

THE POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAREER OF

SIR HENRY VANE THE YOUNGER

1640 TO APRIL 1653.

by

Violet A. Rowe

Thesis presented for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

LONDON 1965

ProQuest Number: 10096717

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10096717

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract of thesis.

This thesis covers the period (1640-53) of Vane's significant political activity in England. It examines his work as administrator - a neglected aspect of his career. The fluctuating fortunes and membership of the group led by Vane and St. John are traced; its struggle with Holles's group was reflected in the use made of the Committee of Both Kingdoms to deprive parliament as a whole of authority. Vane's mastery of parliamentary tactics was often demonstrated, for instance in the Self-Denying Ordinance, which had important political purposes. His support of religious toleration in England, Ireland and America contrasts strongly with his harsh attitude to political opposition. By December 1646 Holles's group dominated the Commons, and Vane virtually boycotted parliament for some months. Though always aware of the dangers of military control, he was at one with some Army leaders, though not with the Levellers, on many issues, and when the Army intervened in 1647 he returned to the House.

His administrative gifts were shown by his work on the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and as Navy Treasurer; the financial rewards of the latter office were considerable from 1645 onwards. His withdrawal from public affairs in January 1649 was followed by a period of extraordinary activity, in which Vane was the architect of the Union with Scotland, the abortive Union with Holland, and above all, the Commonwealth Navy, though he did not neglect the interests of his constituency, his family or himself. He probably opposed the Dutch War at first, but in December 1652 he wrested from a reluctant parliament authority

for an Admiralty Commission, whose new policy bore fruit in Blake's victory off Portland. By this time Vane was politically isolated, and at odds with Hesilrige and Marten; friction with Cromwell on naval policy was followed by the dismissal of the Rump.

Chapter i.	The rise to leadership, (November 1640-December 1643).	17-49
" ii.	The struggle with Holles, (1644).	50-98
" iii.	The issue of peace or war, (1645-1646).	99-153
" iv.	Relations with the Army, (1647-1648).	154-201
" v.	Vane's part in naval administration, (1640-1648).	202-243
" vi.	The republican statesman, (1649-1653).	244-273
" vii.	Vane and the Admiralty, (1649-1653).	
	Part i. The Admiralty Committee number, February 1649-December 1652.	274-311
	Part ii. The Admiralty Commissioner, December 1652-April 1653.	312-353
" viii.	Religious policy, (1640-1653).	354-356
" ix.	Conclusion.	357-385
Abbreviations		386-389
Bibliography		390-426

The political and administrative career of Sir Henry Vane
the Younger. 1640-to April 1653.

	Page
Introduction.	5-18
Chapter i. The rise to leadership, (November 1640-December 1643).	19-49
" ii. The struggle with Holles, (1644).	50-98
" iii. The issue of peace or war, (1645-1646).	99-153
" iv. Relations with the Army, (1647-1648)	154-201
" v. Vane's part in naval administration, (1640-1648).	202-243
" vi. The republican statesman, (1649-1653).	244-273
" vii. Vane and the Admiralty, (1649-1653).	
Part i. The Admiralty Committee member, February 1649-December 1652.	274-311
Part ii. The Admiralty Commissioner, December 1652-April 1653.	312-333
" viii. Religious policy, (1640-1653).	334-356
" ix. Conclusion.	357-385
Abbreviations	386-389
Bibliography	390-426

INTRODUCTION

Sir Henry Vane the younger¹ came of a family which had played a part in the public life of England at least since the fourteenth century. His great-grandfather had taken part in Wyatt's rebellion, and had narrowly escaped death for treason,² but had lived to be a member of Elizabeth's first two parliaments.³ His grandfather had died in the English forces at Rouen, fighting for Henry IV of France, in 1596.⁴ His father's part in English diplomatic, political and administrative history would require a volume to itself. The protestant tradition was strong in the family - they were early converts to the Reformed religion.⁵

The elder Vane was certainly one of the 'rising' gentry. According to his own account⁶ the land he inherited in Kent (where the family had been settled at least since Henry VI's reign) was worth only £460 a year, of which £160 was his mother's dowry. But his marriage to a wealthy heiress and his good fortune at court enabled him to buy Fairlawn in Kent, for £4,000,⁷ and in 1629 he purchased estates at Raby, Barnard Castle and Long Newton for £18,000.⁸

1. In this thesis referred to as 'Vane' whenever possible.
 2. Collins, Peerage, iii, 284-295; iv, 500-503.
 3. Return of M.P.s, i. 402, 407.
 4. Collins, op. cit.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Dalton, Wrays of Glentworth, ii, 112. His wife's dowry was £3,000.
 7. Ibid.
 8. Ibid.

Young Sir Henry's bride, Frances Wray, brought with her a dowry of £5,500,¹ £3,000 of which was used to purchase a farm and other lands in Staindrop,² the village which adjoins Raby Castle. At the same time the elder Vane purchased a colliery in the Durham coalfield, Cockfield, for £900.³ In 1648 he purchased two small estates near Fairlawn for £1,000, probably obtained by leasing the Cockfield mine.⁴ In 1650 he bought yet more property, church lands in county Durham, the manors of Wivestoe, with associated cottages, quarries and mills, and of Evenwood.⁵ In 1652 he acquired some rents in Durham and Kent, but these were of small value.⁶ He had also acquired by 1623 a house in Whitehall, fronting the Strand, and next to the earl of Northumberland's.⁷ From the Durham lands an annuity of £500 was due to the redoubtable Lady Elizabeth Hatton; she purchased this through trustees in 1633.⁸

Writing in 1649⁹ Sir Henry Vane senior asserted that his estates were well worth £3,000 a year, and 'when my lease expire, which will not be long' they would be worth nearer £5,000 than £4,000 a year.

(Both he and his eldest son were well aware of the possibility of

1. Raby deeds, indenture, 30 June 1640.
2. Ibid. indenture, 15 June 1640.
3. Ibid. indenture, 28 May 1640.
4. Dalton, op. cit., Raby deeds, indenture, 25 May 1648; lease for seven years to William Lodge and George Marley.
5. Will of Sir Henry Vane the elder, 1655. P.C.C. Reg. Aylett. 159.
6. Ibid.
7. He writes for the first time from Charing Cross in 1623. (CSPD. 1619-23, 550)
8. Raby deeds, lease, 13 May 1633.
9. Dalton, op. cit.

'improving' rents).¹ The Fairlawn estate, the house at Charing Cross, and the Raby, Barnard Castle and Long Newton estates were all settled on young Sir Henry in 1640.² The Wivestoe estates and the small rents in county Durham and Kent were bequeathed to Sir Walter and William Vane, two of the younger sons, by their father's will, drawn up in 1654.³ He had probably purchased the lands with this in mind. The elder Vane declared that he had spent £20,000 on buildings, parks, fish ponds and other 'conveniences' on his three manor houses.⁴

The younger Vane was sent to Westminster school,⁵ where he was a contemporary of Hesilrige and Thomas Scot. In later life he retained some connection with the school, for its well-known puritan headmaster, Lambert Osbaldeston, appealed to Vane in 1649 to assist the brilliant and impecunious Henry Stubbe.⁶ Vane's biographers have failed to notice that it was while Vane was at school that he experienced his religious 'conversion'.⁷ After only a short time at

1. Vane wrote to his father on 9 May 1640, 'If you shall please to make £600 per annum joynture and present maintenance and to let the demeanes of Barnard Castle be part thereof; which in present doe yeild but £230 per annum or thereabout, but some five or six yeares hence will improve £100 or £120 per annum and some nine or tenne yeares hence will improve another £100 or thereabouts'. S.P. 16/452/92. See also CSPD.1650, 242.
2. Dalton, op. cit.
3. Op. cit.
4. Dalton, op. cit.
5. Wood, Athenae, iii, 578. (Vane's name is not in J. Welch, List of scholars of St. Peter's College, Westminster, 1788, but the list is obviously incomplete for this early period).
6. See below, p. 118.
7. Though Wood, who had read Sikes' biography, hints at this. Vane's 'conversion' took place when he was fourteen or fifteen (Sikes, Life, 7-8), and he went up to Oxford at about 16 years of age. (Wood, op. cit. Wood's information about Vane at Oxford was obtained from Stubbe, and is therefore reliable).

Oxford, Vane travelled abroad. Viscount Conway's correspondent, Garrard, wrote that the elder Vane's sons were 'all bred up at Leyden,'¹ while Clarendon asserted that Vane had spent 'some little time in France and more in Geneva'.² His father tells us only that he had brought up his eldest son and six others 'beyond seas'.³ If Vane in fact attended Leyden university it seems to have left no record, though many links between Vane's family and the Dutch Netherlands can be detected, from the 1630s to the 1650s,⁴ and lend support to Garrard's assertion. It is interesting that Charles Vane, a younger brother, is recorded as Master of Arts of Saumur.⁵ This academy was the intellectual centre of French protestantism until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; it is very possible that Vane studied here, like his brother, and this would explain his excellent French.⁶ In 1631 he was in the train of the English ambassador in Vienna.⁷ On his return to England he was disappointed in his hopes of a place in the king's privy chamber.⁸ (A military career was distasteful to him.)⁹ By 1635 he was friendly with Pym and Pym's friend, Sir

-
1. CSPD. 1635, 385.
 2. Rebellion, iii, 35.
 3. Dalton, *op. cit.*
 4. See for instance, CSPD. 1635, 207, and GJ. ii, 512. (Two of Vane's brothers 'have command there').
 5. Wood, Fasti, ii, 504.
 6. Harl. 164, f.94v.
 7. S.P.80/8/19.
 8. S.P.16/211/18. 5 February 1632.
 9. Willcock, Life, 27.

Nathaniel Rich,¹ and he left in that year for Massachusetts. With his unsuccessful career in New England during the next two years, as Governor of Massachusetts, this study is not concerned, though some of the friends or acquaintances he made there, John Winthrop, Hugh Peters and Roger Williams, played a part in his later life.

According to Clarendon, Vane was much reformed in his 'extravagancies', that is, his puritan convictions, after his return from New England, and seemed a man 'well satisfied and composed to the government'.² But very little is known of Vane between his return to England in 1637 and the opening of the Long Parliament. There are deeds among the Raby manuscripts dating from the spring of 1638 relating to the provision made by his father for Nathaniel Ward, the vicar of Staindrop, which adjoins Raby Castle.³ Ward was given the tithes of Staindrop, which the elder Vane had bought some years before,⁴ and some land in the parish, the provision being made, so one deed states, 'for the better advancement of the worship of God for the fynding and mainteyning of one able, learned and fit Minister'. The word 'Minister' is added in a different hand, as though the term to be used had been debated, and the more Protestant

-
1. Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ed. Knowler, i, 463.
 2. Clarendon, Rebellion, iii, 35.
 3. Raby deeds, 20 March 1638. This was not the famous Nathaniel Ward of this period. The incumbent of Staindrop was killed in 1644. CSPD.1644-5, 96-97.
 4. Raby deed, 22 June 1627.

word finally decided upon. Vane may have suggested or encouraged his father's action; the fact that his father promoted the transaction only when his son was with him lends support to this supposition, and certainly the younger man took some part in arranging it.¹ At some point during the 1630s Vane was attending the meetings held by a puritan of Barnard Castle, Matthew Stoddart, on his private days of fasting and humiliation,² but this could have been either before or after Vane's visit to Massachusetts.

In 1639 Vane embarked on what was to prove a long career in naval administration, when in January of that year he became joint-treasurer of the navy with Sir William Russell. The earl of Northumberland, the elder Vane's friend and neighbour, had sought the post for young Vane, but failed. The king however granted it at the suit of Vane's father. The half-share of the office was certainly obtained by purchase.³ The value of the office is difficult to establish. Professor Aylmer accepted £800 per annum as its worth

1. CSPD.1638-39, 12-13.
2. W.H.D. Longstaffe, The Acts of the High Commission Court within the Diocese of Durham, Surtees Soc. vol. xxxiv, (Durham, 1858), p. 193, note a. Quoted R. Howell, 'Puritanism in Newcastle before the summoning of the Long Parliament', Archeologia Aeliana, ser. iv, vol. xli, 1963. Stoddart was later an elder in the Presbyterian classis for Staindrop. Shaw, English Church, ii, 367-68. Vane was at Raby in 1638.
3. 'The office whereof Mr. Vane now standeth possessed of is worth £800 p.ann. and if Sir William Russell dy will be worth as much more ... If Mr. Vane dispose of the office, then if Sir Henry Vane rescieve the whole benefit hee to make up £800 p.an. maintenance'. S.P.16/452/92.I. (Sir Christopher Wray or his representative to Sir Henry Vane the elder).

to a single treasurer,¹ but from the letter whence this figure was originally derived² it is clear that the £800 would be Vane's share alone. Even this sum seems inadequate for an office which contemporaries agreed was a very profitable one,³ and according to the warrant for monthly payment in January 1639, the value of the poundage, if navy expenditure continued at the same rate, would have been over £4,000 a year⁴ to a single holder of the office. The officially admitted poundage however bears no relation to this figure. In 1638 Sir William Russell, according to his account for that year, drew £275.5s.6d. as poundage.⁵ When he and Vane presented their joint account for 1639 their poundage (to be divided equally between them according to the terms of Vane's appointment), amounted to £728.14s.0d.⁶ The navy treasurer had sources of income however outside his official fees and allowances, and probably £800 can be accepted as the minimum figure which a joint-treasurer might be expected to derive from the post. As joint-treasurer of the navy, Vane was responsible, with Russell, for the ship-money accounts. No doubt he already knew something of naval affairs - his father had been a navy

1. Aylmer, 207.

2. See note 3, p. 10.

3. Clarendon called it an office of great trust and profit (*Rebellion*, iii, 34), and Hollond (308) declared it to be a 'warm thing'.

4. *CSPD.1638-9*, 307. 11 January 1639. The expenditure on the navy was over £26,000 a month.

5. A.O.I/1704/81.

6. A.O.I/1704/83.

commissioner since 1632.¹ In 1639 the majority of the weekly accounts were signed by both treasurers, though on those accounts signed by one man only, Vane signed considerably more for the 1638 ship-money levy than did Russell. No doubt Vane's responsibility was held to begin with the 1638 accounts, though he did sign four for 1637.² The form of the weekly accounts, and of the annual ones, did not change with Vane's appointment.

As Navy Treasurer Vane soon showed the energy and efficiency were to mark all his career. Nicholas wrote in July 1640, 'The new treasurer of the navy takes very much upon him, and has already, as I hear, wearied all the officers of the navy'.³ They may well have been 'wearied' by one change introduced into navy administration two months after Vane's appointment, and probably therefore due to Vane; instead of the principal officers of the navy charging the service accounts with payments for their lodging, firing and dinners when they were in London for their meetings, a fixed sum each year was allowed them for these expenses. The king saved over £300 a year by the new arrangement.⁴ The fact that Vane was a government official is of course no indication of his attitude to the administration at this time - Pym held a post as a Receiver in the Exchequer, and many other leaders of opposition

-
1. D.N.B.
 2. CSPD.1638-39, passim; notes 5 and 6, p.11.
 3. CSPD.1639, 383, 10 July, 1639.
 4. Privy Seal Docket, Index, IND.6789, Mar. 1639. There are other indications of Vane's official activity at this time, e.g. CSPD. 1638-39, 568; ibid. 1640, 137. I have found no indication that Vane advanced money to the government in the same way that his fellow-treasurer had done, except on one occasion, to be described below. For Russell see R. Ashton, 'The disbursing official under the early Stuarts; the cases of Sir William Russell and Philip Burlamachi', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xxx, 1957, 162-174. For the later value of the Navy Treasurer's office to Vane, see below, pp. 237-8.

to the king were also royal officials. There is some evidence however that at the end of 1639 Vane was regarded as a reliable 'court' candidate for parliament, for this seems the only reasonable interpretation of the king's extraordinary action, described elsewhere, in ordering the withdrawal of an exchequer court case against the corporation of Hull. This was the price paid for Vane's election to the Short Parliament.¹

One is tempted to believe that Vane never attended that parliament. He was not nominated to a single committee, though St. John, with whom he could be compared for lack of parliamentary experience, was named to six.² Vane was very busy at this time with business affairs in connection with his marriage to Frances Wray,³ and perhaps this caused him to absent himself from parliament. His marriage took place on 1st July 1640⁴, and in view of the well-known puritan sympathies of his bride's family,⁵ it would seem that the elder Vane must have shared the Wrays' views, in spite of Clarendon's assertion that Vane senior 'liked the government of both Church and State'.⁶ But even if the elder Vane had not been inclined to puritanism, the earl of Strafford's provocative action in taking the barony of Raby as one of his titles in February 1640 was well-calculated to drive the Vanes into the camp of those who hated the earl.

It would seem from the letters (already quoted), concerning the

-
1. V.A. Rowe, 'Sir Henry Vane the Younger as M.P. for Hull', *Notes and Queries*, New Series, vol. vi, No. 1, January 1959.
 2. *CJ.* ii, 4-14, *passim*.
 3. A large number of deeds in connection with the marriage settlement are recorded at Raby.
 4. *Dalton*, *op. cit.*
 5. *Ibid.*
 6. *Rebellion*, vi, 411.

marriage settlement of Vane and Frances Wray, and the family deeds,¹ that he was to enjoy the £800 a year which it was then reckoned that his share of the navy treasurer's office would be worth, and that his bride would have £600 a year from the lands settled upon her at her marriage. The elder Vane also settled on his son the third part of the sub-poena office in Chancery, which he had bought some years before. Vane was married at St. Mary's, Lambeth, though the Vane house in the Strand was just opposite St. Martin's-in-the-Fields - probably St. Martin's was not puritan enough for himself and his father. Vane had been knighted eight days before.³ His friendship with Pym continued, for Pym came to see him in September - when Vane had an ague, Clarendon says⁴ - and the famous copy was made of his father's notes of a Privy Council meeting which was used by Pym to procure Strafford's death. Vane did not take part in the Scots War, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary by his detractors and biographers.⁵

The Vane 'connection' in parliament, in so far as it depended on consanguinity, was remarkably small, smaller indeed probably than that of most M.P.s. Young Vane's father-in-law, Sir Christopher Wray, was a prominent member of the Lower House, and Wray's half-brother,

-
1. Raby deeds; 'The settlement of the inheritance in the North', 30 June 1640, and S.P.16/452/92.
 2. Dalton, op. cit.
 3. Shaw, Knights, ii, 207.
 4. Clarendon, Rebellion, iii, 131. If Vane had contracted malaria abroad, it would go far to explain his later ill-health.
 5. See below, p. 35.

Sir John Wray,¹ and brother-in-law, Sir Edward Ayscough,² were also members. Vane's name figures largely in the Wray family deeds of the period,³ and his ties with his wife's family were probably close. (They did not prevent Sir Christopher Wray from being a leading member of Holles's group). Sir Thomas Pelham, M.P. for Sussex county, was a brother-in-law of Vane;⁴ among Sir Thomas's friends were Henry and Peregrine Pelham and Antony Stapley.⁵ Vane's family connections in parliament seem to have extended no farther than this.

The two Vanes however had friendly relations or business ties with a number of other M.P.s and peers. The elder Vane sat for Wilton in 1640,⁶ which would indicate that he counted the earl of Pembroke among his well-wishers, but a common antipathy to the earl of Strafford may explain this. Cornelius Holland was said to have been a 'link-boy' taken into the elder Vane's service after his father had died in prison for debt;⁷ he was certainly one of the parties to the 1640 marriage settlement and also one of the overseers of the elder Vane's will,⁸ so that the connection between the two men lasted

-
1. Maddison, Lincolnshire Pedigrees, iv, 1323. Sir Antony Irby was another brother-in-law of Sir Christopher.
 2. 'My brother, Sir Edward Ayscough' was a trustee, with Vane, under Sir Christopher's will. P.C.C.36 Twisse. 4 October 1645.
 3. Wray's will, op. cit.; Dalton, op. cit. ii, app. 24; will of Sir Christopher's widow, Lady Albinia, P.C.C. Reg. 174. Bath.
 4. Willcock, 352.
 5. Keeler, 302. Return of M.Ps, 483. Peregrine Pelham was Vane's fellow M.P. for Hull.
 6. Return of M.Ps, i, 484.
 7. 'The Second Centurie', E 465(13); Chippes of the Old Block, 669, f.23 f.14.
 8. Op. cit. D'Ewes called Holland the elder Vane's servant, e.g. Harl. 164.f. 334v.

until the end of the older man's life. Through his friendship with Pym Vane was linked with the extensive Warwick-Barrington-St. John group. There is no sign however that Vane showed Warwick any friendship in politics - such evidence as there is indicates rather hostility between the two men.¹ St. John and Vane were probably close friends, and certainly close political associates.² The earl of Northumberland and the elder Vane were friends as well as neighbours,³ but the earl was also a reforming Lord High Admiral,⁴ and his official duties brought him into close contact with the younger Vane before the Long Parliament began.⁵ The elder Vane was a close friend of the Electress Palatine,⁶ and one of his daughters married her steward, Sir Robert Honeywood, in 1642;⁷ this would be a link with the many M.P.s who were interested in the fortunes of the Winter Queen. William Say, a 'recruiter' M.P., was a friend of the elder Vane by the time the latter's will was drawn up in 1654.⁸ He also had a distant connection with the much-respected Northern M.P., Sir Thomas Widdrington; a colourful Newcastle

1. See below pp.70, 215.

2. See below p. 40.

3. HMC. 3rd Rep. App. 82; CSPD.1645-47, 215.

4. Hollond, Discourses, 25.

5. 'My Lord Admirall hath sent for mee to attend his Lordship with all possible speed'. S.P.16/452/92.

6. See below p. 91.

7. Willcock, 352.

8. Op. cit.

character, Mark Shafto ('six-bottle Mark'), who was acting as steward at Sir Henry Vane senior's courts baron and courts leet in 1645¹, was Widdrington's father-in-law. Shafto was a close friend of the elder Vane's solicitor in legal matters, Henry Dingley.² Incidentally, when the elder Vane became the leading member of the important Committee of the King's Revenue, Cornelius Holland was one of the committee,³ and its secretary was Edward Cousins,⁴ who had been in Sir Henry Vane senior's employ before 1640, dealing with estate matters.⁵

Vane's links with those who afterwards took the royalist side were few - perhaps this partly accounts for his somewhat uncompromising attitude towards 'Malignants'. Lilburne accused Vane's next brother, Sir George, who managed the family collieries⁶ and lived at Long Newton, of being a royalist at first, but this, though probable, is not certain. Sir George Vane's father-in-law, Sir Lionel Maddison, a royalist at the beginning of the Civil War, changed sides just before the storming of Newcastle.⁷ The elder Vane's fourth son,

1. Records of C.C. Durham, 337.

2. Ibid.

3. See e.g. BM.Add.19, 398 (Letter from the Committee to the Corporation of Norwich, signed by Vane, Holland and others).

4. CSPD.1644, 235.

5. CSPD.1639-40, 530. Clement Walker stated that the elder Vane's 'man', Cozens, 'is clearke to the Committee, and gets £2,000 p.a. by it' (The Second Centurie, op.cit.) Note also CSPD.1645-47, 58,

6. CSPD.1644-45, 96-97.

7. See below p.145.

8. See below p.372.

Sir Walter, was certainly a royalist;¹ it was probably he who was to save Vane from the loathsome tortures associated with a traitor's death.²

Vane's preparation for his public career in England may be seen to have included a period of Continental travel likely to have reinforced the interest in foreign affairs that his father's diplomatic experience would have given him. He had also had experience as Governor of Massachusetts, and nearly two years of active work in naval administration. He came of stout protestant stock, who had suffered for their faith, and his education and marriage were calculated to strengthen this factor in Vane's inheritance. He and his wife probably enjoyed a joint income of some £1,400 a year, but with the prospect of much more when old Sir Henry Vane should die. Pym is the one friend Vane is known to have had in England when the Long Parliament met, and only some half-dozen members of parliament were at all closely related to him. But his varied experience before 1640 gave him an advantage over almost all his contemporaries, and foreshadowed his major interests in the Long Parliament, religion, the navy, and foreign policy. In the two latter subjects no-one who supported the Parliamentary cause in 1642, except his own father, possessed Vane's expert knowledge.

-
1. His knighthood is not listed in Shaw's Knights, but his father refers to him as Sir Walter Vane in his will of 1654. He must therefore have been knighted during the Civil War, and this would accord with the fact that Charles II appointed him in 1664, only two years after Sir Henry's execution, as envoy to the Elector of Brandenburg. (M. Cranston, John Locke, a biography, 1957, 81).
 2. Wood, Athenae, iii, 578.

Vane did not come to the fore in the first three years of the Long Parliament as quickly as his outstanding abilities would lead one to expect. Perhaps his youth and inexperience, his record as governor of Massachusetts, his association with ship-money, or all three, account for his comparatively slow rise to leadership in the House. Not until early in 1642 was he employed in the drafting of documents, and not until after Pym's death was he chairman of a committee. The records of the debates confirm Clarendon's statement that at the beginning of the Long Parliament some eight or nine men managed the 'designs', that is, the political planning; Vane was among the 'stout seconders' who were trusted **only** upon occasion.¹ During the first two months indeed he was on no important general committee, except those on the navy and religion, the only two subjects on which he spoke.²

In January 1641 however the House began to appoint him to important committees,³ and in March, as a result of his work on one of these,⁴ he was for the first time given responsibility for formulating the wishes, and therefore to some extent the policy of

-
1. Clarendon, Rebellion, iii, 55.
 2. These two subjects are separately considered.
 3. CJ.ii,67.12 January. This committee was to consider how money could be obtained for the army. It later obtained responsibility for the relief of the Northern counties, and the navy, and Vane, though already a member was added to it; a not infrequent occurrence. Ibid., 82,83. There was a multiplicity of committees at this time - for Vane's membership of two committees which were to meet at the same time, see ibid.139.
 4. The committee for preparing the tunnage and poundage bill, which also considered how to obtain money for the navy urgently. Ibid., 107. 18 Mar.

the House. In the same month he began to be appointed as a reporter of conferences with the Lords,¹ and in May he managed a conference with the Lords for the first time, though it seems that Vane's part was to deal with naval topics.² The Commons' growing respect for Vane was shown in the same month when his name replaced Kirton's in the Bill of Subsidies Committee, Kirton having disgraced himself in the eyes of the House by declaring that Strafford's trial was unjust.³ All through that summer he was coming to the fore as a member of important organising committees.⁴

Vane was not however in the same category as Pym as a leader of the House, at least until the autumn of 1643, and it is certain that he cannot be reckoned one of the half-dozen foremost men in the Commons until the time of Pym's illness.⁵ He was not chairman of a single Commons committee, though on one occasion he did take over such duties from Pierrepoint, who was indisposed.⁶ The king himself did not regard Vane during 1642 and 1643 as one of his leading opponents; Vane was not one of the famous Five Members of January 1642, and though, as late as June 1643, the king speaks of the House of Commons being overawed by a powerful faction, Vane was

1. Ibid. 109.20 Mar.

2. CJ. ii, 140, 8 May.

3. Ibid. 137. 6 May. A mistake had again been made in the naming of committee members - Kirton's name was not on the original committee, ibid. 130. 30 April.

4. Ibid. 180, 188, 190, 207-8, 210.

5. The Puritan writer who lists 'the best' of the king's subjects in Oct. 1642 names 15 M.Ps or peers, but does not include Vane. A Speedy Post from Heaven to the King of England, E.121 (6).

6. Harl.162,f.391v. 18 Feb. 1642.

not one of the members of parliament excepted from the royal offer of pardon.¹ In this same month Edmund Waller and his fellow-conspirators planned to arrest Say, Wharton, Pym, Stapleton, Hampden and Strode, but there was no mention of Vane.²

Nevertheless, even in these years, he was energetically employed in parliament's affairs. After the attempted arrest of the Five Members, he was appointed to several important committees connected with this incident.³ Work on these, on drafting and other committees occupied him from January to April 1642. By the beginning of 1642 the Commons had also become aware that Vane was extremely skilful in drafting documents, and one of the features of this and the following year is the frequency with which Vane was appointed to committees entrusted with this kind of duty.⁴ When an answer to a petition had to be framed, or a reply to a message from the Scottish commissioners or the king had to be composed, Vane was very likely to be one of the committee.

1. Harl. 164 f.278v. 27 June 1643.

2. Ibid. f.396v.

3. CJ. ii, 368,376,382.

4. See e.g. CJ.ii, 388,439,449,478,513. After the dismissal of the Vanes from their official posts in Dec. 1641 it is more often difficult to decide which of the two is indicated when only the name 'Sir Henry Vane' is written, for the elder Vane was no longer 'Mr. Treasurer' after that date. Moreover between 4 Aug. and Dec. 1641 he had accompanied Charles to Scotland (CJ.ii.236). Occasionally D'Ewes establishes the identity which the Journals leave undecided (e.g. CJ. ii, 625.15 June 1642, and Harl.163, f.162), and less often the Journals themselves clarify the point later (CJ. ii, 665), or identify the Vane to whom D'Ewes refers (Harl. 164, f.46 and CJ.ii,266), but there are many occasions on which it is impossible to say whether Vane junior or his father is being referred to. On rare occasions only the surname is given, in which case George Vane, M.P. for Callington, Cornwall, is also a candidate for recognition.

There is evidence in 1642 and 1643 that Vane was already critical of the Upper House. When on 8 February 1642 the Lords made amendments to a Commons' declaration concerning the forts and militia of the kingdom, Vane suggested 'wee may send upp to the Lords in our message that wee should consent to ther amendments upon condition that they would consent to our additions.' D'Ewes, evidently scandalised at Vane's attitude, spoke against 'such a conditionall message.'¹ In the following month Vane was impatient at the delay of the Upper House in dealing with one of Parliament's broadsides in the 'pamphlet war' of 1642. He moved that 'wee might send upp to the Lords to quicken them concerning our declaration of the causes and remedies of our evils.'² Other M.P.s added similar complaints, and it was Vane who was sent up to the Lords to expedite the matter he had raised.³ In January 1643 when the Commons were asked to concur with a report by the Lords concerning the earl of Leicester and Ireland - Leicester had been criticised for not taking up his duties in Ireland - Vane was one of the tellers for the Noes.⁴

More significantly, when in May 1643 the Commons were discussing the provision of a new Great Seal, Vane wanted the bill so phrased that the two houses or either of them should provide a remedy⁵ - a clear indication that Vane considered that legislative power lay in the hands of the Commons alone. Certainly it would be difficult

1. Harl. 164, f.237.

2. Harl. 162, f.43v. 23 Mar.1642.

3. CJ.ii,493.

4. CJ.ii,947, 28 Jan.1643.

5. Harl.162, f.388, 11 May 1643. The italics are mine.

to believe that the Lords then at Westminster could claim any legislative power when in that summer their numbers at division time totalled only sixteen.¹ Vane was evidently anxious that the making of a new Great Seal should go through; when the Lords sent messages desiring a conference with the Commons which would put an end to the discussion in the Lower House for that day, it was Vane who moved that the House should take up the matter of the Seal on the following morning.² But Vane derided the idea that the members should consult their constituents on important matters. When Killigrew argued in April 1642 that before the House concluded matters of 'great moment' it should send some M.P.s into each county to have the county's consent for 'it was not the enacting of a Law that made it in force but the willing obedience to it', Vane and others took 'great exceptions' to Killigrew's words, though unfortunately D'Ewes does not tell us what Vane said in the 'hot debate' that followed.³

It is relevant to consider in connection with Vane's attitude both to the Upper House and to peace the negotiations which the French envoy, the Comte d'Harcourt, hoped to initiate in 1643, for here Vane played an important part. Vane reported the conference

-
1. Harl.165, f.125, 11 Jul.1643. For Pym's declaration to the Lords as early as Nov.1641 that the Commons were the representative body see Gardiner, History .. 1603-42, x,94.
 2. Ibid., f.389, 12 May 1643.
 3. Harl.162,f.58v. 1 Apr.1642.

4. The terms for the drafting committee was four, of whom Vane would have to be one, as the matter had been 'especially recommended' to him.

5. Op. cit., 318.

6. Op. cit., 318. 22 Nov. 1643.

with the Lords at which Harcourt's approach to the earl of Northumberland was described,¹ and when a Commons committee to consider these overtures was set up, the care of the matter was 'especially recommended' to Vane.² He was one of the managers of the conference with the Lords on the reply to be made to Harcourt.³ Vane was at least partly responsible for the reply which the Commons formulated,⁴ and its differences from the answer that the Lords had drafted are significant. The Commons deleted the Lords' expression of thankfulness to the French king and queen, and to the 'most affectionate desire' of the French king to procure peace in England, but included a reference to the liberties of the three kingdoms, which the Lords had not mentioned, and to the Solemn League and Covenant. The Lords answer⁵ promised that when Harcourt approached Parliament, the two Houses would answer in such a way as to make it evident that nothing was more desired by them than peace. The Commons' committee's draft does not promise an answer, only that Parliament would do 'that which shall be fit', and all reference to the desire for peace was omitted.⁶ The total effect is of a very chilly welcome indeed to the French mediation proposals. Harcourt tried once more to intervene in the dispute between the king and parliament, and again it was probably Vane who

-
1. Harl.165, f.209. 14 Nov.1643.
 2. CJ.iii, 316, 20 Nov.1643.
 3. Ibid., 317. 22 Nov.1643.
 4. The quorum for the drafting committee was four, of whom Vane would have to be one, as the matter had been 'especially recommended' to him.
 5. CJ. iii, 318.
 6. CJ.iii, 318. 22 Nov. 1643.

was drafting replies to the Lords and managing conferences, though the clerk does not make it clear in the journals whether he is referring to Vane senior.¹

Allegations of Vane's duplicity² receive support from some of his actions in 1643. In March the Commons instructed five of their members, including Marten and Gurdon, to destroy the superstitious monuments in the chapel of Somerset House, Henrietta Maria's private residence, which was served by Capuchin friars. The members carried out their duties with zeal, and arrested five of the friars.³ A fortnight later a protest was despatched from the French king; his Agent, Monsieur Burin, wished to present it to the House. Vane opposed the reception of the letter; he argued that the House did not know whether Monsieur Burin was indeed the French king's agent, but, as D'Ewes pointed out, the House had given passes to travel to Monsieur Burin's servants, thus implicitly accepting his credentials, only two or three days before.⁴ Vane's specious argument was undoubtedly being used to protect Marten, Gurdon and the others from attack; it cannot have strengthened his reputation for honesty. Incidentally, he was also implicitly defending the rights of the Commons as against the Lords - the peers had refused to support the

-
1. Ibid., 325, 327, 330 (Vane junior), 352, 364. The affair dragged on into Jan. 1644.
 2. Clarendon, Rebellion, iii, 34. 'Of great natural parts & of very profound dissimulation.'
 3. CJ, ii, 843, 1001. 13 Mar. 1643; Harl. 164, 348v., 368v. D'Ewes considered that Marten had obtained the order as a means of delaying peace talks, ibid., f. 361. Marten was not noted for religious zeal, and D'Ewes was probably right.
 4. Harl. 164, f. 366. 13 Apr. 1643. The House had actually done so on 5 Apr., ibid., f. 356.

Lower House in this matter, and the Commons alone had authorised Marten's action.¹ A disingenuous attitude on Vane's part is reflected also during the investigations into the Waller plot two months later. When the Lord Mayor had been thanked for his 'care and pains' in discovering the plot, it was Vane who moved as the Mayor was going out, that he might be: 'desired to conceale this business of the new conspiracy until it should be published into the city by order of the house'.² There was no obvious reason for concealment.

At times Vane showed a ruthless side to his character. When details of Waller's plot had been laid before the House, Glyn moved that the earl of Manchester might name M.P.s who held command in the army to try Waller and his fellow-conspirators by martial law. Various members began to excuse themselves from this duty, and Holles moved: 'that wee might bee very wary how wee proceeded in taking away the lives of men and to goe upon sure ground'. Glyn replied that the Judge Advocate of the Army (Dorislus) avouched these proceedings to be according to the use and custom of other armies. It is understandable that, as D'Ewes writes: 'This made divers to dislike the proceedings more than formerly, seeing that the lives of men were to be taken away upon an advocate's opinion, being also of Holland.' But Vane supported Glyn in arguing that Manchester had the necessary

1. Marten's speech in 1646. Harrington, B.M. Add. 10, 114, f.22.
 2. Harl. 164f. 398v. 6 June 1643.

power to try the accused by court martial, though this must seem a most unjust proceeding to any modern reader.¹

Again, in October 1643, when reporting to the House on the negotiations which led to the Solemn League and Covenant, Vane informed the House that the Scots had declared that all who refused the Covenant were to be declared enemies to the king and state and the true religion, incapable of bearing any office in the commonwealth, and their lands and goods were to be confiscated.² On 6 November, the House discussed what punishment should be inflicted on M.P.s who had refused to take the Covenant. (The English version had no penal clause attached). Whittaker implies that Vane again repeated the Scots' penalties.³

On a very large number of committees Vane was a fellow-member with Pym. In Professor Hexter's brilliant study of Pym's career in the Long Parliament⁴ - for all its remarkable qualities - there are some important qualifications to be made concerning Pym's relations with Vane. If Professor Hexter's view of Pym as a leader who held in check extremists of both sides, and who won over the 'middle' group is correct, then it would seem that Vane could not have been working in alliance with him, for Vane strenuously opposed peace negotiations.

-
1. Harl.165,f.103.29 Jun.1643. Two of Waller's accomplices were tried on one day and executed two days later. Waller himself escaped with a fine. D.N.B. Art. sub Edmund Waller. A royalist pamphleteer (E.554(14) writing in 1649, remembered that Dorislaus had 'made a shift to hang Tomkins & Challoner in broken Dutchified English'. 669 f.10(55) has one or two details of the plot not mentioned in Gardiner.
 2. Whittaker, f. 86v. 26 Oct. 1643.
 3. Ibid. f.90. On the following day Vane took care to inform the Commons, apropos of another matter, that the masters, captains and crews of ships would not be permitted to go to sea without taking the Covenant. BM. Add. 18, 778 f.84.
 4. J.H. Hexter, Reign of King Pym. Cambridge, Mass., 1941.

during the winter of 1642, and during the following spring, and peace negotiations were the major policy on which the House divided. On this subject however Pym was more intransigent than Professor Hexter allows. It is true that something depends on one's view of the practicability of peace negotiations. Professor Hexter thinks that the king's refusal to accept Sir John Evelyn as one of Parliament's negotiators was 'a flimsy pretext' for breaking off relations with parliament,¹ and that his refusal of Parliament's four propositions eighteen days later was provocative.² But Parliament was surely equally provocative in sequestering the king's revenue and delinquents' estates just at the time when peace negotiations were likely to get under way - and these radical financial measures were part of Pym's policy.³ Moreover it is difficult to see why Evelyn could not have been replaced by another negotiator. On the question, discussed in February 1643, of insisting on disbandment by both sides before treating with the king, Pym's language was more diplomatic,⁴ - he was much more aware of the importance of public

1. Ibid., 16.

2. Ibid., 17.

3. CJ.ii, 823. Reign of King Pym, 18.

4. 'It will be a disadvantage to us and draw a partie against us if we treat not before see the forts may be putt into indifferent hands; the forts are for the protection of the kingdom;' [i.e. Pym wants the question of the forts magazines etc. settled before the negotiations for a peace treaty proper, but the use of the word 'treat' here has a soothing effect]. The speech ends however, 'If the king yeeld not to a disbandinge we shall have no hope of peace'. Add.18, 777, f.151. 11 Feb. D'Ewes lists Vane, Martin, Pym, Strode & Wentworth in that order, as the 'hot spirits' opposing peace. Harl. 164f. 301v.

opinion than Vane¹ - but his conclusion was the same. Certainly Pym had reason to distrust the king, but the question here is not whether the 'war party's' policy was the only practical policy, but whether Pym supported it. It is difficult to believe that the propositions made by parliament in August 1642 and February 1643 were really made with a view to achieving peace.² Even if they were however, how can the vow and covenant which Pym pleaded for so 'vehemently' in October 1642, and the impeachment of the queen, be represented as other than measures intended to widen the rift between the supporters of parliament and those of the king? Neither measure can be defended as constructive war measures, and both were pre-eminently Pym's work.³ Pym's claim to be regarded as leader of the 'war party' rests on more than D'Ewes' ill-tempered assertions.

That Vane himself vigorously opposed peace negotiations in a forthright way which evinced his impatience with the whole idea of 'treating' with the king is not open to doubt. As early as April 1642, when he opposed Killigrew on what might be called a 'referendum',⁴ he was incidentally attacking the peace party, for it is surely hardly possible to doubt that the country would have been in favour of

-
1. 'If we change our debate and treatate, we should treatate upon those points as may induce the kingdom to joyne with us'. Ibid., f.157.
 2. One may instance no. ii in the February propositions, that the king should leave delinquents to a legal trial and judgement of parliament, and no. viii, under which Lenthall would be Master of the Rolls, Rolle a judge of the King's Bench, and Browne a baron of the Exchequer - why should these appointments be insisted upon? Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 262-267.
 3. Reign of King Pym, 29-30.
 4. See p. 24 above.

continued negotiations, even a compromise, rather than war. When at the end of August 1642 Culpeper had come with a message from Charles, D'Ewes believed that Marten and Strode did not want Culpeper admitted and his message read, lest this should lead to peace, and that it was for this reason that Marten introduced the question of the covenant of adherence to the earl of Essex. This covenant had been passed, and many M.P.s had given their individual support, on 11 August. The House had resolved that M.P.s who were not present on that day should declare their support for Essex when they next came into the House, but the Commons Journals give no sign that this was done, and D'Ewes says that he had come into the House on several days after the covenant had been passed, but had never been asked to give his assent. There can be little doubt that Marten was raising the matter as a diversion to prevent Culpeper's request from being considered - he guessed that the covenant to support Essex would lead to controversy, which it did, and might well hope that Culpeper would return to York, either in despair, or in indignation at the treatment he was receiving.¹ Glyn declared his assent to the covenant, and was immediately followed by Vane,² and it is difficult to construe Vane's action other than as support to the 'war party', or at any rate as opposition to any compromise.

-
1. For the humiliation to which Culpeper was treated, see C.M. Williams, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Oxford, 1954, 'The political career of Henry Marten...'
 2. Harl.163, f.303v. 27 Aug. 1642.

Again, in November 1642, when Holles and others wanted peace propositions sent to the king, Vane vehemently opposed the plan, 'leaste we send propositions which will be returned us again to our scorne. If we send propositions', he concluded, 'to send them when we are in good case'.¹ Similarly in February 1643 he declared he would have no treaty before the disbanding. 'We are to have no mediators between us and the king...our purpose will be accomplished without a treaty, because the disbanding...will carry us on in our ancient way of parliament.'² A few days later, when the Lords were objecting to the demand for prior disbanding, Vane showed his impatience to prosecute the war by saying: ' [Let us] propose we desire an ordinance for money. [This would demonstrate parliament's intention to continue the war.] The Lords will not agree. The disagreement is on their side. We must not recede our votes els the Lords will not agree with us, and therefore would have the question putt whether we should adhere to our former votes.'³ In his usual politer language Pym had just said that the Lords would eventually give way. 'The Lords will not adhere to their votes absolutely, but with limitations...before, they voted a treaty before disbanding and a cessation from hostilities without limitation of tyme, now they would have a resolution for twenty dayes for the cessation'⁴ - i.e. the Lords had already given way on the duration of the armistice. Pym may

1. Add. 18,777,f.64.

2. Ibid., f.149, 11 Feb.

3. Ibid., f.157.

4. Ibid.

have had to restrain his youthful colleague's exuberance, but there was no real difference of policy between them. Probably both knew that the king would not disband his forces before entering into negotiations - the royalists had been winning.

Later on that same day Stapleton, who was opposing negotiations with the king during this period, moved that not only the disbandment of the armies but also the return of forts, ships and magazines to the king should be discussed by the Commons before any other peace propositions were dealt with. Stapleton evidently thought that his addition would hinder the passing of the peace proposals in the Commons, for among the peace party there would be many who would be dubious of handing over forts and magazines to the king at a stage when peace negotiations might fail and hostilities have to be resumed. Vane and Rigby however disliked Stapleton's amendment, 'fearing that it would cause the whole question to passe with the lesse opposition'¹ - the feeling in favour of peace was very strong,² and some wavering M.P.s might vote for Stapleton's motion just because it would make further resistance to the king impossible and therefore ensure a speedy peace.³ On this occasion as on others in February, the 'war party' was defeated, and on 1 March peace proposals were sent to the king.

-
1. Harl. 164, f.301v. 17 Feb. 1643.
 2. Gardiner, *CW.*, i, 93.
 3. D'Ewes is obscure on Vane and Stapleton's motives, but this seems the most reasonable explanation.

1. Harl. 164, f. 301v.

2. For Vane's attitude see *Journal of the House of Commons*, 30.

3. *Ibid.*, 30. Harl. 164, f. 301v. 17 Feb 1643.

On 18 March, when the second Oxford proposals actually passed the Commons, Vane was one of those who absented themselves,¹ since they saw they would not be able to persuade the House to vote for their policy; this withdrawal from parliament when he was in a minority has parallels in Vane's later career.

It should be noted that Vane did not join in the attacks that were made by Marten, Rigby and Mildmay on the Committee of the Safety, Pym's Committee.² Certainly the elder Vane was often its chairman, but Vane did not scruple to oppose his father on occasion, and he would not have kept silent out of loyalty to him. Vane's policy on this, as on so much else, was in line with Pym's. The Scottish alliance was Pym's policy,³ and Vane was sent to carry it out, which he would hardly have been chosen to do if Pym had not felt complete confidence in him.

But if Pym and Vane were in substantial agreement on policy it would seem on a superficial reading of the sources that they did differ in their attitude to two people - the earl of Essex and Henry Marten. After the failure of the March 1643 peace propositions suggestions for an accommodation were not renewed until July, when the earl of Essex took the initiative. In a letter to the Commons he suggested that: 'If the House should thinke it fitt to desire peace of his Majestie hee wished that some propositions to that end might speedilie be sent unto him.' Strode, Wentworth and other 'violent

1. Harl.164, f.334.

2. For their attacks see Reign of King Pym, 58.

3. Ibid., 30. Harl.164, f.381v. 1 May 1643.

spirits' were observed to 'pluck their hatts over ther eyes', presumably to express their impatience with the earl's attitude, and during the debate Vane made a sarcastic speech. Seeing the Commons had neglected, he said, 'upon the severall messages of the Lords to entertain the consideration of sending propositions to the king, Essex had 'done well to stirre us upp to it, although our fatherlie care of the Kingdome should have preceded his Lordship's care.' He added that he observed Essex's letters to mean 'that if wee would send propositions of peace to his Majestie and they did not take effect that then hee would doe his dutie.' Vane's attack called forth a vigorous defence by the partisans of Essex; Stapleton and Goodwin objected to Vane's words, and Vane had twice to apologise.¹

On 13 July Essex replied, also in sarcastic vein, to Vane's attack of two days before. He 'desired that Sir Henry Vane the younger might bee sent to him, of whom the House of Commons had a very good opinion, that soe he might advise with him touching the great affairs of the Kingdome, and that if the said Sir Henry Vane should advise him to march up to the walls of Oxford hee would goe with him.'²

1. Harl.165, f.123v. 11 July.

2. Harl.165 f.126. Vane's biographers have assumed that Essex was slyly referring to the inglorious part which a Royalist lampoon (Somers Tracts, vii, 92) alleged Vane had played at the battle of Newburn in 1640. The contemporary account of this skirmish (HMC.10th Rep. App.part iv, 393, Percy MSS., and CSPD.1640, 645) refer to 'Captain Vane', but this cannot have been Sir Henry. Firstly because he had been knighted in June, and could not be referred to in August as 'Captain Vane', secondly, because he had been busy all that summer with ship-money accounts, by virtue of his position as joint navy treasurer. (CSPD.1640, 272, 305, 485, 566). One ship-money account is actually dated 28 Nov.1640, the very day of Newburn, (ibid., 644). Captain George Vane, Sir Henry's brother, was near Newcastle with his troop on 9 July (ibid., 460), and is probably the officer mentioned in the Newburn Heath accounts, for he was knighted in Nov.1640. (Shaw, Knights, ii, 208). Another brother, William, is mentioned as raising a troop in Mar. (CSPD.1640, 545). Essex may have been emphasising Vane's inexperience, but not his cowardice.

Clarendon noted that it was Vane whom of all men Essex 'hated and looked upon as an enemy.¹

Professor Hexter showed that Pym was concerned to defend the reputation of the earl of Essex during the summer of 1643.² He also noted however that Pym himself drafted a very hostile letter to the earl when instructed by the House to reply to the message from Essex in July.³ And it is significant that Vane's provocative remarks of 11 July, after the reception of the letter from Essex, followed a very critical speech from Pym, who rose and declared that Parliament could not make overtures again to the king, as the earl was suggesting, because all parliament's offers of peace had been rejected by Charles.⁴ Vane as usual spoke in a more intemperate way than Pym, but he was following Pym's lead.

Indeed there is nothing to show until Vane's speech of 11 July that he was among the critics of Essex. In April he had moved that one subject of conference with the Lords should be the sequestration of Sir Arthur Capel's estate, which should be assigned to Essex to compensate him for the loss of his own.⁵ If Vane had found this motion uncongenial he could no doubt have found someone else to sponsor it. He had taken no part in a debate in June on the earl's conduct of the war.⁶ In short, in this as on other major issues, Vane's

1. Clarendon, *Rebellion*, viii, 92. (Writing of 1644).

2. *Reign of King Pym*, 114.

3. *Ibid.*, 132.

4. Harl.165, f.123v.

5. Harl.164, f.380.

6. *Ibid.*, f.233v. 2 June.

policy was in line with Pym's.

In November 1643, with the Scots alliance safely settled, and Pym too ill to take part in politics, the situation had changed. When Stapleton, Essex's defender and possibly his spokesman, declared that Essex lacked regular pay for his troops it was Vane who rose and declared that the committee of the navy had met the day before with another committee, and that he thought twenty thousand pounds was provided already for Essex's immediate use; the committee were to meet next day to consider the question of providing regular payment.¹ It sounds as though Vane was trying to silence Essex's protest, and if so, he succeeded, for the House was satisfied with his assurance, for the time being. In December D'Ewes, in conversation with Sir Walter Earle's son after a desultory debate on recruiting for Essex's army, heard an interesting account of the party divisions in the House. Young Earle told D'Ewes that there were now 'sparkes' or factions in the House. The first was 'Those that desired all that might possibly bee spared for the satisfying of the Scotts, and were therefore loath that the Lord Generall's army should either bee too numerous or require too much money, and the cheife leader of this party was young Sir Henry Vane, with whom joyned most of the Northren gentlemen whose estates were seized by the earl of Newcastle'.² The second consisted of 'such as desired to further Sir William Waller's

1. Harl.165, f.226. 10 Nov.1643.

2. The Vane family estates in the North suffered crippling losses during the Civil War. See CJ.iii,690;CSPD.1644-5,162,310.

expedition into the West ... the cheife leaders were Mr. Trenchard and Mr. Prideaux, being Westerne men'. The third party consisted of 'Sir Philip Stapleton and others that had command in the Lord General's army, and of all those who were not comprehended in the associations, who as appeared.....did almost equall the number of the other two.'¹ Like other political explanations which D'Ewes accepted,² the analysis was probably an over-simplification of the situation, but it does confirm the impression that diaries give of Vane as leader of the pro-Scottish and anti-Essex party at this time. On 12 December, 1643, Vane evidently attempted to divert the House from proceeding with the discussion of recruiting for Essex's forces, by delivering a letter from Parliament's commissioners in Scotland, 'alledging that there was great necessity for the reading thereof', but on this occasion Vane was unsuccessful, and the House after dealing with the letter, went back to the subject of Essex's army.³

As far as Henry Marten is concerned, there are one or two indications that he and Vane gave support to one another in parliament at this time.⁴ This would be natural - in their undisguised hostility

-
1. Harl. 165, f.233, 6 Dec. 1643.
 2. D'Ewes held that it was men of 'mean estates' who supported the war party - they were not so aware of the ruin of the country, and were silly enough to follow Pym and some others, whichever way they went. Harl.164,f.346. 28 Mar.1643.
 3. Harl.165,f.242.
 4. See pp.26 and 39.

to the Lords and to peace negotiations the two men had much in common. But Marten had wittily attacked Pym, and it was Pym who had Marten expelled from the House. This would indicate some difference of opinion between Pym and his young friend; but Vane was not there to object, for in fact Marten was expelled while Vane was in Scotland.¹

In considering Vane's attitude to Pym, one must keep in mind the fact emphasised by Professor Hexter and others, that parties as we know them today did not exist, and that in the changing war situation M.P.s changed their policies. Vane and Pym could openly differ on occasion, on minor matters. In March 1642 when the House were discussing a bill connected with providing money for Ireland Vane moved that the House should adjourn, and later that day should discuss the king's answer to the Newmarket proposals. The House laid this aside, and Pym returned to Irish affairs, suggesting that he should report on some matters connected with that country. It seems that Vane preferred to discuss negotiations with the king, and Pym the Irish problem; incidentally it was Marten, who supported Vane.²

-
1. Reign of King Pym, 148. Vane left for Scotland on 20 July.
 2. Marten tried to raise Vane's motion again as a point of order, interrupting Pym. Harl. 162, f.54v.

Pym's friend St. John was a close associate of Vane - a contemporary diurnall refers to the two as 'intimate friends'¹ - and the diaries give a strong impression that the two men were co-operating in parliament. On many occasions St. John is found taking exactly the same line as Vane,² seconding his suggestions,³ or immediately following up a suggestion Vane had made.⁴ Both men, with Pym and Glyn, formed the committee set up to investigate Edmund Waller's plot, and carried out their duties with great energy - they must have been collaborators in this work.⁵ With St. John however, as with Pym, Vane could disagree on occasion, and in January 1642 they differed on an important point. St. John had just brought in a bill of tannage and poundage which was to be in force for the king's lifetime. Vane rose to move that a short bill, authorising the levy for two months only, should be brought in.⁶ St. John, in the cause of financial stability, was trying to get tannage and poundage put on a permanent basis. He probably expected

-
1. Anti-Aulicus, E 31(17)p.6. 3 Feb.1644. There is much other evidence pointing in the same direction.
 2. E.g. Harl.164, f.275, 26 Dec.1642 (peace proposals).
 3. Ibid., 876v, Harl.165, ff.213v. 254.
 4. Whittaker, 86v. 26 Oct. 1643. Vane said, on his return from Scotland, that the Scots were discouraged because they had heard nothing about money for the forces they were to levy for the English parliament. St. John at once brought in the ordinance providing for the money to be raised.
 5. Harl.164, ff.210,397v. et seq. Harl.165,f.103.
 6. Harl.162, f.351v. 26 Jan.1642.

3. Harl.163, f.354v.

4. Statutes of the Realm, v.147.

5. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 180.

6. Botstein, D'Eves, 421. 3 Mar.1641.

opposition - he had brought the bill in early in the day, and the House ordered that it should be brought in between 11 a.m. and 4.0 p.m. in a fuller house. D'Ewes noted that: 'divers... who were the intimate friends of Mr. Saint John the king's solicitor [Vane was probably one] spake against the bill,'¹ and the House took Vane's advice.² No doubt his objection was not so much to the impracticability of the bill, but to the power which it would give the king vis-a-vis parliament. On the following day St. John brought in a new act³ which was to be in force for some two months only.⁴

There are indications that Vane's circle in these early days of the Long Parliament included some prominent Londoners. Clarendon wrote of the end of 1644 that the war party prevailed among the mayor and aldermen of the City, for Vane had 'diligently provided that men of his own principles and inclinations should be brought into the government of the city, of which he saw they should always have great need.'⁵ As early as March 1641 Alderman Pennington reported to the Commons that Vane was one of the M.P.s of whom the City had a good opinion, and he was accordingly sent with five other M.P.s to make a request to the City for a loan of £100,000.⁶

At the beginning of November 1641 when the Irish rebellion had

1. Ibid., f.353.

2. Pym also spoke against the bill, on the grounds that subsidy bills should only be brought in by order of the Lower House. Peyton, 26 Jan.1641-2.

3. Harl.163, f.354v.

4. Statutes of the Realm, v.140.

5. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 188.

6. Notestein, D'Ewes, 421. 1 Mar.1641.

broken out and Parliament wished for another loan from the City, to deal with this emergency, Vane was one of the committee of twenty-four M.P.s who, with representatives of the Lords, were sent to the City to negotiate the loan.¹ When the Recorder of London declared to this committee that the protections allowed to M.P.s' servants hindered the lending of money and stopped trade it was Vane who replied that the House was taking steps to deal with this question of protections.²

In June 1642, when war was imminent, six peers and twelve M.P.s were sent to the City to request another substantial loan; Vane was not among them.³ But when the Lord Mayor had issued his precept to the several Companies to meet and decide what they would raise, the House decided to send several M.P.s who were to go into the City and be present at the Companies' meetings, to 'advance' the Loan; Vane was one.⁴ But the sort of dilemma that must often have faced Vane and other very active members of the House now revealed itself; for Vane rose in the House next day and moved that some 'new men' should be appointed to go to the City, in place of those M.P.s who

1. CJ.ii, 302.

2. Ibid., 303. 3 Nov. 1641. Vane is the only M.P. mentioned by name in the Commons report. The names of the delegates from Parliament are not given in the Journal of the Common Council, nor any except the briefest account of what was said. JCC.London, vol.39, f.240.

3. CJ.ii, 598.

4. CJ.ii, 605. 4 June. The Commons' clerk writes only 'Sir H. Vane'. But as D'Ewes states that it was the younger Vane who proposed that 'new men' should be sent in place of the Irish commissioners, and as the younger Vane was a commissioner for Ireland whereas his father was not (CJ.ii, 453, 24 Feb. 1642), Elsing must have meant the younger Vane here. The Livery Companies were not impressed, and comparatively little money was forthcoming. Pearl London, 208-9, Dr. Pearl does not mention the M.P.s personal appeal.

were commissioners for Irish affairs;¹ Vane suggested Sir Thomas Dacres, the House accepted this nomination and three others.²

The Irish commissioners were probably sitting at the same time as the Livery Companies, and Vane evidently considered that Ireland had priority in importance over the City Companies.

Vane was not an inevitable member of committees on London;³ but on 12 October 1642 he and Pym managed a conference with the Lords on putting London and adjacent counties in a position for defence,⁴ and when on 25 October the House decided that able-bodied Londoners should be exempt from the fast fixed for the following day, so that their preparations for defending the City should not be impeded, Vane was one of the four M.P.s appointed to draft the necessary order.⁵ This again was probably due to his ability to frame suitable phrases (it would not be altogether easy to convince the godly that material considerations should be put before religious ones). On 8 November 1642 Vane and five others were sent to a Common Hall to report what endeavours Parliament had made for peace,⁶ perhaps because Vane could argue convincingly, or because the City respected him. He informed the City of the king's refusal to accept Sir John Evelyn as one of Parliament's envoys in negotiating for peace,

1. Harl.163, f.152.

2. CJ. ii, 611.

3. E.g., CJ. ii, 684.

4. CJ. ii, 805. This was when Prince Rupert was said to be on his way to attack the City.

5. Ibid. 823.

6. Ibid. 840. E.126 (44). Vane made one of the three speeches to the Common Hall, and Lord Brooke made the other two. It is puzzling that this meeting is not reported in any of the London records, and hence finds no place in Dr. Pearl's book, nor in Sharpe.

and that it was Parliament's determination to remain loyal to their impugned member, and not any unwillingness to make peace, that had made it impossible for the negotiations to continue.

A few days later Vane was named first on a committee set up by the Commons to consult with the Committee of Militia for London,¹ and a week later, just after some persons in the City sent a delegation opposing the current peace negotiations, Vane was a teller against resuming debate on the king's message concerning those negotiations.² Obviously Vane was at one on this subject with the 'war party' in the City. On three other occasions in November 1642 and January 1643, 'Sir Henry Vane' was sent with others, to a Common Hall or the Guildhall;³ but the Commons Journals do not show whether this was young Vane or his father.

By February 1643, when the Oxford negotiations were still continuing, D'Ewes was convinced that the 'fierie spirits' in the City were working with Hampden, Pym, Rouse and 'others of the same minde', though he does not name Vane among these.⁴ But on 27 April D'Ewes again suspected collusion between certain M.P.s and some of the City leaders, and on this occasion Vane was involved. On that day D'Ewes came into the House to find Vane talking of a conference with the Lords, who were to be asked to join the Commons in sending a delegation to the Common

1. CJ. ii, 848, 14 Nov. 1642.

2. Ibid. 858, 21 Nov. 1642. I am assuming that the younger Vane is here meant.

3. Ibid. 860, 863, 925.

4. Harl. 164, f. 303. 20 Feb. 1643.

Council of London. Vane proposed that the delegates from parliament should have certain powers. 'When we should move them', said Vane, 'that the City might advance more money for the payment of the army... if there should be anything objected against the said advancing of money...that then the said committee might have power to remove the said obstructions'. This sounds curiously vague, and D'Ewes was suspicious - 'I did at this verie instant suspect that one of the obstructions which would be made by the fierie spirits in the cittie of London would be that we should enter into a new oath or covenant, and that this business was before plotted betweene themselves and those of the same leaven in the House, which proved so in the issue'.¹

The Court of Common Council had put forward the demand for a covenant twice before, in February and March,² and again in April.³ The sting of the Covenant plan lay in clause 2 - 'That the rents, revenews, goods, monies and estates of such as shall refuse to joyne in the association and Covenant aforesaid shall be employed in such maner and proporcion as the howses shall thinke fitt for the good of the kingdom, and their persons be secured'.⁴ This was a monstrous proposal - its penalties would have been more appropriate for active royalism. Once more Vane was taking a harsh attitude towards his opponents, and it is certainly difficult to believe that he was not acting in collaboration with a party in the City. He did not carry

1. Harl.164, ff.380-380v.

2. Pearl, London, 258-261.

3. CJ. iii, 37. 10 April.

4. J.C.C. London, 40, ff.47v, 48. 18 Feb; f.49, 21 Feb.

the Commons with him however - the House let the matter of the extended powers drop.¹

Vane was in Scotland while Marten's 'general rising' project was under weigh, in July and August, though it is unlikely that this impractical project would ever have commended itself to Vane. His Scottish visit also precludes any possibility that Vane had a hand in organising the London mob who arrived at the Houses of Parliament on 6 August, to denounce the peace party. Vane may well have been connected however with the audacious and successful attempt to 'rig' the London Common Council elections in December 1643. The elections were always held on 21 December, and St. John, on the day before they were to take place, rose in the Commons to present an ordinance excluding, both from voting and from standing as candidates for the Common Council, all those who had been questioned for 'malignancy', or who had not taken the Covenant. D'Ewes urged the omission of the 'malignancy' clause, asserting with truth that many might have been unjustly suspected.² But the House was informed that there was a plot in the City to 'put out' from the Common Council 'divers well-affected men', and St. John's ordinance passed. There was no time to organise any counter-pressure on the House - the stratagem had been well-planned. There is no record that Vane spoke in the debate. He was in the House two days later, when he and St. John spoke on the

-
1. Ibid. f.50v. (Parliament promised only to consider Common Council's proposal). Harl.164, ff.381, 381v; Whittaker, f.46v.
 2. Harl.165, f.249v. Dr. Pearl (London, 274) says that there was a shift in power in the City when in October Pennington gave up the mayoralty to Wollaston, a moderate. If so, St. John's ordinance was a counter-move. Whittaker f.102v. has 'convinced of malignancy'.

same side.¹ It seems highly likely that it was to this incident that Clarendon was referring when he wrote of Vane's securing men of his own principles in the government of London.² If Vane was widely blamed for the manoeuvre this also would strengthen his reputation for being less than honest in political matters.

Vane's relations with John Maynard may be noted in passing, for there are indications that the hostility between the two, which can be clearly seen in Burton's diary of the 1659 parliament, and which culminated in Maynard's acting as one of Vane's bitterest accusers at his trial for treason, dates at least from 1643. In February of that year when Vane and others were arguing that disbandment of the two opposing armies must precede a peace treaty Maynard made a very telling reply, pointing out that the House had voted disbanding to mean that the king would disband all his armies, whereas Parliament would keep the garrisons and the navy. Besides, Parliament could reassemble its army quickly - the men came mostly from London and adjacent counties - the king could not.³ Later in the same year the two men crossed swords on the making of a new Great Seal, which Maynard strenuously opposed.⁴

Vane was obviously concerned that the Irish rebellion should be put down as quickly as possible. A few days after it had broken out

1. Ibid. f.254, 22 Dec.1643.

2. Clarendon did not blame St. John for the London ordinance; either he did not know of his part, or treated more kindly one who afterwards welcomed Charles II's return.

3. Harl.164, ff.301v. 17 Feb.1643.

4. Ibid. f.389, 12 May 1643. For examples of Maynard's rising in the Commons to reply to Vane, see Yonge, BM.Add. 18, 777 ff.148v. 149, 157

he moved that the House should go into committee to debate a supply of money for this purpose,¹ and later in the same month that the four ships that were to guard the coasts of Ireland, to prevent foreign help from reaching the rebels, should be 'hastened away'.² In March 1642 he rose to demand of the House they might 'accept of certaine proportions of gunpowder which were desired of him, or refuse it,' for use in Ireland - Sir John Evelyn rose immediately after Vane to offer gunpowder at 13s. 4d. a barrel, but D'Ewes does not indicate whether Vane's gunpowder was similarly for sale at a reduced rate, or as a gift.³ In April he was troubled that cavalry collected at Chester for service in Ireland had not yet gone,⁴ and the House sent John Moore to expedite their departure. This was a subject in which Vane was interested, though his pre-occupation with events at home prevented him from giving much attention to Irish affairs during the following years, until he was appointed to the Irish and Scottish Committee in 1651.⁵

The indications are that in the 1640-1643 period Vane was co-operating with Pym and St. John, and to a much lesser extent and only on occasions for specific purposes, with Marten and Glyn. His association with Cromwell and Hesilrige at the time of the Root and Branch bill is probably significant, though it has left few other

1. Coates, *D'Ewes*, 120. 11 Nov. 1641.

2. *Ibid.* 183. 22 Nov. 1641.

3. *Harl.* 163, 27v. 10 Mar. 1642.

4. *Ibid.* f.73, 13 Apr. 1642.

5. He was a commissioner for Ireland (above, p.42), but the only minute book of this committee now extant (BM.Add.4771), shows him to have been an extremely infrequent attender.

traces.¹ Stapleton, before the rift with the earl of Essex, may well have been another of Vane's collaborators. Vane vigorously supported the Scottish alliance, and his hostility to Essex is related to this. There are some tenuous but interesting hints of Vane's connections with the City.

The period sheds much light on Vane's character. Possessed of a subtle mind, and a power of sarcasm which may well have made him enemies, Vane stands out in the diaries as a very individual member of parliament.² His ruthlessness is marked, and though there is no evidence of republicanism in him, there are hints that he was working with Marten in other ways. The diaries and Commons Journals give a strong impression of a politician essentially radical in attitude, both to the king and the Lords, with an intelligence and an adroitness in manoeuvre which already marked him out from his fellow-members.

-
1. Cromwell moved that Vane should be added to a committee on Kent. Harl.162, f.56v. Hesilrige frequently took the same attitude as Vane, and developed his ideas (e.g. B.M. Add 18, 777 f.64), but this does not prove previous consultation between them.
 2. It was Vane who raised the question of the care of manuscripts seized at Camden House. This led to the appointment of a committee, including Selden and D'Ewes, to see that such manuscripts should be safely 'laid up'. Harl.165, f.202. 2 Nov. 1643.

By January 1644 the King himself was referring to Vane as the leader of a party in the House,¹ and the diaries bear this out, though St. John was probably equally important, and Strode hardly less so. On large issues such as the establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and on small, such as the disposal of

X Chapter ii. The struggle with Holles, (1644).

Vane was probably the leader, though by no means always, the House followed.

It is also clear that by January 1644 Holles and Clowdery were Vane and St. John's most usual opponents. Holles had, according to D'Eves, become a supporter of peace negotiations in November 1643,² but the formation of a cohesive political group with Holles at its centre would seem to have been a very gradual process. Stapleton was persuaded by Eyn in the summer of 1643 not to give his support to the peace party, as he had been inclined to do,³ and was probably not in general accord with Holles until December of that year.⁴ Eyn in 1645 he was once a teller against Holles.⁵ Waller was associated with the Independents until the autumn of 1644.⁶ The political issues on which Holles differed from Vane and St. John will be discussed later, but it is necessary first to consider briefly the religious ones.

1. See below, p.72.

2. Harl. 166, ff.126-27.

3. Harl. 164, f.302.

4. According to D'Eves he had spoken strongly in favour of a peace treaty the day before, but it was thought he and others had been 'taken off' by Eyn, Say and some others. Harl. 165, f.133v.

5. D'Eves names him as a leader of the earl of Essex's group in Dec. 1644, f.233v.

6. Cl. iv, 471.

7. See below, p.81.

By January 1644 the king himself was referring to Vane as the leader of a party in the House,¹ and the diaries bear this out, though St. John was probably equally important, and Strode hardly less so. On large issues such as the establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and on small, such as the disposal of a large number of petitions which the House was too tired to deal with,² Vane was giving a lead, and often, though by no means always, the House followed.

It is also clear that by January 1644 Holles and Clotworthy were Vane and St. John's most usual opponents. Holles had, according to D'Ewes, become a supporter of peace negotiations in November 1642,³ but the formation of a cohesive political group with Holles at its centre would seem to have been a very gradual process. Stapleton was persuaded by Pym in the summer of 1643 not to give his support to the peace party, as he had been inclined to do,⁴ and was probably not in general accord with Holles until December of that year.⁵ Even in 1645 he was once a teller against Holles.⁶ Waller was associated with the Independents until the autumn of 1644.⁷ The political issues on which Holles differed from Vane and St. John will be discussed later, but it is necessary first to consider briefly the religious ones.

1. See below, p.72.

2. Harl. 166, ff.126-27.

3. Harl. 164, f.302.

4. According to D'Ewes he had spoken strongly in favour of a peace treaty the day before, but it was thought he and others had been 'taken off' by Pym, Say and some others. Harl.165, f.123v.

5. D'Ewes names him as a leader of the earl of Essex's group in Dec. *ibid.*, f.233v.

6. *CJ*.iv, 471.

7. See below, p.81.

According to Professor Hexter¹ Pym prevented religious issues of any consequence from emerging in parliament during the first year of the Civil War, and for a year after his death religious ardour rather than ecclesiastical theories determined a man's party allegiance. All the fiery puritans were united in the soi-disant 'godly party', and hostile to the earl of Essex. The words 'party allegiance' here must not be taken to imply the consistent loyalty to one group which it would mean in modern times. It may also be doubted whether even Pym could have had such a restraining influence for a whole year after his death. Much depends too on the use of the word 'puritan'. Men such as Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Sir John Clotworthy and Sir Christopher Wray, were as fervent in their religious beliefs as Sir Arthur Hesilrige or Henry Marten, but were not hostile to Essex, as Hesilrige and Marten were. One must then consider the possibility that, as the intensity of their religious ardour did not divide the two groups, ecclesiastical theories did. Here the difficulty is the lack of evidence; Dr. Yule conjectures that the Independent ministers in the Assembly and a group in the House of Commons had some cohesion,² but the evidence is very scanty. The king was negotiating with Nye, the Independent leader in the Assembly, in November 1643 on a basis of religious toleration, and on a similar basis with Vane in the following January. Vane was in touch with Peter Sterry,³

1. 'The problem of the Presbyterian Independents', Re-appraisals in History, London, 1962, 177.

2. Yule, Independents, 43. Dr. Yule's deduction is based only on the similarity of policy between Nye and Vane.

3. He was present when Vane consulted various people about the Lovelace negotiations. (See below). But Vane chose Moses Wall, who is not known to have been an Independent, as his emissary.

another Independent, and with Roger Williams,¹ at that time, but this is hardly sufficient proof that the Independent ministers and Vane's group were co-operating. Vane himself did not openly champion liberty of conscience until September 1644.² It seems very likely that theological questions slumbered in 1644, not because of Pym's influence, but because Parliament's military position was so desperate. They continued to slumber until the summer, because until Marston Moor had been fought, the military situation was still uncertain. Quite probably Vane deliberately refrained from raising controversial religious questions for the same reason. But if Vane and his opponents were not divided on religious issues, can one then call Vane's group Independents, and Holles's Presbyterians?

As early as August 1643 D'Ewes wrote that the 'Independent and heretical party' were hoping to carry through their design of extirpating monarchy.³ He was clearly associating Independency with very radical political views. But D'Ewes was full of religious prejudices, and Vane and St. John are not known to have supported republicanism; Vane is most unlikely to have done so.⁴ On their side Holles and Clotworthy did not appear as fervent supporters of presbyterianism, though from the summer of 1644 onwards the Scots commissioners in London were gravitating towards them. It seems likely that Holles emerged as a leader, with others such as Maynard, in the spring of 1643, during the debates on the peace negotiations, that he led the opposition to the

1. See below, p. 347.

2. See below, p. 345.

3. Harl. 165, f. 152.

4. See below, conclusion, p. 370.

Scottish alliance (which of course was related to the continuation of war) later in 1643, and that through 1643 and 1644 the key questions were, as Professor Hexter saw,¹ political ones. The terms which have a religious connotation will not be used here therefore for the 1644 period, but only for 1645 and later, when religious issues had more clearly emerged, (though their importance has often been exaggerated), and when the terms have the justification of common contemporary usage.

Vane's collaborators again included St. John, whose name is coupled with Vane's on innumerable occasions. Both wanted the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and not parliament, to control peace negotiations,² and to direct the earl of Essex's army,³ and later the two friends tried to weaken that army by giving more authority to Skippon and Waller;⁴ there are many other instances of their co-operation. Hesilrige often supported them,⁵ and Tate belonged to this group.⁶ Strode took the same line on referring peace negotiations to the Committee of Both Kingdoms,⁷ and on other matters too,⁸ though he was an important and independent-minded member, and Samuel Browne, whose part in parliament has not been sufficiently valued, sometimes at least co-operated with Vane and St. John.⁹ Cromwell of course was associated

1. op. cit.

2. Harl.166, f.33.

3. Ibid., f.36.

4. Ibid., f.128v. For other examples of their co-operation, see ibid. ff.48, 53v, 61v, 128, et. al.

5. Ibid., ff.36, 37, 46.

6. Ibid., f.33. 'Tate, set on by yong Fane, Sollicitor, and others'. See also ff.38v, 40.

7. Ibid., f.41.

8. Ibid., f.128.

9. See below, pp. 70, 78.

with them, and Lisle's willingness to act as their agent in the Commons was suspected by D'Ewes, probably with reason.¹ The political methods of Vane and St. John, in so far as they can be ascertained, are illustrated later in this chapter. One must remember that leading M.P.s might vote sometimes with a group and sometimes against it; nevertheless it is still true to say that Vane and St. John in some sort led a 'war-party', or at least an anti-peace group. And though Vane and St. John could not always carry the House with them in 1644, they used adroit parliamentary tactics in their endeavours to do so.

Undoubtedly their most important instrument for this purpose was the Committee of Both Kingdoms, not only in the manner in which it was set up, but also in the way it was used after its establishment. Professor Notestein gave a masterly account of the formation of this remarkable committee,² but as the committee, like so many of the constructive measures of 1643-45, was evidently Vane's brain-child, more detailed consideration is given here to those events of the period of the committee's formation, (the months of October 1643 to February 1644), which are of interest in connection with Vane. There are also important aspects of the work of the committee, when once established, which concern Vane, and which were outside Professor Notestein's terms of reference.

-
1. Ibid., f.149. 'Mr. Lisle by a pre-arrangement doubtless of some the violent moved very earnestly that writts might be issued out for new elections'. 16 Oct. 1644. See also f.36.
 2. W. Notestein, 'The establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms', AHR., xvii(1912), 477-95, hereafter referred to as Notestein.

In July 1642 a Committee for the Safety of the Kingdom was established.¹ As Professor Hexter pointed out, there is no analysis of this committee's activities.² It was a committee for directing the war,³ and pre-eminently Pym's committee.⁴ Professor Notestein thought the committee was never a powerful council of state, in spite of the view taken of it in a royal proclamation, which speaks of 'the whole power of parliament, and more, being resolved into a committee of a few men, contrary to all law, custom and precedent'.⁵ The king can hardly have been referring to any other committee, and Professor Notestein's estimate of the Committee of Safety should be revised. For fourteen months it was a very powerful committee. When Hotham was approached by Lord Savill with the offer of the surrender of York on condition that Hotham made Savill's peace with parliament, Hotham consulted the Committee of Safety, and not parliament. D'Ewes asserts that some M.P.s were indignant on hearing this.⁶ One diurnall declared that when the establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms was being considered, the Commons held that the new committee would in no way detract from the Lord General's power, 'for the Committee of the

-
1. It was more often called the Committee for the Safety than the Committee of the Safety.
 2. Reign of King Pym, Cambridge, Mass., 1941, 58.
 3. CJ. iii, 314, 316, 318, 323 et al.
 4. For Pym's reports of its activities see ibid., ii, 659, 668, 696, 714.
 5. Clarendon, Rebellion, vii, 141.
 6. Harl.165, f.133v. 2 Aug. 1643.

Safetie had the same power formerlie'.¹ But in October 1643 Pym fell ill, and the Committee of Safety lost all its drive. On 17 October Whittaker reported that: 'the Committee of the Safety not now sitting, Mr. Pym being sick', a committee was named to 'consider of a Council of War'.² It should be noted that Whittaker evidently equated the Committee of Safety with a council of war. It certainly had been busy enough to have its own secretary, Henry Parker.³ Perhaps it had been too busy, for it seems to have acquired a reputation for dilatoriness even before Pym's death. In March 1643 Rigby asked for gunpowder to be supplied to Lancashire from the magazine at Hull. When some M.P.s moved to refer the matter to the Committee for the Safety Rigby said he would rather be refused. Pym protested vigorously, but Rigby said he had waited on the Committee endlessly and fruitlessly, and according to D'Ewes the House rested very 'well satisfied' of Rigby's complaint.⁴

The committee set up to consider the nomination of a Council of War never reported. The nominating committee's membership is odd - it included Pym, St. John and one of the Vanes, but with the exception of Hesilrige and Waller (then probably supported by Vane's group), no M.P. with actual experience in the field; the friends of the earl of

1. The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, pp.330-331. 7-14 Feb. 1644 E33(6.) One correspondent wrote to the Committee of Both Kingdoms as the Committee for the Safety of Both Kingdoms. CSPD.1644,161. For D'Ewes view of the Committee as an extremely powerful committee which 'communicated as much to us as they thought it fitting for us to know', see Harl.164, f.818v.
2. Whittaker, f.84v.
3. Harl. 165, f.210v.
4. Harl. 164, f.338. 22 Mar. 1643.

Essex, such as Stapleton, were pointedly excluded.¹ One wonders why the committee never reported - probably because the council of war was intended by the opponents of Essex to take the direction of military operations out of the hands of the earl, but the House would never have tolerated a council of war from which both Stapleton and Clotworthy were excluded, as the nominating committee would have liked.

The Committee of Safety continued to sit - on 18 October it was ordered to recruit men for the army of the earl of Essex.² On 2 October Hesilrige was actually added to it,³ and it was ordered to meet in the afternoon, and at Pym's home, Derby House, just as the Committee of Both Kingdoms was to do in the following years. It looks as though a determined attempt to secure government by committees was made on 13 November 1643 - the Committee of Safety, followed by other committees, was to sit on three days a week, and the Commons were to sit only on the other weekdays.⁴ That afternoon, for some reason, only the Commons' members of the Committee of Safety met.⁵ Probably some of the Lords' members, or the House of Lords itself, were not personae gratae to the dominant party in the Lower House. In Pym's absence the elder Vane evidently acted as chairman - he reported from the committee on 20 November, when his proposals for supplying Waller's army met

-
1. CJ. iii, 278. Professor Notestein did not mention this abortive committee.
 2. Ibid., 280.
 3. Ibid., 299.
 4. Ibid., 309.
 5. Ibid., 310.

with the opposition of his son.¹ In the following weeks, many matters were directed to the attention of the Committee of Safety, almost all in connection with providing men or money for the war,² but certainly there is no indication that it was preparing drafts for the House to ratify, unless the House so instructed - it was not a prototype of the Committee of Both Kingdoms in that respect. Perhaps the House did not want a directing committee at this juncture - the Commons were soon sitting on the days reserved for the committees,³ and it looks as though the Commons merely wanted a body that would do some preparatory and follow-up work, and not a 'cabinet'. Moreover, the Committee of Safety seems to have lacked some essential energy - on 12 December it was ordered to sit every day at 3 p.m. but it evidently did not - six days later it was ordered to meet 'peremptorily' at 3 p.m. at latest, an unnecessary instruction if the previous order had been obeyed.⁴

The first open move foreshadowing the Committee of Both Kingdoms was made in November 1643; Professor Notestein thought that this was probably due to Vane, St. John and Say, for Pym was already ill.⁵ This may well be so - Vane had arrived from Scotland, probably on 25 October; he gave a report to the Commons on 26 October, and as he spoke in the Commons on 2 November he was almost certainly in London when

1. Harl.165, f.213v.

2. See p.56, note 3.

3. CJ.iii, 322, 324.

4. Ibid., 339, 344.

5. Notestein, 480. The 8 Oct. move, before parliament was told of the proposal to appoint special commissioners, was not Vane's, for he was in Scotland.

the instructions were sent to Parliament's commissioners.¹ But there is nothing to indicate that even yet there was any intention to supersede the Committee of Safety; the obvious method of constituting a committee for both kingdoms was to join the Committee of Safety with some Scots commissioners. On 30 January 1644, almost immediately after the arrival of the Scots commissioners, the ordinance establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms was drafted, and an almost entirely new committee was nominated to join the Scots. The ordinance was the work of St. John and Vane,² and Professor Notestein showed that Holles's group, who were the peace party and the friends of the earl of Essex, were being excluded. It was presumably the last two factors which led the Scots to acquiesce in the exclusion of Holles and his supporters - if indeed the Scots understood the political situation in England at all.³

It should be noted that those prominent M.P.s who generally supported Holles and who were excluded from the Committee⁴ were those who had particularly crossed swords with Vane. Holles himself, though he was one of the most respected M.P.s⁵ and had had military experience, was not one of the committee. About this time Holles was more than once in opposition to Vane in the House, and Vane was defeated -

Holles's following was considerable. In this same month of January

1. Harl.165, f.202. It was intended that Vane should return to Scotland 'shortly' but he did not. (Ibid., f.200. 31 Oct.1643).
2. Baillie, ii, 141.
3. For Holles's view, that the earl of Essex was obnoxious both as a monarchist and peace-lover, see his Memoirs, 195.
4. Stapleton was a member.
5. For the respect in which he was held see for instance Sabran, 'Mm. Holis et Vaynes fort accredités dans la Chambre des Communes...' BM.Add.5460 f.50. 23 May 1644. Stapleton wanted to be sent to the Scottish army, according to Baillie - this may explain his inclusion.

1644, for instance, Vane and Hesilrige were in favour of impeaching the earl of Holland for deserting to the king at Oxford; they were tellers in the division, against Holles and Stapleton, and were in the minority.¹ Clotworthy's exclusion from the new committee is also noteworthy; he too had had military experience. But Vane had clashed with him several times - Clotworthy had argued vigorously in favour of appointing an English nobleman to command the English troops in Ireland, rather than allowing General Leslie to control the troops of both nations,² and Vane had also accused Clotworthy of complicity in the City Plot in January, though he did not persist with the charge.³

Another aspect of the original ordinance of 30 January, and one which Professor Notestein did not discuss, is important. If this ordinance had passed, the Committee of Both Kingdoms, would not merely have consisted of the 'war-party', but it would have had authority over the vital issue of peace or war. This was a bold attempt to remove peace negotiations from parliament's control, and the circumstances of the time show why. The royalist parliament at Oxford had met on 22 January 1644.⁴ Within five days it had sent peace overtures to the earl of Essex.⁵ The 'war party' must have been well aware how strong was the demand for peace,⁶ and Vane's trials of strength with Holles had shown

1. CJ. iii, 370.

2. Harl. 165, f.254. 22 Dec. 1643.

3. Whittaker, f.106. 8 Jan. 1644.

4. Clarendon, Rebellion, vii, 370.

5. Ibid.

6. D.A.Bigby, Anglo-French Relations, 1641 to 1649, 1933,46; Harl.165, f.149v.

him that in the House he might lose the day. Hence the attempt to give the new committee a power the Committee of Safety had never had, that of negotiating peace terms. The attempt was unsuccessful - the ordinance of 30 January did not pass, though months later, when the Committee of Both Kingdoms had been set up, the coveted authority was obtained, after a struggle. D'Ewes saw in the January ordinance many signs of political manoeuvring, and his account of the failure of the ordinance is interesting: 'Divers of those members...whose names were inserted...stood up and professed that they knew [not] anything of it (but most certain it was that though Mr. Perepoint and Sir Philip Stapleton were put as slei [gh] t or deyvice to make the matter seem the better, being men without exception, yet... the sense of the Howse was that it was a breach of privilege etc...and soe it was not resolutelie damnd but laid aside.)'¹ The Commons had at once seen the importance of the powers and personnel of the Committee - Reynolds had suggested that most of the members held positions in the army and would be able to continue the war as long as they liked and fatten their purses.² Vane opposed him,³ but he did not forget the accusation.

The Commons evidently were not going to pass Vane and St. John's ordinance. A second ordinance was therefore introduced, this time in the Lords, but exactly the same twenty-one names were put forward.⁴

1. Harl. 166, f.18, 3 Feb. 1644. The breach of privilege is explained below.

2. Notestein, 489. (This is from Whittaker, f.113v.)

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., 491.

Vane was the man behind this second ordinance - he bore the brunt of the debate in its defence. According to D'Ewes, who was an expert on constitutional procedure, it was not parliamentary practice for the names of a committee to be included in the draft ordinance¹ - the Commons should fix the number of the committee, and insert the names of their nominees only when the Lords had chosen theirs. His was probably the correct view of parliamentary practice, but the framers of the ordinance, of whom Vane must have been one, if not the chief, were evidently determined not to let the Commons have a free vote, and a division took place, on the question of voting on the names already put forward (contrary to custom) in the ordinance. As Professor Notestein saw, Vane's group, who ordinarily had a narrow majority in the Commons, were ensuring their own control of the committee - the Commons were not to be allowed to make nominations themselves. Hesilrige and Vane were the tellers in favour of this unusual ordinance, Holles and Sir William Lewes were the tellers for the opposition, and were defeated, by 51 to 65 votes.² The Commons were now allowed to vote for or against each of the whole twenty-one, but of course they could not add names to the list. The Lords too, it may be noted, were tied down to the names in the ordinance, and the Venetian ambassador saw that the Commons were in fact nominating

1. Cage, 'an old parliament man', said in 1642 that 'noe man ought to bring in the name of a Committee or an addition to a Committee written in paper, but that they ought to be named by the House'. On this occasion the written paper of committee names was rejected. Harl. 163, f.285v. 21 July 1642. Yonge's view (BM.Add.18, 779 f.107) is slightly different from D'Ewes, but he too thought that the Upper House had the right to refuse the names put forward by the Commons.
2. CJ.iii, 391. 7 Feb. 1644. Whitelocke (i,257) notes that the Commons' nominees were not friends of Essex, and Holles (Memoirs, i, 198) refers to the packing of the committee.

the Lords' representatives.¹ The peers did try to add some other names, but eventually gave way.² In the struggle with the Lords, Vane played the most important part. When the Lords wanted the Committee of Both Kingdoms to 'advise and consult', not 'order and direct' the conduct of the war, Vane was one of the committee to prepare an answer to the Lords in defence of the Commons' position, he was a manager of both the conferences with the Lords, and reporter of one.³ His line of argument was well-calculated to appeal to parliament. He 'would not have too great a power in the soldiery, but would have them subject to the parliament, and to your committee'.⁴ After the second joint conference the Commons ordered the committee which had prepared the previous answer to the Lords to have a statement ready for the following morning.⁵ The committee should have met that same day therefore, but apparently did not, for early next morning Vane moved that it should withdraw to do the work the House had set it.⁶ He returned so quickly that D'Ewes sourly concluded that Vane had 'doubtless prepared most of the reasons' for the Commons' attitude, the night before.⁷ Vane sat in front of D'Ewes in the House,⁸ and D'Ewes probably had opportunities of observing him. To the Lords'

-
1. CSPV.1643-47, 74-75.
 2. Notestein, 492.
 3. CJ.iii, 396, 397, 398.
 4. BM.Add. 18, 779 f.64v. 9 Feb.
 5. CJ.iii, 398.
 6. Harl.166, f.2.
 7. Ibid., f.12.
 8. Ibid., f.3v.

attempts to defend the power of the earl of Essex as against the committee Vane returned answer that the committee would be discreet, and not command or direct anything unwise, and that Essex could always send the committee the reason for his refusal to obey!¹ This assurance would hardly assuage the wounded pride of Essex, and as Professor Notestein saw,² Vane could hardly have been sincere in giving it. Essex was much discouraged by the loss of his authority³ - Vane had certainly won his contest with the earl and Holles.

The whole episode of the establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms reflected Vane's character and methods, as Professor Notestein perceived. Vane's determination was clearly shown; though his first ordinance was in effect defeated in the House, within a few days he had returned to the charge with a new ordinance so framed as to be more acceptable to the Commons - the Committee would not now have the responsibility for peace negotiations, unless the Commons so directed.⁴ Vane was also using the Commons' awareness of the weakness of the older Committee for the Safety to enable him to destroy it - with his own capacity for sustained and thorough work he probably despised the committee's ineffectiveness, and was replacing it by a more efficient instrument for winning the war, (which the Committee of Both Kingdoms certainly was). In political dexterity few of his contemporaries

1. Harl. 166, f.12.

2. Notestein, 493.

3. Ibid., 494.

4. The ordinance is explicit - 'nothing in this ordinance shall authorize the Committee hereby appointed to advise, treat, or consult concerning any cessation of arms, or making peace, without express directions from both Houses of Parliament'. CJ. iii, 392.

could excel Vane.

In the later struggle to secure for the Committee of Both Kingdoms the control of peace negotiations with the king, Vane again played a very prominent part. On 14 March 1644 the Dutch ambassadors informed the Lords that they were willing to mediate;¹ Tate 'set on', according to D'Ewes, by Vane and St. John, moved next morning that the Dutch offer should be referred to the Committee of Both Kingdoms. The Commons resolved without a division that the Committee (not, be it noted, the Commons), should prepare grounds for a safe and well-grounded peace, such as both England and Scotland might consent to,² and Vane was one of the twelve who were instructed to withdraw and prepare for a conference with the Lords on the subject.³ He, with St. John, Tate, Holles, and Whitelocke managed the conference with the Upper House.⁴ The declaration of the committee of twelve, that the preparations for peace should be entrusted to the Committee of Both Kingdoms, on the ground that by that method the advice of the Scots would be obtained,⁵ has a hollow ring, especially in view of the way the Scots on the Committee were in fact often ignored. The Commons' majority probably did not represent the country's opinion - there was an almost overwhelming

-
1. Gardiner, CW., i, 329.
 2. Harl. 166, f.33.
 3. CJ. iii, 428.
 4. CJ. iii, 432.
 5. Ibid., 429.

desire in the country for peace, and the Commons showed themselves aware of the suspicion at home and abroad, that Parliament did not want it.¹ The Lords objected to allowing the Committee of Both Kingdoms to control peace negotiations; they had appointed an ad hoc committee of nine to manage the negotiations for peace, and another conference between the two Houses was held. Again Vane, this time with three others, managed the conference, and he reported it.² The committee of twelve's second answer to the Lords, which the Commons endorsed, is clever, but quite unconvincing;³ it is impossible to do other than accept Gardiner's conclusion that the Lords knew that the Committee of Both Kingdoms was hostile to peace, and that so did the leading members of the Commons. The struggle continued for over a fortnight; at the end of March the Lords were still demanding a separate committee to conduct peace negotiations, but Vane retorted that this dispute was a matter of principle, not of procedure, and that, if the Lords would not approve, the Commons alone should empower the Committee of Both Kingdoms to conduct the peace negotiations.⁴ On 30 March, when the vote was taken upon the Lords' request for a ad hoc committee to consider the Dutch offer to mediate, Vane was one of the tellers for the opposition, and only the Speaker's casting

-
1. Ibid. 'Whereas there have been many endeavours from Oxford...to raise a belief in the people, and in foreign parts, that they were inclined to peace, and the Parliament averse to it'.
 2. Ibid., 433.
 3. Ibid., 435-36. 23 Mar.
 4. Harl. 166, f.40. 28 Mar.

vote secured him a majority.¹

It is evident that the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and the retention of its power, continued to be important to Vane. Some of the Commons' replies to the Lords during the controversy may well have been his - the dubious argument that Parliament, by directing the original Committee not to discuss peace negotiations without order from both Houses, were intending to refer matters of this kind to the Committee, reads very like Vane's methods of reasoning.² Incidentally, he knew that the Committee had been discussing peace negotiations without instructions from the two Houses.³

Even before the struggle over the establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, another bitter conflict had taken place between Holles's group, who were supporting the earls of Essex and Warwick, and Vane's. Early in January 1644 Vane, St. John and Hesilrige revealed to the Commons Sir Basil Brooke's plot to have the king's proclamation, summoning a parliament to Oxford, published in London; this was to be accompanied by peace overtures to the Lord Mayor. How the intercepted letter that betrayed the plot was obtained is nowhere stated.⁴ A Common Hall was called to make known the plot to the Londoners, and Vane, one of the speakers, made the occasion an opportunity to attack the King's recent proclamations.⁵ Vane pointed out that if the Westminster parliament

1. CJ. iii, 443.

2. Ibid., 436.

3. CSPD. 1644, 36. See below, p. 77.

4. CJ. iii, 358. 6 Jan. 1644. Whittaker, f. 105v. Baillie (ii, 133) says it 'came to the nose' of Vane.

5. E 29(13) 16 Jan.

were declared only a 'pretended' parliament 'laws, liberties and rights' i.e. [the established gains of the Long Parliament,] would be in danger. He shrewdly appealed both to the City's suspicion of the king's double-dealing and to the citizens' regard for their own pockets. He reminded his hearers that in the royal proclamation recalling the law-courts to Oxford the City had been called the disobedient and rebellious city, whereas in Charles I's letter to the Lord Mayor no such approbrious terms were used. Vane ended with a vigorous passage in which he pointed out that if the parliament and law-courts were moved to Oxford London would be 'desolate from all traffic [trade]', and the law-courts, 'the life and preservation of all your affairs and businesses', would be no longer there. He warned the City also that those who went to Oxford would have their estates confiscated. The City, to reassure the Commons of their loyalty, invited the whole House to dine, and Vane seconded St. John in moving the acceptance of the City's offer;¹ he was also one of the four who drafted the reply.²

In the middle of the same month Vane was himself accused of being a party to a royalist plot. Lord Lovelace had sent a servant to Vane, with a letter in which Lovelace suggested that Vane should send an envoy to whom Lovelace might 'impart some propositions from authority, which might lead to public peace'. Vane asked the earl of Warwick's chaplain, Moses Wall, to undertake the mission; with him in the room when he

1. Harl. 165, f.276. 16 Jan.

2. CJ. iii, 365. 13 Jan. CSPV.1643-47, 64, 67.

did so were his usual collaborators, St. John and Hesilrige, and some others, including Peter Sterry, the minister, later to be much associated with Vane. Wall, having been first assured that the mission was lawful, as the Speaker was acquainted with it, went to Windsor, and met Lovelace, who would put nothing in writing. But he declared that the king 'did esteem Sir Henry Vane and his party to be the honestest men of them that stuck to the parliament', and that 'the king will yield to the disannulling of laws which are made against tender consciences'. Wall on his return wrote down what Lovelace had asserted; when he did so the Speaker, Hesilrige and 'Mr. Browne' were in the room with Vane.¹

At this point Vane himself was in danger; the earls of Essex and Warwick had heard something of the Lovelace negotiations, and they proceeded to bring pressure to bear on Vane by the use they made of them. The plan was clever, and had an element of ironic justice; Vane and St. John had a year before drawn up an ordinance by which it was treason to hold intelligence with Oxford unless both Houses, or the earl of Essex, were acquainted with the negotiations.² Essex and Warwick thought they had Vane 'circumscribed', but they had not; Vane had somehow learnt of their plan, and before they could raise the matter in the Lords Vane brought it before the Commons. Vane defended himself not only by revealing

1. HMC. House of Lords' MSS, 6th Rep. App. Part i, p.3. The accounts in Anti-Aulicus (E 31(17) 6 Feb. 1644) and Whittaker (f.216v. 17 Jan. 1644) tally very well indeed with the depositions (by Wall, by Lovelace's servant, and by Sterry), now in the Lords' MSS. It is difficult to see why Vane chose Wall as his emissary. 'Mr. Browne' was probably Samuel Browne, but there were three other M.P.s with that surname.

2. Baillie, ii, 135-36.

that the negotiations were known to the Commons committee on the City Plot, but also by ingeniously pleading that the ordinance of 1643 was not binding; it had not been entered on the Lords' Journal by the Clerk, owing to the cunning of some peers.¹ Vane did not dwell on the facts that he had at no time consulted the House of Lords, and that the Speaker was not the House of Commons. He won over the House, however - the Commons voted him thanks.²

Further friction with the earl of Essex soon followed. Dorislaus, the Advocate-General of the earl's army, had taken depositions from Lovelace's servant, who had been caught, from Wall, and from another chaplain. Essex had been ordered by the Commons to draw up a standing commission for trying treason suspects by martial law - it would have been ironical if Vane had been the first victim. St. John must have heard of Dorislaus's action, for he came to see him, and while Dorislaus was showing St. John the draft of the martial law commission Vane came in. 'They two', said Dorislaus, 'walked aside together, and after a little time Mr. Solicitor and Sir Henry Vane came to me again, as if they had an intention to speak unto me'. Dorislaus seems now to have admitted to St. John and Vane that the interrogations had taken place, and Vane evidently considered this an infringement of M.P.s' privileges, in that the depositions were a preparation for trying those involved, and by martial law. Essex was clearly still trying to ruin Vane. But a

-
1. I cannot trace this ordinance. But a similar one imposing the death penalty for holding intelligence with the royalists, was passed on 16 Aug. 1644 (to last for four months only), and Baillie may well be right. (Acts and Ordinances, i, 486-88). It may be part of the Draconian legislation mentioned by Holles, Memoirs, 195. For the debates on it see Harl. 166, ff. 98, 106, 106v.
 2. CJ. iii, 358. 6 Jan.

day or two later the matter was raised in the Commons, and a committee was appointed, not including Vane.¹ There the matter was allowed to drop, both by the Commons, and by Essex.

According to Baillie, Warwick and Essex were using their knowledge of the Lovelace negotiations as a form of blackmail on Vane and St. John - the two earls knew that Vane and St. John were taking steps to revive the impeachment of the earl of Holland for deserting to the king at Oxford, and the earls were prepared to drop their charges if Vane and St. John would spare Holland from continued attack.² Vane and St. John refused however, and it is interesting to see from the Journals who were the M.P.s involved in this struggle - Vane and Hesilrige were the tellers for the impeachment, Holles and Stapleton, the friends of Essex,³ defended Holland, as they had done in November, when the impeachment was first proposed.⁴ Once more Holles was opposing Vane, and this time Holles won; Holland was reprieved.⁵

It is certainly difficult to see why the king should have attempted to negotiate with Vane. According to Whittaker⁶ the king was relying upon Vane's 'true inclination to the public good...knowing him to have a strong party in the House, and he the chief of it'. But none of

-
1. CJ. iii, 375. 24 Jan. 1644. The depositions are clearly those in the Lords' MSS.
 2. Baillie, as before. Vane had vehemently opposed Holland's re-admission to the Upper House. BM. Add. 18, 779 f.49.
 3. Rushworth, part iv, vol. i, 1645-47, 2.
 4. Holland's impeachment had been proposed on 7 and 11 Nov. 1643. (CJ.iii, 304, 308.) A committee was set up to consider the matter; five weeks later an ordinance was twice read in the House which provided for the punishment of Holland and other deserters (an early morning move), and both Vane and Holles were added to the previous committee. (Ibid., 349.)
 5. By 75-60 votes. CJ.iii, 370. 17 Jan. 1644.
 6. Whittaker, f.216v.

Vane's speeches in 1643 or 1644 indicate that he was likely to support peace proposals, and one can hardly think the king would be so misguided as to think so. Anti-Aulicus¹ thought the negotiation was intended to discredit Vane, which seems too malicious for Charles. It is possible that the king was exploiting the differences between the supporters and opponents of religious toleration, but this explanation has its difficulties, for Vane was still co-operating with the Scottish Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly in the spring of 1644, and had not yet appeared openly as an advocate of toleration. Probably however Vane was already working with Roger Williams to obtain religious toleration for Rhode Island, in the parliamentary Committee for the Colonies,² and this was known at Oxford. Whatever the king's motives, they still leave Vane's to be accounted for. According to the evidence of Moses Wall, Vane hoped by continuing the negotiations to find out more about the City Plot, and this seems a reasonable explanation, for Vane might conceivably find out which City men were secret royalists, or at least secret supporters of peace negotiations. That Vane was honestly treating with the king implies that he thought the prospects of an acceptable compromise between his views and the king's were hopeful, and Vane's intelligence makes this unlikely.

-
1. E 31(17), as before.
 2. See below p. 347.

Vane's part in establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms shows that he certainly sought power, and achieved it sometimes by dubious means. But he used that power to serve what he conceived to be the public interest with tireless energy. It is possible to construct almost a day-by-day diary for Vane at this time from the Committee of Both Kingdoms' Day-Book and the Commons' Journals, and his record is impressive. Allowing for the fact that he was absent on the Committee's business, and in the summer for health reasons, for 45 days, Vane was present in 1644 on 154 out of the 199 days on which the Committee transacted business, for which the list of members present is given. In addition on nine more such days, when the clerk gives no indication which man he is referring to, either he or his father was present. Assuming that on four of these occasions the younger Vane is meant, his total attendance rises to 158. On at least 20 days when he was not at the Committee he was in the Commons¹ - sometimes obviously because he considered the Commons were transacting particularly important business. Naval matters,² peace negotiations,³ and religion⁴ drew him away from the Committee of Both Kingdoms, it seems, and there are one or two other subjects that one would guess accounted for his

-
1. I have assumed Vane's presence in the Commons if he was named as a committee member, manager of a conference, or teller on that day. Examination of the subjects discussed in the Commons when Vane was absent from the Committee leads one to deduce that these account for his absence on those days. Baillie (ii, 230.16 Sept.1644) testifies to Vane's part in discussions on religion in the House, of which one would know little from the Journals and diaries.
 2. CJ. iii, 701. 21 Nov. 1644.
 3. CJ. iii, 434-5, 22 Mar.1644; 445-6, 3 Apr.1644; 713-4, 4 Dec.1644.
 4. Ibid., 628. 16 Sept. 1644.

absence from the Committee's sessions.¹ On four days when Vane was absent from the Committee of Both Kingdoms, committees of the Commons to which he had been nominated met, or at least had been ordered to meet. This leaves only seventeen days on which Vane was not certainly either at the House of Commons or at the Committee. But there were many occasions on which Vane had been appointed to draft documents, to interrogate suspects, or carry out other missions on behalf of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and these may well have been responsible for some of his absences. In addition he was still Treasurer of the Navy, and though there is reason to think that his deputy did much of the work, some of the duties of the office undoubtedly devolved on Vane himself. He must have had a prodigious capacity for work.

Unfortunately the Day-book of the Committee of Both Kingdoms does not record discussions and it gives little indication of the part played by individual members in the work of the Committee. Vane was frequently the Committee's spokesman in the Commons; sometimes he went straight from the Committee to the Commons,² sometimes it was a day or two more before he put the Committee's business before the House.³ On one

-
1. The Elector Palatine's arrival in England was discussed on 30 Aug. 1644 (CJ.iii,612), 31 Aug. (ibid. 613), 28 Sept. (ibid.,642); and Scottish affairs on 23 Nov. (ibid. 703), 13 Dec. (ibid. 722-3); the North on 31 Oct. (ibid. 682); Kent on 29 Nov. (ibid.708). These were all days when Vane was not present at the Committee.
 2. E.g. CSPD.1644, 44, and Whittaker, f.122v; CSPD.1644, 137, and CJ. iii, 483.
 3. E.g. CSPD.1644, 95, and CJ. iii, 461; CSPD.1644, 98-99, and CJ. iii, 453.

occasion a packet of intercepted letters had been given to him,¹ on another he delivered to the Commons an intercepted letter which revealed that a Dutchman had been given a royal commission to destroy Parliament's ships,² and perhaps the 'secret service' side of the Committee's activities was particularly his responsibility. Scottish affairs were certainly his province - almost always when these had to be reported to the Commons Vane was the spokesman.³ At one of the first meetings of the Committee, for example, Vane was instructed to report to the Commons the Scots commissioners' complaints of the parlous condition of their army in Ireland.⁴ This he did at the next session of the Commons,⁵ and he continued to be much occupied with relations with Scotland.⁶ The House of Commons was unenthusiastic about help for the Scots, especially at the end of 1644, when a Parliamentary victory in the war seemed likely, and peace propositions were under way. There was therefore reluctance to supply the financial and other needs of the Scots, and Vane or St. John had to raise the matter in December 1644 several times.⁷

-
1. SP.21/16, p.6. 'That Mr. Weckerlin do open a packett of letters which was brought in by Sir Henry Vane, which he received from Mr. Corbett, being intercepted coming from beyond Seas'. This is the younger Vane, for his father is not recorded to have been present that day.
 2. Harl. 166, f.39.
 3. Ibid. ff.33, 35, 47, 52v. 55, et al.
 4. CSPD.1644, 98-99. 6 Apr.1644.
 5. CJ. iii, 453, 8 Apr.
 6. See e.g. Whittaker, f.167v. 17 Oct.; Harl.166, f.66v. 25 May; Ibid. f.69, 3 June.
 7. CSPD.1644-45, 172, 175; CJ.iii, 717, 723, 731. At this time the House was busy discussing peace proposals, the Committee of Both Kingdoms was ignoring them.

The attitude of the Committee of Both Kingdoms to Parliament is remarkable; the dates of Vane's activities as a member of the Committee reveal an extraordinary state of affairs. On 6 March 1644 a sub-committee, with a quorum of two, was set up by the Committee to draft a Declaration on the king's recent letter to the earl of Essex concerning peace proposals. Vane was a member.¹ It will be remembered that when the Committee of Both Kingdoms had been set up, it was instructed to conduct peace negotiations only when parliament so ordered, and parliament had not so ordered on this occasion. The Committee evidently belatedly remembered this restriction - on 9 March, three days after the sub-committee had been set up, the Commons instructed the Committee to prepare the Declaration, which, unbeknown to the House, was already in hand.² A similar incident took place on 2 April, when Vane was sent to the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee to ask them to let the Committee at Derby House know how much money could be provided for the Scots army and when it could be sent.³ At the same time, evidently in the morning, Stapleton was sent off to read to the Commons the letter from the Scots commissioners about the needs of their army in the North,⁴ whereupon the Commons duly ordered the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee to meet that afternoon to 'make provision of necessities to be sent unto our brethren in Scotland'.⁵ The House was in fact 'rubber-stamping' the decisions of the Committee of Both Kingdoms. It should be noted that the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee was asked

-
1. CSPD.1644, 36.
 2. CJ.iii, 423.
 3. CSPD.1644, 91-92.
 4. Ibid.
 5. CJ.iii, 444.

by the Commons to give particulars of what sum it could provide, not to the Commons, but to the Committee of Both Kingdoms, On 9 May the Commons instructed Vane to prepare a letter to the County Committee of Kent urging them to maintain their cavalry, and assuring them that it would not be employed except for the service of the county.¹ In fact the letter had already been prepared, read, and despatched, (at the direction of the Committee), the previous day.² Even more interesting is an incident in July. The Committee ordered Vane and a Mr. Browne (probably Samuel Browne) to draft a letter to the committees of the Eastern Association to hasten the collection of money for the earl of Manchester's army.³ The letter with its clever reminder that supporting the earl's army in the North was a means of keeping the war out of East Anglia, was drawn up on the same day, and despatched on the following day, the 9th.⁴ Not until the day after that did the Commons resolve that such a letter should be sent.⁵ By July the Venetian ambassador was noting the discontent of the M.P.s, who 'realise they have made a mistake in setting up the Council of the Two Nations [sic], a body which does everything without so much as participating the state of affairs in full parliament, where some have made complaint.⁶

1. Ibid., 487.

2. CSPD.1644, 152-154.

3. Ibid., 325. 8 July.

4. Ibid., 328.

5. CJ.iii, 556.

6. CSPV.1643-47, 115. Holles noted that the Committee 'did manage all the great business...as framing propositions for peace...all negotiations with foreign states'. Memoirs, 221.

On 13 May 1644 St. John notified the Commons that the Committee's term of appointment had ended: he evidently expected the House to renew it, but the House did not.¹ Three days later Alderman Fowke appeared with an opportune petition from the City requesting that the Committee of Both Kingdoms might sit again,² and the Commons did now send up to the Lords an ordinance to renew the Committee's powers. But the Lords were determined to make changes in the membership of the Committee, and for a fortnight a vigorous struggle with the Commons continued on this issue. The Lords wished to add five names to the original seven peers on the Committee or to be allowed to nominate whom they would. But the Commons' majority - not a large one, on 7 May only eleven votes - refused all the Lords' amendments, even their final concession, on 21 May, that two peers' names only should be added to the Committee.³ After the last unsuccessful conference of the two Houses on 22 May the Commons majority resorted to the trick of bringing in the first ordinance, 'the Omnipotent Ordinance', as it was called in the House, which empowered the Committee to 'order and direct' the war, and control peace negotiations, and which had been dropped at the beginning of February, after being introduced into, and passing, the Lords.⁴ For this, of course, the Lords' consent was not necessary, for it had already been given.

1. Harl. 166, f.61.

2. Ibid., f.62. CJ.iii, 495. Vane, St. John and others were deputed to prepare an answer.

3. CJ. iii, 503.

4. The dispute may be followed in Whittaker, ff.136, 136v, 137, 137v, 139, 139v.

Vane played a leading part in this struggle with the Lords. He reported a conference with them on 10 May, and D'Ewes records that Vane, together with Glyn, and St. John, spoke against the Lords' dignified and vigorous statement of 15 May, when they protested against the infringement of their privileges by the Commons in nominating the Lords' members of the Committee.¹ After these speeches a committee, which had previously drafted an answer to the Lords on another matter, was re-appointed to prepare the Commons' case on this new issue; Vane was a member.² But though Gardiner stated that D'Ewes ascribed to Vane the stratagem by which the ordinance was revived,³ there does not appear to be evidence of this in D'Ewes - Strode re-introduced the ordinance which left the Lords helpless, and there is no evidence that Vane spoke in the 'hot debate' which D'Ewes tells us followed.⁴ One may agree however with Gardiner that the political method used was 'characteristic of the leadership of Vane and St. John', and the stratagem must have served to discredit Parliament in the eyes of the informed public. It may be noted that Holles was in favour of accepting the Lords' compromise offer on 21 May.⁵

In October Vane and St. John, according to D'Ewes, took advantage of another City petition, to introduce a plan which would have weakened the forces of Holles's friend, the earl of Essex, and strengthened those

1. Harl.166, f.61v.

2. CJ.iii, 494, 475.

3. Gardiner, OW.,i, 343.

4. Harl.166, f.64v. 22 May.

5. CJ. iii, 503.

of Hesilrige and Waller. Some aldermen and citizens of London presented a petition containing two ordinances, one concerning trade, but the other dealing with the City Brigade.¹ St. John and Vane wanted Skippon withdrawn from the earl's forces in the West to command the City's militia once again, and had, according to D'Ewes, 'cunningly wrought this to proceed from the City petition which was contrary to their [the City's] meaning, and soe to draw all power to Waller, Hesilrige etc. But Glynne the Recorder discovered the knavish packing and soe it was exploded by the House.² It is interesting that the man who presented the petition to the House was Alderman Fowke.³

It seems that for a few months Vane planned to supplant the earl of Essex by Sir William Waller - it is characteristic of the shifting loyalties of many M.P.s that Waller, a noted supporter of Holles's 'presbyterian' group in 1647-1648, should in 1644 be associated with Vane's. Waller in his Memoirs asserted that Parliament was about to give him command of its army when the news of Cropredy came, and thus disappointed his hopes.⁴ It looks as if this plan was Vane's, though only a few months before he had opposed allotting to Waller's army money designated for the Scots' forces.⁵ In July 1644 even after Waller's defeat, Vane pleaded earnestly with the House to allow Waller to recruit his army, and rescind a former order that Waller should

-
1. Ibid., 651. 4 Oct.
 2. Harl. 166, f.128v. 7 Oct.
 3. CJ. iii, 651, and Harl. 166, f.128.
 4. Poetry of Anna Matilda, 1788, 131.
 5. Harl. 165, f.213v.

a prominent part.¹ He was a member of the committee which pursued the king. Vane's group were trying to replace Essex by Waller - in August Hesilrige and Waller's 'other friends', as D'Ewes called them, unsuccessfully tried to persuade the House not to order Waller to join Essex,² and in October St. John and Vane, in the incident already noted, were trying to strengthen Waller, at the expense of Essex, thought D'Ewes.³

A number of Vane's activities in connection with the Committee of Both Kingdoms have already been described; it is not possible to describe the others in detail, but some mention of his day-to-day work is necessary. As already noted, he was frequently employed as a messenger from the Committee; he was also asked to give the Commons reports of naval or military matters, and diplomatic questions.⁴ Occasionally the Committee employed Vane in settling local differences, particularly in Kent,⁵ and he was one of a small committee to fix the salaries of the Committee's officials.⁶ Once he was appointed to a sub-committee to prepare business for an afternoon session⁷ - it is not clear who drew up the agenda for the Committee of Both Kingdoms. One of the Vanes - there is no indication which - was a member of the sub-committee responsible for the report which finally led to Cromwell's famous denunciation in the Commons of the earl of Manchester.⁸

In peace negotiations, with which, as already shown, the Committee did in fact concern itself before it was authorised to do so, Vane took

-
1. Harl.166, f.98v. 17 July.
 2. Ibid., f.106. 10 Aug.
 3. See p.81.
 4. CSPD.1644, 68, 79, 95, 97, 137, 152, 189, 333.
 5. Ibid., 155, 181, 387.
 6. Ibid., 155.
 7. S.P.21/16, p.23.
 8. CSPD.1644-45, 137.

a prominent part. He was a member of the unauthorised committee already mentioned, set up to draft the Declaration to the Kingdom on the peace overtures and on the letter to the king himself.¹ He reported the letter, though not the Declaration, to the Commons. As he was deputed to defend the letter in the House, he was probably largely responsible for the form the letter took, and the fact that the Scottish commissioners secured the rejection of a clause presenting the king with the intolerable condition, of returning to the Westminster parliament by a certain date, or facing the continuation of the war, shows that the letter was far from conciliatory.²

He continued to be a firm opponent of negotiating for peace. He was one of the committee of three who drafted the very cool reply to the Dutch offer of mediation in March 1644, and was named first.³ When the Committee of Both Kingdoms obtained control of the peace negotiations, the Lords proposed that the Committee should present peace terms within four days; Vane and Hesilrige were tellers for the opposition.⁴ Holles, as so often, was Vane's opponent. The Committee however did decide that action was called for; three days later it set up a sub-committee to bring in a report, and either Vane or his father was a member.⁵ There is some doubt about the length of time the Committee

1. Whittaker, f.122v. 9 Mar.1644.

2. Gardiner (CW, i, 328) states that the alternative to the king's return was that means were to be taken to provide for the government without him, but Gardiner does not give his authority. Whittaker is followed here.

3. CJ. iii, 454-56.

4. Ibid., 458. 13 April.

5. CSPD.1644, 122. 16 April. The elder Vane was present in the morning, both Venes in the afternoon, and the minutes do not show which of them was appointed to the sub-committee. (S.P.21/16 p.48-9).

was given to draft its proposed peace terms;¹ Pierrepont when he reported them to the House on 29 April thought it necessary to protest that the Committee had used all diligence,² and the House had to reassure the City that the Commons were in fact at work on peace terms.³ Three days later St. John was one of the tellers against a motion to discuss the peace proposals next day, and probably the only reason that Vane was not also one of the tellers was that he happened to be out of the House at the time, taking a message to the Lords.⁴ D'Ewes reported that Vane, 'seeing that he could not at first divert the business of the peace negotiations, found another to interrupt it'⁵ - he presented a letter from the earl of Maitland recounting Scots military successes. With the Commons vote of 3 May peace proposals lapsed for some weeks. The Venetian ambassador commented at this time that the Committee of Both Kingdoms had been lukewarm, and had not got its peace proposals ready.⁶

In July Waller refused the king an answer to a peace overture - and Vane and Glynne were deputed to thank him on behalf of the House.⁷

-
1. The Committee of Both Kingdoms said (CSPD.1644, 122) that the House had allowed it until 26 April to bring in the peace proposals. But the Commons did not give them this date until 22 April, following a request from the Committee itself for an extension of time (Ibid., 127 - 'an amendment of the ordinance' - CJ.iii, 467). The Committee had again decided what the Commons should do.
 2. CJ.iii, 472.
 3. Ibid., 478. 3 May.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Harl.166, f.55.
 6. CSPV.1643-7, 94, 97. 6 May. In October Agostini was writing that Parliament had completed peace proposals, but 'their sole object is to deceive the people, and to obliterate the opinion, which has become universal, that parliament abhors any treaty'. Ibid., 146.
 7. CJ.iii, 555. 8 July.

Peace proposals were discussed at length on 1st August;¹ on the next day Vane obtained permission to leave for Kent, thus tacitly demonstrating his lack of enthusiasm for peace.² All through September and early October, peace terms were discussed; another letter from the king was received, and Vane was one of the committee (a large one) to draft a reply, which was simply a statement that the House would hasten to complete its peace proposals.³ On 15 October the main work on the proposals was at last done, and the preamble and conclusion were referred to the Committee of Both Kingdoms;⁴ the Committee did nothing and had to be sharply reminded to make its report.⁵ The Committee again delayed this, but when the report was finally made to the House on 24 October Vane was its spokesman in the Commons.⁶ These were the proposals that Holles and other M.P.s took to the king at Oxford, in November 1644. The Dutch ambassador again offered to mediate, and Vane was added to the committee to draw up a reply, but if one was ever made there seems to be no record of it.⁷ The usual difficulty of distinguishing Vane's own part from the collective work of the Committee is seen in considering this subject, but it is obvious that he was hostile to the policy of a negotiated peace.

Vane's most important mission for the Committee of Both Kingdoms took place in June 1644. The Committee decided on 3 June that he and

-
1. CJ. iii, 575.
 2. See below p.92 note 1.
 3. CJ.iii, 629, 630. 16-18 Sept.
 4. Ibid., 665.
 5. Ibid., 668. 17 October.
 6. Ibid., 675. According to D'Ewes the Committee had altered propositions which Parliament and the Scots had already agreed to. Harl.166, f.151.
 7. Ibid., 701. 21 Nov.

William White should be sent to the Scottish and English armies outside York, to 'advise with' the Parliamentary delegates to the Scottish army, and with the earl of Manchester and Lord Fairfax, as to 'what course shall be taken for securing Lancashire and ruining Prince Rupert's army'.¹ The Committee had decided that part at least of the armies besieging York should be diverted to the relief of Lancashire, and in particular to Liverpool, which was in great danger.² Vane, with his usual despatch, left on the 4th or early on the 5th, when the Committee reported his departure to the Commons.³ His instructions were to return to London by 22 June, or earlier if possible, but he did not return until 30 June.⁴ He had asked for permission to stay longer than the time originally fixed, for reasons that do not carry conviction - Parliament's representatives with the army were not a quorum without him (but they cannot have been before his arrival either), and he wished to see the fall of York.⁵ The Committee returned the firm reply that he was to return by the date fixed in

-
1. CSPD.1644, 197. Aulicus (E 54(5) says that Vane took £30,000 to the Scots. Vane however met his own expenses for the journey. D'Ewes has for 10 July, when Lenthall thanked Vane for his services, 'Speaker adulatorie that who else would take such a journey upon ther own cost etc?' Harl.166, f.79.
 2. For Liverpool's danger see CSPD.1644, 193, 204. The Committee's attitude is shown in Vane's letter, ibid., 223-4.
 3. Ibid., 204. The letter from Vane and the earl of Lindsay has been wrongly dated by the Committee's clerk who copied it into the Letter-book - Vane reported from the Committee to the Commons on 3 June (CSPD.1644, 197, CJ. iii, 516) and could not possibly have reached York by 5 June. Vane says himself (CSPD.1644, 223) that he reached York on the Sunday night, i.e. the 9th. The Committee's regular meeting time was 3 p.m., so that Vane could have left on the morning of the 5th.
 4. CSPD.1644, 292.
 5. Ibid., 241.

his instructions.¹

The whole incident is very odd indeed. Why should the Committee send Vane, who had no military experience at all, on a mission designed to persuade the generals of the superior wisdom of the Committee of Both Kingdoms?² They could have sent Stapleton. Why did Vane stay for eighteen days?³ Both the Venetian envoy, and Sabran, the French 'ambassador' in England, had heard that Vane's mission had another purpose than that which was publicly avowed - the establishment of a republican government in England. The Venetian envoy does not state the source of his information, but he was writing in June - his first despatch is dated 7 June (English style) - only two or three days after Vane's departure.⁴ Agostini's statement that Vane had gone on to Scotland in the utmost secrecy would certainly explain Vane's overlong stay in the North. But Vane cannot have crossed the border - there are letters from Vane at York on 11, 16, 20 and 23 June, he must have started back on the 27th, and this would not allow time for a visit to Scotland as well. It is possible however that the Committee in their letter of 13 June peremptorily ordering Vane to return by the date previously fixed were referring to such a

1. Ibid., 229. The letter-book is usually very complete, and all the other letters mentioned in the minutes for that day are in the Letter-book; the letter to Vane however, containing this instruction to return is not. It is strange too that the letter in which Vane first asked for an extension of time for his mission is also not in the Letter-book - in his letter of 16 June he refers to a previous request for a postponement of his return; as this is not in his letter of 11 June, he must have written a letter on or about 13 June, which was not copied in the letter book.
2. Gardiner, CW., i, 368, notes this.
3. Lindsay and the other generals at York say, on 28 June, 'Sir Henry Vane being now to return to you'. (CSPD.1644, 287-8). But to arrive at the Committee's meeting in London on 30 June Vane must have started back on the 27th.
4. CSPV.1643-47, 110.

project. Sabran's letter is dated much later, on 8 September; his informant was the earl of Holland, a frequent visitor to the French envoy.¹ According to Sabran, Vane, finding the generals inclined to make peace with the king, told them boldly that parliament and people could not feel themselves secure with Charles or his family, that things had gone too far, and that the form of government would have to be changed.² Holland could have received his information from his brother, the earl of Warwick, a close friend and relation of Manchester. It would seem that the two foreign envoys' sources of information were different, and, at the very least, this was the story that was believed about Vane in certain quarters in London.

Vane returned to London on 30 June. At the end of July and during August it was rumoured that there was a scheme afoot to change the government of England by making Charles Lewis, Elector Palatine, king. This was no new idea; in 1629 one Stephan ap Evan, of Rilth, Shropshire, was accused of declaring that the king would be hunted out of the land, and that the Palsgrave would be crowned in his stead.³ In 1641 the Venetian ambassador had heard that Charles Lewis was suggested in the Commons as a possible king.⁴ No more was heard of the idea until 1644, when in August Sabran reported, 'Le prompt départ du Prince palatin de la Hague n'est pas sans mystère...je tiens avec le commun que c'est part le convy du Parlement qu'il vient...enfin

puisque toutes choses les plus horribles sont maintenant faisable par

1. For other visits by Holland to Sabran, see BM.Add.5460 ff.267, 319, 346, 348; BM.Add.5461, f.47.
2. Gardiner, above, prints the relevant passage. The reference to 'the people' does add verisimilitude to the story - Vane frequently spoke and wrote in such terms.
3. Judson, Crisis of the Constitution, 306, based on CSPD.1629-31, 17.
4. CSPV.1640-42, 200.

les gens ici, lui offrir une couronne...'¹ The Committee of Both Kingdoms knew that Charles Lewis intended to come to England; on 16 August Weckherlin, their secretary for foreign affairs, was instructed to write to Strickland in Holland, 'not to give any encouragement to the Prince Elector for his coming over to England!'² The Commons however were not informed. In spite of the Committee's discouraging attitude Charles Lewis came; on 29 August the Committee discussed his arrival and decided to report it to the Commons, who were also to be informed that the Committee 'understood nothing of his coming before this morning from himself or from any other by his direction'.³ By 26 August Agostini had heard 'in the utmost confidence by one who is acquainted with the secret moves', that Charles Lewis was to be put forward as king.⁴ By 1 September Sabran was asserting of the 'parliament men' that: 'leur dessein est... transferrer en un autre nom la Royaute, auquel cas le Prince Palatin pourroit estre induit, et que sous les conditions que l'on voudroit il pourroit accepter cette couronne, qui lui feroit recouvrer la siene de Palatin'.⁵ Parliament's reception was frigid; Charles Lewis was

1. BM.Add.5460, f.206.

2. CSPD.1644, 433.

3. Ibid., 460.

4. CSPV.1643-47, 130. Agostini refers to the project later also: ibid., 131, 135, 138-9, 150.

5. BM.Add.5460, f.217. 1 Sept. 1644.

1. Ibid., 514.

2. BM.Add.5460, f.243-44. 5 Sept. 1644.

3. K. Hauck, Die Briefe des Kinder des Winterkönigs, 1871, 27.

Dr. Wedgewood kindly brought this book to my notice.

4. Ibid., 27-28.

5. Formules reflecting upon the Mass, B 430(31). 13 Nov. 1644. A 1643 pamphlet B 298(7) also refers briefly to the suggestion of replacing Charles I by another king.

told the shorter his stay the better it would be for his interests and the public's.¹ Yet he was later voted a huge allowance, and lodged in Whitehall palace. Sabran wrote that it was believed Charles Lewis had been induced to come over by underhand means, 'par le conseil de quelque particulier du Parlement, et entre autres des deux Vaynes, Beaupère et Beaufrère', and by those who advised the Queen of Bohemia. Sabran thought that perhaps the official rebuff was a feint designed to cover the real intentions of those who had brought Charles Lewis over.² There was a widespread impression that the Elector was aiming at the crown - Charles I's own letter at this time enquiring the reason for his nephew's visit to England hinted at this³ - and Charles Lewis's insulting reply, in which he pointedly put his respects to the parliament before his respects to the king, does nothing to correct this impression.⁴ A curious contemporary pamphlet, which described the uprising against the king in an allegory of birds, referred obliquely to the project: 'It was shrewdly suspected, that there was a pernicious plot amongst them to let in the storke, who is never seene to stay long in any monarchie'.⁵

Only Sabran's assertion connects Vane with the plan to crown Charles Lewis. The elder Vane's friendship with the Palatine family went back many years, and numerous letters testify to the Winter Queen's

-
1. CJ. iii, 614.
 2. EM.Add. 5460, f.243-44. 5 Sept. 1644.
 3. K. Hauck, Die Briefe des Kinder des Winterkonigs, 1891, 27. Dr. Wedgewood kindly brought this book to my notice.
 4. Ibid., 27-28.
 5. Parables reflecting upon the Times, E 470(31). 13 Nov.1648. A 1645 pamphlet E 298(7) also refers briefly to the suggestion of replacing Charles I by another king.

regard for him.¹ It is not unlikely that Vane senior should have conceived the idea of making Charles Lewis king. It is more difficult to believe the younger Vane was involved in the scheme, for parliament was not interested in Charles Lewis in 1644 - D'Ewes made frequent attempts to persuade the Commons to pay the Elector the £3,000 Parliament had voted him, but the House refused to take any action.² Moreover, when Charles Lewis had actually come to England Vane and some others spoke very bitterly against the prince's coming, 'shewing that it was against the consent or knowledge of the Houses, of the Committee of Both Kingdomes, that it was at a most unseasonable time, raising much talke and jealousy in many men's heads and tongues'.³ This does not sound as though Vane had invited the prince, unless, as S.R. Gardiner believed, Charles Lewis had come prematurely, before plans were ripe.⁴ It is certainly odd that rumours about making Charles Lewis king should circulate soon after Vane's republican schemes were said to have been defeated. It is also a strange coincidence that Vane returned to London, after staying somewhat longer in Kent than parliament had authorised him to do, on the very day the Prince Elector's arrival at Gravesend was reported.⁵ Vane had been given permission on 2 August to be absent from parliament for health reasons

-
1. See e.g. CSPD.1635, 435; ibid., 1640, 583; ibid., 1640-41, 549.
 2. Harl.166, f.40, 26 Mar. 'Mr. Prideaux scoffed at the busines'. On this occasion Vane secured a decision that the Lords' vote on the Dutch peace negotiations should be discussed first when the House next met, thus ousting D'Ewes' motion on the Elector from its position on the agenda for that day. This could have been a deliberate move on Vane's part. CJ.iii, 439.
 3. Harl.166, f.111v. 31 Aug.
 4. CW, ii, 28.
 5. CSPD.1644, 460.

for 'a fortnight or thereabouts',¹ but he had stayed away for twenty-seven days.

The whole incident remains very obscure - perhaps, as D'Ewes asserted, the Elector had come over only to obtain the promised £3,000. On the other hand Sabran, a shrewd observer, thought there had been a plan to replace the king by his nephew. Perhaps Vane toyed with the idea but rejected it. In October the earl of Holland, in conversation with Sabran's secretary, asserted that there had been a scheme to replace Charles I, but the Scots had objected. 'Les Escossais ne vouloient point changer de Roy, ainsi que ceux de la chambre des Communes desiroient'.² The earl of Argyle's brother also told Sabran, in November, that the Scottish parliament 'ne desiroient l'entremise d'aucune prince', and as Sabran went on to refer sarcastically to Charles Lewis's attendance at the Westminster Assembly, it is clear that the Palatine was meant.³ It looks as if some such scheme was mooted by someone, but whether Vane was in any way connected with it is an open question. If he was in fact suggesting a republic in June 1644 it would be the first indication that he held 'republican' views,⁴ but Vane's 'republicanism' was of a very pragmatic

1. CJ.iii, 576. That he was going to Kent is clear from CSPD.1644,387.

2. BM.Add.5460, f.320. 17 Oct.

3. Ibid., f.366. 17 Nov.

4. Though there was a hint in the declaration drawn up by the Committee of Both Kingdoms in answer to the king's peace proposals to Essex. (LJ.vi, 484-5. Above p.61). Vane was on the committee that drew up this document. The declaration asserted that the king's evil counsellors would in the end prove 'as dangerous to his majesty as to the kingdom, which may be made apparent by the example of some of his predecessors, unhappily misled by the desperate counsels of private and ill-affected persons'.

variety, and it would not be at all inconsistent with his views on government that he should be a republican in June and a monarchist in August.

One of the most successful strokes achieved in parliament by Vane's group was the Self-Denying Ordinance, proposed by Zouch Tate, and seconded by Vane,¹ but its origins, which are interesting, have not been properly understood. On 14 November 1644 an ordinance was introduced appointing Lisle Master of St. Cross Hospital at Winchester.² This touched off some long-smouldering impatience in the House, and a committee was named to 'consider of all the offices and places of benefit bestowed by the Parliament, what profits they that had them did make of them, and what might be made of them for the use of the public, the officers having a competent allowance made out of them, and to begin with first the places conferred upon members of each House'.³ It is significant that Reynolds, who had months before foreseen that some men might acquire a vested interest in war, was put in charge of the investigation.⁴ Stapleton and Holles were on Reynolds's committee,

-
1. Rushworth, part iv, vol.ii, 1645-47, 4. 9 Dec.1644. A petition from London followed. Ibid., 5. According to D'Ewes (Harl.166, f.151) a petition was presented on 28 Oct. in which 'some citizens of London' thanked the House for passing a vote taking away the offices both civil and military of the members of both Houses. A heated debate followed. Could D'Ewes, who copied out his notes here, have made a mistake in the date? There seems no other mention of this petition and debate.
 2. Whittaker, f.174. Mercurius Aulicus later alleged that this post was worth £800 a year. E 465(19) 26 Sept.-3 Oct.1648.
 3. Whittaker, op. cit.
 4. CJ.iii, 695.

Vane, St. John, Hesilrige and Cromwell were not¹ - the motion evidently did not proceed from their group. On the same day - and surely the two were connected? - some Kentish knights and gentlemen appeared, to present a petition of very similar tenor, which is worth quoting at length.

The petition, recalling that the petitioners had taken on the obligation of assisting Parliament's forces, continues with the very frank statement that: 'To the intent that this obligation of assistance (particularly pecuniary) so just and necessary yet so suitable to the soldiers' present interest of making a trade of war, may not prove an occasion of lengthening out our miseries, we shall humbly crave that some honourable and beneficial reward may be settled to the commanders and common soldiers, to be received by them out of the estates of delinquents at the end of the warre, as may quicken them to a noble desire of the speedy enjoyment thereof. And in the meantime such competent allowance only to be made to all commanders...as may reasonably defray the charge of their employment'.²

The Press as a whole considered discretion the better part of valour, and only two newspapers were bold enough to mention this clause in the Kentish petition; the True Informer lived up to its name,³ and the Scottish Dove also included an account of the clause.⁴ Thomason could

1. Ibid.

2. E 19(11). The petition is mentioned in Whitelocke, i, 329, and CSPV.1643-47, 157.

3. E 17(9).

4. E 18(7). For newspapers omitting the news see e.g. E 18(2).

the ordinance was made, or on the day after the fact and the petition; obtain only a hand-written copy of the petition, and drily adds he ended with the offer to surrender his own office of Treasurer of at the end of it: 'All which was received with much thankfulness;

[this was true - the House was almost fulsomely polite to the petitioners]

but Mr. Rushworth durst not license it to print'.¹ In the ensuing weeks however traces of the long-suppressed suspicion and indignation of some at least of the public can be seen in the newspapers,²

Of course a great number of the M.P.s held lucrative offices - Pym had been Master of the Ordnance,³ Prideaux was Postmaster-general,

Vane had the Navy Treasurership. They would doubtless have replied that they were sacrificing their time and talents to 'the Cause', and they had to live. The Kentish petition was quietly ignored, presumably Reynolds's committee sat throughout November, unless Cromwell's quarrel with Manchester distracted the committee's attention, until a month later, when on 14 December the Self-Denying Ordinance was introduced.

The Ordinance was in fact a **clever device** to stifle Reynolds's committee, appease the Kentish petitioners, and rid the country of the unsuccessful generals, all at one stroke. Clarendon, who is confirmed by Agostini and Whitelocke, asserted that the Independents enlisted the help of the preachers to get the measure through.⁴

Vane made a long speech either on the day when the motion introducing

-
1. As note 2, page 94.
 2. 'Divers of ours that make show to fight for religion more than pay, betray the trust reposed in them'. E 18(4). 'Other men in those offices will be afraid to do amiss, when they have no party in the House'. E 21(36), Scottish Dove.
 3. Harl.166, f.154v.
 4. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 191-92. CSPV.1643-47, 166. Whitelocke, i, 351. Agostini refers to the 'scattering of seditious pamphlets'. op. cit.164.

the ordinance was made, or on the day after the fast and the sermons; he ended with the offer to surrender his own office of Treasurer of the Navy, and the wish that the profits might be applied to the cost of the war.¹ Incidentally if Vane really declared that he did not owe his Navy Treasurership to the favour of parliament, this was a half-truth that some M.P.s must have heard with scepticism, seeing that from December 1641 to August 1642 Vane had been out of the office, and had been re-appointed to it only by parliament. It may be remarked that in spite of the Self-Denying Ordinance, which later passed,² Vane continued to be Treasurer of the Navy, as 'Honest John Lilburne' did not fail to point out.³ He, and one or two others, including Warwick, were protected from loss of office by a clause excepting from resignation those who had been dismissed by the king and re-appointed by Parliament.⁴ Vane also secured from parliament specific re-instatement.⁵

Vane's parliamentary activities in 1644 give a clear picture of his energy and resourcefulness. He could take advantage of parliamentary procedure in a way that though legal was not completely honest - witness the introduction of the ordinances establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms; the first was introduced into a very thin House of Lords,⁶ and was later revived in order to by-pass opposition in that

-
1. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 194. There seems to be no record of this speech elsewhere.
 2. Rushworth, part iv, vol.i, 14-16. 3 April, 1645.
 3. Haller, Tracts, iii, 288.
 4. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 288.
 5. See below, p. 215.
 6. Opposition was expected here. Baillie, ii, 141.

Kingdoms are not easily established, though it is clear that he House. The Lovelace negotiations too could hardly have been carried on by a very scrupulous man. Vane continued to be a master of shrewd argument, and could defend himself or his cause with great ability. His 'leadership' of the House was a qualified one however. Undoubtedly he was a leader - both the Committee of Both Kingdoms and the Self-Denying Ordinance can be presumed with fair certainty to be Vane's inventions. But he was not a master of the House in the same way that Pym was, nor even of the Committee of Both Kingdoms.¹ He was sometimes defeated in the Commons, and when he wanted an extension of time for his mission to York, he had to 'state his case' to the Committee, plead for a concession and even then was refused.

How far the somewhat high-handed actions of the Committee of Both Kingdoms were due to Vane one does not know - it has to be remembered that he was only one member of a large committee. But certainly he was often associated with incidents in which the Committee acted without prior authorisation by parliament. He knew, up to a point, when the House of Commons must be conciliated, as when he introduced the modified ordinance establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms, or framed the Self-Denying Ordinance. Whether he also realised that he was retaining votes, but not necessarily the good opinion of the House and the public, is doubtful.

Vane's views on policy in the hey-day of the Committee of Both

1. Pierrepoint and Northumberland attended even more often - of course they had no other official duties outside parliament.

2. CJ. 111, 725. 29 Dec.

Kingdoms are not easily established, though it is clear that he consistently opposed peace negotiations. His attitude to the Lords, collectively and individually, argues that his hostility to the Upper House had also continued and even increased.¹ There is no substantial evidence to connect Vane with a republican position at this time - his mission to York for the Committee of Both Kingdoms is a very obscure incident indeed.

With St. John he was continuing to work very closely, and it is possible to identify some of his other political associates, such as Tate, Hesilrige and Samuel Browne. This is not always easy however - even Cromwell was a teller in December 1644 against Vane.² Probably Vane, St. John and their collaborators were not concerting beforehand by any means all their policy. Whether Vane endeavoured to place Charles Lewis on the throne is still an open question. In the summer of 1644 the 'war party' could look forward to victory, and would need some constructive policy for the peace. It is not impossible that Vane should for a time have considered the accession of Charles Lewis as a possible solution of the political dilemma. He was concerned with almost every other major political problem of this vitally important period.

-
1. One incident which reveals this occurred in April 1644. The earl of Manchester had taken off the sequestration from the Lincolnshire estates of the earl of Clare, who had returned to Parliament's allegiance. Vane and Hesilrige objected to Manchester's action, though a few short months before Vane and St. John had vigorously championed Manchester's power to remove the sequestration from the property of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vane took the lead in introducing a bill to regulate sequestrations, which would have the double object of limiting Manchester's power to lift sequestrations, and bringing in money for the Scots armies. Harl. 166, f. 46.
 2. CJ. iii, 729. 19 Dec.

Vane does not seem to have been a 'Presbyterian Independent' in the term of Baxter's definition, (unless perhaps when he negotiated the Solemn League and Covenant). At least his name is not on the existing lists of elders, nor is he known to have had other connections with religious presbyterianism. His father signed the letter in December 1645 certifying that the classis system had been set up in Durham. Chap. iii. The issue of peace or war, (1645-46). George's father-in-law were elders at Staindrop,¹ but Vane himself does not appear as an elder for Durham or London. This is hardly conclusive, for neither the elder Vane nor his eldest son resided at Raby for any considerable time during the Civil Wars. They did stay in London for long periods, but it was Kent which would probably be regarded as their main residence, and on the setting up of the presbyterian system in Kent the only information is an evasive letter, signed by neither of the Vanes, politely postponing the task of establishing the classis.²

According to Clarendon the names 'Presbyterian' and 'Independent' were first employed by the two rival groups in Parliament after the Oxford negotiations, and he would date their use to about March 1645,³ though it is true that in another passage relating to the period December 1645-March 1646 he speaks of the Independents, 'who were a faction newly grown up'.⁴ Holles however did not use the

1. Ibid., 367-68, 13 Dec. 1645.

2. Ibid., 373.

3. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 259.

4. Ibid., ix, 167.

Vane does not seem to have been a 'Presbyterian Independent' in the term of Hexter's definition, (unless perhaps when he negotiated the Solemn League and Covenant). At least his name is not on the existing lists of elders, nor is he known to have had other connections with religious presbyterianism. His father signed the letter in December 1645 certifying that the classis system had been set up in Durham, and both the second son, Sir George, and Sir George's father-in-law were elders at Staindrop,¹ but Vane himself does not appear as an elder for Durham or London. This is hardly conclusive, for neither the elder Vane nor his eldest son resided at Raby for any considerable time during the Civil Wars. They did stay in London for long periods, but it was Kent which would probably be regarded as their main residence, and on the setting up of the presbyterian system in Kent the only information is an evasive letter, signed by neither of the Vanes, politely postponing the task of establishing the classis.²

According to Clarendon the names 'Presbyterian' and 'Independent' were first employed of the two rival groups in Parliament after the Uxbridge negotiations, and he would date their use to about March 1645,³ though it is true that in another passage relating to the period December 1645-March 1646 he speaks of the Independents, 'who were a faction newly grown up'.⁴ Holles however did not use the word

-
1. Shaw, ii, 367-68. 13 Dec. 1645.
 2. Ibid., 373.
 3. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 259.
 4. Ibid., ix, 167.

Independent until he was writing of 1646,¹ though Holles, like Clarendon but with less excuse, was deplorably vague in dating events.² One could almost believe that Holles was deliberately avoiding the term 'Independent', but a more likely explanation is that during the first three years of the war the word was little used, and Holles unconsciously reflected this.

The problem of the questions at issue between the two groups remains. In this connection it is important to realise that by no means all the members of parliament belonged to either group, and if they did belong to one group for some months it by no means follows that they belonged to it for years. There has been a tendency to regard parliament in the 1640s as though it were the contemporary parliament, with the members ranged consistently behind one or other party, whereas it was in fact more analogous to the French Revolutionary Convention, in which two-thirds of the members constituted the 'Plain', and belonged to none of the main political groups. During 1646, when the 'Recruiters' were coming in, the average number voting at divisions in the Commons was 179.³ If Holles was right in saying that the 'Independents' could rely on some fifty M.P.s,⁴ and as we know that Holles cannot have commanded more regular support than his

1. Memoirs, 232.

2. Holles was writing nearer in time to the events he described. For his inaccuracy see, for instance, his statement that the Scots were called in after the crowd surrounded the door of the Commons in August 1643, whereas Vane, Darley and the other envoys had departed for Scotland several days before. Memoirs, 197.

3. This figure is admittedly only a rough one, for it includes early morning and vacation-time divisions, when attendance was low; and some divisions on private matters show an unexpectedly large number of M.P.s voting.

4. Memoirs, p. 214.

would certainly seem to have led one group for the other. Holles far more than any other M.P. But if one considers his opponents' records on this basis, the surprising result is that the rival group led by Marten, who was taller in the House than Holles, had prevailed so far, upon the affections of the people, and especially, upon well-meaning, but not so discerning, Members of Parliament, that they were able to suppress all good motions, tending towards peace'.¹ Marten said much the same.²

There has been no study of the M.P.s who 'turned their coat' during the Civil Wars, but there were a great many of them, and it would be instructive to know their motives. But if men were prepared for on two occasions Holles was a teller for the royalist cause and was once a teller for the parliamentary cause for its rival, there would certainly be some who would move from support of one group to the other in the House. In politics, as in religion, where Dr. Yule noted,³ that men's views did not remain static, men changed their attitude. One must beware of assuming that because a man was a regicide or Rumper in 1649 he was an 'Independent' in 1645.

We are thus faced with a political situation of great complexity and fluidity. Nevertheless, it is true that in the 1645-48 period even more clearly than in 1644, two rival groups are clearly discernible in the House. If statistics of the tellers are relied upon, Holles

1. Memoirs, 230.

2. Quoted Yule, op. cit., 64.

3. Ibid., 20.

would certainly seem to have led one group, for he was a teller far more than any other M.P. But if one considers his opponents' records on this basis, the surprising result is that the rival party was led by Hesilrige, who was teller in thirty-two divisions between May 1645 and December 1646, and Sir John Evelyn of Wiltshire, whose total was twenty. Vane was a teller against Holles only three times, as often as Sir John Danvers, and less often than Nathaniel Fynes. Stapleton was Holles's most usual lieutenant, for he was a teller with Holles in thirty-one divisions, and Sir William Lewes in seven. The statistics are revealing in another way however, for on two occasions Hesilrige was a teller with Holles, and Stapleton was once a teller against him. Sir Walter Earle was a teller with Holles four times, but was a teller against him twice.¹ There is no reason to think that anyone at the time considered this odd.

In considering the differences between Holles's group and the group which evidently contained Hesilrige and Evelyn - the question of its leadership will be later discussed - the religious issue must be examined. If divisions in the House are an indication, as they must be, of the main issues, then these are seen to be as in 1644, not religious but political. Of the seventy divisions in which the two groups were clearly opposed to one another in 1645 and 1646, seven can be classed mainly as religious in character, sixty-three as mainly political. The two groups of M.P.s divided most often over

1. All the figures are from CJ. iv, and v, passim. Holles was a teller 58 times.

such questions as their attitude to the king, the House of Lords or the Scots. They also differed on policy towards delinquents, as individuals or as a class, and on how a London petition should be received. Religious issues, such as whether the ceremony of ordination should include taking the Covenant, or whether a petition from the Westminster Assembly was a breach of privilege, were much less frequent.¹ As Clarendon asserted,² and Holles in his memoirs more or less admitted,³ Holles's group supported the Scots for political reasons, not for religious ones. Probably most of the 'Independents' also were moved chiefly by political considerations - if one thinks of St. John or Pierrepoint happily settling down under the Restored monarchy's religious settlement one must allow that this is probable - though no doubt some supported the Hesilrige-Evelyn group for religious reasons.⁴

In this and the following chapters the term 'Presbyterian' has been used for the Holles-Stapleton group, and 'Independent' for the St. John-Hesilrige group, in spite of the inappropriateness of such religious terms. The names are in common use, and it is difficult to find substitutes. They are used here however in a strictly political sense, of the two groups, at least some of whose members were, by the summer of 1645, bitterly antagonistic to the leaders of the other.

1. CJ.iv, 542, 672(the king); 485, 558, 576, 598, 624, 675, 730(the Lords); 540, 545, 644, 655, 659, CJ.v, 12, 27(the Scots); CJ.iv, 297, 471, 529, 588, 665(delinquents); 449, 555, 561, CJ.v, 25(City petitions); CJ.iv, 319, 463, 552(the Covenant); 506,(Assembly petition).

2. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 248.

3. Memoirs, 202.

4. On the issue of toleration, for example.

There is no absolutely hard and fast line between the two groups, just as there was no hard and fast line between independents and presbyterians in religion. It is possible however from the diaries and other sources to draw up a list of some 40 M.P.s who can be seen to be working more or less consistently with the Independents.¹ As Holles considered his group were the moderates,² it seems inappropriate to use the term for the uncommitted M.P.s. Clarendon states,³ and any reader of the contemporary diurnalls and diaries will confirm, that the Independents spoke more and more persuasively than Holles's supporters did; this no doubt accounts for the comparative success of his rivals.

Vane continued to be one of the leaders of the group, as he had been in 1644, though as we have seen he rarely acted as a teller. It is remarkable too that Holles reserved his venom for St. John as the man chiefly responsible for the Independents' policy, and though he named Cromwell, Hesilrige, Mildmay and Marten as the Independent 'teazers' or 'gang',⁴ he hardly mentioned Vane. Clarendon however named Nathaniel Fynes, Vane, Cromwell, Hesilrige and Marten as the leaders of the Independents,⁵ and the diarists, the Commons Journals and other evidence support his view, though St. John was probably equally important behind the scenes. Baillie, the Scots, and the king regarded Vane as not the least important of the leaders, and on such vital matters as the appointment of Fairfax as commander-in-chief of the New Model,

-
1. See note C.
 2. Memoirs, 229.
 3. Clarendon, Rebellion, viii, 260.
 4. Memoirs, 220.
 5. Op. cit.

or launching the attack on Holles and Whitelocke in July 1645, Vane played a dominant part. Perhaps he did not act as teller because he could be more usefully employed in the lobby persuading M.P.s to vote for the Independent policy.

In February 1645 he was one of Parliament's commissioners at the peace negotiations at Uxbridge;¹ he had vigorously opposed negotiations with the king in 1643 and 1644; it seems odd therefore that he should be chosen to take part in the Uxbridge 'treaty'. The Uxbridge negotiations developed out of the Oxford discussions of November 1644 when Holles, Pierrepont, Lord Wenman, and Whitelocke had represented the Commons.² Holles and Whitelocke genuinely wanted peace, going so far as to draft at the king's request an answer to parliament which would facilitate peace (though they stoutly denied under cross-questioning later that they had done any such thing³). Whether Wenman and Pierrepont also wanted peace is not known. In January 1645 Vane, St. John, Crew and Prideaux were added to the previous four Oxford commissioners; the Lords sent four, (of whom Northumberland was one), and the Scots ten.⁴ Why was Vane sent? Perhaps he had changed his mind about making peace with the king, but there is no other evidence of this. Perhaps he wished to safeguard the interests of the Independents, and to prevent the

1. CJ. iv, 19.

2. Whitelocke, i, 329.

3. Ibid., 336.

4. See note 1.

Presbyterians from making an alliance with the king. Sabran writes at this time: 'il y a lieu de craindre des etranges extremités...si la chambre des Communs peut disposer des Escossais et des independants, les uns et les autres desquels sont meantmoins pour se joindre au party du roi de la Grande Bretagne, les premiers s'il chasse les éveques, les autres s'il résiste aux presbiteriat'.¹ Another explanation is also possible. The commissioners at Uxbridge would negotiate under severe disabilities - the three topics which Parliament had voted should be the subjects of discussion were surely those on which agreement was least likely to be obtained, religion, the militia, and Ireland.² Sabran, speaking to the Scots delegates to Uxbridge, pointed out to them the difficulties caused because: 'ceux qui avoient mis les trois articles moins possible en testes de propositions sembloient l'avoir fait pour arrester le cours du traité'.³ Moreover, Parliament's commissioners were given no room for manoeuvre. They had to demand such concessions from the king as the abolition of episcopacy, the acceptance of the Directory of Public Worship, and the taking of the Solemn League and Covenant not only by the king but also by all his subjects.⁴ The commissioners of the two sides were to exchange written memoranda;⁵ though discussion would have been a quicker

1. BM.Add.5461, f.98v.

2. See Northumberland's speech (E 272 (3) pp.3 and 4, for the subjects discussed.

3. BM.Add.5461, f.65v.

4. See note 2 above.

5. See note 3 below, p.108.

method of interchanging propositions, and would have been less likely to use up the 21 days allowed by Parliament for negotiation. But in spite of these and other difficulties the public demand for peace was so overwhelming that an agreement might well be reached. The Scottish Dove, a 'Parliament' newspaper, though the most outspoken, was writing: 'Some will object...that the kingdome is already almost undone, and that you are not able to subsist, the taxes are great, and you have little left to live'.¹ If the dominant party in parliament did not intend the peace negotiations to succeed, they could have sent some of their number to Uxbridge with this purpose in mind, and this was the view put forward by Agostini, and Brienne.² Other circumstances lend colour to their opinion. The Commons would not accede to the Lords' suggestion that the fast, proclaimed for the Wednesday, the first day of the meeting, should be put back a day.³ Therefore, though the commissioners were expected earlier, they did not arrive at Uxbridge until seven or eight in the evening.⁴ They then said that they could do nothing until the Scots commissioners arrived, which postponed the talks for another day. When the king's commissioners wanted the talks extended for a further few days,

-
1. E 270(33), 21-29 Feb. 1644/5.
 2. CSPV.1643-47, 173; BM.Add.5461, f.120v. Dr. Wedgewood (King's War, 418) seems to take the view that the king was at least as intransigent as Parliament, but in view of his perilous military situation in England this would surely have been an unlikely policy for him to pursue, in spite of Montrose's victories?
 3. The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer, E 26(7).
 4. Mercurius Aulicus, E 271(4).

Parliament's commissioners refused.¹ There is also the very
 X damaging fact pointed out by Aulicus: 'their Solemn League and
 Covenant is now only tendered to good consciences whom they hope
 will refuse it, and waived as often as any sort of Rebels pretend
 to stumble at it...they have now granted that their new General,
 Sir Thomas Fairfax, and all the officers of their intended Army, shall
 not have the Covenant prest upon them, and yet their commissioners
 at Uxbridge will have no peace unless His Sacred Majesty sweare to
 this covenant and injoyne it to all his subjects'.² This accusation
 is borne out by facts - Cromwell not a month before had been a teller
 for the Noes when it was moved that the Covenant should be tendered
 to the New Model Army.³

There seems to be no record of Vane's part in the negotiations
 at Uxbridge - the peers' reports to Parliament are laconic in the
 extreme.⁴ Whitelocke tells us only that Culpepper came to pay a
 courtesy visit to Vane, as Clarendon, Whitelocke's old friend, did
 to him.⁵ In the early years of the Long Parliament Culpepper and
 Vane had several times acted as joint managers of conferences with
 the Lords, or on other missions for the Commons,⁶ and had probably
 come to know each other quite well. Clarendon asserted that Vane,

-
1. Whitelocke, i, 395. Loudon, in reporting to the City, gives the same reason as Whitelocke - no progress had been made on the three subjects so far discussed. E 273(3) p. 7.
 2. See note 4 above, p.108.
 3. CJ.iv, 48. 13 Feb. Parliament's refusal to recognise the titles of some of the royalist commissioners - Hyde's earldom, for instance - also looks like obstructive tactics. The king overlooked this. See above, note 3, p.108.
 4. LJ.vii, 175 seq.
 5. Whitelocke, i, 375.
 6. CJ.ii, 140, 234, 238, et al.

St. John and Prideaux acted as spies on the other Parliament commissioners, and that they did not desire peace.¹ On the whole the evidence lends itself to this view. Certainly it would be consistent with Vane's drawing away from the Scots at this period, and with his attempts to bring the Scots army into England, probably to embroil them yet more deeply in the war, and thus ensure that they did not make peace with the king. It could well be that Laud was executed at this time to make the prospects of peace less likely, by antagonising the king against the parliament. There is no definite evidence to connect Vane with the resumed attack on Laud, but Samuel Browne played a very prominent part.² Browne was probably, as we have seen, a member of Vane's group at the time of the Vane-Lovelace negotiations;³ no doubt his experience as one of the original feoffees for Improvements would pre-dispose him to lead the attack on Laud.⁴ Vane may have objected to the peace negotiations partly because they impeded progress in organising the 'New Model' - this was a reason to Clarendon for trying to prolong the discussions.⁵ But probably one cause of Vane's attitude to peace negotiations lay in his knowledge of the king's religious policy. 'All

1. Clarendon, Rebellion, iii, 492.
 2. CJ.iv, 7, 12, 16.
 3. See above, chap.iii, p.70. Samuel Browne dined with St.John and Vane, and was said by Whitelocke to be 'a grandee of that [St.John's] party'. Whitelocke, i, 527.
 4. C. Hill, Economic Problems of the Church, Oxford, 1956, 257, 259.
 5. Clarendon, Rebellion, iii, 498.

the king's propositions are to maintain the present religion', he had declared in the Commons early in January 1644.¹

The grounds for identifying Vane with a 'war policy' at Uxbridge lie in his attitude to peace negotiations before and after the treaty, in Clarendon's account of the meeting,² and in the speech Vane made to the City after his return. In his speech³ there is much about the further prosecution of the war, and almost nothing about the blighted hopes of peace. Parliament, he says, has 'sent us to you for a double end...The one to give you a clear representation of the candour of their actions and intentions in this late treaty'. [There were evidently still suspicions in some people's minds that Parliament did not wish for peace]. 'The other, the firmness...of their resolutions to live and dye with you...in the prosecution of this war'. It is true that at this conference at a Common Council it was the task of Northumberland and Loudon to deal with the record of the negotiations, and Vane's to ask for more money to prosecute the war. If Vane had really regretted the failure of the 'treaty', however, one would expect this to be shown at some point during the speech. He did say: 'If it pleased God, notwithstanding all the designs of foreigners upon us, that we can but be betimes in the field,...we may be able to compose these unhappy differences...

1. BM.Add.18, 779 f.45v.

2. Op. cit. For Clarendon's value as a witness at this point see C.H. Firth 'Clarendon's History of the Rebellion', EHR., xix, (1904), 26-54.

3. E 273(3).

amongst ourselves'. He went on: 'There can be no argument I know be more prevelent with you, then the shortening of the war; the Houses of Parliament have been willing to end it either way, by treaty or war; but they think all treaties will be uselesse till they [Parliament] be in a posture to shew themselves able to repell that opposition that can be made against them'. Probably the last sentence reflects Vane's true opinions, and he was relying on the newly formed army to secure the kind of peace that he would consider acceptable.

In June 1645 a report was circulated in the City by a well-known Presbyterian minister, Cranford, that Vane and three others, without authority, had constituted themselves a sub-committee of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and for three months had been secretly negotiating with the King, even treating with him concerning the surrender of forts, castles and garrisons in Parliament's hands.¹ Cranford's assertions were based on something Baillie had told him about an intercepted letter to Lord Digby, containing peace propositions for the king.² Two days later St. John, one of the M.P.s named by

-
1. CJ.iv, 172. 212. St. John said the sub-committee was instructed to negotiate about the surrender of royalist forts, and the writer of Manifest Truths (see note 2, p.114) accepts this. The sub-committee however is one more example of the methods of the Committee of Both Kingdoms. The sub-committee's establishment is not recorded in the Day-Book, and the Scots commissioners on the main committee were not told of its appointment until nearly a month had passed. A Scots member was then appointed - but never summoned to a meeting. Baillie, ii, 487-89, CSPD.1644-45, 400-01, 460. Stapleton and Pierrepont declared that they knew nothing of the sub-committee (Harl.166, f.219), though St. John had stated Pierrepont was a member.
 2. Baillie, ii, 279.

Cranford - the others apart from Vane, were Pierrepoint and Crew - told the House that there was a sub-committee of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, appointed, among other duties, to find out who sent to Oxford intelligence of what was done in the House.¹ The sub-committee consisted of four men, but those St. John named were not the same as those mentioned by Cranford, and did not include Vane. According to Baillie it was Vane and St. John who were instrumental in having Cranford's allegations brought up in the Commons; information had come to the Committee of Both Kingdoms, Vane and St. John had exaggerated the matter, and reported it to the House.² According to Whittaker, it was the Lord Mayor, Atkins, who actually sent the information to the House³ - another slight indication of the links between Vane and the City. A committee was set up, and after a debate in July, the Commons voted Cranford's words false and scandalous, ordered him to be imprisoned in the Tower, and to pay £500 each to the men he had maligned.⁴ His arrest was delayed however,⁵ and he was released soon after at the request of the same four members.⁶

Baillie says that he did not name any particular M.P.s in his conversations with Cranford, in which case Cranford merely guessed the identity of those concerned. Apparently Vane was not one of the

-
1. Whittaker, f.215. 13 June. D'Ewes did not include Vane among those named by Cranford (Harl.166, f.218.), but the Journals and Yonge (BM.Add.18, 780 f.76v.) did.
 2. Baillie, op. cit.
 3. Whittaker, f.214-15.
 4. CJ.iv, 212-13. 19 July.
 5. Baillie, ii, 311.
 6. CJ.iv, 245. 18 Aug.

members of the unauthorised sub-committee of Both Kingdoms alleged to be negotiating with the king. But the Committee was so curiously constituted that its membership was not clearly established, and Vane may well have attended meetings. The accusation against Cranford may have been designed to whip up anti-Scottish feeling, or Vane may have decided that the best defence was attack, if he had heard something of Baillie's suspicions. It was asserted in the House that the accusation was only an Independent plot against Cranford, a strong presbyterian.¹ The incident is chiefly important however for illustrating the continuing theme of the fear of separate Independent peace negotiations, and for Baillie's belief that St. John and Vane were directing spirits in such matters as the Cranford affair. It is not known whether Cranford paid his crippling fine, though it seems unlikely that he could have done.² His speedy release may have been due to the generosity of the men he had 'injured', but the House may have taken into consideration also the severe epidemic of plague that was raging in London in the summer.

The Cranford affair was connected with another political struggle at the same time. In July 1645 a deliberate attempt, to which Vane was a party, was made, and ruthlessly pressed, to ruin Holles and Whitelocke. The two M.P.s who had taken part in the Oxford

1. Harl.166, f.218v.

2. The author of Manifest Truths (E 343(I), 4 July 1646), replying to the Scots version of relations between the two kingdoms, Truth's Manifest E1179(5) stated that the M.P.s whom Cranford had libelled 'I beleeve regard no pecuniary benefit'. He also asserted that Cranford's allegations might have ruined the New Model Army, by discrediting those who had been active in creating it.

the negotiations in November were accused, as has already been mentioned, of suggesting what answer the king should make to Parliament; they were also accused of distinguishing between the 'parties' in parliament, identifying the earl of Essex's as the friends of peace, and the rival party as opposed to peace.¹ Holles was further accused of corresponding with the royalist Lord Digby.² John Gurdon produced the letter of accusation from Lord Savile, and according to his evidence Vane was one of the three men who were informed of Savile's letter before it was brought up in the Commons; Lord Say, Vane and Barnardiston were told of the letter - were perhaps shown it - and advised Gurdon to proceed. Gurdon pointed out that the House would be at the time in a Grand Committee, when the letter could not be received, so Vane and Barnardiston promised to call the Speaker to the chair.³ The charges were a severe ordeal for Holles and Whitelocke - their honour, fortune and life were at stake, as Whitelocke says - and the methods used in prosecuting them shed a sinister light on the parliamentary tactics of the Independents. The attack was delivered entirely without warning; Gurdon had told none but Say and the two others the identity of the men he intended to accuse,⁴ and Whitelocke was not even in the House.⁵ Lisle was

1. The king, in his letter to Vane of Feb. 1646, makes an oblique reference to this - 'I may not say party', he writes. Clarendon S.P. 226-27.

2. Whitelocke, i, 457, 466-67, 476; Holles, Memoirs, 212-13.

3. Whitelocke, op. cit. The MS version is clearer about this. Lilburne also made charges against Holles - see e.g. Whittaker, f.221v.

4. Whitelocke, i, 469.

5. Whittaker, f.218. 2 July.

thereupon instructed to summon Whitelocke, who was at Deptford, to the House, but Lisle sent him a 'grave generall letter'.... intimating not a word of the business', which only caused Whitelocke 'amusement',¹ and gave him no idea of the serious charges that had been made. But his friends did, and Whitelocke realised that the Independents were 'earnestly labouring to be rid of us both, either by cutting off our heads, or at least by expelling us both from being any more members of Parliament'.² For several days he forbore to tell his wife, who had been ill, for fear of the anxiety it would cause her. The attack could have succeeded - the House sat until nine one night debating the matter³ - and Holles states that in their attempts to ruin him his enemies came nearest to success in this affair.⁴ Probably Holles was the real target - Whitelocke asserts that friends of his had found St. John and 'other great men' of the Commons investigating committee not 'so sharp' against Whitelocke as against Holles, whom they were resolved to ruin if they could.⁵ Vane was one of the committee,⁶ and certainly one of its 'great men'. It is interesting to note that Samuel Browne was chairman of the committee,⁷ and Whitelocke thought he was far from impartial. He 'pressed matters against us more than a chairman

-
1. BM.Add.37, 343, f.395. 2 July. 'Amusement' here has the seventeenth century meaning of astonishment, or misunderstanding deliberately caused. Note that the MS version of Whitelocke's Memorials is considerably different from the printed one for 1645. See below.
 2. Whitelocke, i, 479.
 3. Ibid., 480.
 4. Holles, Memoirs, 212.
 5. Whitelocke, i, 470-71.
 6. CJ.iv, 195.
 7. Ibid., 213.

was to do',¹ wrote Whitelocke, and a month or so later, when Whitelocke was taking up his legal career again (doubtless it was safer than politics), he stated: 'I am willing to believe that Mr. Samuel Brown was the more willing to show kindness to me, as being conscious that he had bin over severe against me in the buisnes of the Lord Savile'.²

When the committee was set up, care was taken, said Whitelocke, 'that as many of our friends as we could get in, should be of it, and Mr. Elsing, the Clarke of the Parliament, my kind friend and a friend to the earl of Essex his party, tooke order, about the names of those that were friends of us to be of this committee that so much concerned us'.³ It would be interesting to know what Elsing did - did he become conveniently deaf when certain names were called? Even so, Whitelocke was aware that he must make strenuous efforts to repel the attack. 'Although it [20 July] was the Lord's day, yett mercy and self-preservation requiring it, I laboured to ingage my friends to be in the house early the next morning'.⁴ Lambert Osbaldeston, 'who had been school-master att Westminster Colledge, and was much acquainted with all grandees in his time, went this day and every day to the Sollicitor St. John, and most of the great men

1. Whitelocke, i, 466.

2. BM.Add. 37, 344, f.1.

3. BM.Add. 37, 343 f.398. There is much evidence that committees were far from impartial, and that it was important to have friends on those with which one was concerned. See note at end of chapter.

4. Ibid., f.406.

adversaries to Mr. Holles and me', Whitelocke tells us, 'to take them off from their severe prosecution of us'.¹ Vane was an alumnus of Westminster school, and would certainly be among those whom Osbaldeston visited.² Osbaldeston did more than this - Whitelocke seems to have had charm, as well as an instinct for survival, and his friends were many and loyal - for when M.P.s came out of the house during these debates 'Mr. Osbaldeston, and some others of our friends, were attending the doore of the house, and neer thereabouts to sollicite the members our friends to returne to the house,'. By this means 'even the gallants who used, whatever buisnes was in agitation, to goe forth to dinner and some other of their refreshments, yett they attended constantly all the time that this buisnes was in debate, and would not stirre from it'.³ Whitelocke's exertions were successful - the charge of treasonable correspondence was rejected by the House, though only after protracted debates, one of which lasted four or five hours.⁴ Whitelocke states that his enemies wanted the other charge, concerning the draft reply which he and Holles had composed for the king at Oxford, postponed until a time when the House was more likely to vote against the two accused men,

1. Ibid., f.401.

2. We know that Vane visited the school, and that Osbaldeston had influence upon him, for Vane's considerable financial and other help to the scholar Henry Stubbe was given as a result of an appeal by the headmaster when Vane was visiting the school. Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, iii, 1068; Stubbe, Legends no Histories, London, 1670, preface.

3. BM.Add.37, 343, f.406v. For Hugh Peter's similar standing at a door to solicit votes in a Common Council meeting, see Pearl, London, 261.

4. Harl.166, ff.241, 243v.

but the manoeuvre was foiled.¹ This charge however was brought up again and used against Holles in the 1647 crisis.²

Doubtless as a counter-attack, it was moved that Cranford's allegations should be finally dealt with on the same day that the House was to proceed to judgement on Savile's charges.³ It was a neat riposte - St. John, Vane and the other M.P.s named by Cranford were accused of negotiating with the king at Oxford, and so was Holles. Probably all were guilty. Holles asserts that he had seen letters from Savile to persons at Oxford, with 'many propositions made in the name of that [the Independent] party'. He names Whitelocke, Essex and others, including Sir Christopher Wray, as persons who had also seen the letters.⁴ The Press as usual was discreet, and hardly mentioned the Savile affair. A Diary or an exact Iournal frankly declared: 'I dare not wade into these deepes'.⁵ The Scottish Dove made its sympathies clear when it wrote in the week when the Savile charges were brought: 'an evill spirit is raysed, and good men are accused'.⁶

In spite of the Savile affair, Vane continued to be on friendly terms with Whitelocke. In November 1645, when the earl of Pembroke moved at a parliamentary committee that Whitelocke should be the steward of Westminster school, Vane supported this,⁷ and in 1646 Vane was advising with Whitelocke about the affairs of Lord Willoughby, a mutual friend.⁸

1. Whitelocke, i, 480.

2. Ibid., ii, 174.

3. CJ.iv, 212. There was a long debate about which set of accusations should first be discussed in the House. Harl.166, f.240.

4. Holles, op. cit.

5. E 292(4).

6. E 292(5). 27 June-4 July.

7. BM.Add.37, 344, f.28. 25 Nov.1645.

8. Ibid., f.110. 9 Sept.

Meanwhile, in the spring of 1645, Vane was noted by more than one observer to have taken up a very hostile attitude to the Scots, with whom Holles and his group were now working, so that on yet one more issue Vane and Holles were opponents. In February Aulicus claimed to have intercepted a letter from an M.P., 'Mr. Pyne', clearly John Pyne, the member for Poole.¹ Pyne had enclosed a note in which he told his correspondent: 'The Scots Commissioners have withdrawn their intimateness with those of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, viz. Sir Henry Vane, **sen.**, Sir Henry Vane, jun., Mr. Solicitor, Mr. Pierpoint, Lieut. General Cromwell, Sir William Waller, Sir Arthur Haslerigg, Mr. Crewe, Mr. Wallop, and have joined themselves in a seeming conspiracy and compliance with Sir Philip Stapleton and his associates; viz. Holles, the Recorder, Clotworthy, Reynolds, Whitelocke, Maynard and the Lords: what is the design, is not yet discerned'. Pyne continued: 'Tis hope, that 'tis only done to advance the presbyteriall government with us...This is a great secret, as yet known to some few; it is reported that they have some private meetings with those malignant creatures, when this is perused, burn it'.² Aulicus challenged Pyne to repudiate the letter, which was not done; one can therefore presumably accept its authenticity. Sabran reported in April an outburst by Vane in the Committee of Both Kingdoms; the Scots

1. For Pyne see Keeler, 319.

2. E 272(13), 23 Feb.-2 Mar. 1645. Presumably the 'malignant creatures' were Holles and his circle.

Commissioners had protested at the opening of their letters by an agent of the Committee, and according to Sabran: 'le jeune Wayne a dit qu'ils avoient médiocrement contribuez a la guerre, et au service du parlement, mais avoient tirez beaucoup de l'argent, et euz soing de bien assurez leurs affaires'.¹ The able Scots pamphleteer, David Buchanan, writing in January 1646, had his own explanation of what had happened. Some of the English, he asserted, 'seeing that by the help of the Scots...they began to stand upon their own legs, they feel the pulse of the Scots to try if they were pliable to their phantasies and opinions, and perceiving the Scots constant to their principles and firm unto their Covenant, begin to care less for those who had raised them from the dust; yea, they begin to oppose the Scots'. Buchanan went on: 'Then, in the Council of State [i.e. the Committee of Both Kingdoms] the Scots have a long time been crossed in a high measure, by those who were against their incoming; and thereafter have still been opposed by these men, and their participants, who are adverse to the settling of the Church'. The Scots, with grief of mind... see those whom they at first conceived certainly to be right and round in this business, to have corners and byways'. In the same pamphlet there is an interesting reference to Vané's part in obtaining the Rhode Island Charter. Buchanan wrote: 'Then a great stickler of the Independents moves the Houses of Parliament

1. BM.Add.5, 461, f.176. 20 April 1645.

2. CSPD. 1645-47. 135. D'Swain noted that the Commons ignored the Scots' request for peace propositions to be sent to the king himself in June 1645. Parl. Hist. 4. 200.

for those of his holy Society, Fraternity, and adherents, to have liberty of conscience in the transmarin plantations, thinking by these means to make a step for the same liberty at home'. It was almost certainly Vane too whom he had in mind in another passage. 'The Scots [it was argued] must be sent back in all haste...and this went on so far by the artifice of the Independents that it was moved in public by a great stickler of that Faction, and a venter of their plots'.¹

It is fair to conclude that Vane had become one of the leading critics of the Scots, but his motives are not clear. He may genuinely have felt that the Scots had not done enough, and probably religious disagreement played a part. He evidently also disliked the Scots' policy of supporting negotiation with the king - this is indicated in his own letter of 23 September to his father. 'I hear the business of peace is like to be pressed very hard by our brethren', he wrote,² and though the words are carefully non-committal they are not those of a man who was himself hoping for peace. If Northumberland's letter to the elder Vane, which he sent on the previous day, is any guide to opinion in the Vane circle, it was felt there at that time that the Scots garrisons in the Northern towns should be removed, and the Scots army brought

-
1. David Buchanan, An explanation of some truths... E314(15), 3 Jan. 1646. For Vane's connection with the policy of sending the Scots back see note 6, p.123. Buchanan had written Truth's Manifest (see note 2 p.114 above) E1179(5), and Histoire des derniers troubles (E 547), both of which are interesting on this period. He had to flee the country to avoid arrest by parliament on account of his pamphlets. (BM.Add.10, 114, f.12v.) He is noticed in DNB. and Baillie (ii, 179, 197).
 2. CSPD.1645-47, 155. D'Ewes noted that the Commons ignored the Scots' request for peace propositions to be sent to the king himself in June 1645. Harl.166, f.221v.

down south into England.¹ (Of course this would effectually put an end to Scots negotiations for peace). Vane had reported in May 1645, and again in September, on the measures necessary to assist the Scots in their march south.² When soon after this the complaints of the Scots about the non-payment of their army and the failure to establish presbyterianism in England were discussed in the Commons, it was Vane who put forward the propositions that were adopted, that Parliament would send £2000 and 200 barrels of gunpowder to meet the Scots at Newark, which Parliament forces were besieging, provided the Scots were there by 1 November.³ When the Commons insisted on the return of the English towns garrisoned by the Scots Vane was named first on the committee to prepare a letter to the Scots on this subject,⁴ though Goodwyn actually presented the draft to the House.⁵ When a division took place a few months later on fixing a date for the withdrawal of the Scots from the towns in England, Vane and Pierrepoint were the tellers for the motion, while Stapleton and Holles, who wanted no definite date fixed, were tellers for the opposition, and lost.⁶

That the Scots viewed Vane's group as their leading opponents is indicated by the letter from Cheisly, secretary to the Scots commissioners in London, which had been taken from him as he was on his way to Scotland in May 1646. The letter was read in the Commons, and Harrington recorded: 'Mr. Solliciter [St. John] ,

1. CSPD.1645-47, 105.

2. Harl.166, ff.214v., 239v.

3. CSPD.1645-47, 179-181; CJ.iv, 298. 6 Oct.

4. CJ.iv, 340. 12 Nov.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

Brown, Sir H. Vane iunior, Mr. Martin, Mr. White shamefully traduced'.¹ In August 1646 the Scots made suggestions for improving relations between the two countries - they included measures for restricting the press, and for the payment of the money due to them. The Scots proposals were generally approved by the Commons, though Vane 'suspected' them, but discussion was postponed for two days. In the meanwhile the Lords discussed the proposals, and framed an ordinance based on them, which they sent to the Commons, obviously hoping that better relations between the two countries could be quickly established. Vane, whether because he objected to the Scots' plans, or to the Lords' interference, or probably, to both, opposed the Lords' ordinance; Harrington wrote: 'Some object it is against our privilege that the Lords should offer us an ordinance in, after our moving for it. Sir H. Vane that our members erred in receiving it'.² (There is much other evidence of acute friction between the two Houses in 1646, though nothing else connects Vane with it specifically).³

There are in 1645 again indications that Vane had connections with the City. According to Agostini the 'war party' in December 1644 were having a petition prepared by some of the most 'seditious spirits' of London, to present to parliament, to put away the 'charms of peace' and consider preparations for war. They might

-
1. BM.Add. 10, 114, f.15, 8 May 1646.
 2. Ibid., f.17. 14 Aug.1646.
 3. BM.Add.10, 114, passim.

also add, Agostini thought, a demand for the Scots to advance, 'which is desired by the same party'.¹ This was exactly Vane's policy in 1645. Sabran in March thought he saw evidence of collusion between some in the City and one of the parliamentary groups. 'La chambre des Communes', he wrote, 'c'est advisée d'une ruse bien subtile...et a demandé audit Maire et Ville de Londres, un emprunt de cent mille Jacobus, pour estre recouvert sur les douanes et assises [excise], laquelle en a accordé quatre vingt mil, a condition que tous les chefs et officiers, demandez par ledit Ferfax, et accordez par ladicte chambre des Communes, soient, les seuls admis...dont vous jugez le forte intelligence avec ladicte chambre'.² This loan was the one that Vane had asked for when he spoke to the Common Council after the Uxbridge negotiations. There is no indication in the Commons Journals or in those of the Common Council of the City³ that the City had in fact made the stipulation that Sabran speaks of, though there certainly was a conflict with the Lords, who did not wish to accept all Fairfax's list of officers for the New Model.⁴

One of the Vanes - unfortunately the Journals do not say which - was on a committee to prepare reasons why the Commons

-
1. CSPV.1643-47, 160. 9 Dec.1644. The Journal of the Common Council of London records the presentation of a petition for the fortification of Windsor Castle and other places, but does not mention the Scots. J.C.C.London, 40, f.117.
 2. BM.Add. 5, 461, f.138. The £80,000 loan was agreed to. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, ii, 214. For an interesting reference to citizens meeting M.P.s to discuss the excise, see BM.Add.37, 344, f.19. (Not in the printed Whitelocke Memorials). Whitelocke does not name the M.P.s. In June there was a rumour of a plot to murder some M.P.s and 'those who was their chief men in the Citie'. E 339(16).
 3. JCC.London, 40, f.123v.
 4. QJ. iv, 77, 81, 83. As usual the Lords gave way.

were adhering to Fairfax's list,¹ and Browne, Hesilrige, Glyn and Sir Peter Wentworth managed a conference with the Lords on the subject,² so that it is sufficiently clear which group was supporting Fairfax. It was Vane and Cromwell who were tellers for the motion that Fairfax should be commander-in-chief of the New Model, when Holles and Stapleton were tellers against, in January,³ and altogether it seems likely that if Sabran's story is true, Vane was concerned in the manoeuvre. The Commons' decision to hold the 4 March conference with the Common Council and not a Common Hall, was maintained in spite of strong opposition from the Lords, and Vane managed a conference with the Upper House on this subject.⁴ There had been another ordinance in December 1644 ordering the Lord Mayor and aldermen to secure the election of 'well-affected' persons to the Common Council,⁵ and it looks as though Vane and his group could rely on the Common Council far more than they could do on a Common Hall. That this was so finds corroboration in the appearance of that inveterate petitioner, Alderman Fowke, in June 1645 with a petition from the Common Council requesting that Fairfax should be freed from the control exercised by the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and that Cromwell should command Fairfax's cavalry.⁶ This instructive contrast to the earlier attitude of Vane's group to the authority to be exercised by that Committee over the earl of Essex is one indication

1. Ibid., 77.

2. Ibid., 81.

3. Ibid., 26. 21 Jan. 1645.

4. Ibid., 68. 4 Mar.

5. CJ.iii, 729. 19 Dec. 1644.

6. Harl.166, f.216. 4 June.

that the Independents had lost control of the Committee. It is noticeable that after March 1645 Vane was not sent to the City when parliament had to make contact with its leaders; for example when the City was informed of parliament's plan to capture Oxford in May,¹ nor when the City was asked to advance a month's pay for the Scots in June.² In April and May it is true that Vane was away from the Committee of Both Kingdoms for ten days,³ which was unusual for him, and may mean that he was ill, but there is no obvious reason for his omission from the June committee, except his continuing pre-occupation with other affairs of state.

Some of these will now be indicated. He continued to be employed whenever important documents were to be drafted. The Commons had much need in 1645 of letters of thanks to successful generals and of other documents connected with Parliament's victories in the field, or with the settlement of the country, and Vane was often employed. In March he, Pierrepont and Whitelocke drafted a clear and sensible declaration to some mutinous soldiers,⁴ and with Holles and Glynne he drew up a letter to Parliament's commissioners in Scotland about the speedy march of the Scots army southwards.⁵ When his father and the other representatives were sent to Scotland in July Vane was on the large committee to

1. CJ. iv, 147.

2. Ibid., 173.

3. CSPD.1644-45, 375 seq. He was perhaps absent from 29 Mar. to 13 May, and after 15 May to 27 May. The clerk does not always indicate whether he was recording the attendance of Sir Henry Vane senior or his son.

4. CJ. iv, 69. 5 Mar.

5. Ibid., 167. 7 June.

prepare the envoys' instructions.¹ He interrupted a debate on 23 July to tell the House the good news of the fall of Bridgewater,² and with Reynolds was instructed to write the letter of congratulation to Fairfax.³ It is interesting however that when the Committee of the Army, whose leading spirit was Robert Scawen, proposed that martial law should be enforced in all counties, apparently even on civilians, it was Vane who with Whitelocke and others, secured rejection of the plan, 'shewing', D'Ewes recounts, 'that the counties of England would be brought to an intolerable bondage'. Though Vane might frame messages of congratulation to the generals, he was alert to the danger of Englishmen's lives 'depending on the will of a few men', as D'Ewes put it.⁴

It seems likely that as already noted, about the summer of 1645 Vane and St. John's group lost the control over the Committee of Both Kingdoms, which they had so carefully planned to obtain when the Committee was established. According to Holles this led the Independents to boycott the Committee. 'Now the tide was turned: they [the Committee] had nothing to do...They of the Committee, who were of that [the Independent] faction, seldom or never came to it; so that the Commissioners of Scotland, and the other members of it, did come and attend three or four days one after another, sometimes oftener, to no purpose, and no Committee could sit for want of a

-
1. Ibid., 199.
 2. Whittaker, f.222.
 3. CJ. iv, 220. 6 July.
 4. Harl. 166, f.207v.

number: nay, they prevailed so far, as now to vilifie and show their neglect or jealousie of the Scottish Commissioners. They would sometimes get business referred to the Members of Both Houses that were of that Committee, with their [the Scots] exclusion.¹

Unfortunately only three of the letters copied into the Letter-book of the Committee for 1646-47 have signatures appended; from these it looks as if Holles's group predominated in October 1646.²

Holles's allegation receives confirmation also from the request of Alderman Fowke and his fellow-petitioners, already noted, that the Committee should not control Fairfax, and from an incident in June 1645 in which that 'fiery spirit', Peregrine Pelham, was the central figure. Pelham was accused of declaring 'in some speeches spoken by him that wee could not prosper soe long as wee trusted these disobliged persons in the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and that hee had named the earle of Essex, the earle of Manchester, the earle of Warwicke and Sir Philip Stapleton.' Pelham was sent for out of the Abbey, though he was taking part in a fast kept by divines of the Assembly for the good success of Sir Thomas Fairfax's army. He ingenuously confessed in the House that 'he had named

1. Holles, Memoirs, 221. Holles is as usual vague about dates.
2. The letter of 23 Oct. was signed by the earls of Northumberland and Manchester, Lord Wharton, Holles, Pierrepont, Lisle, Lewes, Robert Goodwin, Sir John Temple and Stapleton. Wharton and Lisle were members of the Independent group, Pierrepont a respected neutral, Northumberland a 'trimmer', Goodwin, probably an Independent, but not a strong character. Four of the others were supporters of Holles at this time. Another letter in October has the signatures of Manchester and Lauderdale noted, a third, in December, those of Lauderdale and Warwick. S.P.21/23 pp.107, 108. If Holles is right, the absence of the Committee's records for the latter part of 1645 and for 1646 would be explained.

the earle of Manchester and Sir Philip Stapleton, but did not remember that hee had named the earles of Essex and Warwick'.¹

Perhaps the most important of Vane's activities in 1646 was his part in the negotiations with the king for peace. Charles wrote to Vane in March pointing the advantages of an agreement between the two sides. There appears to be no full account of what led up to this development, and it is necessary to look in some detail at the peace negotiations after Naseby. As Nicholas endorsed the copies of the letters to Vane in the Clarendon Papers: 'Copies of two letters sent to the Independent Party, by his Majesty's Command',² it is obvious that the king regarded Vane as the leader of the Independent group, and was writing to him as such. It is impossible to elucidate this important topic at all fully, for information is very scanty, but it is necessary to examine what is available.

In August 1645 the Commons decided that the House should sit as a Grand Committee on certain days each week, and the Scots commissioners were to be informed of this.³ Was this a victory for the peace party, or for their opponents? Probably the former - Vane and St. John were absent, and there was a very thin house, partly because the M.P.s often did visit their homes at this time of year, and partly because of the plague epidemic in London. The motion may perhaps have been passed as a retort to Aulicus, who had in a vigorous issue accused the Parliament of being hostile to peace. He had told his readers on

-
1. Harl. 166, f. 218. 11 June.
 2. Clarendon, S.P., f. 726-27.
 3. Whitelocke, i. 496. 18 Aug.

13 August that Parliament had stopped Harcourt on his way to Oxford ^{appointed by the Scots to negotiate} ~~only~~ because the French envoy had worked for peace, and that the Dutch ambassadors found so much 'foule play' at London that they had told the M.P.s: 'they had no hopes left to make them heare of peace'.¹ On the other hand, the motion could have been a victory for the 'war party' - it would ensure that peace propositions would be discussed only on two days each week, and those days were not yet fixed. Sabran thought the Commons were 'hoping to have contented the Scots, by showing they concurred in the desire for peace, and by delaying all the time the said proposition'.² Since the motion expressly mentioned the Scots, he may well have been right about Scots pressure; his interpretation is supported by the fact that the Commons did not fix the days on which the peace propositions were to be debated weekly until 13 October,³ when Tuesdays and Thursdays were set aside, and we know from Vane's own letter to his father that this was in answer to a Scots request.⁴

Meanwhile Montreuil had told Mazarin in September that 'Lord Balmerino came...to inform me that Prince Rupert had brought from Bristol to Oxford, articles of peace, drawn up between the king of Great Britain and the Independents'.⁵ (Balmerino was the commissioner

1. E 298(23).

2. BM.Add.5461 f.335. 31 Aug.1645. On 30 June the judges had been ordered to let the people know that Parliament had twice tried, and was now trying to obtain peace. CJ. iv, 594.

3. Whitelocke, i, 523.

4. CSPD.1645-47, 191-92. 14 Oct. 1645.

5. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 16. 18/28 Sept. 1645.

which was met by the unconvincing reply that the House was appointed by the Scots to negotiate with the French envoy). This private negotiation between the king and the Independents rests on the unsupported testimony of Balmerino alone - he did not give the name of his informant. Vane was singularly inactive in the Commons that September - apart from one or two references to Northern affairs and those connected with the Scottish army, his name hardly appears in the Journals.¹ It was the month when he was busy obtaining arms for Raby castle. (It was also the month when the Commons were working out details of the Presbyterian scheme of church government for England and perhaps Vane preferred to be absent). Was he also pre-occupied with negotiations with the king? According to Montreuil the negotiations were still going on in November.² On the king's side they were apparently only a manoeuvre to gain time until he could obtain foreign help.³ In Parliament itself the peace negotiations hung fire - there were only seven discussions in November, three of which took place after another Scots request for speedy consideration of peace terms had been received.⁴

In December the king approached Parliament itself - perhaps he was already losing faith in the possibility of an arrangement with the Independents, if he ever had one. He sent a letter to the Commons,

-
1. From 5 Aug. to 1 Oct. Vane's name appears twice (except on committees) in the Commons Journals iv (including that on p.267, which must refer to the younger Vane, as his father was in Scotland).
 2. Gardiner, CW, ii, 12.
 3. Ibid., 17.
 4. Whitelocke, i, 533 seq.

Hill Letters, 121.

2. Ibid., 395, 1 Jan. 1646.

3. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 31, 11/25 Jan. 1646.

which was met by the uncompromising reply that the House was already discussing peace propositions to be sent to the king as parliamentary bills¹ - that is, Parliament was allowing no discussion with the king's representatives. Vane appeared once in these negotiations - on 17 December he was sent to the Lords to urge that Parliament's reply should be sent quickly.² The Lords had hesitated about the answer to the king's letter, and the Scots commissioners disapproved of it - they wanted an agreed peace and not a dictated one. Vane must have endorsed the majority view in the Commons, or he would not have been sent to the Lords on this mission. In October Loudon had added his voice to those who believed the Parliament majority (an Independent one according to Holles, since the summer by-elections) did not want peace. He had told Montreuil that he despaired of a general peace, 'seeing those who had the most authority in the English Parliament have no inclination for it'.³ On 27 December the king sent another letter. After debate the Commons decided not to 'treat' with the king at all, and to keep the militia wholly in Parliament's hands.⁴ Again Vane was the envoy who carried this bill to the Lords, which shows that he supported this policy.⁵

In January 1646 the lagging but to the people vital negotiations for peace continued. Charles told Killigrew, according to Montreuil,⁶

1. Ibid., 544. 10 Dec.
2. CJ. iv, 379.
3. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 45. 30 Oct/9 Nov, 1645.
4. Whitelocke, i, 552. 30 Dec. Baron Thorpe refers to the public surprise at the refusal of the king's letters. T. Wildridge, Hull Letters, 121.
5. CJ. iv, 393. 1 Jan. 1646.
6. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 91. 11/21 Jan. 1646.

that he began to see that he had very little to expect from the Independents, but whether he was referring to any secret negotiations with the Independents, or to the open transactions with Parliament, is not clear. Marten was allowed to return to the Commons in January 1646, and Whitelocke cautiously stated: 'This gave occasion to some to believe that the house began to be more averse from the king'.¹ It was Vane who found the constitutional method of restoring Marten to his place as an M.P. - he probably wanted Marten's support in attacks on the king.² Whitelocke's view of Marten's return is consistent with a statement by Montreuil a fortnight later that: 'What is no less secret than strange, four or five leaders of the Independent party met on Friday last and resolved that it was necessary to depose the king of Great Britain, towards which the letters they had received from him and his declaration in favour of the Irish Catholics, which had been read in parliament that same day, would give them sufficient reason'.³ Montreuil's source of information could have been the Countess of Carlisle. He mentions the 'help' she had given the French-Presbyterian plan for peace, 'in spite', he wrote, 'of what she owes to ties of blood and the interests of her brother'.⁴ Her brother, the earl of Northumberland, may have been her informant. Montreuil soon wrote however that the Independents

1. Whitelocke, i, 555. 6 Jan. 1646.

2. Somers Tracts, vi, 589-90.

3. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 117. 22 Jan/1 Feb. 1646. The Glamorgan treaty had been read on 16 Jan. CJ. iv, 408.

4. Montreuil Correspondence, op. cit.

had changed their plans - they had proposed in parliament to send the king the three Uxbridge propositions, to which they had spoken of adding four others, in order to show they wished peace no less than the Scots.¹ It reads as though Montreuil had judged of this change of plan by what he heard had happened in parliament, and not from any private information of the Independents' intentions.

At last the Commons got down to the task of drawing up the bill which was in effect to be an ultimatum to the king, and Vane was one of the twelve members who were to prepare it,² though Sir Thomas Widdrington was specially charged with the responsibility for it, and on the following day Vane was not on the committee to go to the Lords to discuss the propositions.³ In the king's letter of 31 January Charles had suggested that the church should be as in the days of Queen Elizabeth, 'having regard still to tender consciences'.⁴ Vane's policy is clearer at this point, if one may give credit to a report by Montreuil, which is almost certainly to be relied on, for he would probably hear of what was said in public debates in the House. 'Whatever the king may have done by this letter in trying to satisfy the Independents concerning religion, they have shown so little gratitude for it that young Vane, who has great credit among them,

1. Ibid., 124, 29 Jan./8. Feb. 1646.

2. CJ.iv, 423. 30 Jan. 1646.

3. Ibid., 425.

4. Whitelocke, i, 567.

said openly that it was an artifice of this prince to try and detach them from the interests of Parliament, to which they would always remain attached, and that when matters were settled, they would much rather prefer to receive from it [Parliament] than from their king, that tranquillity for their consciences which this king offered them at present'.¹ 'Openly' almost certainly means that Vane was speaking in the Commons, as it was here that the king's letter was debated. Again the House's reception of the king's letter was cold - they voted it unsatisfactory and set up a large committee, which included Vane, to draft a reply, and frame a declaration to the kingdom.² Vane reported a conference with the Lords on the peace propositions on 20 February³ - he was playing a prominent part. When a committee was set up to justify to the Lords the vindictive fifth proposition, demanding the punishment of delinquents, whom Parliament would name in the future, Vane was one of its nine members.⁴

This was the situation when Charles wrote to Vane on 2 March 1646. His letters have been printed, and it only remains to comment briefly upon them. When Charles wrote: 'You cannot suppose the work is done, though God should suffer you to destroy the king', he

1. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 130-131. 5/15 Feb. 1646.

2. CJ.iv, 428. 3 Feb. 1646.

3. Ibid., 448. 26 Feb. 1646.

4. Ibid., 454.

was perhaps referring to what he had heard from French sources of the secret Independent meeting in January. It is interesting that Charles laid such stress in writing to Vane on considerations of foreign policy. There are indications that this was a sphere in which Vane was already particularly interested,¹ though there does not seem to be enough evidence to regard him as at this date Parliament's 'Foreign Secretary'. The identity of the 'Gentleman that was quartered with you', who is to help to persuade Parliament to allow the king to come to London, as he had asked in his letter of 31 December, is not known. Vane's biographers,² and other writers, following the printed version of Whitelocke's autobiography, have assumed that Whitelocke is referred to, but the editor of the Memorials has incorrectly transcribed the manuscript. Whitelocke did not twice write: 'I lived with Sir Henry Vane, Mr. Solicitor, Mr. Browne, and other grandees of that party', he wrote that he dined with Vane and the others. And he wrote that once only.³ It is quite possible

1. See below, p. 253.

2. E.g. Willcock, 162n.

3. The passage is repeated in exactly the same words for 15 Oct. and 20 Oct. 1646. (Whitelocke, i, 525, 527). It is not in the account of 15 Oct. at all (BM.Add.37, 344 f.19-19v). Whitelocke writes it at 20 Oct., but the words are definitely 'dined with'. (Ibid., f.20v). The passage continues as in the printed version ('and was kindly treated by them, as I used to be by the other'), but goes on with a significant reflection which Whitelocke's editor did not print - 'in publique affairs (my children) you will find it of advantage to keep favour with all, and not to side with any faction'. In other words, Whitelocke had decided it was too dangerous to be identified with any one party. Holles had lost an influential supporter by an attack which Vane had helped to launch.

that Whitelocke's editor was subconsciously remembering Whitelocke's tenancy of Vane's official house at Deptford, but there is absolutely nothing to indicate that the Vanes and Whitelockes lived there together. It is difficult also to see why Whitelocke should stay with Vane in the house at Charing Cross - Whitelocke writes as though his wife and he were established in his lawyers' quarters at the Temple.¹ More probably the king was referring to some other M.P. who lived with Vane - in the absence of any definite evidence one would guess Hesilrige.²

From February 1646 onwards it is impossible to follow Vane's policy towards peace. He was ill on 20 April, and away from parliament for a short time at least.³ He was not certainly back in the House - the clerk omits for some weeks to distinguish between the two Vanes, father and son - until 11 May. On that day an amendment, insolent and humiliating to the king, was added to a resolution that the king should surrender all his garrisons; by the amendment the king, upon the demand of both Houses, should be 'delivered to be disposed as both Houses shall appoint'. Vane was one of the tellers for the amendment, Holles and Stapleton, as so often, were tellers against him, and they won, by seven votes.⁴ The amendment significantly highlights Vane's attitude, but for a moment only. He was a member

-
1. BM.Add.37, 343 f.398v; 37, 344 f.15v, et al.
 2. He is said in a 1660 pamphlet to have lived with Vane. A dialogue between Sir Henry Vaine and Sir Arthur Haslerigg, E 1849(2). Hesilrige could have stayed with Vane on his visits to London.
 3. CJ.iv, 515. Vane had leave of absence for 14 days to 'take some course for the recovery of his health'.
 4. Ibid., 542.

of various committees connected with the peace propositions in May, June and July, but none shed light on his individual position.¹

Meanwhile the public demand for peace grew no less pressing. The Weekly Intelligencer adjured its readers not to be too impatient for peace.² The Scottish Dove, always the enfant terrible of the Press, frankly admitted: 'The people in City and Country generally have long desired Propositions might be sent to the king'.³ The Weekly Intelligencer was moved by its loyalty to the king to make an unwontedly courageous stand, for in October it ventured to say: 'The king being (indeed) better beloved, then many doe apprehend he is', and to print the Covenant, so that there should be 'no diminution of his majesty's just power and greatness'.⁴ This was the month in which St. John moved that the peace propositions in the form of a bill should be passed;⁵ he was probably working again with Vane, but Vane's name does not appear in connection with this motion.

Information about Vane's policy in the years 1645 and 1646 is somewhat scanty, and it is understandable that his biographers should have resorted to general descriptions of public affairs when they came

-
1. Ibid., 558, 564, 576, 584, 587, et al.
 2. E 350(3). 4-11 Aug. 1646.
 3. E 350(5). 5-12 Aug. 1646.
 4. E 358(8). 13-20 Oct. 1646. Article iii of the Covenant was the relevant one. A Republican pamphlet of Mar. 1646 had accused the Londoners of 'wanting the king in again upon any conditions'. The Last Warning to all the inhabitants of London. E 328(24).
 5. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 280. 4 Oct. 1646 - Bellievre was speaking of 2 Oct.

to this period of Vane's life.¹ There are several reasons for the lack of material; the records of the Committee of Both Kingdoms become thinner, and its Day Books for the second half of 1645 and for 1646 are not extant.² D'Ewes' notes of Commons debates are non-existent for some days, and very brief and summarised when he does make any - he had been discouraged by the Commons' attitude to himself,³ and in any case probably thought it unsafe to commit too much to paper, when accusations of treason were being made with deadly purpose against men so respected and influential as Holles and Whitelocke. Whittaker had lost his first enthusiasm for keeping his diary of Commons debates, and his record is usually very flat and uninformative. Harrington's diary⁴ is fuller and much more interesting, but though it gives some information about the period from May 1646 to August 1647, there are many days of which the diarist provides no record. The newspapers were frankly timid - they give long accounts of military affairs, and hurriedly pass over

-
1. One of the best of Vane's biographers, J.K. Hosmer, gave six out of 517 pages to the years 1645 and 1646, and devoted three of the six pages to reprinting Vane's speech of 3 Mar. 1645 and the king's 1646 letters to Vane. But Hosmer gives a long account, with a map, of Naseby, with which Vane was not concerned at all.
 2. The Fair Day Books stop in June 1645, the Draft Day Books (much less full than the Fair Day Books) extend to 11 Dec. 1645. After this there is considerably less information from the Committee's records - The Letters Sent for instance give no information about attendances.
 3. Harl. 163, f. 292v. D'Ewes had thought in the summer of 1642 that freedom of speech was disappearing, and decided not to go often to the House after this.
 4. BM. Add. 10, 114.

parliamentary business in a few words.¹ This obviously does not apply to Mercurius Aulicus, but he was too occupied with the king's tragic military situation to pay much attention to the London Parliament, and not in a good position to know much about it anyway.² Whitelocke's views on day-to-day events in the Commons would have been very interesting to have, but scarcely a word of personal comment or interpretation escapes him, and he too gives a colourless summary of parliamentary affairs, though here and there he does offer a brief light on the situation. There are by chance some of Vane's own letters, interesting, but short and few, in the State Papers Domestic;³ they were written to his father when the old man was on his parliamentary mission to Scotland in August 1645. The Commons Journals are as full as they usually are for the 1640s, but of course they give no speeches by individual M.P.s. There are scattered references to Vane in a number of sources, but there are many gaps in the account of Vane's activities during these years.

1. The Scottish Dove wrote: 'Whatsoever is devulged displeasing to unjust men, is usually questioned...The Prudent keep silence'. E 322(38), 11-18 Feb. 1646. As an example of the attitude of the Press, one may take Perfect Occurrences of BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT and MARTIALl affairs - the capitals are its editors - for a typical week, 8-15 May 1646, when out of roughly 320 lines, only some 20 refer to parliamentary business. E 337(22).
2. Though the king himself was generally believed to receive accounts of Parliament's activities - see Say's statement that Holles kept up a weekly correspondence with Oxford. (Baillie, ii, 489). See also the Scottish Dove (E 317(4), 14-21 Jan. 1646: 'I shall intreat the reader to consider that his Majesty...have better intelligence of the Parliament's proceedings, then the Parliament have of theirs; for it is too apparent that they know at Oxford, each dayes proceedings in both houses'.
3. CSPD.1645-7, 104, 123, 138, 155, 166, 183, 191.

Nevertheless, some conclusions are possible. It is clear that in the Commons Vane pursued a 'tough' line in his attitude to peace negotiations with the king. To judge from his speech to the City Common Council in March 1645 he considered that it was useless to treat with the king until Parliament was in a position to dictate terms. He advocated the condign punishment of the leading royalists, and a humiliating form of words for the king's surrender. His whole policy is consistent with the attitude of implacable hostility to the King implicit in Charles's first letter to Vane of March 1646. There is evidence however that Vane's attitude was not endorsed by public opinion. Of the secret negotiations between the king and the Independents nothing is known for certain. All the evidence comes from Montreuil, except for the letters from the king, which give no indication that there had been earlier peace feelers. It is quite possible that Vane had been in communication with the king from November 1645 to January 1646, with the same purpose attributed to Vane in the 1644 Lovelace affair, the Macchiavellian one of discovering Charles's own policy and thus weakening the royalists, but the evidence is very uncertain. Vane shrewdly discerned however that the royal offer of toleration to the Independents was made merely to strengthen the king's own position.

Contemporaries assumed that St. John and Vane were working together in parliament, and the group of M.P.s who usually viewed politics in the same light included Prideaux, Samuel Browne, Hesilrige and Cromwell. There are again indications that Hesilrige and Vane worked closely

together. For instance, when Blackston wanted the power to appoint officers in the army withdrawn from the Northern Committee, Stapleton objected. Blackston thereupon produced letters found after the capture of Pontefract which implicated Holles and three members of the Northern Committee, Pierrepont, Sir Christopher Wray and Sir Edward Ayscough, in correspondence with the king. When the vote was taken, Vane and Hesilrige were tellers for Blackston's motion, Stapleton and Wray were tellers against. On this occasion the Presbyterians won,¹ perhaps because Pierrepont, a very respected figure in the House, was involved.

It is clear also that Vane had become hostile to the Scots, that he wanted them out of Carlisle and the other northern towns and urged them to send their army south into England, but we do not know his motives - whether to end the war quickly, to save the north from continued oppression by the Scots, to put an end to Scottish negotiations with the king, or all three.

On a majority of occasions the Independents carried the House with them - Vane continued to show his usual skill in 'managing' the Commons, in which timely petitions, and appeals to the Commons' jealousy of the Upper House played a part. But the frequency with which he and his political friends spoke, their industry as committee members, and the cogency of their arguments, must all have been important factors in their success - there were some able members of the Commons who were

1. Harl.166, f.267. CJ.iv, 295. 1 Oct.1645. Note that this victory was also won before the 'recruiters' had come in.

not in Holles's circle, but were not among Vane and St. John's regular supporters either, such men as Giles Greene or Sir Thomas Widdrington, to name only two, and these would have to be won over.

It should be noted that sometimes the House was not convinced by Vane or his collaborators.¹ Holles and his friends felt strong enough to challenge Vane's group in the division lobby in May 1645 - during the earlier part of the year there were no divisions - and lost,² but in August Sir William Lewes was a teller against Sir William Brereton and Edmund Prideaux, and won³ - the Presbyterians' first victory, apart from the hard-fought struggle over Holles's and Whitelocke's part in the Oxford negotiations⁴ and the Cranford affairs. In this Vane showed the same ruthlessness in attacking his opponents that he had shown earlier.

The evidence that the Independents were using their power in parliament to reward their own supporters is conclusive, if one judges from those instances with which Vane was connected. Vane's activity

-
1. Harl.166, f.193. 'Mr. Sollicitor, young Fane, Perpoint and others moved to sett out some new declaration to be sett out for all men to come in upon as good termes as was proposed in the Articles of the late Treatie etc. but no vote past'. 18 Mar. 1645. See also f.201v.
 2. CJ. iv, 136.
 3. Ibid., 238.
 4. In July. Ibid., 213. These division figures are much higher than usual, thus substantiating Whitelocke's assertions that his friends had canvassed support for him.

5. CJ. iv, 590.

on behalf of Raby castle¹ can hardly have been justified by public interest,² and the restoration of his royalist relations to authority is also open to criticism.³ He absolutely ignored the ordinance ordering him to return half his profits as treasurer of the Navy - Lilburne's slighting reference to Vane and St. John as covetous earthworms is understandable.⁴ It is interesting to note in this connection that when a motion was introduced making a ballot compulsory whenever the House voted on appointments to be made Cromwell was one of the tellers against it.⁵ Taken in conjunction with the very considerable profits Vane was making as Navy Treasurer one would guess that in this division he voted in Cromwell's lobby.

-
1. CSPD.1645-47, 123, 165; S.P.10/510/159.
 2. Archeological Soc. of Durham, Transactions, 1880-89, 174.
 3. His brother Sir George, alleged by Lilburne to have been a royalist (E 387(4)), became sheriff of Durham, and receiver of the royal revenue (CJ.iii, 593; Records of C.C.Durham, 129; E 324(7) - published illegally). Sir George's father-in-law, a royalist, until 1644, was made one of the County Committee (CJ.iii, 709; iv, 275; CSPD.1645-47, 166). Vane's sister Anne made a surprising marriage in May 1646 to the heir of a prominent royalist, old Sir Thomas Liddell, who made his composition in the same month on very favourable terms. The marriage settlement was productive of much future litigation. (CJ.iv, 530; C8/92/135; C8/119/151; C33/196 ff.17v, 70v, 98v, 151; CSPD.1650, 613 - a Chancery court order).
 4. The most recent writer to find Lilburne's accusations unintelligible is H.N. Brailsford, The Levellers and the English Revolution, 1961, 235.
 5. CJ.iv, 690.

Note A. Contemporary views of Committee methods and practice.

The letters of Alderman Peregrine Pelham, M.P., to the Mayor and Corporation of Hull give frequent evidence of the ways in which pressure could be brought to bear on committees. 'Upon the post day [he wrote in his weekly letter] I was long at the Committee of Examinacions and had your letter read. Tomorrow is appointed for that businesse, where I intend to be with divers of my friends'. Pelham was expecting to go to sea shortly, and he told the mayor in the same letter: 'Mr. Whitterker coming amongst the rest to salute me, I desired him to take noe informations against the Towne of Hull, he promist faire.' (T. Wildridge, The Hull letters, 1625-46, 1886, 68-69. 1 May 1645). And again: 'This day in the House of Commons I spake with Mr. Corbet and Mr. Whitterker, the Chairemen at the Committee for Examinacions.' (Ibid., 88, 24 June 1645). Later he wrote: 'I will speake with the Chaireman for Sequestrations (who is my freind).' (Ibid., 98, 29 July 1645). Sometimes the chairman's inefficiency had a frustrating effect. 'I doe now hope to accomplish your desires for maintenance for your ministers, having now another Chaireman, who will not lose his report as the last did...this Chaireman hath promised me to do what he can the next Fryday in that behalfe, the vote being past at the Committee, I shall get it speedily reported to the House.' (Hull MSS, L 397. 9 Sept. 1645). Pelham was not intimidated by the most formidable chairman. 'My disposition is such that I care for noe Chaireman noe farther than I find him for the publique. I told Mr. Corbet that I wondered

he would send for Hull men so far when there intentions were for the publique...I am confident you neede not feare any committee to doe you any prejudice, I doe not spend £500 per annum here for nothing. I have noe ends of my owne, my ambition is to do you and your town service'. Wildridge, *op. cit.*, 63, 8 April 1645).

Hull Corporation wondered whether to try to obtain the money for their ministers, and timber for their blockhouses, from the Goldsmith's Hall Committee, and there is one puzzling passage which suggests that there was even room for bribery. 'I have spoken with one that hath beene the Chaireman at Goldsmith's Hall. He toulde me unlesse they have £10 per annum or £200 in moneys you are not to meddle with them...as for your timber...the House is unwilling that any timber should be sold, especially near rivers'. (*Ibid.*, Hull MSS, L 470. 6 July 1646). Whitelocke also testifies to the importance of having friends to speak for one at committees (See above pp.117-8)

Some diurnals and pamphlets showed considerable hostility to committees. The Scottish Dove cordially disliked them all, though he seems to have reserved his worst animus for the County Committees. 'It is too true' he writes in August 1646, 'that the name of Committees are [sic] not pleasing to the people of England'. (E 349 (7), 19 July-2 Aug. 1646). Earlier he had written: 'The House of Commons... ordered that the Committee of Examinations should bee dissolved, and remains no longer; it is an introduction to more'. (E 344 (9) . 8-15 July 1646). The Dove had many other references of a similar kind. (E 304 (24), E 310(9), E 311(4), (19) E 319(17), E 322(38).

Mercurius Academicus asserted that: 'The boyes at their next game of cards, instead of calling for a knave, will call for a committee man'. (Quoted by Mercurius Britannicus, E 318(8).

19-26 Jan.1646. In Speculum Anglie, a poem by C. Mercer of March 1646, the following lines occur:

'To the Honourable Committees,

Ner let not love, nor hatred, not the lust

Of earthly things, move thee to be unjust...

But now I fear, that thou wilt shake the head,

And think me sawcie, for the thing ye read'.

(E 327(13). 9 Mar.1646).

1. E 325 (5). 23 Feb.

2. E 329 (5) 23 Mar.

3. E 337 (12). 12 May 1646. S. Torshei to the Commons.

4. E 331 (11). p.29.

Note B. Accusations in 1646 and 1647 that private individuals were enriching themselves at public expense.

Some of these accusations were made in sermons - the ministers were often more outspoken than the newspapers dared to be. Antony Burgess, preaching to the Commons on 25 February 1646 said: 'How necessary is it that you, whose labour and praise it is to set the Church and State at liberty should have your own hearts also at liberty from all corrupt aims and respects?'¹ Thomas Case, preaching about the same time to the Lords, on The Set-backs of Reformation, declared that one cause of miscarriage was when those in authority were activated by personal interests.² Another sermon, The Palace of Justice, referred to the necessity of impartiality, not favouring friends, incorruptibility, and the hatred of bribes.³ Burroughs adjured his hearers not to reserve the 'waters of blessing' for 'kinsmen, my Cosen...my Brother, and such a one's Cosen'.⁴ Among the newspapers only the Dove showed similar outspokenness. 'The kingdom is robbed and the thieves not pursued...the kingdom payes much; the parliament receives little, God heares and sees, how Private men seeke great things for themselves, and to feed their fancy and fill their purses, seek to engage the kingdome in a new

-
1. E 325 (5). 25 Feb.
 2. E 329 (9) 25 Mar.
 3. E 337 (12). 12 May 1646. S. Torshel to the Commons.
 4. E 351 (11), p.29.

embroyement'.¹ He piously wished that the county committees were free from covetousness, and added: 'I feare it is not only to be found there, but that it is exalted into higher places'.² Montreuil demonstrated the current cynicism: 'What leads me most to think that the king will hold out yet for some time, is that those most in authority in parliament do not wish to put an end to a war from which they derive much profit'.³ Buchanan spoke of the Independents 'hunting after moneys and preferments, and their self-conceits and self-love are so manifest that they cannot deny the two first fundamentalls of Popery, ambition and avarice'.⁴

The writer of A Warning for all the Counties of England alleged that prisoners for debt had petitioned for release and nothing had been done for them, but: 'Were it to passe an ordinance for paying this or that man among themselves, his arrears, who happily was never out one penny, but hath rather repared a broken estate (as it is well knowne many of them have) by the service of the State, they would presently order a day to dispatche and passe it'.⁵ A poem of 1647 runs:

'Yet such as have no service done,

Nor ever did one hazard run

-
1. E 335 (1) 22-30 April 1646.
 2. E 322 (38) 11-18 Feb. 1646.
 3. Montreuil Correspondence, i, 55. 13/23 Nov. 1645.
 4. E 314 (15). An explanation of some truths...
 5. E 381 (13). 24 Mar. 1647 (Thomason's date).

Note C. These warres I dare be sworne, Commons, 1645-46.

The But lay for Offices in waite
 (printed Aiming to get a great Estate, Commons Journals, and
 other sources) Get thousands in a morne'.¹

It will be remembered that it was in 1646 that parliament was said to intend that all officials holding places of trust should 'account upon oath for the profitts of their place to the State. and bee allowed stipends for the execution only'.²

Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston	Giles Greens *
Sir Thomas Harrington	John Gardon *
Alexander Bence *	Sir Arthur Hesilrige
Squire Bence *	Cornelius Holland
John Blakiston *	John Lisle
Samuel Browne	Sir William Meehan
Sir William Constable *	Henry Marten
Miles Corbet	Sir Henry Mildmay
Oliver Cromwell	Antony Nichol *
Sir Thomas Daores	Peregrine Pelham
Thomas Harle	William Pierrepont
Sir Walter Harle	Edmond Prideaux
Sir John Evelyn of Wilts.	Sir Benjamin Rudyerd *
	Robert Vyner

1. E 374 (10). 9 Feb. (Thomason's date).
 2. Aylmer, 434.

Note C. The Independent group in the Commons, 1645-46.

The following M.P.s, one would judge from Whitelocke (printed and MS), Holles's Memoirs, the Commons Journals, and other sources, including the press of the time, were 39 of the 50 M.P.s alleged by Holles to have been reliable members of the group. In the case of those marked * their political attitude admits of some uncertainty.

Sir William Armine	John Glyn *
Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston	Giles Greene *
Sir Thomas Barrington	John Gurdon *
Alexander Bence *	Sir Arthur Hesilrige
Squire Bence *	Cornelius Holland
John Blakiston *	John Lisle
Samuel Browne	Sir William Masham
Sir William Constable *	Henry Marten
Miles Corbet	Sir Henry Mildmay
Oliver Cromwell	Antony Nichol *
Sir Thomas Dacres	Peregrine Pelham
Thomas Earle	William Pierrepont
Sir Walter Earle	Edmund Prideaux
Sir John Evelyn of Wilts.	Sir Benjamin Rudyard *
Nathaniel Fiennes	Robert Scawen

Oliver St. John

Sir Henry Vane junior

William Strode

Sir Peter Wentworth

Zouch Tate

Sir Thomas Withrington

Sir Henry Vane senior

John Wyld.

chap. iv. Relations with the Army, (1647-48).

Introductory note

chap. iv. Relations with the Army, (1647-48).

In this account of Vane's part in the complex events of 1647-48, as far as it can be reconstructed, (which is not very far), considerable reliance has been placed on royalist diurnals of the time, particularly Pragmaticus. These newspapers are not usually regarded as trustworthy sources, and this use of material requires some explanation. The royalist diurnals are almost the only source of information for what was said during this period by individual M.P.s. As during the 1645-6 years, there are no parliamentary diaries, apart from Harrington's very few pages, no separates, and no individual speeches in Rushworth. There are a very few references in news-letters, but their authenticity is open to the same doubts as the diurnals. One has therefore to decide whether to give any credence to the mercuries. They must of course be treated with reserve, for they are not first-hand accounts of proceedings in the House, but one must decide whether to dismiss them as wholly unreliable, or to consider each report on its merits. Pragmaticus seems to have been interested in Vane, and the substantial truth of his reports has been accepted here. This is partly because some of the speeches he reports have an authentic ring,¹ as though someone had reported to Cleveland, who was writing Pragmaticus at this time, what the listener had actually heard. One parliamentarian journalist did

1. See below pp. 192, 194.

In fact all-ye that Pragmaticus had an interest in the Cause,

In this account of Vane's part in the complex events of 1647-48, as far as it can be reconstructed, (which is not very far), considerable reliance has been placed on royalist diurnalls of the time, particularly on Mercurius Pragmaticus. These newspapers are not usually regarded as trustworthy sources, and this use of material requires some explanation. The royalist diurnalls are almost the only source of information for what was said during this period by individual M.P.s. As during the 1645-6 years, there are no parliamentary diaries, apart from Harrington's very few pages, no separates, and no individual speeches in Rushworth. There are a very few references in news-letters, but their authenticity is open to the same doubts as the diurnalls. One has therefore to decide whether to give any credence to the mercuries. They must of course be treated with reserve, for they are not first-hand accounts of proceedings in the House, but one must decide whether to dismiss them as wholly unreliable, or to consider each report on its merits. Pragmaticus seems to have been interested in Vane, and the substantial truth of his reports has been accepted here. This is partly because some of the speeches he reports have an authentic ring,¹ as though someone had reported to Cleveland, who was writing Pragmaticus at this time, what the listener had actually heard. One parliamentarian journalist did

1. See below pp.189,191.

in fact allege that Pragmaticus had an informant in the Commons, for, addressing the Commons, and referring to Pragmaticus, he said: 'A poysonous spider hangs in the cobwebs...feeding on your secret councells and vomits them up in gall...it will not be labour lost to make inquisition for the impostor, and having found him kicke him to the devil'.¹ Moreover, what was said in London, which was a much smaller city than it is now, by royalists who were interested in events in parliament, may be given the benefit of the doubt - London was largely royalist,² or at any rate anti-parliament, and there must have been many who would run some risk to bring information to the royalist journalists in their hiding-places.³ Certainly Cleveland's accounts of Vane's speeches are not always what one would expect if they were fabrications - once or twice they are even what would in Cleveland's view be creditable to Vane.⁴ It may be added that in the 'republic of silence' which Parliament had in effect set up, news of any sort was hard to come by, and what there was acquires a disproportionate importance.

It is also necessary to make clear one underlying assumption

-
1. Mercurius Anti-Mercurius, E 465(11). 26 Sept.-2 Oct.1648.
 2. Gardiner (CW.,) iv, 94) accepts this. So, for what it is worth, does a relatively moderate Presbyterian pamphlet, Certaine Considerations touching the Present Factions in the King's Dominions, E 466(3). 'Much the supernumerary part of the City are Presbyters, and are awed only by the activity of the Independent faction; who, working by authority of the Parliament, with whom they correspond daily...'
 3. For the journalists in hiding see W. Clyde, Struggle for Freedom of the Press, 1934, passim.
 4. See below, p. 177.

that is here made. It is difficult in writing of the 1645-6 period in Vane's career not to take sides on the issue of the possibility of a 'safe and well-grounded' peace, but for 1647-8 it is impossible. The view taken here is that it was not beyond the wit of man to devise a settlement in 1647, and still more in 1648, in spite of the untrustworthiness of the king.¹ To be lasting it would have had to be a compromise - opinion was too deeply divided for anything else to be possible - and compromise was anathema to some of the Independent Grandees, but the vote on 5 December 1648 shows that it was possible, or at any rate that a majority of M.P.s thought so.² At Newport Charles agreed to give parliament control of the militia for twenty years, to set up Presbyterianism for three, to let the Houses deal with Ireland as they chose. These were enormous concessions, and the king could not be expected to sign away the lives of his supporters, the 'delinquents', as well. The permanence of any settlement of course depended largely on public opinion, and on this the Independents' hold one would judge to have been very shaky, as Vane was probably aware.³ But the feasibility of a settlement is the criterion by which his policy must largely be judged, and the assumption here made is that a settlement was possible.

-
1. That Gardiner was aware of the dilemma is shown by his admission (CW., iv, 42), that the Engagement was substantially the Restoration Settlement, but he concluded that the situation in 1647 and 1648 was radically different because of the character of the two kings.
 2. The voting was 129-83. CJ. vi, 93.
 3. Though he is said by Clarendon to have dismissed the risings as few and contemptible. Clarendon, Rebellion, iv, 461.
-

The month of December 1646 was an important one for the fortunes of the Independents, but Vane appears to have taken little part in affairs in parliament at that time. He was appointed to half a dozen committees between 1-31 December¹ and once was named first, to a financial committee,² but there is no definite evidence that he was in the Commons until 12 December, when he presented a report from the Commissioners who had been sent to Scotland, about the payment for the Scots army.³ He was one of a committee two days later, to draft a reply to the Scots, who had wanted some more reliable security for the payment of their £300,000 than the public faith⁴ - Vane as usual was being employed when there was a delicate piece of formulation to be done. There is no evidence that he was present in the House again until 28 December.⁵ In the interval, round about Christmas Day 1646, the Presbyterians had gained a majority in the House, and from then until the Army intervention in June 1647 they maintained it.⁶ Vane's absence from the House in December is extraordinary. At the beginning of December one or two of the divisions were comparatively close,⁷ and Vane's vote and influence one would have thought important to

1. CJ.v, 1, 8, 12(2), 30, 31, 33.

2. Ibid., 8. 10 Dec. 1647.

3. Ibid., 11.

4. Ibid., 12.

5. Ibid., 31. (One of a committee ordered to withdraw and draft a clause in the agreement with the Scots).

6. See Note A at end of chapter.

7. Ibid. On 7 Dec. Holles had a majority of 4 only, and on 12 and 14 Dec. was actually defeated.

the Independents. Vane's record for the next four months is even more baffling. He was appointed to only seven committees, on six separate days, during the whole period.¹ He can be said with certainty to have been in the House once only, on 11 May.² There is no indication of his presence in the House between 5 January and 6 February 1647 at all, and his name is missing from many committees to which one would think the House would have wished to appoint him - for example the committee of 9 January set up to examine Andrew Burrell's book about the navy.³ He was present at only three of the six Admiralty committee meetings in January, none after 12 January, and only two of the twelve meetings in February, but he had not been a frequent attender at this committee, at any rate since October 1646, when the record of the committee for this period begins.⁴

The weak position of the Independents in the House during the first six months of 1647 has not received enough attention. Hesilrige and Sir John Evelyn of Wiltshire were fighting a losing battle against Holles and Stapleton - the divisions show this, and observers comment on it.⁵ On 8 March Hesilrige and Evelyn were

-
1. On 5 and 26 Jan., 6 Feb., 22 and 27 Mar., 6 April. CJ.v, 42-134, passim. On several other occasions either he or his father was nominated, but the Journals do not indicate which.
 2. Ibid., 167. Ordered to withdraw and prepare a statement.
 3. Ibid., 47. Burrell's book, on the reformation of the navy (E 335 (8)), resulted in the setting up of a committee to consider the building of four new frigates.
 4. See Note B, chap. v.
 5. Berkeley's Memoirs, Harleian Miscellany, ix, 471; Wildman's Putney Projects, E 421(9); Clarendon MSS, 2417, 2495 (news-letters).

tellers against forcing the officers in Fairfax's army to conform to the government of the church established by both Houses (i.e. to the presbyterian system).¹ On 5 March Fairfax himself was narrowly saved from being superseded as commander-in-chief by a presbyterian, Colonel Graves.² Lilburne in March, rated Cromwell for 'betraying us into the tyrannical clutches of Holles and Stapleton',³ and another pamphleteer saw a proposed order that all M.P.s should take the Covenant as a stroke by Holles and Stapleton to enable them to control the House.⁴

What then was Vane doing during these months? The Admiralty committee minutes are most instructive on this point. During the early months of 1647 Vane was admittedly an infrequent attender, but in June and July his attendances sank to a very low ebb - he made only one attendance during the whole of the two months. There were of course no meetings during early August, when the Army had come to London, and Parliament and city were in the throes of the crisis. He attended however on 11 August when the issue between Independents and Presbyterians was still in the balance. He was

-
1. CJ.v, 108.
 2. Ibid., 106. The name of Fairfax's rival is given in E 381(2). Gardiner describes Graves as a Presbyterian. (C.W., iii, 259). See also Bodl. Clarendon MS 2565.
 3. Jonah's Cry; E 400(5). 25 Mar. 1647.
 4. A warning for all the Counties of England, E 381(13).

not at the meetings on 13 and 14 August for reasons which one can only guess, but which are not difficult to guess - he was probably consulting with the Army. But after 16 August, when Holles and five others of the impeached Presbyterians fled and the Army ascendancy over parliament was established, a sudden change came over Vane and he began to attend regularly. On 9 September, when the Independents with Army support had established firm control over the Commons (at least temporarily), five M.P.s, four of whom were tried and trusty Independents, Rainsborough, Sir Henry Mildmay, Nathaniel Fynes, and Marten, together with Vane senior, were added to the Admiralty committee.¹ Four peers, one of whom was Manchester, now said by Pragmaticus to be a close confidant of Cromwell,² also joined it.³ It is obvious that the Independents were determinedly seizing control of this committee. Without this it would probably have been impossible to send for Batten, as was done a few days later, and in effect to dismiss him.⁴ From this time until 10 December 1647, when Vane had leave of absence for health reasons, his record of attendance at the committee was much better.

1. Adm. 7/673, f.376.

2. E 410(19).

3. Manchester, Mulgrave, Grey and Howard. LJ.ix, 430.

4. Adm. 7/673, f.381. 17 Sept. 1647. Pragmaticus (E 407(18) asserts that Batten was a man of no religion, but belonged to the Presbyterian faction, and this accords with Batten's own justification for joining the royalists in 1648. (A Declaration of Sir William Batten. B460(13)).

Now according to news-letters of February to April 1647 Vane and Cromwell were deliberately forbearing to attend the Commons.¹ (All through 1647 and 1648 Vane's name is coupled with Cromwell's as though their association was a well-known fact).² Holles wrote that Cromwell and his friends purposely absented themselves from the Committee of Both Kingdoms at this time,³ and there is some evidence for May 1647 to confirm this.⁴ In fact because Cromwell and Vane could not control the House and its important committees they refused to attend as an ineffective minority. This certainly does not indicate a democratic acceptance of the will of the majority. On the other hand, Holles and Stapleton were not using their power in a wise and tolerant manner, as their determination precipitately to disband the Army, largely Independent, showed. Vane in particular must have been furiously indignant when the House ordered in February that the new defence works at Raby, which he had been at such pains to obtain only the year before, were to be 'slighted', and the garrison sent away,⁵ leaving the castle vulnerable to yet another assault. It may be noted incidentally that Vane's policy of abstention was not followed by Hesilrige. He assiduously attended the Commons and led the doubtless

-
1. C.H. Firth, ed. Selections from the Papers of William Clarke, 1891-1901, i, preface, xviii; Bodl. Clarendon MS 2504.
 2. See below.
 3. Holles, Memoirs, 237-8.
 4. Letters in May from the Committee, sent to the Army, are signed by Holles, Stapleton, and others, but not by Vane. Clarke Papers, i, 107, 114, 115. The Day Books of the Committee for 1646 and 1647 are not extant, and the copies of Letters Sent (S.P.21/23) have no signatures for this period.
 5. CJ.v, 98.

disheartened Independents during the early months of 1647, and at the Admiralty Committee also¹ was a more frequent attender than Vane. One sees here a difference in character between the two men. There are numerous references during 1647 and 1648 to the close co-operation between Vane and Cromwell, and all the signs are that it was at this time that they became intimate. Lilburne, writing in February 1647, accused Vane and St. John, 'those worldly-wise prudential men', of preventing his release, and accused Cromwell of being 'led by the nose' - a metaphor his readers would enjoy, for Cromwell's nose was a constant subject of derision - by the two men.² And, wrote Lilburne; 'never was I so afraid of all mine enemies, as of divers the great ones I have looked upon as your [Cromwell's] chief counsellors'. The author of Westminster Projects, who Lilburne asserted to be Wildman, declared that: 'long before the breaking out of the army' - the impeachment of the eleven M.P.s in June 1647 - 'Lord Say, Lord Wharton, Lieut. General Cromwell, young Sir Henry Vane, St. John, Fines, and the rest, who now oppresse the people, had their private counsels',³ and that the design 'was, is, and is like to be, that these few men shall hold the raynes of Government in their own hands, not for a yeare, but for ever'. He also accused the Independents of not removing the Presbyterians from the House in June, in order to retain their help against the Levellers, and of attempting to secure the support of a leading Presbyterian, Sir Gilbert Gerrard, by making

-
1. Adm. 7/673, passim.
 2. Jonah's Cry, E 400(5).
 3. E 433 (15). 23 Mar. 1648.

him Chancellor of the Duchy - a post which Gerrard had certainly just been given.¹

In September Lilburne, copied within the week by Pragmaticus, asserted that Cromwell was 'glued in interest' to 'those foure sons of Machiavel...the Lord Say, the Lord Wharton, young sir Henry Vaine, and Solicitor St. John, who,...never in their lives stood further for the just liberty of the Commons of England, then might helpe them to pull downe those great men that stood in the way of their preferment'. He also declared that the Agitators had not been removed from the Army, so that Cromwell might use their attitude as a threat, to make the Presbyterians of the 'Junto' do and say what he pleased, and that in this design 'precious young Sir Henry Vane' was pleased to join.² In October Pragmaticus again referred to Vane as Cromwell's mouthpiece in the Commons,³ and Lilburne wrote of the two men as working closely together. 'I clearly see Cromwell's and Vaine's design, which is to keep the poore people everlastingly (if they can) in bondage and slaverie'.⁴ In November Pragmaticus described Wharton as Cromwell's mouthpiece in the Lords, and Vane as his tool in the

-
1. Gerrard was voted this office on 13 Feb. 1648. CJ.v, 493.
 2. E 407(41). Two Letters...To Col. Henry Martin. Pragmaticus is E 410(4), 28 Sept.-6 Oct. 1647. Lilburne, in another pamphlet at this time, again attacks the 'most base and wicked juglings of Lord General Cromwell, and his son Ireton; whose power and interest in the Army (by those foure grand juglers' means, viz. Lord Say, Lord Wharton, young Sir Henry Vaine, and Soliciter St. John) is now vigorously improved to support and uphold the Lords' usurpations'. BM.1104.a.16(1). It will be remembered that Cromwell called Vane a 'juggler' when the Rump was expelled in 1653.
 3. E 410(19). 5-12 Oct. 1647.
 4. E 407(41). Two Letters... 22 Sept. 1647.

Commons.¹

Vane's own political aims and activities are very difficult to trace during 1647. On 14 June Dr. Denton, a London physician, and close friend of a Presbyterian M.P., wrote to Sir Ralph Verney, 'I have only several collections for my grounds and those not very authentic, that the Scots and a Presbyterian party there in parliament of some members, not without the counsel of the Queen or some French party, had a design of carrying the King into Scotland, and to set him up in the head of an army there, and to bring him up to London, and so to quell the Independent party; but if I rightly guess, a false Presbyterian father betrayed them to his Independent son'.² Another letter, also quoted by Firth in his introduction to the Clarke Papers, mentions the Scottish invasion plan, and was written on the same date.³

S. R. Gardiner, who, it is clear, noticed how often Vane and Cromwell were associated in people's minds at the time, identified the Vanes as the father and son of Denton's letter, and wrote; 'We may be sure that if Vane knew the secret, Cromwell knew it too'.⁴ Gardiner thought that it was knowledge of this plot that led Cromwell to sanction the removal of the King from Holmby. This assumes that Vane, and therefore Cromwell, knew of the plot at the end of May, when the famous meeting at Cromwell's house was held. But both the letters which mention the plot are dated 14 June. Would the writers have been so late with their news? It is true that Dunfermline left with instructions from the

1. E 417(20).

2. Clarke Papers, op. cit., i, preface, xxv. Denton was a friend of Sir Roger Burgoyne.

3. Ibid., 135.

4. CW., iii, 265.

English Presbyterians and the Scots, for the Queen, on 20 May, but if Cromwell had heard as early as that, the seizure of the king at Holmby would surely have been carried out before 4 June. It seems more likely that Cromwell was anticipating the seizure of the king by parliament.¹ (Incidentally in the newspapers Joyce's name too is often coupled with Cromwell's). Denton can hardly have been referring to any others than the two Vanes, and it is significant that he too assumed the close co-operation between Vane and Cromwell that several observers noted. But it would seem unlikely that Vane was directly responsible for the removal of Charles from Holmby. Curiously enough, on 27 May he and his father were tellers on opposite sides for a division in the House. But it does not seem probable that this was the Macchiavellian scheme Lilburne detected to delude people into thinking that the two were at odds, for Stapleton and Holles, those Presbyterian inseparables, also voted on different sides on this question of the mastership of a hospital in Wiltshire.² Unfortunately, there is no evidence about the political attitude of the elder Vane at this time, though there are indications in 1648 that he and his son held similar views.³

In June Vane was one of the commissioners appointed to go to the Army.⁴ Holles was sure this was 'a thing laid', that is, a plot, and had the same effect that the appointment of a committee of officer M.P.s had had earlier, it put the different branches of the Army together,

-
1. Sir Lewis Dyve, relying no doubt on Lilburne, informed Charles that the Army were afraid of the king's removal from Holmby by the 'Presbyterian party'. Dyve, 56.
 2. CJ.v, 187.
 3. See below.
 4. CJ.v, 201. 7 June.

the better to 'contrive and lay their business'.¹ He presumably meant that Vane (whom he named first among the commissioners), Scawen and the other parliament envoys played a double game, persuading the Army to follow a policy agreed among themselves. It is most tantalising that there is no record of what Vane was doing while he was with the Army, during the following six vital weeks. With his usual promptitude he left at once when appointed - perhaps Whitelocke's remark that the commissioners 'went away this day' conceals the fact that he too thought the mission 'a thing laid', since Vane and the others could leave so quickly² - and worked hard. (In July Cromwell told Berkeley that he could not see him until ten o'clock at night, because he was sitting with the committee of parliament, and should not rise till then).³ That Vane was the dominating figure among the commissioners cannot be doubted, for Scawen and Povey, and even Skippon, were not politicians of his standing. According to the information Sir Lewis Dyve received from Lilburne, Vane was in London in July, for Watson, the Army Scout-master, and the commissary, Dr. Stone, were staying in town to negotiate with Vane, St. John and others of their party in both Houses, 'to advance their owne dangerous designes, wherin some of the officers of the army, not without just cause, are suspected to be of the same confederacy'.⁴ (Watson and Stone are later said by

1. Holles, Memoirs, 242.

2. Whitelocke, ii, 155. 2 July.

3. Berkeley, op. cit., 472; CJ.v, 264.

4. Dyve, 68. 19 July 1647.

a different authority¹ to have influenced Vane). But when at the beginning of August, after the disorders in and near parliament on 26 July, a Commons messenger was sent to parliament's commissioners at High Wycombe, he delivered parliament's letter to Vane, and the Commons Journal account reads as though it was Vane who phrased the reply.² That the London mob held Vane responsible for the actions of the Independent party in parliament is shown by their threat to cut him to pieces the day after the Independents had opposed bringing the king to London³ - though in fact Vane was with the Army at St. Albans that day,⁴ and it was St. John, Fynes and Hesilrige who had opposed the Presbyterian leaders. A little later Lilburne was saying that he would rather cut Vane's throat than Holles's,⁵ though whether because Vane was covetous, or an anti-Leveller, or because he was preventing Lilburne's release, he did not say.

How far Vane was acting in co-operation with the Army leaders, and with which leaders, we do not know. But he must have been very close to Ireton at least,⁶ for it was Vane who presented Ireton's 'Heads of the Proposals' to the House.⁷ It is remarkable that Ireton did not do

-
1. See below, p. 184.
 2. CJ.v, 264.
 3. Clarke Papers, op. cit., i, 136.
 4. CJ.v, 210.
 5. Clarke Papers, op. cit., i, 158.
 6. Dyve's informant (probably Lilburne) stated that Vane and Ireton were members of the 'Junto' in Sept. Dyve, 89.
 7. CJ.v, 268. 6 Aug. Ireton was apparently not popular in parliament. Abbott, Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, ii, 75.

this himself; perhaps he was not a good speaker, or perhaps it was thought more politic for a civilian to introduce them. Wildman, and others believed, probably rightly, that the Newcastle Propositions which were sent to the king in September 1647 were not sent with any genuine desire for their acceptance; the plan was that the House, out of sheer desperation, would allow the 'Heads of the Proposals' to be put forward as a basis for peace, since the Presbyterian Newcastle Propositions were not. Wildman thought this was another 'Machivilian' scheme on the part of the Independent Grandees. When the king rejected the Newcastle propositions, however, a proposal that no more addresses should be made to the king was put forward in the Commons, doubtless by the Levellers. This would have doomed the 'Heads of the Proposals', and when the issue was in doubt, there was, according to Wildman, 'a Cabinet Councill of the Grandees...Sir John Eveling, Mr. William Pierpoint, and Mr. Fynes, Sir Henry Vane, Cromwell, and Ireton, cum paucis aliis: and O how was the quintessence of their braines extracted, in plausible arguments for a new addresse to the King!...and I conclude from that event, that in such a cabinet councell the question was first concluded in the affirmative, and then the debate on the question was managed in the House, with much seeming solemnity'. Nevertheless, the House seemed disposed to vote for no addresses, whereupon, according to Wildman, 'one of the same confederacy' told the House that the Army wished for another approach to be made to the king, and so debate ended.¹ Wildman's version of Vane's attitude

1. Wildman, Putney Projects, E 421(19), 43. Bodl. Clarendon MSS 2583, 2602(news-letters) give a similar version of events.

2. B. 411(23). 13-26 Oct.
3. G. v. 302.

to the vote of no addresses finds corroboration in Berkeley, who wrote that after Marten had moved this vote in September 'both Cromwell and Ireton, with Vane and all their friends, seconded with great resolution this desire of his majesty' for a treaty.¹ Apparently Vane was adopting a generally conciliatory attitude to the king at this time, for Clarendon's correspondent Sir Edward Ford wrote of Cromwell and Ireton: 'Of late they have spoken much in the King's behalf, seconded by young Harry Vane, Mr. Solicitor, and Mr. Fiennes'.²

It would be interesting to know how Vane kept up the contact with Cromwell and Ireton which the passages quoted imply. He would not have to go, as Pragmaticus alleged Wharton did, to Putney every week to 'do homage' to the grandees of the Army,³ for Vane still had his official position as one of parliament's commissioners to the Army, which he could make use of when he would. On Wednesday, 15 September he reported from the commissioners resident with the Army that since the previous Friday they had 'treated' with the Army's commissioners, and had shown them where anything in the Army's proposals was contrary to votes of the Houses, which must mean that he was trying to work out a policy mutually acceptable to the Army officers and the Independent Grandees.⁴ Curiously enough, Montereuil had been told at this very time by some of the Scots that they were 'sought after' by the Independents, and that

1. Berkeley, op. cit., 43.

2. Clarke Papers, op. cit., i, 231, note. St. John and Vane seem still to have been in agreement on policy at this time - at least St. John seems also to have absented himself from parliament a great deal in the early part of the year, and Holles believed that it was St. John who arranged that the Independent M.P.s should take refuge with the Army, in July. Holles, Memoirs, 275. It is technically incorrect to say of Vane 'Fled to the Army', (Yule, op. cit., 122) for Vane was already with the Army when the London riots of 26 July took place.

3. E 411(23). 19-26 Oct.

4. CJ.v, 302.

'the younger Vane had offered on the part of the former to the earl of Lauderdale all that Scotland could demand, provided that they [the Scots] would consent to the ruin of the King'.¹ Montreuil sensibly did not believe this story, but it does reflect the position of power which many believed Vane to hold.

There is practically no evidence about Vane's part in politics during October and November 1647. In September and October he was very busy with the Admiralty committee work - Greene was ill, and had gone to the country,² and this probably put more responsibility on Vane. He rarely attended the committee's meetings in November however.³ He presumably put in an appearance at the House itself on 9 October or his name would have been given as one of those absent from the roll-call ordered for that day.⁴ Otherwise he seems to have attended the House only when navy business came up; for example on 12 October when he withdrew to conduct in person, with two others, negotiations concerning a loan of £30,000 for the navy.⁵ On 10 December he had leave to go to the country for 6 weeks,⁶ an unusually long leave, and probably an indication of the strenuous part he had been playing in events, but he had not gone next day, when navy business came up again, and a committee of six, which included Vane, was ordered to withdraw, and manage two conferences with the Lords.⁷ He was

1. Montreuil, Correspondence, ii, 274. 8 Oct.

2. CJ.v., 297. 9 Sept.

3. See note B, chap. v.

4. CJ., v, 330.

5. Ibid., 331.

6. Ibid., 378.

7. Ibid., 379.

appointed to another committee on 15 December, which is an indication, but not proof, that he was still in the House.¹ Greene was back in the House by 28 December,² so presumably Vane could temporarily abandon naval affairs with an easy mind. The only other indications of his presence in the House in the autumn of 1647 are on 22 November, when he was instructed with three others, to prepare an answer to a petition from the City, and rebuke the City for its unsatisfactory collection of the assessment,³ and on 1 December. On this latter date, Vane is said by a letter-writer to have threatened the City with a fresh military intervention, and so secured the rejection of a City petition asking for the removal of the Army to a safe distance.⁴

In view of later allegations that the Independents, and Vane in particular, made similar threats against the House, there is nothing inherently improbable in this. Pragmaticus gibed at Vane's zeal for Cromwell and the Army at this time - for Cromwell, he declared, Vane 'upon all occasions prepares the way (like a true John-a-Baptist)... and then he never opens his mouth in vaine. And therefore it was, that with so much confidence hee made more reports than ever my Lord Cook did, to the House of the Proceedings of the Army, at the late rendezvous [the famous November Ware meeting], and of the resolution of the Army to serve them. He meanes as they have done heretofore, and at length turne them out of service, if they cannot serve their ends upon them'.⁵

1. Ibid., 385.

2. Ibid., 407.

3. Ibid., 366.

4. Bodl. Clarendon MS 2672. A number of Presbyterian M.P.s thereupon withdrew.

5. E 417(20).

But even at this time Vane's interests transcended politics. The university authorities at Oxford, led by their vice-chancellor, Fell, had coolly defied the parliamentary Visitors appointed to 'purge' the university of offending elements - the university officials had refused to appear before the Visitors, or produce their books or staves of office, and had continued to lecture though forbidden to do so. The Visitors were responsible to a Parliamentary committee, who summoned the offenders before them. The university officials appeared on 15 November, and Vane, that most independent of Independents, defended them.¹ He may have had sympathy with his old university; more likely, in view of the Camden House manuscripts incident earlier in the parliament, he cared for learning, and therefore valued university independence.

He seems to have availed himself of his six weeks leave of absence - there is no record of any public activity on his part during the latter half of December 1647 or the whole of January 1648. On 3 January the Derby House Committee was set up to replace the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and Vane, presumably in his absence, was appointed to it.² There were allegations, of doubtful truth, that the House was surprised into voting

-
1. He was not the only Independent to do so - Selden had helped them all he could, as one might expect, and Whitelocke and Fiennes also spoke for them at the committee. Camden Soc., Visitors Registers of the University of Oxford, 1853, lxxi. Gardiner (CW., iv, 65, suggests that the Independents were scheming for the succession of the Prince of Wales, and did not want to close the door of preferment to his supporters, but apart from the fact that Gardiner elsewhere wrote (Ibid., 57-8) that Vane was opposed to the succession of the prince, the dates do not tally, for the committee met in November 1647, and the earliest mention of the Independents' Prince of Wales plan appears to occur at the end of January 1648. (Ibid., 56).
 2. CJ.v, 415.

this committee at 10 p.m.,¹ but if there was any sharp practice, he may on this occasion be exonerated. Pragmaticus noted that Vane was a member of the committee, and proceeded to indulge in vituperation such as he did not often apply to Vane.² Pragmaticus obviously suspected him of being powerful behind the schemes - one who 'hath plundered Gyges his Ring, to make himselfe invisible upon all occasions'. By 1 February 1648 Vane was back in the House, according to a correspondent of the earl of Lanark,³ but both this writer and another indicate that there were differences between Vane and Cromwell at this time. The letter of intelligence has, 'The prevailing party are in great feares and divisions among themselves, in soe much as Sir H. Vane Junior hath left them'.⁴ But Vane's estrangement from Cromwell, if it ever happened, must have been a very temporary one, for by the beginning of March Aulicus was again writing of him as a leader of the Commons - one who 'thinks he is able to carry a Kingdom on his camell's back'⁵ - and Lilburne was describing Vane, yet again,

1. Mercurius Pragmaticus, E 465(19). 26 Sept.-3 Oct. 1648, allegedly quoting an M.P. Rushworth too says that the House sat late that night, but the division numbers (CJ. v, 415.) that evening do not indicate a thin House.
2. Part of this may be given, as an example of royalist feeling about Vane. 'The Sainted Salamander, that hath lived hitherto in flames of zeal...the very floure and creame of knight-errantry, that wanders through every faction with his pedlery of all religions'. Royalist writers at this period make frequent jeering references to some deformity in Vane's shoulders, which they had not done before. Had he perhaps become very round-shouldered as a result of desk-work?
3. Gardiner, CW., iv, 57, note. 'Sir Henry Vane the younger is returned to the Commons House, yet seems unsatisfied, notwithstanding that Cromwell hath bestowed two nights' oratory upon him'.
4. Bodl. Clarendon MS. 2723.
5. E 431(20), 2-9 Mar. 1648.

as a confederate of Cromwell.¹ The royalists joyfully reported that the Presbyterians in the House were gathering strength,² and one royalist pamphleteer asserted that Say, hearing that the Scots proposed to impeach the leading Independents, could only secure indemnity for his party's action in deserting parliament in July 1647, by calling on Cromwell to speak. This writer, who gives a full list of Cromwell's and Ireton's confederates in the House at this time, had no doubt that Vane was one.³

In April 1648 he showed his loyalty to Cromwell by voting against the proposition that the tapestries from the royal Wardrobes should be sold, to realise the £1,500 needed to pay the soldiers at the Tower - many of the royal possessions had already been disposed of. An alternative proposal had been made that the 'Hangings' should be assigned to Cromwell, no doubt to increase the dignity of his residence, and Vane found himself opposed to his fellow-Independents, Wentworth and Brereton, but he carried the day.⁴

Another incident concerned Alderman Fowke. Again it is reported by a royalist journalist, but since it reflects credit on Vane it is hardly likely to be a fabrication. According to this writer Fowke had prevailed on Sir Henry Mildmay, whom the House had deputed to report on a dispute between Fowke and one John Bland, Receiver of the

-
1. E 431(1) A Whip for the present House of Lords.
 2. Pragmaticus, E 431(5), 29 Feb.-7 Mar. 1648.
 3. Mercurius Elencticus, E 431(15), 1-8 Mar. A news-letter of 28 Mar. speaks of Manchester, Say, Wharton and Vane as 'of that faction'. HMC. 5th Rep. App., 143.
 4. CJ.v, 532. 15 April 1648.

Crown rents for Yorkshire, to 'blot out' one order of the House, and falsify another, to Bland's great prejudice. But 'so notoriously base was the deportment of Sir Henry Mildmay herein, that Sir Henry Vane told him he lied'.¹ Bland, according to another royalist journalist, was Giles Greene's son-in-law; thus Vane was supporting Greene, whose sympathies lay with the Presbyterians,² rather than a powerful member of Vane's own group, and it seems likely that his intervention was due to a disinterested sense of justice.

According to the royalists, the English Presbyterians and the Independents were drawing together at this time, in face of their common consciousness of an imminent Scots invasion,³ and when the Presbyterians voted that the House would not alter the fundamental government of the country by King, Lords and Commons Vane, Pierrepont and other leading Independents supported them.⁴ Moreover, when the City petitioned that Skippon should have the command of the City militia, which they wanted restored, and that the chains which the New Model's soldiers had removed from the London streets should be

-
1. Mercurius Veridicus, E 437(14). Veridicus described Bland merely as a receiver, but the pamphlet mentioned in note 2 described him as a receiver for Yorkshire. There is evidence in the Journals that Mildmay did fail to report the matter to the House on a date assigned, and of other delays. CJ.v, 464, 515, 554. Veridicus says that Bland was a Presbyterian.
 2. E 458(12). A list of the names of the Members... 14 Aug. 1648.
 3. E 437(10). Mercurius Elencticus 19-26 Ap. 1648, p. 166. Mercurius Bellicus, E 433(8). 14-21 Mar.
 4. Gardiner, CW., iv, 116, quoting Hamilton Papers, 190.

replaced, Vane seconded Cromwell in supporting the City's request.¹ According to Pragmaticus, again, when the City went on to ask that the Common Council should themselves nominate the members of the Committee for the militia, Vane was one of the first to approve the motion, it being necessary for 'Sir Harry Weathercock' to 'act Sir John Presbyter, and whistle a little in disguise, in the behalf of Independency, that he may gain a good opinion among the Brethren, till the Plague of Presbytery be a little over'. Pragmaticus added however that the whole 'godly gang' of the Independents thought likewise.² Perhaps Vane's apparent changes of front were referred to by Stephen Marshall at the Commons service of thanksgiving on 17 May, when he told the M.P.s: 'Vote not one thing this day to please one party, and then another thing, another time, to please another party'.³ - Marshall was always outspoken. But Vane was one of the committee sent to the City to inform it that the restored militia must be so disposed of 'as to provide for the safety of the kingdom and Parliament'.⁴ probably that parliament should not be left exposed to violence by

1. Mercurius Pragmaticus, E 437(31). Gardiner, ut sup. uses this diurnall but mentions only the removal of Parliament's troops. There is other evidence however that the restoration of the militia and occupation of the Tower was involved. See for instance The British Bellman, E 422(2), 12 May 1648, The Honest Citizen, E 438(5), The Weekly Intelligencer, E 422(20).
2. E 422(16). 9-16 May 1648.
3. E 433(3), p.35. Marshall was troubled at the development of parties - 'if there have got among you any factions or divisions, any driving of parties [i.e. Whips] or siding with this or the other...throw them all in the dust'. He himself was often accused of swaying from Presbyterian to Independent, and like others, may have found it difficult to decide which group to follow. A biography of Marshall, who was practically official chaplain to the Long Parliament is much overdue, though Prof. Trevor-Roper's 'Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament' (Essays in British History Presented to Sir Keith Feiling, 1964) is illuminating.
4. CJ.v, 565. 18 May.

presbyterian London mobs, as in July of the year before. There are several references in May 1648 to Vane as one of the Independent Grandees of Cromwell's 'junto'.¹

In that month the royalist storm broke, and the risings began - starting, ironically enough, in Vane's own county of Kent. The House at once decided that Fairfax's troops must stay in London - the newly restored militia could not be trusted against the royalists, the M.P.s probably thought, and rightly - and it was Vane who drafted the letter to Fairfax about this.² He evidently now held that concessions to the Presbyterians had gone far enough. They had wanted to change the suggested terms which the House, at their instigation, were again offering Charles, so that presbyterianism should be settled, not just for three years, but 'until King, Lords and Commons should alter it'. Vane was one of the tellers against this proposition, and won, in a fairly thin house, by 67 to 48 votes.³ All though May, rising as usual to an emergency, he was occupied with the multitude of affairs that the rebellion imposed on him; he was especially concerned because of the navy's part in the Kent revolt. Pragmaticus gloated over the thought that Vane's official house at Deptford was likely to be attacked, and did not fail to notice Vane's assiduous attendance

-
1. E.g. Windsor Projects and Westminster Practices, E422(10) 15 May 1648.
 2. CJ.v, 574, 26 May.
 3. Ibid.

at the Derby House Committee¹ - before the Kent rising he had attended the committee only twice during all the four months of 1648, but during May he attended at least eleven times,² reporting back to the House from the Committee,³ as he had done in 1644 from the old Committee of Both Kingdoms. The Admiralty Committee however had been abruptly superseded when the revolt broke out, and the earl of Warwick had resumed the powers of Lord High Admiral.

On 1 June Vane obtained leave to accompany his wife and family to Lincolnshire,⁴ but did not go for another month. His family, and that of Lady Wray, his mother-in-law, received their pass to travel on 17 June,⁵ but the Derby House Committee proceedings show that he attended all the numerous meetings in that month, except those on 9, 10, 19, 22 and 26 June. He was also concerned with Hull - the Derby House Committee had ordered Peregrine Pelham to go there lest the naval mutiny should affect that vital port,⁶ but the order was

1. E 445(21). 23-30 May. 'Sir Harry Weather-Cock, or Vaine, (which you please; for, all is one), hath other businesse to doe, than sit fooling at Derby-House'. Apparently Fairlawn was attacked. 'Sir Henry Vane had a little taste of the good affections of the Kentish men unto him; they have helped to ease him of the care and charge of some cattle and household stuffe'. Mercurius Publicus, E 445(19), 19. 22-29 May.
2. CSPD.1648-9, passim. He did not attend at all until 23 Mar., when a matter affecting the navy (the supply of gunpowder) came up for discussion. The Kent rising was first discussed on 15 May, when he was present, and in the ensuing weeks his attendances were much more frequent.
3. CJ.v, 575, 584, 610.
4. Ibid., 581.
5. CSPD.1648-9, 132.
6. The letter to Pelham is dated 30 May, but the order is not in the minutes for 29 May, and those for 30 May have only the cancellation of the order. It looks as though Pelham had prevailed on the clerk not to enter the order for his departure, as he intended to have it cancelled. Ibid., 88.

cancelled, and instead, on 6 June, both the Hull M.P.s were instructed to consult with Fairfax about the city.¹ Two days later they received new instructions; with Giles Greene they were to discuss with Fairfax means of persuading the rebellious ships to return to their parliamentary allegiance.² Looking ahead to the needs of the navy, as Vane usually did, he and the other two M.P.s were also to consult with Fairfax about securing the ships and stores at Rochester and Chatham when the victorious army had gone. The Committee of Navy and Customs (the financial committee) was hurriedly told to give the three envoys any further necessary instructions about this matter;³ he would have to peruse those before he left, presumably on 9 June. The three M.P.s were unsuccessful in their main mission; Warwick - who was probably sceptical about their influence with the sailors - dryly added a footnote to one of his letters, announcing that the revolted ships had already left for Holland.⁴ Vane did not stay to confer with Warwick, as instructed, for he was back at the Committee on 11 June.

Meanwhile Hull, always restless under control by the soldiers, had asked Vane and Pelham to intercede for the city with the Derby House Committee to secure a joint watch on the town by soldiers and townsmen.

-
1. Ibid., 102.
 2. Ibid., 110, 112-3.
 3. Ibid., 113.
 4. Ibid., 361.

Vane and Pelham secured a letter from the Committee to Fairfax and the governor about the matter, and the payment of a part of the money, £6000, assigned to Hull for its defence.¹ On 17 June he carried to the Committee of the Navy the Derby House Committee order for a joint emergency committee to prevent 'evil effects' of the navy revolt against parliament.² He probably left for Lincolnshire in early July.³

The question of restoring the king was now, in June and July 1648, being mooted again, but Vane's policy is reported in most contradictory terms. According to one Presbyterian pamphleteer, Vane wanted to bring in the king, upon the king's own terms. 'The quarrel between the factions in the Houses, is now not whether the king shall be brought in, but who shall bring him in, and who shall be the Princes of the People, [i.e. ministers] under him, when brought in. The Royall Presbyterian and Independent (for there are such of both sorts, as Northumberland, Warwick, Say, Cromwell, Ireton, Vane, Senior, Vane iunior, etc. they would bring in the King upon their Accompt, and make such agreement with him, as might...advance them to honour also; the reall Presbyterian, and reall Independent, they are willing to bring

1. Ibid., 173-8. 20 June. Baron Thorpe of the Exchequer, Recorder of Hull, had shown a letter from the mayor and corporation, especially a passage about some officers in whom the city had no confidence, to Vane, 'your burgess'. Hull MSS, L.498, 12 June.
2. CSPD.1648-9, 132.
3. He was not at the Derby House Committee on 26 or 27 June. He may have gone early in July, judging from his attendances in that month. Vane's fifth child had been born at Fairlawn on 19 June (Willcock, 353); doubtless Lady Vane had intended to stay at her mother's house for the confinement.

in the king, but they would first have the king secure unto them Religion, Law, and the Liberties of the Nation, but alack they are but a few...the cry of the others is, let us use the best means we can to satisfie the king, no matter what becomes of the kingdome; and to this end they have underhand promoted and procured these tumults, [the Essex, Surrey and Kent petitions] so that thereby they might force the House to an adjournment, which is the chief thing they desire, and if procured, then all the power will reside in that Committee [the Derby House Committee]'.¹ An anonymous letter to Fairfax of 24 May had also reported that Vane had voted for the treaty with the king. 'Sir Henry Vane Junior (upon devisiion of the House of this day concerning the treaty with his Majesty) voted with the Malignant partie against the honest partie'.² According to this writer Vane's actions were due to the persuasions of Dr. Stone and Scout-Master-General Watson; the latter certainly does seem to have indulged in some rather heavy-handed intrigues in France with the royalists a little later.³ Other versions of Vane's attitude are quite different. Pragmaticus has: 'about the personal treaty...when it was first moved, that his majesty might be trusted upon his royall word at one of his houses neer London, up stood young Vane and Whimzy Mildmay⁴ in the House, who living like kings in the Committee for the Revenue, and fearing that if his majesty were admitted to a treaty he might soon slip into the revenue, made bold to tell Mr. Speaker...that the king was a perjured man, and

1. Westminster Projects, or the Mystery of Iniquity of Derby House, E 446(5). 6 June 1648.

2. Clarke Papers, ii, 17.

3. T. Carte, ed., A Collection of Original Letters, 1739, ii, 17.

4. Pragmaticus's usual name for Sir Henry Mildmay.

therefore ought in no case to be trusted'.¹ Other royalist journalists gave a similar version of Vane's attitude. 'I promised the last week', wrote Mercurius Melancholicus, 'to give you the names of those that were the main obstructers of a personal treaty... Corbet, Challoner, Vaine and others in the Commons House, that hold for the Independents and their cut-throat Army'.² Mercurius Bellicus drops into Rhyme -

'Then Vane the Father, Vane the Son,
Two Devils on conjunction...
Yet these two hornets still are prest
To be the foremost 'mongst the rest,
Their votes are neere to seek [Speak?] , I, I,
To all that banes his majesty.'

These conflicting reports are puzzling; though one would guess, to judge from Vane's later attitude, that Pragmaticus was probably right. In the diurnall quoted above Bellicus says that when the City petitioned for a peace 'treaty', the Commons appointed a committee to meet with the Common Council, but 'packed together...those whom they know to be perfect haters of peace...such as Earl, Vane, senior...', and in this instance does not mention the son.³

By August 1648 Vane was alleged by a royalist writer to be plotting the king's death,⁴ but on 1 September he was appointed one of the

-
1. E 453(11), 11-18 July 1648.
 2. E 455(12). 24-31 July.
 3. E 452(19), 11-18 July. Similarly The Mad Dog Rebelling, E 452(22), 13 July.
 4. The Royall Diurnall, E 460(15), 14-22 Aug. 'heere we find the sonnes of mischief and errours met in counsell for the murthering of our soveraigne...they approach...by couples, 2 Vanes, 2 Challoners.'

commissioners for the Newport treaty.¹ (Many journalists were pessimistic about the outcome of these negotiations, but even the royalist ones were disposed to hope). Once more, as often in his career at important periods, there is little or no information about what one would most like to know - in this case, his personal part in the negotiations. Burnet, as is well known, declared that Vane did not really want to treat with the king, but that the pressure from the City and the Country was too strong to be resisted.² Burnet had information about the treaty from Holles and Grimston, who were also commissioners, but whether this particular statement derives from them we do not know. More reliable is their description to Burnet of the incident in which they begged the king on their knees to make substantial concessions straight away because they knew that Vane 'would study to draw out the treaty to a great length'; this sounds like a recollection of an event that actually took place. Both Holles and Grimston must have known Vane well. They also told Burnet that Vane, who 'declared for an unbounded liberty of conscience, would try to gain on the king's party by the offer of a toleration for the common prayer and the episcopal clergy'. Titus, who was in attendance on the king at that time, told Burnet that Vane, taking advantage of the king's belief that he could play off the Presbyterians against the

1. CJ.v, 697.

2. Burnet, i, 174.

Independents, 'flattered the episcopal party'. From Cromwell's letter to Hammond in October it sounds almost as though Vane was being swayed by Pierrepont towards a peace based on concessions in religion to the king - 'some of my friends have advanced too far, and neede make an honourable retreat', this Hammond was to tell Vane, with whom he was in close contact.¹ Cromwell was evidently conscious that Independent policy had not been consistent, in the eyes of many - 'wee have walkē in this thing (whatsoever surmises are to the contrary) in plainness and godly simplicity'. Gardiner believed that Vane, Pierrepont and Hammond, 'in their alarm at the thorough-going reforms demanded by the Levellers, were anxious to come to an understanding with the king',² but Cromwell's cryptic letter is doubtful evidence. Volpone, whom Gardiner relied on at this juncture, also says: 'It is to be feared (though I shall name no Body) that my Lord Say and Sir Harry Vane have appeared to some in the shape of angells. These two hate the Covenant, as they do the devill; and though my Lord says he would give halfe his estate for peace, and hath some new agents to insinuate so much unto his Majesty, yet its but a small signe, when he helps heave that main stumbling block in the way. God help us'.³ This reads as though Say and Vane, though outwardly supporting an accommodation, were in fact demanding that the Covenant should be taken by the whole nation,

-
1. Clarke Papers, *op. cit.*, ii, 49-53. Warwick told the commissioners of the navy that one Capt. Taylor had been recommended to him for a post at Portsmouth by Vane and Hammond. CSPD.1648-9, 374.
 2. Gardiner, CW., iv, 248.
 3. E 467(22) 11 Oct.

and so making peace impossible.

At this time also old Sir Henry Vane was apparently making every effort to prevent an accommodation, and he is so often coupled with his son at this time that it is surely a fair assumption that their policies were similar.¹

In December 1648 a major crisis, in this year of crises, presented itself, this time over the question of continuing peace negotiations, and a bitter tussle took place in the Commons. The Newport commissioners presented their report on 1 December.² It was clear that the king could not be brought to consent to the ruin of these 'delinquents' who had supported him - he did agree to submit their cases to process of law. Vane evidently wanted all negotiations to

1. E 470(7).
2. CJ.vi, 92.

be broken off - the king's concessions were not enough.¹
 Fiennes, of all people, rose to the king's defence. He declared the king had 'done enough to secure religion, lawes and libertyes, in granting the militia...and these things having been provided for, which were the only things which the Parliament had so often declared, to be the ground of their quarrell, his Majesty must needs have given satisfaction'. When the debate was resumed Vane spoke first; he labelled those who wanted to continue negotiations as royalists. 'We may do well now to consider the King's last answer upon the treaty, for, by the debate, we shall soone guesse who are our friends, and who our enemies; and to speak more plainly, we shall understand by the carriage of the busines, who are the King's Party in the House, and who for the 'People'.

It was a clever move, designed to forestall any demand for continued negotiations, but it met with a courageous reply. One M.P. - Mercurius Pragmaticus did not dare to give his name - rose and said: 'Mr. Speaker, since this Gentleman hath the boldness to deal thus by way of prevention in a threatening manner,

1. If one accepts Pragmaticus's version of these few days John Lawrence's account of them in his letter of 4 Dec. to Nicholas becomes intelligible - 'Young Sir Henry Vane, one of the commissioners of the Isle of Wight, was very partial in reporting to the prejudice of his majesty. But Nat. Fiennes confuted him most rationally and gallantly, arguing...that the king had granted enough to secure religion, laws and liberties'. Clarendon SP., App.p.xlviii. 'Lawrence' said the Independent party were enraged with Fiennes.

and forejudged and divided the House into two parts, I hope it is lawful for me that am no Grandee, to take the same liberty... you will find some that are zealous of a peace and settlement, and those are such as have lost by the warre; others you will find that are against peace, and those are such that have gained by the Wars'.¹ This reply silenced Vane, for it was the most widely believed of all the accusations made against the M.P.s,² and the one on which his father certainly, and himself probably, was the most vulnerable. Prideaux and Sir Peter Wentworth supported Vane in his views on continued negotiations, and wanted a decision taken then and there, but the debate was again adjourned.³ Two days later on the Monday it was resumed, and old Sir Symonds D'Ewes, Sir Benjamin Rudyerd and Sir Robert Harley maintained their opinion that the concessions made by the king were sufficient to justify another attempt to 'treat'. All day it was argued 'to and fro', and among the long list of M.P.s who, Pragmaticus alleged, opposed D'Ewes were the two

-
1. E 476(2). 5-12 Dec. Gardiner did not use this diurnall.
 2. See e.g. The Antipodes, or Reformation with the Heeles Upward, E 399(16).
 3. They evidently thought that the Army's approach would be a convincing argument, but the M.P.s were not so easily intimidated. Prynne wanted the question laid aside, openly declaring that they were not a free parliament, because they were endangered by the Army's approach. (As note 1.)

Vanes. But they and the others who thought like them based their argument now not on reason but on necessity - Cromwell and the Army had arrived at Whitehall on the Saturday, and without complying with the Resolutions of the Army¹ there could be no hope of a settlement. Mildmay said the king could not be trusted any more than a lion that had been 'raged' and set at liberty again. The House rose at eight o'clock next morning,² when Vane and his friends had been defeated in a full House.³

If this account of Pragmaticus's is true, and again it has the ring of authenticity, it still leaves Vane's motives for opposing the continuance of peace negotiations unexplained. It is probable that he shared Mildmay's distrust of the king, he may have felt that an ideal commonwealth of the tolerant type

1. Rushworth, 1647-8, part iv, vol.2, p.1331. This is an abbreviated version - royalist writers comment on the verbosity of the original.
2. One M.P. asserted that: 'the drift of these gentlemen is, to take advantage not only of the terror now brought on us by the present approach of the Army, but also to spin out the debate of this business to an unseasonable time of night, by which means the more ancient gentlemen of the House (whom they look upon as most averse) [to Vane's and Prideaux's views] will be tired out, and forced to depart'. See note 1, p.190. D'Ewes, Rudyerd and Harley were old men. The speech of Vane's mentioned by Ludlow (i,208) is evidently, to judge from the reference to the army, one made in the Monday debate.
3. Pragmaticus gives 119-84, and is not far wrong - it was actually 129-83. CJ.vi, 93.

that he wished for was impossible with either the king or the presbyterians in power, or again he may have been moved by loyalty to Cromwell and the Army. Though he spoke for accepting the Army's Remonstrance of November, which made a negotiated peace impossible, he did not apparently wish for the death of the king - at any rate he was not a member of the committee set up on 23 December to consider 'how to proceed in any way of justice against the king,¹ though St. John and Marten were, and Vane surely could have been so if he had wished. Here again Vane's distinctions were too subtle to be understood by the multitude, who would know only that he was one of the very small group - thirty Elencticus says - who were 'downright for the Army',² and that the Army's Remonstrance clearly implied the punishment if not the death of the king.³ On 6 December came Pride's

1. CJ.vi, 102-3. See note E.

2. Elencticus gives a list of them, and includes Vane, but not his father.

3. It named among offenders the king himself, and urged that he should be brought to justice. See note 1, p.191.

Purge, and the political situation changed for Vane; Giles Greene was gone from the House,¹ and someone else would have to do the work he had done for the navy. Pierrepont also was gone² - he had withdrawn voluntarily. It was likely that those who had successfully forced their policy on the House would find themselves carrying considerably more responsibilities in the future - of course this may have been one of their objectives.

The royalist journalists made one strange allegation against Vane, which can hardly be taken seriously, when they began to assert in May 1648 that the new frigates were being prepared to enable him to escape from England! If the Kent rebellion were successful 'Sir Harry's magazine may chance to be blown up, and himself and his Conventicle, and all the creatures

1. E 476(1), The Parliament under the power of the sword, names Greene as one of the secluded M.P.s (11 Dec.), though he is stated in another pamphlet, (E 477(30), 19-26 Dec.), to be one of the 'prudentiall' men, who might be 'willing to be drawn off upon advantage'. Pragmaticus in his issue of 12-19 Dec. speaks of Greene as 'in Limbo'. E 476(35). It was Greene who had presented the petition of the 11 impeached Presbyterian members in 1647; he must have had at least some sympathy with them - and some courage. E 399(11).
2. Pierrepont had, according to Mercurius Elencticus, voluntarily withdrawn. E 476(4). 5-12 Dec. 1648.

of his Confederacy, loose the confederacy of those new frigots, which have attended there these two months, to carry away him and his own pretty men of God, and their She-Baggages besides, that have laboured with them in all the work of the New Gospell'.¹

The references to Vane's conventicle are interesting; again Pragmaticus seems to have had some private source of information, and one wishes he had divulged the identity of Vane's group of friends.

There are many indications that, apart from one short period, Vane was acting with his usual energy during the 1647-8 period. It is clear that he was closely co-operating with Cromwell at the time, and was indeed the spokesman for Cromwell and the Army in the autumn of 1647 and during 1648. It seems highly likely that Vane absented himself deliberately from parliament and its main committees for six months from

1. E 433(37); E 445(21); Such allegations were being freely made at the time against Reynolds, Skippon and other M.P.s. E 445(1) and (3); E 438(7); E 458(12).

December 1646, while the Independents were in eclipse, and only returned when the Army had temporarily secured power for the Independents in June 1647. He was travelling about with the Army all that summer, and when the Army firmly established the Independents in authority in August 1647, Vane was one of those who took the reins of government in their hands. Probably his main sphere of action was the navy, but he was also prominent in the House on other matters. His political concessions to the king in September 1647 and to the City in 1648 cannot have improved his reputation for honesty. Whether he really leaned towards an agreement with the king in the summer and autumn of 1648, or whether he was, at Westminster and Newport, dissembling his real wishes is not clear; since the evidence is scanty and conflicting much must depend on one's estimate of Vane's character - it seems likely that the royalist view of Vane as a disciple of Macchiavelli is not far from the truth. A desire for power, an outstanding capacity for hard work, intelligence of a high order, which led him sometimes to stand apart from personal and party loyalties, mark Vane in this period as

always, and help to explain both his unpopularity and his stormy political career.

Note A. Division numbers in the Commons, 5 Dec. 1646-31 May 1647.

(This list does not include divisions on personal or very minor matters, and it includes only those divisions where it is obvious from the identity of the tellers that Holles and his group were opposed to Hesilrige and his).

C.J.V. 1646

- 3 7 Dec. Holles and Sir John Holland v. Hesilrige and Westrow, 60-56.
- 11 12 Dec. Erle and Lewes v. Sir P. Wentworth and Sir Henry Mildmay,
72-89.
- 12 14 Dec. Holles and Erle v. Evelyn and Hesilrige, 80-88.
- 25 22 Dec. Hesilrige and Evelyn v. Stapleton and Lewes, 99-156.
- 27 24 Dec. Stapleton and North v. Hesilrige and Evelyn, 105-129.
- 28 25 Stapleton and Irby v. Wentworth and Norton, 133-91.
- 33 29 Heyman and Constable v. Holles and Stapleton, 71-133.
- 34 31 Hesilrige and Cromwell v. Erle and Irby, 57-105.

1647

- 42 5 Jan. Holles and Stapleton v. Hesilrige and Hoyle, 130-69.
- 73 3 Feb. Holles and Stapleton v. Strickland and Hesilrige, 83-74.
- 90 17 Feb. Hesilrige and Evelyn v. Holles and Stapleton, 145-147.
- 91 19 Feb. Hesilrige and Evelyn v. Holles and Stapleton 148-158.
- 108 8 Mar. Holles and Stapleton v. Hesilrige and Evelyn, 136-108.
- 127 27 Mar. Hesilrige and Morley v. Waller and Stapleton, 48-49.
- 127 27 Mar. Hesilrige and Morley v. Stapleton and Lewes, 42-45.
- 131 31 Mar. Holles and Tate v. Hesilrige and Evelyn, 64-56.
- 143 15 April. Stapleton and Glyn v. Danvers and Hesilrige, 81-61.

C.J.V. 1647

- 154 27 April. Lewes and Doyley v. Evelyn and Livesey, 104-81.
- 155 27 April. Hesilrige and Livesey v. Stapleton and Glyn, 7-114.
- 162 4 May. Holles and Stapleton v. Evelyn and Hesilrige, 80-54.
- 179 20 May. Holles and Erle v. Pierpoint and Evelyn, 94-86.
- 179 20 May. Holles and Massey v. Armyn and Evelyn, 96-78.

Note B. Vane's withdrawal from parliament, Dec.1648 - ?Feb.1649.

At his trial Vane declared (Tryal, 31) that he was absent from parliament from 3 December 1648 to 7 February 1649 (a period of 9 weeks and 3 days). He had withdrawn, so he said, because he objected to the army's intervention. In February 1659 before there was any question of putting him on trial, he declared that he was absent from his seat in the House in 1648-9 for six weeks, and that this was due to his uncertainty as to whether the trial and execution of the king were right. (Burton, iii, 174). In 1656 he had written of the army as the defender of the people's liberties, with no indication that he objected to its interference in parliament's affairs.¹ One may tentatively conclude in favour of the 1659 speech rather than the trial speech for the following reasons, though there are counter-arguments:

1. Vane was back at the Admiralty office on 30 January.² Why should he wait a whole week before attending parliament? If he left parliament round about 20 December, because it had been decided to appoint the committee for the king's trial, an absence of six weeks would fit the 30 January date almost exactly.
2. His attitude to the Army in 1647 and 1656 does not indicate any dislike of its interference in politics, at that time.
3. The 1659 speech is a spontaneous utterance, the 'Tryal' speech was prepared for publication by someone else.

1. A Healing Question, 8-9.
 2. See below, chap.vi, p.275.

4. Vane had suffered two periods of imprisonment by 1662, and his memory was more likely to be faulty. A further three years separated him in 1662 from the events to which he was referring. He was not allowed access to records while he was in the Tower.

[Vane had so often worked with St. John that one might expect them to pursue a similar policy in 1648, but St. John said (E 1035(5) in 1660 that he had been excluded from parliament from October 1648 to June 1651, so that no help is forthcoming from this source.¹

1. The statement in the Sydney Papers (ed. Blencowe, 1825, 54) that Vane 'who had long absented himself', came and sat in parliament on 20 Jan. is unreliable, for the diary seems to have been written, or at least re-written, after the Restoration, and there is no record in the Commons Journals of Vane's attendance in January 1649.

Chap. v. - Vane's part in naval administration, (1640-48).

Throughout the Long Parliament the navy was to occupy much of Vane's time and energy, and his first recorded speech dealt with the subject. The House of Commons was discussing financing the army in the North, on 23 December 1640, when Sir Robert Pye raised the question of supply for the navy. Doubtless this was by pre-arrangement, for Vane promptly rose with a 'paper' to give details of the navy's financial needs.¹ Though he was concerned almost entirely with money matters, one can see in his warning that: '60,000 [£] presently supplied for the navy, or our walls will be much broken', something of the broader view and the vigour that were to mark many of his later speeches.² Six days later he again urged that money should be speedily provided for the navy, and gave details of what was required.³ Still the Commons, pre-occupied with the needs of the army, did nothing for the fleet, and he had to return to the charge three weeks later,⁴ criticising by implication the inaction of the House, but the fleet remained unprovided for. In February and March 1641 he spoke again on its needs,⁵ and at last, on 11 March, the House decided that the Victualler and Treasurer⁶ of the navy should be sent for, to see if they would advance ready money for its use⁷ - the Commons were in fact proposing to use the

1. Notestein, D'Ewes, 106.

2. Ibid., 186.

3. Northcote, 115.

4. Notestein, D'Ewes, 266. 20 Jan. 1641.

5. Ibid., 339, 429.

6. Vane was already in the House, so that his fellow-treasurer, Sir William Russell, was being sent for.

7. CJ.ii, 102.

method the crown had long adopted. Six days later, in a trenchant speech, Vane again explained in detail the number of ships that were necessary and the amount of money required. 'The French intend this year a fleet of eightysail', he declared, 'we shall loose the regallitie of the seas otherwise', and, 'our strength hath bin in being able to governe the seas'.¹ Vane made a reference to 'the care of the lord admirall' for the fleet, but the conviction of the speech marks it as Vane's own.

On the following day the elder Vane raised the question of providing for the fleet. His son had been to see his fellow-treasurer, Sir William Russell, (who had gout, and therefore probably could not come to the House). Russell had made what D'Ewes called only a 'slight offer' to supply the fleet, and D'Ewes, when he rose to speak, more than hinted that the navy's ill-preparedness was due to Russell, and made significant references to the wealth Russell had acquired.² He cast no similar aspersions on Vane however. A committee was set up to consider finance for the navy, and Russell finally offered to lend six thousand pounds, he and his fellow-Treasurer jointly agreeing to pledge their personal credit for the rest of the twenty thousand pounds required.³

1. Notestein, D'Ewes, 498-9.

2. Ibid., 505-6. Russell had been navy-treasurer since 1618, with some intervals.

3. Ibid., 518-9.

The House decided to assign tunnage and poundage (and not a subsidy) for the needs of the navy, presumably preferring indirect taxation to direct, and the money for twenty ships was provided by April 1641.¹ The vessels were fitted and ready for sea, except for the crews - Northumberland wrote to the king that: 'having lately had occasion to presse forty men for your majesty's service, only one man of them appeared, who ran away the next day'.² The old severe penalties for resisting the press had gone, and mere exhortation was ineffective. Northumberland wrote to the king, that 'if some other course bee not speedily taken, to make marriners obedient to the presse, the great expense in preparing of this fleete will be totally lost, the seas left unguarded this sommer...leaving the provision of a remedy to your majesty's wisdom'.³

Perhaps Northumberland hoped for another royal proclamation. Vane preferred to rely on Parliament. In words almost identical to those Northumberland had used in his letter to the king Vane urged in the Commons that unless the House took some course that sailors might be 'pressed' the cost already incurred in victualling

-
1. For Vane's later statement that the navy's services in protecting merchant shipping were the grounds for assigning tunnage and poundage to the navy, see Burton,iii, 445.
 2. Bodl. Tanner MS 66 f.48. Northumberland told the king: 'The principall officers of your majesty's navy have advertised mee...'. This could mean Vane. For pressing as carried on in the 1630s see Hollond, Discourses, 134, and for the 1640s, 'The humble remonstrance of Andrewes Burrell', E 335(6). J. R. Hutchinson, The Press-Gang, Afloat and Ashore, 1913, has little information about the seventeenth century, but does mention the proclamation of 1623, which merely admonished the pressed seaman to do his duty.
 3. Tanner MS. loc. cit.

and furnishing the ships would be lost. A sharp debate followed. Some members 'would by noe meanes have anie mariners prest as being against the lawes and libertie of the subject'.¹ Nothing was decided about the matter that day, and on the next day, although motion was made for taking up the matter again, it was 'laid aside'.² Clearly the House disliked the idea of forcing sailors to serve against their will, and for the time being Vane was defeated.

Not until 7 May was the subject raised again, on a day when the excitement about the first Army Plot and the Protestation was running high, and at the time for the mid-day meal, when many M.P.s would be absent.³ This time Wyld was ordered to bring in a bill for the 'pressing' of sailors, but only 'for this occasion'. The House was evidently still uneasy about the measure. It seems however that the House had been 'managed' - that a time had been chosen when members' minds were full of other subjects, and when their numbers were depleted.⁴ The bill now went rapidly ahead. It was read twice and committed the next day,⁵ and a committee was appointed, with Vane named second after Glyn, to meet with the Lords.⁶ On 11 May the bill passed the Commons,⁷ and shortly received the royal assent. Vane seems also to have

1. Harl.163, f.55-55v. 16 Ap.1641.

2. Ibid.,63.

3. CJ.ii, 138.

4. Mercurius Pragmaticus asserted that this trick was resorted to in 1648 - a motion was started 'after 12 o'clock (the usuall time when the House rises) when most members that they feared would hinder it were gone to dinner, and by this trick carried it'. E 470(35). 21-28 Nov.

5. Peyton, f.117. 8 May 1641 (a.m.)

6. CJ.ii, 140-42. The committee met that afternoon, though the House was sitting at the time - the bill was being rushed through.

7. Harl.163, f.164.

supported the conscription of soldiers - at least in December 1641 when discussion on this subject had been interrupted by a summons to the royal presence, it was he who moved the resumption of the debate on the engrossing of the bill.¹

In November 1641, when the Lord Admiral desired an ordinance of parliament as his warrant in carrying out a Commons' request to set out four ships to defend Ireland, Vane appeared as his spokesman. Vane presented the ordinance ready drafted, and the House passed it. The Lords were probably troubled at the way in which the royal authority was being ignored - they apparently contemplated an amendment to the effect that the action was taken in accordance with the king's directions.² D'Ewes was aware of the Commons' assumption of responsibility for the navy; he wrote in June 1642 that: 'we tooke upon us the care of it [the navy] for about the space of two years [since]'.³

It was Vane who moved that the ships that were assigned to the Irish coast should be hastened away, and that money should be borrowed from the City at once for this purpose. The Court of Aldermen authorised payment next day.⁴ A week later Vassall proposed that the sailors of the merchant ships lent to the royal navy should be paid at the rate

-
1. Coates, D'Ewes, 224. Maynard, more than once Vane's opponent, attacked the compulsion in the bill very cogently - 'presse he would nott, because that was a kind of contract, to which noe man could bee compelled'. Peyton, f.162 11 Dec.1641.
 2. Coates, D'Ewes, 165.
 3. Harl.163, f.146. 4 Jun.1642.
 4. Coates, D'Ewes, 183. 22 Nov.

of twenty-eight days to the month, and not thirty¹ - sailors in the merchant marine had higher pay than royal navy men² - but Vane and others opposed Vassall's suggestion. It would be interesting to know on what grounds - possibly it was feared that sailors would desert from merchant ships - but on this there is no information.

Vane lost his post as Treasurer of the Navy in December 1641; a Commons committee later stated that he had been punished for his part in Strafford's trial in the previous April.³ It is odd that the dismissal had not come much earlier. He had taken no part in the famous Grand Remonstrance debate of 22 November, nor on those of the previous days, though it is true that he had probably drafted part of the document,⁴ and this may have been known to the king.

Henceforward he was less active in navy affairs, though he was still concerned with them. A few weeks after his dismissal he urged that a short bill should be passed prolonging the grant of tunnage and poundage for two months, and when D'Ewes rose to support him 'soe the seas and kingdome might not be left unguarded', his words read as

-
1. Ibid., 208.
 2. Harl. 163, f. 55. Some members, when the conscription of sailors was proposed, held that the service would be more attractive if 'ther wages might bee encreased and ther persons better used then formerlie'. Ibid., f. 55-6. This implies that royal navy pay was lower, and Slyngesby (Hollond, Discourses, 351-2) states this was so in 1660. Sir Thomas Roe said that food in the State's navy was better than in merchant ships, but work and discipline was harder - higher pay would not solve the problem. Perhaps this was Vane's view.
 3. Whittaker, f. 220v, says of Vane that he had the treasurership 'taken from him upon the question of the earl of Strafford.' 15 July 1645.
 4. See below, pp. 339-40.

though they were an echo of Vane's own speech.¹ He continued to be Northumberland's spokesman in the Commons on occasion.²

On 7 March Vane reported to the Commons from the Lord Admiral that the king had proposed that one larger ship, the Prince, should take the place of two that the House had recently decided should be sent to the Irish Sea. The matter was referred, after a division,³ to the Committee of the Navy.⁴ Giles Greene, its chairman, visited Northumberland, who declared the Prince unfit for service. The House decided to ignore the king's proposal, and to send the two ships, but Vane now argued that in place of one of these ships, of 4-500 tons each, several smaller ones, of 50-60 tons each, would be more useful, and Sir Walter Earle seconded him.⁵

-
1. Harl.162, f.351v, 26 Jan.1642.
 2. CJ.ii, 493; Harl.163, f.45v; ibid.,f.92v; ibid.,f.45v.
 3. No doubt because the king's wishes were being defied.
 4. Ibid.,ff.21v, 22v.
 5. Ibid.,f.31v.

The Committee of the Navy just mentioned had become very important in naval administration.¹ It was one of the many ad hoc committees set up in 1641 to deal with naval affairs, and had been instructed to prepare a tunnage and poundage bill, and consider how money should be provided for the navy.² Most of its members were also on a Committee of Customs which did yeoman service in drawing up a Book of Rates,³ so useful that it continued in force until after the Restoration.⁴ It was the only navy committee to survive the 1641 recess, when all committees lapsed by order of the House, except those specifically revived.⁵ As the navy was paid for out of some customs duties, including tunnage and poundage, the decision of the House to amalgamate the two committees in 1643 is understandable.⁶ Thus the 'Committee of Navy and Customs' was created.

With the Navy and Customs Committee was associated a network of

1. For the MS sources for the Navy Committees, 1642-1653, see bibliography, note A, p. 396.
2. CJ.ii, 107. 18 Mar.
3. A Declaration in Vindication of the Honour of the Parliament; and of the Committee of the Navy and Customs against all Traducers...by Giles Greene. 405(8), 1 Sept.1647 (Thomason's date).
4. C.D. Chandaman, The English Public Revenue, 1660-88 (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London, 1954), p.58.
5. CJ.ii, 304.
6. CJ.iii, 299, 2 Nov.1643.

other navy committees. Greene, Vane and four merchants were unpaid Commissioners of the Navy; with the paid commissioners they took over in September 1642 the duties the Surveyor, Comptroller and Clerk of the Acts had performed hitherto.¹ Shortly after, in October, six of the Navy and Customs Committee and three peers were given the jurisdictional function of the Lord High Admiral; the earl of Northumberland had been dismissed by the King, and though the House appointed the earl of Warwick Commander-in-chief, it put the admiralty into commission.² Both Vane and his father were on this Admiralty Committee, and Greene, the earls of Northumberland and Warwick were fellow-members. The jurisdictional duties of the Admiralty put a further responsibility upon six of the same men who already had a heavy financial burden as members of the Navy and Customs Committee; as Greene put it later, they: 'did wade through those intricate cases which fell out in that first year'.³ Almost the same men were a Committee of Excise and a Foreign Affairs Committee. The Committee of Excise dealt with disputes arising out of ships and goods taken by reprisal; this also involved many intricate law-cases, and was, according to Greene, 'a distracted work'. The Committee for Foreign Affairs dealt with

-
- I642-9
1. For a brief outline of naval administration of the Interregnum, 1641-59, see A.C. Dewar, R.N., Mariner's Mirror, xii, 1926, 406-. I owe this, and the reference to those of Vane's accounts for as navy treasurer which are in the Public Record Office, to the kindness of Mr. D.E. Kennedy, of the university of Melbourne.
 2. CJ.ii, 812, 813, 19 Oct.1642.
 3. Greene, op. cit.

complaints from the ambassadors of Spain, France and Holland, and was kept busy.¹

The central figure in all these committees was Giles Greene - this is clear from the diaries and Commons Journals.² Vane, though a member of these committees, played a secondary role. The fact that he lost his office as navy treasurer in December 1641 was partly responsible for this, no doubt, but the major factor must have been his pre-occupation with general policy. From March 1642 to the end of 1643 he appears not to have spoken on the navy or naval matters more than twice. In June 1642 he delivered a petition presented by ships' captains who brought ammunition from Hull to London,³ and in March 1643 he was the spokesman of the Navy Committee, Greene on this occasion acting only as his seconder. This last is a curious incident. Vane informed the Commons that the commissioners the House had lately appointed to receive the customs, who were certain London aldermen, would not lend the £30,000 requested by the Committee of the Navy, but £20,000 only. The Committee thought fit that the House should press the merchants to lend the whole sum. The merchants were called in, the Speaker addressed them on the subject, and presumably rebuked them, for D'Ewes was surprised to see the London citizens who had been, as he says, so much responsible for the civil war, 'soe roughly dealt withall'. He concluded that 'they had some

1. Ibid.

2. See below, p.216 note 6.

3. CJ.ii, 627 states that the ships came from Kingston-upon-Hull, which would explain Vane's presenting the petition and is probably correct. D'Ewes states that the ships were from Berwick (Harl.163, f.164v); he gives Vane's name as the person presenting the petition.

secret plott to make some advantage of this request of ours, which fell out accordinglie the day following, for Mr. Greene preferred an ordinance on ther behalfe to be past both houses extremelie to ther advantage.¹ (The aldermen were to retain the receivership of the customs for a certain time and had power to dismiss and employ all officers - which might be a profitable right).² It would seem that the public rebuke administered to the citizens was designed to cover up the fact that substantial concessions were to be made to their demands. Alternatively they may have been allowed to state their objections, though D'Ewes does not assert this, and by so doing prepare the House for an ordinance meeting their grievances. Certainly if Vane and Greene's intentions were merely to overawe the commissioners, one would hardly expect the ordinance to follow the next day, as it did. It is not clear why Vane, and not Greene, represented the committee's views to the Commons. Perhaps he was a more persuasive speaker - though Greene was a very able man. By this time however Vane was one of those most concerned with the relations of the House to the City; this may be the reason that he brought the matter up in the Commons.

Meanwhile he had been restored by parliament to his former office as navy treasurer. A week after the members had heard of

-
1. Harl.164, f.327. 14 Mar. D'Ewes says these 'fiery spirits' among the citizens had been the main instruments with Hampden and the other 'violent men' to 'blow up the flame of our present civil wars.'
 2. Ibid.,f.331.

Vane's dismissal by the king, Walter Yonge rose to move that:
 'Sir H. Vane bee putt into the next Bill off Tunnage and Poundage to bee continued Treasurer of the Navy.'¹ That the House should control the appointment of royal officials was an extraordinary suggestion² and the method suggested savoured of blackmail. Holland does not record any debate on Yonge's suggestion, and no action was taken. On 12 March, 1642 Vane, whom Peyton still calls Treasurer of the Navy, moved that the House should make financial provision for the navy.³ It was another of his lucid speeches, and evidently reminded the House that he had lost his official position, for on 18 March D'Ewes came into the House and found a debate in progress 'touching the naming of Sir Henry Vane the younger in the Bill of Tonnage and Poundage to be one of the Treasurers of the navie.'⁴ D'Ewes thought that it was 'referred to the Committee that was to drawe the bill for Tonnage & Poundage to present a clause to the House whereby that place might bee settled upon him.'⁴ The clerk however had understood differently. 'It shall be referred to the Consideration of the Committee, to insert a clause in this bill for the making Sir H. Vane junior one of the Treasurers of the Navy.'⁵

-
1. Coates, D'Ewes, 312. 18 Dec. 1641.
 2. An act disabling royal officials from sitting in parliament was actually introduced but evidently the separation of powers did not commend itself. Harl.163, f.256. 3 June 1641.
 3. Peyton, f.102.
 4. Harl.163, f.37.
 5. CJ.ii, 485.

The clerk was evidently right, for neither of the two tonnage and poundage acts of the period concerned has anything about continuing Vane in office.¹ It would have been difficult to do - as it was, Warwick sent by Pym, four days later, a petition detailing the offices such as that of chief postmaster which had been taken from him,² and, luckier than Vane, was re-instated by order of the House.³ But if Vane had been similarly favoured a host of other disgruntled ex-officials might have besieged the House. Warwick's services to the country and his rank put him in a different class. The tunnage and poundage committee may have considered that the tenth of the Nineteen Propositions was a more regular way of obtaining redress for Vane.⁴ It seems he tried to prevent Warwick from regaining his lost office of Postmaster, for the earl wrote to his son-in-law Lord Mandevile requesting him to further Warwick's interests in the House of Commons, in respect of the Letter Office, which Vane wished 'to continue in sequestration'.⁵

In August 1642 however, by ordinance of parliament, Vane again became Treasurer, and this time sole Treasurer, of the Navy.⁶ He had received some help in the matter from Whitelocke, who wrote in May 1644 in an unpublished passage: 'I therefore spake to Sir Henry

-
1. Statutes of the Realm, 1810-28, v, 144, 175.
 2. Harl.163, f.42v.
 3. Ibid., 52v.
 4. LJ.v, 97.
 5. HMC.8th Rep. App. ii, 58.
 6. CJ.ii, 705. 5 Aug.1642.

Vane the Younger, for whom I did some service in Parliament in drawing and passing his Ordinance touching the office of Treasurer of the Navy, that he would lend me the house at Deptford belonging to that office, and whereof he himselfe then made no use.¹ Two days after the ordinance took effect, a clerk began to record, in a book now in the Bodleian Library,² the orders which the Committee of Navy and Customs gave Vane. The Committee of Both Kingdoms also instructed him to make payments for navy purposes.³ But when the Commons wanted a report on the general state of the navy they called on Giles Greene, the chairman of the Navy and Customs Committee,⁴ whose orders Greene signed.⁵ Greene also made frequent reports from the Committee to the Commons.⁶ There is even some evidence that Vane was not carrying out in person his duties as navy treasurer - when in the spring of 1645 Greene's Committee wished to know what money was owing for ships hired for transport duties, it was the deputy-treasurer, Richard Hutchinson, who was summoned before it.⁷ The Admiralty Committee had lapsed in December 1643; Parliament's fortunes were then at a desperately low ebb, the earl of Warwick was appointed Lord Admiral, and he exercised the powers the Committee had formerly had.⁸

1. BM.Add.37, 343, f.300v.

2. Bodl.Rawl. A 220, 10 Aug.

3. E.g. CSPD.1644-45, 124; CJ.iii, 628.

4. E.g. CJ.iii, 507.

5. S.P.16/509/17, 37, 43.

6. E.g. Harl.166, ff.31v, 33v, 41, 58v, 150v, 153v, (this last was a two-hour report).

7. CSPD.1644-45, 632. 8 Mar. For Hutchinson see below.

8. CJ.iii, 329.

Not until 1645 were there further significant changes in naval administration, but in these Vane was closely concerned. After the Self-Denying Ordinance had been introduced, and the 'New-Modelling' of the army had begun, it was natural for parliament to consider the control of the navy also, and in February 1645 an ordinance was brought in to the House, by which naval administration was to be reformed. A committee was set up, to send for the commission formerly granted for carrying on naval affairs (the October 1642 ordinance appointing the nine Admiralty Commissioners, of whom Vane was one), and to consider what officials were necessary for the navy, their salaries and privileges.¹ The committee was a large one; Greene was named first, but Vane was not a member, no doubt because he was at Uxbridge. As soon as he returned, on 27 February, he was added to the committee.² In April, perhaps as the result of the deliberations of this committee, the earl of Warwick lost his office of Lord Admiral. The powers of the office were again put into the hands of a committee, this time of eighteen - among whom Vane was not included.³ It is very difficult to account for his omission. The new Admiralty committee's composition was probably a triumph for Holles's faction; of the eighteen members nine belonged to Holles's

1. CJ.iv, 21 Feb. 1645.

2. Ibid., 64. In Vane's case, he was not added to committees when the House knew he was absent.

3. LJ.vii, 327; A.O.I. i, 669.

group, and only two to Vane's.¹ But why should Holles's group wish to humiliate Warwick, whose sympathies were with their group, by putting the admiralty into commission? Perhaps this was the plan of Vane and St. John's group, but Holles and his followers had won one of their occasional successes when the Admiralty committee was actually nominated. It seems unlikely that Vane wished to give up some of his navy work, and was therefore not nominated, for in October he became a member. If his exclusion was indeed a political matter, why should Holles be so powerful in April 1645? It is possible that Vane was ill - there is practically no information about him in that month. He did not attend the Committee of Both Kingdoms, he made no reports in the House, and apart from Sabran's statement that Vane had denounced the Scots, there is no evidence of activity on his part at all.

The new Admiralty committee was instructed to name a commander-in-chief for the navy, and a political struggle ensued; when the committee met two days later it resolved that both Houses should be informed that the Self-Denying Ordinance made it impossible to nominate a

1. I assume that the earls of Pembroke, North and Warwick belonged to Holles's group, and the M.P.s Stapleton, Whitelocke, Sir Christopher Wray and Sir John Evelyn of Surrey. With Holles himself this makes a total of nine, and probably Greene leaned to the Presbyterians (see p.193 above). Only Say certainly belonged to Vane's group. For evidence as to Holles's associates see Whitelocke's Memorials, his MS and Holles's Memoirs.

suitable person.¹ Holles, who was instructed to inform the Commons of the Committee's decision, and Warwick, who was to inform the Lords, were in fact continuing the fight against the ordinance which they hated. Aulicus noted the extraordinary arrangement of dividing the admiral's power among eighteen commissioners, but added: 'Yet for all this power is cut into 18 parcels, you may see it gathering into one single person, which if you will observe who leads up the other seventeen, is no hard discovery'.² Perhaps Aulicus thought Greene would dominate the new committee - if so, he was right. Within a week however of setting up the committee of eighteen, Parliament, 'seeing their distractions increase and their forces diminish', as Aulicus put it,³ appointed Warwick as commander-in-chief, but the circumstances in which this was done are interesting. It was seriously proposed that a committee of three should command the navy, of whom Warwick was to be one, Peregrine Pelham and Alexander Bence his coadjutors.⁴ According to Whittaker Pelham and Bence were

1. Bodl. Rawl. C.416, f.2 (the Committee's Minutes), 21 April. It would seem from D'Ewes (Harl.166, f.209v.) that the Admiralty Committee wanted Warwick as admiral, as one would expect, but D'Ewes is not clear on this. (Cf. f.205v.) Yonge reports Holles as saying that the committee considered that the fleet should be under the command of one man, but could not think of anyone fit for so great a trust. Sir Robert Pye then moved that Warwick should be appointed. BM.Add. 18,780 f.5.
2. E 284(20). 20-27 April.
3. E 286(17). 4-11 May.
4. Whittaker, f.207-207v, Harl.166, f.205v. Whitelocke, like Whittaker, thought that all three were nominated successfully, 'after long debate', and Pelham certainly took it for granted that he and the two others were appointed (see note 1), but it seems clear from the Commons Journals that Bence was negatived. (Whitelocke, i, 427. CJ.iv, 125). Blake, Deane and Monk later formed a successful triumvirate at sea, but they were better qualified to command than Bence and Pelham.

experienced seamen, but really Aulicus was more accurate when he called them 'two most famous, eminent, unheard-of-gentlemen',¹ though Bence worked very hard on the Navy and Customs Committee.² Neither M.P. however can be said to have had the training or experience necessary to command the navy. But Pelham belonged to the Independent group, Warwick to the Presbyterians, and probably Bence was to hold the balance. Actually, after a long debate the Commons negatived Bence; this left Warwick and Pelham, and the Lords rejected Pelham,³ a decision which the Commons accepted. When it came to appointing a commander for the summer's expedition there was another trial of strength between the two rival parties; D'Ewes suggested that Batten, the vice-admiral, should command the fleet,⁴ and there was a proposal that the Lords should be asked to agree to this. Vane, always hostile to the Lords, and Waller, probably still hoping for favours from the Independents, were the tellers against this, and were defeated, by the narrow margin of two votes.⁵

The minutes of the Admiralty Committee set up in April⁶ show that it was dominated by Holles's group, with Warwick often in the chair, but in October Vane was added to it.⁷ This may be connected with the

-
1. See note 3, p.219.
 2. Bodl. Rawl. A 221, passim, e.g. ff.11v. and 130.
 3. Aulicus, op. cit.
 4. Harl.166, f.209v.
 5. CJ.iv, 144. 15 May.
 6. Bodl. Rawl. C 416.
 7. CJ.iv, 297.

election of the new 'Recruiter' M.P.s. According to Holles, after the failure of the Savile accusations against himself and Whitelocke, the Independents were afraid they would lose control of the House, and therefore in the long summer vacation, when many members were away, they raised the question of filling the vacant places, and even so, carried their motion by only three votes.¹ Perhaps Vane's election to the Admiralty Committee was one of the fruits of the Independents' increased hold on the House after the new elections.

An important incident, referred to by Vane's first biographer, Sikes, had occurred in July 1645 - the Commons resolved that Vane should keep his office of Navy Treasurer 'during the continuance of the war, and no longer', as the House stipulated, provided that he paid over to the Receiver-General one half of the clear profits, for the benefit of the nation.² Some months before a committee had been set up to consider what salaries should be allowed the new holders of offices vacated by M.P.s under the Self-Denying Ordinance;³ presumably it was this committee which reported on the Navy Treasurership. At the end of June the House had voted that the Ordnance Office should be regulated 'for the best advantage of the State',⁴ and this new attitude

-
1. Holles, Memoirs, 214, 221. Action was in fact taken by the House in August, though the matter had been raised seven months before. See R.N. Kershaw, 'The Recruiting of the Long Parliament', History, viii, no.23. (Oct. 1923).
 2. CJ.iv, 207. 15 July.
 3. Ibid., iv, 62. 82.
 4. BM.Add.18, 780. f.58.

to administration was bound to affect naval administration also sooner or later.

Vane's post as Navy treasurer had been protected, as we have seen, by the last clause of the Self-Denying Ordinance - 'These members of either House, who had offices by grant from his Majesty before this Parliament, and were by his Majesty displaced sitting this Parliament, and have since by authority of both Houses been restored, shall not by this Ordinance be discharged from their said offices or profits thereof, but shall enjoy the same'.¹ But now he obtained express confirmation of his post, and his re-appointment was dated from 12 May, when the Self-Denying Ordinance came into force. His accounts from May 1645 therefore run from that date.²

At least once later his somewhat anomalous position was challenged. In April 1647, when party feeling was running high, Walter Long was restored to his post as Register of Chancery, notwithstanding the Self-Denying Ordinance. According to Harrington's diary, 'Sir E. Vane iunior [was] not restored though prest for'.³ Harrington must have misunderstood the point at issue, but it is clear that Vane's tenure of office had been disputed, though of course he continued to hold the post.

It is remarkable that, as Oppenheim states,⁴ Vane did not return

-
1. S.R. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1906, 288.
 2. A.O.I. 1706/90. 13 May 1645 to 31 Dec. 1646.
 3. BM.Add.10, 114, f.23. 29 April.
 4. M. Oppenheim, A history of the administration of the royal navy... 1509 to 1660, London 1896, 295-96. Oppenheim noticed Sikes' Life only, and overlooked the Commons ordinance.

to the State one penny of his profits as navy treasurer for 1645-50 - in fact, he ignored the ordinance of July 1645 entirely as far as this was concerned. His accounts for May 1645 to December 1646, which were not presented until December 1650, show that his poundage was £4,909-17-6d. for this period - some £3,000 a year. If he had paid any of this over to the Receiver-General it would have been mentioned in his voluminous declared accounts, but there is no indication of this whatever, and one must conclude that Oppenheim's strictures were justified. Perhaps Vane found that he could not meet his necessary expenses without the whole poundage, but in that case he should have put his case before parliament. Perhaps he never intended the July ordinance to be more than a means of placating public criticism - there is a wealth of evidence that those in public places were believed to be enriching themselves at public expense.¹ It is odd that parliament did not demand that he should return the half of his profits, but of course the M.P.s may have innocently believe that their injunction was being carried out. It should be noted, for comparison with Vane's £3,000, that those M.P.s who were in need were allowed by the House £200 a year.² No doubt Vane would claim that he was faithfully serving the country in many different ways, and with the Raby estates and the Cockfield and Chester-le-street mines yielding little or nothing he (and his father) had to rely on their

1. See above, chapter iii, note B.

2. CJ.iv, 161. For comparative figures on wages to M.P.s see R.C. Latham, 'The payment of Parliamentary wages - the last phase', English Historical Review, (1951), 27-30.

income from official sources.

The Navy Treasurer's house at Deptford, which as already noted, Vane had let to Whitelocke, Lady Vane now wanted returned. 'I came with my wife and Mr. Hall and his wife to Detford', wrote Whitelocke, 'and my Lady Willoughby told us that my Lady Vane desired to make use of Detford house herself, a recompense not very gratefull for my labour in doing service for Sir Henry Vane about his office, to which this house belongeth'.¹ Vane apparently agreed, for in October Whitelocke wrote: 'I visited Mr. Holles, who was not well, and meeting Sir Henry Vane by the way he went thither with me, and made a large apology to me concerning his house at Detford'.² The house was worth twenty pounds a year in the 1630s,³ and it too, if let, would add to the Treasurer's income.

On 27 October 1645 Vane moved that another M.P. should have payment for his services to the navy; he proposed that Giles Greene, the leading member of the Navy and Customs Committee, should have five hundred pounds a year, and arrears for three years.⁴ Greene had lost his whole estate to the royalists, and had been maintained by his children, but even so Whitelocke was envious - it was, he said, a reward for committee services that few others obtained.⁵ About the

1. BM.Add.37, 344 f.3. 12 Aug.1645.

2. Ibid., f.18v. 11 Oct.1645.

3. Aylmer, 19.

4. CJ.iv, 322. (Vane senior was in the North, so Elsing must have meant the younger). The ordinance accords Greene no official position.

5. Whitelocke, i, 529.

same time Cornelius Holland was given an extensive grant of royal lands in Buckinghamshire to compensate him for the offices he had lost by his support of Parliament's cause,¹ and Vane's group² must have been one of those in Holles's mind when he wrote, 'they [the dominant Independent group] had power over all the money of the kingdom, pleased and recompensed whom they would; which were none to be sure but their creatures, or such as were willing to become so'.³ In justice to the Independents one must point out that avarice did not mark all the group. Many of them claimed the £200 a year which parliament allowed M.P.s in need, and Greene had served for three years on the Navy Committee before he received a penny for his services. Moreover there were some who stayed in town all through August 1645 to carry on the nation's business, although plague was raging in the capital - Greene was one, (Vane was not).⁴

At the end of 1646 Vane planned to give up the office of Treasurer of the Navy, which he had held for eight exacting years. His decision is understandable - there are several possible motives for it. His health may have suffered from the years of strenuous activity, he may have found difficulty in working with a predominantly Presbyterian Admiralty committee, he may have wished to give more time to other

-
1. CJ.iv, 270. 11 Sept. 1645. Royalist pamphleteers often referred to Holland's financial gains. Holland bought bishops' lands for £807.0.7d. (Bodl.MS Rawl. B 239). Vane bought none, but acquired church lands in another way, explained below (chap. vii).
 2. Though Greene was probably politically a neutral with Presbyterian leanings, he is regarded here as coming under Vane's protection.
 3. Holles, *Memoirs*, 193.
 4. CJ.iv, 251 *et al.*

activities. What is remarkable is that he intended to sell his office. There is no other explanation of the fact that he asked the House to give him power to surrender the office, 'with all his interest therein', and to nominate someone in his place.¹ One of Clarendon's correspondents wrote that Vane had sold the position,² which shows how contemporaries interpreted his action. One is left with the problem of accounting for the House's consent - no other 'royal' official was similarly allowed to dispose of his post. The motion was introduced very early one morning, and was pushed through with great speed, the Lords agreeing straight away³ - perhaps it had been arranged that only Vane's friends should be present. The Presbyterians had gained what proved to be a stable majority in the House only a day or two before, and one would expect them to have opposed Vane's motion vigorously. Of course Vane, or his father on Vane's behalf, had bought the office in 1639, and they wanted to recoup themselves, but one would not expect the House to have acquiesced. However, he continued to hold the post until December 1650, so he evidently thought better of his decision.

It has already been noted that Vane was an infrequent attender at the Admiralty committee meetings in 1647 until his party gained

-
1. CJ.v, 30. 28 Dec. 1646.
 2. Bodl. Clarendon MS. 2417, 14/24 Jan. 1647. (Letter of intelligence from London). Whitelocke (ii, 98) notes the passing of the ordinance.
 3. CJ.v, 31.

control of the committee in September.¹ By an interesting coincidence in time, Greene was given leave of absence from the Commons on the very day that the Independents were added to the committee² - did he not want to work with them, or were they taking advantage of his departure? As already noted,³ the Independents used their control of the Committee to dispense with Captain Batten's services as vice-admiral. Batten did not like Vane,⁴ and one cannot help making a connection between Greene's departure, Vane's assiduous attendances, and Batten's virtual dismissal. Batten declared that he could not understand why he was displaced,⁵ but his sympathy with Holles's group is explanation enough. He had also, in November 1646, brought a charge against a ship's captain of uttering 'scandalous words' against the king and his issue, which some members of the Admiralty Committee may have thought ill-judged enthusiasm.⁶

Batten was astonished that 'another (such another) [was] thrust in to be my successor as till then I never imagined would be vice-admiral of a navy'.⁷ This was Rainsborough, and Vane was concerned, according

1. Note B. and pp.162-3 above.

2. CJ.v, 297. 9 Sept. 1647.

3. Page 163 above.

4. To judge from his sarcastic comment on Vane's absence from the Navy Office in Oct. 1641, which Batten attributed to the dearth of money in the Office. (CSPD.1641-43, 139). Vane was very busy with public affairs at that time. Pepys gives an unfavourable picture of Batten's own avarice.

5. E 460(13).

6. Adm.7/673, f.41. 12 Nov.

7. Probably because Rainsborough had started as a cabin-boy? (BM.Add.II, 602, f.39); Mercurius Pragmaticus, E 435(42).

to Sir Lewis Dyve,¹ in the extraordinary incidents leading to Rainsborough's appointment. Dyve had heard (doubtless from Lilburne, his fellow-prisoner), that Rainsborough was confident of obtaining Batten's position, but Cromwell and others, jealous of Rainsborough's popularity with the soldiers, and afraid of his independence of character, planned to appoint the less popular, and more flexible, Richard Deane. They could then 'place or displace him at pleasure'. As Cromwell and Rainsborough were friends, however, it was arranged that Cromwell should not appear openly in opposition to Rainsborough's appointment. But Rainsborough knew of the plot, and a fortnight later came to a meeting of Cromwell, Ireton, Vane and St. John, whereupon a violent quarrel ensued. Rainsborough got his way, and was appointed.

Lilburne's connections with the army were close, and the month's delay in appointing a successor to Batten certainly requires explanation.² But Deane's claim to the command was strong - he was a fine seaman - and the objections to Rainsborough's appointment could have been on service grounds, particularly, as time was to show, Rainsborough was certainly not popular among the sailors. Vane signed the Committee

-
1. Dyve, 84-85, 89. Lilburne wrote in 1649 that Cromwell had tried to 'worm' Rainsborough out of the navy. E 552(15); E 568(20).
 2. Pragmaticus (E 410(4)) had heard by 9 Oct. that Rainsborough was to be appointed; not until ten days later did the Committee's minute-book record the appointment - another instance of Pragmaticus's 'inside information'.

order appointing Rainsborough,¹ but he signed other admiralty orders occasionally, and one cannot deduce from this one fact that he was supporting Rainsborough's appointment.² In the conflict with the Upper House over the appointment of this notorious Leveller, to whom the Lords strongly objected, Vane's name is not mentioned. It is true however that though the dispute continued from October 1647 to March 1648, when the Lords finally gave way, there was only one division on the question,³ and therefore little indication of the attitude of individual M.P.s. Pragmaticus cynically suggested that Rainsborough was being sent to sea because he had had a major hand in drawing up the 'Agreement of the People', one item of which called for an account by the M.P.s of how the kingdom's money had been spent!⁴

Before Giles Greene left for the country in September 1647, he published the judicious and able pamphlet,⁵ already referred to, which sheds light on Vane as Treasurer of the Navy. Greene explained how the committee had power to order payment from the customs to the Treasurer. 'The moneys being so settled in his hands, they were all to be issued out by him, by the only order of that committee; which trust I dare confidently affirm he hath discharged with as much clearnesse and freedome from any corruption as ever Treasurer did'.

-
1. Adm. 7/673, f. 413-14.
 2. Hugh Peters was - in Aug. 1646 he was wishing Rainsborough 'sutable imployment by sea or land, for both which God hath especially fitted him'. E 351(2), Peters' Last Report.
 3. CJ.v, 405, 413, 417, 503. Northumberland supported Batten, according to one news-letter writer. (Bodl. Clar. 2605).
 4. E 421(1). 14-21 Dec. 1647.
 5. Above, page 210, note 3.

This is a valuable testimony to Vane's honesty in administration, for Greene was an independent-minded M.P., who although he usually supported Vane's views in 1645-46, showed Presbyterian sympathies in the following years. The pamphlet demonstrates the sound policies of Greene's committee, that, for instance, 'they being furnished with this great power and trust,...took along with them the concurrent advice and full consent of the Commissioners of the Navy, Victuallers of the Navy, Officers of the Ordnance'. Greene asserted that the ship-yards, store-houses and ships were very efficiently provided, and, which was largely true, that no complaints of sailors were heard at the doors of parliament - a remarkable achievement, when one remembers how often soldiers were driven to make their protests in person in this way.¹ Some at least of the credit for this must go to Vane.

It may be that he was inspired by similar motives to those of Greene.² Greene stated categorically that in making appointments to offices neither he nor any members of the committee received a penny for any appointment made. As Vane sometimes made such

-
1. See for instance CJ.v, 526. It is true however that John Hollond (140) asserts that several ships' companies came to the parliament door to clamour for their pay in 1644.
 2. '...next that duty I owe to God and to the Parliament and to my country...to make me account no labour too great, nor care too much, to be any way instrumentall in so great and glorious a work as the Reformation in Church and State...next...to manage that work...as that on the one side the King, on the other side the people, might be in love with Parliaments...'

recommendations¹ Greene's assertion is interesting. Fragmaticus did accuse Greene and Corbet, another prominent member of the committee, of 'locking their fingers',² but his only charge against Vane was repeated from a pamphlet by Elencticus, in which Vane's treasurership was said to be worth at least £6000 a year in time of war,³ and one cannot treat this assertion seriously.⁴

The year 1648 saw Vane's accounts as Treasurer of the Navy brought in at last - but only for 1642-1645.⁵ Royalist writers and others had continued to criticise parliament for not insisting on the production of the public accounts,⁶ and the belief that M.P.s were reaping financial advantage from the country's suffering was more widespread than ever.⁷ Probably as a result of the pressure of public opinion, the Navy and Army Treasurers and the Master of the Ordnance were ordered on 12 April 1648 to bring in their

-
1. E.g. Adm. 7/673, ff. 4, 394, 413.
 2. E 435(12). 4-11 April 1648.
 3. E 465(13). The Second Centurie, n.d.;
 4. See Note A below for details of Vane's actual profits.
 5. CJ.vi, 14. 9 Sept. This can be only a summary of Vane's original accounts - the later ones in the Public Record Office are rolls of enormous size, and practically exposés of the work of the navy - all money spent on the navy went through the treasurer's hands.
 6. The poore Committee Man's accompt, BM.669f. 11 (n.d. but among 1647 pamphlets); Mercurius Pragmaticus, E 421(1), 14-21 Dec. 1647; The Antipodes [a tract addressed to the army] E 399(16), 22 July 1647; Mystery of the Two Juntoes, E 393(29) 24 June 1647.
 7. See Milton's disillusion, Hist. of Britain, Bohn's standard ed. vol. v, 236-7. For Bellièvre's bribery of M.P.s see Montreuil ii, 109. Other complaints about accounts not being presented include E 442(2), British Bellman. As late as Nov. 1648 Col. Rich's regiment in its petition to Parliament was still asking for State accounts to be presented by those who had been entrusted with the State's money. E 472(3).

accounts¹ thirteen days later. 25 April came and went, but nothing was heard of the accounts. The subject was next raised on 5 August,² being doubtless brought to mind by that other hardy perennial, the question of the offices held by M.P.s contrary to the Self-Denying Ordinance.³ Again nothing was done, but on 4 September the House ordered that the first business on Friday 8 September should be the accounts of Vane and the other two officials, Gerrard and Peck.⁴ They were given yet another day's grace,⁵ but on 9 September the accounts were finally presented to the House, with the certificates of the Committee of Accounts appended. Vane's accounts for the early period of the war, now that they were at last forthcoming,⁶ are surprising. Between August 1642 and May 1645 he had paid out for navy purposes, if the account is to be believed - and surely any discrepancy would not have escaped the eagle eye of William Prynne, who signed the

-
1. CJ.v, 527. The order instructing M.P.s to bring in their accounts to the Committee of Accounts is CJ.v, 204-5, 10 June 1647. No M.P. was to receive any profit from an office given by parliament.
 2. CJ.v, 662.
 3. E 458(25). Mercurius Pragmaticus asserted that when it was moved that 4 Aug. might be a day of humiliation, one M.P. said that the preparation for a fast should be the putting aside of pride, vain-glory etc., and therefore moved that the Self-Denying Ordinance should be re-inforced. The House agreed to debate this on 9 Aug. but put it off - Pragmaticus is right here (CJ.v, 665). On 9 Aug. it was postponed for a week, on 16 for another week, on 23 Aug. it was not raised, and the matter was dropped. This was a subject that the House did not like.
 4. CJ.vi, 6.
 5. Ibid., 10.
 6. CJ.vi, 14. Oppenheim, Administration of the Royal Navy, 296, said that Vane's accounts for 1642-45 were missing - he had evidently once more overlooked the Commons Journals record. In the 1647-50 period accounts were going to the Committee of Accounts, and not to the Audit Office of the Exchequer (see note 1 above).

account?¹ - some £640,000. He had received, chiefly from the commissioners of excise, some £641,000. He had in fact taken for himself only about £617 for the thirty-three months covered by the accounts. He should have been receiving some £3,300 a year as poundage and for other allowances due to him; he had actually taken only some £200 a year. (It should be noted however that he ultimately drew every penny that was due to him).

But in June 1648 an order of the Commons instructed Vane to pay towards the cost of defending the Isle of Wight, five hundred pounds, for which he should re-imburse himself 'out of that moiety of the profits of the place of Treasurer of the Navy, which he pays in to the Committee of the Revenue'.² The same order later spoke of the five hundred pounds as being advanced 'voluntarily' by Vane. It may be remarked that the rest of the £2,500 required for the Isle of Wight was to come from John Bland, whom Vane had defended, according to Mercurius Veridicus, in the dispute with Fowke and Mildmay already noted. This is the period in 1648, when the Presbyterians were said to be regaining power in the House of Commons, and Cromwell and Vane were making concessions to them. It looks as though the Presbyterians were pursuing Vane with some vindictiveness. Of course the chairman

-
1. D'Ewes had written in 1644: 'Mr. William Prynne and others named in the Ordinance for taking the accounts were this day sworne in at the House of Commons table', which sounds as though Prynne was expected to be the dominant figure on this committee. Harl.166, f.17v.
 2. CJ.v, 582. 2 June.

of the Committee of the Revenue was Vane's own father, so he may have found means of avoiding this payment, as he did for the rest of the half of his profits as navy treasurer!

In February 1648 Vane raised in the Admiralty Committee the question of the deputy-treasurer's office.¹ The Committee minute runs: 'Sir Henry Vane, knight, Treasurer of the Navy, having this day represented to this Committee that whereas he is appointed Treasurer of the Navy...to execute the same by himself, his sufficient deputie or deputies, and therefore that a constant personall attendance may be given to the severall trusts and duties belonging to the said office, which cannot by reason of his relation to the publique be so well performed by himselfe, hath...appointed Charles Vane, Esq., his brother, a person well affected unto the Parliament and of abilitye, for the dischargeing of the said service to be his deputy'. The Committee approved of the appointment, and by Vane's desire a record was made in the minutes. It was witnessed by two men; the first name is that of Richard Hutchinson who had been the deputy-treasurer.² He must have signed resentfully; he had probably done

1. Adm.7/673 f.510. 8 Feb.

2. Hutchinson had originally been employed by the Navy and Customs Committee to discover arrears of customs due before the Committee was set up. (Bodl. Rawl. A 221, f.53v; A 222, f.30v). He had presumably done this work efficiently, and had come to be familiar with navy accounts thereby. He was described as Vane's 'menial servant' in 1644, (Calendar of the Committee for the Advance of Money, i, 34), but had become 'Clarke to the Treasurer of the Navy' in Vane's 1647 accounts, (E 351/2286), and 'Ric. Hutchinson, Esq., Paymaster to the Accomptant', in 1652. (E 351/2288).

a great deal of the financial work that was nominally done by Vane.¹ It has been shown earlier that he had been sent for on one occasion by the Navy Committee when accounts were to be produced,² and he was similarly sent for this very month of 1648,³ in a document referring to the treasurers of the navy,⁴ which might mean that he was thought of as joint treasurer with Vane. It looks as though Vane was trying to oust Hutchinson from the position of importance he had acquired, and as though he was jealous of Hutchinson - with reason, for Hutchinson later replaced him as treasurer, in face of opposition from Vane himself. But it was evidently too difficult for a newcomer to take over the complex duties of Deputy-treasurer, or perhaps Charles Vane was not competent to do so, for by February 1649 Hutchinson had regained his position as deputy-treasurer.⁵

During all the period reviewed in this chapter, with the exception of eight months from December 1641 to August 1642, Vane was Treasurer of the Navy. He was also a member of the important Committee of

-
1. In Vane's accounts for 1648-49, presented in 1650, there is recorded a payment to a navy messenger for 'attending the Paymaster and Clerks whilst they were making upp the Treasurer's Accompts'. Hutchinson is described earlier in the document as Paymaster to Vane. (E 251/2287).
 2. p. 216, note 7.
 3. CSPD.1648-49, 355.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Bodl.Rawl. A 224, f.20v. 16 Feb. 1649. (Admiralty Committee minute-book). On 26 Feb. Hutchinson is to attend the next Thursday and give account of what moneys he has received from Goldsmiths Hall on the excise, and what payments he has made 'thereout' since the last balancing of his accounts. Ibid., f.27v.

Navy and Customs, and of the Admiralty Committee for most of the period of its existence. Giles Greene testified that Vane did not use his position as Treasurer to sell appointments, and Vane's accounts show that he had made an almost ludicrously small profit from the office by May 1645, though by December 1650 the position was very different. Though his second and third accounts as treasurer, and probably the earlier one too, were drawn up by Richard Hutchinson, Vane's first speeches in the Long Parliament show that he was himself expert in navy finance, and from the beginning spoke on it with authority. He also saw the navy's importance in foreign policy, as one would expect him to do, in view of his diplomatic experience. In the navy, as in other spheres he supported the transference of power from the king to parliament, nor did he shrink from reducing the rights of the individual if he judged this necessary for efficiency. He was not the central figure in naval administration during this period - Giles Greene was - and there were members of the navy committees who worked very hard, probably indeed harder than Vane, whose political duties absorbed much of his time. If the period before 1640 saw Vane's apprenticeship to naval administration, the years 1640-48 saw him as the journeyman; he was to emerge in 1649-53 as the unequalled master of this field of national policy.

Note A. Sir Henry Vane's profits from the office of Navy Treasurer.

<u>Declared account</u>	<u>Dates covered by the account</u>	<u>Vane's poundage (3d.in the £)</u>	<u>'Surplusage' i.e. sums due to Vane but not yet drawn by him</u>	<u>Date of account</u>	
CJ.vi,14	8 Aug.1642- 12 May 1645.	£9,046-8-8d. ²	£8,428-17-2 $\frac{3}{4}$ d	9 Sept.1648	
A.O.I. 1706/90	13 May 1645- 31 Dec. 1646.	£4,909-17-6d	}		
E 351/ 2286	1 Jan. 1647- 31 Dec. 1647	£2,217-4-10d		£352-12-0 $\frac{3}{4}$ d	2 Dec.1650.
E 351/ 2287	1 Jan. 1648- 12 May 1649	£4,200-2-6d			
E 351/ 2288	13 May 1649- 31 Dec. 1650	£8,293-14-6d	Nothing	26 June 1652	
	<u>TOTAL SUM DRAWN BY VANE</u>		£27,305-11-9d ³		

Notes.

- Vane was appointed by Parliament to resume his post as Navy Treasurer, (from which the king had dismissed him), on 8 August 1642. When the Commons confirmed his appointment in 1645, his re-appointment was to date from the day the Self-Denying Ordinance was passed. i.e. 12 May 1645.
- This sum includes Vane's Patent Fee (£551-13-4d) and portage etc. (£910-2-11d).

3. Vane's Patent Fee of £220-13-4d per year should be added to this, and also the considerable sums allowed him for portage, bags, wax and other charges for May 1645 onwards. Payments to Hutchinson, his Paymaster or Deputy Treasurer, and to the clerks, are entered separately on the accounts, and were not deducted from the sums due to Vane. Hutchinson's salary as Navy Treasurer was finally raised to £2,500, during the First Dutch War.

Note B. Vane's attendances at the Admiralty Committee, 8 Oct.1646-
29 Feb.1648 (From Adm. 7/673)

P = Name given in the list of those present.

L = signs letter on that day.

A = no evidence of attendance.

(Sir Henry Vane senior was not a member of this committee until 9 Sept. 1647. It is assumed here that where the committee's secretary does not indicate which of the two men was present after that date, the son is intended).

1646

8 Oct. P

13, 15, 20, 23, 29 Oct. A

3, 7, 10 Nov. A

12 Nov. P

17 Nov. P

19, 21 Nov. A

1, 3, 8, 14, 17, 22, 25, 29, 31 Dec. A

1647

2 Jan. A

5 Jan. L

14, 16, 19 Jan. A

2, 4, 5 Feb. A

9 Feb. P

1647

11, 13, 16, 20, 23, 25, 26 Feb. A

27 Feb. P

1 Mar. A

2 Mar. P

4 Mar. No list of attenders given. A

8, 11, 16, 19, 23, 26, 29, 30 Mar. A

2, 8, 13, 15 April. A

22 April. P

23 April. No list of attenders given. A

27 April. No list of attenders given, but L

29 April. No list of attenders given, but L

1 May. A

4 May. L

6, 7, 11 May. A

13 May. P

18, 25, 27 May. A

28 May. L

31 May. A

2 June. A

5 June. L

10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 29 June. A

1, 5, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22, 23 July. A

11 Aug. P

13, 14 Aug. A

17 Aug. P L

1647

24 Aug. P

26, 27 Aug. L

2 Sept. P

14 Sept. L

16 Sept. L

17 Sept. P

18 Sept. L

23 Sept. P

25 Sept. A

28, 30 Sept. P

5, 9, Oct. A

12 Oct. L

19 Oct. P

21 Oct. L

26 Oct. P

28 Oct. A

29 Oct. L

30 Oct. A

2 Nov. P

4, 11 Nov. A

12, 15 Nov. A

18 Nov. L

19 Nov. A

25 Nov. L

26 Nov. L

30 Nov. L

1647

2 Dec. A

3, 7 Dec. L

10, 15, 16, 17, 23, 30 Dec. A

1648

6, 11, 13, 22, 25 Jan. A

1 Feb. L

2 Feb. A

8 Feb. P

11, 17, 19 Feb. A

22 Feb. L

29 Feb. A

Chap. vi, The republican statesman, (1649-53).

Vane returned to parliament early in 1649. He at once threw himself into naval administration, but this did not preclude his playing an important part in many other spheres of parliamentary activity. He was named to committees of parliament on 1 and 2 February,¹ and may therefore have taken his seat there by that time, but he did not appear at the Council of State until 23 February.² It is true that Darnall, under-clerk of the House, stated in his evidence at Vane's trial that the Council of State was set up on 7 February, and that Vane was a member.³ But this is one of the many half-truths that his enemies resorted to in order to secure his conviction - Vane was not appointed a member until 14 February,⁴ and the fact that he did not take his seat there for nine days lends support to his protestation at the trial that he was appointed to the Council without his consent.⁵

In the vital political question before this parliament, that of establishing a new representative body, he was early given important

1. CJ.vi, 127, 130.

2. CSPD.1649-50, 13.

3. Tryal, 27. Darnall's testimony that if Vane was set down in the Journals to have acted or reported anything, he was present in the House, is interesting; evidently Darnall was not prepared to guarantee that if a member's name appeared in a committee list, that member was actually in the House. Darnall may have had a reason for giving evidence against Vane; in 1647 he had obtained the grant of part of the sub-poena office in chancery, but had had to surrender it, as it had been previously granted to the elder Vane who had, as already noted (above, p. 14), given it to his eldest son. (Calendar of the Committee for the Advance of Money, 1888, i, 62).

4. CJ.vi, 141.

5. Tryal, 31.

responsibilities. On 15 May 1649 he and one other M.P. were given the 'special care' of the work of a committee on regulating elections and putting an end to the Long Parliament.¹ This was one matter with which he did not, or could not, deal with his usual despatch, and the debates were interminable. As chairman of this committee he did report in October 1649 a letter he had received concerning Henry Neville's election for Abingdon, and this led to an order by the House that the Committee should sit every day.² The Committee did not do so, however, and the Army's impatience with the lack of action on this subject is well known. But there was much other work for Vane to do. Both the Council of State and parliament turned to Vane as they had done in previous years, to draft documents to be presented to parliament or to the public. On 5 January 1650, for instance, the Council instructed Vane, the Commissioners of the Great Seal and three others, to draw up a statement of the 'state of the nation', to be presented to parliament when the Council's term of office expired on 3 February.³ On 9 July of that year the 'special care' of the narrative of a battle at Scariffhollis in Ireland was entrusted to him,⁴ though Scot

1. CJ.vi, 210.

2. Ibid., 305.

3. CSPD.1649-50, 469. The MS. S.P/25/5 adds the supplementary information.

4. CJ.vi, 438, 440.

actually reported it, probably because this was the month in which Vane was pre-occupied with his surrender of the navy treasurership and the resulting business transactions. Ten days later, when the bill 'against atheist opinions' was being discussed, he was one of those instructed to withdraw and draft a clause for inclusion in the bill.¹ On 10 September 1640, a committee was instructed to prepare a narrative of the battle of Dunbar, together with an act fixing a day of thanksgiving for the victory, and though Salwey had the 'special care' of this,² it was evidently Vane who took charge, for a week later he reported the act and the account of the victory to the House.³ The drafting committee was small - it consisted of only three men, so that Vane's share must have been considerable, and the 'narrative'⁴ is most

-
1. Ibid., 443. 19 July. He was teller for omitting a clause from this bill, on 9 Aug. (ibid., 453), but the diurnalls have no information on this. E 778(19), Severall Proceedings... gives an account of the act, but does not mention the clause opposed by Vane. His intervention must have been designed to mitigate the severity of the act, which among other things, imposed a penalty of six months imprisonment for asserting that drunkenness and swearing were not unholy.
 2. CJ.vi, 464, 465.
 3. Ibid., 468.
 4. E 780(8), Severall Proceedings... E 612(11) has some information on this incident, but has been wrongly bound, and pp. 9 seq. are in E 612(3). E 780(8) has; 'when we have been reduced to the greatest straits, and had as it were the sentence of death in ourselves; and our enemies heightened and hardened by their power and multitudes, in their confidences...in the bosom of it [the victory at Dunbar] is comprehended the safety of all that hath bin fought for these many years last past: and together with this Victory, God hath renewed Being, and life itself to this Commonwealth, and the Government there-of; whose totall ruine...was...almost ripened into an accomplishment'.

interesting. It frankly admitted the straits to which Parliament had been reduced before the victory - Vane was said in May 1650 to have spoken very pessimistically of Parliament's situation¹ - and it shrewdly assessed the importance of Dunbar. But no thanks at all were given to Cromwell for the victory; the praise was for God alone, and though Cromwell could hardly in public have disparaged God's efforts in comparison with his own, Vane's attitude may well have rankled. Cromwell may also have resented Parliament's vote about this time that part of the Excise receipts assigned to the Army by a 1644 ordinance, should be paid to the Treasurer of the Navy; this was for the use of the fleet which was to recapture Barbados for the Commonwealth, but Cromwell in Scotland had his own pressing need for money.²

Irish and Scottish policy was critically important as soon as the Republic was established - Cromwell was about to embark on the conquest of Ireland, and Scotland had to be kept quiescent. Here too Vane was a leading figure as soon as he appeared at the Council of State in February 1649.³ (On several of the relevant committees Cromwell also sat, and doubtless Vane's zeal was quickened by the knowledge of the importance of their work to his friend). It was natural that when the 'Irish and Scottish Committee' was set up in

-
1. Gardiner, Commonwealth, i, 277. Vane's remarks were made at dinner with Baron Thorpe, the Recorder of Hull.
 2. CJ.vi, 482. 11 Oct. 1650.
 3. GSPD.1649-50, 22, 25, 58, 62, 97, 217, 302, and S.P.25/2, 18 May 1649. This last is doubtless the letter referred to by the counterfeit Mercurius Pragmaticus who noted that Vane was drawing up a conciliatory letter to the Scots. E 556(25).

March 1651 Vane should be a member.

This proved to be a very important committee whose purview included a number of subjects not obviously connected with those two countries. The poorly paid clerk and the commissary¹ who gave evidence at Vane's trial, stated that in 1651 and 1652 they several times saw him sit in the Committee for Irish and Scottish affairs, where he was often in the chair.² (Some of Vane's ex-colleagues, such as St. John, could have given fuller particulars of Vane's work on the Committees, but that would have been embarrassing as they had made their peace with the king). This Irish and Scottish Committee³ soon absorbed the Ordnance Committee⁴ of which Vane was also a member,⁵ and an extraordinary variety of business was referred to it. In 1651, for instance, the Council of State instructed it to consider the state of parliament's guard,⁶ to consider where money could be obtained for the Council's expenses, and for carrying on the affairs of the Commonwealth,⁷ to report how the militia in Kent and adjoining districts should be ordered,⁸ and to deal with the

-
1. Matthew Locke had 30s. a week (CSPD.1650, 608; ibid., 1651, 575). William Dobbins was a commissary, supplying provisions for Scotland and Ireland. (Ibid., 1651-2, 584, 594, 621).
 2. Tryal, 28.
 3. CSPD.1651, 66-67.
 4. Ibid., 68.
 5. CJ.vi, 533.
 6. CSPD.1651, 358.
 7. Ibid., 99.
 8. Ibid., 125.

published account of Britain's war with Portugal, since there were passages in it which the House had ordered to be kept secret.¹ The Committee examined a man who had detained £600 of excise money,² reported to the Council on the amount of ready cash in the Excise Office,³ and was instructed to plan the disposal of the £20,000 left in the hands of the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee,⁴ which had been wound up the previous year. This was in addition to dealing with numerous petitions,⁵ and of course the business one would expect it to despatch concerning Ireland and Scotland. The Committee seems to have worked hard - it sat, sometimes at least, at 7 a.m.⁶ - and how Vane fitted in the sessions of this committee with his work on the Council of State, whose meetings he rarely missed until July,⁷ and with his unremitting attendance at the Admiralty Committee, it is difficult to see. He had a great deal of other business to do as well, and his complaint to Cromwell in August, that his family duties and his health had suffered, must have been well justified. It is not surprising that when Francis Rous wrote in June appealing to him to urge Parliament to secure the payment of Pym's debts, still

1. Ibid., 184.

2. Ibid., 522.

3. Ibid., 342.

4. Ibid., 449.

5. E.g. ibid., 496, 500.

6. Ibid., 455.

7. He went to Lincolnshire for a well-earned holiday in August, but within a couple of weeks the Council of State were requesting his speedy return. CSPD.1651, 341.

unpaid after more than seven years, he began his letter: 'I know you want not work'.¹ It is typical of Vane however that he went straight to the House next day, and secured an order for the release of the estates, assigned by Parliament years before for payment of the debts, but now held by the Committee for Compounding. He himself headed a committee to receive the accounts of the trustees for the property.²

The energy which he brought to committee work is well illustrated by another matter which eventually found its way to the same 'maid of all work', the Irish and Scottish Committee. Parliament in March 1650 referred the question of the nation's postal system to the Council of State, which did nothing about it. On 30 September 1651 parliament requested a report 'forthwith' from the Council, which hastily set up a sub-committee. Three days passed, and again nothing was done. On 3 October however Vane, Hesilrige and Fielder were added to this sub-committee. It met next day, fixed days for meeting, to hear claims and propositions for improvement. By 7 November the sub-committee had taken its decision - the posts should be farmed.³

In the early months of 1652 the affairs of Scotland called for

-
1. H. Carey, ed., Memorials of the great civil war, 1842, ii, 277. 16 June.
 2. CJ.vi, 589.
 3. CSPD.1652-53, 109-111. Parliament did not accept the decision.

skilled handling; it was necessary to pacify that conquered country, and re-organise its government, now that parliament had decided on the union with England. Several men were appointed to do the work, among them Vane and St.John, and Rushworth wrote as though these two were in charge, as one would expect.¹ It was Vane who with Fenwick was sent back early in March, when most of the Scottish constituencies had accepted the commissioners' plan, to report it to parliament.² He found time to attend the Admiralty Committee on the day before he made his report to the House,³ but was too busy to attend the Committee again for the next few days; the M.P.s who were also members of the Council of State had the task of drafting the act of Union, and probably the brunt of this work fell on Vane, who had for years been parliament's leading 'expert' on Scotland. Certainly it was he who reported the bill to parliament about a week later.⁴

In addition to being in effect (as will be shown later) First Lord of the Admiralty under the Republic, it would seem that Vane was also Foreign Secretary. He had long been interested in foreign affairs - the king in his letters to Vane had assumed his interest

-
1. Calendar...of the Committee for Compounding, ed. M.A.E. Green, 1889-92, i, 535.
 2. C.S. Terry, The Cromwellian Union, 1902, pp.xvii-xliii.
 3. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.98v. 15 Mar.
 4. He reported to parliament on 16 Mar. (CJ.vii, 105). On 18 Mar. parliament referred the bill to the Council of State M.P.s (ibid., 107). Vane reported the declaration, specifying the preliminary steps to the union, on 25 Mar. (ibid.,110). Whitelocke introduced the bill on 13 April (ibid.,118). See also CSPD.1651-2, 185.

in this subject.¹ He had been a member of the Foreign Affairs sub-committee of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and with Northumberland and Crew had perused the draft treaty and petition that the commissioners of the king of Denmark had brought in 1645.² He reported to the Commons from the Committee of Both Kingdoms the draft of a reply to Queen Christina of Sweden, when an Anglo-Swedish alliance was under consideration.³ On one or two occasions in 1646 he was a committee member or reporting a conference on foreign policy,⁴ otherwise there is little indication of Vane's interest in this sphere from 1645 until after the king's death.

But from early in 1649 onwards Vane was a dominating influence in foreign policy. On the day when he first attended the Council of State he was nominated to a committee to consider the Dutch seizure of a Levant Company's ship.⁵ In March 1649 he was one of a sub-committee of the Council to consider what alliances the king had had, and which should be continued.⁶ In May he was added to this sub-committee, to which he already belonged, which was to report in a few days on the alliances.⁷ The Council asked five of its members,

1. See above, p. 130.
2. CSPD.1643-47, 170. 13 Jan.1645.
3. CJ.iv, 90. 27 Mar.1645.
4. CJ.iv, 622, 624, 649.
5. CSPD.1649-50, 14. 23 Feb.1649.
6. Ibid., 36.
7. Ibid., 166.

Vane's words. He was a teller against allowing the Portuguese including Vane, to consider whether the Commonwealth ought to send an agent to Spain.¹ This evidently took a long time to decide, for it was two months before the Council resolved to send an envoy, and the decision was taken just after Vane came in one day in December;² probably he made the report from the committee. It was some time before the Spaniards returned the compliment by offering to send an ambassador, but the Commonwealth navy changed foreign powers' attitudes to the new republic. An interesting letter to Cromwell gives a glimpse of Vane's motives and characteristic subtlety. After recounting with pride how Blake's seven ships had ruined Rupert's fleet, and struck terror to the French, Vane told Cromwell that the British victories had made the Spanish government send an ambassador. 'The Portuguese likewise stands knocking at the door for audience, and we pause upon it a little, that he may be sensible of his error in so rashly engaging against us... but by degrees, we shall hear what he will say, and play our game the best we can between them both for the interest of England. The French and Dutch will not sit out long, unless they resolve to sit out altogether, and turn downright enemies, which we hope they will think on twice before they resolve on it'.³ The Commons Journals bear out

1. Ibid., 329. 3 Oct.

2. Ibid., 434-35.

3. Nickolls, 39-40, 41.

Vane's words. He was a teller against allowing the Portuguese ambassador to come to London to negotiate a treaty after Blake's victories.¹ He was defeated however on this question, in which Henry Marten was his opponent. About the same time he was named first to a committee to draft an answer to the Spanish ambassador, but Marten had the 'particular care' of it² - perhaps the House was more anxious than Vane was to conclude treaties of friendship speedily.

In the vital negotiations with Holland Vane also played an important part. He had shown interest in the United Provinces as early as 1643,³ but in 1649 he began to be deeply involved in England's relations with her commercial rival, and religious ally. He had much work to do after Dorislaus's murder, including the arrangements for the funeral, which became a military demonstration.⁴ But according to his first biographer he strove to prevent the war with Holland,⁵ and in this connection Vane's policy deserves more careful consideration than it has hitherto received. Certainly when the House divided on the question of sending St. John and Strickland

1. CJ.vi, 511.

2. Ibid., 516. 27 Dec.

3. It was Vane who moved in 1643 that the Westminster Assembly should be asked to write letters to some ministers of churches in Zeeland and Holland, who would thus learn of 'the artifices and disguises of his majesty's agents in those parts'. Harl.165, f.214v. CJ.iii, 317. 22 Nov. An entry in the Commons Journals for Nov.1642 records that the two Vanes, Fym and four others were to form a committee to 'consider propositions for a league with Holland', but nothing seems to have come of this. CJ.ii, 865.

4. CSPD.1649-50, 131, 137, 144, 147; CJ.vi, 209, 212; S.P.25/2.

5. Sikes, Life, 96.

as ambassadors-extraordinary to the Netherlands, Vane was one of the tellers in favour of the project.¹ Whether he was also the author of the bold plan of union between the two countries we do not know. St. John later stated that he had been unwilling to go to Holland, but had to do so,² which sounds as though this early 'Common Market' plan was not his. In January 1651, before St. John's mission had been finally decided upon, the Council of State named Vane first to a committee set up to examine the relations between England and Holland,³ and evidently he took charge, for when the Council wanted the Magnus Intercursus translated - the Dutch view of their rights was partly based on this old treaty - the document was in Vane's possession.⁴ Early in April, when St. John and Strickland were still in Holland, he was ordered to prepare a letter to them from parliament,⁵ a task of some difficulty no doubt, for their reception had been far from encouraging to the supporters of a close alliance.⁶

-
1. CJ.vi, 528. Some thought it wrong to 'fall at the feet of those that have spurned and abused us', remembering Amboyna and Dorislaus's murder. Nickolls, 55. Vane was one of the committee to draft the envoys' instructions. CSPD.1651, 53.
 2. E 1035(5).
 3. CSPD.1651, 19.
 4. Ibid., 116. He was ordered to give it to Milton; their first recorded contact had been in Mar. 1649. Ibid., 1649-50, 36.
 5. CJ.vi, 554. It is assumed that the younger Vane was named.
 6. C. Wilson, Profit and Power, 1956, is illuminating on Anglo-Dutch relations, but states that: 'Vane saw in the threatened war with the Dutch a means of creating political support for themselves, i.e. the Independents'. Professor Wilson does not give his evidence for this view, and on the whole it seems that Sikes' version is more probable. Col. Dolman, who acted as intermediary when the Dutch began negotiations for peace in 1653, had had 'much converse' with Vane in Dec. 1650. (Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 623; Nickolls, 43). Vane took a different view of peace with the Dutch in 1659, but the political and international situation had changed.

The negotiations with the Dutch continued to be largely in Vane's hands; he informed the House of the letters from Pau, the aged Dutch envoy-extraordinary, who was anxiously striving to prevent full-scale war between the two countries,¹ and on 18 June Vane reported the meeting between Pau and the Council's delegates.² Next day however the Council of State allowed Vane no part in drafting the English reply to the Dutch envoys,³ and this led, five days later, to a remarkable development - the earl of Pembroke reported to parliament the Council of State's reply to Pau's representations, and Vane acted as teller against the Council's statement, which was decisively rejected by the House.⁴ A new statement was ordered to be drawn up, was brought into parliament immediately after prayers next day, and passed, but Vane had had no hand in it. He had absented himself from the Council that day.⁵ What is more, he failed to appear either in parliament, the Council of State, or the Admiralty Committee for more than two months, from 1 July onwards.⁶

This very public disagreement with the Council requires explanation, and the most likely one seems to be that he, like Cromwell, wanted

-
1. CJ.vii, 135.
 2. Ibid., 143.
 3. See below, p. 269.
 4. Ibid., 145. One would assume that Vane reported in mid-June because he was president of the Council for that month (CSPD.1651-2, 243, 278), and Pembroke in late June because he now held that office (Ibid., 291). But from Vane's attitude to the report this does not seem to be the whole explanation. The clerk does not indicate which of the Vanes was acting as teller on this occasion, but as Purefoy was Vane's fellow-teller, it seems more likely to have been the younger - Purefoy is found supporting him on other occasions.
 5. CSPD.1651-52, xli.
 6. Ibid., xlii; CJ.vii, 145 seq; Bodl. Rawl. A 226, ff.161-194v., passim.

peace with the Dutch, and thought the Council's reply not conciliatory enough. If he knew that he could not carry the Council with him, this would explain his absence from its meeting on the 25th June. It is true that the Council's revised, and surely no less intransigent reply, passed the House without a division when it was brought in next day,¹ but the Council may have rallied its supporters. Certain it is that Vane withdrew from public affairs until 9 September, when he attended a Council meeting,² and there is no information of value about him for these two months,³ though there is an interesting passage in an August letter from the royalist, Sir George Radcliffe, who stated that he had heard Vane mentioned as ambassador to Holland.⁴ This would tally well with pacific views on Vane's part, but Radcliffe's informant is unknown, and his statement stands quite alone. Vane's absence certainly was unusual. The Admiralty Committee was sitting every day,⁵ and July and August were critical months for the Commonwealth, with Blake hunting the Dutch East India vessels and Ayscough lying in wait for their ships from the New World, the famous 'Silver Fleet'. It is incomprehensible that Vane should not be at his post at such a time. There are three possible explanations. Either he was ill, or he was interviewing De Retz in Paris, on the mysterious mission discussed below, or he was deliberately absenting himself in silent

1. CJ.vii, 145.

2. CSPD.1651-52, xliv.

3. Except that his accounts as navy treasurer for 1649-50 were declared on 26 June (E 351/2288), and that Milton's sonnet to Vane belongs to July - was the sonnet a gesture of sympathy?

4. HMC.Bath MSS, ii, 106.

5. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, op. cit.

protest against a policy of which he disapproved. The last fits in best with Sikes' account of Vane's attitude to the Dutch War, and with what is suspected to have been his policy in 1647, when he had found himself in a minority.¹ A visit to France at this time would have been dangerous² (with De Ruyter cruising off Calais with twenty-two warships, and Blake seizing a French squadron early in September), but perhaps not impossible. There is no reference to ill-health on Vane's part at this time, but this is inconclusive. On the whole voluntary withdrawal seems the most likely explanation, but the episode is obscure.

The occasion for the visit to De Retz could have been the letter of credence from the Prince of Condé for his envoy, which was read in parliament in March 1652; both letter and emissary were referred to the Council of State.³ This secret embassy of Vane, known only from the memoirs of the cardinal, who gives it no date,⁴ is wrapped in mystery, both as to its purpose, and its length.⁵ Vane was hostile

1. See above, chap. iv.

2. Roger Williams, writing in July, mentions the danger in the Channel from French and Dutch attacks. Knowles, 146.

3. *CJ.vii*, 118.

4. J.F. P. de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, *Mémoires*, 1956, 375.

5. Abbott, *Cromwell*, ii, 525, relying on the Council of State attendances, rightly questions Gardiner's date (Oct. or Nov. 1651) for the De Retz visit, and suggests that Vane may have gone to Paris after his return from Scotland. The Admiralty Committee records (Bodl. Rawl. A 225, ff.70-158, A 226, ff.1-52v) rule out the 1651 dates, and narrow the 1652 possibilities to April-May, or July-August. Abbott's conjecture that the elder Vane may have been the envoy must be rejected - De Retz states that the envoy was Cromwell's intimate confidant, which the elder Vane never was. De Retz names one 'Fildin' as the intermediary. This may have been Fielder, who had been a member of the Admiralty Committee from March to Dec. 1651, but unfortunately was not re-nominated to the Committee; otherwise his attendances might have given a valuable clue to the date of Vane's visit.

at this time to Spain,¹ and may have hoped for some sort of alliance with France directed against Spain, though from De Retz's cryptic account it sounds as though the projected treaty was more an anti-Roman Catholic one. But there is so little information about the incident that one can only speculate.

During the years 1649-51 many letters passed between Cromwell and Vane, though only a few remain. Cromwell wrote to Vane when he wanted to secure parliament's attention for matters in which he was personally interested,² and Vane kept Cromwell informed of the news from London.³ After Dunbar he wrote appreciately of Cromwell's 'honest and despised army', but in his reference to the parliament there is both condescension and a hint of his policy of keeping it in session - 'I never knew anything take a deeper and more kindly impression [than Dunbar] upon the parliament, who in general have good aims, and are capable of improvement upon such wonderful deliverances as these vouchsafed to them.'⁴ His letter of December 1650 with its account of naval victories and policy towards Portugal has already been mentioned. In the spring and summer of 1651, Cromwell wrote several times to Vane requesting supplies for his Scottish campaign⁵ - he, like a number of other people, evidently thought that if he wanted parliament or a committee to deal with

-
1. According to the Spanish ambassador, Cardenas. 'In the absence of Harry Vane, who has just set out as commissioner to Scotland, and who is a man of great influence, and moreover very hostile to Spain, I have determined to request an audience from the Council of State'. Guizot, Cromwell, i, 468.
 2. Calendar of the Committee for Compounding, 1643-6, 1889-92, 1432.
 3. Nickolls, 17. July 1650.
 4. Ibid., 19. 10 Sept. 1650.
 5. Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 402-3, 411-12, 428.

some business speedily, Vane was the man to interest. Vane brought the May letter to the Council of State, who referred it to the Irish and Scottish committee, and the next day Cromwell's letter was being read in the Commons.¹ On one occasion the general wrote to his wife: 'Mind Sir Henry Vane of the businesse of my estate'.² (The son of the marquis of Worcester was trying to secure from parliament part of the family property sequestered on account of his father's 'delinquency', and assigned to Cromwell.) Christopher Love's case prompted letters to Cromwell from Vane at this time,³ and early in August 1651 Vane was assuring Cromwell that the men and supplies he had asked for, and more, were being despatched.⁴ This letter is an interesting one in many ways, for it shows his conscientious attitude to his duties, his assumption that August was 'vacation time', and his impatience with those who were not so quick as himself to see what was needed. It also reveals the friction between some Council or Committee members. Another letter passed between the two in August,⁵ but if there were any letters after that month they have not survived.

In an oblique style, which he could assume on occasion, he indicated in the letter written on 2 August 1651, before he went on holiday, that there was some difference of opinion between Cromwell

-
1. GSPD.1651, 182.
 2. Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 405.
 3. See below p. 271.
 4. Nickolls, 79.
 5. Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 447.

and himself. He assured Cromwell that he: 'answers your heart's desire in all things, except he be esteemed even by you in principles too high to fathom'. The meaning of this is not clear; the subjects on which the two men were probably in disagreement at this time, the army's strength, and the continuance of the Rump, could hardly have been referred to in these terms. The vital votes on the latter subject took place in parliament in November¹ and, though there is no positive evidence that Vane took part in the debate, there is no reason to doubt the accepted view of his attitude. He was not one of those M.P.s and officers who met at Lenthall's house on 10 December to discuss the future form of government, which indicates that Cromwell thought his views on the Rump were not shared by Vane.

His exclusion however in August 1652 from the committee for the 'new representative' may not have been a deliberate slight - he had been absent from London when the Army officers' petition was presented, and this may well account for his exclusion from the committee set up to consider the petition.² It was this same committee which was instructed to draw up a bill on the plan for a new representative, but again Vane's exclusion need not have been so complete as Gardiner and others have assumed, for 'all that come to have voices' was the rule for this committee, so that Vane could have attended if he chose.³ During October Cromwell and the Army officers were having

1. Ibid., 499.

2. CJ.vi, 164.

3. Ibid., 178.

discussions with M.P.s;¹ almost certainly Vane, as one of the leading men in the House, would have been there, but there is no evidence on this. If the late November vote, in an unusually full parliament, for the new Council of State is an index to members' popularity at the time, Vane's stood high, though why St. John's and Rolle's should stand higher is hard to understand.² In that month Vane was almost continuously occupied with the navy finance and administration, and is only twice recorded to have interested himself in other subjects.³ Early in December the new navy commissioners were appointed, and he was immersed in naval matters until the end of March 1653.

On 6 January 1653, when Vane was working with great energy to strengthen the navy, and was in fact at Chatham, responsibility for the committee drawing up the 'new representative' bill was transferred from Carew, to whom it had earlier been assigned, to Major Harrison. Carew was Vane's fellow-commissioner for the navy, and like him was at Chatham - possibly this was the excuse for the change of convenor.

-
1. Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 584. The diurnalls show an awareness that there were dissensions among the politicians. See E 799(17) and (22).
 2. CJ.vii, 220. 24 Nov. 1652. Whitelocke had many friends, and obviously was popular. Reynolds spoke of St. John as a favourite of parliament, (Burton, iv, 297), but was referring to an incident early in the Long Parliament. From Clarendon's description of St. John one would not expect him to command a large following, but he may have obtained credit as a moderate. (See his letter to Cromwell, Nickolls, 26, and St. John's own account of his attitude at the time, op. cit.). But why Rolle?
 3. The treaty with Portugal, (CJ.vii, 223) and ex-lord mayor Gurney's fine. (Ibid., 214).

Both men would still have been entitled to attend the committee under the 'all that come, to have voice' rule, but both were working hard to supply the navy's needs, much of the time at Chatham, and cannot have had time to spare for the parliament bill. On 30 March however, with Blake's victory off Portland safely behind him, Vane had time to give to other matters, and was in the House when the bill 'for a new representative' was discussed¹ - the House had gone back, during the anxious days of the Dutch War, to debating this subject once a week only. When the House divided on the question of fixing a high property qualification (estate to the value of £200 a year) for the franchise, Vane and Bond were tellers for not putting the question.² Defeated on this, they were tellers in favour of this very restrictive franchise. Presumably Vane had guessed he would be defeated, in the very thin House,³ on the franchise clause, and hence his opposition to putting the question.

There are several indications that by 1650 Henry Marten was among Vane's political opponents. According to Mercurius Pragmaticus Marten defended and Vane attacked Lilburne at a Council of State

-
1. CJ.vii, 244. Abbott, Cromwell, 571, stated that Harrison replaced Vane in charge of the bill, but failed to notice the August committee. For Vane and Carew at Chatham, see below, p. 316 and Bodl. Rawl. A 227 f.9v. Harrison was absent from the Council for the whole of the second half of February (Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 619), and it seems unlikely therefore that he really took charge of the bill.
 2. CJ.vii, 273.
 3. For the numbers in the House at this time see Masson, Milton, iv, 398-99. Masson says that after Dec. 1652 a House of over 50 was a good one. 38 voted in this division.

meeting in March 1650.¹ Certainly Marten and Vane were tellers for opposite sides in divisions in Parliament in September and December 1650.² And when Parliament voted on the composition of the new Council of State in January 1650, though old Sir Henry Vane's name was one of the five at the top of the list in the secret ballot of the House, the nominations had to be confirmed by open voting, and in this old Sir Henry was rejected, and Marten was one of the tellers against him.³ This may well have been the occasion recounted by Aubrey on which Marten ridiculed the elder Vane in parliament; on no other name was there a division, so that some special attack must have been made on the old man. The quarrel between the Committee of the Navy (the financial committee), and what became known as the 'Merchants Committee' may have added fuel to the flames. The latter committee had been set up after the king's execution to purge the navy and the customs service of royalists, and to abolish useless offices in the two branches of government administration. A number of honest men, or 'good fellows', as John Hollond calls them, were appointed with the object, if Hollond is to be believed, of giving the Committee an appearance of impartiality. In fact, so Hollond says, the Committee members used their authority to give positions in

-
1. E 596(12). 19-26 Mar. 'No faith with Lilburne', cries young Vane.
 2. CJ.vi, 468. 17 Sept.; 511, 18 Dec. On the first occasion Vane wished to retain, and Marten to expunge, the word 'change' from Parliament's answer to a declaration by Charles II. But the word 'change' occurs five times in Parliament's statement, in different contexts; thus the issue on which Vane and Marten disagreed cannot now be discovered. E 613 (2), 20 Sept.
 3. CJ.vi, 369. Sir William Armysyn, Vane's friend, was one of the tellers for Vane senior. It will be remembered that the younger Vane himself did not escape a barbed comment from Marten.

the customs, which were profitable, to their friends and relations.¹ Such charges were freely bandied about in this period, but Parliament was evidently persuaded to take a critical view of the Committee of Merchants, for it abolished it on 23 April 1650. Marten was a member of the Merchants' Committee, but was not nominated to the Council of State Admiralty sub-committee until December 1651.²

After his return from Scotland in 1652 Vane clashed several times with Marten. On the first occasion the subject under discussion was the complicated one of the Holland Fen dispute. It is necessary briefly to outline this, as there is no account of it, except in numerous contemporary pamphlets. The earl of Lindsey had begun the drainage of the fen in the 1630s, and in 1641 the Fen-men had taken forcible possession of the lands already drained. Lindsey had sold part of his interest in the project to Sir William Killigrew, who appeared as spokesman for the undertakers in the 1640s and '50s and who wrote numerous pamphlets on their behalf. Killigrew wanted the restoration of the land seized by the commoners, and the completion of the whole project. The Fen-men repudiated the undertakers' title

-
1. Hollond, 117, 122, 120. (Oppenheim wrongly identified the Committee of the Navy (financial) with the Committee of Merchants. EHR.xi, 571. The nomenclature of the various navy committees is complicated, and often defeated even contemporaries. For the quarrel between the two committees see CJ.vi, 400, 401. Ap.1650). Marten owned a ship (the Marten, Bodl. Rawl. A 221, f.7v), had belonged to earlier admiralty committees, (BM.Add.9305 passim) and probably knew something of naval affairs.
 2. CSPD.1651-2, 46.

to the land, and wanted no more than a 'settlement' between themselves and Lindsey's group. A committee of parliament of which John Goodwin was chairman had sensibly recommended in 1649 that the parties to the dispute should come to a settlement, but the commoners had responded by offering to negotiate on the basis of their own admission to the scheme as undertakers. Killigrew indignantly refused - he and Lindsey had spent thousands of pounds already, he claimed, and the commoners would be receiving a share of the land which Lindsey and himself had paid to drain. Petitions, deputations and full debates at a large parliamentary committee during 1651 followed, but the bill drawn up on the lines desired by Killigrew was not brought in until April 1652 - it looks as though he had waited for Vane's return from Scotland. It is clear what Vane's policy was - support for Killigrew and the undertakers, who wanted to regain the drained lands and to continue with the project, as opposed to the Commoners, who wanted their title to the recovered land established, but no more drainage undertaken. Vane's position was weak however, for the Fen-men made great play with the fact that Killigrew, Lindsey and their partners had been active royalists, whereas the Fen-men had nearly all fought for Parliament. Vane was therefore roundly defeated, and Marten (who with Lilburne had been championing the Fen-men), was with John Goodwin authorised to bring in a bill merely 'settling' the fens already drained.¹ Whether Vane,

1. CJ.vii, 118. 9 April 1652.

when he acquired so much of Lindsey's other property acquired also his title to the drained fenlands, is not known, but it seems probable, though Killigrew never mentions Vane's name. Killigrew made a strong case for completing the project, but the Fen-men's arguments were also convincingly presented in the contemporary pamphlets, and Vane may have been moved either by private or public interest, or both. It is to be noted however that he was once more championing the less democratic side.¹

He was Marten's opponent on a number of other subjects. On 21 May 1652, for instance, Hesilrige and Marten wanted to continue a debate on the Irish settlement, while Vane was a teller against this.² Probably he was anxious to get on with the urgent navy business for that day, and did not want this delayed by a long and wearisome debate on religious toleration for Ireland. He prevailed, and the debate was postponed for ten days. On the day of the resumed debate Vane found himself in the same lobby as Marten, for both wanted religious toleration for Ireland, and the House accepted this bold policy.³ But on other matters they continued to differ - for instance over the transfer of the powers of the old Committee of Indemnity to the Goldsmiths' Hall Committee.⁴ On 19 June there was the clash mentioned above, in the Council of State, on the negotiations with Holland; the Council decided that a three-man committee, and not the

-
1. The 1649-52 phase of the Lindsey Level dispute can be followed chronologically in: BM.725c.37; 669 f.19(63); 545 k.21(10* and 10); 669 f.19 (59) and (62).
 2. CJ.vii, 134. Vane had returned to parliament on 14 May (ibid., 132). There was a good attendance (66) in the House on 21 May, so Vane's attitude cannot have been due to a desire to have a fuller House.
 3. Ibid., 137.
 4. CJ.vii, 144.

Committee for Foreign Affairs, which had been in charge of the negotiations, was to draw up the second answer to Pau, the Dutch envoy.¹ Vane had been the leading figure on the Foreign Affairs Committee in this matter,² but Marten, Bradshaw and Scot formed the new committee - Vane was pointedly excluded. At the critical debate in the House, five days later, Marten was one of the tellers against Vane.³

Vane was always on the alert to prevent political enemies of the Commonwealth from undermining its security. According to Pragmaticus, it was Vane and his father who moved for an act prohibiting royalists from staying within twenty miles of London.⁴ The Council of State instructed Vane in September 1650 to report to Parliament the Council's view that the residence in England of the wives of prominent royalists then abroad was dangerous.⁵ The attack on Barbados, for which he asked parliament for money in the same month, was said to be due to the desire to prevent royalists from seeking asylum there.⁶

The same ruthlessness to political opponents which Vane had shown to those involved in Waller's plot in 1643, and to Holles and his friends in 1646, was evinced again in 1651. The popular young presbyterian preacher, Christopher Love, was one of several ministers implicated in plotting a London rising, part of a nation-wide royalist

1. CSPD.1652-3, 298.

2. Ibid., 297.

3. CJ.vii, 145.

4. E 595(8). 12-19 Mar. 1650.

5. CSPD.1640, 352. 23 Sept.

6. C. Wilson, Profit and Power, 45.

plot. Love was deeply involved, but he was only thirty, his wife was expecting a child, and his trial was far from just.¹

In spite of these mitigating factors, Vane relentlessly opposed every attempt, in parliament and out, to save Love's life. When it was proposed that Love's case should be postponed, Vane was a teller against this.² Two days later, after Love had been condemned, petitions on Love's behalf poured into the House, and it was moved that the execution should be postponed for a month - Vane opposed this also. Love's sympathisers now suggested banishment, as an alternative to execution, but Vane, still inflexible, prevented this too.³ He had had a safe majority on each division, and wanted to have Love's fate settled beyond all doubt; he was therefore a teller for putting the motion that Love should be pardoned, for he knew it would be lost. Love's friends abandoned the struggle for the time being - they did not even call for a division, and the motion was negatived,⁴ though four days later, in the teeth of opposition from

-
1. Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 438, thinks the evidence against Love was flimsy, but this is not borne out by the contemporary pamphlets about the case. He did not deny that royalist meetings were held at his house, and in his sermon from the scaffold declared: 'I would not...be looked upon (now I am a dying man)... as a man owning this present Government'. E 790(1) Mr. Love's Case. See also E 790(2), A Short Plea for the Commonwealth, and E 790(5), A Vindication of Mr. Love. Love says that his envoy to Cromwell was arrested, and his letters to Cromwell seized. He prophesied that 'those who have gotten power into their hands by policy, and use it by cruelty, they will lose it with ignominy', and, in what must have been a warning to Vane, declared: 'I see men hunger after my flesh, and thirst after my blood, which will hasten my happiness and their ruine'. E 790(1).
 2. CJ.vi, 599. 9 July.
 3. Ibid., 603.
 4. Ibid.

Vane, they secured the reprieve of one month, after petitions from Love and his wife had been read.¹ Vane had twice written to Cromwell, warning him against any clemency to Love,² and in August the minister was executed. Neither the Commonwealth Government, nor Vane, can have enhanced their reputation by their attitude to this famous case.

The political rivalries and conflicting policies of the 1649-1653 period are difficult to elucidate. It is clear that Marten and Vane were at odds with one another, and probably Marten's support for the Leveller doctrines which he had championed for several years accounts for this. Certainly it would explain Vane's attitude to the Lindsey Fen dispute, and would be consonant with his support for a property franchise. There are hints also in the contemporary press that Vane was hostile to Lilburne. Vane did not however, in spite of Lilburne's attacks, pursue him vindictively, - Vane might have said, like Richelieu, that his enemies were those of the State. Though his father had been vehemently criticised in Lilburne's 1649 pamphlets,³ Vane was not present when Lilburne's case first came before the Council of State, and on succeeding days preferred to attend the Admiralty

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Nickolls, 84.
 3. Legall Fundamentall Liberties E 560(14), An impeachment of High Treason E 568(20).

2. See below, chap. vi.

3. Ol. vi, 50, 12 Dec. There must have been some ambiguity about the 1650 ordinance mentioned by Dr. Ashley. (Financial and Commercial History of the Protectorate, 1902, 63).

Committee and to other business rather than to hear Lilburne's case debated.¹ He was at odds with Hesilrige at this time, which is unexpected, but the Rhode Island dispute may account for this.²

Vane was determined to defend the Commonwealth against its enemies, both within and without. He was probably aware that the regime was insecurely based in the loyalties of the nation, and this would explain the ruthlessness with which he pursued Christopher Love. Probably he did not realise the odium he was thereby incurring, or perhaps his own popularity was not a matter of moment to him. In December 1651 when a parliamentary committee advised that only beer or ale brewed by common brewers or sold by inn-keepers should be excisable,³ Vane was one of the tellers against the proposal. It would have needed an army of officials to check on all the home-brewed beer in the country, and Vane was roundly defeated. If he cared about his own popularity, he would hardly have taken the attitude he did on this trivial matter.

During the 1649-53 period no other member of the Long Parliament took a leading part in so many aspects of government. Perhaps Marten

-
1. He was absent from the morning session of 19 Sept., though it is true that he attended in the afternoon. (S.P. 25/3). When Lilburne's case came up again on 20 and 22 Oct. Vane was not at the Council. He attended an Admiralty Committee meeting on the 20th, (S.P.18/3), and on the night of the 22nd Vane read to the Council of State the account of the nation's finances which he delivered to parliament on the 23rd, and which must have taken him considerable time to prepare. (CSPD.1649-50, 357. The MS (S.P.25/3) gives 'night'.
 2. See below, chap. viii.
 3. CJ.vi, 50. 12 Dec. There must have been some ambiguity about the 1650 ordinance mentioned by Dr. Ashley. (Financial and Commercial Policy of the Protectorate, 1962, 68).

comes nearest to Vane in this respect, but Marten was not interested in Scottish affairs or the colonies. Vane directed, or helped to direct, so many of the Council and Parliament's activities that he must have been the most important single member of the parliament. Planning with Roger Williams how to counter Hesilrige's schemes for Rhode Island, drafting the union with Scotland, directing relations with Portugal and Holland, probably with Spain also, giving unremitting attention to navy administration - it is again difficult to see how Vane accomplished all the work he did. With it went a multitude of minor tasks, uncompleted or too unimportant to consider here - such as meetings in connection with riots in York¹ or Kent,² and the early stages of the plan for co-ordinating all the revenue into one receipt,³ one of the Commonwealth's most urgent problems. Vane's prodigious industry always compels one's admiration.

1. CSPD.1649-50, 233. 16 July 1649.

2. Ibid., 172. The MS gives the information that Vane was to speak to Col. Sydney about the riots 'when he met the colonel'. S.P.25/2. 4 June 1649.

3. S.P.25/3; CJ.vi, 310.

Chap. vii. Vane and the Admiralty, (1649-53).

Part i. The Admiralty Committee member,

February 1649-December 1652.

The first indication that Vane had returned to his previous duties and interests after his absence from public affairs in December 1648 and January 1649 is his signature on a Navy Committee letter;¹ this was on the very day of the king's execution. He signed other navy orders on 10 and 14 February,² and it may be an indication of his concern for the navy that he appeared at the Council the day after Parliament had assigned to that body responsibility for the admiralty function of the navy³ - Vane arrived at the afternoon session, at which the vital matter of the command at sea was discussed, and much other naval business also.⁴ Professor Abbott however attributed Vane's attendance to the fact that Parliament had that day dispensed with the oath required by the Engagement.⁵ He was at once given important work to do for the navy. Jessop and Coytmore, the secretaries of the Admiralty Committee which had lapsed in May 1648, brought the old Committee's records with them, and Vane, Walton and Scott had the task of reading them, evidently to decide what powers should be given to the three newly appointed admirals.⁶

Henceforward Vane's arrival at the Council of State was generally,

-
1. Bodl. Rawl. A 224, f.8v. 30 Jan.
 2. *Ibid.*, ff.8v, 15v, 18.
 3. *CJ*.vi, 149. Warwick resigned as Lord High Admiral the same day.
 4. *CSPD*.1649-50, 13.
 5. Abbott, *op. cit.* ii, 19.
 6. See note 4, and S.P.25/1.

though not invariably, the signal for naval business to be discussed,¹ and it seems as though the Council was spurred into action for improving the navy as soon as he began to attend. Certainly Mercurius Pragmaticus, which in February 1649 was referring to the navy as 'Miles Corbet's fleet',² and in early April was asserting that Parliament had no ships ready to go to sea,³ was writing in mid-May as though it was Vane who was striving to produce a fleet to defend the Commonwealth.⁴ A spate of letters

-
1. E.g. Vane's arrival at the Council was followed by the discussion of navy affairs on 24, 26, 27 Feb. and on 1, 3, 6, 15, 26 and 27 Mar. X (CSPD.1649-50, passim) and (S.P.25/1 passim). Vane's appearance was not followed by the transaction of navy business on 2, 5, 7, 10 or 12 Mar. - there was very little navy business on either of these two last days, and Vane was meeting the commissioners of the navy on the 12th. On the 20th the Council dealt with three navy items before Vane appeared, but he may well have been preparing the report on the navy which he presented to the Commons next day. On 21 Mar. the Council discussed some naval affairs in Vane's absence, but he was in the House, making this most important report.
 2. E 545(15). 20-27 Feb. Corbet was one of the key members of the Navy and Customs Committee, and his name is often coupled with Greene's in the Diurnalls. The Admiralty Committee had lapsed when Warwick was appointed admiral in May 1648, Greene disappeared from public affairs at Pride's Purge, and Corbet and the Navy and Customs Committee took responsibility for naval matters generally for a few weeks. Corbet continued to report from the financial committee for some months after the Feb. Committee of Council was established. (CJ.vi, 161, (10 Mar.), 234 (16 June et al.)
 3. E 549(13). 27 Mar.-3 Ap.
 4. E 555(10). 7-14 May. 'Sir Henry Nave Junior (anagrammatised by the addition of K) hath reckoned without his host, how to keep 5 and 40 muffle boats afloat, man'd with 3000 turn-coat tarpaulings (if they can rake hel, and skim the baudy houses about Rosemary Lane and Ratcliffe high-way for them)...and Col. Walton, to forward the present expedition that's now adrift in the name of a Navy, hath stated their debts, which amount to more then all their necks are worth;...they have made a dew-trap of old jugling device...to double their monies...and then they shall have all that morgageable security of Deans and Chapters Lands for it'.

on naval matters began to be despatched from the Council after he made his appearance there,¹ and much naval business fell to him. More than one authority on this period has described him as the leading spirit on the Admiralty Committee,² but substantiation for this claim has been lacking, no doubt because the value of the Rawlinson MSS for this purpose has not been realised. An examination of this important aspect of Vane's career is overdue, and the following account, it is hoped, will go some way towards supplying this.

On 5 March 1649 Vane, Walton and two others were instructed to meet the navy commissioners on the following day about preparing eight ships for sea. They did so, and a letter from the Council the very next day instructed the commissioners to put carpenters to work.³ (Mercurius Pragmaticus had early notice of this activity, and reported that sailors were being pressed all the next week).⁴ But meanwhile the Council of State had evidently decided that it was a waste of time for the whole Council to debate navy affairs, and on 12 March took the important step of appointing Vane, Walton and Alderman Wilson as a committee of three to sit daily on admiralty

1. CSPD.1649-50, 14 seq.

2. S.R. Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, i, 25, noted that Vane was the leading spirit of the Admiralty Committee. J.R. Tanner, in his introduction to Hollond's 'Discourses of the Navy', (Navy Records Soc., 1896, intro.xix), called Vane the 'soul' of the Committee.

3. CSPD.1649-50, 28. S.P.25/2.

4. E 548(3). 13-20 Mar.

affairs.¹ The next day Vane brought or sent to the Council some propositions by John Hollond, the Navy Surveyor,² and it looks as though it was Vane who recommended Coytmore as secretary to the three-man Admiralty Committee, for Coytmore's appointment followed immediately after Vane's arrival at the afternoon session. A committee of three would hardly need two secretaries, and Jessop's appointment was terminated.³ On 21 March Vane on instructions from the Council gave a major report on the fleet's state of readiness to parliament. The new Admiralty Committee was well aware of the importance of incentives to the navy, and in this speech Vane dealt with an increase in naval officers' pay.⁴

He made another report on the navy two days later,⁵ and on the following day, when the House debated the important question of the new assessments, (on which the navy was largely to depend for financial support), Vane was in the chair at a Grand Committee,⁶ for the first time in his career. The Council of State did not sit that day - evidently the members' attendance at the Commons

-
1. CSPD.1649-50, 34. Coytmore evidently considered that this 3-man committee was a continuation of the old Admiralty Committee set up in 1645. Ibid., 346.
 2. According to the Council's minutes Vane did not attend the morning session (CSPD.1649-50, 36, and the original MS, S.P.25/2), yet a paper was brought in by him. Probably the clerk failed to note in his minutes the arrival of Vane. Item 19 began the afternoon session, when Vane arrived, probably for the second time that day, and is the record of Coytmore's appointment.
 3. He found employment with the Goldsmith's Hall Committee. See below for a suggested reason that the Council preferred Coytmore.
 4. CSPD.1649-50, 48.
 5. CJ.vi, 171.
 6. Ibid., 172.

was considered vital. On 27 March naval business again followed his arrival at the Council;¹ Walton came at the same time, and this happened so often as to indicate that both men were at the Admiralty Committee just before the Council met. At the end of March the Council took the decision to have five new ships built.² This meant finding ready money, and someone solved the problem by suggesting that the fines of the royalists who had taken part in the 1648 rising in South Wales, and which had been allocated to the army, should instead be handed over for the temporary use of the navy.³ Vane had come early that day, and it was he who was instructed to report to Parliament on the plan - probably therefore he suggested it. Parliament agreed, and that very same day Vane was reporting back to the Admiralty Committee of the Council on the matter⁴ - one more instance of his speed in administration. During the following week he was not at the Council - the Admiralty Committee was very busy, but there is no record of attendances there at this time.⁵ The Council despatched little navy business during that week,

1. CSPD.1649-50, 55-56.

2. Ibid., 59. Printed in the calendar as 'fire-ships' but the MS has 'five', and subsequent references confirm this reading.

3. CSPD.1649-50, 59; CJ.vi, 176. Cromwell intervened, and secured the return of the money to the army. Abbott, Cromwell, ii, 67. The later hostility between the two men may have had one of its roots in this kind of competition.

4. CSPD.1649-50, 51.

5. The committee met every day from 29 Mar. to 7 April, except on 1 and 2 April. Bodl. Rawl. A 224.

but when Vane returned to the Council on 7 April the second item on the agenda was a navy matter.¹ Meanwhile the Council had been concerned at intervals for some weeks with the act brought in by Corbet's Navy Committee, for the 'encouragement' of seamen, and the minutes for 14 April record a resolution: 'that the Gent. of this Counsel doe endeavour on Monday next to procure the reading of the act which is to be brought in by Sir Henry Vane concerning the amendment of the act for the encouragement of seamen'.² The Council members were evidently successful - Vane reported to the House on the subject on the 16th, and the amendments were passed next day.³

In one of his important speeches in March he had persuaded the House to maintain the summer fleet in service for eight months instead of the customary six,⁴ but on 23 April he reported some difficulties with the Commissioners of Customs over the money for the extra two

1. CSPD.1649-50, 74.
2. S.P.25/2. Deane, writing to the Speaker a few days later to press for the passing of this act, thought the act was in Vane's hands. J.B. Deane, Life of Richard Deane, 1870, 400-402.
3. CJ.vi, 187, 188. Vane's act differed from Corbet's only in the important particular that it provided financial rewards, and medals, for those who distinguished themselves in an action at sea. One tenth of the proceeds from captured enemy ships was to be set aside for this purpose. But Vane's act is a very long one, and must have taken some time to draft; he may have been working on it on 14 April, when he did not attend the Council meeting. Vane's act is in Acts and Ordinances, ii, 66-75, Corbet's Ibid., 9-13.
4. CJ.vi, 171, 23 Mar.

months, and the Council had to authorise letters of credit.¹

Vane, evidently feeling that not a day should be lost, instructed Coytmore, immediately the Council's order had been passed, to write to the navy commissioners for an estimate of what money would be needed to fit three of the four 'great ships' on which the carpenters had earlier been set to work.² Coytmore, in this letter to the commissioners, wrote, not for the last time, as though Vane himself constituted the whole Admiralty Committee, and made no mention of Walton or Wilson. Vane himself, on one occasion, seems to have treated the Council of State in the same off-hand fashion that he had used to the Committee of Both Kingdoms; on 26 April 1649 the Council discussed bringing the ship Swiftsure from Portsmouth to the Thames, but gave no instructions about providing the necessary

-
1. It looks as though the South Wales' royalists' £10,000 was to be used to provide for the seamen's pay, etc., but the customs were to provide the victuals. The Council minutes have: 'That the Committee of the Navy doe write to the Commissioners of the Customes to give letteres of Credit to such ports as the Generals of the Fleet shall desire, for the payment of money in lieu of two moneths provisions over and above the six moneths formerly ordered, according to the report made by Sir H. Vane to the Council, which likewise to bee sent unto them'. S.P.25/2. According to the minutes Vane was absent from the Council that day, but it seems from this that he was there.
 2. CSPD.1649-50, 107. 'I am desired by Sir Henry Vane to request you...' The navy commissioners at this period were also devoted and efficient (M. Oppenheim, A history of the administration of the royal navy 347), and Vane reported their estimate back to Parliament only three days later; the Council had already considered their figures, and on the 26th instructed Vane to inform Parliament of the importance of sending out the ships - he did so the same day. S.P.25/2. 26 April.

men and stores for the journey.¹ A letter was sent the next day, as from the Council, with such instructions,² though in fact the Council did not discuss these matters until 30 April.³ It is not certain that Vane had sent this letter, but it happened at the time that Pragmaticus was writing as though Vane were creating the navy, and probably he was responsible.

In early June 1649 he was away from the Council of State, and perhaps from parliament too, though he was nominated to Commons committees on 6 and 8 June.⁴ But a statement that he had been ordered to make to parliament on 29 May was not made until 11 June, thirteen days later,⁵ on which day he arrived late (with Walton again) at the Council of State; the last two items on that day were navy matters, and Vane's, Walton's and Colonel Jones' names appear just below them.⁶ On 22 June a letter reflecting the Council's pride in its achievement in putting such a great fleet to sea, went out to the three admirals.⁷ Vane was at the Council when it was decided that the letter should be sent, and it would be interesting to know who drafted it, for the masterly final letter is much superior to

1. CSPD.1649-50, 110.

2. S.P.25/2.

3. CSPD.1649-50, 119.

4. CJ.vi, 225.

5. Ibid., 228. (House's order to report, 219).

6. S.P.25/2.

7. CSPD.1649-50, 202-03.

the Council's brief outline.¹ The emphasis on finance - the Council doubted, understandably, whether the country would be able to shoulder a similar expense in future years - could well have come from Vane, and the description of 'our own forces at sea' as 'so many good ships...as have not formerly been set out in any one year',² is certainly a tribute to Vane's own efforts.

On 14 July Vane wrote to Colonel Deane, discussing navy finance with his usual authority.³ Deane passed Vane's letter to Popham, who thereupon wrote somewhat sharply of Vane's under-estimate of the fleet's financial requirements.⁴ But this did not prevent Vane from realising that Popham's judgement was to be relied upon in the matter of victualling the fleet off the Irish coast, and he wrote next day to the navy commissioners to have the previous estimate revised.⁵ The navy commissioners, having been rapped

1. The Council's instructions were: 'That a letter be written to the Generals at sea to let them know how much it concerns the State that the utmost improvement there may be of their present fleet... least if their fleet be not broken this summer they [the royalists] may prove very prejudiciall to trade. To desire them to doe what they can for that purpose but to leave the maner to them upon the place'. S.P.25/2. 21 June.
2. See note 7, above.
3. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 1899, 21.
4. Ibid.
5. That the letter, ostensibly from the Admiralty Committee (CSPD. 1649-50, 240), was actually from Vane, is shown by Coytmore's letter to Popham of 19 July (HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 22) - another instance of Vane's acting as though he were the whole Admiralty Committee. For Vane's belief in giving the men on the spot a free hand, see CSPD. 1649-50, 311, 319, 420, and below. He was also prompt in carrying out what they thought necessary - see Popham's letter to Vane requiring £3,000 to be sent him in specie, which the Council of State at once did. Ibid., 227, and HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 20.

over the knuckles, for the original mistake in the estimate was theirs, complained to Popham for reporting their error to the Council of State, and not first of all to themselves. Popham's reply is instructive. 'I only wrote a private letter to Sir Henry Vane, desiring his opinion, as a person best able to rectify a mistake in point of money...had I known you could have given me better satisfaction than Sir Henry Vane, I should not have applied to him'.¹

That Vane was having to 'manage' the Council of State itself in the interests of the fleet is clear from one of his letters to Popham - characteristically he replied on the day he received Popham's. 'If you and Col. Deane do not write to the Council of State,' Vane wrote, 'that care be taken to provide monies timely to pay off the mariners' wages against their coming in we shall be exceedingly to seek... [the Council of State] may be slow if they be not quickened by you'. Vane's shrewdness is shown in his last piece of advice to Popham. 'I pray let our winter guard be out and this summer's service first over before you mention the next summer's fleet, lest we be overwhelmed by the thought of charge before we be able to overcome it'.² Coytmore's letter already mentioned showed Vane's methods. 'Sir Henry Vane hath written to the Commissioners of the Navy to...make a new calculation of the number of men and what the charge for victualling them will amount for for two months,

1. CSPD.1649-50, 248. 25 July.
2. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 22.

whereby he may move the Council of State for a supply of money to what hath been already delivered forth'.¹

In August Coytmore was writing as though Vane were not merely the Admiralty Committee but could speak for the whole Council of State.² Ten days later the Navy Commissioners, who were reluctant to cut down the trees in the royal park at Theobalds, wrote to the Admiralty Committee about this; Coytmore replied: 'The Admiralty Committee had risen before yours came, but Sir Henry Vane wonders you should boggle in cutting elm timber in Theobalds Park, as you are empowered thereto by Parliament, and wishes you to go in hand with speed'.³ Vane did not wait to consult his two fellow-members about this, though the Admiralty Committee met next day, and he was present.⁴ Admittedly he was sure of his facts.⁵

Vane believed in taking an August holiday - as often before, he did not carry out his official duties for a few days in August and September 1649. He did not attend the Council of State from 25 August to 4 September; he ought perhaps to have been preparing his accounts as Treasurer of the Navy, for Parliament had called for them on 3 August,⁶ but as he did not present them for another fifteen months, evidently he did not allow this task to interrupt his holiday.

-
1. Ibid.
 2. CSPD.1649-50, 276.
 3. Ibid., 288. 23 Aug.
 4. Rawl. A 224, f.101v.
 5. CSPD.1649-50, 288.
 6. CJ.vi, 274.

He was back at the Council on 4 September, and immediately after his arrival the Council began to discuss navy matters.¹ He attended every meeting for several days, and on 8 September was nominated to two important and small financial committees.² On 12 September he did not attend, but he rebuked Colonel Popham in a letter for allowing Charles II to land in Jersey, and urged Popham to write to Parliament about the trial of sailors.³ Popham replied to Vane when he defended himself,⁴ evidently believing that this was equivalent to writing to the Council of State.

In the following weeks Coytmore continued to write not as from the Admiralty Committee, nor even from the Council, but from Vane. 'The Council of State', he wrote to Popham, 'is informed that the Unicorn has ridden in Stokes Bay these three weeks and done no service at all. Sir Henry Vane commanded me to acquaint you with it, and that you should send for her and employ her for the service of the State'.⁵ On 1 November Vane wrote to Popham in his own hand about a protest Popham had received concerning the capture of a French ship. Characteristically, Vane informed Popham that the Governor of Boulogne's protest was to be rejected on a technicality.⁶

1. S.P.25/2.

2. CSPD.1649-50, 302.

3. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 36-37.

4. Ibid., 37.

5. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 44. See also S.P.18/3, f.91.

6. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 49.

A letter from Coytmore shows that Vane could differ in opinion from the Council on occasion. Captain Penrose, of the ship Mary Rose, had been ordered by the Council of State to convoy merchant ships to Spain; he had made an excuse for not doing this, which the Council had accepted.¹ Vane however, did not 'take well' from Penrose the assertion that his ship was foul and in want of stores.² It is of interest in this connection that convoys had been difficult to obtain, and expensive, but in 1649 were supplied free of charge for the first time.³ Was this also Vane's work?

In November 1649 the Council of State took an important decision, behind which Vane's hand is almost certainly to be seen. The generals - at-sea had written that there was a great need for a winter guard for the coasts.⁴ On 14 November the Council, authorised by Parliament, entrusted the task of organising the guard to its Admiralty Committee.⁵ Vane had been present at the Council meeting, but he was absent from the next day's session. The Admiralty Committee met that day however,⁶ and on 16 November, when Vane again attended the Council, the important decision to build six new frigates was taken.⁷ The Council left it to the Admiralty Committee to decide

-
1. CSPD.1649-50, 321.
 2. HMC.,Leyborne-Popham MSS, 41.
 3. Hollond, 355.
 4. CSPD.1649-50, 364.
 5. CJ.vi, 32;: CSPD.1649-50, 391; S.P.25/3.
 6. CSPD.1649-50, 395.
 7. Ibid.,396; S.P.25/3. 16 Nov.

where and how the vessels should be built, and the Committee acted with its usual despatch, meeting that very same day, and promptly ordering the Petts to attend three days later.¹ This meeting with the Petts was on Friday, and on Saturday Vane attended both the Council and the Admiralty Committee.² He was, understandably, feeling the pressure of work, and on the Monday he made another attempt to get his brother Charles installed as deputy-treasurer of the navy.³ But again Charles Vane cannot have mastered the work, for in January 1650 he was sent off to Portugal as British Agent, and Hutchinson continued to be an important figure in the navy office.⁴

Vane was at Council of State meetings, and probably Admiralty Committees too, during the following days,⁵ and on his arrival at the Council on 27 November a number of navy matters were discussed.⁶ The problem of paying for the six new ships was a formidable one, and probably it was the Admiralty Committee which suggested selling old ships to pay for the new ones. It was Vane who was instructed

-
1. CSPD.1649-50, 396.
 2. Ibid., 397; S.P.25/3. 17 Nov.
 3. S.P.25/3. 19 Nov.
 4. See above, pp. 234-5.
 5. He attended the Council meetings on 20, 21 (when he came in with Walton, Cornelius Holland and two others), 22, 23, 24 Nov. S.P.25/3.
 6. He came in after item 6; items 7, 8, 9, and 10 were navy matters. S.P.25/3. 27 Nov.

to ask Parliament for the necessary authority.¹ On 29 November Coytmore wrote to the Petts: 'I have iust now received further commands from Sir Henry Vane and the Committee to desire you to spare your attendance till Saterdag next'.² On 30 November Vane was requested to report to the House Admiral Blake's letter announcing the surrender of Kinsale,³ and early in December the Admiralty Committee was very busy organising the building of the six new ships.⁴ Generally only when Vane attended the Council of State was navy business brought up; when he was absent navy matters were not dealt with.⁵

On one matter about this time Vane did not act with his usual speed. Coytmore wrote to Colonel Popham in September asking Popham to use his influence with Vane, Walton, and Popham's other friends, to secure Coytmore an adequate allowance,⁶ but it was two months later before the Admiralty Committee decided to recommend an increase

-
1. It is not clear from the Council minutes whether Vane reported from the Admiralty Committee the possibility of selling the old ships - he probably did - but quite clear that he was instructed to inform the House. S.P.25/2. 27 Nov.
 2. S.P.18/3, f.78.
 3. CSPD.1649-50, 413.
 4. Ibid., 409. 412, 421.
 5. On 3 Dec., when Vane was there, a number of navy items were discussed, but on 5 Dec., when he was absent, no navy business was considered. (Ibid., 421, 425-26). On 8 Dec. he came at item 5, when Admiralty matters began (S.P.25/3; CSPD.1649-50, 429-30). Though when Vane was away on 1 Dec. one or two navy items were discussed. (Ibid., 417). No important decision were taken however.
 6. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 37.

in its secretary's salary.¹ Coytmore does not give the impression of being particularly efficient, and was somewhat self-important² - the Admiralty Committee's 'drive' did not spring from him.

In the latter part of December 1649 Vane continued to attend the Admiralty Committee, though not always the Council of State - on 17 and 18 December for instance he was present at the Committee, though not at the Council meetings on those days.³ On 20 December he came in to the Council with a letter about the unauthorised felling of timber in the Forest of Dean, a matter which was of importance to the navy.⁴ During the rest of the month there was comparatively little navy business transacted in the Council, except that the accounts for the next summer's guard were presented to the House, and that was done by Walton, who had become the key figure on the Navy and Customs Committee.⁵ Walton in fact made an important contribution to the work of the Commonwealth navy,

-
1. CSPD.1649-50, 395. 15 Nov. The increase was confirmed by the Council of State about a month later. Ibid., 433, 434. Coytmore did not get the increase he had hoped for, £150 or £200, but only £50 p.a.
 2. Popham to Vane: 'It is not unusual for Mr. Coytmore to mistake 'winter' for 'summer' guard'. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 21. Deane complained that Coytmore was opening letters he had no authority to do, ibid., 24. Probably Coytmore had been retained as secretary rather than Jessop because Jessop was in the '30s very much Warwick's man, and had been the earl's secretary. After the Restoration Coytmore gave evidence against the regicides.
 3. S.P.18/3, f.101. (Letter signed by Vane). CSPD.1649-50, lxxvii-lxix.
 4. Vane came in at item 8, and items 9 and 10 are concerned with the timber. (S.P.25/2. 20 Dec.) Information about the incident had been sent to Vane (CSPD.1649-50, 464); and one can assume therefore that he raised it.
 5. Ibid., 451. CJ.vi, 339. 28 Dec.

and Vane did not carry the burden alone, either at this time or later. In the period March 1649 to February 1650 122 letters from the Admiralty Committee were signed by Vane, 91 by Walton, and 60 by Colonel John Jones,¹ and probably this roughly reflects the respective shares of responsibility shouldered by the three men.

In 1650, for an unknown reason, the clerk keeping the minute-book of the Admiralty Committee suddenly began to record, on 26 February, the names of those attending the meetings,² and this he continued to do until the series of volumes ends in August 1653. From these entries, as the accompanying table demonstrates,³ it is quite clear that Vane was the main-spring of this committee. The figures are most interesting, for Vane is shown to have attended 114 meetings for which attendances were recorded during the period 26 February-31 December 1650, and to have signed Admiralty Committee letters on 12 other days. Thus Vane's total attendances for the period, for he must have been at least briefly present on the days on which he signed letters, were 126. Dennis Bond attended at least 67 meetings of the committee, and, in addition, signed 10 letters; from August 1650 onwards his record of attendance is impressive.

1. CSPD.1649-50, xxii.

2. The minute-book for 23 Feb. 1649-19 Oct. 1650 is S.P.25/123. This MS is numbered by pages. For Oct. 1650-Aug. 1651 it is Rawl A 225 (Bodleian), for Aug. 1651-Nov. 1652 Rawl. A 226, and for Dec. 1652-Aug. 1653 Rawl. A 227. If there was any idea that a written record of attendances would encourage committee members to appear more regularly at the meetings, the Council were disappointed - the numbers attending did not increase. After 26 Feb. 1649 the clerk does not so often indicate who signed the Committee's letters.

3. App. A, 329-333.

The third highest attendance was Walton's, with 57 recorded attendances and letters signed on 8 other days. Challoner was nearly as reliable - the clerk records his presence at 42 meetings, and he signed letters on 16 other days. But the attendances of none of these last three compare with Vane's, and it is clear beyond doubt that he must have been the person on whom most of the committee work devolved.

The Council of State may indeed have thought either that the Admiralty Committee was too hard-worked, or that Vane had too much influence on it, for the Council decided that the Committee quorum was to be three (after March 1650¹), and not two, as in 1649; they also enlarged the new committee to eight members.² Incidentally, the standing order about the quorum was not taken too seriously - on two occasions when only Vane and Walton were present, they still proceeded to transact the business.³ The Committee was somewhat informal in another way also - in 1649 and 1650 Dennis Bond signed five letters, and attended another Committee meeting at least once before he was officially appointed to the Committee!⁴

1. S.P.25/123, 12. 2 Mar.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., pp.273(20 Mar.), 292(6 April).

4. He was added to the Committee on 9 April (Ibid., p.12). He had signed letters on 16 Jan., 17 Jan., 16 Feb. (3 letters), 22 Feb., 13 Mar., 3 April. (Ibid., pp.222, 223, 241, 248, 263, 289).

Obviously the work done by the Committee must have been largely Vane's, and individual items from the Committee's Letter-books only underline this. Thus on 7 January 1650 Walton and he came to the afternoon session of the Council of State together, and almost immediately the Council discussed a proposition from the Navy Commissioners for building the six new ships.¹ During this and the following months as so often before the Council of State transacted no naval business if he was away, but if he was present naval affairs were taken up immediately or soon after his arrival.² Sometimes, as in 1649, he

-
1. CSPD.1649-50, 470-472. The MS Order Book of the Council of State (S.P.18/3) shows that Vane arrived in the afternoon, with Walton.
 2. Any careful reading of S.P.18/3 (see note 1 above), CSPD.1649-50, and S.P.25/123 will confirm this. One may take as examples 26 Feb., when the act for the impressment of seamen was discussed just after Vane had come in, alone, or 1 Mar., when Admiralty business followed immediately after Vane's arrival. An actual instruction to Vane to report from the Committee to the Council, on a very important matter, is given in Bodl. Rawl. A 225, f.24v. 3 Dec.1650.

came in to the Council of State with one of his fellow-members of the Admiralty Committee, as though they had come together from the Committee.¹ On 8 April the Committee went to Woolwich to confer with the 'generals of the Fleet'.² On 27 April Vane wrote to Popham to hasten the Fleet's departure for Portugal, and incidentally to ask Popham to take care for the safety of Vane's brother Charles, the Commonwealth's envoy to that country.³ Meanwhile, the Council of State was much exercised about providing the necessary money for the Portuguese expedition, and Vane was ordered on 13 April to report to parliament the need for money.⁴ For once it was five days before he carried out his mission, but then it was in specific terms - that the army and navy should each have £50,000 out of the next £200,000 coming into the excise.⁵ But this was not enough, and on 15 May he reported to Parliament that it would be necessary to borrow £200,000 on the security of the customs, to which parliament agreed.⁶ It looks as though he was the Government's expert on defence expenditure.

-
1. See p.293, note 1 above - Walton had attended the Committee that day (S.P.25/123, 216-7). On 4 Mar. Vane came in with Purefoy (Ibid.,253. S.P.18/3). Many other examples could be given. On 11 Mar. he left the Council to attend an Admiralty Committee meeting - at least his arrival is twice recorded, and he came in the second time with Walton, who also had been at the Committee (S.P.25/123, 260). S.P.25/4.
 2. S.P.25/123, 292.
 3. HMC., Leyborne-Popham MSS, 72. Vane wrote that the Council of State would send instructions about this, and they did so two days later.
 4. CSPD.1650, 101.
 5. CJ.vi, 400.
 6. Ibid.,412.

Meanwhile, it was to him that Popham wrote with an account of faulty provisions and the poor condition of the Fleet.¹ General Deane, too, though he wrote to the Navy commissioners about the usual money compensation for Captain Penn's crews, whose provisions had been short, wrote to Vane to warn him that if this matter were neglected it might lead to mutiny, and to support Penn's claim that he was entitled to pay both as vice-admiral and as captain.² Penn received his money,³ whether the crews did or not. Vane was away from the Council many days in July and early August,⁴ though not from the Admiralty Committee,⁵ but on one occasion wrote to the Council about navy matters, for they sent his letter on to the navy commissioners.⁶ In August, though he had not himself attended the council that day,⁷ he was ordered to report to Parliament an encounter between one Captain Wyard and some royalist ships. Wyard had distinguished himself in the action and it must have been Vane who had written to the Council about the officer's gallant conduct. He must have done justice to Wyard's crew, for these were the first ordinary sailors in British history to receive medals for their services.⁸ On 13 August the Admiralty Committee order book for

-
1. CSPD.1650, 200. 12 June.
 2. Ibid., 209. 19 June.
 3. CSPD.1650, 237. 10 July.
 4. Ibid., Intro., xv-xli.
 5. S.P.25/123, 408 seq.
 6. CSPD.1650, 254. 26 July.
 7. Ibid., intro., xv-xli.
 8. Ibid., 277. 8 Aug. Wyard had beaten off a royalist attack when conveying ten Hull ships to London and Rotterdam. E 778(19). For the medals see Oppenheim, EHR. xi, 44.

once gives some indication of an actual debate at one of the meetings; the entry begins 'Debated at the Committee', and proceeds to list the subjects discussed: the number of ships to patrol Portuguese waters, how many were to be ready to support the army and how many to be convoys, and how many were to protect the East Anglian and Scottish coasts.¹ (Vane was present, as was usual.) On 17 August he and his fellow-member of the Admiralty Committee, Challoner, were instructed by the Council to confer about propositions on trade which Thomas Violet, the merchant and writer, and Boone, one of the navy commissioners, were to make.²

Three days later the Council instructed him to report to Parliament the list of officers for the winter Fleet and the necessity for passing a bill, concerning roads near the Tower, with which the Navy Office was much concerned.³ Coytmore wrote once more in September as though Vane were the whole Admiralty Committee,⁴ and a week later Vane reported to Parliament an estimate of the cost of the Fleet, from what is called in the Commons Journals the Committee of the Navy,⁵ and may have been so, for the Navy and Customs Committee

1. S.P.25/123, 429-430.

2. CSPD.1650, 292.

3. Ibid., 294, 297. For once Vane neglected his duty, for nothing appears in the Commons Journals about these roads until Challenor had been instructed to remind the House about them on 8 Oct. CSPD.1650, 375. CJ.vi, 486. Vane was, even for him, exceptionally busy in August 1650.

4. CSPD.1650, 328. 5 Sept.

5. CJ.vi, 467. He had made another report on Council instructions the day before, on naval matters.

continued to function¹ though, unfortunately, its minutes have not survived. He made another report to Parliament a few days later on the need for a supplementary estimate for the Fleet off Portugal² and, on the last day of September, Coytmore wrote to the Navy Commissioners to inform them that if they considered the ship Liberty should go to Lisbon, : 'Sir Henry Vane conceives it best to pay the men on board [i.e. not on shore] that you may preserve them together'.³ (Vane had no doubt foreseen that once the men had their pay in their hands on shore they would disappear to their homes or the ale-houses.) Deane had written to him that there was a great want of three or four 'nimble ketches' for the Scottish coast,⁴ thus showing that the generals-at-sea thought Vane was most likely to further their requests. The next day he received a letter from Popham,⁵ which he read to the Council, who instructed him to report it to Parliament. On 5 October, one Captain Wadsworth had come to the Admiralty Committee in person to complain that his men were mutinous. The Committee was probably not sitting that day, but Vane instructed Coytmore to write to the navy commissioners ordering them to deal

-
1. It is mentioned quite often in Bodl. Rawl. A 225. See also CSPD.1650, 326, where Col. Thomson, now its chairman, is mentioned, and page 299 below. The indications are that this committee met less often than the Admiralty Committee, had a more changeable membership, and dealt only with the authorisation of payments. S.P.46/102 contains many of these; they are signed by Thomson and several others, but not by Vane. As Treasurer of the Navy he acknowledged receipt of many of these payments (ibid., passim), and he could hardly have authorised payments to himself. He could however presumably have attended the committee's meetings.
 2. CJ.vi, 473. 26 Sept.
 3. CSPD.1650, 365.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid.

with the situation.¹ Deane came up for a conference in October² with the Committee - again one sees the system of personal consultation and consideration, in which the Committee, or more probably Vane, believed. He signed a number of the usual Admiralty Committee letters in November 1650,³ but was busy with a multitude of other, including personal, affairs, though he reported to Parliament on the situation in Portugal on 26 and 30 November,⁴ and on 10 December the Council appointed him to prompt Parliament to press on with the Trinity House bill which Vane, among his innumerable official duties, had found time to help draft.⁵

At the end of 1650, his long tenure of office as Treasurer of the Navy came to an end. The circumstances are interesting. On 27 June a petition from Vane, first brought in a week before, was read in Parliament.⁶ According to the diurnalls he stated that he was anxious that the profits of the Treasurer's office should redound to the State, and the office be put into a way of management, with the least charge.⁷ But he must also have asked that he should be

-
1. S.P.25/123, 489.
 2. Bodl. Rawl. A 225, f.7v. 30 Oct.
 3. Ibid., f.9v. seq.
 4. CJ.vii, 473. CSPD.1650, 448.
 5. CJ.vi, 465, and 183(30 May).
 6. Ibid., 427, 432. The petition is not in the House of Lords' MSS, and does not appear to be extant.
 7. E 777(27), Severall Proceedings in Parliament. A Perfect Diurnall. E 777(30) has almost the same wording. The Weekly Intelligencer is briefer, but states that Vane was 'sollicitous' that the profits should redound to the state (E 608(9)). The order about Vane's office was accompanied by a special committee to consider what offices were burdensome to the people - the two subjects were obviously connected.

awarded compensation for surrendering his office, for the Committee of the Navy (the financial Committee) instructed to consider how the office of Treasurer was to be managed in the future, was also to consider what compensation should be given to the petitioner. Colonel Thomson, its chairman, reported from the Navy Committee on 16 July - hardly with the 'all speed' which had been ordered. The Committee recommended that 'fit compensation' should be given Vane for the surrender of his right to the office and, 'in consideration of the profit to the State', £1,200 p.a. out of the Deans' and Chapters' lands should be paid him. The Committee also recommended that 'there shall be one fit and able person appointed Treasurer of the Navy...who...shall personally attend upon that employment; and be allowed, for the entertainment and salary of himself, his deputies and clerks, £1,000 p.a., which shall be in lieu of all salaries, fees and other profits, formerly belonging to the place of treasurer of the navy'.¹

The emphasis placed upon personally carrying out the duties indicates that, as we have seen, Vane's work as treasurer had been largely performed by his deputy. In view of Vane's innumerable other duties, it is hard to see what else could have been done. The act embodying the Committee's proposals was passed on 19 July.² (Incidentally, it is interesting to find that Vane was absent from the Council of

1. CJ.vi, 440.

2. Ibid., 444.

State from 1 July onwards,¹ though he attended the Admiralty Committee as usual,² and was in Parliament at least occasionally³ - was he canvassing support for his Navy Treasurership bill?).

On 10 October, three months after his resignation was first mooted, Parliament discussed the appointment of a new Treasurer, and Hutchinson was proposed; there was a division, Vane was one of the tellers for the Noes, and was defeated.⁴ On 18 October an act was brought in for 'removing obstructions in the sale of Dean and Chapters' lands',⁵ and eight days later the commissioners for the sale of these lands granted to Vane the manors of Cheddar and Chicknalls in Somerset, and much property, formerly belonging to

-
1. CSPD.1650, intro. xv-xli.
 2. S.P.25/123, 369 seq.
 3. CJ.vi, 438-440.
 4. Ibid., 482. Perhaps Vane was hoping that his brother Charles might still obtain the office. Charles Vane had been generously paid for his services as parliament's envoy to Portugal. He received £1,200 for his embassy before he left England, and £200 on his return. (CSPD.1650, 230, 580, 597; Ibid., 1649-50, 508). In November 1651 a sub-committee of the Admiralty Committee recommended the payment of £500 to Charles Vane for his services in Portugal. (Bodl. Rawl. A 226, ff.48, 49v.). Vane was not a member of the sub-committee. Charles Vane shortly afterwards bought from the trustees for the sale of Crown lands an estate at Chopwell, Northumberland which his family had formerly leased from the Crown. (Records of G.C. Durham, 358). He was already (1646) part-owner of a colliery in Durham. (Galloway, Annals of Coal Mining, 133).
 5. CJ.vi, 485. This was the very day that the act concerning the Navy Treasurership became law, and the two were connected. Vane was named first on the 'obstructions' committee.

Exeter cathedral, in Topsham, Devon. From the Close Roll¹ it appears that the lands were worth not the £1,200 that Parliament had granted Vane, but £1,864-8-5³₄d a year, though, in fairness to Vane and the commissioners, it may be supposed that in the circumstances of the time he might not be able to sell the lands for their ordinary market value.² He would know all about the amount of money available from the Deans' and Chapters' lands. As far back as March 1650 he, Sir Henry Mildmay and Heveningham had been appointed a committee by the Council of State to examine the receipts from this source,³ and he was one of those appointed in November to view the accounts of the surveyors of these lands.⁴

The Close Roll records the transfer of various Lincolnshire rectories by the earl of Lindsey to Vane and his fellow-M.P. Thomas Lister in November.⁵ A few days before, Vane had requested the Council of State to allow Lindsey to come to town, to enable him to effect a sale of his lands 'in which a very-well affected person

-
1. C 54/3550. 26 Oct.
 2. Dr. Thirsk quotes Clement Walker's allegation that Cromwell acquired lands worth 50% more than the grant Parliament allowed him (I.J. Thirsk, Sale of Delinquents' estates, Ph.D. thesis, London, 1950, 125).
 3. CSPD.1650, 37. 13 Mar.
 4. Ibid., 434. 19 Nov.
 5. C 54/3589. 18 Nov. The Goldsmiths Hall Committee had stipulated that Lindsey should settle the rectories on Vane and others. Armynt, a trustee for the earl's sisters, was a party to the transaction. Calendar of Committee for Compounding, ii, 503. For Lister see D.N.B.

is much concerned'.¹ This elliptical description refers to Vane himself; a chancery bill and answer records the sale of the manors of Belleau, Aby and Swaby, with other property in Lincolnshire, to Vane, for the sum of £8,500.² Four times after the first request the Council gave Lindsey permission to stay on in London, the last license being granted in February 1651.³ Vane shortly added local offices in Lincolnshire to his many other commitments - he became a militia commissioner and a J.P.⁴ and, by the end of January 1651, was a vice-admiral for the county.⁵

The state gained a considerable sum in replacing poundage by a fixed annual payment to the navy treasurer. Vane's accounts for 12 May 1649 to 31 December 1650⁶ show that he had drawn £8,253-14-6d as poundage, or some £4,949-4-0d per annum. In addition he had drawn over £1,000 porterage money, and allowances for his clerks etc. One may note that it required a man of strong mental fibre (which Hutchinson was not) to be Navy Treasurer at this period of the navy's history.

-
1. CSPD.1650, 565. 8 Nov.
 2. C10/9/93 (Chancery Bills and Answers). Lindsey was deeply in debt, and Vane wanted to make sure the property was not burdened with any mortgages etc. The fact that Vane's suit was not the beginning of a conventional law-suit is shown by the speed with which Lindsey replied to Vane's bill of complaint - normally the answer was presented weeks or even months later, but Lindsey's was returned the following day. For the chancery procedure, see W. Phillimore, Chancery Proceedings...temp. Charles I, 1889, i, preface. Lindsey later alleged that his property was much undervalued in the sale. (S.P.29/56/62). It will be noted that Vane's profits from his office from May 1649 to December 1650 are within £250 of the sum he paid Lindsey.
 3. CSPD.1650, 566, 23 Nov.; 567(2 Dec.); Ibid., 1651, 32(3 Feb.); 58(24 Feb.)
 4. Ibid., 1650, 479. 23 Dec.
 5. Bodl. Rawl. A 225, f.56v. One hopes that Vane had efficient deputies - Lincolnshire was a long way from London.
 6. E 351/2288.

He was probably an efficient civil servant, but no more. The corruption and inefficiency in the navy nearly drove him mad, and in spite of a large increase in the salary of £1,000 a year that Parliament had allowed him in 1650, in April 1653 he was piteously begging the admiralty committee to find a successor.¹

Vane still continued to be a constant attender at the Council of State Admiralty sub-committee, except when he was away from London. The Committee went on with its usual work - new ships were built, petitions were received, guns ordered, rewards assigned and victualling orders given.² The Committee was further enlarged in March 1651 to eleven³ and in July two more names were added.⁴ This may have prompted Vane's attempt in June of that year to wrest control of the navy from the Council of State. A bill was introduced in that month providing that the office and affairs of the Admiralty should be vested in commissioners and he was one of the tellers for it. To secure autonomy for the new commissioners, they and the navy commissioners were also to control all stores, magazines and provisions relating to the navy, so that the Ordnance officials would also lose authority. Vane and Bond wanted the bill brought in with despatch, and were therefore against sending it to a committee. But they lost, and the whole plan was abandoned, an act being quickly

-
1. CSPD.1652-3, 265. 7 April. He had actually been arrested in 1651. (CJ.vi, 547).
 2. Bodl. Rawl. A 225, 226, passim.
 3. Ibid., f.70.
 4. Ibid.

brought in to continue the Admiralty powers in the Council of State.¹ It is quite likely that Vane found the process of reporting back from the Admiralty sub-Committee to the Council of State, who then reported to Parliament, intolerably slow. He may also have found it irksome to work with a large committee, many of whom knew little or nothing of naval affairs, for in this way, the Council of State Committee was in marked contrast with the 1643-4 Committee of Navy and Customs, a number of whose members were merchants and ship-owners.² Vane's predominance on the later committee may be partly due to this change. Parliament's decision in May that orders by a committee should be signed by at least the quorum³ made little difference to the Admiralty Committee, for its letters were almost always signed by at least three members,

1. CJ.vi, 592. 26 June.
2. Of the March 1651 committee only Bond, Walton, Vane himself and Col. Thomson, if this is George Thomson, navy commissioner, which seems doubtful, had any considerable knowledge of naval matters. The 1643 Committee included the two Bences, Greene, Moyer and Vassall. Bodl. Rawl. A 221, passim.
3. CJ.vi, 569. 1 May. An attempt was made at the same time to prevent the authority of the Council of State from being exercised by a few members, but the House negatived the proposal that acts of the Council should be signed by at least five members. Later, however, when Vane was reporting to parliament in November about recording all payments of money in a book, opportunity was taken to insert a clause that all such payments, and warrants for imprisonment, must be signed by **five** Council members, (Ibid., 43). Vane alone signed one Admiralty Committee letter in May 1651, (Bodl. Rawl. A 225, f.127v.)

or sent on behalf of the Committee by its secretary, Coytmore.¹
 On rare occasions, in 1651 and 1652, as in 1650, men attended who were not members of the Committee, and even signed letters² - committees had proliferated so much that perhaps it was difficult to remember just which committees one belonged to.

Though he reported sometimes in 1651 from the Committee to the Council of State, he was not the only member to do so, and during that year Dennis Bond reported far more often than Vane.³ In August Bond alone, in spite of parliament's order of 2 May,⁴ ordered one warrant to be issued. In the same month the Council, evidently considering that the planned reduction in the army should be paralleled by a similar reduction in the fleet, ordered the Admiralty Committee to consider how the 'great charge' of the navy could be lessened,⁵ and the Committee, in a letter signed first by Vane, did order Deane, off the Scottish coast, to reduce his squadron, but no further effort at economy was made, and in view of the worsening relations with Holland, could hardly have been. In March 1651, an entry in the Committee's order-book again shows who was regarded as the leading member of the

-
1. Bodl. Rawl. A 225, passim.
 2. Sir Henry Mildmay, not a member of the committee (see p.303, note 3). signed a committee letter on 21 May, Ibid., f.114. Alderman Pennington attended as a Committee member on 6 Sept.1652, but was not added to the committee until the next day. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.191, 192.
 3. Vane reported six times to Bond's twenty. Bodl. Rawl. A 225, passim.
 4. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.2v. 9 Aug.
 5. Ibid., f.8v. 27 Aug.

Committee: 'Dr. Walker returned his report according to the Committee's order yesterday. The Committee not sitting, it was sent into the Council to Sir Henry Vane'.¹ Similarly, Popham, off Dunkirk, wrote to Vane about his position and Vane passed on the information to the Council.²

Vane's absence in Scotland, from Christmas Day 1651 to the beginning of 1652, accounts for his failure to attend the Admiralty Committee during this period, though, as already noted, he appeared at the Committee the day before he reported the Scottish settlement to parliament.³ Just over a week later, while still working on the act of Union, he re-appeared at the Committee,⁴ and attended regularly until 16 April, when he was not present.⁵ After that date he did not attend the Committee until 12 May, but from then onwards attended regularly for some weeks.⁶ From 30 June however until 10 September 1652 Vane withdrew from the Committee,⁷ as from parliament; this unusually long absence has been discussed above.⁸

The months of March-May 1652 were important ones for the navy; on 25 March an 'extraordinary' meeting of the Admiralty Committee was held, attended by several Council members who were not normally

-
1. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.2v. 9 Aug.
 2. CSED.1651, 254, 16 June.
 3. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.98v. 15 Mar.
 4. Ibid., f.104. 23 Mar.
 5. Ibid., f.104-121v.
 6. Ibid., f.121v-132, 132-160.
 7. Ibid., f.160-194v.
 8. p.257 seq.

members of that Committee. The main subject was the provision of guns for the whole fleet.¹ In May the clerk sometimes forgot to record the names of those attending the Admiralty Committee, but whenever he did inscribe the names, Vane's is one.² This was the time of Blake's first encounter with Tromp in the Downs, and in the Committee some important decisions were taken to hire forty merchant ships, for example, and to offer suitable financial inducements to captains of Commonwealth ships who remained on board their vessels when they reached port instead of decamping as soon as they could.³ It was Vane who reported to parliament the decision to hire the merchant ships, the Council's approval having been first obtained, and requested parliament to allocate the necessary money. He gave an account of the battle in the Downs, and presented information about this from Cromwell and Bond, who were now at Dover.⁴ He reported, and probably drafted, the account of the battle which was released for the Press.⁵ For several weeks he was occupied with the crucial diplomatic problems, and then came his long absence from public affairs.

By 9 September Vane was back in London, and attending a meeting of the Council.⁶ Next day he resumed his regular attendance at the Admiralty Committee.⁷ There is no evidence that he was back

-
1. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.105v.
 2. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.132 seq. 12 May onwards.
 3. Ibid., f.138v. 24 May.
 4. CJ. vii, 135. 25 May.
 5. Ibid., 139. 5 June.
 6. CSPD. 1651-2, 328.
 7. Bodl. Rawl. A 226 f.194v.

in parliament however until 28 September, when he reported on naval matters from the Council. An important speech was made that day by some member of the House; parliament's approval was asked for the building of the quite unprecedented number of thirty new frigates.¹ Evidently the government had decided that the fleet should not be so dependent on the hired merchant ships - probably these were not of the new design which had first appeared in the '30s. It is significant that the decision to build this great number of ships was taken in the fortnight or so after Vane's re-appearance at the Council table. The Commons Journals are even more uninformative at this period than they are for the years 1647-49 - the clerk was deliberately filling his pages with unimportant material² - and it is nowhere stated who put the plan before parliament; it may well have been Vane. He now also returned to the attack on the administration of the navy. At the end of July, after Vane had gone, Salwey had reported on two matters with which Vane had been connected, one of which was consideration of the 'executive part' of the navy.³ On 30 September Salwey was deputed by the Council of State to urge parliament to resume discussion on the re-organisation of the admiralty,⁴ and went down to the House

-
1. CJ.vii, 186.
 2. See e.g. ibid., 179-182.
 3. Ibid., 159. 27 July.
 4. CSPD.1651-2, 424.

next day to do so. There was a division on whether the Committee of the Navy should be allowed to nominate M.P.s among the special admiralty commissioners now to be appointed if the new plan was adopted, and Vane was a teller against.¹ He was perhaps hoping that, as in the case of the Self-Denying Ordinance, he himself would be excepted. Or perhaps he thought that the loss of himself as a commissioner would be a small price to pay for purging the administration of the navy from the amateurs who strolled in to the meetings of the Council of State Admiralty sub-committee.² He was defeated, however. The Navy Committee was instructed to report the bill in a week's time, but it did not do so.³

Early in October Vane, Dixwell and Lisle went down to Blake at Dover to confer with him about the Council's dispositions for the fleet.⁴ (This was just before the Kentish Knock battle). Their instructions were prepared by the Council's Foreign Affairs Committee, a large committee, of which Vane was also a member.⁵ On 4 November

-
1. CJ.viii, 188. The Treasury Commissioners were not to be M.P.s. These proposed Admiralty Commissioners are not to be confused with the Navy Commissioners, Willoughby, Bourne and others.
 2. Such as Lord Grey (Bodl. Rawl. A 225, f.100v. et al.), Hesilrige (ibid., f.114v.)
 3. Presumably this is the financial committee of Navy and Customs, though again this is by no means certain. Its warrant was signed by Thomson, Walton, a Popham, Aldwort and Boone in Jan. 1651. (S.P.46/102 f.219). In Sept.1652 its warrant was signed by Sir J. Danvers, Gilbert Millington, James Nelthorpe, Nathaniel Hollowe and Algernon Sydney. (Ibid., f.241). The first committee might be expected to make a wise choice of special commissioners for the navy, the second not.
 4. CSPD.1651-2, 430. 5 Oct.
 5. Ibid., 67.

the Council ordered Vane to report to the House a letter from Blake,¹ who was expecting another encounter with the Dutch, and the Council's dispositions for the ships, which Vane did straight away the same day.² The papers were returned to him, presumably when the Clerk had copied them. The House adjourned next day from Friday 5 November to the Tuesday, obviously to give those concerned time to consider the financial problem. Colonel Thomson had reported from the Navy and Customs Committee on the navy's debts and financial needs.

On the Tuesday 9 November Vane presented to Parliament a lucid account of the receipts from the sale of delinquents' and Bishops' lands and from the Excise. The document occupies nearly one and a half pages in the Journals³ and Vane had expounded it to the Council of State the day before,⁴ so presumably he and others had been working hard over the weekend. It is interesting that this duty fell to Vane's lot, for one would have imagined that one of the more frequent attenders at the Committee for Navy and Customs would do it, but it was evidently thought that as the account concerned

1. Ibid., 473.

2. CJ. vii, 210. According to the Council of State's order-book, (see note 1 above), he should have reported on the navy's financial needs also, but Thomson did this. He was the most active member of the navy and customs committee in 1650 and 1651 (S.P. 46/102, ff. 219, 223, 226, 220, 235), and he and Vane may have decided it was more appropriate for Thomson to deal with this subject. Thomson figures in Pepys' diary as a self-styled navy expert.

3. CJ. vii, 210-212. 9 Nov.

4. CSPD. 1651-2, 482.

so many different departments of state, Vane would be the best person for the task. He secured the approval of the House for using the money in hand from delinquents' estates for the immediate use of the navy, and next day the House also agreed to the proposal that the purchasers of Bishops' lands should be compelled to pay what they owed - they were in default to the tune of over £15,000.¹ He was energetically procuring money for the fleet, but the Commons' long weekend - it rose on Fridays until Tuesdays at this period - was an obstacle to a quick settlement, and though he was twice a teller in favour of the House's sitting temporarily on Saturdays and Mondays, Parliament would not agree to do this.² On the same day he reported back to the Council from its Admiralty sub-committee on the size of the squadron to defend the Straits,³ the vital area if Tromp decided on a winter campaign. On 23 November he sustained another defeat; the House again voted that the Admiralty powers should be settled in the Council of State, though it did take authority over convoys from the Committee of Navy and Customs and transfer it to the Council.⁴ Obviously convoys in war-time would have to be correlated to general naval strategy. But the special naval commissioners whom Vane had wanted were still not authorised.

1. CJ.vii, 212.

2. Ibid., 214. 11 Nov.

3. Bodl. Rawl. A 226, f.241, 11 Nov.

4. Ibid., 219.

On 2 December Vane was named first to the Admiralty sub-committee (this time of twelve members) of the Council of State.¹

Only two days later this committee was superseded by another; the Dungeness defeat had accomplished what Vane and Oliver had long

Part ii. The Admiralty Commissioner, December 1652-April 1653.

failed to do, and the House decided to reconstitute a committee to organise the provision of ships for the navy, and the necessary supplies.² The bill was rushed through the House on 10 December.

It was laid down that there should be four K.P.s on the committee (two were not to be members of the Council of State - an interesting provision), the three generals of the fleet, (Blake, Brouncker and Brouncker), and two other men who were not K.P.s.

No writer on the naval history of this period has noted this change in naval administration, and the significance of it was this committee to which Vane's biographer refers referred to as declared: 'In this war, after some months' delay, the immediate care of the fleet was entrusted to a committee which were appointed by the parliament to attend to the navy, amongst which asserted, the [Vane] amongst the [Vane] and [Vane] of that successful fleet that did our best in a very important battle, the Hollander captured [sic] upon the [sic] and [sic] of [sic].'

1. O.S.D., 1652-3, 2.

2. *Ibid.*, 27.

3. *Ibid.*, 27.

4. Blake was certainly not a general officer, the rank of which serving most of the time.

On 2 December Vane was named first to the Admiralty sub-committee (this time of twelve members) of the Council of State.¹ Only two days later this committee was superseded by another; the Dungeness defeat had accomplished what Vane and Salwey had long failed to do, and the House decided to establish a small committee to organise the provision of ships for the navy, and the necessary supplies.² The bill was rushed through the House on 10 December.³ It was laid down that there should be four M.P.s on the committee (two were not to be members of the Council of State - an interesting provision), the three generals of the fleet, (Blake, Deane and Monk), and two other men who were not M.P.s.

No writer on the naval history of this period has noted this change in naval administration, and its significance, but it was this committee to which Vane's biographer Sikes referred when he declared: 'In this war, after some dubious fights, (while the immediate care of the fleet was in other hands) he with five others⁴ were appointed by the parliament to attend that affaire. Hereupon', Sikes asserted, 'he [Vane] became the happy and speedy contriver of that successful fleet that did our work in a very critical season, when the Hollander vapoured [sic] upon our seas, took prizes at pleasure,

1. CSPD.1652-3, 2.

2. CJ.vii, 225.

3. Ibid., 228.

4. Sikes was omitting the three generals-at-sea, who were on active service most of the time.

hovered about our ports, and were ready to spoil all.'¹ Vane had long wanted such a committee; naturally parliament nominated him as one of the members. Probably a number of people in touch with naval matters would have echoed the sentiments of Robert Coytmore, who wrote to Blackborne, the new commissioners' secretary: 'I believe the honourable Commissioners and yourself have your hands full to bring the affairs of the navy into order.' He ended on a warning note - 'All is expected from you'.²

From the first the new commissioners' letter-book gives a different impression from that of the Council's Admiralty sub-committee.³ Five of the commissioners⁴ wrote to Blake on 17 December, three days after the act came into force, clearly setting out their plans. 'We...are preparing...inducements and encouragements to seamen cheerfully to engage in their service. We are also taking care how victuals may be provided for the next year's service...seeing the fleet well officered that is now in preparation...we think it requisite to have a meeting and conference with yourself, and to

-
1. Sikes, *Life*, 96.
 2. S.P.46/114, f.66.
 3. Roger Williams noticed the religious enthusiasm of the committee. 'The mightywar with the Dutch...hath made the Parliament set Sir Henry Vane and two or three more as commissioners to manage the war, which they have done, with much engaging the name of God with them'. Knowles, 258.
 4. Vane and Salwey were the Council members, George Thomson and John Carew the M.P.s, Langley the only other acting member, apart from the generals-at-sea when they were available.

that end doe (God willing) resolve to make our repaire down to you either on ship board or some convenient place ashore'.¹

The last sentence sets the keynote of their policy, and is underlined by letters a few days later, in which the new commissioners told Blake they were glad he approved the way of 'consulting personally with you',² and that they desired 'in this as in all particulars that concern the service to have frequent and mutual correspondence with you in all freedom for the good of the service'.³ Already they had been busy on a new act for the 'encouragement of seamen',⁴ raising their wages and prize-money and taking particular care for the sick and wounded. Next they turned to the Ordinances for War, and on this Vane once more clashed with Marten.⁵

At the end of the month the commissioners assured Blake they were doing their utmost that 'provisions and necessaries may be speeded to you'.⁶ (The very friendly and pious tone which marks many of their letters is quite unlike those from the old Admiralty sub-committee of the Council of State.) They had been anxious to go down to Blake at

1. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.1.

2. Ibid., f.2v. 23 Dec.

3. Ibid., f.2v-3.

4. The Council appointed Vane to put this matter before parliament, but actually Whitelocke did so. CSPD.1652-3, 39. CJ.vii, 231.

5. CJ.vii, 235. 24 Dec. Art. xxiv, over which Vane and Marten differed, is given in Gardiner, Letters and Papers relating to the First Dutch War, Navy Records Soc., 1906, iii, 298, but there is no indication of the cause of the disagreement. These articles were the first codification of naval law. W.M. Clowes, Royal Navy, 1898, ii, 98-101.

6. Rawl. A 227, f.3v. 27 Dec.

Portsmouth ever since they had been appointed,¹ but had been detained by the necessity of seeing through parliament the 'encouragement to seamen' act, the ordinances of war, and the measures for supplying the fleet with money. On 29 December, however, they wrote that they hoped to leave on 3 January and ended their letter by piously congratulating themselves on the good relations mutually prevailing.² On the principle of trusting God and keeping your powder dry, a letter of the same day accedes to Commissioner Pett's request that the ship-wrights should be allowed to work on Sundays.³

By 4 January 1653 the special commissioners were at Chatham, instructing Hutchinson to send down £12,000 in their coaches, which they had sent back to London for the purpose.⁴ They reported to the Council of State that they found the seamen 'in some distempers, calling for their pay, being many months due to them'.⁵ But they did not pay the sailors all their due, for the men would promptly have gone home, but kept back two months' pay and disbursed the rest on ship-board, and then only after the ships had been put into condition.⁶ The commissioners decided that political agitation was behind the sailors' discontent -

-
1. Ibid., f.1.
 2. Ibid., f.4v.
 3. Ibid., f.5.
 4. Ibid., f.6.
 5. Ibid., f.7v.
 6. Ibid. 10v-11.

the men were mutinous 'upon pretence of their pay, but in truth desirous upon the receiving of their money to get out of the service at present, set on as may be suspected by malignant spirits dis-affected to parliament'.

On 8 January they were back at Whitehall; it was a Saturday, but they were at work, sending Blake intelligence.¹ A week later they were telling him that in view of the news from Holland he would understand 'what great concernment it is to the State to have a fleet speedily at sea to intercept the return of Tromp'². The usual work of victualling and providing other supplies went on, and on the 26th they were back at Chatham again, conferring with Blake (arriving inopportunately on a day of prayer),³ appointing new clerks of the Cheque⁴ and writing urgent letters to the Treasury Commissioners representing the need for money.⁵ The lighthouse keepers, who had been instructed to confuse the Dutch by changing their lights, were ordered to restore them to their old positions now that the English fleet was putting to sea.⁶ The Commissioners informed the Council of State that they were sending one or more of their number to consult with the Council about the command of the fleet. The commissioners would arrive at 8 or 9 p.m. - if that was too late

1. Ibid.,f.12.

2. Ibid.,f.14. 15 Jan.

3. Ibid.,f.20. 27 Jan.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.,f.23. The navy treasurer's agents, they wrote, 'dare hardly show their faces, or keep in the office'.

6. Ibid.,f.24.

for the Council, could an early morning meeting be arranged?¹

Salwey was sent to London, and did a magnificent job, finding men for the fleet, and what was nearly as important, clothes and beds for them.²

The other commissioners went on board the flagship, to 'hasten their putting to sea', at Queenborough,³ and then back at Chatham wrote at midnight to Blake, telling him the good news that one thousand soldiers from Cromwell's and Ingoldsby's regiments were coming to the fleet, the Irish and Scottish Committee having this in hand.⁴

The Generals-at-sea were anxious about the proportion of sailors to landmen, and the commissioners replied: 'As soon as we received your letter the last night we ordered your desires put in execution concerning the proportion of land soldiers unto each ship in the list you sent up'.⁵ They wrote to Blake to tell him that Tromp intended to convey the merchant ships home before the English fleet could get out of port, and therefore urged him to put to sea.⁶

On the morning following their midnight letter of Friday to the generals they left for London,⁷ having first written to Blake.⁸ They

1. Ibid., f.22. All three generals were eager to take part in the expedition against Tromp.

2. Ibid., f.26v-27.

3. Ibid., 26-26v. 3 Feb.

4. Ibid., 27v.

5. Ibid., 28-28v, 4 Feb.

6. Ibid., f.7v, 2 Feb.

7. Ibid., f.29.

8. Ibid., f.28.

reported to the Council that afternoon.¹ Later that evening they wrote again to the Generals, commenting with asperity that they had met on their way to London one Captain Harris, 'distempered in drink' and they had moved the Council of State to dismiss him.² They had written to Parliament the same day from Chatham. Vane signed every single letter, but so did Langley and Carew, and Salwey when he was not 'on mission'.⁴

When parliament met after the weekend, on Tuesday, Vane reported on the state of the fleet, and on what the commissioners had been doing. The House evidently appreciated, as well it might, how great had been his efforts, and those of his fellow-commissioners, the navy commissioners, and the ship-wrights, and warm thanks were given to them all.⁵ The five commissioners wrote the same day to the Generals, despatching the votes of thanks, and asking how the commissioners could be kept in touch with the fleet at sea.⁶ They also wrote on the same day to the navy commissioners, instructing them to obtain £400 on imprest from Hutchinson for the sick and wounded; Vane had been deputed by the Council of State to ask parliament to provide money for this need - he had evidently spoken of it at the Saturday afternoon meeting.⁷

-
1. Ibid., f.29v. The clerk failed to enter all the letters on the proper day at this time - doubtless the pressure of business was too great.
 2. Ibid., f.29.
 3. Ibid., f.29v.
 4. Ibid., passim.
 5. CJ.vii, 256. 8 Feb.
 6. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.29v.
 7. Ibid., f.30; CSPD.1652-3, 154.

The correspondence continued in full spate all through February, giving a vivid picture of the industry and efficiency of the new commissioners. One sees them finding officers, ('men fearing God, faithful to the State'), for a Dutch prize, arranging means of keeping in touch with the generals-at-sea, sending them news of Tromp's whereabouts, enquiring why ships assigned to the fleet have not yet arrived, ordering ammunition to be brought from Hull¹ - a ceaseless stream of letters poured out of the Navy Office. Obviously the same five men, Vane, Carew, Salwey, Thomson and Langley, were working night and day.² Between 18 and 20 February the two-days battle off Portland was fought, and a moving letter from General Deane was sent, not to the Admiralty commissioners in general, but to Vane, appealing to him to take steps to assist the families of the dead and wounded.³ The admiralty commissioners wrote straight away to the generals-at-sea to reassure them on this head,⁴ and at the same time to navy commissioner Willoughby at Portsmouth,⁵ with

1. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, ff.35v. 36v, 33v, 37v.

2. One letter of 14 Feb. has 'Sat. night' by the date.

3. S.P.46/114, f.123. 'I know your affection to the poor widows of the seamen now slaine...is such that you need neither provocation nor anie remembrance, yet fearing lest multitude of business may prevent the speedy settling thereof, I have therefore presumed to offer to your thoughts whether a present order of parliament to the effect following may not be necessary'. n.d. but the letters below are obviously answers to it.

4. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.40v-41. 20 Feb.

5. Ibid., f.41.

17. Ibid., f.41. Dr. Whistler was sent to Blake not, as Dodson (Robert Blake, 1937, 126) says, at the instance of the navy commissioners, but at the suggestion of Vane and his fellow admiralty commissioners.

full instructions on this matter. The next day was a Monday, and parliament was not sitting, but when it met on Tuesday, Vane delivered an account of the battle.¹ While he was in the Commons the other three signed letters,² but he returned later in the day.³ Next day they wrote that refitting the fleet would be an 'extraordinary difficulty',⁴ nevertheless they set to work to do so, instructing mayors of port towns to obtain seamen,⁵ and trying to obtain ordnance,⁶ but not relaxing their care for the sick and wounded.⁷ The large numbers of Dutch prisoners had also to be dealt with.⁸

On 1 March the commissioners hurried down to Portsmouth,⁹ to see the situation there for themselves, reporting back to London the almost overwhelming needs of the fleet, and doing much other work besides.¹⁰ They left four days later, writing en route to London, at Guildford, to the Council of State about sending another physician to Blake.¹¹ On Tuesday 8 March Vane was present at the

-
1. CJ.vii, 261. The Council of State had ordered him to do so the same day. CSPD.1652-3, 177.
 2. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.42-42v.
 3. Ibid., and f.43.
 4. Ibid., f.44.
 5. Ibid., f.46. 26 Feb.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Ibid., f.46v. Ibid. 47-47v. 2 Mar.
 8. Ibid., f.47.
 9. Ibid., f.48, 50.
 10. Ibid., ff.48v-49v.
 11. Ibid., f.50. Dr. Whistler was sent to Blake not, as Beadon (Robert Blake, 1935, 186) says, at the instance of the navy commissioners, but at the suggestion of Vane and his fellow admiralty commissioners.

the Council of State, when the Council sanctioned resolutions jointly agreed upon at Portsmouth between the Generals and the four Admiralty commissioners.¹ During the following days, the old tasks of obtaining ordnance, men and provisions were carried on, and careful scrutiny was made of the list of officers drawn up by Deane and Monk.² The need for crews was desperate, and a new act for pressing seamen was rushed through parliament in one day,³ giving the pressmasters and others wider powers. The commissioners now had to see that the act was put into force,⁴ but fish for the fleet, appointments of ship's officers, and the investigation of the burning of the 'Fairfax' figured almost as largely in their correspondence.⁵ At last they found time to express their appreciation of the beer with which a kindly army colonel had supplied them when they were at Portsmouth more than a fortnight before, and a hogshead of French wine (together with the two empty hogsheads and a hamper of bottles) were despatched to him.⁶ On 24 March Vane was not with his fellow-commissioners,⁷ doubtless **because** peace overtures from Holland and Zeeland were being discussed in the House,⁸ but he was back next day.⁹ The work of

-
1. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.52v.
 2. Ibid., f.50-56.
 3. CJ.vii, 269. 18 Mar.
 4. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.56v.
 5. Ibid., ff.57, 57v, 58.
 6. Ibid., f.59. 23 Mar.
 7. Ibid., ff.59v, 60.
 8. CJ.vii, 271.
 9. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.60v-61.

supplying the fleet and transmitting intelligence went on; some days were more difficult than others, for instance, when the captains of the hired merchant ships would not accept the terms offered them.¹

The Dutch now planned an attack on England's vulnerable point - the Newcastle coal-trade. Penn's fleet was ordered to join Lawson's as convoy for the coal-ships, and on 7 April the commissioners went down to Gravesend to hasten the preparations of the hired merchant ships which were to be part of Penn's fleet.² After what was doubtless an exhausting day, Vane and his fellow-commissioners were roused between 3 and 4 a.m. by Fielder and Scott, who had been sent down by the Council of State with intelligence from Scarborough and the Low Countries, and with instructions to consult with the four commissioners. There was 'debate' on all this, and by 7 a.m. a messenger was on his way to Penn.³ The instructions now sent to Penn could not have been phrased in more general terms - he was to use the best means he could 'being upon the place' to secure or

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Ibid., f.64. 6 April.
 3. Ibid., ff.65, 65v.

rescue the colliers; Penn, if he ever received the letter, must have been mystified as to why it had been sent, for of course he knew what his objective was. The four commissioners now dictated a letter whose tone is strongly reminiscent of Vane's sarcastic remarks on other occasions and merits quotation. 'My Lords', said the commissioners, 'Colonel Fielder and Mr. Scot were with us this morning between three and four of the clocke and have communicated unto us your lordships' instructions...whereupon we immediately in obedience to your commands sent the letter enclosed to Vice-admiral Penn, that he may be losing no time till he shall receive your lordships' orders in so weighty and important a juncture as this is, more particularly to guide him than we find ourselves able to give him, who have heard nothing of the posture of his fleet since our coming to this place. We have desired Sir Henry Vane, one of our number, to attend the Council in company of Mr. Scot and Col. Fielder, as well to represent to them the state of affairs here in reference to the ships that are to go out of the river, as to offer to the Council such things as are necessary for the fitting them with men, which is their great want.'¹ Vane carried with him to Whitehall a memorandum four of whose points are connected solely with the manning and officering of the fleet. The fifth, however, reflects the irritation which had shown itself in

1. Ibid., f. 65v.

He did not stay in London, for he was back at Gravesend next the letter, for he was to 'represent to the Council that we find that the giving of orders to the fleet when at sea is a great hindrance to us in the speedy setting forth of the ships in the service, which is the executive part of the navy, wherewith we are entrusted'.¹ It is clear that the commissioners wanted to leave naval tactics to the man-on-the-spot, having provided him with the means of carrying them out, while the Council of State, on the other hand, thought it should have a hand in these important decisions. Significantly it was Vane who was sent to argue with the Council. Later that day the commissioners still at Gravesend wrote to Vane at Whitehall to tell him that Penn had left Margate before the messenger arrived that morning, so: 'although we doubt not but the Council have sent their orders before this comes to your hands, yet lest any neglect might lie upon us, we presently despatched away the messenger in a ketch, which we hope if the wind hold will be at Sole before tomorrow night'.² The Council of State record³ is completely colourless, and tells us nothing of the lively interview that must have taken place between Vane and the Council.

-
1. Ibid., f.66.
 2. Ibid., f.66v.
 3. CSPD.1652-3, 268.

He did not stay in London, for he was back at Gravesend next day.¹ He must have returned to London, however, on that day, a Saturday, or on the Sunday, for on Monday he and three other commissioners were at the Navy Office, whence a very sharp letter to Cromwell himself was despatched.² Cromwell had been asked on 1 April to order that the men of Ingoldsby's regiment who were to join the fleet should be despatched to Portsmouth,³ and later the men from his own regiment had also been sent. He was now tartly informed that his soldiers had been accompanied by no officers and that no clothes or bedding had been provided for them. He was requested to give orders that those soldiers who had already gone and those who might be sent later, should be properly supplied.

Next day the commissioners wrote to the generals of the fleet explaining the reason for their personal visits to the ports, 'We finding by experience,' they regretfully admitted, 'that the captains are slow enough in their preparations, unless they be under a continual inspection.'⁴ Navy pay, fish and other victuals, intelligence, congratulations to navy commissioner Nehemiah Bourne, are the subjects of letters in the following week.⁵ The last letter signed by Vane is

-
1. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.66v. 9 April.
 2. Ibid., f.67. 11 April.
 3. Ibid., f.62. It may be significant that he had to be asked to do this.
 4. Ibid., 67v. 12 April.
 5. Ibid., 68-69v.

dated 18 April; the 19th was a Sunday. On the 20th Cromwell dissolved the Rump, and Vane's long official connection with the navy was ended for several years. On 22 April Salwey and Langley wrote to Blake, Deane and Monk. Deane had written wondering whether anyone at this time worried about the fleet, and the two commissioners replied: 'Sir Henry Vane being gone to the country, and Col. Thomson being not at present with us, and Mr. Langley being ill, who yet we expect suddenly with us, we are necessitated to despatch this to you from ourselves,¹ to let you know that through God's assistance care will be continued for your encouragement and furtherance in the present service'.² Later that day Thomson re-appeared,³ Langley returned after a brief absence,⁴ and the work went on as before, though perhaps not with quite the same energy.⁵

The re-organisation of the navy which took place in the critical five months December 1652-April 1653 was clearly the work of the special commissioners for the Admiralty and Navy appointed in December 1652. It depended on a careful survey and mobilisation of resources of manpower and materials, a keen appreciation of the paramount importance

-
1. They were not a quorum, which required three members, of whom one must be an M.P. CJ.vii, 228.
 2. A briefer version is in CSPD.1652-3, 289. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.70 gives the letter in full.
 3. Ibid., f.70-71.
 4. Ibid., f.71v. 25 April.
 5. Ibid., f.72 seq. The four months before Vane's dismissal occupy 70 folios in Bodl. Rawl. A 227, the four months after his dismissal only 56.

of finance, and, as its foundation, personal consultation with the commanders, and personal supervision of the work in the ports and dockyards. The replacement of the clumsy Admiralty committee of the Council of State by a more workable group of five or six knowledgeable commissioners made the task easier, and was partly at least due to Vane. The successive phases of Civil War and Commonwealth administration of the State navy become clearer when the extant records of its committees are examined, and so does the factual basis for the claim often made, but not substantiated, that Vane was an able administrator.¹ It is hardly possible to doubt that the devotion and energies of the commissioners of the Admiralty and Navy, who were given a fairly free hand in December 1652, were largely responsible for the later English victories in the first Dutch War, and that among these men Vane held the premier place.

and this has not been counted as a Committee meeting. The 'possible attendances' figure indicates the number of meetings for which the names of those attending are available, usually through the clerk's record of attenders, but occasionally, where the clerk forgot this duty, through signatures to letters, as given in the other-book.

For 17 December 1652 onwards the record of all the eight Admiralty commissioners is given; for the previous period the attendance only

of those who appeared more frequently at the Committee; there were

1. E.g. M. Ashley, Greatness of Oliver Cromwell, 1958, 137.

App. A.

Analysis of attendances at Admiralty Committee, 23 Feb. 1650 to
20 April 1653. (From S.P.25/123, Bodl. Rawl. A 225, 226, 227).

Note. The period covered by the table is that during which the clerk entered the attendances of the members. In most months however there were two or three days on which the clerk forgot to enter the names of those attending the Committee's meeting, and it occasionally happens that no signatures for letters are given for that day either. The figures in brackets indicate the probable number of committee meetings during the month; where the order book records only one warrant or an unimportant letter of a routine nature, it is assumed that the Committee clerk, or a Committee member calling at the office for a short time, despatched the business, and this has not been counted as a Committee meeting. The 'possible attendances' figure indicates the number of meetings for which the names of those attending are available, usually through the clerk's record of attenders, but occasionally, where the clerk forgot this duty, through signatures to letters, as given in the order-book.

For 17 December 1652 onwards the record of all the eight Admiralty commissioners is given; for the previous period the attendance only of those who appeared more frequently at the Committee; there were many who attended occasionally.

YEAR. 1650.

Month.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Possible attendances.	2	21	16	13	6	10	14	7	14	16	14
	(2)	(21)	(18)	(16)	(10)	(17)	(16)	(15)	(21)	(19)	(17)
Vane	2	19	16	11	6	9	14	7	14	14	14
Bond		1	5 ¹	5	3	5	11	5	11	12	13
Walton		20	16	1 ²	6	5	0	0	9 ³	8	2
Purefoy	2	10 ⁴	0	0	3	9	8	1	2	8	5
Challoner		9	8	5	4	5	7	4	8	5	4

1. Added to the Committee.
2. Absent until 20th.
3. Absent until 30th.
4. Absent after 16th.

YEAR. 1651.

<u>Month</u>	<u>Jan.</u>	<u>Feb.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug.</u>	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>Oct.</u>	<u>Nov.</u>	<u>Dec.</u>
Possible attendances.	20	10	12	13	15	16	16	12	9	12	12	10
	(21)	(10)	(13)	(19)	(18)	(20)	(22)	(14)	(9)	(13)	(13)	(11)
Vane	16	9	12	13	6 ¹	14	10	8	9	12	9	6
Bond	9	7	12	9	15	15	14	9	8	9	6	9
Walton	6	4	9	7	3	0	0	1	0	2 ²	8	8
Purefoy	9	6	0	0	3 ³	0	0	4	5	9	1	7
Challoner	11	3	8	3	11	4	3	6	3	2	2	6
Trevor			2 ⁴	8	7	8	11	7	5	2	5	0 ⁵

1. Absent after 17th.
2. Returns on 27th.
3. Returns on 27th.
4. Added to the Committee.
5. Not re-nominated to the Committee.

YEAR 1652 to 26 Nov.

<u>Month.</u>	<u>Jan.</u>	<u>Feb.</u>	<u>Mar.</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Aug.</u>	<u>Sept.</u>	<u>Oct.</u>	<u>Nov.</u>	<u>Dec.</u>
Possible attendances.	10 (10)	11 (12)	16 (17)	12 (15)	10 (11)	7 (7)	12 (14)	10 (10)	11 (11)	11 (12)	9 (9)	(0)
Vane	0 ¹	0 ¹	8 ²	6 ³	6	6	0	0	8	9	7	
Bond	8	11	12	10	6	2	11	3 ⁴	0	7 ⁵	6	No meetings recorded. Committee probably superseded.
Blake	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Challenor	3	4	6	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	1	
Dixwell					1	5 ⁶	3	0	9	9	5	
Marten ⁷	4	3	1	1	4	3	1	2	3	0	1	
Morley ⁷	6	0	8	7	7	7	5	0	5	0	4	
Neville ⁷	6	4	6	5	5	3	8	5	4	5	1	
Purefoy	4	5	3	0	0	1	8	4	7	9	3	
Walton	0	8	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	

1. In Scotland.
2. Returned on 15th.
3. Absent after 14th.
4. Absent after 11th.
5. Returned on 11th.
6. Added to Committee.
7. Nominated to Committee in Dec. 1651.

YEAR 1652, Dec. 17, to 18 April 1653.

Month 17-31.Dec. Jan. Feb. Mar. April.

Possible attendances.	6	18	22	19	11
attendances.	(6)	(18)	(22)	(19)	(11)
Vane	6	18	22	17	10
Carew	6	15	22	18	11
Langley	2	15	15	9	8
Salwey	4	16	15	16	5
Thomson	5	18	22	14	9
Blake	0	3	1	0	0
Deane	0	4	1	2	0
Monk	5	0	0	1	0

(Cromwell attended once in Feb. 1652, once in April, and once in Nov. of that year).

chap.viii. Religious policy, 1640-1653.

Though he was appointed to one or two committees on church matters in the first two months of the Long Parliament,¹ Vane did not play a leading role in religious affairs as early as in naval policy. For instance he was not a member of the important Committee of Twenty-Four set up on 10 November to frame a 'Declaration of the State of the Kingdom'² (the genesis of the Grand Remonstrance), though the declaration was clearly to cover ecclesiastical as well as political grievances. By early February 1641, however, the House had a higher opinion of him; when the London petition on episcopacy was discussed, and referred to the Committee of Twenty-Four, six members were added to the Committee, and Vane was one.³ Shaw is doubtless right in interpreting this as an attempt by the anti-episcopal members to strengthen their hand.⁴ Dering was one of the tellers for the opposition to the six, which makes his later acceptance of the Root and Branch bill from the hands of Vane, Hesilrige and Cromwell all the more strange. On 26 February 1641 the House showed Vane's growing importance by appointing him, though two others were proposed, to carry a request to the Lords for a conference on the articles to be presented in the impeachment of archbishop Laud,⁵ though there is no record of a speech from Vane on this subject. Even now he was not an inevitable member of committees on religious subjects.⁶

1. CJ.ii, 24, 52, 54.

2. Ibid., 25.

3. Ibid., 81.

4. Shaw, i, 42.

5. CJ.ii, 93, Notestein, D'Ewes, 412.

6. E.g. CJ.ii, 72, 84, 128.

On 27 May 1641 the Root and Branch bill was put forward by Dering, in circumstances which he described. The fact that the bill was thrust into Dering's hands by Hesilrige, Vane and Cromwell rests on Dering's evidence alone,¹ but it is difficult to believe that he would have fabricated such a story, and put it into print. The incident reveals something of Vane's position at the time - neither he, Hesilrige nor Cromwell carried enough weight in the House to present a bill; Dering did. It also shows that the three men were acting thus early in collaboration. Dering's purpose was to use the bill as a lever to force the Lords to give way and allow the exclusion of the bishops from secular jurisdiction.² He does not indicate that Vane, Cromwell and Hesilrige had any such similar moderate intention. It must be remembered that Dering's book was hotly attacked in the House, and he was censured for it.³ Presumably Hesilrige, Vane and Cromwell did not accept Dering's version of events. Incidentally Sir Christopher Wray, Vane's father-in-law, was one of the tellers for those who wished to censure Dering, and it was Cromwell who moved that the book should be burnt, which was done.⁴

1. E 197.

2. A. Everitt, Kent and its Gentry, 1640-60, Ph.D. thesis, London, 1957, 111-2; Shaw, i, 79.

3. Harl.162, f.366, 2 Feb.1642.

4. Ibid., f.366v. In the valuable thesis above mentioned Dr. Everitt quotes Dering as asserting that the Kent petition for Root and Branch abolition of episcopacy was founded on a copy sent down from London (ut sup., 108-9). Was this also organised by the promoters of the Root and Branch bill? The opportunity for Dering's presentation of the bill was provided by a petition from Lincolnshire presented by Sir Edward Ayscough (CJ.ii, 159), who was Sir Christopher Wray's brother-in-law. Dering says that the petition was a 'fair invitement' to him to 'issue forth the bill then in my hand'. Shaw, op. cit.

A printed separate of a speech on 11 June 1641, during the debates on the Root and Branch bill, was published, as Vane's,¹ and has been accepted by all his modern biographers,² but there is no record of the delivery of the speech,³ and it seems highly doubtful whether Vane ever made it. As printed this lucid carefully arranged speech, with its very telling arguments, is certainly a very able attack on episcopacy. It is understandable that Vane, or one of his friends, should want it printed.

Early in June 1641 he was for the first time a member of a 'directing' committee, apart from committees on naval affairs, and this was a committee on religious policy.⁴ On 21 June he brought in his important amendment to the Root and Branch bill - 'some of the clergie and some of the laitie' were 'to exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in everie shire for a time'.⁵ The proposal was a revolutionary one - D'Ewes' first note, later erased, called it 'a new government of the church' - but the house adopted it on 12 July in an even more radical

1. E 198(2). If spoken at all the speech must have been delivered on 12 June, for it reminded its hearers that the day before the House had voted episcopacy to be an impediment to the perfect reformation and growth of religion. This resolution was passed on 11 June (CJ.ii,173). Shaw assigns Vane's speech to 12 June, presumably for this reason. Shaw, i, 86.
2. E.g. Hosmer, 142; Willcocks, 104-5; Ireland, 160.
3. It is not in D'Ewes (Harl.163 f.306), nor in Peyton's diary. All Vane's longer speeches seem, like this one, to have an extremely logical arrangement which is covertly or overtly mathematical. He marshals his arguments under numbered headings, and it is easy to see that he had financial ability.
4. CJ.ii, 165.
5. Harl.163, f.337.

form under which all the commissioners would be laymen.¹

His resentment against the bishops showed itself without disguise in August of that year when he moved that the House might 'fall upon the impeachment of the Bishoppes to give their offence a name or stile.'² The impeachment of the bishops had so far spoken only of 'oppression of the Clergy of this realm, and other his majesty's subjects, and in contempt of the king, and laws of this Kingdom'.³ Pelham, his fellow-member for Hull, followed immediately after Vane, in a way which gives a strong impression of pre-arrangement, to declare that 'They that did anything that is against the prerogative of the King...the rights of parliament...is treason, which he conceived that this is'. To impeach the bishops on a charge of treason would have been to endanger their lives; the presumption is that Vane would have been willing to go thus far. Serjeant Wyld argued strongly for making the charge one of Praemunire, but the House was evidently unwilling to categorise its charges against the bishops more precisely than it had done, and when the matter was brought up again in October the House declined to name the bishops' offence, or to fix a day for discussing the subject.⁴ There was also a proviso that if the matter were brought up again it must be after 10 a.m. - perhaps Pelham and those who thought like him tried to take advantage of a half-empty house.

-
1. Ibid., f.393v. There is a discrepancy here between the Commons Journals, which indicate the passing of the clause on 10 July. (CJ.ii,205) and D'Ewes. But the Journals reference to 'commissioners to be named in this act' may perhaps have been defined on 12 July.
 2. Harl.164, f.8. 8 Aug. Shaw does not deal with this incident.
 3. CJ.ii, 235.
 4. Ibid.,295.

In September, on information from Pelham, the House decided to ask for a conference with the Lords concerning the prevention of 'superstitious innovations', and Vane was the Commons' messenger.¹ A few weeks later he spoke in favour of sequestering the votes in the Lords of the bishops who had been impeached; Cromwell seconded him on this occasion.² He was one of the committee who were to prepare for a conference with the Upper House on this bill,³ and was the House's messenger to the Lords.⁴ On 20 November, when the Commons had decided that certain named papists should be arrested⁵ (an aftermath of the Irish rebellion), he moved that their names should be sent to the Lords, so that the Lords' concurrence in the arrests should be obtained, and was again sent as the messenger to the Upper House.⁶

For light on Vane's part in the Grand Remonstrance we turn to the Commons Journals. In February 1641 he was added to the original November committee for drafting a declaration,⁷ but the enlarged committee did nothing, and on 23 July it was ordered to draft a remonstrance and present it to the House four days later.⁸ On that day the House was occupied with many important matters - army estimates,

-
1. Harl.164, f.98.
 2. Coates, D'Ewes, 40.
 3. CJ.ii, 295.
 4. Ibid., 296. 27 Oct.
 5. Coates, D'Ewes, 177.
 6. Ibid.
 7. See above, p.335.
 8. CJ.ii, 221.

the Root and Branch bill, and others - and no remonstrance appeared.¹ By 3 August the plan had changed; a committee of eight, including Pym, Hampden and Vane, were to bring in, by Friday 6 August 'peremptorily', the remonstrances 'of the State of the Kingdom and of the Church'² - two separate documents were projected. But still the documents were not presented to the House; on 12 August, four of the original eight members were ordered to bring in two days later the remonstrance concerning the State, and two others, Fiennes and Vane, that concerning the Church.³ The committee again failed to carry out its instructions, and on 14 August were ordered to bring in the Remonstrances, though only with 'all convenient speed'.⁴ After the recess it had been decided to revert to the original plan for one remonstrance; on 25 October it was ordered that the 'Declaration concerning the State of the Kingdom', be presented to the House on 29 October.⁵ This was done, and throughout November the debates went on with a single document under discussion. Godfrey Davies noted that clauses 181-204, nearly all of which deal with church matters, are, according to internal evidence, by a different hand;⁶ presumably these formed Fiennes and Vane's remonstrance, incorporated with Pym's. Strangely enough, Vane is not reported to have taken any part in the debates on the Remonstrance,⁷ as one would certainly expect him to have done.

1. Ibid., 225-6.

2. Ibid., 234.

3. Ibid., 253.

4. Ibid., 257.

5. Ibid., 294.

6. Early Stuarts, Oxford, 1938, 117.

7. Coates, D'Ewes, 185.

In 1642 and for most of the following year he did not speak again on religious subjects, save for requests for lecturers to be appointed at St. Martin's, and the church at Isleworth, and these may have had a political purpose - there were a number of such requests at the time, and the sermons were probably needed to enlist support for Parliament's cause.¹ The Irish rebellion, the attempted arrest of the Five Members, and many other political problems, were diverting members' minds from purely religious questions, and it is not surprising that Vane ceased to devote so much time in parliament to these subjects. He had not always carried the House with him; the Root and Branch bill was dropped, the treason charge against the bishops was rejected. He had shown himself a very able speaker however, and there are indications, in the Root and Branch bill episode and the impeachment of the bishops, that he was concerting his policy with other members.

The Solemn League and Covenant is an important episode in connection with the development of Vane's religious view. When in the summer of 1643 Parliament's fortunes were at a low ebb, and it was decided to invite the help of the Scots, it was natural that he should be sent.² The House evidently considered that he was skilled

-
1. Harl.162, f.385v. 15 Feb. f.390v. 18 Feb. There were several such petitions - Pym presented one from Andover (Ibid., f.392v.) Vane's nominee was Thomas Case, for whose London connections see Pearl, London, 232.
 2. CJ.iii,132. There is no satisfactory account of the Solemn League and Covenant, its genesis and importance.

in finding the right phrase or word, and must have realised that in this negotiation many discordant interests would have to be reconciled. Moreover he was Pym's friend, and it was Pym who had urged the policy of inviting Scots help.¹ According to Clarendon Vane was chiefly responsible for the negotiations with the Scots though three others were joined with him.² Clarendon, though contemptuous of Vane's duplicity, had a high opinion of his intelligence - 'in all matters without the verge of religion...inferior to that of few men'.³ According to Clarendon Vane altered many expressions in the Covenant, until he 'made them doubtful enough to bear many interpretations'.⁴ Ludlow, as is well known, asserted that Vane was responsible for inserting the phrases which enabled England to avoid the Presbyterian system.⁵ Vane, he says, 'found an expedient, by adding...to the second [clause] - 'according to the word of God".⁶

Though there is no direct proof that Vane dominated the negotiations, it is probably true; none of the other emissaries of Parliament who accompanied him were so prominent, and Clarendon very likely heard

-
1. Harl.164, f.381, 1 May 1643. The suggestion may well have been made before - a pamphlet of 28 Ap. urged the Scots to help the Parliamentarians. E 99(31). The Venetian ambassador had written in Mar. that the King's opponents counted on help from Scotland CSPV.1641-2, 257.
 2. See below, note 4.
 3. Clarendon, Rebellion, xvi, 88.
 4. Ibid., vii, 266, 274.
 5. Ludlow, i, 65.
 6. The words with which Ludlow credits Vane in the 'first clause', 'in preservation of the laws of the land, and liberty of the subject', are not in the Solemn League and Covenant at all. The others are part of the first main section, on religion. Gardiner, Constitutional Documents, 267-271.

what was being said in London - there was a great deal of coming and going between Oxford and the capital.¹ In a contemporary pamphlet which included various documents concerning the Solemn League and Covenant, one account of the negotiations mentioned Vane alone among the English delegates,² and he is said to have brought up to London the figures concerning the Scots army.³ The same pamphlet printed a letter from Edinburgh in which 'the truly worthie and right worshippful Sir Henry Vane' was the only lay commissioner mentioned.⁴

His responsibility, however, for the words which could relieve Parliament from the necessity of introducing presbyterianism cannot be proved. The Solemn League and Covenant met with strenuous opposition in England - this is evident from the pains taken by numerous preachers to answer the many cogent objections.⁵ A Royalist writer at once noted that the oath to the Covenant was 'capable of a million of interpretations, as when they swear to promote the reformation of the Church of England, according to the Word of God, and the best Reformed Churches'.⁶ He also commented upon the gulf between swearing to maintain the presbyterian discipline in Scotland, and the words

-
1. See e.g. A royal declaration repealing all licences for bringing goods from London, BM.669 f.7(59).
 2. E 74(5) p. 23.
 3. Ibid., p. 26.
 4. Ibid., Marshall is only 'truly zealous'.
 5. E 78(4), E 72(12), E 71(13), 1208(1), Marshall's was by far the best sermon.
 6. E 73(1). (Thomason's date 26 Oct.1643), p.11.

used concerning a religious reformation in England.¹ 'But here', he wrote, 'you may see the crafty dealing of these men, that had the framing and contriving of this covenant. They knew well enough with whom they had to do...the Scots on the one side, much wooed and courted by them...the various sectaries and disagreeing humorists on the other side. These must both be pleased'.² The writer however had only the internal evidence of the Solemn League and Covenant to work upon - there is no indication that he had other reasons to suspect the English negotiators of double-dealing. Clarendon believed that Vane was already, in the late summer and autumn of 1643, an enemy of presbyterianism. On the other hand, his one reported speech of any length on religious matters, that of June 1641, would not be incompatible with presbyterian sympathies, and the information which he gave the House in October 1643 of the Scottish penalties imposed on those who would not accept the Covenant, facts which he surely could have withheld had he not wished England to follow the Scottish example, support that view. But there are serious objections to it. In the 1630s as governor of

-
1. Ibid., p.12 ... if they do not like it [the Scottish Discipline] why durst they not sweare to introduce it here?'
 2. Ibid., p.13. The whole pamphlet is able and penetrating. See e.g. p.15, 'not a word of the Law in the whole oath. You may see by that how they meane to governe', and the extraordinary prophecy, 'Tis too cleere the purpose is to leave the people at liberty, to kill the King's person, and to trample on his authority,' ibid.

Massachusetts he had pleaded for the admission to the colony of men whose religious views differed from those of the ruling religious group. In the spring of 1644 he secured toleration for Rhode Island, and by the autumn of that year Baillie was writing angrily that Vane was one of the leaders of the toleration party.¹ It is unlikely that he veered to religious intolerance and presbyterianism during the intervening period. No doubt the parlous situation of the Roundhead armies in 1643 which is reflected in the contemporary sermons² justified in his mind the concessions which had been made to Presbyterianism.

In September 1644 he appeared for the first time as the open champion of toleration. He had taken part earlier in a discussion between members of the Westminster Assembly who were endeavouring to find a modus vivendi in religious matters between presbyterians and independents, but had not shown open sympathy with the latter, though Baillie had begun to suspect where Vane's true loyalties lay. 'Sir Harie Vane, whatever be his judgement, yet less nor more, does not own them [the Independents], and gives them no encouragement',

1. Baillie, ii, 235-6, 25 Oct. 1644.

2. E.g. Marshall's at Pym's funeral, (E 80(1)). 'Our armies wasted, our treasure is exhausted'. T. Mocket's A View of the Solemn League and Covenant (E 80(2)) has: 'They say, the Parliament's side do decline...all seems to go against them'. E 78(4) speaks of the ruin in the North and West.

wrote Baillie.¹ After his return from Kent however at the end of August in that year Vane twice argued at the Westminster Assembly for a full liberty of conscience.² On 13 September the 'Accommodation Order', which held out the possibility of toleration for the sects, was introduced; he and St. John, according to Baillie, were responsible for this challenge to Presbyterianism.³ Baillie wrote that Vane and St. John had differed about the Order - Vane had not wanted the differences about church government mentioned, but only the theological differences about free grace; he would apparently have left freedom of church government to be inferred by omitting all mention of this topic.⁴ This is important, for when Vane had secured the charter for Rhode Island in March 1644, he used the very same indirect, but nevertheless effective method of achieving religious liberty. The charter made no mention of the civil government's

-
1. Baillie, i, 145-46. 2 Ap. 1644. All Vane's biographers assume that Roger Williams was referring to a speech by Vane in favour of toleration, when in the 'Bloody Tenent', published on 15 July 1644 (Thomason's date) he quoted a 'heavenly speech' he had heard in the House of Commons. (E 661(6)). The speech may well have been made by Vane, but there is no proof of this. Neither D'Ewes, Whittaker nor the Thomason tracts record the speech, and Williams himself does not name the M.P. who made it. Other M.P.s spoke in favour of toleration - D'Ewes himself made a fine speech on the subject on 6 Nov. 1643 (Harl. 165, f. 222v), and it seems Vane's public support of toleration cannot be dated earlier than Sept. 1644. But the Rhode Island charter is very significant.
 2. Ibid., ii, 235-36. 25 Oct.
 3. Ibid., 230. 16 Sept. CJ.iii, 626.
 4. Baillie, op. cit.

connection with religious matters¹ - an omission which in the circumstances of Rhode Island's quarrel with Massachusetts, must have infuriated Vane's old colony. Vane's biographers have failed to notice that his policy in relation to the charter is consistent with his writings, in which he advocated that the State should refrain from concerning itself at all with church matters.² The Rhode Island charter was the first victory for his theory.

In the same month in which the 'Accommodation Order' was discussed, the Commons, following a petition from London presbyterian clergy, considered the new form of ordination. The debates went on through September and early October, and on 1 October Vane and St. John were tellers against a clause which would have enjoined the congregation to 'obey and submit' to their minister, for ministers were 'over their flocks in the Lord'.³ According to Baillie, Vane also opposed the compulsory subscription of the Covenant to newly ordained ministers.⁴ Meanwhile the Accommodation Order had been put into force, and resulted in the appointment of a sub-committee of the Westminster Assembly, which had the task of considering the differences between presbyterian and independent.

-
1. Haller, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, 1955, 159; Gammell, 119; Knowles, 146, 414-6; Rhode Island Records, i, 143. The parliamentary committee which was given responsibility for the colonies was set up on 2 Nov. 1643. Masson, iii, 119. The charter is dated 14 Mar. 1644.
 2. A Healing Question, 6-7, Retired Man's Meditations, 387-8. (See chap. ix (conclusion)).
 3. CJ.iii, 647. Baillie, ii, 235-36.
 4. Ibid.

This sub-committee discussed a plan whereby church government should be administered by county boards, composed of local ministers and lay governors, to be named by parliament.¹ This is exactly Vane's old plan of June 1641, and he surely must have been responsible for reviving it.² When the Assembly's sub-committee reported to the committee of Parliament set up under the 'Accommodation Order', Vane and Say secured a narrow victory by one vote for the independents' view.³ According to Baillie, Vane, together with Say, Wharton and St. John, wanted the sub-committee's propositions debated in the Parliamentary committee, and not in the Assembly, for Vane knew he would have a majority in the committee,⁴ and there is nothing in his previous parliamentary career to make this seem unlikely.

Baillie was bitterly disillusioned with Vane; his attack on the intolerant presbyterianism of the Scots came as a bomb-shell to the Scottish delegates.⁵ That he was now openly professing what he had all along believed is the generally accepted view,⁶ and can hardly be denied. His change in religious policy may have been due

-
1. Jordan, Development of Religious Toleration, ii, 57. Shaw, 37-43,
 2. Perhaps through Nye, who had been Vane's colleague in Scotland when the Solemn League and Covenant had been negotiated, and who was a member of this sub-committee.
 3. Shaw, op. cit.
 4. Baillie, op. cit.
 5. Ibid., and 231.
 6. E.g. Yule, Independents, 43.

to Parliament's increasing independence of Scots military aid; and if he had indeed found the Scots hostile to his plans for the future government of Britain this too may have played its part. Certainly when D'Ewes wanted the officer who brought the letters from Cromwell and his fellow-generals describing the Marston Moor victory brought in to the House, so that recognition could be given to the Scots' contribution to the battle, Vane, 'alleging that the three generalls had written as much as they thought fit', advised against calling in the officer.¹

There is curiously little evidence of his religious views in the next few months, though through Yonge and D'Ewes we catch one glimpse of his attitude. In September 1645 Selden had argued vigorously against allowing ministers to withhold the sacrament from offenders. Vane supported him, declaring that it would be better to convince the offender of the grievousness of his sin, and thus bring about his reformation. He ended by warning the House that: 'If we give this power which is demaunded there is noe powere in this kingdon', and: 'It would bring a great distraction in the Kingdom'.² He showed, according to D'Ewes, that: 'We ought not to place an arbitrary power in any but the parliament'.³ His speech must have been influential, for D'Ewes added: 'And soe all power was taken

-
1. Harl.166, f.81v. 10 July.
 2. BM.Add.18, 780, f.114v.
 3. Harl.166, f.266.

from them [the ministers] and see they were not to judge but to represent it to the Parliament'. The debate went on until five o'clock, D'Ewes tells us. Some months later Vane befriended John Biddle, the Unitarian scholar, who had appealed to him for help, by moving that Biddle should either have his case heard in the House, or be set at liberty. Biddle was released, but in September 1647 was again imprisoned for a bold pamphlet he had written, and this time Vane could not, or did not, save him, though Biddle prefixed the pamphlet by a letter to him.¹ During the years of negotiations with the defeated king such indications as there are of Vane's religious views are inextricably bound up with the political developments already considered.

In 1650 there are one or two rather vague references to Vane's religious views in Pragmaticus, but they are too lacking in any supporting evidence for reliance to be placed on them. In March 1650 for instance the royalist journalist declared: 'The Saints ...are so fraught with jealousy and fears...to see the Estates of Scotland all hooded under a Blew-Cap, and stick close to the Covenant that it makes young Vane to cry out (in the Councell of Stinkards [State] at Whitehall) A Plot, a Plot of the English Presbyters, bidding, Downe with the Relick of Prelacy, advising

1. DNB.art.sub. Biddle.

all with his spirituall Rhetorick...to adhere to the Hodge-
 podge Reformation so happily begun by the learned Rabbies
 of Rebellion, king Oliver of Ireland, Ireton...'.¹ In May
 1650 Vane struck another vigorous blow for religious freedom,
 this time in a country where many M.P.s might well have thought it a
 most dangerous innovation. The House were debating the settlement
 of Ireland, and discussing a clause which declared that parliament's
 commissioners did not intend to force anyone to worship contrary
 to their conscience. Vane and Marten, as already noted, went into
 the lobby as tellers in favour of toleration. Sir Henry Mildmay
 and Masham, normally among Vane's supporters, understandably were
 against. By a narrow majority, in a thin House, Vane won.² In
 the same month Pragmaticus was writing that 'they [the Saints] will
 talke of a knack [act] against incest, adulterie and fornication,
 but Marten, Weaver, Corbet, Holland, young Vane etc. will cry who [a]
 there, they cannot live without libertie of cod-piece, but that will
 be winked at in Parliament men, they themselves may doe anything'.³
 This allegation appears to be nothing more than a confused idea that
 Vane would support the principle of liberty in personal relationships,
 and to have no solid basis in fact.

-
1. E 595(8). 12-19 Mar. 1650. Parliament was alarmed lest the English Presbyterians should throw in their lot with the Scots. (Gardiner, CP, Commonwealth, i, 215).
 2. CJ.vii, 157.
 3. E 600(6). 30 April-7 May.

In the following year the House discussed a book by John Fry, one of the members. It was a lively, anti-clerical, somewhat rationalist treatise, which at one point actually demonstrated how small the differences were between Catholics and Protestants. Vane was a teller against allowing extracts from the book to be read, and was defeated, and when the House divided on the question of whether the book was scandalous, Vane was a teller against condemning the book, and won.¹ On both divisions, his friend Arny was a teller for the opposite side. Hesilrige also was a teller against Vane on the first division - not the last time in 1651 that the two men were opponents, for when Hesilrige wanted Newcastle's market day changed from Monday to Tuesday, Vane twice acted as teller against him.² Public opposition to his old colleague upon such a petty issue probably indicates some underlying impatience with Hesilrige on Vane's part; and this is borne out by a passage in one of Roger Williams' letters.³

For his old friend, Roger Williams, was back in England. One of the prominent citizens of Rhode Island, a Mr. Codrington, had procured a charter in 1651 by which he himself became governor of the colony for life, and this had naturally caused friction among the settlers.⁴

-
1. CJ.vi, 529. 31 Jan.1651. J. Fry, 'The Clergy in their Colours'. E 1378(5).
 2. CJ.vi, 589. 18 June.
 3. See below, p. 353.
 4. Gammell, 134, 147.

Williams came to secure a new charter, but he probably did not know that Vane had been sent to Scotland, for although Williams arrived in England at the end of 1651 or the beginning of 1652,¹ he waited until April before presenting his petition to the Council of State.² The Council referred the matter to its Committee for Foreign Affairs, of which Vane was a member,³ and through his help Codrington's charter was revoked, and the old one temporarily confirmed.⁴ Williams and Vane jointly drew up the Council's answer to the Rhode Island petition⁵ - one more indication of the way in which business was done by the Council committees.

Williams could not obtain all he wanted - the confirmation of the 1644 charter was to be in force only until the differences between Codrington and the colonists were settled, and this, Williams told the colonists,⁶ was hindered by two things, one being the Dutch War. The other obstruction was 'the opposition of our enemies, Sir Arthur Hesilrige and Col. Fenwicke, who hath married his daughter, Mr. Winslow,⁷ and Mr. Hopkins, both in great place; and all the friends

-
1. He left New England in Nov. 1651, ibid., 146.
 2. Knowles, 252.
 3. Ibid., Vane's part in the Committee's activities is seen in its proceedings, CSPD.1651-52, 242.
 4. Knowles, 146, 258-9.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Massachusetts' agent in England. J.G. Palfrey, History of New England, 1858-64, ii, 207-213.

they can make in Parliament and Council, and all the priests, both Presbyterian and Independent; so that we stand as two armies, ready to engage, observing the postures and motions of each of the other, and yet shy each of other'. Perhaps this division of opinion over the Massachusetts-Rhode Island controversy explains the hostility between Hesilrige and Vane at this time. Williams' letter gives an interesting glimpse of the factions within the Council.

Williams could not remain in England without taking part in the religious controversies of the day, but he waited for Vane's return from Scotland before bursting into print. At the end of March 1652 he contributed an 'explanation' to a small pamphlet in defence of religious toleration, a statement submitted to the parliamentary committee for the Propagation of the Gospel by six men, one of whom was Charles Vane.¹ Williams published at least three more tracts during the year.² When Vane went down to Portsmouth on navy matters Williams accompanied Lady Vane to Belleau, and dedicated one of his pamphlets to her.³ Vane faithfully promised Williams that he would 'observe the motion of the New England business' while Williams stayed

-
1. The Fourth Paper presented by Major Butler... 30 Mar. (Thomason's date). 1652.E 1378(5). The pamphlet declared the licensing and payment of ministers to be wrong, and claims the right of Jews to live freely among the nation. If Vane was known to be associated with the demand for freedom for Jews, it would explain the occasional references to Jews in ballads aimed at him.
 2. Gammell, 153.
 3. Knowles, *op. cit.* Masson, Milton, iv, 530. Vane went down to Portsmouth on 2 March. Bodl. Rawl. A 227, f.48.

some ten weeks with Lady Vane in Lincolnshire - one more duty for Vane, and this when navy affairs must have been taxing all his energies. But Williams seems to have rendered Vane a reciprocal service, for in the winter of 1652 Williams gave personal help towards alleviating the sufferings and discontent of the miners in Northumberland and Durham.¹ It must surely have been Vane who called Williams' attention to the needs of the people in this area, where most of the Vane and Liddell families' collieries were.

Vane's guiding principles in religious policy seem to have been two - a rooted distrust of clerical power, whether of bishops or presbyters, and a belief that the state should abstain from interference in church matters altogether. The latter belief, which he shared with his friend Roger Williams, is well illustrated in the Rhode Island charter. His friendship with Williams seems to have been responsible for the rift with Hesilrige, which began to appear in 1651. The Solemn League and Covenant was probably, as generally recognised, a temporary reversal of his usual attitude, made necessary by the political emergency. His support for the imposition of severe penalties on those who refused the Covenant, which has hitherto passed unnoticed, is a more significant deviation, and equally revealing of Vane's character. One of the most surprising facts about Vane's career in parliament in the 1640s and early 1650s

1. Gammell, op. cit., 153.

however is that religious policy figures so comparatively little; he was far more occupied with the war, the navy, peace negotiations, and a host of other political problems.

On naval affairs, from the very first days of the long Parliament, he was putting forward important proposals and plans - this was natural, since he had been Treasurer of the Navy since January 1639, and he close work with the Admiralty. In religious matters too he had been making a significant contribution, but though the Whigs were beginning to recognise his qualities as a parliamentary statesman, his responsibilities in the House were limited, even as late as 1642. Except for naval matters and religion, he did not initiate measures, but confined himself with supporting the Commons, the King, the Lord and other leaders. There are indications that he had been occasionally assisted by another member of the party, but this does not mean that Pym was a representative of the two main groups that a similar attitude to peace negotiations and the trial of Louis, and co-operated singly in their efforts. In the summer of 1641, when he was in the House, having successfully negotiated the Treaty of London and the Peace, Pym was elected to be one of the members of the Council. He was always ill, and the unexpected absence of the other members available, the Commons and the King, allowed Pym and his friends to create the instrument by which it was that their group should control parliament - the Declaration of the 1st of August. It was

CONCLUSION.

Vane did not immediately upon his entry into English parliamentary politics in 1640 become one of the leaders of the Commons. On naval affairs, from the very first days of the Long Parliament, he was putting forward important motions and plans - this was natural, since he had been Treasurer of the Navy since January 1639, and in close touch with the Lord Admiral. In religious matters too in 1640 and 1641 he was making a significant contribution, but though the Commons were beginning to recognise his qualities as a parliamentary draftsman, his responsibilities in the House were limited, even as late as 1642. Except for naval matters and religion, he did not initiate measures, but contented himself with supporting Pym, Hampden, Strode, St. John and other leaders. There are indications that he and Marten occasionally assisted one another during this period, but this does not mean that Vane was a republican, merely that the two men took a similar attitude to peace negotiations and the House of Lords, and co-operated simply on these matters.

But in the autumn of 1643, when he returned from Scotland, having successfully negotiated the Solemn League and Covenant, Vane was listened to as one of the leaders of the House. Pym was already ill, and the consequent collapse of his main executive committee, the Committee of the Safety, allowed Vane and St. John to create the instrument by means of which their group should control parliament - the Committee of Both Kingdoms. By this

time some of the M.P.s who had originally supported the war, such as Holles and Stapleton, together with a large section of the public, were now eager for peace negotiations. Vane and those who were working with him therefore tried to wrest from the Commons the authority to conduct peace discussions, and vest it in the Committee of Both Kingdoms, which they planned their group should control. In all the manoeuvres associated with this Vane was a key figure. At this period he collaborated closely with St. John, and received support from Hesilrige, Samuel Browne and Cromwell; probably Lisle and Zouch Tate were on occasion instruments of his policy.

The relations between the Committee of Both Kingdoms and parliament are an important aspect of English politics in the 1640s. The Committee of the Safety, and even more the Committee of Both Kingdoms, often acted in advance of receiving instructions from parliament, and in fact used parliament merely to ratify decisions already made by the Committee, the real policy-making body. Vane was frequently involved when the Committee of Both Kingdoms treated parliament in this disrespectful fashion; he would doubtless have pleaded the war emergency as his excuse. But very probably also he found the slow working of parliamentary government trying; he favoured government by a small group - in his pamphlet of 1656, A Healing Question, he suggested that government should be carried on by a standing Council of State, to be chosen for life, and whose orders should be binding in the intervals of 'Supreme National

Assemblies'.¹

For a brief time in 1644 and 1645 Vane was trying to increase the authority of Sir William Waller, in the hope of replacing the earl of Essex by Waller as commander of Parliament's forces. Waller was of course later a member of Holles's group - one more instance of the important but little remarked fact that political allegiances often changed during this period.

By January 1644 the struggle for political and military power was beginning to take on a more bitter character; Vane was consistently hostile to Essex's group, and they retaliated by accusing Vane and St. John of treason, in that they had negotiated with the King's emissary, Lord Lovelace. The tension between the two groups was acute, and in 1645 Vane was one of those who launched a surprise attack in the Commons on Holles and Whitelocke. The two M.P.s were given no inkling of the charges beforehand, and the episode was a critical one for their fortunes. Whitelocke's manuscript memoirs give a vivid picture² of the danger he and his friend faced; they exerted themselves however to organise their defence, and Vane and his collaborators St. John, Lisle and Samuel Browne, were defeated.

There are indications, such as the pointed omission of Vane from the new Admiralty Committee set up in April 1645, that the Independents' control of the House was precarious by this time; the

1. A Healing Question..., 18.

2. BM.Add.37, 343, f.395 seq.

victory of Holles and Whitelocke in the Savile affair must have brought this home to Vane's group. But in the autumn the 'recruiters' began to come in, and possibly this accounts for his return to the Admiralty Committee. The Committee of Both Kingdoms had also been won over to Holles's view, and some of the leading Independents, including Vane, boycotted committees they could not control. This may explain the absence of the Draft Day Books of the Committee of Both Kingdoms after December 1645 - the Committee's quorum was seven, and this was probably unobtainable without its Independent members. By the end of 1646 the Independents had lost control of parliament itself to Holles's group, and the indications are that Vane, like Cromwell, now boycotted parliament as he had earlier boycotted the Committee. When the Army restored the Independents to power in 1647 Vane began to attend the Admiralty Committee, which he had been neglecting, once again.

There is little information about his political attitude during the vital summer of 1647, but what there is indicates that he, with St. John, Say and Wharton negotiated with some of the army leaders, and Vane presented Ireton's 'Heads of the Proposals' to parliament. But the vote of 'no addresses' of September 1647 was a Leveller move; Vane, with Cromwell and the other leading Independents, thereupon adopted a more conciliatory attitude to the king - Vane showed himself no friend to the Levellers both now and in the following years. His policy in the early months of 1648 is also obscure; such evidence as there is indicates that he was trying to co-operate

now with the Presbyterians also, making common cause with them against the threatened Scottish invasion.

Once the royalist rebellion broke out Vane's organising gifts were fully employed in taking steps to counter it, especially in the navy; whether after this he favoured coming to terms with the king is doubtful. He certainly took part in the Newport negotiations, but this does not prove that he sincerely wanted peace. It is obvious that Pierrepont, Cromwell and Vane had not concerted their policy on this. It seems that in the crucial debate of 5 December 1648 on the Newport treaty, Vane opposed continuing negotiations with the king, and one royalist diurnall names him among those who were 'downright for the army'. At his trial in 1662 Vane declared that he left parliament before Pride's Purge because he objected to army interference with parliament; in the 1659 parliament he spoke as if he approved of bringing the king to trial, but not to execution, and therefore absented himself from the House. The latter version fits better what contemporary journalists and letter-writers reported. It also accords better with the fact that Vane returned to parliament in early February 1649, (when after all the army still controlled parliament), and with what he wrote in his 'Healing Question'.¹

1. A Healing Question..., 8-9. 'These the 'good Party'...have stood by the Army against all opposition whatever, as those that, by the growing light of these times, have been taught...to look above and beyond the letter, forme and outward circumstances of government, into the inward reason and spirit thereof...to the leaving behind all empty shadows, that would obtrude themselves in the place of true freedome'.

The years 1649-53 saw the apogee of his political power. One of the organisers of the Union with Scotland, and a frequent chairman of the important Irish and Scottish Committee, a major figure in foreign policy, the man most responsible for the brilliant record of the navy during the last months of this period, and working indefatigably for it - he was one of the masters of the State. With power came the opportunity for Vane to put his original and constructive ideas into practice - the projected union with Holland had his warm support, and the new administration of the navy of December 1652 was his work. He must however have been a politically isolated figure during the latter part of this period. From August 1651 onwards there are no more indications of the close co-operation that had certainly existed between Vane and Cromwell at times during the previous five years. St. John was no longer taking an active part in politics, Hesilrige and Vane were now antagonistic, probably because of their differing attitudes to Roger Williams and Rhode Island. Marten and the Levellers were almost consistently Vane's opponents. His exclusion from the committee set up in September 1652 to consider the Army Officers' petition on a new parliament, may be due to nothing more than his absence from London at this time - though perhaps the Army officers were taking advantage of that. Writers on this subject have failed to notice that Vane could still have attended the Committee under the 'All that come, to have voice' provision. At this period, the autumn of 1652 and early 1653, with the outcome of the Dutch War in the balance, his

time was mainly spent on naval administration; friction between Vane and the Council of State over navy policy may have contributed to Cromwell's decision to dissolve the Rump.

In the 1640s and the early 1650s party groupings in the Commons were very complex. The majority of the M.P.s were not in any way committed to a particular group in the House, and the very word 'party' was disliked by some contemporaries. There was a Presbyterian 'Whip' by 1646, and probably an Independent one also, but the Whips would have to rely even more than their modern counterparts on persuasion, and, where a party had a majority, on patronage. Whoever was working closely with Vane would sometimes be found at the same period voting against him, and this is equally true of Holles. Religious affiliations are not by any means invariably an indication of political attitude - though Tate and Prideaux were usually found on Vane's side in political matters, Baillie mentions the strong support they gave to the Scottish members of the Westminster Assembly in the matter of religious toleration.¹

Nevertheless there are numerous indications that individual M.P.s planned beforehand the policy they would follow in parliament, and made use of procedural rules to secure a majority for their views. This was not a new parliamentary art - it had of course been used by Elizabethan M.P.s - but Vane was an able and also

1. Baillie, ii, 237.

unscrupulous exponent of it. As early as May 1641 he was trying to secure the passing of a bill legalising the impressment of sailors by introducing it in a thin house, and rushing the measure through, and in the same month he was one of those who persuaded Dering to introduce their Root and Branch bill as his own. The two ordinances establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms were Vane's work, and there is an indication in D'Ewes that Vane deliberately forbore to convene a committee one afternoon so that next morning early, probably when few members were present, he could call the meeting and control the committee's findings. He could ignore parliamentary precedent on occasion - it was not usual for the names of committee members to be included in a bill when it was brought into the House, but this was done in the Committee of Both Kingdoms ordinance. Peregrine Pelham and Tate are both found more than once speaking in a way that gives a strong impression of prior arrangement with Vane. The London petitions which so opportunely expressed support for Vane's policy cannot have arrived by coincidence. He used the Independent majority in parliament to secure control of peace negotiations for the Committee of Both Kingdoms in 1644, and of the navy in 1647. His appointment as commissioner to the Army in 1647 was thought by Holles, and perhaps by Whitelocke also, to be the result of a previous arrangement among the Independent leaders, and there is evidence from Lilburne, Wildman and the royalist diurnals that there was an Independent 'Junto' at this period which concerted policy among themselves.

Such Juntoes naturally did not blazon their activities abroad, but the letters of Vane and Northern M.P.s such as Pelham and Widdrington show that often much preliminary work was necessary to secure action by the Commons.

Vane's relations with the City of London are important and interesting, but in the nature of things, his contacts were likely to be clandestine. His attempt in 1643 to circumvent the Commons' refusal to accept the introduction of a punitive 'covenant' which the City wanted, is a case in point. It was Vane's friend, St. John, with whom Vane was working closely, who 'rigged'

connections with the City which he feared, and the situation had clearly changed.

Vane was not only tolerant in religion, but was also tolerant towards those who differed from his political views. The first instance of this ruthlessness, (which has received little or no attention from his biographers), were the unfortunate Justice and Challenge, Edward Waller's accomplices, tried by military law and very speedily executed - Vane argued in favour of their trial by court martial. His support for the City covenant, mentioned above, and for severe penalties to be imposed on those refusing the Solemn League and Covenant, are in keeping with his unwillingness to exempt royalists from stringent penalties, and with his assistance in Father West that doughty partisan showed the bishops to be arraigned on a capital charge. Vane's obstinate attack on Christopher Love, which resulted in the loss of another life, is illustration of the fact that to Vane politics were indeed a form of vicarious war.

the Common Council elections in December 1643. As already noted, City petitions arrived at peculiarly opportune moments - for instance Fowke's petition in favour of re-establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms, which was presented at the crucial time in 1644. Fowke's October petition of that year was used by Vane in an attempt to weaken the earl of Essex's forces. It was Lord Mayor Atkins who informed Vane of Cranford's allegations against St. John and Vane - one would have expected Atkins to inform the Speaker, but he did not. After 1645 these indications of Vane's connections with the City cease to appear, and the situation had clearly changed.

Widely tolerant in religion, Vane was far from tolerant towards those who differed from him politically. The first victims of this ruthlessness, (which has received little or no attention from his biographers), were the unfortunate Tomkins and Challenor, Edmund Waller's accomplices, tried by military law and very speedily executed - Vane argued in favour of their trial by court martial. His support for the City covenant, mentioned above, and for severe penalties to be imposed on those refusing the Solemn League and Covenant, are in keeping with his unwillingness to exempt royalists from stringent punishment, and with his assistance to Pelham when that doughty puritan wished the bishops to be arraigned on a capital charge. Vane's vindictive attack on Christopher Love, which resulted in the loss of another life, is illustration of the fact that to Vane politics were indeed a form of civilian war.

His equivocal attitude to that part of the Solemn League and Covenant which promised the establishment of presbyterianism in England is only one instance of a certain lack of honesty which marks much of his political career. From the time he used specious arguments to prevent the French envoy from denouncing the vandalism of Marten and Gurdon at Somerset House, to December 1648, when he labelled as royalists those who wanted to continue peace negotiations with the king, one sees on many occasions his lack of scrupulous regard for truth. This is of course a charge frequently levelled against politicians, and one supposes that M.P.s of the 1640s and 1650s were subject to the same temptations as others. Nevertheless Vane's 'juggling' seems to have no parallel among his contemporaries (unless Cromwell is admitted here), and goes far to justify the epithet Lilburne so frequently uses of Vane - Macchiavellian. He was Macchiavellian to assert that the earl of Essex could always send the Committee of Both Kingdoms his reasons for refusing to obey their orders, and to argue that the Committee of Both Kingdoms, and not an ad hoc committee, should have charge of peace negotiations, because this would mean that the Scots would have a part in such negotiations, though he knew that the Scots were often excluded from the Committee's deliberations. To argue, as he did in 1644, that he did not owe his office of navy treasurer to parliament, was disingenuous, even though he had originally probably bought the office from the king. The re-introduction of an ordinance which the Lords had passed, and doubtless

forgotten, establishing the Committee of Both Kingdoms, was dishonest, though legal. Whatever the purpose of his negotiations with Lord Lovelace, they are marked by deception. Contemporary allegations that Vane took part in peace negotiations which he intended to fail, are probably not far off the mark. Two of his missions, to York in 1644, and to De Retz at a later and uncertain date, are somewhat mysterious; this is in keeping with his devious political methods. His candid admission in 1656 shows that he was aware of the unorthodox nature of his expedients: 'As to the capacity wherein these persons [the supporters of the 'good party']... have acted, it hath been very variable, and subject to great changes... very seldome, if ever at all, so exactly, and in all points consonant to the rule of former Lawes and Constitutions of Government, as to be clearly and fully justified by them, any longer than the Law of Successe and Conquest did uphold them who had the inward warrant of Justice and Righteousness to encourage them in such their actings'.¹

From the beginning of the war until Pride's Purge, with the one exception of the vote of 'No Addresses' of August 1647, Vane appears

1. A Healing Question..., 9.

as the determined opponent of negotiations with the king - he wanted a dictated peace. He defended Parliament's failure to negotiate with the king, in a speech to the City in October 1642, and expressed the House's approval of the rejection of peace overtures reported by Essex and Waller. He was the spokesman in the Commons for the Committee of Both Kingdom's very unencouraging response to peace 'feelers' in 1644, and probably drafted the chilly reply which was to be sent to the king. He certainly had a hand in the uncompromising answer to Harcourt's offer of mediation, and was associated with the obstructive response to the Dutch offer. He was frequently found supporting peace terms which would be quite intolerable to the king. D'Ewes gives much evidence that Vane tried to divert the House from even discussing peace proposals. It is more difficult to determine the reasons for his attitude. He probably feared the establishment of a national presbyterian church, with its religious intolerance - even in the king's extremity in 1648, at the Newport negotiations, presbyterianism for three years was one of the conditions. No doubt another factor in his mind was the desire to keep all vital political control, such as that over the militia, in parliament's hands...¹

1. For Vane's perception of the importance of the militia see Burton, iii, 171. Also A Healing Question, op. cit., 5 and 9-10. 'As not ignorant, that when once embodied in this their [the good party's] Military posture, in such manner as they by common consent shall be found requisite for the safety of the body, they are most irresistible, absolute and comprehensive in their power; having that wherein the substance of all Government is continued'. See also p. 133 above.

Whether he himself was involved in genuine negotiations with the king cannot be determined; the Lovelace negotiations could have been intended simply to obtain 'intelligence', and though Cranford's allegations must be taken more seriously, Vane's connection with them, and their exact purport, is not certain. For some reason Charles himself thought as late as March 1646 that Vane was open to persuasion, though he evidently took it for granted that Vane was committed to 'destroying' the king, but there is no evidence that Vane replied to the king's overture other than by a speech in open parliament.

Was he a republican? He was certainly not a doctrinaire republican in the way that Marten was. His view is probably summed up in a phrase in his 'Retired Man's Meditations', when he speaks of: 'In whatever formes the government be administered (that in themselves, simply considered, are all lawful and Just)'.¹ He took the lead in giving parliament control over the navy, and in the making of a new Great Seal, he supported parliament's assumption of authority over the militia, but there is no speech from Vane denouncing monarchy as such. The indications are that he wanted to transfer all political authority to parliament, but he was prepared to vote for government by King, Lords and Commons if the realities of power were in parliament's hands. He had supported war because only war would establish parliament's control.² The

1. Retired Man's Meditations, 384-85. See also ibid., 388, and A Healing Question, 6.

2. Burton, iii, 171.

removal of kingship, he asserted in 1659, had been 'the only happy way of returning to their [the people's] own freedom'.¹ There is nothing inherently improbable in his suggesting to the Scots at York in 1644 that a republic should be set up, or later that same year that Charles Lewis should be king.

In the same way, the term 'radical' must be used of Vane only with caution and with precise definition. He certainly wanted to destroy the royal power, less certainly the monarchy or the king. He was however consistently hostile to the House of Lords. As early as February 1642 he was prepared to bargain with the Lords, suggesting a quid pro quo in amendments that shocked D'Ewes. In 1644 he prevented the Upper House from exercising their right to make nominations to the Committee of Both Kingdoms. In 1646 he resented the Lords framing an ordinance on matters already discussed in the Commons, and objected to asking the Lords' approval for the appointment of Batten as commander of the fleet.

He was no democrat however. His Republic was to be a republic of the 'good party'. 'Sovereignty', he wrote, 'ought to be in the whole body of the people that have adhered to the cause'.² He objected to an ordinance being submitted to the people for ratification. The Levellers found him one of their opponents and in the conflict of interest between the Fen-men and the Undertakers for the draining

1. Burton, iii, 171.

8. A Healing Question, 15. The italics are mine.

of the fen known as the earl of Lindsey's Level, he was on the side of the Undertakers. He defended a prohibitively high property qualification for the franchise, as is well known, in 1653. In Vane's mind the natural right even of the godly was to 'enjoy the freedome (by way of dutifull compliance and condiscension from all the parts and members of this society) to set up meet persons in the place of Supreme Judicature and Authority amongst them, whereby they may have the use and benefit of the choicest light and wisdome of the Nation that they are capable to call forth, for the Rule and Government under which they will live'.¹ He did not advocate the right of the rank-and-file godly to govern themselves.

Vane's theoretical respect for parliament is curiously at variance with the actual policy he followed on some occasions. Not only did he sometimes fail to wait for parliament's instructions, but it seems that when it suited him to do so, he ignored parliament's orders - his delays in presenting his navy accounts are an example of this (though when one sees the enormous amount of work that these involved, one has sympathy with Vane). His failure to pay half of his profits as navy treasurer to the Committee of the Revenue is a more flagrant example of the same attitude. By working closely with Ireton in the summer of 1647 and almost certainly with Cromwell too,

1. A Healing Question, 3-4.

he was not defending parliament against army control, and, if royalist allegations are to be relied upon, he actually used the threat of Army intervention to persuade parliament to vote according to his wishes in December 1648. His condescending references to parliament in his letter to Cromwell of August 1651 do not indicate a great respect for that body.

Moreover there is evidence that, as already noted, when Vane's group were in a minority in parliament or its committees he simply did not attend. Holles made this allegation concerning the Independent group's attendance at the Committee of Both Kingdoms in the latter part of 1646 and the early months of 1647, and it would certainly explain Vane's prolonged absence from the Admiralty Committee and parliament at that time. Similarly he absented himself from those bodies for about six weeks at the time of the king's trial. Failure to carry the House with him in his attitude to the vital negotiations with Holland in 1652 would explain his otherwise surprising absence from parliament for two months at the beginning of the Dutch War.

After this interval Vane returned, as after the king's execution, to put his outstanding organising powers at the service of the state, and Britain's victory in the war was due to his administration of the navy more than to any other factor except the genius of the British admirals. His maiden speech in parliament had struck the keynote of his later work for the navy. In this Vane pleaded for money for the fleet, and his references to the British command

of the sea showed that he was aware of the challenge of Richelieu's navy, and that he saw the navy as an important instrument of foreign policy. The Lord Admiral, the earl of Northumberland, had also shown much interest in the navy, but Vane's speeches of this period had a force and urgency that Northumberland's lacked, and it was probably Vane who led the demand for an energetic policy. In November 1641 Parliament took an important step; it assumed control of the disposition of naval forces when it requested the Lord Admiral to assign four ships for the defence of Ireland; and Vane presented the ordinance which was to be Northumberland's warrant for carrying out Parliament's order. This action was, as already noted, consistent with his determination to wrest control of the militia from the crown, and his support for the making of a new Great Seal. The November ordinance was followed within a couple of weeks by Vane's dismissal from the post of navy treasurer, and one wonders if the two events were connected.

When war had broken out, parliament appointed six men to take over the duties of the Surveyor, Comptroller and Clerk of the Acts to the navy; Vane was one of the six, and was re-appointed also as navy treasurer. But it was Giles Green who dominated navy administration until 1647 - it was he who constantly reported from the important Navy and Customs Committee, and who wrote the justification of that Committee against its critics' ill-informed attacks. Vane was a member however of the many navy committees of the period,

of the period, and Greene paid tribute in his 'Defence' to the work of the navy treasurer. Undoubtedly Vane's major pre-occupation from 1642 to 1648 was with politics - he could not have devoted enough time to the navy to be the mainspring of the Navy and Customs or Admiralty Committees. In fact during this period a new official appears in the Navy Office - the deputy treasurer. The Committee of Navy and Customs sent for him when they needed details of navy finance, and Vane admitted that he was unable to devote the personal attention to navy finance that it required, because he was pre-occupied with public affairs.

The last clause of the Self-Denying Ordinance protected Vane, if no-one else, from loss of office, and his tenure of the navy treasurership was further strengthened by an ordinance of parliament of July 1645. This confirmed his appointment for the duration of the war, but stipulated that he should pay to the Committee of the Revenue half his profits from his office. According to the accounts Vane belatedly presented to the Commons Committee of Accounts, his profits for August 1642 to May 1645 were small - some £617 altogether. When he presented his accounts for May 1645 to May 1649 to the less public inspection of the Audit and Pipe Offices, a very different situation was revealed - he had derived a profit of some £4,000 a year for the three years after May 1645, and well over £5,000 a year for May 1649 to December 1650. He did not pay half to the Committee of the Revenue, and the Committee (of which his father was chairman) made no complaint. Nor did he surrender his office at the end of the war, as instructed, and the Commons raised no objection.

Vane probably did not attend very frequently the Admiralty Committee, set up in April 1645 but to which he was not appointed until October of that year; certainly he did not attend from October 1646 to September 1647, but when the Independents secured control of the Committee in September 1647 he began to appear more regularly. Only for a month or two however; in November 1647 he was rarely present, and in December went off to the country for eight weeks, probably on account of ill-health. Greene had returned to London in that December after a three months' absence; he was probably once more the directing spirit in naval administration, for even when Vane returned to parliament he made infrequent attendances at the Committee. With the earl of Warwick's appointment as Admiral in 1648, as a result of the naval mutinies, the Admiralty Committee lapsed, though the financial committee was still continuing. The Newport negotiations and other vital political problems must have occupied him in the late summer and autumn of 1648, and he withdrew from public affairs early in December. The conclusion must be drawn that he was not a major figure in naval administration from 1642 to 1648, except as navy treasurer.

In February 1649 Vane and two other men were appointed as the Admiralty Committee of the Council of State. This Committee, whose membership was soon enlarged, has left very full records which give us an illuminating picture of his astonishing energy. His activity in naval administration at this time is his true claim to be regarded as the creator of the Commonwealth navy. He was tireless in making

plans for financing the navy, devising inducements for officers, corresponding with the generals-at-sea, whom he was at pains to consult on every matter on which their experience would be valuable. His mastery of navy finance is shown in a hundred ways, and his foresight on this and many other topics. Legislation on sailors' pay, on impressment and good conduct medals was passed, and the care for the wounded at this period owes something to Vane. One sees once more his administrative and political methods - on occasion he would act first and seek authorisation from the Council afterwards, and he was aware of the necessity for prior 'organisation' if the Council was to be moved to take action. The great naval building programme of November 1649 onwards was due to the initiative of the Council's Admiralty Committee, on which, it is clear from the records of attendance at the Committee, Vane was the main figure, though the contribution of Valentine Walton and other members must not be ignored. Parliament had built six ships in 1647, none in 1648 and early 1649, in spite of the defection in May 1648 of Batten and nearly half the Fleet. From the time Vane became a member of the Admiralty Committee, Parliament embarked on an ambitious ship-building programme - six in 1649, ten each in each of the next three years, thirteen in 1653. In September 1652, when the Dutch War had begun, Parliament actually agreed to the building of thirty new frigates, though this was probably beyond the country's resources, and there seems to be no indication that this grandiose project was carried out. The enormous programme which actually was effected

would have been impossible if Vane had not devised the financial means for carrying it out, and the lines in Milton's sonnet, sent to him in July 1652,

Then to advise how war may best upheld

Move by her two main nerves, iron and gold

were a reference to Vane's work in this sphere at this time.

Probably the ships Parliament was building were of the new type first built in the 1630s, and this explains the sale of many royal ships at this time. Slyngeby later wrote that convoys had been difficult to obtain and expensive until 1649; after that they were supplied to merchantmen free of charge - was this also due to Vane's initiative?

Proof of his diligent work in the Admiralty Committee is found in its minutes from February 1650 onwards, when fortunately the clerk began to record attendances conscientiously. By October 1651 there were thirteen members of the Committee, but the usual attendance was three or four, of whom Vane was almost always one. The control by the Council of State however and the delays which it entailed, must have irked him, for in June 1651 he and Bond wanted the Commons to set up Admiralty Commissioners; the Commons rejected the plan, and vested control once more in the Council of State. Two further attempts to persuade the Commons to appoint special Admiralty commissioners failed, but in December 1652 the British defeat at Dungeness persuaded parliament to do what Vane

had long seen was necessary, and nine Admiralty commissioners, including the three commanders of the fleet and two men who were not members of parliament, were appointed. The balance of the committee was thus changed - a majority of the new men were navy experts and not politicians. Hesilrige's tribute to Vane in 1659 - 'When our affairs, as to the Navy, were such we could not turn ourselves unto them, did we not turn our eyes upon that gentleman, by whose providence it was so excellently managed?'¹ - and that of Vane's first biographer, Sikes, both refer to this period in Vane's career. The new commissioners' letters have a religious tone absent from those of the previous Admiralty Committee's, and though Giles Greene had taken pride in his committee's practice of consulting the sailors and navy officials, this is much more marked in the December 1652 commissioners. Vane's prodigious activity during the next few months is beyond praise; his great administrative powers had full scope, and there is ample proof that the English victory in the Dutch War owed most to his efforts, though tribute should also be paid to his fellow-M.P.s Carew, Salwey, and Thomson, and to Navy Commissioner Langley. There was friction however with Cromwell and the Council of State; whether this was a cause or a result of his worsening relations with Cromwell there is no means of knowing.

1. Burton, iii, 442-43.

As a constructive statesman Vane was a figure of considerable stature. It is remarkable how many of the decisive measures of the 1640s and early 1650s were either initiated by him, or carried out by him, or both. He possessed an original mind - he wrote that no human ordinance must expect to be exempt from change and removal, if the spirit of Christ requires its change.¹ The re-introduction of impressment in the navy was largely due to his efforts, and he, with one other M.P. drafted the ordinance by which the Court of Wards was finally abolished; this followed a motion that his young brother-in-law should be freed from wardship.² It was Vane who negotiated the Solemn League and Covenant.³ He and St. John were responsible for the establishment and later renewal of the Committee of Both Kingdoms. The Self-Denying Ordinance, proposed by Tate, was seconded by Vane. The ordinance was an exceedingly shrewd move, for it not only rid the country of the ineffective leadership - as Vane and St. John thought - of the earl of Essex, but it meant the suppressing of a committee controlled by their rivals, led by Holles. It also countered allegations that the M.P.s were enriching themselves. The latter would make it very difficult for Holles, and the earls of Essex and Warwick, to oppose the measure in the country at large. Vane was associated in one way or another with the bold and imaginative

1. Retired Man's Meditations, 389.

2. CJ.iv, 432.

3. 'That gentleman has most reason to know the grounds of the Covenant'. Col.Birch, speaking in the 1659 debates. Burton,iv,331.

schemes of union with Scotland and union with Holland; he may even have toyed with the idea of union between Parliamentarians and Frondeurs.

Baillie asserted Vane was Parliament's draftsman, and there is much evidence in the Commons Journals to support his statement. Replies to petitions, messages from the King or from foreign powers all fell to Vane's lot to frame, as did narratives of battles, letters of thanks to generals and instructions to holders of public office. If there was difficulty in phrasing the document in such a way as to make it acceptable it was even more likely to be his responsibility. The latter part of the Grand Remonstrance seems to have been the work of Vane and Fiennes. His financial knowledge and acumen meant that he often had the responsibility for presenting long and intricate statements of sections of the nation's accounts to parliament. In this sphere alone parliament's dependence on his skill and clear-headedness is amply demonstrated.

In foreign affairs he played an important part from the establishment of the republic to the dissolution of the Rump. In his letters to Cromwell he wrote as though he had control of foreign policy, and this corresponds with the authority with which he spoke of foreign affairs in the 1659 parliament.¹ But in the sphere of foreign policy, a much-neglected aspect of the interregnum, the difficulty

1. Burton, iii, 401.

of distinguishing between the work of one man and the work of the council or committee to which he belonged, is particularly acute. It can be seen however that he was determined to make foreign powers respect the Commonwealth, that the Spanish ambassador in 1652 regarded him as the enemy of Spain, and it looks as though he opposed the rupture with Holland in that year.

His religious views are better learnt from his writings than from the records of his parliamentary activities. He was a stern enemy of the bishops, and made this clear from the time of the Root and Branch bill debates onwards. He was equally opposed to clerical control by presbyterian ministers. He vigorously defended in the Commons men of unorthodox religious views. The struggling colony of Rhode Island was twice protected from the clutches of intolerant Massachusetts by Vane's efforts. It is important to notice that his method of securing religious toleration was to omit all reference in the relevant documents to the state's coercive power in the religious sphere. This is entirely consonant with his written views - as he put it, 'When the Scripture saith that the Rule of Magistracy is over men, we are to understand by this terme, the proper sphere, bounds and limits of that office; which is not to intrude into the office and proper concerns of Christ's inward Government and rule in the conscience, but to content itself with the outward man'.¹

1. Retired Man's Meditations, 388.

His political gifts reveal themselves unmistakeably in the records of the 1640s and early 1650s. He was a master of parliamentary tactics, with an original mind, and extraordinary capacity for reconciling the irreconcilable, and energy limited only by his periods of bad health. His ruthlessness, one must remember, was probably due to his desire to protect the party he championed - he was in no doubt that only a section of the nation had supported the Good Old Cause, and that its enemies were very powerful.¹

His extraordinary independence of mind must have been a handicap to him in politics - he could take an opposite side to his father, and, if Aulicus is to be relied upon, he attacked alderman Fowke, though Fowke and he must have been working closely together for several years. His sarcasm must have made him enemies. One cannot but respect his interest in the Camden House manuscripts, the help he gave Henry Stubbe, his support for Oxford university against its

1. A Healing Question, 12. See also the remarks attributed to Vane in conversation with Baron Thorpe in 1650, above, p.248, and Retired Man's Meditations, 391.

Visitors. Apart from the Solemn League and Covenant episode Vane consistently supported the principle of religious toleration, though this subject occupied comparatively little of his time during the 1640s, and has received a disproportionate amount of attention from later writers. Nevertheless, the determination with which he fought for this novel principle, against opponents of all kinds, compels admiration, as do the logical and sincere principles on which he based his policy. As a naval administrator he was beyond praise.

The Independents perhaps owed their victory in the Civil War more to Vane than to any other single man except Cromwell. The Solemn League and Covenant, the Committee of Both Kingdoms, the Self-Denying Ordinance, were all to a large extent of his devising. In all these he did not work alone, and this is also true of his contribution to the Commonwealth navy. He was however a brilliant opportunist, who used the turns of fortune to secure victory in parliament for the policies he supported. But on the other hand it may be said that he also contributed substantially to the ultimate downfall of his cause. His support for continuing the war, his ruthlessness, the rumours of his financial gains, which had a considerable basis in fact, must have cost him and his cause much unpopularity. He spoke of the people, but there is no evidence that he appreciated the suffering that the ordinary people endured in the Civil War - though one must remember here his concern for the wounded sailors. He spoke and wrote of freedom, but it was

the freedom of the 'good party', not of those who differed from him in politics. His views are reflected in what he wrote in 1656: 'If now it shall be objected, that...should once the Sovereignty be acknowledged to be in the disused body of the people...they would suddenly put the use and exercise of the Legislative power into such hands, as would, through their ill-qualifiednesse to the work spoil all...the Answer unto this is, first that God by his providence hath eased our minds much of this solicitude, by the course he hath already taken to fit and prepare a selected number of the people unto this work, that are tried and refined by their inward and outward experiences in this great quarrell, and the many changes they have passed through. In respect whereof well qualified persons are to be found, if due care be but taken in the choice of them'.¹ One feels that he believed in the Divine Right of Vane and the political elect to rule.

1. A Healing Question, 19. (cf. the accusation made by one M.P. in 1659 that Hesilrige was endeavouring to make himself and Vane the great 'Hogen-Mogens' (the contemporary term of contempt for the Dutch ministers), to rule the Commonwealth. Burton, iii, 221-22.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Abbott, Cromwell W.C. Abbott, Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, Cambridge, Mass., 1937-47.
- Add. Additional MSS, British Museum.
- AHR. American Historical Review.
- A.O.I. C.H. Firth and C.S. Rait, Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660, Oxford, 1906.
- Aylmer G. Aylmer, The King's Servants, London, 1961.
- Baillie R. Baillie, The Letters and Journals of, ed. D. Laing, Edinburgh 1841-42.
- Bodl. Bodleian Library, Oxford.
- BM. British Museum.
- Burnet G. Burnet, History of My Own Time, ed. M.J.Routh, Oxford, 1847.
- Burton T. Burton, Diary of... ed. J.T. Rutt, London, 1828.
- CJ. Journals of the House of Commons, London, 1803-.
- Clarendon, Rebellion | Edward earl of Clarendon. The History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England. ed. W.D. Macray, Oxford, 1888.
- Clarendon S.P. Edward earl of Clarendon, State Papers collected by, ed. R. Scrope and T. Monkhouse, Oxford, 1767-86.
- Coates, D'Ewes Sir Simonds D'Ewes, The Journal of... ed. W.H.Coates, New Haven, Connecticut, 1942.
- CSPD. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series.
- CSPV. Calendar of State Papers in the archives...of Venice, ed. H.F. Brown and A.B. Hind, London, 1900-25.
- DNB. Dictionary of National Biography

- Dyve Sir Lewis Dyve, 'The Tower of London Letter-Book of, 1646-47' Bedfordshire Historical Records Soc., Bedford, 1958.
- E Thomason Tracts, British Museum.
- EHR. English Historical Review.
- Gammell W. Gammell, Life of Roger Williams, Boston, 1846.
- Gardiner Constitutional Docs. S.R. Gardiner, The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-60, Oxford, 1906.
- Gardiner, CW S.R. Gardiner, History of the Great Civil War, 1642-49, London, 1893.
- Gardiner, CP. S.R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, London, 1894-1901.
- Guizot, Cromwell Guizot F.P.G., History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth, trans. A.R.Scoble, 2 vols., London, 1854.
- Haller, Tracts, W.Haller, Tracts on liberty in the Puritan Revolution, New York, 1934.
- HMC. Historical Manuscripts Commission.
- Holles, Memoirs D.Holles, Memoirs of, reprinted in Select Tracts, ed. F. Maseres, London, 1815.
- Hollond J. Hollond, Two Discourses of the navy, 1638 and 1659, ed. J.R. Tanner, Navy Records Soc., London, 1896.
- Hull City MSS Hull City MSS, Guildhall, Kingston-upon-Hull.

- JCC London Journal of Common Council, London City MSS,
Guildhall, London.
- Keeler M.F. Keeler, The Long Parliament 1640-41, Philadelphia,
1954.
- Knowles J.D. Knowles, Memoir of Roger Williams, Boston, 1834.
- LJ Journals of the House of Lords, n.p., n.d.
- Ludlow E. Ludlow, Memoirs of, ed. C.H. Firth, Oxford, 1894.
- Northcote Sir J. Northcote, Notebook of... ed. A.H.A. Hamilton,
London, 1877.
- Nicholls J. Nickolls, Original Letters... London, 1743.
- Montreuil J. de Montreuil, Diplomatic correspondence of,
Edinburgh, 1898-99.
- Notestein, D'Ewes Sir Simonds D'Ewes, The Journal of... ed.
W. Notestein, New Haven, Connecticut, 1923.
- Pearl, London V. Pearl, London and the Outbreak of the Puritan
Revolution, 1625-43, London, 1961.
- Peyton Parliamentary of Sir Thomas Peyton, Bodleian Library,
Oxford.
- P.R.O. Public Record Office.
- Raby deeds Estate deeds belonging to Lord Barnard, Raby Castle.
- Records of C.C. Durham Records of the Committees for Compounding...
in Durham and Northumberland, ed. R. Welford, 1905.
- Rawl. Rawlinson MSS, Bodleian Library.
- Rushworth J. Rushworth, Historical Collections, London,
1659-1701.

- Sharpe R.R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, London, 1894-95.
- Shaw W.A. Shaw, History of the English Church..., London, 1900.
- Sikes, Life [G. Sikes], The Life of Sir Henry Vane, London, 1662.
- Somers Tracts A collection of...tracts...from libraries, particularly that of the late Lord Somers, London, 1748-52.
- Tryal Anon., The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane at the King's Bench, Westminster, London, 1662.
- Whitelocke Bulstrode Whitelocke, Memorials of English Affairs, Oxford, 1853.
- Whittaker L. Whittaker, Diary of proceedings in the House of Commons. Add. 31, 116.
- Willcock J. Willcock, The Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger, London, 1913.
- Yule The Independents in the English Civil War, Cambridge, 1958.

Note. MSS referred to in this thesis are in the Public Record Office, London, unless otherwise indicated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCESA. MANUSCRIPTI. PUBLIC RECORD OFFICEi. Admiralty

Minutes of the Committee of Admiralty 8 Oct.1646-29 Feb.1648

Adm.7/673

ii. Chancery

Bills and Answers in the court of Chancery

Sir Henry Vane senior v Sir Thomas Liddell C8/92/135 20 May 1649

" " " " v Sir Francis Liddell C8/119/151 5 July 1653

Sir Henry Vane junior v Montagu Bertie, earl of Lindsey
C10/9/93 2 Dec.1650

Decrees and Orders of the court of Chancery C33/196. 29 Oct.1649

Close Roll C54/3550 Grant of lands by the Commissioners for the
sale of Dean and Chapters' lands to Sir Henry Vane 26 Oct.1650

Close Roll C54/3568 Sir Henry Vane's surrender of his office as
Treasurer of the Navy 31 Dec.1650

Close Roll C54/3589 Grant by the earl of Lindsey of church
property in Lincolnshire to Sir Henry Vane 18 Nov.1650

iii. Exchequer

Pipe and Audit Office Declared Accounts: Treasurer of the Navy

A.O.I./1704/81 1 Jan.-31 Dec.1638

A.O.I./1704/83 1 Jan.-31 Dec.1639

A.O.I./1706/90 13 May 1645-31 Dec.1646

E 351/2286 1 Jan.1646-47 - 31 Dec.1647

E 351/2287 1 Jan.1647-48 - 12 May 1649

E 351/2288 13 May 1649 - 31 Dec. 1650

iv. Privy Seal Office

Docket Book IND.6789 1637-1641

v. State Papers Domestic

- S.P.16/452/92 9 May 1640
 S.P.16/211/18 5 Feb.1632
 S.P.16/511/12 8 Oct.1645 Letter of Sir H.Vane junior
 S.P.18/3 Oct.-Dec.1649 Letters and Papers
 S.P.18/11 Sept.-Dec.1650 " " "
 S.P.21/1 1-28 June 1644 Draft Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/2 4 Mar.1645-22 April Draft Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/3 23 April-6 June 1645 Draft Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/4 7 June-27 Aug.1645 Draft Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/5 28 Aug.-11 Dec.1645 Draft Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/6 20 Jan.1648-3 Feb.1649 Draft Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/7 19 Feb.-15 Nov.1644 Fair Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/8 16 Nov.1644-5 July 1645 Fair Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/10 9 July 1648-19 Dec.1648 Fair Day Book, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/16 June-Sept.1644 Entry Book: Letters Received, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/17 Sept.1644-Feb.1645 Entry Book: Letters Received, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/18 18 Feb.1644-29 Aug.1644 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/19 29 Aug.1644-28 Feb.1645 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/20 1 Mar.-11 June 1645 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/21 12 June 1645-6 Oct.1645 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/22 7 Oct.1645-11 Mar.1646 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/23 11 Mar.1646-22 Mar.1647 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.21/27 22 Mar.1647-1 Aug.1648 Entry Book: Letters Sent, Committee of Both Kingdoms
 S.P.25/1 17 Feb.-4 April 1649 Draft Order Book, Council of State

- S.P.25/2 5 April-6 Sept.1649 Draft Order Book, Council of State
 S.P.25/3 7 Sept.1649-15 Feb.1650 Draft Order Book, Council of State
- S.P.25/4 16 Feb.-25 Mar.1650 Draft Order Book, Council of State
 S.P.25/21 8-30 Aug.1651 Draft Order Book, Council of State
 S.P.25/123 Feb.1649-Oct.1650 Orders, Letters etc. of the Admiralty Committee
- S.P.46/102 1650-1652 Navy Committee warrants for payments etc.
 S.P.46/114 1651-53 Papers of the Commissioners for Admiralty

vi. State Papers Foreign

S.P.80/8/19 20 Aug.1631

II. BRITISH MUSEUM

Sir Symonds D'Ewes A Journall of the Parliament begunne Nov.3 Tuesday Anno Domini 1640. 3 Nov.1640-3 Nov.1645. Harl.162-166.

Lawrence Whittaker Diary of proceedings in the House of Commons 8 Oct.1642-8 July 1647. Add.31,116.

Walter Yonge Journal of proceedings in the House of Commons 19 Sept.1642-10 Dec.1645. Add.18,777-18,780.

John Harrington of Kelweston, the Memorandum book of, Mar.1646-Nov.1653 (various periods).

Bulstrode Whitelocke Memorials. Add.37,343 and 37,344. Nov.1634-July 1649.

Despatches of French Envoys, 1644 and 1645. Add.5,460 and 5,461.

Minutes ... of the proceedings of the parliamentary commissioners of the Admiralty and Navy from 1645 to 1648. Add,9,305.

A collection of one hundred and twenty papers and letters relating to the Navy of England, between the years 1650 and 1700, made by Richard Gibson, of the Navy Office. Add.II,602.

III. SOMERSET HOUSE

Will of Sir Henry Vane senior 1655. Register Aylett 159

Will of Sir Henry Vane junior's son, Henry, 1662. Register Laud 120

Will of Sir Christopher Wray 1646. Register Twisse 36

Will of Lady Albinia Wray 1660. Register Bath 174

IV. CORPORATION OF LONDON, GUILDHALL RECORD OFFICE

Journal of Common Council vol.39. 7 Nov.1639-29 Oct.1642
 " " " " " 40.24 Mar.1641-2 June 1649

Common Hall Book, vol.i. 5 Nov.1642-20 Oct.1646

V. HOUSE OF LORDS RECORD OFFICE

Petition of Alexander, Lord Forbes. 14 June 1648

VI. BODLEIAN LIBRARY, OXFORD

Orders from the Navy and Customs Committee to the
 Treasurer of the Navy 1642-43 Rawl.A 220

Order Books of the Committee of Navy and Customs

Mar.1643-Mar.1644 Rawl.A 221

Mar.-Aug.1644 Rawl. A 222

Jan.-Oct.1649 Rawl.A 224

Order Books of the Committee of the Admiralty

April -Sept.1645 Rawl.C 416

Oct.1650-Aug.1653 Rawl.A 225, 226, 227

List of Purchasers of Bishops' Lands Rawl. B 239

Letter of the earl of Northumberland to Charles I

5 April 1641 Tanner 66 f.48

Letter of the Commissioners in Scotland to Parliament

2 Mar.1652 Tanner 55 f.158

News-letters Clarendon MSS 2495, 2504, 2565, 2583, 2597, 2605,
 2632, 2644, 2672

Parliamentary Diary of Sir Thomas Peyton 6 Nov.1640-

17 Mar.1642 (Microfilm no.39)

VII. CITY AND COUNTY OF KINGSTON UPON HULL, GUILDHALL

Corporation Bench Books

vol.v. 1609-1650

vol.vi. 1650-64

Letters 1643-53

VIII. RABY CASTLE

Estate Deeds belonging to Lord Barnard.

IX. Note on manuscript sources for the Committee of Navy and Customs and for the Admiralty Committee from 1642 to 1653.

The Committee of Navy and Customs, the financial committee, has left no records of its meetings, except Vane's order-book, for the period November 1641, (when it was 'revived' after the recess), until March 1643. Vane's order-book, begun two days after the House appointed him as Treasurer in 1642, is now in the Bodleian, among the manuscripts collected by Pepys. (Rawl. A 220). A minute-book of the Committee however begins in March 1643, and reads as though one had not been kept before. (Rawl. A 221). Since the membership of this Committee was almost identical with that of the Admiralty Commissioners appointed in October 1642, and the work of both would be inter-related, perhaps there was no need for two minute-books at first. Certainly there are no records of the October 1642 Admiralty Committee extant. Rawl. A 222 is the continuation of the Navy and Customs (financial) Committee's minutes, and extends from March to August 1644; in the latter month seven new members were added to the Committee, and probably the clerk began a new minute-book which has not survived. Giles Greene's printed Apology (see chap.v) is a valuable source for both these Committees.

With the establishment of the new Admiralty Committee in April 1645 a remarkably complete series of minute-books for this Committee begins, but they are scattered. Rawl. C416 is the minute-book for April-September 1645. The Admiralty MS in the P.R.O. (7/673) is the minute-book for October 1646 to February 1648, but the March-May 1648 minute-book has found its way to the British Museum (Add.9305).

In May 1648, as a result of the mutinies, the earl of Warwick resumed the powers of admiral, and thus the Admiralty Committee lapsed. The Council of State set up its three-man Committee of the Admiralty in February 1649, and this Committee's first minute-book is in the P.R.O. (S.P.25/123). The later minute-books, from October 1650 to August 1653, are all in the Bodleian (Rawl. A 225, 226, 227). The financial Committee's minutes for 1645-48 have not survived, but its minutes for January-October 1649 are in the Rawlinson MSS (A 224). Some of its papers, chiefly authorisations to make payments, and receipts, are in the P.R.O. (S.P.46/102(1650-52), and S.P.46/114(1651-3)).

PRIMARY SOURCESB. PRINTEDi. Letters

Abbot W.C., Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, 2 vols.,
Cambridge, Mass., 1937-39.

Baillie R., The Letters and Journals of, ed. D. Laing, 3 vols., Bannatyne
Club, Edinburgh, 1841-2.

Carte T. ed., A collection of Original Letters, 1641-68..., 2 vols.,
London, 1739.

Dyve Sir Lewis, 'The Tower of London Letter-Book of, 1646-47', ed.
H.G. Tibbutt, Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Records Soc.,
vol. xxxviii, 1958, 49-97.

Gardiner S.R. and Atkinson S.T. ed., Letters and Papers relating to the
first Dutch War, 1652-54, 5 vols., Navy Record Soc., London, 1898-1912.

Hauck K., Die Briefe der Kinder des Winterkonigs, Heidelberg, 1908.

W. Knowler ed. The Earl of Strafforde's Letters and Despatches,
2 vols., London, 1739.

Montereul Jean de, and the brothers de Bellievre, French ambassadors
in England and Scotland, 1645-48, The diplomatic correspondence of,
ed. J.G. Fotheringham, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1898-99.

Nicholas Sir Edward, Correspondence of, ed. Sir G.F. Warner, Camden
Soc., 4 vols.

Nickolls J., Original Letters and Papers of State... found among the
political collections of Mr. John Milton, London, 1743.

ii. Diaries

Burton Thomas, Diary of... ed. J.T. Rutt, 4 vols., London, 1828.

D'Ewes Sir Simonds, The Journal of... ed. W. Notestein, New Haven,
Conn., 1923.

D'Ewes Sir Simonds, The Journal of... ed. W.H. Coates, New Haven,
Conn., 1942.

Johnstone Sir Archibald of Waristoun, Diary of, ed. Sir G.M. Paul and D.H. Fleming, Scottish History Soc., 2 vols., Edinburgh. 1911-1919.

Leicester Journal of the earl of, 1646-61, ed. Blencowe R.W., London, 1825.

Northcote Sir J., Notebook of..., ed. A.H.A. Hamilton, London, 1877.

Pepys S., Diary... ed. H.B. Wheatley, 10 vols., London, 1904.

Verney Sir Ralph, Notes of proceedings in the Long Parliament... by, ed. J. Bruce, 1845.

iii. Calendars

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series. The reign of Charles I, 1625-49. 22 vols., 1858-93. Addenda vol., 1629-49, London, 1897.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series. Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-60. 13 vols., 1875-86.

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English affairs... in the archives... of Venice... vols. 25-32, 1924-31. ed. H.F. Brown and A.B. Hind. London, 1900-25.

Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1633-47, 1647-60, ed. R.P. Mahaffy, London, 1901, 1903.

Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, 1643-60, ed. M.A.E. Green, 5 vols., London, 1889-92.

Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Advance of Money, 1642-56, ed. M.A.E. Green, 3 vols., London, 1888.

iv. Pamphlets

Anon.

Alas, poore Parliament, how art thou betray'd? 9 Dec. 1644. E 21(9)

The Antipodes, or Reformation with the Heeles Upward. 22 July 1647.
E 399(16)

The Answer of the Parliament of England to... a Declaration of the King's Majesty. 20 Sept. 1650. E 613(2)

- Bloody Plots against the Parliament, the City and the Kingdoms.
4 June 1646. E 339(16)
- Bartholomew Fairing. 30 Aug.1649. E 572(7)
- Carmen Elegiacum. 28 Ap.1643. E 99(101)
- Certaine Considerations touching the Present Factions in the King's Dominions. 6 Oct. 1648. E 466(3)
- Chartae Scriptae. 17 Nov.1645. E 309(19)
- Chippes of the Old Block. 22 Jan.1660. BM.669 f.23,f.14.
- The City Alarm. 7 July 1645. E 292(12)
- The poore Committee Man's Accompt.n.d. [?1647]BM.669 f.11(68)
- De Comparatis Comparandis. 13 May 1648. E 442(3)
- A dialogue between Sir Henry Vane and Sir Arthur Haslerigg. E 1849(2)
n.d.[?1662]
- A Diary...Communicating the most remarkable proceedings of both Houses of Parliament. 26 Sept.1645. E 303(29)
- An Engagement of the Lords and Commons that went to the Army.
15 Dec.1647. E 419(12)
- England's Monument. 21 Sept.1646. BM.669 f.10(55)
- The Kentish Petition. Nov.1644. E 19(11) [In MS]
- A Letter from a true Lover of Peace...25 Aug.1645. E 298(7)
- The Petition of the Lord Mayor of London...27 April 1648. E 437(11)
- The Mad Dog Rebelling. 13 July 1648. E 452(22)
- The Mysterie of the Two Juntoes. 24 June 1647. E 393(29)
- New Presbyterian Light springing out of Independent Darkness.
30 July 1647. E 400(24)
- Passes Granted by the Free-born People of England to severall of the most eminent perjur'd rebels...22 May 1648. E 443(33)

The Parliament under the power of the Sword. 11 Dec.1648 E 476(1)

The Representations and Consultations of the General Council
of The Army at St.Albans. 14 Nov.1648 E 472(3)

A Speedy Post from Heaven to the King of England. Written by A.H.
5 Oct.1642. E 121(6)

A True Account and Character of the Times. 9 Aug.1647. E 401(13)

The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane at the King's Bench, Westminster.
London, 1662.

A Warning for all the Counties of England... E 381(13) 24 Mar.1647.

A Letter to the House from the Laird Wareston... 2 Feb.1660.
B.M.669 f.23(26)

Vox Populi, or the cry of the Commons against Committee-men.
29 July 1647. E 400(18)

Batten Sir W., A declaration of Sir William Batten concerning
his departure from London to the Prince. 21 Aug.1648. E 460(13)

Bowles Edward, Manifest Truths. 4 July 1646. E 343(1)

Buchanan David, Truth its Manifest. 12 Nov.1645. E 1179(5)
" " Some Papers of the Commissioners of Scotland. II Ap.
1646. E 333(1)
" " Histoire Veritable de ces derniers troubles...Mar.
1649. E 547
" " An Explanation of some truths...a short view of
the present condition of Scotland. 3 Jan.1646. E 314(15).

Burgess A., Public Affections pressed, in a sermon before the
House of Commons. 25 Feb.1646. E 325(5)

Burrell Andrewes, The humble remonstrance of...for a reformation
of England's navie. n.d. [1646] E 335(6)

The Answer of the Commissioners of the Navy [An answer to the above]
18 June 1646. E 340(31)

Burroughs J., A Sermon preached before the House of Commons.
26 Aug.1646. E 351(11)

Butler Major, The Fourth Paper presented by Major Butler.
30 Mar.1650. E 658(9)

Caryl J., Heaven and Earth embracing, a sermon before the House of Peers. 28 Jan.1646 E 319(11)

Case T., Deliverance-Obstruction, a sermon before the House of Peers, 25 Mar.1646 E 329(9)

Cleveland J., The Scots Apostasy. 10 Mar.1646. BM.669 f.10(117).

Fry John, The Clergy in their Colours. 29 Nov.1650. E 1378(5).

Greene Giles, A declaration in vindication...of the Committee of the Navy and Customes. 1 Sept.1647. E 405(8).

Holles Denzil, A grave and learned speech by Denzil Holles...to the charge against him from Sir Thomas Fairfax and the Army. 20 July 1647. E 399(14)

Killigrew Sir William, Certaine papers concerning the Earle of Lindsey his fennes ...London, [1649]

A paper delivered and dispersed by...1 June 1651, London.

A reply to...by the owners and commoners in Lincolnshire,
London, [1651]

The rioters in Lindsey Levell...London, 18 Jan.1654/5

Sir W.K. His answer to the Fennemans objections...n.p.1649.

Sir W.K. and others, A breviat of the Cause depending...
before Parliament, London, 1651

Lilburne J., Oppressed Man's Oppressions. 1 Feb.1647. E 373(1)

The Resolved Man's Resolution. 30 Ap.1647. E 387(4).

Jonah's Cry out of the Whale's Belly. 26 July 1647. E 400(5)

Two Letters...13 and 15 Sept.1647. E 407(41)

The Iuglers Discovered. 28 Sept.1647. E 409(22)

The Grand Plea...25 Oct.1647. E 411(21)

A Whip for the present House of Lords. 6 Mar.1648. E 431(1)

A Prisoner's Plea for a Habeas Corpus. 4 Ap.1648. E 434(19)

The Second Part of England's New Chaines Discovered.

24 Mar.1649. E 548(9)

The Discoverer. 13 July 1649. E 564(9) [An answer to
Lilburne's 'New Chaines' by John Canne]

Lilburne J., The picture of the Council of State. II Ap.1649.
E 550(14)

Legall Fundamentall Liberties...18 June 1649.
E 560(14)

An Impeachment...10 Aug.1649. E 508(20)

Love Christopher, Mr.Love's Case. 1651. E 790(1)

Short Plea for the Commonwealth...discovering
the treasonable practices of Mr.Love. 29 July
1651. E 790(2)

A cleare and necessary Vindication...of Mr.Love
8 Aug.1651. E 790(5)

Marshall Stephen, ἑργασια, The Churches Lamentation, A Sermon
to the two houses of Parliament at the Funerall of John Pym.
15 Dec.1643. E 80(1)

England's Monument of Mercies. 21 Sept.1646.669
f.10(85)

Sermon preached to the two Houses of Parliament...
on the day of thanksgiving]. 12 Aug.1647.E 401(29)

Emmanuel, a Thanksgiving Sermon preached to the
House of Commons. 17 May 1648. E 443(3)

Mercer C., Speculum Anglie. 9 Mar.1646. E 327(13)

Oliver Cromwell the late great Tirant his Life-Guard, by P.D.E 1040(10)

Peters Hugh, Peter's last Report. 27 Aug.1646. E 351(12)

" " A Word for the Army. 11 Oct.1647. E 410(16)

P.B., Gentleman, The Privileges of the H ouse of Commons in Parliament
Assembled. 31 Dec.1642. E 83(39)

The Six Secondary Causes of the Spinning Out of this Unnaturall War.
by D.P.F. 25 Nov.1644. E 18(4)

P.D. Parables reflecting upon the Times. 13 Nov.1648. E 470(31)

The Solemn League and Covenant-tracts relating to:Anon.

The Reformation of the Discipline and Service of the Church according to the best Reformed Churches. 5 Oct.1643. E 69(21).

A briefe discourse declaring the impiety and unlawfulness of the new covenant with the Scots. 26 Oct.1643. E 73(1).

Letters of consequence from Scotland. 30 Oct.1643. E 74(5).

The Three Kingdomes' Healing Plaster. 17 Oct.1643. E 71(14).

The Anti-Confederacie. 6 Ap.1644. E 40(29).

Case T. The Quarrel of the Covenant. 8 Dec.1643. E 78(4).

Mocket T. A view of the Solemn League and Covenant. 1 Jan.1644. E 80(2).

Saltmarsh J. A Solemn Discourse upon the Grand Covenant. 12 Oct.1643.
E 1208(1).

E.W. The Solemn League and Covenant. 17 Oct.1643. E 71(13).

St. John O., The Case of Oliver St. John, Esq. 30 July 1660. E 1035(5).

Torshel S., The Palace of Justice. 12 May 1646. E 337(12).

Vane Sir Henry, Junior. Speech in the House of Commons against Episcopal Government. E 198(20) 11 [12] June 1641.

Speech in Guildhall, London, 8 Nov.1642. E 126(44).

Speech at a Common Hall, 27 Oct.1643. E 74(7).

" " " " " , 16 Jan.1644. E 29(13).

Two Speeches in the Guildhall, London, 4 March,
11 April 1644. E 273(3).

Vane Sir Henry, Junior. The Retired Man's Meditations,
20 April 1655. (Date of composition).

A Healing Question Propounded..., 12 May
(Thomason's date) 1656.

Walker Clement, Historie of Independency. 26 May 1648. E 445(1).

" " The first centurie... 1 Aug. 1648. E 458(12).

" " The second centurie... 1648. E 465(13).

Walwyn, W., Fountain of Schlauder discovered. 30 May 1649. E 557(4).

Wildman J., Putney Projects... 30 Dec. 1647. E 421(19).

" " Windsor Projects... 15 May 1648. E 442(10).

" " Westminster Projects... 23 Mar. 1648. E 433(15).

" " Westminster Projects... No. 5 6 June 1648. E 446(5).

Republica Anglicana by G.W. 28 Oct. 1650. E 780(25).

v. Diurnalls

E 2(30)	6 July 1644.	Mercurius Aulicus.
E 17(9)	16 Nov. 1644.	The True Informer.
E 18(4)	21 Nov. 1644.	A Diary or an Exact Iournall.
E 18(17)	22 Nov. 1644.	The Scottish Dove.
E 21(36)	20 Dec. 1644.	The Scottish Dove.
E 22(4)	23 Dec. 1644.	Mercurius Britannicus.
E 22(5)	19 Nov. 1644.	Mercurius Aulicus.
E 22(9)	24 Dec. 1644.	The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
E 22(11)	26 Dec. 1644.	The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
E 22(16)	31 Jan. 1645.	The Scottish Dove.
E 26(7)	28 Jan. 1645.	The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
E 26(9)	28 Jan. 1645.	Perfect Passages.
E 26(11)	30 Jan. 1645.	A Diary or an Exact Iournall.
E 26(12)	30 Jan. 1645.	The Parliament Scout.
E 26(16)	31 Jan. 1645.	The Scottish Dove.
E 31(21)	7 Feb. 1644.	The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
E 33(2)	13 Feb. 1644.	The Spie.

- E 33(6) 14 Feb.1644. The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
 E 54(5) 22 June 1644. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 70(20) 28 Sept.1643. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 270(14) 2 Feb.1645. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 270(29) 27 Feb.1645. Mercurius Civicus.
 E 270(30) 27 Feb.1645. A Diary or an Exact Journall.
 E 270(33) 29 Feb.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 271(4) 9 Feb.1645. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 273(13) 2 Mar.1645. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 277(15) 11 Ap.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 284(20) 27 Ap.1645. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 284(21) 19 May 1645. Mercurius Britannicus.
 E 292(4) 3 July 1645. A Diary or an Exact Journall.
 E 292(5) 4 July 1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 292(23) 11 July 1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 292(27) 15 Aug.1645. The Moderate Intelligencer.
 E 296(4) 8 Aug.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 296(33) 20 July 1645. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 298(23) 13 Aug.1645. Mercurius Aulicus.
 E 303(29) 1 Oct.1645. A Diary or an Exact Journall.
 E 309(24) 19 Nov.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 310(9) 27 Nov.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 311(4) 3 Dec.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 311(19) 10 Dec.1645. The Scottish Dove.
 E 317(4) 21 Jan.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 318(8) 26 Jan.1646. Mercurius Britannicus.
 E 319(17) 29 Jan.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 320(2) 2 Feb.1646. Mercurius Academicus.
 E 322(38) 18 Feb.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 325(11) 26 Feb.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 325(29) 4 Mar. 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 330(31) 8 Ap.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 335(1) 30 Ap.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 337(22) 15 May 1646. Perfect Occurrences.
 E 337(28) 20 May 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 339(13) 3 June 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 340(14) 10 June 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 341(19) 25 June 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 344(9) 15 July 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 345(11) 22 July 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 349(7) 5 Aug.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 350(3) 11 Aug.1646. The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
 E 350(5) 12 Aug.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 351(10) 26 Aug.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 353(6) 2 Sept. 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 353(19) 9 Sept. 1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 355(5) 23 Sept.1646. The Scottish Dove.
 E 358(8) 20 Oct.1646. The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
 E 358(11) 21 Oct.1646. The Scottish Dove.

E 358(23)	27 Sept.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 407(8)	28 Sept.1647	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 410(4)	6 Oct.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 410(19)	12 Oct.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 411(8)	19 Oct.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 411(23)	26 Oct.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 414(15)	16 Nov.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 417(20)	30 Nov.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 419(12)	7 Dec.1647.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 421(1)	21 Dec.1647	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 421(15)	28 Dec.1647	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 422(17)	11 Jan.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 422(25)	12 Jan.1648.	Mercurius Elencticus.
E 426(6)	8 Feb.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 426(7)	10 Feb.1648.	Mercurius Melancholicus.
E 427(1)	12 Feb.1648.	Mercurius Melancholicus.
E 427(13)	17 Feb.1648.	Mercurius Aulicus.
E 429(15)	29 Feb.1648.	Mercurius Bellicus.
E 431(5)	7 Mar.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 431(20)	9 Mar.1648.	Mercurius Aulicus.
E 433(4)	21 Mar.1648.	Mercurius Aulicus.
E 433(8)	21 Mar.1648.	Mercurius Bellicus.
E 433(33)	27 Apr.1648.	The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
E 435(12)	11 Apr.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 435(42)	18 Apr.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 437(14)	27 Apr.1648.	Mercurius Veridicus.
E 437(33)	27 Apr.1648.	The Kingdome's Weekly Intelligencer.
E 438(7)	3 May 1648.	Mercurius Elencticus.
E 438(12)	16 May 1648.	Mercurius Criticus.
E 442(16)	16 May 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 443(6)	17 May 1648.	The Parliament Kite
E 443(37)	23 May 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 445(19)	29 May 1648.	Mercurius Publicus.
E 445(21)	30 May 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 446(32)	9 June 1648.	The Parliament Kite.
E 447(5)	13 June 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 451(42)	11 July 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 452(19)	18 July 1648.	Mercurius Bellicus.
E 453(11)	18 July 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 455(12)	31 July 1648.	Mercurius Melancholicus.
E 458(25)	15 Aug. 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 460(15)	22 Aug. 1648.	The Royall Diurnall
E 462(34)	12 Sept.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 465(11)	2 Oct.1648.	Mercurius Anti-Mercurius
E 465(19)	3 Oct.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 465(37)	5 Oct.1648.	Mercurius Volpone.

E 467(22)	12 Oct.1648.	Mercurius Volpone.
E 468(14)	18 Oct.1648.	Mercurius Elencticus.
E 470(7)	21 Nov.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 470(35)	28 Nov.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 476(2)	12 Dec. 1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 476(4)	12 Dec.1648.	Mercurius Elencticus.
E 476(30)	26 Dec.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 476(35)	19 Dec.1648.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 476(36)	19 Dec.1648.	Mercurius Elencticus.
E 518(2)	July 1648.	Perfect Occurrences.
E 533()	12 Oct.1649.	Perfect Occurrences.
E 534(1)	April 1650.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.
E 534(3)	April 1650.	Severall Proceedings in Parliament.
E 540(15)	30 Jan.1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 545(15)	27 Feb.1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 545(16)	27 Feb.1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 546(18)	13 Mar.1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 549(13)	3 Apr.1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 555(10)	14 May 1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 555(14)	15 May 1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 556(5)	22 May 1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 556(16)	18 May 1649.	Mercurius Pacificus.
E 556(25)	29 May 1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 558(20)	5 June 1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 559(14)	12 June 1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 566(5)	18 May 1649.	Mercurius Pacificus
E 566(28)	2 Aug.1649.	The Man in the Moon.
E 572(22)	5 Sept.1649.	The Man in the Moon.
E 578(4)	6 Nov.1649.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 593(15)	19 Feb.1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 594(6)	25 Feb.1650.	The Royall Diurnall.
E 594(9)	n.d.	The Man in the Moon.
E 584(17)	5 Mar.1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 594(21)	6 Mar.1650.	The Man in the Moon.
E 594(24)	12 Mar.1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 595(8)	19 Mar.1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 596(12)	26 Mar.1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 599(5)	2 Apr.1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 600(6)	7 May 1650.	Mercurius Pragmaticus.
E 601(5)	26 Apr.1650.	The Man in the Moon.
E 608(9)	16 July 1650.	The Weekly Intelligencer.
E 614(6)	24 Oct.1650.	Mercurius Politicus.
E 614(12)	17 Oct.1650.	Mercurius Politicus.
E 777(18)	4 July 1650.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.
E 777(27)	18 July 1650.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.
E 777(30)	22 July 1650.	A Perfect Diurnall.
E 778(19)	15 Aug. 1650.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.
E 780(8)	19 Sept.1650.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.
E 785(2)	28 Mar.1651.	The Faithful Scout.

E 786(12)	3 July 1651.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.
E 799(6)	1 Oct.1652.	The Faithful Scout.
E 799(10)	8 Oct.1652.	The Faithful Scout.
E 799(17)	22 Oct.1652.	The Faithful Scout.
E 799(20)	26 Oct.1652.	Mercurius Britannicus.
E 799(24)	29 Oct.1652.	The Faithful Scout.
E 801(6)	2 Dec.1652.	Several Proceedings in Parliament.

vi. Miscellaneous.

Aubrey John, Brief Lives, ed. A. Clark, Oxford, 1898.

Baxter Richard, Reliquiae Baxterianae, ed. M. Sylvester, London, 1696.

" " Holy Commonwealth, London, 1659.

Berkeley Sir John, Memoirs of, in A Narrative by John Ashburnham of his attendance on King Charles the First, London, 1830.

Bruce J. and Masson D. ed., Documents relating to the quarrel between the earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell, Camden Soc., 1875.

Burnet G., History of my own time, ed. M.J. Routh, 2 vols., Oxford, 1847.

Cary H. ed., Memorials of the great civil war, 1646-52, 2 vols., London, 1842.

Charters...granted to Kingston-upon-Hull, ed. J.R. Boyle, Hull, 1905.

Clarendon Edward earl of, The history of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England, ed. W.D. Macray, 6 vols., Oxford, 1888.

Clarendon Edward earl of, State Papers collected by, ed. R. Scope and T. Monkhouse, 3 vols., fol., Oxford, 1767-86.

Cobbett W., Complete collection of state trials...vol.vi, London, 1809-28.

Commons, Journals of the House of, vols.ii to vii, 1803-.

Durham and Northumberland Records of the Committees for Compounding with delinquent royalists in...1643-60, ed. R. Welford, Surtees Soc., 1905.

Firth C.H. and Rait C.S., Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660, Oxford, 1906.

Firth C.H. ed., Selections from the Papers of William Clarke, 4 vols., Camden Soc., 1891-1901.

Gardiner S.R. ed., The constitutional documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-60, Oxford, 1906.

Haller W., Tracts on liberty in the Puritan revolution, 1638-1647, 3 vols., New York, 1934.

Haller W., Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution, New York, 1955.

Hetherington W.M., History of the Westminster Assembly, ed. R. Williamson, Edinburgh, 1878.

Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Report on the MSS of F.W. Leyborne-Popham, Norwich, 1899.

Report on the MSS of Sir Harry Verney, bart., Report vii, app.i, 433-509.

Report on the Percy MSS, 10th Report, App., part iv.

Report on the Marten-Loder MSS, 13th Rep. App. iv, 378-404.

Report on the MSS of the House of Lords, Report vi, part i, App.

Holles Denzil, Lord, Memoirs of, reprinted in Select Tracts, ed. F. Maseres, 2 vols., London, 1815, i, 183-320.

Hollond J., Two discourses of the navy, 1638 and 1659, ed. J.R. Tanner, Navy Records Soc., 1896.

- Lightfoot J., "The journal of the Assembly of Divines",
The whole works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, ed. J.R. Pitman,
 vol. xiii, London, 1825-42.
- Longstaffe W., The Acts of the High Commission Court within
 the Diocese of Durham, Surtees Soc., vol. xxxiv, Durham, 1858.
- House of Lords, Journals of, vols. iv- n.p.n.d.
- Ludlow E., Memoirs of, ed. C.H. Firth, 2 vols., Oxford, 1894.
- Milton J., Character of the Long Parliament and Assembly of Divines,
 Milton's Prose Works, Bohn's Standard Edition, v. 236- , 1853.
- Mitchell A.F. and Struthers J., Minutes of the Westminster Assembly,
 Edinburgh and London, 1874.
- Rhode Island, Records of the Colony of, ed. J.R. Bartlett, 10 vols.,
 Providence, R.I., 1856-65.
- The Rump, or an exact collection of the choicest poems and songs
 relating to the late times, reprinted London, 1874.
- Rushworth John, Historical Collections, 7 vols., London, 1659-1701.
- Sikes George, The Book of Nature translated, London, 1667.
- Evangelical Essays, London, 1666.
- The life of Sir Henry Vane, London, 1662.
- Somers Tracts A collection of scarce and valuable tracts...
 selected from... public as well as private libraries, particularly
 that of the late Lord Somers, London, 1809-15 ed. Sir W. Scott.
- Stubbe Henry, Legends no Histories, London, 1670.
- Statutes of the Realm, ed. A. Luders, T.E. Tomlins, J. Raithby,
 1810-28, London, 1742.
- Thurloe J. A collection of the state papers of John Thurloe, Esq.,
 ed. T. Birch, 7 vols., London, 1742.

- Waller Sir William, Recollections, App.to 'Poetry of Anna Matilda', London, 1788.
- Warburton Elliot, Memoirs of Prince Rupert, 3 vols., London, 1849.
- Welch J., List of Scholars of St.Peter's College, Westminster, London, 1788.
- Whitelocke Bulstrode, Memorials of English affairs, 4 vols., Oxford, 1853.
- Williams Roger, The Bloody Tenent of persecution...discussed, London, 1644. Reprinted by the Hansard Knollys Soc. in "Tracts on liberty of conscience and persecution, 1614-61", ed. E.B. Underhill, London, 1848.
- Williams Roger, The Bloody Tenent yet more Bloody...28 April 1652, London, E 661(6)

SECONDARY SOURCESA. PRINTED

Abbott W.C., Bibliography of Oliver Cromwell, Harvard, 1929.

Anderson R.C., 'Lists of Men of War', Soc. for Historical research,
Occasional Publications, no.5, part 1,

Ashley M., Financial and Commercial Policy of the Protectorate,
London, 1962.

Ashley, M. The Greatness of Oliver Cromwell, London, 1958.

Ashton R., 'The Disbursing Official under the early Stuarts...',
Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xxx, 1957, 162-174.

Aylmer G., The King's Servants, London, 1961.

Bagwell R., Ireland under the Stuarts, 3 vols., London, 1909-16.

Barker G.F Russell, Record of Old Westminster, n.p. 1928.

Batiffol L., Le Cardinal de Retz..., Paris, 1927.

Bell H.E., The Court of Wards and Liveries, Cambridge, 1953.

Bell H.E and Ollard R.L., Historical Essays 1650-1750... London, 1963.

Bigby D.A., Anglo-French Relations, 1641-49, London, 1933.

Brunton D. and Pennington D.H., Members of the Long Parliament,
London, 1954.

Burke J. , Landed Gentry, 1952.

" Peerage, London, 1963.

Burrows M., ed., Register of the Visitors of the University of
Oxford, 1647-58, Camden Soc., 1881.

Clyde W., Struggle for the Freedom of the Press, Edinburgh, 1934.

Coates W.H., 'Some Observations on the Grand Remonstrance',
Journal of Modern History, Mar.1932, p.7-.

- Coates W.H., 'The Genesis of the Grand Remonstrance',
University of Illinois Studies, i, no.4, Urbana, 1902.
- Collins A., Peerage of England, London, 1812.
- Cranston M., John Locke, London, 1957.
- Craster H.H.E., History of Northumberland, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
and London, 1907-1914.
- Dalton C., History of the Wrays of Glentworth, 2 vols.,
London, 1880-81.
- Davies Godfrey, The Early Stuarts 1603-60, Oxford, 1959.
- Dawson William H., Cromwell's Understudy, the life and times
of General John Lambert... London, 1938.
- Deane J.B., Life of Richard Deane, London, 1870.
- Dewar A.C., 'The naval administration of the Interregnum',
Mariners' Mirror, xii, London, 1926.
- Dickinson W.Croft, Donaldson G., Milne I.A., ed., A Source Book
of Scottish History, 3 vols., London, 1958-61.
- Dictionary of National Biography, ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee,
London, 1885-1900.
- Dietz F., English Public Finance 1558-1641, New York and
London, 1932.
- Durham and Northumberland, Architectural and Archeological Soc.
of, Transactions, 1880-81, London.
- Everitt A.E., The County Committee of Kent, in the Civil War.
University of Leicester, Dept. of English Local History,
Occasional Papers, ix, Leicester, 1957.
- Firth C.H. 'Cromwell and Sir Henry Vane', English Historical
Review, xxvi, 751.
- Fisher F.J. ed., Essays in the Economic and Social History
of Tudor and Stuart England in honour of R.H. Tawney,
London, 1961.
- Forster John, The Arrest of the Five members by Charles the First,
London, 1860.

- Forster John, The Debates on the Grand Remonstrance...
London, 1860.
- Fortescue G.K., Catalogue of the pamphlets...collected by
George Thomason, 1640-61, 2 vols., London, 1908.
- Galloway R.K., A History of Coal Mining in Great Britain,
London, 1881.
- " " " Annals of Coal Mining and the Coal Trade,
London, 1898, 1904.
- Gammell W., Life of Roger Williams, Library of American
Biography, vol.iv, Boston, 1846.
- Gardiner S.R., History of England from the Accession of
James I to the outbreak of the Civil War, 10 vols.,
London, 1883-84.
- Gardiner S.R., History of the Great Civil War, 1642-49,
4 vols., London, 1893.
- Gardiner S.R., History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate,
1649-56, 3 vols., London, 1894-1901.
- Geddes James, The history of the Administration of De Witt,
London, 1879.
- Gibb M.A., John Lilburne, Leveller, London, 1947.
- Gooch G.P. and Laski H., English Democratic Ideas in the
Seventeenth Century, Cambridge, 1927.
- Green T.H., Four Lectures on the Puritan Revolution,
London, 1912.
- Guizot F.P.G., History of Charles the First and the English
Revolution, trans. A.R. Scoble, London, 1854. 2 vols.
- Guizot F.P.G., History of Oliver Cromwell and the English
Commonwealth, trans. A.R.Scoble, 2 vols., London, 1854.
- Guizot F.P.G., History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration
of Charles II, trans. A.R. Scoble, 2 vols., London, 1856.
- Hardacre P., The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution,
London, 1956.
- Hexter J.F., The Reign of King Pym, Cambridge, Mass., 1941.

- Hexter J.F., 'The Problem of the Presbyterian Independents',
Re-appraisals in History, 1662, 163-184.
- Hill Christopher, Puritanism and Revolution, London, 1958.
- " " Economic Problems of the Church, Oxford, 1956.
- Hobman D.L., Cromwell's Master Spy, London, 1961.
- Hutchinson, J.R., The Press Gang, Afloat and Ashore, London,
1913.
- Inderwick F.A., The Interregnum, London, 1891.
- Jordan W.K., Development of Religious Toleration in England,
1640-60, vol.iii, 1938.
- Judson M.A., The Crisis of the Constitution...New Brunswick,
1949.
- Keeler M.F., The Long Parliament 1640-41, Philadelphia, 1954.
- Kennedy D.E., 'The English naval revolt of 1648', English
Historical Review, (Ap.1962), lxxvii, 247-
- Kershaw R., 'The Recruiting of the Long Parliament', History,
(Oct.1923), viii, no.31.
- Knowles J.D., Memoir of Roger Williams, Boston, 1834.
- Lamont W.M., Marginal Prynne, London, 1963.
- Latham R.C., 'The payment of Parliamentary wages-the last
phase', English Historical Review, (1951), 27-50.
- Latimer J., The Annals of Bristol in the Seventeenth century,
Bristol, 1900.
- Lewis Michael, England's Sea Officers, London, 1939.
- " " The Navy of Britain, London, 1948.
- Masson D., Life of Milton, 7 vols., Cambridge and London,
1859-94.
- Moore J.B., Lives of the governors of New Plymouth and
Massachusetts Bay... 1620-92, Boston, 1851.

- Nef J., Rise of the British Coal Industry, 2 vols., London, 1932.
- Norsworthy L., Lady of Bleeding Heart Yard, London, 1935.
- Notestein W., 'The establishment of the Committee of Both Kingdoms', American Historical Review, (1912), xvii, 477-495.
- Oppenheim M.A., A history of the administration of the royal navy...1509-1660, London, 1896.
- Oppenheim M.A., 'The Navy of the Commonwealth, 1649-60', English Historical Review, xi, , 20-58.
- Orr R.B., Alexander Henderson, churchman and statesman, London, 1919.
- Palfrey J.G., History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty, 3 vols., Boston (Mass), 1858-64.
- Penn C.D., The Navy under the Early Stuarts... Leighton Buzzard and Manchester, 1913.
- Pennington D.H., Roots I.A., The Committee at Stafford, 1643-45, Collections for a History of Staffordshire, ser.iv, vol.i, Manchester, 1957.
- Pearl V., London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-43, London, 1961.
- Plomer H., Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers...1641 to 1667, London, 1907.
- Ramsey R.W., Henry Ireton, London, 1949.
- Reckitt B., Charles I and Hull, London, 1952.
- Return of the names of every...member in each parliament, 2 vols. s.l. 1878.
- Retz J.F.P. de Gondi, Cardinal de, Mémoires, ed.M.Allem, Paris, 1956.
- Sharpe R.R., London and the Kingdom...3 vols., London, 1894-95.
- Shaw W.A., History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640-1660, 2 vols., London, 1900.

- Shaw W.A., 'The Westminster Assembly', Cambridge Modern History, vol.iv, Cambridge, 1906.
- Shaw W.A., The Knights of England, 2 vols., London, 1906.
- Smith H.F., Harrington and his Oceana, Cambridge, 1914.
- Stanewell L.M., Calendar of the Ancient Dees, Letters... etc. in the Archives of the City and County of Kingston upon Hull, Kingston upon Hull, 1951.
- Stearns R.P., The strenuous Puritan, Urbana, 1954.
- Strickland J.E., Young Sir Harry Vane, London, 1904.
- Surtees R., History and Antiquities of...Durham, London, 1816-40.
- Tedder A.W., The Navy of the Restoration... Cambridge, 1916.
- Terry C.S. ed., The Cromwellian Union...1651-52,...Edinburgh, 1902.
- Tickell J., History of the Town...of Kingston upon Hull, Hull, 1798.
- Trevor-Roper H.R.: Historical Essays, London, 1957.
- " " " " 'The Fast Sermons of the Long Parliament', Essays in British History, London, 1964.
- Snow V.F., 'Parliamentary Reapportionment Proposals in the Puritan Revolution, English Historical Review, (1912), lxxiv, 409-
- Turner G.Lyon ed., Original Records of Early Nonconformity, 3 vols., London, 1911.
- Underdown D., Royalist Conspiracy in England, New Haven, 1960.
- Upham C.W., Life of Sir Henry Vane, Library of American Biography, vol.iii, Boston, Mass., 1835.
- Wedgewood C.V., The King's Peace, London, 1955.
- " " " The King's War, London, 1958.

Welford R., Men of Mark 'Twixt Tyne and Tweed, London,
1895.

Wildridge T.T. ed., The Hull Letters...1625-46, Hull,
1886.

Willcock J., The Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger,
London, 1913.

Wilson C.H., Profit and Power, London, 1957.

Wood A., Athenanae Oxonienses...ed.W.Bliss, Oxford, 1817.

" " Fasti Oxonienses London, 1813.

Woodhouse A.S.P., Puritanism and Liberty, London, 1950.

Yule G., The Independents in the English Civil War,
Cambridge, 1958.

SECONDARY SOURCES B. UNPRINTED THESES

Brown, G.H., The place of Sir Arthur Leselrige in English
politics 1659-60. (Oxford B.Litt 1949)

Everitt A.M. Kent and its Gentry 1640-60. (London Ph.D. 1957)

Thirsk I.J. The Sale of Delinquents' Estates. (London Ph.D.
1950)

Williams C.M. The political career of Henry Marten, with
special reference to the origins of Republicanism in the
Long Parliament. (Oxford Ph.D. 1954)

Notes on Sikes' Life of Vane, and on later biographies.

The Life and Death of Sir Henry Vane, Knight was, according to its title-page, published in 1662, and there is no reason to doubt that it was in fact published in that year, the year of Vane's death, when the book would certainly command a large sale. Two other books, either written by Vane or relating to him, appeared in the same year, and it would be interesting to know who was responsible for publishing these, and in how large an edition, but all three books were published anonymously and without authorisation. The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane, Kt., and Two Treatises, viz. An Epistle General to the Mystical Body of Christ on Earth, the Church Universal in Babylon. 2. The Face of the Times are both dated 1662, but only in printing the 'Two Treatises' was any printer's 'Ornament' used, and then only sparingly, doubtless to make identification of the printer more difficult for royal agents. Nevertheless one would guess, from certain indications, that the same printer was responsible both for the Life and for the other two books.¹ Thomas Brewster, who re-

1. The outer frame on the title-page of all three books is a rectangle of black lines, which would seem to be more than a coincidence, though this type of printer's ornament is by no means uncommon in the period. Each book has "Printed in the year, 1662" on the title-page, and the type used for the printer's "signature" at the foot of the relevant pages seems the same.

printed Vane's Healing Question in 1660, is the person most likely to have brought out the 1662 books. This hypothesis rests on very slender foundations - such as the use of lines on the title-page - but we know that Brewster was willing to run risks in publishing works that would incur the hostility of Charles II's government,¹ and the fact that Brewster lost his appointment as official printer to the Council of State at the end of 1653 would be consonant with some connection with Vane.² One would assume that the Tryal was published first and the Life later, when its author had had a little time to gather his information together. This chronological order would explain Baxter's statement that 'when he [Vane] was dead, his intended speech was printed, and afterwards his opinions more plainly expressed by his friend than by himself',³ for the Tryal has Vane's intended speech from the scaffold appended to the book, and the Life is indeed largely an exposition of Vane's opinions, or what the author believed them to be. The Two Treatises were probably published later still, when the government had been put thoroughly on the alert by the publication of the two previous books, and were determined to prevent any further defence of Vane from appearing. (At

-
1. For Brewster, see H.R. Plomer, Dictionary of Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland, and Ireland from 1641-to 1667, London, 1907, p.32.
 2. In 1664 he had to stand in the pillory for two days for having caused two pamphlets to be printed. He died shortly afterwards. ibid.
 3. M. Sylvester, Reliquiae Baxterianae, London 1696, p.76.

Vane's trial the notebooks of the bystanders had to be given up). The risks the printer of the Two Treatises took are shown by his apology at the end of the work, when he states: 'Many other obscurities ... have happened in the printing of this General Epistle by reason of the several difficulties that attended its publication: It being twice taken in the Press, and two Presses, well furnished with materials, taken away in the doing of it'. It is a tribute to the loyalty that Vane, even when dead, inspired in his friends, that they were willing to run such risks to present his justification to their contemporaries and to posterity.

The attribution of the Life to George Sikes rests solely on Antony à Wood's authority, and practically all that is known of Sikes, which is meagre, comes from the same source.¹ Sikes's father, according to Wood, was George Sikes of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, but the family seems to have left little trace. The younger Sikes was a servitor at St. John's College, Oxford, according to Wood, and took his B.A. in 1638, his M.A. and B.D. later. Sikes was appointed a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford by the Parliamentary Visitors in 1648, and was Bursar in 1650 and 1659. He had leave of absence for a year from 3 February 1652, and resigned in 1660.² Wood asserts that Sikes was 'a great admirer and follower of Sir Henry Vane junior,

-
1. Antony à Wood, Fasti Oxonienses, London, 1813, i, 500, ii, 3.
 2. Register of Magdalen College, Oxford, New Series, vol. iv, ed. W.D. Macray, 1904, p. 68.

and therefore esteemed by the generality an anabaptist, fifth-monarchy man, and a hodge-podge of religions'. 'What else [apart, that is, from the Life] he hath written I know not', declared Wood, but Sikes was the author of at least one other work, Evangelical Essays, towards the discovery of a gospel-state. The first part. One copy of this is at Raby Castle,¹ and belonged to Lady Vane, the younger Sir Henry's wife. It is dated 1666 and is a theological work, with chapters on free-will, the Arminian controversy, heaven, hell, and numerous other weighty subjects. The British Museum has a copy of The Book of Nature,² by one George Sikes, which internal evidence suggests is by the same author as the Life of Vane. The main interest of the author of the Book of Nature lay, as its title denotes, in the world of natural science, but there are indications of such an interest in the Life of Vane, and one might expect that Sikes, who was, according to Wood, a 'great encourager' of Henry Stubbe,³ would share the learned Stubbe's interest in science. Similarities of style make it practically certain that Sikes wrote the Tryal as well as the 1662 Life of Vane. An Exposition of Ecclesiastes, published in 1680, is also attributed in Wing to Sikes.⁴ The date of Sikes's death, like almost everything else about him, is not known; he must have been still alive in 1688

-
1. Another copy is in the library of Union Theological Seminary, New York. D. Wing, Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed 1641-1700, N.Y. 1951. S.6323.
 2. G. Sikes, The Book of Nature Translated, London 1667. Macray accepts his authorship. See note 2, p.422, above.
 3. Wood, as above.
 4. Wing, as above.

when he was a subscriber to the folio edition of Milton's poems
brought out by Lord Somers.¹

The life of Vane, published in the year of his death, and written by one of his friends, is bound to be of great interest; one must sympathise with Antony a Wood, however, who complains that Sikes 'instead of giving the reader an account of the birth, extract, breeding, actions etc. of that knight...put the reader off with his (such as 'tis) divinity'. Only a small part of Sikes' Life, perhaps one fifth of its 143 pages, consists of biographical matter. The rest is Sikes' own theological commentary, through which however his own grief and near despair at Vane's death can be easily discerned. Vane's remarkable capacity for inspiring loyalty and friendship was unfortunately almost equalled by his capacity for inspiring hatred.² The peculiar form which Sikes' biography took may be due to two reasons. First, the danger of setting out frankly, and therefore controversially, the facts of Vane's life - Vane had just been condemned to death for treason. It must be remembered also that many other men, St. John and Holles for example, who had been involved in Vane's political activities, were still alive, and Vane's family might have suffered if these men had been antagonised by full accounts of what

-
1. J. Willcock, Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger, London, 1913, p.220.
 2. Vane's friends included Cromwell, Roger Williams, St. John, Milton and Henry Stubbe. Among his enemies were Cromwell (after 1653), Maynard, the Earl of Essex, John Lilburne, and Mrs. Monk.

had happened in parliament in the 1640s and 1650s. Secondly, Sikes may simply not have had enough information to write a more factual account of Vane's life. There is little or no indication in the biography that he obtained information direct from Vane himself about the salient facts of Vane's career- even his account of Vane's conversion is taken from Vane's own words in the Tryal.¹

Sikes' shortcomings however have not prevented him from being followed by most, (though not, as Oppenheim asserts by all)² of Vane's many biographers.³ Sikes' contemporaries had also read the

-
1. Tryal, p.87, Life pp.7-8.
 2. Oppenheim, History of the Administration of the Royal Navy... London, 1896, 296.
 3. There are biographies of Vane by the following authors:-
 C.W.Upham, Life of young Sir Henry Vane, Library of American Biography, 1835, vol.iii, pp.85-403. (there were later editions). This is more critical and careful than some later biographies. The author was aware of the defects caused by the absence of English sources. Upham was critical of Sikes.
 John Forster, Lives of Eminent British Statesmen, vol.4, 1840. Forster used no MS sources, but a considerable number of printed primary sources. His opinions he largely took from Godwin.
 J.K. Hosmer, The Life of young Sir Henry Vane, Boston and London, 1888. The author does use one or two MS sources, though very sparingly, and the work is well dated on the whole. The best of the longer biographies.
 J.E. Strickland, Young Sir Harry Vane, British Free Church Heroes, no.4, London, 1904. This does not purport to be anything more than a summary of Hosmer and is valueless by modern standards.
 W.W.Ireland, The Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger, London, 1908. Makes some serious mistakes, uses no MSS, and has very few dates.
 F.J.C. Hearnshaw, The Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger, London, 1910. Congregational Worthies Series. An admirable short biography within its limits of space.
 Henry M. King, Sir Henry Vane, Junior... Providence, R.I...1909. Uncritical and based entirely on other biographies.
 John Willcock, Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger, London, 1913. This has little or no careful dating, and the author does not make use of MS sources. Largely based on Hosmer's biography, but Willcock has one or two shrewd deductions, and is useful on some points of detail, chiefly genealogical.
 Judicious brief comments on six of these biographies are given in Hearnshaw's short study.
 C.H.Firth's article on Vane in the Dictionary of National Biography is indispensable for any student of the life of Vane.

biography - Ludlow quotes extensively from it, without acknowledgement, when he writes of Vane's election to parliament, abilities, and navy treasurership,¹ and there are certainly echoes of Sikes in Clarendon.²

1. E. Ludlow, Memoirs, Oxford, 1894, ii, 339.

2. Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, ed. Macray, Oxford, 1888, vii, 267.