maastricht just a year after his father, in 1632.

Horace himself died in May 1635 at the age of 70, after a comparatively long life. Yet despite his contemporary fame and military longevity little has been written

111 NA Prob 11/338/214. In her will Mary left a number of benefactions. Interestingly she left ‘unto my loving grandchild, Horatio, Lord Townshend, the picture of my late dear husband, Horace, Lord Vere, deceased, in my great parlour, and the pictures of all my Lord Vere’s officers and captains (full-length portraits, probably by Ravesteyn) in the said room or elsewhere in my house called Kirby Hall, to be delivered to his Lordship or whom he shall appoint immediately after my decease.’ The pictures, commissioned by Horace Vere, remained in the family until the early 20th century when they were sold off or otherwise dispersed. The independent US art historian Barry Tsirelson is engaged in tracking down the paintings and their locations. 112 CSP Domestic, James, 1623, Mary Vere to Conway, Feb 13 1623. p. 491. At this time the Earl Marshal was Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey. 113 CSP, Domestic, James,1623, p. 509. Conway to the Earl Marshal, 3 March 1623. 114 Clements Markham, The Fighting Veres, p. 421. 115 Ibid., p. 384. 116 Ibid., pp. 422-423. 117 His five surviving daughters all married well; Elizabeth, the eldest, became the Countess of Clare; Mary became Lady Townshend/Countess of Westmoreland; Katherine married Oliver St John and after his death Lord Poulett. Anne became Lady Fairfax and Dorothy became Mrs Wolstenholme.

about him as a soldier. In the next section this thesis will review the key primary and secondary texts that touch upon his career.

Primary Sources and Historiography

Fifty-one letters written by Horace between 1620 and 1623 are currently lodged in the British Library. In this series Horace was writing mainly to William Trumball,
and to George Calvert. Vere’s letters exclusively concern military, financial and
diplomatic issues mostly touching the Palatinate campaign and have not been
previously examined systematically. A further 80 or so documents held at the National
Archives are letters written by Vere, also mainly during the Palatinate campaign, though
some date from as early as 1598 and as late as 1633. Again, the letters
cover mainly military and diplomatic matters and include few personal matters.
Addressed to a wide range of individuals and also unstudied they add more depth and
substance to Horace’s character and shed light on many of the military and political
issues of the day. They show Horace’s even tempered mentality whether discussing
battles, lack of funds, lack of information or individuals. Of course, as Richard Evans
has pointed out,
‘historians cannot recover a single, unalterably ‘true’ meaning of a dispatch simply by
reading it; on the other hand, we cannot impose any meaning we wish onto such a text
either. We are limited by the words it contains, words which are not, ...capable of an
infinity of meaning. And the limits...are set... by the original author’ and the wider
context within which the words are written.

But Horace’s letters, limited as they are in uncovering personal detail, provide a
useful insight into his military situations especially regarding his time in the Palatinate.
In the circumstances the fact that they survived at all is quite surprising since Vere was,
for much of the campaign, cut off and besieged and also, as James Daybell informs us,
‘Letters in the early modern period were normally treated as ephemeral’. Phillip
West concurs ‘recipients kept them ... with no more care then they did most early modern
papers.’ All of Vere’s surviving letters were sent to officials and this was why
they were retained.

118 BL, Trumball papers, Add. Mss. 72315, (1620-1622). 119 Respectively; Envoy from James I and
then Charles I at the Brussels Court of Archduke Albert of Austria, ruler of the Habsburg
Netherlands; Principal Secretary to the Privy Council 120 N.A. SP84/83; SP84/127; SP84/101;
Also at the NA is the ‘Compendium’ a treatise which runs to 40 pages and covers a wide range of military matters.\(^{124}\) (App.1). It is one of the earliest drill manuals in English, though never published, and was probably inspired by previous continental works on the military arts such as Maurice of Nassau’s *The Exercise of Arms for Calivers, Muskets and Pikes* (1607) which became the standard Northern European handbook on infantry training.\(^{125}\) The ‘Compendium’ was produced initially in or around 1611 though some parts of the document refer to later actions and events, including the 1614 phase of the Cleves-Julich war. It contains detailed instructions concerning not only drill but also descriptions of and instructions for the proving, size and weight of muskets and of powder, shot and match.\(^{126}\) Details of how a camp is to be set out and the relationship of the soldiers to the many civilians who marched and lived with the army are also included, as are the orders of march.

The fact that Horace Vere issued these instructions presupposes that he may not have been content with the way that things were being done at the time and wanted to improve the efficiency and organisation of his troops. He may also have been introducing a new or revised system, possibly conforming with the way in which Dutch troops were drilled since Vere’s English troops were, of course, part of Maurice of Nassau’s larger allied force.\(^{127}\) Indeed, page seven of the manual states that ‘The Form of Exercising of a company of foot (was) translated out of the Dutch by his Excellency’s order and confirmed by my council the 26\(^{th}\) of December 1612 s.v.’

The ‘Compendium’ gives detailed instructions in the use of pikes and muskets en masse and similarly meticulous [and complex] directives regarding skirmishing, the distances between ranks and files, and the exact words that officers must use when
directing their men. But the ‘Compendium’ is more than a simple drill manual, it covers most aspects of military life from the proving of new muskets, the amount of powder and shot to be used, manoeuvring, the roles of civilians, the layout of a quarter [camp], the order of march and the role of the quartermaster who is to 'look out for ammunition, bread and powder & match & bullets' with a special order that the match [the fuse used to ignite the powder in the musket] ‘be not wasted in the tying of boordes’ [boards]. This last to prevent the soldiers using the expensive match as cord or string when assembling their cabins in camp ‘for the carrying is very chargeable.’

124 NA SP 9/202/1 A Compendium of the Art of War Under Sir Horace Vere. 125 Geoffrey Parker, ‘The Limits to Revolutions in Military Affairs: Maurice of Nassau, The Battle of Nieuwpooort’. In ‘The Journal of Military History’, Vol. 71, No 2 (Apr., 2007). pp. 331-372. And see Sarah Fraser, The Prince who would be King, The Life and Death of Henry Stuart, (London, 2017), p.98. 126 ‘Proving’ means testing the musket to ensure it works properly. This was not always done and old or badly made firearms could be more dangerous to the wielder than to the enemy. 127 They were not all English but included men from a wide variety of nationalities. 128 NA SP9/202/1 ‘A Compendium of the Art of War’. p.13.

The ‘Compendium’ tells us that a musket weighed 13-15 pounds (and was four feet long) and with the rest (on which the musket was laid when shooting), match, powder, shot and bandolier a musketeer had to carry about 25 pounds weight plus his bread and other victuals and necessities and in addition about 20 pounds weight of armour. 129 Instructions are set out so as to avoid disorder when on the march and to maintain discipline. And here the instruction to ‘have the old men placed in the rear’ is not a concession to age, it is done to ‘keep them from straggling’ and with the same sentiment in mind ‘the beer must be sold upon the march as it is sold in the quarter [i.e. at the same price as in the camp] ‘if not to take such as will serve the troops cheapest or else they will set their own prices’.
Lengthy instructions are given regarding sentries – the watch - who are sternly reminded that swapping duties is a punishable offence. Whilst for practical, rather than compassionate, reasons 'the sentinel [is] to stand but two hours at the most'.

Punishments are only fleetingly referred to but the words used are quite chilling 'a provost marshall goes also out with his executioner to punish any soldier that he finds as to give the frappado (a stick to hit or beat men] or to whip boys of the horsemen'.

Interestingly too, 'The Colonels company [usually up to twice the size of the others] is upon the right hand & his outermost file to be all gentlemen in the right hand; for there they guide all the ranks of the division & are ready for to be in the front when the troop hath order to charge upon the right hand'.

The ‘Compendium’ also gives details of the numbers of infantry and cavalry in the order of battle before Rees [during the 1614 fighting around Cleve-Julich] with the numbers of men in each of the regiments. Also of interest are the detailed instructions for the setting up of a camp, with precise measurements regarding the distances between cabins and tents. There are also directives for the digging of a latrine (at least 200 feet in the rear) and that ‘it must be digged very deep’ as well as for constructing wells, and clear orders that the sale of beer and victuals must be contained within one area.

The ‘Compendium’ is a set of instructions covering the wide range of issues that affected and governed military life both on and off campaign just before the upheaval of the English Civil Wars. It must have influenced those who were subject to its regulations and thus, by inference, also affected the early organisation of the civil war armies. Henry Hexham, who later wrote three influential military instructional manuals,
admitted the debt he owed to both the Veres in military matters.\textsuperscript{134} Hexham was a long standing member of the Veres' military circle.\textsuperscript{135} He would certainly have been aware of Vere’s ‘Compendium’ and may even have had a hand in its composition. The first printed manual of arms in England, \textit{Instructions for Musters and Armes}, ordered by the Privy Council, was not available until 1623 and it owes some of its content to the ‘Compendium’ and to Horace Vere’s attempts to modernise and professionalise his troops.\textsuperscript{136} In particular both use the same set of orders for mustering and presenting weapons, the way in which troops are moved around and the set distances between ranks and files. This is unsurprising since Cecil, Vere and Edward Conway were 'influential in shaping military policy and went on to advocate the introduction of...[this]. drill manual'.\textsuperscript{137} Vere’s ‘Compendium’ is much longer than the 1623 Privy Council version and covers a wider range of subjects, being concerned not only with drill. The later 1631 Privy Council edition gives more information about how soldiers, especially musketeers and pikemen, should stand and includes a number of drawings to aid learning. David Lawrence does not mention the ‘Compendium’ in his otherwise excellent book but this may be simply because the ‘Compendium’ was never printed or published and may have been used exclusively by men in service in the Netherlands and it is in any case only fair to note that the ‘Compendium’ itself borrows from earlier Dutch works. Nevertheless its importance and relevance to the beginnings of English battlefield organisation is profound.

Military treatises had been produced in Roman times, 'over sixty-seven such works were issued in Venice between 1492 and 1570' whilst 'almost sixty' had been published in the Low Countries between 1567 and 1621 some of which were translated into English.\textsuperscript{138} David Lawrence states that between 1603 and 1645 'Englishmen penned over ninety books on military subjects’ and though not all of them were manuals the ‘Compendium’ was thus not unique, though its connection to the foremost English soldier of the age must increase its cachet.\textsuperscript{139} Francis Vere also had an interest
in military books and treatises and he donated a number of military (and other) tracts to Thomas Bodley’s new library at Oxford in the early years of the seventeenth century as his military career was coming to an end. It is not known how long these works had

134 Henry Hexham, A True and Historicall Relation of the Bloody battell of Nieuport in Flanders’ (Delff, 1641), dedication. 135 Lawrence The Complete Soldier, (2009), p.104. 136 Ibid., p. 137. 137 Ibid., p.15. 138 Lawrence, The Complete Soldier, p.7. 139 Lawrence, The Complete Soldier, p.1. 140 Bod. Lib, Bodleian Benefactors List, 44-46. Registrum Donatorum (the first volume of the Benefactors’ Registers covering 1600 -1688 at Library Records b. 903). Francis was one of the first donors in 1598, and followed his £100 present then with regular donations in the

been in Francis’s possession, though some of them were published at the start of his military career, but it is documented that Francis was a devotee of Caesar’s commentaries – which may be why he entitled his own military memories as he did. 141

Francis’s benefaction is not surprising, since Bodley had served as a diplomat in the Low Countries ‘during the period that [Francis] Vere was establishing his reputation’ and given Francis Vere’s donations it is clear that the two men were friends. 142 One may wonder why brother Horace, was not the recipient of this wealth of military knowledge, unless he too owned a similar collection. In any case Horace, who at the very least would have been aware of his brother’s library, may thus have been sufficiently influenced by Francis’s’ apparent interest in martial manuscripts to create, or cause to be created, his own version just a few years later.

Horace Vere’s ‘Compendium’ is clearly a response to the need for greater military discipline on the battlefield and elsewhere. It fits well within what was a growing library of military books engendered by the evolving use of firearms. 143

Other primary sources
Before his death in 1609 Francis Vere wrote a biographical account of the Dutch campaigns in which he fought between 1585 and 1604. Although not published until 1657 by William Dillingham *The Commentaries* give a detailed account of the Dutch wars, from Francis’s perspective, between 1585 and 1609. Francis mentions his younger brother Horace infrequently though approvingly, and describes military actions in which Horace took part which is helpful as a reference and comparator to other reports but he gives no biographical or character description. *The Commentaries* present a picture of Francis Vere as a brilliant and perceptive strategist whose ideas and plans were inevitably adopted by the leadership of the United Provinces. However, as Tracey Borman suggests, *The Commentaries* is at ‘best self-congratulatory and at worst so boastful as to be implausible’. 

Jan Janszn in his *Triumphs of Nassau*, written in 1613, paints a different picture regarding Francis’s contribution. In this book, translated into English via a French version, it is Maurice of Nassau who is credited with the principal military genius. The truth almost certainly lies somewhere between these two extremes. Janszn mentions Horace Vere in passing but the real value of his work for this present study, as with *The Commentaries*, is in giving contemporary accounts of the early conflicts in which Horace fought. These, together with other broader outlines of the various campaigns in...
which he was involved, help to give substance to Horace Vere’s early military background. However, both *The Commentaries* and the *Triumphs of Nassau* must be read cautiously and as part of a wider appreciation of the events they portray and the actions of those involved. Janszn’s description of the battle of Nieuwpoort however (see page 103) refers directly to Horace Vere’s important role and gives credit to him for his use of artillery and his leadership skills at a time of great difficulty. Janzen’s account, coming from a Dutch admirer of Maurice, adds weight to Horace Vere’s reputation as a good war commander.

For Horace Vere’s later career the work of Arthur Wilson is useful. Wilson was the earl of Essex’s secretary for several years, going on campaign with him including to the Palatinate in 1621 under Horace Vere’s command. Wilson’s *History of Great Britain, being the Life And Reign of King James The First*, was published in 1653, the year after Wilson’s death. An unfashionable historian now his *History* is devoid of references or other scholarly rigour but Wilson was nevertheless a contemporary of Vere and accompanied him to the Palatinate, writing extensively about that campaign. There has been little else written regarding this expedition but we do have a number of Horace Vere’s letters from that time and in actions mentioned by both men Wilson’s account appears to corroborate Vere’s version and is thus less questionable.

For any non-military biographical detail the first extant information comes from Thomas Fuller (1608 – 16 August 1661) an English churchman and historian. In his *Worthies of England*, published in 1662, Fuller says that both Vere brothers were born in Essex but suggests that several different places had been assigned by different authors as their place of birth. These are the family home at castle Hedingham in north-east Essex, four miles west of Halstead; Colchester and also Tilbury-juxta-Clare a village also in north-east Essex. When Horace was ennobled he took the title of...
Baron Vere of Tilbury which slender evidence may suggest that it was in Tilbury that he was born, since no record of his birth is now extant. Full 

Fuller tells us that Francis’s fiery spirit and rigid nature ‘did not over-value the price of men’s lives to purchase a victory’ whereas Horace had ‘more meekness and as much valour as his brother; so pious, that he first made peace with God before he went out to war with man’. It was said of him ‘what is said of the Caspian sea, that it doth neither ebb nor flow; observing a constant tenor, neither elated nor depressed with success’. Fuller also says that Horace was ‘loved by the soldiery’. As a contemporary of Vere Fuller was writing at a time when many people would have had personal knowledge of him and thus Fuller’s evaluation must be given serious consideration. Certainly Horace Vere’s popularity with his soldiers is well attested. A ‘biography of the noble families of Cavendishe, Holles, Vere, Harley, and others’ was printed in 1752. The work of Arthur Collins (1681-1760) it was written, in his own words, because of ‘an innate desire to preserve the memory of famous men.’ Collins seems to demonstrate ‘an adulation of birth and rank’, an affectation which comes across in his work, which must therefore be considered with caution. It contains some additional biographical detail about Horace and his brothers but again draws heavily on the (already suspect) Commentaries. It does provide background information about Horace Vere’s wider family but there is no new material about the man himself. Entries in Biographia Britannica give information about Horace relating to his military career but also, like Fuller, regarding his character and religious persona. This shows Horace Vere to have been respected and admired by his soldiers but the work provides little evidence for its assertions.

None of these works focus primarily upon Horace Vere but their contributions provide some useful material in the construction of a more detailed assessment of his
life. Much of that material finds its way into the The Fighting Veres, the only major work dedicated to the Veres. Published in 1888 and ostensibly devoted to both Sir Francis and Horace the book offers only a quarter of its 460 pages to the younger brother.\textsuperscript{154}

There is no serious attempt to examine their birth or early years and there are few supporting references, yet Clements Markham is frequently quoted in other works as the prime authority, probably because there is so little else to fall back upon.\textsuperscript{155}

Markham’s book itself draws heavily on The Commentaries, on Wilson and on the Biographia though he is sparing in his attributions. Markham is eulogistic in his uncritical acceptance of Francis Vere’s version of events whilst recognising the merit of the less self-aggrandising approach of Horace. Several successful military and political events described by Sir Francis in the commentaries as being uniquely attributable to him have been shown, by Dutch and other sources, to be at least questionable and in some cases clearly heavily embellished.\textsuperscript{156} Markham is also blatantly anti-Jacobean though he is an avowed supporter of the Protestant cause and his failure to recognise that relations between Francis Vere and the Dutch were not always cordial is a major flaw, especially as Horace was demonstrably able to keep on good terms with Maurice and later Dutch leaders.\textsuperscript{157} Markham’s considerable bias and his antipathy towards James I require the reader to weigh his words and ideas carefully.

More recently a number of PhDs have added to our knowledge and

\textsuperscript{149} The Essex record office holds all the parish registers for the county. There is a gap in the entries around this period. Tilbury Juxta Clare was part of the De Vere estate. Ecclesiastical records are equally barren. \textsuperscript{150} John Freeman (ed.), Thomas Fuller, The Worthies of England, pp.179 -180. \textsuperscript{151} Cecil R. Humphrey-Smith, ‘Collins, Arthur (1681/2 – 1760)’ ODNB, ( 2004). \textsuperscript{152} Arthur Collins, A Historical collection of the Noble families of Cavendishe, Holles, Vere, Harley, (London,1752). \textsuperscript{153} Biographica Britannica, Vol. 6,see n.18 p. 400 – 411. \textsuperscript{154} Markham, The Fighting Veres.
understanding of both the religious and military events of the period. Simon L. Adams unpublished D.Phil. thesis (1973) provides a valuable discussion of the influence of the religious revolution on English politics between the years 1585 – 1630 an almost exact match for Horace Vere’s life. At a time when the new Protestant religion was actively splitting into fresh variants, Adams work offers religious reasons as ‘the leading motive for English intervention on the continent.’ This certainly meshes well with Horace Vere’s clear religious motivation which Adams notes and emphasises. However he also shows that neither Elizabeth I, nor James I was particularly sympathetic to political Puritanism or to positive action in Europe in its defence. Indeed at the time of the Palatinate crisis the English clergy were specifically told not to preach the war as ‘one of religion.’ Nevertheless, Adams argues clearly that it was at this time that religion first became a major factor in European warfare and Horace Vere’s known piety, allied to his military reputation, argues strongly that for him the Palatine war was an important religious confrontation. Adams asserts that whilst zealots in England pressed for religious wars, they did not associate such action with political change (which in the main they, and Horace Vere, would have deplored) whereas Elizabeth and James ‘had a far greater sensitivity to the revolutionary potentialities of these aspirations’


Adams also sheds light upon the Puritan character of Horace and his ‘permanent feud’ with Edward Cecil over military and social advancement. These two aspects relate directly as Adams asserts that Vere’s patronage clearly favored those whose religious beliefs were aligned with his own. Which supports the proposal that Vere approached all military action from a religious perspective. Adams’ discussion of political Puritanism in the army is particularly helpful too as it concerns not only the
appointment of preachers to Vere’s and to other regiments, but also because it demonstrates that the army in the Low Countries, under Vere’s control, was able to protect ‘radical divines’ who had often been deprived of their livings in England.\textsuperscript{164} This military/religious independence persisted until the early 1630s when King Charles appears to have acceded to Archbishop Laud’s pressure and, with Vere’s death in 1635, the radical preachers lost the protection of the army and were dispersed, many seeking a fresh start in New England.\textsuperscript{165}

Also valuable in trying to determine the political and military role of Horace is David Trim’s work.\textsuperscript{166} This is because Trim discusses the character and political background of the British soldier in the European wars of the late 16\textsuperscript{th} and early 17\textsuperscript{th} Centuries. His references to Horace Vere are descriptive rather than analytical but he provides useful material regarding the overall position and status of English and other British troops in Europe at the time. The relationship of Vere, and other gentleman volunteers, to the English monarch, the States of Holland and the wars in general are well observed providing a soundly developed context to the early part of Horace Vere’s military career. Taken together with Francis Markham’s work on the nature and role of individual ranks within the Allied army [see p 24] it is an excellent appreciation of the role and expectation of such young gentleman generally as they served in the allied forces. The work of Adams and Trim complement and embellish each other in Vere’s respect and provide essential background to this present work.

David Trim also wrote the DNB article on Horace, but this is founded largely on \textit{The Commentaries; The Historical collection of the Noble families of Cavendishe, Holles, Vere, Harley (et al) and Markham}.\textsuperscript{167} The article also exposes the severe lack of extant early biographical detail for both Horace and Francis.

\textsuperscript{162} Cecil was the Grandson of Elizabeth’s great Minister Lord Burghley.  \textsuperscript{163}
In 1999 Dr. Trim also published a brief interpretation of five letters written by Horace Vere to Prince Henry via the Prince’s Secretary, Andrew Newton. Henry offered his patronage to Horace Vere as a way of obtaining first-hand accounts of the Cleves-Julich affair from the pre-eminent English general on the spot. The letters cover military and political concerns, and are useful in shedding light on these issues from the point of view of the senior English general on the spot. In particular these letters give strong evidence that Vere was not actively engaged in the conflict and thus indirectly confirm Vere’s pious approach to warfare. (see pp. 36, 143). However, Trim’s work concentrates mainly on Horace Vere’s military and diplomatic roles. He says little or nothing about Horace’s life away from the battlefields of both Europe and the Jacobean court or about his religious character though close examination of one of these letters can be interpreted as strong evidence of Vere’s religious belief. (see p.43)

Tracy Borman’s unpublished doctoral thesis concentrates on the life of Sir Francis Vere. It discusses in detail the causes and origins of the English involvement in the Dutch wars of liberation after the treaty of Nonsuch in 1585. Borman re-examines Francis Vere’s role in the conflict and is able to show that though Francis was clearly a competent and respected leader he was not the almost infallible and far sighted commander that his own commentaries (and Markham) would imply. In this Borman tends to support Jan Janzsen’s position. Borman sheds light on the political realities of the wider English involvement in the Dutch rebellion showing how relations between various court officials and favorites severely nuanced the political and financial aspects of Elizabeth 1’s policy towards both the Dutch and the Spanish. Overall Borman’s thesis provides an excellent framework to Horace Vere’s early military career though he plays a very minor role in Borman’s evaluation of the older brother.
A recent appraisal of the English relationship to the Thirty Years War is to be found in Adam Marks’ unpublished thesis of 2012. Marks’ asserts that there has been a ‘lack of any serious work on the English abroad during the early modern period’. This is a little disingenuous given David Trim’s work, but Marks does expand the discussion beyond the mere military and he sets out to refute the view held by some Historians that ‘few Englishmen chose foreign mercenary service as a means of migration.’ Complementing the work of Adams and Trim, if obliquely, Marks’ focus is on the wider involvement of the English in the European conflicts of the early Seventeenth Century. He notes, crucially, that Stuart political and military policy was inextricably linked to Elizabethan strategy, flowing from it rather than adopting any radical new stance. Elizabeth and James certainly shared an antipathy for expensive, dangerous and unpredictable diplomatic and military engagement in Europe, which was evidenced by their lack of continuous overt support for such adventures. Marks’ discussion of the Bohemian/Palatinate crisis covers the wider religious, financial and diplomatic issues well but scarcely mentions Horace or indeed any of the other major military figures involved though he is right to allude to the close relationship that Horace had developed with the Dutch leaders as being an important element in the structure and organization of the English forces serving the United Provinces, demonstrated by the ‘Compendium’. Marks recognizes Vere’s military skill and leadership whilst he was in the Palatinate stating that to hold the country ‘for so long was a significant military achievement’ which between 1620 and 1622 prevented Spinola from attacking the United Provinces directly thus giving the Dutch more time to meet the Spanish
challenge.\textsuperscript{175} This direct endorsement of Vere’s significance is almost unique but is clearly part of Marks’ overall view that English involvement in the continental struggle was both widespread and important.

Marks emphasises the importance and status of Horace Vere, as an English General in Dutch pay, when he relates that following Vere’s death in 1635 ‘the Dutch used this moment to re order some of the conditions on which English service was based’ despite the objections of the remaining English Colonels.\textsuperscript{176} Marks also stresses the importance of Vere and the English contingents both at the sieges of s’Hertogenbosch (1629) and Maastricht (1632). In both actions, where English losses were severe, Horace Vere commanded the English forces which bore the brunt of the attack and suffered the highest casualties. Clearly Vere, as the longstanding leader of the English troops in Dutch pay, knew and understood the nature of sieges from every perspective and those who flocked to serve under him did so because of his knowledge and ability in such circumstances. In particular at Maastricht, where ‘The victory was secured by an English assault’ Vere was the dominant commander, despite being in his late-sixties.\textsuperscript{177} This success in particular was a crucial English contribution to the Thirty Years War as it separated Westphalia from Brussels (the capital of the Spanish Netherlands).\textsuperscript{178} This is further evidence of the importance of Horace Vere (and his English troops) in helping to secure recognition of Dutch independence.

\textbf{Other Sources}

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., p. 104. \textsuperscript{176} Ibid., p. 85. \textsuperscript{177} Ibid., p. 83. \textsuperscript{178} Ibid., p. 83.
Seven years after Horace Vere’s death a collection of seventeen elegies in his memory were collected by R. Badger for Christopher Meredith, who published them in London and dedicated them to Lady Mary Vere, Horace’s widow. Some of these poetic appreciations may have been written before 1642, though as many of the elegists were still quite young in that year it is more likely that they were written in or just before the year of their publication. The elegies are interesting in their own right because of the light they shed on how Vere as a soldier, a champion of Protestantism and an important figure in early modern English military, religious and social history was seen by contemporaries. (see Chapter 5).

The website House of Vere.com contains information about the De Vere and Vere families. There is a short paper within the website which concentrates on Horace. However much of the information is not attributed and that which is comes mainly from The Commentaries of Sir Francis and from the Trim DNB article.

The Inns of Court are the four legal societies having the exclusive right of admitting people to the English bar. They were involved in drawing up some of the original legal agreements underpinning the financing, management and staffing of the Jamestown Settlement in the first decade of the Seventeenth Century. In particular the Middle Temple (one of the Inns) has a document approving the appointment of Sir Francis as an honorary bencher (that is a Barrister) in 1603 at the same time as Sir John Frobisher and Sir Francis Drake, both of whom were involved in the English settlements in America. Horace became a part of the Jamestown project in 1609, when he inherited his brother's interest but there is no record of him in MT records.

C.V Wedgewood gives an excellent, if dated, narrative background to the Thirty Years War in her eponymous 1938 book. Balanced, inclusive, self-assured, even patronising at times Wedgwood lays out this complicated and often confusing conflict in an accessible way. Her references to Horace are few and are in no way sufficiently analytical, but Wedgwood’s integrity and balanced approach, supported by other
writers, contrasts greatly with Clement Markham’s and thus whatever she does say can be treated with much less caution. Wedgewood provides context to Horace Vere’s latter military career despite failing to recognise Horace Vere’s contribution in delaying the advance and deployment of Spanish and Imperial troops against the Dutch.

Geoffrey Parker’s analysis of the logistical and economic issues that affected the Spanish attempt to retain, and then subsequently to recover, its lost Dutch provinces in the one hundred years after 1567 highlight the immense difficulties that the Spanish had in moving troops effectively to the Low countries. Parker shows in particular that all of the combatants in this conflict found finances to be the single biggest obstacle in attempting to achieve their military and political aims. This is a frequently corroborated fact in Horace Vere’s letters from the Palatinate wherein he describes the effects of a severe lack of funding for his troops, which Parker’s work contextualises. Even Spain, the richest and most powerful state of the day had to declare itself bankrupt more than once and was frequently plagued by mutinous troops demanding pay that was often months if not years overdue. Time and again, the temporary bankruptcy of the Spanish Crown and the concomitant subsequent difficulties in raising fresh loans caused the failure of its military operations whilst the Dutch, by acquiring collective responsibility for war loans, secured against future taxes and high rates of interest, had little difficulty in securing credits both from domestic and
international investors.\textsuperscript{185}

After the English troops came under Dutch control in 1598 they benefitted greatly from this regularity of pay. Yet in the Palatinate 23 years later, now acting directly for the English crown, Vere’s troops were constantly in arrears of pay which in itself caused considerable difficulties for Vere. (see pages 168-170). Both Elizabeth and James faced similar problems to the Spanish crown and both were reluctant to use their comparatively meagre resources to support their troops.\textsuperscript{186}

A more recent publication, ‘The Thirty Years War; Europe’s Tragedy by Peter Wilson re-examines the conflict from a historical context, setting the loss of life and devastation the war caused in central Europe alongside the Holocaust in its comparative scale and contemporary effect.\textsuperscript{187} Wilson’s holocaustic descriptions are buttressed and supported by Horace Vere’s letters which frequently refer to the devastation and destruction of the conflict. But Wilson’s discussions of the strategic


...and tactical manoeuvrings in the early years of the war barely mention Horace or his importance in holding up the Spanish for nearly two years and at one point he mistakes Horace’s rank.\textsuperscript{188} However, the book does give an excellent overview of the war and thus helps to contextualise Horace’s role.

David Lawrence’s The Complete Soldier examines the military culture of the reigns of the first two Stuarts.\textsuperscript{189} It also presents and discusses the military writing of the era though fails to mention Horace’s drill manual, possibly because Horace’s
work was not published. However, Horace and Francis Vere are mentioned as influential and competent military commanders, Horace especially as ‘the patron to a generation of soldiers, many who were to become significant figures in the English Civil War’. Lawrence attributes Horace Vere’s enduring influence to his longevity and his friendship with the United Provinces ruling Nassau family. But whilst Lawrence, understandably given his focus, makes no mention of Horace Vere’s religious motivation it is clear that this was a major, possibly the major influence upon Horace. Given his ability to successfully ride the political vicissitudes of the day and remain in good standing with both the Dutch and three successive English courts it is even more notable that throughout his ascendancy he never compromised his religious beliefs. Nowhere is this better evidenced than in his choice and prolonged patronage of radical divines – clergymen whose livelihood and personal freedom was often under threat from both the established Church of England and frequently the King. Before turning to Vere’s military career therefore it is important to examine his selection and sponsorship of these men both in the United Provinces and at home in England. This will help determine Horace Vere’s religious persona, provide a backdrop to his military career and help to explain his actions.

188 Wilson, *Europe’s Tragedy*, p. 332. 189
2. Circles of Divinity

The purpose of this chapter is simply to try to establish what Horace Vere’s doctrinal position was, what did he actually believe, at least for the second, more public part of his life? This is important because Vere’s religious stance helped determine his actions which in turn influenced and affected many others. In Horace’s case, the term Holy Warrior sums up, in just two words, the major loci of his life

Even in a more religiously nuanced age Horace Vere, together with his equally devout wife Mary, was regarded by his contemporaries as particularly pious. Letters, dedications, poetic appreciation and elegies, written both before and after his death, attest to this fact. But in an age when religion was undergoing considerable change, and new variants of the Protestant faith were emerging, the definition of piety, at least at the point of observation, became both confused and contentious. As Nicholas Tyacke proposes, ‘In Elizabethan and early Stuart England religion bulked large’ and toleration of religious diversity was not only rare, but could be dangerous as Puritans, Calvinists and later, Arminians, competed for authority in the English church and state. Understanding Horace Vere’s doctrinal position will thus help us to understand his character and his reaction to life events.

Background

Horace Vere grew up in the embryonic Protestant environment of Elizabethan England. He was the grandnephew of John De Vere, the 16th Earl of Oxford, who had supported Mary Tudor in her accession to the throne in 1553. John subsequently assisted in the prosecution, and execution, of a number of men and women suspected of heresy against the Catholic church. However, following John’s death, the Earldom passed to his only son, Edward, the 17th Earl, who was Horace Vere’s first cousin once removed. Edward, then just 12 years old, was raised as a Protestant, firstly, in the
household of William Cecil, Elizabeth’s secretary of State, and subsequently in the household of Sir Thomas Smith, an early convert to Protestantism, who had been prominent at the court of Edward 6th, whom he served as Secretary of State. He was a friend of Cecil, and though a Protestant he seems to have favoured moderation in religion. This dichotomy of religious background within the De Vere family may have been finally settled, pragmatically, with the long Protestant reign of Elizabeth. During


Horace’s early years, the threat of a Catholic resurgence, epitomised by the living presence of Mary Queen of Scots, (executed in 1587) was ever present, but the defeat of the Armada in 1588 must have boosted the confidence of English Protestants, and the belief that theirs was the true religion. Horace’s early environment was likely to have lead him towards one or another of the Protestant streams, though we have no direct evidence as to just what his religious influences might have been at the time. Had he been born a Catholic, he may have taken that older, more doctrinally established, route to what he saw as salvation, and that may have made it easier to understand his true religious feelings. As a Protestant, it is more difficult to get a clear-cut picture of exactly what his spiritual beliefs were, especially given the fluidity of Protestant religious thought at the time. And although Horace left over 130 letters, he at no point, in any of them, gives a specific indication of his religious principles. There are only a few occasions in his letters when he touches upon religion and belief and these are all, with just one exception, simply when in closing, Horace requests God’s blessing, or approval, upon the recipient of the communication. The single exception
appears in a letter Horace wrote to William Trumbull, who was from 1605 to 1625 secretary to the royal envoy, and then the envoy to the Brussels court of Archduke Albert of Austria, joint ruler of the Habsburg Netherlands between 1598 and 1621 with his wife Isabella Clara Eugenia, daughter of Phillip II of Spain.  

Vere’s communication, which is largely a military report, was written on 16 Nov 1621 from the Palatinate. Horace ends this letter by saying that he knows nothing of events in England, and that he hopes for news of a truce in the Palatinate soon ‘which I beseech God may be for the good of his church and the upbringing of his majesties children’. [Vere is referring here to The King of Bohemia]. This is the closest expression we have of any direct recognition of such sympathies on Vere’s part, in this case ostensibly supporting the Calvinist doctrine of Frederick, the Elector Palatine and deposed King of Bohemia. Thus, without any first hand evidence, the strongest contemporary, if circumstantial, indication of Vere’s religious beliefs comes from a range of other sources. These include Vere’s sponsorship of preachers; written dedications; and his family and friendship group. Poetic acclaim he received both before and after his death is discussed in chapter 5.  

We do not know if Horace Vere’s religious belief came to him fully formed, in some moment of revelation, or if, having been born into a Protestant family, he grew into his adult convictions both psychologically and emotionally. It is certainly true that, at this time, many young men of his class set out for Europe, as he did, to fight for their religion. Other young men, seeking adventure, fame, fortune or simply escape from problems at home volunteered for different reasons. We do not know the exact
nature of Horace’s religious philosophy in 1590, when he joined his brothers in the United Provinces, though he must have had some Catholic antipathy. But by the time he had risen, in 1607, to command large numbers of men, his religious standpoint is more discernible, as contemporaries, through their written work, both directly and indirectly, begin to give an increasingly sharper focus to Vere’s spiritual beliefs. Certainly by the early 1620s he was noted for his piety and the religious values he encouraged in his family.\textsuperscript{198}

Personal feelings, empathies, and the effects of life events are not fixed or constant now, nor were they in the past. So we cannot assume that the written words of anyone, at any given time, and which we can only interpret subjectively, necessarily reflect the actuality then, before or later. Margaret Griffin rightly emphasises the difficulty any historian faces in examining ‘evidence’ from the past, ‘consciously or unconsciously, historians frequently fit their methodologies to their own preconceived teleological purposes’.\textsuperscript{199} Thus, attempting to fit Horace Vere into one particular theology is beset with difficulties, especially given the uncertain provenance of his early years, and the fact that many of the English men and women who influenced Horace spent much of their lives, like he did, in the spiritual climate of the United Provinces.

It is not the intention of this thesis to try to ally Vere to any specific brand of Protestantism Puritanism or Calvinism, the more especially since such definitions have changed over time, and many noted historians have themselves explored and described the difficulties of such definition. In addition there were clearly degrees of Puritanism, including those who rejected the book of common prayer, those who rejected certain church ceremonies such as baptism and the wearing of the white surplice and those who saw Bishops as the epitome of the antichrist.\textsuperscript{200}

However I will define Horace Vere as a Puritan for the purpose of this Thesis, even though there is no instance of anyone calling him a Puritan (or a Calvinist), or indeed anything else, though belief was central to his life and influenced his behaviour.
However that definition itself requires explanation which this chapter is intended to provide. However, such labels are not always helpful given the definitional difficulties they present both then and now especially since the evidence we do have about Vere’s religious views, his doctrinal stance if you will, is indirect and circumstantial. Fortunately, the sheer volume of this evidence, recorded across the reasonable time frame of more than thirty years, buttresses the credibility of the conclusions that are reached, without needing to assign him precisely to any particular religious group.\(^{201}\) This is important, given the considerable disagreements, even during Vere’s lifetime, about the religious definition of a Puritan or a Calvinist. Indeed, contemporaries argued that their meaning and characterisation changed as the early years of the Seventeenth Century progressed.\(^{202}\) As Nicholas Tyack puts it ‘To some extent Puritanism has always existed in the eye of the beholder.’\(^{203}\) Whilst Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales declare that ‘Nor is it possible to draw a straight and unbroken line between Puritans and non-Puritans’ [amongst Protestants]. Durston and Eales also argue that the dynamics of Calvinism, as an essentially oppositional movement, ‘gives it a fluidity unsuited to precise definition.’

By placing the emphasis on individual faith rather than on the collective autocracy of the Catholic religion, Protestants came to see religious practice as a matter of personal conviction.\(^{204}\) Fractionalism was thus inevitable. Patrick Collinson’s opinion that time, place and circumstance inevitably determine religious classification,
essentially supports and sums up this view. To which may be added G.E. Aylmer’s opinion that Puritanism was essentially a state of mind.

Some historians have argued that Puritanism can be equated with a belief in the doctrine of predestination, but others have expressed serious reservations about this view. Predestination may be claimed as one of the central principles of ‘Calvinism’ but, as Menna Prestwich and Patrick Collinson argue, it was Calvin’s successor, Theodore de Bèza, who ‘emphasised the doctrine of double predestination and made it the core of reformed [Calvinist] orthodoxy’ This is a claim supported by Richard Stauffer who, whilst acknowledging that the concept occupies ‘no negligible place’ in Calvin’s thought, argues that it is not the central tenet of Calvin’s writings. Double predestination implies both God’s forgiveness of original sin, and election [to a guaranteed place in heaven] as a sign of God’s favour, but Calvin did not ‘give priority to any particular doctrine’ because he saw all scripture as an equal truth. Patrick Collinson however, argues that because mainstream English non-conformists were tolerant, or at least accepting of bishops, whereas their European counterpart churches were not, English Puritans had an essential difference per se. He cites the opposition of Archbishop Whitgift to Puritanism whilst ‘express[ing] ...regard for Calvin’ But

---


even Collinson admits that 'the extent to which English Protestantism in the age of its maturity can be properly called Calvinist is one of some delicacy and difficulty.' He goes on to say that by the turn of the Sixteenth/Seventeenth Century, non-conformism was a broad and loose alliance of many different thoughts and ideas, located in several countries of Western Europe, all sporting subtle and not so subtle variations on the Calvinist theme, with the Church of England occupying a 'floating anchorage within the Calvinist sphere, not necessarily agreeing or complying with all of the doctrinal 'truths' held elsewhere, and occasionally moving to a new, if not distant, anchorage as new helmsmen were appointed'.

Thus English Puritan theology varied with time, place and personality. Nevertheless, despite this difficulty of definition, 'militant Protestants believed that the true Church knew no boundaries: an internationalist perspective that imbued within its adherents the belief that Protestants everywhere needed to protect one another, to take up arms in each other’s defence and to attack their common enemies.' Which is exactly what Horace Vere set out to do in 1590. Whatever his precise motives were at the time, this was an early indication of his desire to aid his Dutch co-religionists.

So within this complex, changing and sometimes dangerous environment, how can we get closer to Horace’s real religious stance? We know that he allowed his regimental preachers to depart from using the authorised prayer book, and to conduct services in line with non-conformist orthodoxy, whilst other commanders, like Edward Cecil, had always conformed. We know too that the absolute keystone of the non-conformist church was the preacher, whose status and position was paramount, and the importance of these men to Horace Vere, when on campaign or in garrison, is

---

clear. Thus, in Horace’s ‘Compendium of the Art of War’, when he regulates the layout of the camp [Fig 1], the preacher is placed in the centre and tops the list of those who are also positioned there. These others are the Sergeant Provost, the quartermaster and the wagon men. Together supplying food and discipline for the body and the soul.

Fig 1 Typical Plan of the Layout of an Army camp as prescribed by Horace Vere. 1612

We also know that Horace and Mary sponsored other Puritan divines at home, both in the Netherlands and in England. So, whilst we can never know precisely what Horace’s
views were [and of course they may have changed, subtly, over time] these actions and the views of his contemporaries, friends and family must supply some compelling clues. The Veres were part of a complex web of sponsorship and religious and familial linkages, towards if not at the very top, of contemporary society and fortunately, unlike Horace, many of those in this circle of divinity left forthright declarations of their doctrinal belief. These, taken together, constitute persuasive and convincing evidence of Vere’s religious principles.

This evidence may usefully be divided into three groups. Firstly, we have ample evidence of Horace’s appointment and sponsorship of preachers, both to his troops and at home. These were men whose views are established through their printed sermons, and other writings, and the views of those who in turn opposed or supported them; secondly, there are the numerous books, sermons and other publications that were dedicated to Horace and Mary; and finally, we have the known religious attitudes of Horace’s friends and family, derived from their written works and letters. All of which leads to an efficient and sufficient conclusion which is beyond reasonable doubt.

**Patronage**

Horace and Mary Vere were notable patrons and employers of preachers. A practice which began as Horace rose to a senior command position. Until he took command of his own company in 1595, Horace would not have had the authority to appoint anyone, other than a personal clergyman. All companies and regiments of soldiers would have had, as they do today, a chaplain or preacher as an integral part of the unit. His job was both to preach the word of God to the troops and to act as a source of spiritual, moral and personal guidance for the common soldiers, as well as for their commanders.

\(^{216}\) NA, SP9/202/1, ‘A compendium of the Art of War’, p.32.
for whom the preacher was also often a personal or family chaplain. Although it is likely
that the religious views of these men played an important part in some commanders’
decisions to employ them, other influences must have been important. Whilst paying lip
service to religious observance in a much more overtly faith-laden age, commanders
would have varied in their insistence upon the particular doctrine of their preachers,
though accommodating powerful patrons at home must have become irresistible at
times.

Another factor was pay. At this time, it was rare indeed for troops to be paid on
time and in full, so appointing an extranumerary, non-combative, preacher was almost a
luxury.\footnote{On the constant lack of funds see NA SP84/74/ letters to Sir Dudley Carleton on 16th, (f52) and 18th (f65) May and to Sir Francis
Nethersole 11th (f152) June 1621, and also on the 18th (f103) May 1621, and to Secretary Calvert
on 16th (f155) June 1621 and on 23 (f85) May 1621. Spanish troops were also often without pay,
see Parker, The Army of Flanders pp.133 -156.}

But many of the available preachers came from a group that had been

\footnote{Not constituted as part of the army establishment till 1796 the RAC\textsc{hD}'s motto is 'In this Sign
Conquer' referring to the cross seen in the sky before the Battle of the Milvian Bridge by the Roman
Emperor Constantine Ist in 312 AD. The motto is part of the chaplains headdress badge and British
chaplains claim an ancestry back to this battle. https://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30103483.}
driven out of their livings in England because their unbending doctrinal position had

become untenable at home following the1604 Hampton Court Conference. This three
day meeting did not lead to the decisive Puritan success that some had hoped for. In fact,
the anti-Calvinist position was comprehensively aired there for the first time.\footnote{King James attempted to ensure an irenic outcome, seeing a differentiation between
moderate and radical non-conformists, and generally seeking uniformity and inclusivity,
providing his own position was not challenged, directly or indirectly. But despite the
King's attempts to find an acceptable conformity, there were many clerics whose views
were still seen as too extreme, and who were soon afterwards forced out of their}

51
livings. Unable to find employment at home, many of these men went to the Low Countries where their religious views found a more agreeable reception. Thus, these men could be employed cheaply. As Keith Sprunger puts it ‘The company of early seventeenth century religious exiles in Holland reads like an honor roll of radical Puritanism’. For Horace Vere, it seems likely that he would have had a clear idea of exactly what sort of divine he wanted to preach to his troops. He had a wide choice but the first of these preachers that we can identify was John Paget.

Horace Vere, and his colleague in arms Sir John Ogle, employed Paget as a chaplain, just after he arrived in the Netherlands, early in 1605. Paget was a young preacher who had developed his non-conformist ideas and skills at the Calvinist breeding ground of Trinity College Cambridge in the last years of the sixteenth century. Here, he came under the influence of Thomas Cartwright’s controversial legacy. In 1569, Cartwright had been appointed Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and though he had been forced out of the post in 1570 by John Whitgift who was then Vice Chancellor, Cartwright had left a strong Puritan heritage. He espoused reformed presbyteries and a much looser form of church government, with local congregations assuming almost all supervisory roles, but he never embraced the separation of state and church. Nevertheless it was exactly this sort of quasi-separatist dilution of power that found ill-favour with King James, who saw it as the first step towards a challenge to his own authority. After getting his MA at Trinity College, Paget had become rector of Nantwich in 1598, but in January 1605 he was ejected from this living for his non-conformity following the Hampton Court Conference and, like many others in a similar position, Paget migrated to the more welcoming religious milieu of the United Provinces. Horace Vere must have been aware of Paget’s notoriety at home but he still employed the man at what was a critical time. Francis Vere was in the process of

leaving his post as head of the English forces and Horace was one of the contenders for the position.

When Horace returned to England in 1607 (to marry Mary), Paget left his regimental duties to become the ‘founding pastor’ of the English reformed church in Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{224} He held this position for over thirty years. John Paget refused to use the English prayer book, and he opposed the established Church of England’s ceremonialism too, but Paget also opposed the separatist movement and made efforts to reduce the growing sectarianism amongst the English churches in the Netherlands. He wrote a number of books opposing separation, and justifying the presbyterian approach. In 1618, for example, he wrote \textit{An arrow against the separation of the Brownists}, opposing the separatist ideology of the group named after the dissenter Robert Brown, who, like Paget, had been influenced in his nonconformity by Thomas Cartwright at Cambridge.\textsuperscript{225}

Paget’s non-separatist view must have chimed well with Horace, if only because as a prominent soldier, not wanting to antagonise the King, it is hard to see how a man otherwise known to be as pious as Vere would have continued to sponsor and employ him.

At about the same time that Paget joined Vere’s troops, Dr John Burgess arrived in the United Provinces where he preached regularly at the Hague and became attached to Vere’s regiment.\textsuperscript{226} In three of his later letters from the Palatinate, Horace Vere, uniquely, gives prodigious praise and recommendation to Burgess, who like Paget was seen by the church at home in England as a religious controversialist.\textsuperscript{227} Burgess had been imprisoned briefly by King James in 1604 for his religious views following the Hampton Court conference.\textsuperscript{228} He was then reprimanded by the Bishop of London, Richard Bancroft, for his failure to subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of the established church.\textsuperscript{229}
On his appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury in August 1583, John Whitgift had utilised these thirty-nine articles in an attempt to bring into line nonconformists who were unwilling to follow the doctrine of the Elizabethan Church of England. Whitgift had gained a reputation as a man who had no love of the Puritans even before his appointment by Elizabeth. He used, in particular, three of the articles to attack and essentially trap recalcitrant clergy. If they subscribed, then they could be turned out of their living for not carrying out their ministry as the articles prescribed. If they failed to subscribe then the same fate awaited them. These three articles read as follows: -

‘That her Majesty, under God, hath, and ought to have, the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within her realms....either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be. That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering bishops, priests and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God....and that he himself will use the form of the said book prescribed in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, and none other. That he alloweth the book of Articles, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God 1562....and that he believeth all the Articles therein contained to be agreeable to the word of God.’

Although soon released from imprisonment, Burgess was, because of his failure to conform to the articles, deprived of his living on January 16th 1605. Archbishop
Bancroft also made efforts to suppress religious dissent abroad, writing to Ralph Winwood in February 1605 about 'many dangerous books and Pamphlets in English' and asking him to ‘deal with the States, not only for the stay of the said books In Amsterdam, but likewise for the supressing and restraining of all such English Books.'\(^{232}\) When Bancroft died in late 1610, ‘only a handful of dioceses had not lost clergy through deprivation, most for inconformity and most in the southern province.'\(^{233}\) After the first year however, Quintrell suggests that the rate of deprivation slowed, as James took less interest in the matter, and in any case the bishops varied greatly in their enforcement.\(^{234}\) But Burgess' failure to conform set him at the more extreme end of the Puritan spectrum, which in turn indicates Horace Vere's own predilection; especially given the highly supportive letters he later wrote to Carleton praising Burgess.\(^{235}\) Nevertheless, despite the King's irenic focus, James did not forgive Burgess.\(^{236}\) Nine years later, in 1613, the King was still angry enough to ban him from preaching in London.\(^{237}\) Yet Horace Vere, whose letters seldom betray his precise views, employed him twice, and is almost ebullient in his praise of 'The Good Dr. Burgess', whom he must have known had upset both the King and more than one bishop. Despite Vere's diplomatic and interpersonal nous he was clearly unwilling to compromise his religious beliefs. In 1611 Burgess had qualified MD at Leiden University, just a few miles from the Hague, writing a still extant thesis on Cholera.\(^{238}\) The role of an army preacher, at
least whilst the soldiers were not in the field, was not especially onerous, consisting of
an evening prayer and a sermon of indeterminate length which was not compulsory for the
men.\textsuperscript{239} Thus divines like Burgess would have had plenty of time for writing and
other study.

Shortly after Burgess qualified at Leiden, the Veres, Ralph Winwood and other
prominent patrons including the Countess of Bedford [Lucy Russell, née Harington],
obtained a licence for him to preach in England again and in 1612 Burgess was
practicing as a medical Doctor in London where he successfully treated Russell. Lucy
Russell was a devout Calvinist and sponsored several Calvinist poets and writers. She
was also a noted patron of the arts, frequently appearing in court masques, which is rather
at odds with a Calvinist outlook.\textsuperscript{240} But as a confidante of Queen Anne, she had
considerable influence. Ralph Winwood too was a prominent figure at the time. He was
a convinced and confident Calvinist, writing in his will of Christ's death being ‘sufficient
for the sins of the whole world and efficient for his elect, in the number of whom I am
one by his mere grace’ \textsuperscript{241}

Mary Vere and Elizabeth Winwood (nee Ball) were also close friends, having
met when Mary went to the Low Countries with her new husband Horace in 1607.
Elizabeth Winwood had married Ralph in 1603, which is when he became the English
resident at the Hague. Of the close friendship of Mary and Elisabeth, John Chamberlain
wrote ‘for these three ladies must not stirre one without the other’.\textsuperscript{242} The
third Lady was Alice Burlacy (nee Ravis), the wife of Sir John Burlacy, who was Vere’s
deputy.\textsuperscript{243} Later, back in England when Mary was expecting her fourth daughter, Anne,
at home in Chiswick, Chamberlain wrote that ‘Lady Winwood was there two or three
days the last weeke at her labor.’\textsuperscript{244}

\textsuperscript{238} Elizabeth Allen, ‘Burgess, John (1563-1635)’, ODNB, (2004). \textsuperscript{239} Sprunger, The Learned Doctor
\textit{Ames}, p. 35. \textsuperscript{240} Norman E McClure,(ed ), ‘The letters of John Chamberlain’,Vol.2, APS,
(Philadelphia,1939), Chamberlain to Carleton, 22 Feb. 1617, p. 54. \textsuperscript{241} Tyacke, \textit{Anti-Calvinists, The

Significantly too Ralph Winwood was a friend of George Abbot, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in March 1611. They had been students together at Oxford.245 Such a powerful connection was, it seems, sufficient to overcome even the antagonism of the King as long as Burgess did not preach in London and in the end Burgess returned home to conform sufficiently to be given a post at Lichfield Cathedral. He returned to Vere for just one year between July 1620 and July 1621 and clearly made a good impression. In July 1621 Vere wrote to Dudley Carleton, then Ambassador to The Hague, about ‘...the departure of this worthy man’ who ‘hath taken great pains among us. I hope with him good success, many of us being much troubled for his departure. His own virtue and words do sufficiently recommend him to your honour. You cannot bestow your favours upon a person that will better deserve them.’246 Burgess died in 1635.

Along with Sir Dudley Carleton, Winwood was a close friend of Vere. All three were frequent correspondents and it must be the case that Burgess was discussed between them and that the religious views of all three overlapped.247 That said, Carleton was the cousin of the Calvinist Bishop, George Carleton, who was one of the English representatives at the Synod of Dort, a national council that took place in 1618-1619 in the town of Dordrecht in the Netherlands.248 This council was called to settle an issue that had just been brought up in the Dutch churches, concerning the spread of Arminianism. After Jacob Arminius died, his followers objected to the teachings of John Calvin and Theodore Beza. These Arminians published their problems with Calvinism in a paper called The Remonstrance of 1610 which taught that salvation was possible for all who would have faith, together with the equal danger of not gaining such grace.
The supporters of the ideas listed in this document were called Remonstrants. Those who followed the teachings of John Calvin, holding to a predestinarian doctrine, became known as Contra-Remonstrants.

Following the departure of Burgess in 1611, Horace employed William Ames as his army preacher. Ames, born in Ipswich in 1576, came from significant Suffolk stock. He was the son of a merchant who had married into another commercial family, but William and his sister Elizabeth were still quite young when both their parents died. The two orphans were brought up by their mother’s brother, likewise a prosperous merchant, at nearby Boxford, also in Essex. The family home of the Veres, at Castle Hedingham, is about 13 miles from Boxford, and it is probable that the Veres, though occupying a much higher station in life than the Ames family, would have been aware of the families, especially if they shared a common non-conformist belief. The town of Boxford itself was, at that time, something of a non-conformist stronghold and it is not unreasonable to suggest that Elizabeth and William’s uncle, Mr Snelling, was of that persuasion too. Certainly it was here that young William was moulded, by his own admission, into a Puritan nonconformist life.

This conviction was reinforced and hardened whilst the young Ames was at Christ’s College Cambridge (1593/4 – 1610), then a stronghold of non-conformity, and in particular by William Perkins, a fellow of the college. Ames later wrote that Perkins ‘stirred them up effectually to seeke after Godliness... that they might promote true religion’.
taking with him a number of other young men.\textsuperscript{255} Ames was particularly opposed to Sunday games, and what he saw as holiday frivolity, but in 1609/10, a new College master, Valentine Carey, later Bishop of Exeter, was appointed.\textsuperscript{256} Carey, under instruction to restore religious conformity, pushed Ames to extremes in his preaching and teaching, and in January 1610 Ames left the college following severe censure from the Vice Chancellor’s Court which stopped just short of expulsion. The official record of the condemnation states that Ames was suspended from all teaching and from all degrees which had been, or might be, awarded. This penalty was ostensibly given for Ames’ equating card playing with abusing ‘the word or sacraments.’ Ames left the University and the college voluntarily, but was clearly not welcome there.\textsuperscript{257}

Falling foul of George Abbot, then bishop of London, Ames could not secure a position at home, so in 1610/11 he went to the Netherlands. Ames joined Vere in 1611, at the latter’s invitation, and stayed with him until 1619. He simultaneously acted as Minister to the small, expatriate, non-conformist English community in The Hague and as spiritual counsellor to the Vere family in succession to John Burgess. It was during this period of attachment that Ames married Elizabeth, a daughter of Burgess, though she died, certainly before 1618, and Ames remarried.\textsuperscript{258}
The place of the Protestant preacher or chaplain within the army had not been clearly established until 1586 when Leicester went to the United Provinces, and it appears that the use of the Church of England prayer book there was a gradual imposition. However during his time with Vere’s regiment Ames used this prayer book selectively, often improvising and preaching his own message now that he was free from the restraints, as he saw them, of the liturgy and sanction of the English Church hierarchy. Horace must have been happy with what Ames was doing and saying, since Ames’ entire ministry and employment rested firmly upon Vere’s authority, so we must conclude that the two men were pretty much united doctrinally.

This affinity is further enhanced because at the same time as his ministry to Vere and his troops, Ames also published, in 1611, a highly inflammatory book entitled *Puritanismus Anglicanus*. Co-authored with William Bradshaw the main point of the tome was that no congregation should be subject to any ecclesiastical jurisdiction ‘save that which is within itself.’ This was a direct refutation of the authority of Bishops, and argued the need for a form of independency or semi-separation. Under this system, members of the congregation could delegate their powers to pastors and elders, retaining that of excommunication, but with no clergyman holding civil office.

This was inflammatory stuff and Archbishop George Abbot, unsurprisingly, wanted Ames ‘punished and removed’ which he made clear in a letter to his old University friend Ralph Winwood, then Ambassador to the United Provinces, on the 12th March 1611. Archbishop Abbot was consecrated to the see of Canterbury on 4th March 1611, so he must have felt strongly about Ames, because he wrote the letter to Winwood just eight days later. His letter describes Ames as having ‘laden the Church and State of England with a great deal of infamous contumely’; so that if he were here among us he would be so far from receiving Preferment, that some exemplary punishment would be his reward’. Abbot tells Winwood that he has written to Vere, asking that Ames be removed from his post, hints that Royal displeasure may have been incurred, and asks Winwood to assist in removing Ames ‘as privately and
cleanly... as the matter will permit.' Abbot even hints that he hopes to find what he calls a 'remedy' for other radical English preachers in 'Zealand.'

But Horace Vere's patronage and support (no doubt with Winwood's help) was, at this time, enough to resist or reassure, the Archbishop, and this again points strongly toward an affinity of Horace's views with those of Ames. It also demonstrates the relative freedom from supervision that English preachers in the United Provinces enjoyed at this time, as well as the real authority of Vere. As Keith Sprunger writes in his biography of Ames, 'In spite of pressure from the English Government to remove Ames, Sir Horace kept Ames with him several years. To the Puritans Sir Horace in those years could be counted upon as an ally who would 'as well wrestle with God, as fight with men.' Also, Horace was well known and well-liked by Maurice of Nassau, the effective ruler of the Netherlands, and an ardent Calvinist. The support of Maurice, even if only tacit would have been beneficial to Horace in resisting pressure from England.

However, in the longer term, Ames' pen proved mightier than Vere's sword. Despite some abatement of Ames's strident opposition to the English church hierarchy a succession of anti-Arminian and pro-Calvinist tracts appeared under Ames' authorship. Growing pressure from England, which by now included direct opposition from King James, finally prevailed, and in 1619 Ames had to leave his regimental post.
It seems that Ames’ success as an outspoken supporter of the Calvinist line at the synod of Dort, led him to apply for a professorship at Leiden. In doing so Ames crossed a line with King James, who opposed the appointment and exerted pressure via Carleton, on the Dutch, to deny Ames the post. Thus drawing royal attention upon himself, the pressure upon his position increased and he was forced to step down as Vere’s chaplain. It may, of course, just be possible that Ames’s strident and oft declared opposition to Bishops, and by inference, church and maybe royal authority, finally pushed Horace towards a stance he was unable, or unwilling, to support. So Ames may well have been sacked, as Dudley Carleton suggests in his letter to Sir Robert Naunton,

‘Our usual preacher here Mr Ayme is suspended by Sir Horace Vere and is now gone to LEYDEN, where he sues to be received as professor... But unless he can as well clear himself of that, which is now laid to his charge, I have laid a block in his way, having desired one of the new curators of that university not to admit any of his majesty's subjects to those public places, without foreknowledge of his majesty's pleasure’.  

Ames did not get the Job and Horace may thus have been forced to dismiss him, though his leaving might have been by mutual agreement. Ironically it was at about this time that “Vere’s regiment abandoned the C of E prayer book”

Ames had opposed the Arminian faction at Dort and in particular, their belief in free will and the possibility of earthly redemption. He strongly supported the strict
Calvinist line of Predestination, as many of his articles and books firmly assert. At Dort, the rigid Calvinists gained the ascendancy, and Ames' well known, even outspoken, backing for their cause gained him support. It is then a little curious that Ames fell afoul of James, who had seemed to endorse the Calvinist victory at the Synod. Indeed, James had caused to be published, also in 1619, *A Meditation upon the Lord's prayer* in which the King specifically attacked what he saw as the 'errors of Arminianism'. However, in the same publication, James also attacked what he called the 'extremitie of some Puritans' – focusing particularly upon their anti-Episcopalian stance. This must have been the first stirring of what later became a 'second thought' by James about the denunciation of Arminianism at Dort. Certainly, within three years, he was backtracking to the extent that he banned all popular preaching about predestination and other, central, Calvinist doctrines.

James' *Basilikon Doron*, his instructions to Prince Henry about how to be a King, made it clear that he saw the Church of England as 'filling the Space between Rome and Geneva’ between the pride and error of popery and the arrogance and extremism of the Puritans. Much of James' response to religious matters can be found in that statement.

Ames spent the rest of his life working and teaching in Europe. Thus it was that he went to Rotterdam, where he hoped to establish a college for likeminded students. However he died shortly after arriving in 1633. In his honour, John Burgess, Ames erstwhile father in law, wrote the dedication to a previously unprinted work of Ames entitled *A fresh suit against Human Ceremonies in Gods worship*. Published posthumously in 1633, this is a lengthy attack upon the use of relics. Despite their earlier doctrinal disagreements when Burgess had conformed enough to be accepted

back in England, there was a clear empathy between the two men. Burgess’s dedication speaks tenderly of ‘the never enough lamented death of my deare friend.’

Clearly, Ames’s religious opinions must have been close to those of the Veres, and it seems unlikely that Ames would have remained in post for over eight years had there been any major disagreement in doctrine. Like Burgess before him, William Ames remained in contact with Mary Vere even after he was no longer acting as regimental preacher. Writing from The Hague on October 12th 1619, Ames thanked Mary for her ‘kindnesses’ and enjoins her to ‘use all diligence for the stirring up, confirming and increasing the grace of God in yourself.’

It can therefore be said, with some assurance, that Mary and Horace's views about the organisation of the church, basic but central non-conformists ideas about predestination, and opposition to Bishops, or indeed any supra-congregational authority barring the King, were closely aligned to Ames' ideas, of which we have ample direct proof in his writing and his sermons. As well, Vere must have spurned separation, like Ames, whose close collaboration with Bradshaw and his exchange of views with John Robinson, the leader of the separatists in Leiden, give us firm direction on this point. In essence, Ames was a semi-separatist who saw the Church as a loose grouping of independent congregations. Still functioning under royal authority, but allowing no direct, outside, control of day to day organisation and doctrine, these congregations would have contact with each other, and would share most aspects of their religious approach. Whilst we cannot be sure of Vere’s precise view regarding the issue of separation it seems likely, based upon his support for Ames, that whilst he stopped short of denying the King’s authority over the Church, his otherwise Presbyterian view did not support the role of Bishops.
We should contrast Ames, however, with the next of Vere’s regimental preachers, John Hassall. A fellow of New College Oxford, he became minister of Burton upon Trent in 1601 and following clerical posts in Lichfield and Norfolk he was installed into the third prebend (or precentor’s prebend) of Norwich Cathedral in December 1615. Hassall was also chaplain to Lord Paget (4th Baron Paget of Beaudesert). Paget had served on the Cadiz expedition in 1596, where he may have become acquainted with Horace Vere. Paget was also a sponsor of the Virginia company and it was probably through Paget that in 1617, Hassall was appointed as a preacher to Vere in the Netherlands, a post he filled until 1625.

It was during his time in the United Provinces that Hassall secured for himself the approval and patronage of Elizabeth, the exiled Queen of Bohemia, and daughter of King James I. It was through her good offices that Hassall obtained the deanery of Norwich in 1628. Clearly an ambitious man, Hassall was, like Ames, a friend of William Bradshaw whose Calvinist views stopped just short of outright church separation. However, once in post at Norwich, Hassall 'changed with the times' as his DNB article says. Hassall thus came into line with William Laud’s growing pre-eminence. Laud was an autocrat who favoured strict Episcopalian church government, promoting church ritual and prayer in line with the new King, Charles’s I’s, views.

So Hassall either changed his formerly hard line Calvinist views, or
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subordinated them to ambition, and he reformed the cathedral and diocese accordingly, in line with the growing strength of Laudian dogma. If he thought that this would improve his chances of further advantageous preferment, he was sadly mistaken, and he gradually sank into obscurity and destitution, especially after 1649 when cathedral deans (and other posts) were abolished under the Commonwealth. He died in poverty in 1654, leaving his family so poor that one of his own daughters was maintained by the parish.

The next preacher Horace employed to serve his troops was Obadiah Sedgwick, though he seems to have been with Vere for a comparatively short time between 1628 and 1629. A native of Wiltshire, Sedgwick matriculated from Queens College Oxford in June 1619 aged 19. He then went to Magdalen Hall, where he graduated BA in May 1620, advancing to MA in January 1623. He joined Vere following a spell as Tutor to Matthew Hale, the noted post Restoration Judge. Whilst with Vere, Sedgwick corresponded with John Davenport and became involved in a group of like-minded reformist ministers. After his return to England, he then became curate and lecturer at St Mildred’s in Bread Street, London. He quickly became a popular preacher, attracting a large following, but his Puritan views and anti-Episcopalian stance caused him to incur the displeasure of the royalist, William Juxon,
who had been appointed bishop of London in 1633 in succession to his friend, William Laud. Eventually Juxon suspended and censured Sedgwick for his extreme Puritan views. Juxon went on to hold important civil posts as well as his ecclesiastical ones; he was Lord High Treasurer of England and First Lord of the Admiralty, between 1636 and 1641. At the Restoration he became Archbishop of Canterbury. Sedgewick became less controversial in his later years however receiving gifts from the exiled King and Queen of Bohemia (whom he may well have met) and he died in 1658, a comparatively wealthy man.

Sedgwick’s well-known 1638 sermon, ‘Military Discipline for the Christian Soldier,’ is an exhortation to honourable and just war.\textsuperscript{282} Dedicated to the colonels and captains of the London Artillery Company, Sedgwick identifies with his congregation, talking of ‘our honourable profession’ and signing off the dedication ‘in soldierly comradeship’, clearly recalling his time with Vere. His opposition to the separatists and to bishops fits neatly into the mould of Vere’s previous preachers and the way Sedgwick aligns his message with circumstances and situations that military men can identify with is clearly well thought out.

In contrast Stephen Goffe died a Catholic. Yet he too served as a preacher to Horace Vere’s troops. Goffe’s father, also Stephen, was another of those non-conformists preachers who were deprived of their livings following the Hampton Court conference. This elder Stephen Goffe had been one of the supposed thousand signatories to the Millenary petition which had been the genesis of the conference.\textsuperscript{283} Thus the younger Stephen, born in 1605, was probably brought up in a strict Puritan household. He went up to Merton College, Oxford, where he gained his BA in 1624 and then his MA at St Alban Hall [a constituent part of Merton College] in 1627. He was ordained by William Laud, then Bishop of London, who also made him his chaplain.

Shortly thereafter, Goffe left for the Low Countries to become Vere’s chaplain, probably between 1630 and 1632. Presumably his non-conformists credentials were
sufficient at that time for Vere to take him on and he may also have had the support of Sir William Boswell, who was secretary to Dudley Carleton at the Hague and also a friend of Mary Vere. Boswell supported Carleton’s opposition to armininism and later cooperated fully with Laud’s insistence on the introduction of the English prayer book amongst the English troops in Dutch pay. Despite this Boswell was knighted by Horace Vere in 1633.

When Boswell succeeded Carleton as Ambassador to the United Provinces in 1632 he enthusiastically carried out Laud’s instructions to harry and deter the exiled English Puritans in Holland. Before Laud, similar attempts had been made to curb and control these men, but some in the English church hierarchy, including King Charles, thought they were ‘well berid of them’. Laud, however, recognised that many of these expatriate divines had for some time now been preaching unhindered to the many thousands of English and Scots soldiers serving the Dutch. Such a body, now radicalised in the eyes of many, would be more than capable of staging a serious challenge to the orthodoxy at home, were favourable conditions to occur. Laud eventually succeeded in enforcing the use of the English prayer book amongst these troops in 1635, but only after Vere’s death.

In 1632 Goffe wrote to Henry, Earl of Dover, in a rather triumphalist manner explaining that, ordered by Horace Vere, he (Goffe) had begun to ‘read the prayers of the Church of England, which gave great contentment to [Vere’s] regiment.’ This was certainly a departure from the practice of Goffe’s predecessors and the enthusiasm of

---

284 NA, SP84/139/131, Lady Vere to Boswell, 11 May 1629.
its reception by Vere’s men may not have been as fulsome as Goffe boasts, but this is clearly a report likely to have pleased Laud. Goffe goes on to say that the various dissenting English and Scottish ministers in the Netherlands had tried to get Goffe’s pay revoked by the United Provinces in 1633 but that Vere himself had intervened and Goffe had promised ‘not to do anything against the peace of the Netherlands Church, [and] the payment had resumed’.\(^{289}\) Despite this Goffe tells the Earl that he [Goffe] was ‘determined to continue to read prayers whether the 30 shillings was paid or not’.\(^{290}\)

Vere’s intervention must only have come because of his perceived need to conform himself to the prevailing orthodoxy, i.e. the growing strength of the Laudian party which was clearly backed by the monarchy. Just a few days later Vere had himself written to Secretary John Coke about Goffe and the adverse reception he had had amongst the expatriate divines in the United Provinces. In his letter Vere acknowledges a previous correspondence from Boswell which apparently expressed the King’s pleasure at Vere and his regiment for using the Book of Common prayer.

But it seems that following complaints from other clerics, the Dutch Council of State required assurances regarding the nature of Goffe’s ministry. Goffe was able to reassure them, and the Council agreed to resume the payment of his stipend. However, Vere then continues,


‘For many years I have had no minister but such as have been conformable to our church, but their practice has been *according to the church here* [my italics]. When I was governor of Brill, his late Majesty instructed me that the preacher of the garrison was to conform himself to the church government of the States here, and this has been
the practice for the most part since I have known these parts. Some of my countrymen here have not been altogether conformable to our church, but their carriadge has been so peaceable, I think your honour may doe a work of charity, to passe bye them favorablie, so long as there carriadge be such as yt ought to be’. 291

This was a clever defence by Vere to any possible accusations against him of inconformability. He is simply saying that his preachers had always adhered to the Dutch church, as King James had instructed him. We know that Vere’s previous preachers had, up to Goffe’s appointment, all been considered radicals back home in England. They would hardly have travelled to the United Provinces in the first place had that not been the case, and whilst in Dutch territory their preaching and ministry conformed, for the most part, to the Dutch church. Vere too must have had a great empathy with the Dutch church. He had after all devoted his military life to preserving and sustaining it and the preachers he appointed to serve his troops quite often took on a secondary role preaching in local Dutch churches. Thus over the years as Vere rose to prominence in the Low Countries his religious identity helped shape and determine that of his Dutch surroundings just as he and Mary must have been influenced in turn.

Certainly worship had ‘generally followed the example of the Dutch reformed Church’ following the favoured approach of Leicester which had then ‘set a precedent for worship in the English regiments’ 292 However Vere was always prudent enough to refrain from specific endorsement of practices that he knew would cross the line back home in England.

And so when Vere, continuing his letter, admits that ‘some of my countrymen here have not been altogether conformable to our church’ he is careful to generalise his comments rather than to discuss his own preachers. In the early years of the Seventeenth Century ‘Puritan religious and intellectual deviations caused little commotion’ in the United Provinces. 293 The Dutch did not seem to trouble themselves
with ‘points of religion’ and the British Church in the United Provinces was able to be a social, economic and political entity, as much as it was a religious foundation. 294

However back in England by the late 1620s Laud was a prominent and influential church leader, much inclined towards episcopalianism and the Arminian doctrine. We know that Goffe worked with Laud to persecute non-conformists, helping to enforce the use of the prayer book amongst all the English troops in the United Provinces. 295 All of which reminds us that the religious flux of the day could, and did, allow individuals, even from strict religious beginnings, to change their views and their affiliation especially when personal advantage might accompany such a change. Goffe’s early influences and experience may have put him, literally, into the same religious and military camp as Vere, but Goffe was clearly not of the same, fixed, spiritual mind that epitomises most of Horace Vere’s other employed chaplains and preachers. Furthermore, Goffe’s 1649 admittance into the Catholic church estranges him from Horace Vere’s religious persona even further. 296 Goffe epitomises the way in which life’s experiences shape and change attitudes and convictions, and his decision to make such a dramatic religious change points to the growing possibility of acceptance of diversity in religion. It may also have been the case that patronage proved irresistible for him, as Arminianism grew in strength and senior figures (and hence patronage) in both church and state inclined away from Calvinist orthodoxy.

From the list of radicals he employed it is clear that Horace Vere had sufficient
personal prestige and authority to resist, for a time, the will of the Archbishop of Canterbury and he was able, in religious matters, to largely tread his own path.\textsuperscript{297} To help round out this divine picture however we must now turn to the views of those who dedicated books and other missives to both Horace and Mary.

**Dedications**

It was a common practice at the time to dedicate written works to prominent figures, especially those who might have assisted or supported the author, or who might be flattered into so doing. Such a dedication of itself presupposes that the dedicatee has some power, influence or other worthy quality in the eyes of the dedicator. For Horace, given his prominent military, social and religious standing, certainly after 1606, when he assumed command of all English troops in Dutch pay, such dedications were not rare. Mary Vere, also noted for her piety and support of


radical preachers likewise attracted a number of dedications which is a testament to her pietical standing given her otherwise non-noble status.

The earliest known dedication to Horace comes in 1604, from one W. Traheron, (about whom there seems to be no extant additional information, but who MAY have been the father of the Metaphysical poet Thomas Traherne (1636 or 1637 – 27 September 1674). This dedication is not of a religious nature concerning itself with a history of Roman Emperors.\textsuperscript{298}

The next sequential dedication to Horace comes from Henry Hexham; one of Vere’s longest serving officers. Born in England, Hexham spent much of his life, like
Horace Vere, in Holland and the Low Countries. He originally served Francis Vere, first as a page at a young age, but after 1606 when Francis was more or less forced to retire, Hexham became attached to Horace, serving him as quartermaster and later reaching the rank of captain. Hexham wrote a narrative about the Siege of Ostend, in which both Francis and Horace were engaged and this narrative was later appended to Francis Vere’s ‘Commentaries’. Hexham knew both the Veres well having served with Horace, often in the front line, for almost all of Vere’s military life as well as during Horace’s Governorship of the Brill.

Hexham’s dedication covers his translation of a work by the Dutch Protestant theologian, John Polyander Van Den Kerckhove, who was Professor of Divinity at Leyden. In 1610 Polyander, as he is best known in English, had written a refutation of the work of [an unnamed] member of the Catholic Augustinian order in Liege. In 1611, he wrote a lengthy riposte to an epistle written three years earlier by the also unnamed Catholic canons of St Marie. Both these works (and others, most notably the ideas of Gerard Mercator, the famous mapmaker) were translated into English by Hexham. Polyander’s 1610 work *The refutation of an epistle written by a certain Doctor of the Augustins order within the city of Liege* is dedicated by Hexham as the translator.

*W Traheron’s translation is of a work by Pedro Mexía, The historie of all the Roman emperors beginning with Caius Iulius Caesar, and successiuely ending with Rodulph the second now rainging. ODNB (2004). Hexham published and translated a number of Protestant tracts, adding further weight to his own Puritan credentials and thus Vere’s.*

Sir Francis Vere, *The Commentaries*, (Cambridge, 1657). Hexham, Henry, *A disputation against the adoration of the reliques of saints departed wherein nine palpable abuses are discovered, committed by the popish Priests in the veneration thereof. Together with, the refutation of a lesuitalle epistle, and an index of the reliques, vvhich every seventh yeere, are shovvne at Avvcon in Germanie unto the superstitious people and pilgrimes, compiled by the canons of S. Maries Church, (an. 1608). By John Polyander Professour of Diuinitie in the Vniuersitie of Leyden in Holland*, at Dordrecht: Printed by George Walters, (Anno
Hexham’s translation of Polyander’s *A disputation against the adoration of the reliques of saints departed in 1611* is dedicated solely to Mary Vere. In the dedication to the *Refutation* Hexham calls Vere his ‘best lord’ and praises his ‘unstained Godliness.’ He then apologises for not seeking permission to dedicate the translation, but assures himself that it will be acceptable, ‘because it is done by one of your companie and in the towne of your garrison where it was also penned ... by me that have devoted myself unto your service.’ Most tellingly, Hexham had not bothered to seek permission from his chief (Vere) for this dedication. This is a clear indication that Hexham knew Vere would approve, and support, both his dedication and the opinions he translated.

Hexham says that Polyander’s treatise is ‘not unworthy a noble patron ... [and] zealous lover of that truth which this author maintaineth and [you] have with losse of blood and hazard of life, defended with your swords, what this man [has] by his pen’. Immediately after this dedication is a short recommendation of Polyander’s treatise by John Burgess, ‘Preacher to the English at the Hague in Holland’. This was the same John Burgess who was forced out of his English living following the Hampton Court conference and who later, twice, became one of Vere’s army preachers. (p. 50)

Burgess ‘confesses to have encouraged the translator of this present treatise’, because of the ‘popish writers ... who provoke ...a counter poyson’ and he says the treatise has found favour amongst the Dutch and French Calvinist churches.

Polyander’s long discourse repeats, and then attempts to refute, the words of the ‘Doctor of Augustins’ and he starts by saying that non-believers are wiser then the papists who ‘instead of addressing themselves to the only God Almighty... they implore the aide of the dead,’ and that they ‘depend upon the Traditions of their Teachers’ rather than ‘read the holy Scripture.’ Polyander’s arguments discuss such issues as whether or not the saints can be properly invoked on behalf of the living, or can be
mediators between men and God and he asserts that only Jesus Christ can be a mediator, and he scorns the idea that the saints, or any of the dead, can offer intercession. The Doctor of Augustins argues at one point that the Catholic church is the only true church because ‘could it be possible that the ...Church be in error for a thousand and so many years?’ which is a rather circular argument.\textsuperscript{306} Polyander asks the Catholics to prove what they say, because there are no proofs in the Bible regarding the intercession of the saints, or of any mention of purgatory. Finally, Polyander touches upon predestination saying ‘that the zeal and charity to the glory of God...are vertues proper ... only to the elect and children of God’.\textsuperscript{307} Hexham’s closeness to and knowledge of Vere leaves little doubt that the views Polyander expresses are close to those of Vere.

In the \textit{Disputation}, dedicated to Mary, Hexham writes that the dedication brings husband and wife together because of his dedication to Horace in the \textit{Refutation}.\textsuperscript{308} In this second dedication, Hexham refers to what he calls ‘popish iugling [juggling]’ which ‘cannot be unknown to your Ladyship.’ This is a reference to the infamous Hailes Abbey Holy blood, of which Mary would have been well aware. ‘This ‘Holy’ blood, which had been kept at Hailes Abbey from 1270 up to the dissolution, had been a great attraction for pilgrims; helping to enrich the Abbey for many years until the last Abbot, probably under pressure, admitted that it was actually duck’s blood, constantly renewed.\textsuperscript{309} After the dissolution, the abbey lands were acquired by the Tracy family, of which Mary Vere (nee Tracy) was a member. This relical trickery explains Hexham’s dedication.

In the introduction of his work, Hexham tells us that he has made the translation

\begin{footnotes}
\item[302] Henry Hexham, \textit{The refutation of an epistle written by a certain Doctor of the Augustins order within the city of Leige together with the arguments, which he hath borrowed from Robert Bellarmine, to proove the invocation of Saints.} (London, 1610).
\item[303] Hexham \textit{Disputation}, dedication, L. A3-A4.
\item[304] Ibid., L. 4-5.
\item[305] Ibid., p. B1.
\item[306] Hexham \textit{Disputation}, dedication, p.15.
\end{footnotes}
so ‘that the graue and learned men of our nation may see, that the Ministers of other reformed churches, marche pouldron to pouldron with them vnto the Lords combate’, which indicates this is a non-conformist tract. Polyander’s _Disputation_ is a detailed and rather superior supplication against the worship and invocation of saints and relics. 154 pages long, it re-affirms the usage of ‘poyson’ to refer to Catholic doctrine and describes how, at the Reformation, many relics were found to be fabricated from the bones of ‘beasts, [from] brickes, sprigges of trees...and many other trifles.’ This exposure of false and fantastical relics was common across the whole Protestant world, and such revelations cannot have done anything but harm the Catholic Church, just as the Blood of Hailes must have done. The _Disputation_ alternates between derision of these false objects of reverence, and utter condemnation of the Roman Catholics who promote and prolong the veneration of such things. And who, worst of

307 Ibid., p.116. 308 Hexham,, _Refutation, dedication_, L. A.3. 309 Nicholas Vincent, _The Holy Blood_ (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 136-191,197,198. At its height the Abbey was attracting over £1,000 p.a from the relic but this had fallen to less than £20 by the end of the 15c. 310 Hexham, _Disputation_, dedication, p.1. A _pouldron_ is armour worn on the upper arm. 311 Ibid., p.43. 312 For example, relics at Canterbury Cathedral described in the 1315/16 Inventory include; the dust from which God made Adam; the rock from which Christ ascended to heaven; the beard of St Peter and a feather from the Archangel Gabriel. J. Wickham Legg, W.H. St John Hope, _Inventories of Christchurch Cathedral Canterbury_, (Westminster,1902). pp. 55-96.

all, foist the entire concept upon their poor, ignorant, congregations whom Polyander is not afraid to call ‘Idiots’. Polyander points out the absurdity of three separate towns claiming the body of one saint and several examples of two towns claiming another. Polyander is careful though to disassociate the early church fathers from his condemnation of the Catholic Church and its veneration of relics. He says that none of these ‘godly men’ made any record of setting aside as ‘holy’ the wide variety of objects associated by the Catholic Church with Christ, the Virgin Mary, and other venerated persons. These include girdles, sheets, blood and a whole host of other personal
possessions and body parts.\textsuperscript{314} Hexham must have been sure that Horace and Mary opposed the veneration of saints and relics as Polyander did. Of all the dedicators and preachers supported and sponsored by the Veres, Hexham probably knew them best, and what is more he owed his position to Horace, which makes it all the more unlikely that he would have risked such dedications had he not been absolutely sure of his man (and woman). He remained in Dutch service until his death in 1650.

Possibly the most favoured of all the preachers supported and sponsored by the Veres was Nicholas Byfield, who was also the most prolific dedicateur of works to them. Byfield went up to Oxford (Exeter College) in 1596, and though he did not graduate, his Puritan convictions led him nevertheless to the ministry. He then served the people of Chester, first as a much respected preacher, and from 1608 as curate, despite opposition from the Bishop of Chester, George Lloyd. Lloyd opposed Byfield’s strident Calvinism, but he remained tolerant, possibly because of Byfield’s popularity. Then, in 1615, Horace Vere (no doubt with Mary’s concurrence) offered Byfield the preferment of the Vicarage at Isleworth in Middlesex, where he remained until his early death in September 1622, aged just 43. Byfield died from a kidney stone of ‘enormous proportion,’ which must have tormented him for many years, but which failed to prevent him becoming a notable and much admired preacher.\textsuperscript{315}

Byfield was also a prolific author, and the publicist of his own sermons, and other texts, often with the encouragement of the Veres. Several of his works were frequently re-published after his death.\textsuperscript{316} The Veres continued as patrons to Byfield, and indeed his whole family, taking one of his ten children into the Vere household, though we do not know in what capacity. This close interest, right on the door of the Veres, must indicate a strong and enduring affinity of religious views.

After his death, Byfield’s wife Elizabeth published \textit{A Commentary or, Sermons upon The Second Chapter of the First Epistle of Saint Peter} written by her late husband

\textsuperscript{313} Hexham, \textit{Refutation}, p. 59. \textsuperscript{314} Ibid., pp.146-8. \textsuperscript{315} Bryan W. Ball, ‘Byfield,

and printed in 1623. The *Commentary*, dedicated by Elizabeth to both Horace and Mary, is a message of thanks for the Veres ‘kindnesses, which, while my husband lived, you did to him and his, and since his death you continue to do to such as he hath left behind him’. Elizabeth also thanks the Veres for ‘tak(ing) into your family a childe of his [Nicholas Byfield’s] body’ and she thanks God for keeping Vere safe during his recent time in the Palatinate.

*Sermons upon the Ten First verses of the third chapter of the first Epistle of St. Peter*, *Being the last that were preached by the late Faithfull and painful minister of God’s word*, Nicholas Byfield was published in 1626 by William Gouge, the London clergyman and author. Gouge had been briefly imprisoned in 1621 for publishing a book seen as an attack on the monarchy and the traditional view of the Sabbath. Gouge was only released after he recanted. He was minister and preacher at St Ann’s, Blackfriars, for 45 years from 1608 and a member of the Westminster Assembly from 1643. In his dedication to Horace and Mary of Byfield’s *Sermons upon the Ten First verses* Gouge, who was known to both the Veres, writes of ‘your honours mutuall affection, and sincere and sweet conversation and carriage one towards another.’ The *Sermons* largely concerns itself with marriage and the relationship between husband, wife and God.

Byfield’s sermon expounds at great length about marriage and its duties, a subject close to Gouge’s heart, and a possible reason for its being published by Gouge, who was himself the author of a book on domestic responsibilities, which, unusually for the age, encouraged love matches. It was not until after the Restoration that the absolute authority of parents over the marriage partners of their children began to erode. However, earlier pre-war Puritan handbooks of domestic conduct, like Gouge’s, had pointed out [the rather obvious fact] that if a couple at least liked each other at the start there was much less chance of divergence and adultery later on.
Gouge’s dedication of *The Sermons*, dated January 25\(^{th}\) 1625, is to both Horace and Mary.


Another of the many posthumous publications by, and on behalf of, Nicholas Byfield is *The Principall Grounds of Christian religion*, published in 1625 by W.C. and printed by I.L. for Ralph Roundthwaite, who seems to have been responsible for the printing of many of Byfield’s sermons and treatises. Several of Byfield’s works give a clear indication of his strong Calvinist beliefs, but in this document, sub-titled *Briefly and plainly propounded by way of question and answer for the instruction of the younger sort*, Byfield is much more precise about the fundamentals of his religious views. He speaks of the revelation ‘unto God’s elect all trueth necessary to their salvation,’ he proclaims that ‘men in every age who are Gods elect, [are] gathered by the power of Christ & separated from the world by the sincere protection of true religion’ and of those ‘whom he predestined ... That all the Godly shall reign with Christ in unspeakable glory and eternal happiness in heaven’. 324

This is extremely potent and telling proof, albeit by extension, that both the
Veres were devout believers in predestination. Their sponsorship and patronage of Byfield, together with their taking in of one of his children, must point to a close union of ideas and doctrine. This is especially true, since this example of patronage was in London, with all the proximate pressures of church hierarchy and crown and not in the Netherlands where Vere was of singular stature and largely beyond the reach and interference of even the Archbishop of Canterbury.

One of the best known of those divines who dedicated works to the Veres was Richard Sibbes DD. Born of artisan stock there is uncertainty about his actual birth year but he did attend St John’s College, Cambridge, matriculating in 1595 and gaining his BA in 1599. Sibbes became a fellow of the college in 1601, gaining his MA the following year. Ordained in March 1609, he became a well-known and widely praised preacher and was appointed as public lecturer at Holy Trinity parish church in Cambridge where he was so well received that a ‘new gallery needed to be built to accommodate his listeners.’

In 1617 he was also appointed preacher at Grey’s Inn in London, one of the Inns of Court which trained and shaped young barristers, and it was probably here that his reputation found an audience of sufficient stature to bring him to the notice of those in power beyond the church.

Sibbes was a friend of John Pym, the English parliamentarian and leader of the Long Parliament. Pym was a lawyer, and he and Sibbes may have first met at one of Sibbes lectures. Certainly, in the early 1620s, Sibbes was a member of an influential group of London preachers which included William Gouge, Thomas Gataker, and John Davenport, all of whom were part of the Vere sponsorship group, which cooperated

---

closely with other similar groups within the non-conformist network. But Sibbes was, in the end, a more circumspect soul. After an earlier refusal, Sibbes did subscribe to, and sign, the three articles as recorded in the Cambridge University Archives. He was also one of the feofees for impropriations, as was Davenport and he and Sibbes collaborated in editing a number of sermons.

The feofees were a London based group, established to buy up land rights that allowed them to appoint Puritan preachers of their choice. Since the feofees were, in effect, a perpetually renewing body they could maintain their choice of parish incumbent indefinitely, and thus ensure that as many pulpits as possible were available to spread the Godly word. Active between 1625 and 1633 they were formally associated as a committee to buy up and dispense patronage of appropriated parish livings and tithes to create new preaching appointments in the Church of England. The group attracted large donations, from 75 persons in total, and they began acquiring impropriations in April 1625 (Dunstable) and then spread as far as York and Pembrokeshire. Problems sometimes arose when sitting incumbents held a doctrine that the feofees disliked, but in these cases bribery was sometimes effective as a means of freeing up the incumbency. Indeed, financial matters came to be one of the major objections to the group, with the accusation that they had benefited, personally, from the income of the parishes they controlled. This was a normal occurrence amongst private landholders, of course, but was not seen as proper by the church authorities who opposed the feofees. John Davenport strongly denied benefitting at all from his role as a feofee complaining, in a letter to Mary Vere, that he was in fact ‘out of purse, in myne own particular for the advanceem[en]t of it’

Charles I and the rapidly rising Laud (at the time Chancellor of Oxford, as well as bishop of London) took an increasingly hostile view of the feofees, seeing them as both ‘encroaching on the royal prerogative and the rights of bishops’ and, in time, disposing of more preferments than the Church of England. Lay ownership of what had been monastic and church benefices had, it was thought, deprived the Church of considerable income even before the 1620s and feofees generally were banned under
the provisions of the Hampton Court conference of 1604. However, that ruling was not enacted until Archbishop Laud’s appointment in 1633 when the group were forced to disband, though it took until the 1640s for the matter to be finally settled by Parliament.

Sibbes most famous work *The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax* published in 1630, is dedicated to both Veres. It is a collection of sermons that Sibbes apologises for as being ‘long since preached’. In the dedication Sibbes praises Horace as one whom ‘the world hath a long time taken notice of... in whom both religion, and military employment, meekness of spirit, with height of courage, humility with honour, by a rare and happy combination have met together’ and ‘shewed that piety can enter into tents & follow after camps.’ This underscores Vere’s pietic approach to soldiering which was both uncommon and well known. Sibbes suggests in the dedication that the Veres still have religious battles to fight, to rescue a church that has come under the power of Christ’s enemies. This may refer to the growing ascendency of Arminian thinking in England, symbolised by what came to be called the Durham House group, following the appointment of Richard Neile to the see of Durham in 1617, though similar concerns must have been held regarding the wider European situation.

Neile’s elevation, together with that of Lancelot Andrewes to Winchester in 1618, and George Montaigne to London in 1621, signalled an increase in the speed of what had been a slow shift towards an Arminian viewpoint. Christopher Hill certainly thought so, writing in his *Society and Puritanism* that even ‘By the 1590s theological unity and respect for Calvin were declining among English Protestants.’
House group included William Laud, who had been a former chaplain to Neile. Laud, bishop of London from 1628, grew in power and influence, eventually replacing George Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. Laud certainly opposed Calvinism, which he saw as being in opposition to prevailing Church hierarchy and uniformity, and he was particularly opposed to the separatism espoused by some non-conformists, which threatened his position at the apex of the religious hierarchy.

*The Bruised Reed and Smokey Flax* is a collection of Sibbes' sermons, in which the reed and flax of the title refers to the weakness of God’s Children, and the necessity of humility in order to receive the blessings of God.\(^{340}\) The work has been reprinted continuously since 1630, with the last edition appearing in 1998. In the sermons, Sibbes gives advice on how best to live, worship and find the correct path to the Lord. He does not condemn the questioning of the Christian, indeed he praises it since ‘nothing is so certain as that which is certaine after doubts... it is a witty thing to be a Christian’ he asserts, since by tackling one’s own doubts, one is the more able to counter the doubts of others.\(^{341}\) Sibbes writes of ‘the Godly souls’ and the ‘Covenant of Grace’ but he also makes the interesting statement that ‘None are damned in the Church, but those that will’, and that damnation awaits those ‘who will not meet Christ in the ways of Mercy,’ hardly the staunchest of predestinarian Calvinist views, unless Sibbes is restricting his words to the Godly alone, but it does conform with his earlier exhortations to be kind to the weak and to look to one’s own faults.\(^{342}\) Sibbes also, towards the end of his long sermon, states that ‘Sahtans [sic] malice is especially
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\(^{334}\) Ibid., p. 23-24.  
\(^{335}\) The title is taken from *Isaiah* 42.3.  
\(^{336}\) A view echoed in the elegies written after Horace Vere’s death.  
\(^{337}\) Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, calls this ‘the first organised opposition to English Calvinism’, p. 123.  
\(^{338}\) Ibid, p.114, Montaigne had been Chaplain to Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, on his expedition against Cadiz in 1596. Horace Vere also served in this expedition where he was knighted by the Earl.  
\(^{339}\) Hill, p.167.  
\(^{340}\) Isaiah 42:3 and quoted by Jesus in Matthew 12:20.

---
against the most religious and manly resolutions’ a reminder to those who consider themselves to be pious that it is they who are subject most to Satan’s hatred, but Sibbes also declares that even the weakest soul and the most sinful can expect God’s help, even if there is only ‘a little truth of grace’.343

But it is on the last pages of The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax that Sibbes makes his attack upon the then doctrine of the Church of England ‘And for the present fate of the Church we see now how forlorn it is’ and ‘God will not suffer Antichrist and his supporters to revel and russe in the Church as they doe. but he is confident that Christ will conquer all. Sibbes’ true colours then emerge as he praises Luther but also praises Luther’s repenting of his errors, and in effect calls for unity amongst all, opposing the separatist tendency of other preachers.

The dedication points strongly to Sibbes’ Puritan leanings and his posthumously published later works indicate that this was so.344 Despite this, Sibbes had written in the Bruised Reed; ‘Ambitious men study accommodation of themselves to the humours of those by whom they hope to be raised’ and so in this way, apparently, Sibbes managed to avoid losing any of the several academic and clerical posts that he held by what seems to have been the (prudent) method of conforming, maybe just enough, to whatever the itself changing Church of England required of its priests.345 This is epitomised by Sibbes comment in the Bruised Reed, ‘New Lords, new laws’, which


may have summed up his employment methodology.346 Richard Sibbes was clearly not
brave (or convinced?), enough to defy his religious or political masters during his lifetime, but all the evidence points to a man of decidedly strong Puritan views. Perhaps his dedication to the Veres stemmed from an admiration for those who were both believers, and achievers, for the faith.

The next author to consider is William Crosse who had been chaplain to Sir John Ogle between 1620 and 1624, and thus would certainly have known and met Horace. In 1625, Crosse wrote a lengthy poem entitled ‘Belgiaes troubles and triumphs’ which discusses the last four years of war in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{347} Published in two parts, Book two is dedicated to Horace Vere and his brother-in-law, Edward Conway. Crosse’s work is more of a history than a poem, but it is valuable because Crosse was an eye-witness to the events he describes, and because of the content of his descriptions of ‘The Conspiracies of Barneveldt’s two sons, and other Arminians against the Prince of Orange.’\textsuperscript{348} Crosse describes an assassination attempt by two of the sons of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, former leader of the United Provinces, whose support for Protestant toleration of the Arminian doctrine led to his execution in 1619. Crosse says

‘Thus was the plot; four assasines designed for this black deed, were solemnly combind by mutual vowes, and interchanged oaths... To pistoll Maurice, Henricke, and the rest of the Nassanian flocke; this being confest By two Conspirators, the Prince straight hies From Risiwicke to the Hague, and there descries In an Arminian house foure of this crue, Whose malice did great Nassaws death pursue.’\textsuperscript{349}

Vere and the house of Nassau had worked together closely and harmoniously for many years and such a conspiracy would have been deplored by Horace. Crosse equates the plot with Arminian design and the dedication of his work to Horace Vere points to Vere’s opposition to Arminian theology. In 1623 Secretary Conway wrote to Calvert ordering the arrest of one of Barneveldt’s sons still, apparently, at liberty.\textsuperscript{350}

The next dedication comes from Thomas Gataker, rector of Rotherhithe from 1611 to 1642, and a close contact (and cousin) of Vere’s good friend (and nephew-in-law) Sir Robert Harley.\textsuperscript{351} Gataker dedicated the second edition of his \textit{A Good Wife God’s}
Gift: and a Wife Indeed to Robert and Brilliana Harley.³⁵² It had been their  


wedding sermon.³⁵³ Gataker was one of a growing number of independently paid for lecturers in London from the end of the 16th century.³⁵⁴ His publication, The joy of the Just with The signes of such Discourse Tending to the Comfort of the Dejected and afflicted; and to the Triall of Sinceritie, was produced in London in 1623 and dedicated to Horace and Mary Vere, whom Gataker describes as ‘persons for place and Pietie so eminent.³⁵⁵

The Joy of the Just is a longer version of an earlier sermon which purports to offer comfort, encouragement and a doctrinal discussion of the Glory of the Kingdom of Christ. It is a ‘... sorry present (though coming somewhat late) to welcome your returne home from your late imployment abroad.’³⁵⁶ The text refers to the ‘Godly’ being ‘received into special grace and favour with God’ and assures them that ‘None but the Godly have good or just cause to rejoyce’ because they have ‘a twofold cause to rejoyce... in regard of present grace and ... their hope of future glory.’³⁵⁷ This refers to double predestination, which is the forgiveness of original sin and election into eternal glory and it places Gataker firmly at the heart of contemporary Puritan doctrine.

Gataker asserts that ‘The godly therefore are girt about...with Gods favour and ...girt about with joy.’³⁵⁸ Gataker's allusions to the ‘Godly’ in his tract are too numerous to count but the essence of his long sermon appears to be to advise the ‘Godly’ that, since they are of the elect, this alone should provide them with all the joy they need. Whatever the trials and privations they face in life, the hardships and the pleasures of this world are nothing compared to the joy to come.
Gataker was also a member of the Westminster Assembly (1642) where, unlike Harley, he supported episcopacy. He also opposed the introduction of the Solemn League and Covenant and the trial of Charles I. Gataker’s dedication of The Joy of the just... to Horace and Mary Vere came in 1623, with Vere recently home from his unsuccessful defence of Mannheim in the Palatinate. At this time, Church of England orthodoxy was still largely Calvinist. But by the early 1640s the tone had changed. Was Gataker simply bending with the prevailing orthodoxy during his time as part of the Westminster Assembly? Or is it possible, even with Horace long dead, that Gataker knew that Mary Vere, and her circle of divinity and influence, of which Gataker was one, would have also supported the King, if not episcopacy? Gataker may well have met Horace and Mary at the wedding of their niece Brilliana to Robert Harley. The most famous living soldier of his time, he would have been a prominent and respected wedding guest. Gataker must have known, or believed, that the Veres’ religious views were close to his own.

And it may have been this pious fame that emboldened Thomas Barnes, who
was a preacher, and the incumbent minister at Saint Margaret’s Church in New Fish Street London, in the early years of the 1620s. Barnes wrote a number of religious tracts, and included amongst them is *Voxbelli or an Alarm to Warre*. This publication is unlike Barnes’s other works, since it is an out and out call for a religious war. Published in 1626 it is dedicated to ‘Right Honourable, Sir Horatio Vere, Knight, Baron Tilbury.’ Vere was ennobled in July 1625, so Barnes was probably hoping to gain the attention and support of the already famous, but now Lord Vere for his cause. There is no record of the two men ever having met, but Barnes must have been aware of Vere’s martial exploits, and the way in which Barnes addresses Vere in his dedication, suggests that Barnes was also well aware of Horace’s religious views.

The dedication begins with an apology for seeking war, which Barnes knows is a ‘mischief and a misery,’ it goes on to describe the atrocities and evils of armed conflict. But he excuses himself by saying that the call is God’s, not his, and that it is this that has emboldened him to ‘crave your Honours patronage for these few papers’... ‘nothing [else] but partly your love to Christ his cause, as you are a Beleever: and partly your place in God’s field, as a warlike commander.’

*Voxbelli* asserts that ‘a lawful warre is to bee preferred before an unlawful peace’. And Barnes declares that seeking and promoting war, ‘bloud and blowes’, as he calls it, makes him fearful to suggest the idea but ‘when I considered that there are Canaanites to be smitten at home, Christians to bee succoured abroad, I took heart to venture to this field’ though he quickly points out his own inadequacy as ‘weaknesse to wield my weapon as I should’

---

361 Brilliana Harley, nee Conway. 362 The church was the first to perish in the Great Fire of 1666 and was not rebuilt. The Monument stands on the site today. 363 Thomas Barnes, *Voxbelli or an Alarm to Warre*, (London, 1626). 364 The object of which was the prosecution of religious war in Europe. 365 Barnes, *Voxbelli*, p.2. 366 Ibid., pp. 2-3.
Barnes lists five ‘just causes’ for war:- Monstrous Pride: Insolence against God: Insulting over the Church: Tumultuousness and Rebellion: False-heartednesse. The last of which is defined as ‘pretences of unity, and yet practice of enmity’  
Barnes argues that there is a duty to wage a just war, indeed that not to do so is tantamount to sin, even if mortal law disagrees, because ‘The Gospel itself is a law’ (a very Puritan mantra). He goes further, by saying ‘how worthy of blame all those bee who take on, and cry out against us [bold in the original], that are Gods messengers…for speaking…in the terrible language of the law’. Voxbelli continues to argue for [just] war throughout its 41 pages. Barnes claims that the Pope and the Turk are equall in evil, calling them both antichrists. But he seems to say that the Pope’s evil arises principally because he claims to have ‘superiority above all princes’ which argument was specially deplored by King James. Indeed, Barnes claims that of the two, Pope and Turk, the Pope is the worst, going on to advance many reasons why this is so. The argument thus is that to make war on such evil is not only necessary but holy.

Barnes criticises those ‘yonguelings’ who go to war with no ‘licence’ and just for the adventure, but he takes care to exclude the ‘Voluntaries’ and those that ‘have a call.’ This exclusion is just as well, because his dedicatee Horace had previously, in April 1610 described himself as a Voluntary in a letter to Andrew Newton, a gentleman of his Highnesses bedchamber when Horace was attending upon the Prince of Orange rather than taking an active part in the Cleave-Julich war. Vere says in his letter ‘It is the first time I was a voluntary since I was of the profession’. Barnes calls Vere a ‘religious commander’ and suggests that, under the command of such a man, impressing the bad (i.e. the wicked and evil) into military service is lawful, because in any fighting that takes place both the wicked enemy and our own evil men will be punished with death; ‘The Lord smiteth one wicked man by the hand of another.’ In that way the punishment of war will fall on the evil more than upon the just. Barnes is, however, careful to point out that this rule applies only to the ‘Common Soldiers.’ He ends his plea by contending that Vere ‘could never stirre in more needful time’
The War of the Julich Succession was a conflict over the right of succession to the United Duchies of Julich-Cleves-Berg. It lasted between 10 June 1609 and 24 October 1610, resuming in May 1614 and finally ending in 13 October 1614.

Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 72D, 32 04B 01 04, Horace Vere to Andrew Newton, April 1610. In this instance Vere is simply stating that he had no official rank or posting but was acting only as an advisor to Maurice. Barnes, Voxbelli, p.16. Trim, ‘Fighting Jacobs Wars’, p. 69. Dr Trim suggests that as known criminals, vagrants and other unemployed men were usually conscripted, in some places this was seen as a useful method of ‘social cleansing’. Barnes Voxbelli, p.40. 79

Family and Friends
More strong evidence of Vere’s religious orientation comes in the form of Horace’s personal associations and through the connections of his wife Mary. The Tracys were notable Calvinists, and it is unlikely that Horace, who when he married Mary was 36 years old, a war hero and a senior officer in Dutch service, would have wed a woman whose views on religion were at any distance from his own. Both Mary and Horace sponsored non-conformists clergy throughout their lives and after Horace’s death Mary continued in that role as an influential and admired family advisor. Mary established herself as a well-respected matriarch, both within her wider family and beyond, corresponding with many ‘godly’ ministers and others, and she was the subject of several dedications in her own right, as well as those she shared with her husband. 375

Mary sponsored ‘equally radical preachers’ including Samuel Bamford and John Davenport. Bamford was a graduate of Emmanuel College Cambridge early in 1616, and proceeded to his MA in 1619. He was chaplain to the Veres at their house in The Hague in the late 1620s and he took a consistently hard line against the established church in England, in particular putting his own interpretation on the liturgy and opposing the use of the established prayer book. He later married Elizabeth, daughter of Nicholas Byfield, one of whose siblings had been accepted into the Veres’ household, a marriage which reinforced an affinity with the Veres’ religious outlook. But
Bamford’s persistent opposition to the orthodoxy of the Laudian establishment was only maintained through the support of the Dutch Reformed Church, and when in 1635 he returned to England, to see the newly widowed Mary Vere, he was arrested.\textsuperscript{377} Though he was detained for some months, he subsequently skipped bail and returned to the Netherlands, where he continued to defy the English Church until 1650 by when conditions had changed and he was able to return to London, there accruing a ‘Godly’ reputation. Bamford’s strident opposition to the prevailing orthodoxy of the English Church, whilst retaining the support and friendship of the Veres, further reinforces their hard line Puritan identity.

Another of Mary Vere’s preachers was John Davenport. He was at Magdalen College Cambridge (a well-known Puritan stronghold at the time) for two years after 1615, but he left before graduating, becoming a chaplain in Durham before transferring to the St Lawrence Jewry parish in London in 1619. His effectiveness there as a preacher carried him to the Vicarage of St Stephen’s in London, though the intervention of the Veres, their brother-in-law Edward Conway (then Secretary of State) and others within the Vere’s pietical circle was required.\textsuperscript{378} This was because of the opposition of George Montaigne, then Bishop of London, who was a staunch Arminian. King James had asked Montaigne to find out what sort of preacher Davenport was, possibly because of the ‘common and mean people’ that supported him. Whereupon Mary Vere and Conway represented Davenport as being ‘the acme of conformity’ and he was thus duly inducted as vicar at St Stephens\textsuperscript{379}.

\textsuperscript{375}Jacqueline Eales, ‘Vere, Mary, Lady Vere (1581–1671)’, ODNB, (2004), p.1. And see Jacqueline Eales, ‘An ancient mother in our Israel’: Mary, Lady Vere (1581-1671) in Elizabeth Scott-Baumann and Johanna Harris (eds), The Intellectual Culture of Puritan Women, 1558-1680 (Basingstoke, 2010).\textsuperscript{376} Adams, ‘The Protestant Cause’, p. 442. \textsuperscript{377} Francis J. Bremer, ‘Davenport, John (bap.1597-1670)’, ODNB, (2004).\textsuperscript{378} This was because of the opposition of George Montaigne, then Bishop of London, who was a staunch Arminian. King James had asked Montaigne to find out what sort of preacher Davenport was, possibly because of the ‘common and mean people’ that supported him. Whereupon Mary Vere and Conway represented Davenport as being ‘the acme of conformity’ and he was thus duly inducted as vicar at St Stephens\textsuperscript{379}.\textsuperscript{379}
Davenport joined with Richard Sibbes and William Gouge in favouring support for Protestant clergy displaced by the war in the Palatinate. This support must have been heightened by news reports of the removal from office of Protestant preachers following the Imperial conquest of the Palatinate which told that ‘the Jesuits who now at Heidlebergh take upon them to be ministers will not baptise any one childe before the Parents have reconciled themselves unto the Church of Rome’.  

Davenport’s frustration at the failure of both James I and Charles I to intervene militarily in defence of Protestant Europe, was a constant irritant. Davenport was clearly well liked and supported by Mary to whom he wrote often, sometimes mentioning affectionately other divines in the Vere circle like Obadiah Sedgwick and Samuel Bamford. However, following the accession of Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, Davenport found himself an outcast, and went into hiding, but he maintained his correspondence with Mary reassuring her that he was ‘willing to lye and dye in prison, if the cause may be advantaged by it.’ Yet, in the same letter he says ‘I doe not censure those thast doe conforme (nay I account many of them faithful, and worthy instrum[en]ts of Gods glory.... But my light [is]different).’ Then, following Horace’s death on May 2nd 1635 Davenport wrote to Mary, on July 21st, offering his condolences in a lengthy letter praising Horace’s devotion to his religious beliefs and how he ‘knytt mine heart unto him’ in regard to all his pious actions. Davenport also gives us more detail about Horace in both life and death, comforting Mary that Horace died quickly and not after a ‘sensible decay...which might have come to be burthensome to himself and uncomfortable to your ladyship.’ But Davenport also makes the curious comment that ‘he died ... of a vomitt, which he could never beare.’ It seems odd that this old