



<http://kentarchaeology.org.uk/research/archaeologia-cantiana/>

Kent Archaeological Society is a registered charity number 223382

© 2017 Kent Archaeological Society

JAMES STUART, DUKE OF LENOX AND
RICHMOND, OF COBHAM HALL.

BY THE LADY ELIZABETH CUST.

JAMES STUART, fourth Duke of Lenox, who was created Duke of Richmond, has, for the Kentish antiquary, an especial interest, as being the first of his name and race who actually resided at Cobham Hall, and as the builder of the central part of that mansion. He was a third cousin of King Charles I, and was, perhaps, the most personally attached of all the devoted adherents of that unfortunate sovereign. He appears to have regarded King Charles, who had superintended his education and bringing up, with almost filial love and reverence. The King on his side always treated him with the same kindness and affection that King James I had evinced for the Duke's father, Esmé Stuart, Lord D'Aubigny, and for his uncle Ludovic, Duke of Lenox. They had both accompanied King James from Scotland when he came to assume the crown of England, and the Duke of Lenox, who was hereditary Lord High Admiral and Lord Great Chamberlain of Scotland, had been created Duke of Richmond, and was enriched by the gift of Settrington, Temple Newsam, and other estates in England. In 1612, the forfeited estates of Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham, were also granted to him subject to a lease

for life, which had been granted in 1604 to the Countess of Kildare, wife of Lord Cobham.

We are more immediately interested, however, in the fortunes of the second brother Esmé, Lord D'Aubigny, who had been brought up in France, and "received a noble education"* from his mother, Katherine,† widow of Esmé, 1st Duke of Lenox. According to Sir Robert Gordon, young Esmé "had constantlie and faithfullie followed King Henry IV, of France, in all his greatest troubles,"‡ and we find that he did homage for the lands of Aubigny§ to that King in the year 1600.||

King James gave Lord D'Aubigny more than £25,000 in money,¶ and found him a rich wife, Katherine, the daughter and heiress of Sir Gervase Clifton, who, in honour of this alliance, was summoned to

* Crawford's *Great Officers of State*, p. 336.

† King James had sent to France in 1579 for her husband, Esmé Stuart, then Lord D'Aubigny (first cousin to Henry, Lord Darnley), and on his arrival in Scotland, had created him Earl of Lenox and Darnley, and in 1581 Duke of Lenox, but the Duke soon afterwards returned to France and died at Paris in 1583. On his death, his eldest son Ludovic, then nine years of age, was sent by the King's orders to Scotland, and brought up in the King's Palace. It is worthy of remark that Katherine, Duchess of Lenox, who was daughter of William de Balsac, Seigneur d'Entragues, could trace her descent through the marriage in 1414 of her ancestor, William de Montauban, with Bonne Visconti of Milan, from the noble and princely families of the Viscontis, Bourbons, Dorias, and Scaligers.

‡ Gordon's *Earldom of Sutherland*, p. 126.

§ The Lordship and lands of Aubigny were granted by Charles VII of France in 1422 to Sir John Stuart of Darnley, in gratitude for his services in the wars against the English, and were henceforth always held by a younger son of the Stuart-Lenox family, of which he was the ancestor.

|| Andrew Stuart's *History of the Stewarts*, p. 266.

¶ Nichols' *Progresses of James I*, vol. ii., p. 247.

Parliament as Lord Clifton, of Leighton Bromswold, in 1608.* Lord Clifton, who seems to have become involved in constant disputes with his son-in-law, was at last sent to the Tower for having threatened to kill the Lord Keeper Bacon,† who had decided a lawsuit against him, and languished there for some months, till he put an end to his miserable life “from ennui,” we are told, in October, 1618.‡ On the death of her father, Katherine, Lady D’Aubigny, came into possession of the Leighton estate, where he had begun to build a fine house.§ In the year 1619, Lord D’Aubigny was created Earl of March and Lord Stuart of Leighton, and was made first Gentleman of the Bedchamber, and Lord Lieutenant of Huntingdonshire.|| He had a large family of children, the eldest of whom, a daughter named Elizabeth, was born in July, 1610. His eldest son, James, the subject of this memoir, was born at Blackfriars, then a fashionable part of the town, on the 6th of April, 1612. He was baptised on the 26th of the same month, at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, King James being his godfather. The officers of the vestry are stated to have received £40 in fees on this occasion.¶ Other children quickly followed, Katherine and Henry, who died young, Anne born 1614, George, afterwards Lord D’Aubigny, born July 17th, 1618, Ludovic born 1619, John born 1621, and Bernard born about 1623. The three

* Gervase Lord Clifton’s lineal descendant, the present Earl of Darnley, sits in the House of Lords as fifteenth Lord Clifton of Leighton Bromswold, in right of this summons.

† *Domestic State Papers*, James I, vol. xciv., No. 83.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. ciii., No. 33.

§ Camden’s *Britannia*, vol. ii., p. 162.

|| Gordon’s *Earldom of Sutherland*, p. 126.

¶ Malcolm’s *London*, vol. iv., p. 275.

younger sons appear to have been born at March house, Drury Lane.*

On the sudden death of his brother Ludovic, on the 16th of February, 1624, Esmé, Lord D'Aubigny, succeeded him as third Duke of Lenox, and in all his other Scotch titles and dignities, and was made a Knight of the Garter in his place. He would also appear from a letter from Burlamachi to Sir Dudley Carleton, to have been Lord Lieutenant of Kent.† Upon his accession to the Dukedom, the courtesy title of Earl of Darnley‡ became the designation of his eldest son James.

Duke Esmé enjoyed his honours little more than five months, for having accompanied the King on a progress to the Midland Counties, he died after three days' illness of "spotted ague," at Kirby in Northamptonshire, July 30th, 1624. The Duchess had been hastily summoned, and came "three hours before his death, and before he was past sense and memory."§ He was buried in Westminster Abbey near Margaret, Countess of Lenox, without any great pomp on account of the absence of the Court. "It was scarce credible," says Sir Robert Gordon, "what grief the King conceived for the sudden and unexpected death of his deir and neir cusin, haveing so latelie lost his eldest brother." He sent at once for the eldest son James, now become fourth Duke of Lenox, who came to him at Woodstock|| in the month of August. The King

* Vincent, *Discovery of Errors of Brook*, p. 332.

† *Domestic State Papers*, James I, vol. clxxii., No. 7.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. clxxi., No. 87.

§ Nichols' *Progresses of James I*, vol. iii., p. 985.

|| The young Duke brought with him this touching letter to the King from his mother. It is preserved in the Advocates' Library,

took on himself the care and guardianship of the young Duke, then only twelve years old, with his brothers and sisters, and appointed commissioners, both in England and Scotland, to manage the Lenox estates. On the 15th of October, at Royston, the King and Duke made Sir Robert Gordon, who was a cousin of the Lenox Family, one of these commissioners, and he was afterwards selected by the Duke as his curator in Scotland. The King appointed the young Duke to be a Gentleman of the Bedchamber, selected for him "particular and domestic servants," and placed him at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Having sent "comfortable messages" to the widowed Duchess,* King James gave her £1,000 in September as a free gift.† In March, 1625, grants were made to her of £3,500, to pay Duke Esmé's debts, and of an annuity of £2,100 for her life and the lives of her two eldest sons, in addition to the yearly pension of £1,400 for table money, which having been given to Dukes Ludovic and Esmé, although "no other subject in Britain had" the like, was continued at Edinburgh, MS. 33, 1, 7, Balfour Collection, Letter No. 80.

II.

"My Soueraigne lorde,

"According to your Ma^{ties} gracious pleasure signified vnto me, I haue sent a young man to attend you, acompanyed with a widowes prayers and teares, that he may waxe olde in your Ma^{ties} service, and in his fidelity and affection may equall his ancestors departed; so shall he find grace and fauor in the eyes of my lord the King, which will reuiue the dying hopes and rayse the deyejected spiritts of a comfortles mother.

"Your Ma^{ties}

"Most humble seruant,

"K^A. LENOX."

* Gordon's *Earldom of Sutherland*, pp. 389, 390.

† *Domestic State Papers*, James I, vol. clxxii., Nos. 8, 9.

to the young Duke.* These grants had not passed the great seal when King James died, but were confirmed a few days afterwards by his successor.†

King Charles I shewed the same affectionate interest that his father had done in Duke Esmé's orphan family, and took the young heir into his special charge. He was sworn a Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the new King on April the 23rd, 1625,‡ and we find him, two days afterwards, helping with his sister, Lady Elizabeth Stuart, to swell the pomp and state of their aunt Frances, Duchess of Richmond, on the occasion of her removal from Ely Place to her new residence, Exeter House, Strand.§

The Duke of Lenox is mentioned as one of the train-bearers of King Charles, at the funeral of his father, James I, which took place on the 7th of May.|| The young Duke had been admitted to the degree of a Master of Arts, at Cambridge, by royal mandate in December, 1624, when King James was staying at Trinity College; a proceeding, which, according to a letter from Carleton to Nethersole, had "troubled the university,"¶ and in spite of his youth, his name was now affixed, as that of the author, to the two first pieces in a volume of Odes and Addresses issued by the University of Cambridge, in memory of the death of King James I.** We may suppose that Dr. Topham,

* Gordon's *Earldom of Sutherland*, p. 390.

† *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. i., No. 13.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. i., No. 80.

§ *Court and Times of Charles I*, vol. i., p. 15.

|| Nichols' *Progresses of James I*, vol. iii., p. 1047.

¶ *Domestic State Papers*, James I, vol. cclxxvi., No. 66.

** *Cantabrigiensium Dolor et Solamen; seu Decessio beatissimi Regis Jacobi pacifici et successio augustissimi Regis Caroli, etc.*, 4to, p. 68 (Nichols' *Progresses of James I*, vol. iv., p. 1050).

the Duke's college tutor, assisted him in the composition of these addresses.

The Duchess continued to reside at March House, in Drury Lane, but probably she occasionally occupied Cobham Hall. It is difficult to decide when the Dukes of Lenox first took possession of their Kentish residence, but it would seem to have been about the year 1624. We know that as early as 1622 King James was trying to persuade Lady Kildare to sell her life interest to the Duke of Lenox, and it is certain that she had left Cobham some time before her death in 1628, when she was living at Deptford.* It may therefore be assumed that the Lenox family were living at Cobham in the year 1625, and this idea is much strengthened by the fact that Charles I brought his bride, Queen Henrietta Maria, to pass the night at Cobham Hall on their journey from Canterbury to London. King Charles would not have been likely to visit Lady Kildare, but it was *most natural and probable that he should wish to make his youthful Queen acquainted with the Duchess and his young cousins, with whom he was on such affectionate terms of intimacy.* The account of this visit must be given in the quaint words of a writer of that period:—

“On Wednesday the King and Queene departed from Canterbury and rode in the most triumphant manner that might be to Cobham Hall, finding all the high waies strewed with Roses and all manner of sweet flowers, and here at Cobham they lodged al that night, where there was all plentifull entertainment, and nothing wanting that might adde any honour either to the King or Kingdome. On Thursday, being the Sixteenth of June according to our Computation, the King and Queene departed from Cobham, all the

* *Archæologia Cantiana*, Vol. XI., pp. 219, 229.

waies prepared as hath been before shewed, and so in most glorious manner came to the City of Rochester.”*

Hitherto the Duchess seems to have stood high in the King's favour, but she gave him mortal offence in the spring of 1626, by having allowed her eldest daughter, Lady Elizabeth Stuart, to marry young Lord Maltravers, son of the Earl of Arundel, without the King's consent. Charles had arranged to marry the young lady to the eldest son of the Earl of Argyll, and was so angry at this frustration of his plans, that he would not listen to Arundel when he went to excuse himself by representing that Frances, the old Duchess of Richmond, had allowed the young people to meet at her house, and that the marriage had been arranged without his being consulted.† Arundel was sent to the Tower on the 6th of March, and remained there till June, although the House of Lords more than once protested against his illegal detention.‡ The young couple were imprisoned at Lambeth Palace for some weeks, where they were very kindly treated by Archbishop Abbott,§ and the Duchess of Lenox was “restrained” for about six months at Langley Lodge.||

The King wrote a letter to the Duchess on the 13th of November, granting her petition to be allowed the tuition and care of her son and his estate during his minority, it being found that the great officers of state, to whom the King had committed the manage-

* *A true discourse of all the Royall Passages, etc., observed on the marriage of King Charles I., etc.*, p. 29. 4to. London, 1625.

† *Court and Times*, vol. i., p. 86.

‡ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. xxii., No. 40.

§ *Court and Times*, vol. i., p. 177.

|| *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. xxxix., No. 56.

ment of the property, were too much occupied to attend to his interests.*

The Duchess was at this time much inconvenienced by the non-payment of her pensions, and wrote many letters to Secretary Conway on the subject; in one she says, if the pensions are not transferred to the Court of Wards, she "knows not how her son will be able to put meat into his mouth."† Lord Conway was able to arrange this for the Duchess, and they were afterwards paid more regularly.‡

The Duke of Lenox was still at Cambridge in November, 1627, and in February, 1627-8, when he wrote letters both to Secretary Conway and to the King, asking that Dr. Topham,§ who had acted as "his tutor for three years and a half, without any recompense," might be made Master of Trinity College at the next avoidance.||

On the 12th of August, 1628, "James Steward, Duke of Leneux, was admitted" of Gray's Inn,¶ but we are not told whether he really devoted himself to the study of the law, or simply accepted the admission as an honorary distinction conferred upon him.

When the young Duke had finished his studies, the King arranged that he should complete his education by travelling in foreign countries, to fit him "for the service of his prince and countrie." The Duke appointed Sir Robert Gordon vice-chamberlain of

* *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. xxxix., p. 56.

† *Ibid.*, vol. xlvi., No. 3.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. lxxxv., No. 2.

§ This request was not granted, but Dr. Topham was soon after made Dean of Lincoln.

|| *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. lxxxv., No. 50, and vol. xciii., No. 64.

¶ *Harleian MSS.* 1912, fol. 162.

Scotland in his absence.* A royal licence was issued in September, 1629, permitting "James, Duke of Lenox, to travel with Dr. Topham, Dean of Lincoln, John St. Alman, and eight other servants with £200 in money."†

The Duke's departure was, however, delayed till the next year, possibly to enable him to attend the marriage of his second sister, Lady Anne Stuart, with Archibald, Earl of Angus, which was arranged this autumn, and which took place about May, 1630.‡ The King gave Lady Anne a marriage portion of £6000.§

At the christening of the Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II, which was performed on June 17th, 1630, by Laud, then Bishop of London, the Duke of Lenox represented King Louis XIII of France, one of the godfathers, and his aunt, the old Duchess Frances of Richmond, stood proxy on the same occasion for the godmother, Marie de Medicis, the Queen's mother.||

We can fix the date when the Duke eventually started on his foreign tour from a letter of Admiral Sir Henry Mervyn's to Secretary Nicholas; he writes on the 10th of August, 1630, to report that he had taken the Duke across to France in his ship, "The Reformation," and that he landed him at Dieppe on the Friday before.¶ By the King's orders constant reports were sent to the Secretary of State, Lord

* Gordon's *Earldom of Sutherland*, p. 422.

† *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cxlix., No. 108.

‡ Douglas's *Peerage*, vol. i., p. 442.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. clxxxvi., No. 106.

|| Rushworth, part ii., p. 69.

¶ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. clxxii., No. 42.

Dorchester, of the Duke's proceedings in France, and we gain from these letters, still preserved among the State Papers, much insight into the life of a young nobleman of that day.

Edward Dacres (probably his chaplain or secretary), writes on the 23rd of September, that the Duke had been to Aubigny to see his aged grandmother (Katherine, Duchess Dowager of Lenox, the widow of the first Duke Esmé), and that he was now settled at Paris, where his French relations took so much notice of him, and insisted on his doing so much, that he found it impossible to live on his allowance of £2,000 a year. The Duke, he says, was by no means extravagant, and he

“was fain to persuade him sometimes to spend as to spare. The Duke keeps house himselfe, pays 50 crowns a month for his house and household stuffe, buyes a coach and four horses and maintains them, hath 10 seruants, whereof 5 are gentlemen, hath bought new liveries for a coachman and 3 lackeys.”

All this, Dacres goes on to say, with other expenses in proportion, and five or six different “exercises,” require an addition of at least £500 a year to his allowance, which he begs Dorchester to obtain from the Duchess, for

“the apprehension of his expences beyond his meanes, with his mother's dislike of it will clog and dull his spirit which hath no other want then quickening, . . . both for his ability of body and diligence he excels all others in his exercises.”*

The Duke often wrote himself to Lord Dorchester, and his letters are written in an extremely good clear hand, well spelt and expressed. Writing also on the 23rd of September, he consults Dorchester as to whether he should write often to the King, or only on par-

* *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. clxxiii., No. 56.

ticular occasions.* In his next letter he alludes to the wish of the King, that his brother, George Lord D'Aubigny, should return to England. D'Aubigny and another brother, Lord Ludovic Stuart, had been brought up in France as Roman Catholics by their grandmother, and were naturalized there, "that thereby they might be capable to inherit the lands of Aubigny."† Consequently D'Aubigny, who was being educated at the College of Navarre, seems to have been unwilling to leave his grandmother and other relations. The Duke wrote on December 3rd that the good news of Dorchester's letter was very welcome to him, and that he should venture sometimes to give an account of himself to the King, to whom he would shortly write:—

"Concerning his commands touching my brother D'Aubigny, whom I hope I shall worke from his friends in these parts, I doe not doubt but that I shall preuaile with him to preferre his obedience to his Ma^{ties} commands before all his hopes of fortunes in France, when Mons^r d'Entragues shall be come to towne which is our kinsman and his great friend, I shall be satisfied of my brother's resolution."‡

The Duchess, his mother, hearing of this, wrote to Dorchester, to beg that D'Aubigny, who was then twelve years old, might be allowed to remain another year in France, "when his course at the acadimeⁱ will be finished;" and also urged that in that time she believed "his grandmother will be departed, considering her great yeares and wekeness."§ The King seems to have granted her request, as we hear no more of the matter.

* *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. clxxiv., No. 38.

† Gordon's *Earldom of Sutherland*, p. 127.

‡ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. clxxv., No. 87.

§ *Ibid.*, vol. clxxxii., No. 68.

The summer of 1631 was spent by the Duke on the Loire, but the Duchess was greatly alarmed by a report which reached her through a Mrs. Sackville, "that honest Mr. Dacres was most dangerously sick, and the plague extreme at Blois."* Dacres was able to write himself on the 12th of August to Dorchester, to explain that he had been very ill of fever, but that the Duke was "continually in health," although they had been driven away from Blois and Tours by the plague. They had come "to Saumur to pass the rest of the dog days, after which the Duke intended to winter in Spain."† Lord Dorchester had written a long letter to the Duke in May, with directions from the King, that, after passing the summer on the Loire the Duke should go to Spain, and had enclosed to him "the opinion" as to his journey there, of Endymion Porter, who, it will be remembered, accompanied King Charles and Buckingham on their adventurous journey to Spain. After this he was to go, in the spring, to Italy; and to return by Lyons and Paris, either directly to England, or to spend the summer of 1632 with one of the two armies in the Low Countries.‡

How far these directions were carried out it is impossible now to say, as the interesting correspondence stops here; but we find that the Duke arrived in Madrid about February 1631-2.§ Young Lenox, then a youth of nearly twenty, of a serious and quiet disposition, but amiable, good-looking, and accomplished, seems at once to have won golden opinions from the Spanish Court, and was made a Grandee of Spain two

* *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I., vol. cxcvii., No. 65.

† *Ibid.*, vol. cxcviii., No. 29.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. cxc., No. 63.

§ *Ibid.*, vol. ccxi., No. 45.

days after his arrival; the Spaniards, we are told, "had a great opinion of him."*

A grant of £1000 was made to the Duke from the Exchequer in May, 1632, as "on foreign service;"† but he would seem to have returned to England to be present at the marriage of his youngest sister, Lady Frances Stuart, in June, to Jerome Weston, eldest son of the Lord Treasurer Weston.‡ The King gave Lady Frances a marriage portion of £6000,§ such as he had previously given to her sister, Lady Angus, and the marriage ceremony was performed at Roehampton by Laud, in the presence of both the King and Queen.||

Jerome Weston was sent in July, 1632, as Lord High Ambassador to the Court of Savoy, and the Duke of Lenox appears to have accompanied him thither. Mr. Pory wrote to Lord Brooke on the 22d of October: "There is now a great present of horses and rich saddles to be sent to the Duke of Savoy, where my Lord Ambassador Weston now resideth, and where his brother-in-law, the Duke of Lenox, is to marry the Duke's sister."¶ What prevented this alliance we do not hear; but the Duke and Jerome, now Lord Weston, returned to England in March 1633, having passed some time in Paris, where Weston was entrusted with a special mission to the King. Richelieu and Portland were at this time close allies, being united by a common

* *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. ccxlv., No. 1.

† *Ibid.*, vol. ccxvi., No. 19.

‡ Richard Lord Weston, who was created Earl of Portland in 1632.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. ccxvi., No. 101.

|| *Ibid.*, vol. ccxviii., No. 27.

¶ *Court and Times*, Charles I, vol. ii., p. 186.

danger, to resist the intrigues of Henrietta Maria and her party against their influence and authority. Travelling to Calais, Lenox and Weston had met a courier, from the Queen, with letters to a French minister. These letters Weston seized, and brought back to England. The Queen was much offended, and most of the Court, we are told, looked coldly on Weston, who was challenged by Lord Holland. Lenox at once came forward boldly to defend his brother-in-law; and although the letters, when examined by the King, were found not to relate to any intrigues against either Richelieu or Portland, being merely to intercede for Chateauneuf and De Jars, who had been thrown into prison by the Cardinal (partly in consequence of the revelations that Weston had made while at Paris of plots made by them and the Queen against Richelieu*), still the King decided that Weston had not exceeded his duty as Ambassador, and ordered the matter to be allowed to drop.†

It appears from the curious examination taken down by Secretary Windebanke, in August, 1633, of a certain John Arismendy, that a great effort had been made in the Duke's absence, during the preceding winter, to arrange a marriage for him with some French lady of rank and distinction; the object being to strengthen the French party in England, and "to prevent the Spaniards getting hold of him." It was thought that some Scottish gentleman might be introduced into his suite, who should suggest that he could not do better, nor establish his fortune more honourably, than by imitating those of his ancestors who had

* *Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, 1^{re} serie, vol. iv., p. 433.

† Gardiner's *Personal Government of Charles I.*, vol. i, p. 264.

formed alliances in France. The plan seems to have been approved of by Cardinal Richelieu and Mademoiselle de Bourbon, daughter of the Prince of Condé; Mademoiselle de St. Paul and Mademoiselle de Rohan were suggested as suitable matches for the Duke. Madame d'Entragues had, it appeared, gone so far as to send to England to treat with the Duchess about a marriage with Mademoiselle de Rohan; but the idea does not seem to have been seriously entertained by the Duke's friends.*

On the 6th of April, 1633, the Duke attained his majority, and henceforth took his place as one of the most brilliant and accomplished courtiers of the day. From his position, as First Gentleman of the Bedchamber, he was now constantly in close attendance on the King. He went with him to Scotland in May, and was present at the coronation which took place on the 18th of June, 1633. He was sworn a Privy Councillor, at Greenwich, on the Sunday after the King's return from Scotland (July 28th).†

Katherine Duchess of Lenox was married some time during 1633 to James second Earl of Abercorn, and she afterwards chiefly resided in Scotland, being allowed to retain her rank and precedence as Duchess of Lenox. She seems to have been a good and careful mother, and to have looked well after her son's interest during his minority. Many of her letters to Secretary Conway bear witness to this. We find her, for instance, at one time opposing the grant of a charter of incorporation to the town of Gravesend, from some idea of its being prejudicial to the Duke's property at that

* *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cclv., No. 135, and vol. ccix., No. 54.

† *Ibid.*, vol. ccxlv., No. 53.

place. The charter was eventually granted in the year 1632, and James Duke of Lenox, who is here described as Chancellor of the University of St. Andrews, in addition to his other titles, was appointed the first Hereditary High Steward of the Borough,* an office which has been held ever since by the owners of Cobham Hall.†

At another time we find her giving £100, and promising to get her son to do as much, to help George Herbert, who was prebendary of Leighton Bromswold, in rebuilding the church at that place, which was in such a ruined state, "that the vicar and parish were fain to use my Lord Duke's great hall for their prayer and preaching." George Herbert was able to restore the church completely, except the rebuilding of the tower, which Ferrar tells us, "the most noble, religious, worthy good Duke of Lenox did afterwards perform at his own proper cost and charges." ‡

We now for the first time hear of the Duke's active secretary, Thomas Webb, whose zeal and energy in the care of his master's interests often brought him into odium with other people, and even ultimately with the King himself. Webb at first occupied himself in procuring a grant of land for the Duke in Ireland, and Wentworth, then Lord Deputy, wrote to Lord Cotting-

* The Corporation of Gravesend and Milton wished "to beare some similitude of the Duke of Lenox his armes and badges," and we find that Le Neve accordingly granted to them in December, 1635, as their arms:—Argent, a tower Gules, charged with a buffaloe's head Sable, springing out of a ducal coronet Or, within a bordure Azure, charged with five fleurs-de-lis and as many oval buckles alternately, Or. (For the Duke of Lenox's arms as borne by him, see note on the two next pages.)

† Pocock's *History of Gravesend*, p. 194.

‡ Mayor's *Nicholas Ferrar*, pp. 49, 86.

ton in November, 1633, to complain that Webb had "gone so far as to treat with Sir William Parsons for the whole plantation of Connaught, and doubts not but to carry it entire for the Duke with his Majesty." "I write not this," says Wentworth, "in opposition to the Duke, for in faith I honour him very much; but 'tis fit his Majesty and my Lord Treasurer know thus much . . . and in my opinion care should be had that Webb do not possess the Duke too far, for I take him to be a very nimble young gentleman, and one, if I mistake not, that will notably work his own Ends out of the Duke." The King, however, seems to have been willing to favour the Duke as much as possible, and we find Wentworth writing some months later to tell him that the King had written under his own hand "such a recommendation of your Lordship's affairs here, in so noble and gracious a way, as I judge it becoming the duty I owe to your Lordship to bring the knowledge of it to you."* Several other letters passed between Wentworth and Lenox during the next few years, in which the latter always signs himself "Your lordship's most affectionate and humble servant, J. Lenos," which appears to have been the signature adopted by him, and is thus explained in a letter from Lord Conway to Wentworth—"The Duke of Lenox as it is written in Scotch, or Lenos as he writes, that it may the more gently terminate, in Spanish."†

The Duke was made a Knight of the Garter‡ in

* *Strafford Letters*, vol. i., pp. 15, 252.

† *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 47.

‡ The Duke's Garter plate still remains in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, though somewhat faded and the colours decayed in some places. The inscription is—"Du tres haut, tres puissant et tres

the autumn of 1633. Du Chesne gives an account of the ceremonies observed at his installation, which took place on November 6, 1633, at the same time when the Prince Palatine Charles was installed by proxy.*

At the Duke of York's christening, on the 24th of November, 1633, the Duke of Lenox supported the Countess of Kent, who carried the royal infant. His future wife, Lady Mary Villiers, then eleven years of age, carried the train of the Marchioness of Hamilton, who represented the Queen of Bohemia, godmother to the little Prince.†

The Duke had again occasion, in the spring of 1634, to shew that constancy and faithfulness to friends in adversity which marked his future life. The Lord Treasurer Portland was then attacked on all sides, and was almost without a friend. Illness prevented his going to Court to defend himself, but

noble prince, Jacques Stewart, duc de Lenox, comte de Marche et Darnley, baron de Leyghton Bromswould, Torbolton et Methven, grand chambellan et admiral d'Escosse, gentilhomme de la chambre du licet de sa majesté, du conseil privé de la Grand Bretagne et chevalier du tres noble ordre de la jartier, enstallé a Windesore le 6 jour de Novembre Anno Dom. 1633."

The arms are :—Quarterly, 1st and 4th quarterly, 1st and 4th Az., three fleurs-de-lis Or within a bordure Gu. semée of buckles Or (Aubigny), 2nd and 3rd Or, a fesse chequy Az. and Arg. within a bordure engrailed Gu. (Stuart). Over all in an escutcheon, Arg., a saltire engrailed between four roses Gu. (Lenox), 2nd and 3rd quarterly, 1st and 4th Sa., semée of cinquefoils a lion rampant Arg. (Clifton), 2nd and 3rd Az. three cinquefoils Arg. (D'Arcy). Crest out of a ducal coronet Or, a bull's head Sa., from the mouth proceeding flames pp^r. Over the crest, AVANT DARNLEY (the old war-cry of the Stuarts in France). Supporters two wolves pp^r.

* Du Chesne, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, p. 1229.

† *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. ccli., No. 23.

Lenox came forward to take his part, and succeeded in setting him right with the King, chiefly by the influence of Buckingham's widow, whom he persuaded to come to Court for the first time since her husband's death, to intercede for Portland with the King.*

Charles, whose passion for the chase is well known, took the Duke this summer to hunt with him in Sherwood Forest, and no doubt found his young cousin a very congenial companion, as Lloyd tells us of him that "hunting was both his pleasure and accomplishment."† A letter among the Phelips MSS., dated August 2, 1634, describes some of their adventures. "The King had a dangerous fall hunting in the Forest of Sherwood, his horse drawing him after him by one of his legs, but is now, thanks be to God, past any danger; the Duke of Lenox had such another fall, as that his recovery is yet doubtful."‡ No serious consequence, however, resulted, for the Duke wrote, on the 8th of August, from Nottingham to Secretary Windebanke on some other business, and made no allusion to these accidents.§

During the next few years the Duke of Lenox's name appears constantly as present at the sittings of the Privy Council. We find him in October, 1634, signing the now famous order for levying ship money, and on November 3 we notice that he was at the Council which ordered the Communion Table in St. Gregory's Church, near St. Paul's, to be replaced "altar-wise" at the upper end. ||

* Gardiner's *Personal Government of Charles I*, vol. ii., p. 65.

† Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 334.

‡ *Historical MSS. Commission*, Third Report, p. 283.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cclxxiii., No. 21.

|| Rushworth, part ii., p. 264.

The Duke also often sat in the Star Chamber, and although he was the friend of Strafford and Laud, he always "advised moderation."* We find him once helping by his vote in preventing a cruel sentence of whipping being added to the fine of £5000, imposed upon a certain Alice Maxwell, who with her husband had sent a disrespectful letter to the Lord Keeper.†

The Duke found time, notwithstanding his attendance at Court, to carry out many improvements on his Kentish property. When he began to build at Cobham Hall is uncertain. Henry Lord Cobham at the time of his forfeiture in 1603 was still engaged in carrying out the rebuilding of the house which had been commenced by his father, William Lord Cobham. The two wings of the house, as now existing, had been completed and the great staircase added, but we have no evidence to determine what the original centre of the house was, or what were Lord Cobham's plans for rebuilding it. Nothing appears to have been done in Lady Kildare's time, but the Duke of Lenox, probably soon after he came of age, called in Inigo Jones, the fashionable architect of the time, to prepare plans for a new west front or centre. Inigo Jones adopted the classic style of his other works, and seems to have thought little of harmonizing the new building with the Tudor wings already built.

As we find that the Duke received, in the year 1635, a large sum of money (£22,000) for surrendering the Priory of St. Andrews to the Crown,‡ it is very possible that he may have employed some of this money in building at Cobham. The civil wars seem to have

* Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 334.

† *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cclxxxvi., No. 103.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. ccxciv., No. 5.

interrupted the completion of Inigo Jones's plans, and the west *façade* of the house would not appear to have been finished till 1662, in the time of Charles, the last Duke of Lenox and Richmond of the Stuart line.*

We learn from an old paper preserved at Cobham Hall that the Duke spent £7500 in the years 1636, 1637, and 1638 in purchasing lands adjacent to the park, in the parishes of Cobham, Strood, and Cuxton, much of which he enclosed and added to the park. An old map or plan made in 1641 shews "The perambulation of the newe parke." This plan, and a survey made by order of the State in 1649, shew that, in Cuxton parish alone, the Duke had enclosed 350 acres in this new park. The enclosure, if finished, was soon abandoned, for another plan made in 1718 shews that Cobham Park was then much the same size as at present, and Hasted states that in 1770 only 80 acres belonging to Cuxton parish then remained enclosed in the park.†

Some incidents of the Duke's life at Court during these years may be gleaned from the Rev. Mr. Garrard's gossiping letters to the Lord Deputy Wentworth. In January, 1635-6, he writes:—"A little Pique happened betwixt the Duke of Lenox and the Lord Chamberlain (Pembroke) about a box at a new Play in the Black-fryars, of which the Duke had got the key. . . . His Majesty hearing of it sent the Earl of Holland to command them not to dispute it but before him; so he heard it, and made them friends."‡

At another time the King employed the Duke to persuade the Earl of Bedford to agree to his son Lord

* *Archæologia Cantiana*, Vol. XI., p. 71.

† Hasted, vol. i., p. 488.

‡ *Strafford Letters*, vol. i., p. 511.

Russell's marrying Lady Anne Carr, daughter of the too notorious Frances, Countess of Somerset. Bedford had told his son that he might choose a wife "in any family but in that," and refused his consent. But as Garrard observes, "Marriages are made in Heaven," and as the young people had been long attached to each other, and Lady Anne being as distinguished for her goodness and virtues as her mother had been for the reverse, Lenox was able to induce the unwilling father to grant the royal request, and the marriage was allowed to take place.*

George Lord D'Aubigny was selected in March, 1636, to accompany the Earl of Arundel, who was sent on an embassy to the Emperor Ferdinand.† They stopped at Nuremberg, on their way, where Arundel bought a library,‡ but D'Aubigny seems not to have proceeded further. He is recorded to have done homage to King Louis XIII for the lands of Aubigny on the 5th of August, 1636, at Paris.§

The Duke often wrote to Sir Francis Windebanke, whom he always addressed as "My noble protector." In one letter from Rufford in August, 1636, he tells him that he had made the King acquainted with the rumour that he (the Secretary) was in disgrace about "the business of ship-money." The King was much astonished, and told Lenox that Windebanke had nothing more to do with it than "writing instructions from him."|| Another time, in a letter from Hampton Court, the Duke recommends to Windebanke from

* *Strafford Letters*, vol. ii., p. 2.

† *Verney Papers*, p. 170.

‡ Collins's *Peerage*, vol. i., p. 115.

§ Andrew Stuart's *History of the Stewarts*, p. 273.

|| *Clarendon State Papers*, vol. i., p. 610.

the King "this man of fate Wallace," and directs the Secretary to listen patiently to him.*

The Duke's marriage had often been talked of, and besides the foreign alliances already mentioned, the heiress of the House of Desmond† and the eldest daughter of the Earl of Suffolk,‡ had been suggested as suitable matches for him, but still at the age of twenty-five he remained unmarried. He would seem, indeed, to have cherished the idea of allying himself with some royal or princely House, and even to have aspired to marry one of the daughters of the Queen of Bohemia.§ It was therefore some strain on his duty and affection when King Charles proposed to him to marry Lady Mary Herbert, only daughter of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham,|| who had been married when a child (as we find from Laud's Diary), on January 8, 1634-5, to Charles Lord Herbert (eldest son of the Earl of Pembroke), who died a year afterwards of small-pox at Florence. Lady Mary, who was born in March, 1622, was god-daughter to King James, who often spoke of her in his letters as his grandchild. In one letter to "his sweete boyes" (Babie Charles and Steenie) he writes, "My lytle grandchylde with her

* *Clarendon State Papers*, vol. i., p. 697.

† *Court and Times of Charles I*, vol. i., p. 495.

‡ *Strafford Letters*, vol. i., p. 167.

§ Baillie's *Letters*, vol. i., p. 11.

|| We find, curiously enough, that the Duke of Buckingham had also some idea of marrying his daughter Lady Mary to one of the Prince Palatines, and one of the reasons assigned by Pedro Maestro to King James for Buckingham's having suddenly become opposed to the Spanish marriage for the Prince of Wales, was that just at that time he received a letter from the Queen of Bohemia holding out hopes of this alliance with one of her sons.—*Domestic State Papers*, James I, vol. clxiv., No. 8.

fowre teeth is, God be thanked, well wained." * Lady Mary after the death of her husband went by the King's desire to live with Lady Roxburgh, and was brought up with the Princesses.†

Baillie writes thus to Mr. Spang about the Duke's intended marriage in January, 1636-7:—"The King cannot get his (the Duke's) minde to it, how facile soever for all her infinite portion. We had hopes he might have obtained one of the Palatine's sisters. Poor prince, God helpe him, Buckingham his friends has drawn him down from high hopes."‡

The Duke himself, long after this, explained to Hyde, speaking in the King's presence, how "he had been brought up from his childhood by the Crown, and had always paid it the obedience of a child, and that he took a wife with the approbation and advice of the Crown."§ Accordingly he seems to have thought it his duty to waive any objections he had at first felt to this marriage, and even before the date of Baillie's letter, Conway, in a letter to Wentworth, dated January 4, 1636-7, after telling him how many people at Court, including the Queen, were just then dissatisfied, writes, "Only the Duke of Lenox and my Lady Mary are well pleased, for they are to marry together, and the Duchess (Buckingham) is now sent for to the Court." When, however, the Duchess tried to bring Lady Mary with her into the Queen's bedchamber, the Queen, whose ill-humour still continued, perhaps because her plans for a French marriage for the Duke were defeated, would not receive her there, and "looked her out." ||

* Nichols' *Progresses of James I*, vol. iii., p. 842.

† *Strafford Letters*, vol. i., p. 524.

‡ Baillie's *Letters*, vol. i., p. 11.

§ Clarendon's *Life*, p. 93.

|| *Strafford Letters*, pp. 45-47.

The Duke of Lenox now entertained the Duchess of Buckingham, the Earl of Antrim her second husband, and Lady Mary for ten days at "Castlebar by Acton," and it was arranged that the marriage should take place at Easter;* but it was for some unexplained reason postponed till the summer. Possibly difficulties arose about Lady Mary's jointure of £4000 a year charged on the Pembroke estates. According to the Duke's marriage settlement, the matter was eventually arranged by his receiving Lady Mary's original fortune of £25,000, and by his settling on her another jointure of £4000 charged on his Cobham estates.†

Archbishop Laud performed the marriage ceremony, and records it in the same diary in which he had entered Lady Mary's first short-lived marriage:—

"August 3, 1637. I married James Duke of Lenox, to the Lady Mary Villers sole daughter to the Duke of Buckingham the marriage was in my Chapel at Lambeth, the day very Rainy, the King present."‡

A news letter tells us that the King "gave the lady to the Duke, but the Court and company were not very great, because that time and place had not been pitched upon till very shortly before."§ Another account written by Nicholas Hermann to the Earl of Middlesex says:—

"On Tuesday last the nuptials of the Duke with the maiden widow were solemnized at Lambeth honoured with the presence of the King and Queen and of the Royal issue, the wedding dinner was at York house, where they say were more cooks than guests, 60 cooks and not 6 Lords, not the Lord Archbishop (who married them) nor the Lord Chamberlain Pembroke."||

* *Historical MSS. Commission*, Fourth Report, p. 293.

† MS. at Cobham Hall. ‡ Laud's *Troubles and Tryall*, p. 54.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cclxiv., No. 25.

|| *Historical MSS. Commission*, Fourth Report, p. 293.

One of the guests was Henry Percy, who became Lord Percy, whom the Duke afterwards describes as "his old acquaintance at school in our travels, and here at home having lived friends together."* He appears to have attended the marriage with his sister, Lucy Countess of Carlisle, and he finishes a letter to the Earl of Leicester, written on August 3, by saying, "We are now in haste going to my Lord Duke's marriage, which you know I am much concerned in."† Frances Duchess of Richmond presented her nephew the Duke, on this occasion, with £5000 "in a white satten purse," and also gave the Duchess "a great necklace of pearl and a pearl chain,"‡ valued at £5000. The Duke took his Duchess to Court two days after the marriage, and she was sworn of the Queen's bedchamber.§

In September, 1637, the Duke was hastily summoned to Scotland by the news of the death of his mother, Katherine Dowager Duchess of Lenox. She was buried on the 17th of September, in the night, "without ceremonie," as her husband was much in debt, owing chiefly "to her princely carriage." "My Lord Duke of Lenox," says Baillie, "coming down post to his mother's buriall, was entrusted with a letter from the King to the council." He found the country violently agitated by the fatal order compelling the use of the Liturgy, and was implored by the Council to present their "supplication" against its use to the King. Lenox could not fail to be impressed by the gravity of the situation, for by the

* *Lords' Journals*, vol. iv., p. 556.

† *Sidney Letters*, p. 509.

‡ *Strafford Letters*, vol. ii., p. 114.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cclxiv., No. 25.

20th of September, "24 noblemen, a number of barons, near a hundreth ministers, many townes, commissioners from 66 parishes," had signed the supplication, "altogether appearing in the street, at the Counsell-house doore, and everywhere in the eye of my Lord Duke of Lenox." He seems to have sympathized with his countrymen, and assured the Council that the King was "much misinformed about the nature of the business, and promised to do all he could for them." After leaving Edinburgh the Duke was entertained magnificently in the Town-house of Glasgow, and having "subscriyved in the bishop's presence an ancient band of his house to maintain that good towne under the King against all whomsoever to his power,"* he returned to England laden with petitions against the Prayer Book.

He appears to have strongly urged the King to consider the wishes of his Scotch subjects, and Lord Napier† (in the defence of his own conduct, written in prison), alluding to this time, speaks of the Duke as follows:—

"The Duke of Lenox, a nobleman sound in the Protestant religion and in his affection to his Majesty and to his country, who in the beginning of these troubles did give his Majesty good and wholesome counsel, and not being followed, never to this hour spoke or did anything to the prejudice of the cause or country."‡

King Charles, however, failed to appreciate the gravity of the occasion, and preferred to follow the more violent counsels of his other advisers, who wished to put down the Scotch resistance by force. The Duke's opinion however seems to have remained

* Baillie's *Letters*, vol. i., p. 17.

† Archibald, first Lord Napier, died 1645.

‡ *Montrose and the Cavaliers*, vol. ii., p. 40.

unchanged, as we find from a celebrated and energetic speech delivered by him before the King in Council some months later.* It is true that Windebanke has endorsed one copy of this speech, "The Duke of Lenox his supposed words;"† but if not actually spoken by him, it no doubt gives the sentiments then avowed by him. In it he speaks strongly against a war "with the King's own subjects and countrymen," and points out that the wisest Kings, like Henry VIII of England and Louis XI of France, had always been ready "to yield even to the unjust demands of their subjects rather than hazard war."

It had been well for Charles had he listened to this honest advice, for Lenox was too loyal a subject to persist long in opposition to his royal master, and was besides, as Clarendon tells us, "although a man of very good parts and an excellent understanding, so diffident of himself that he was sometimes led by men who judged much worse."‡ "He was little understood," says Lloyd,§ "and this too great diffidence and a certain haughtiness," as Larrey calls it, "in point of honour, in spite of his wit, his courage, and his affection to the King, prevented him being of much use to the King who loved him."||

It must have been in the years following his marriage that Van Dyck painted the numerous portraits still existing of the Duke and Duchess. Perhaps one of his best portraits of the Duke is the full-length belonging to Lord Methuen, exhibited at Burlington

* *Historical MSS. Commission*, Fourth Report, p. 22.

† *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cccxcv., No. 56.

‡ Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 296.

§ Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 334.

|| Larrey's *Charles I*, vol. ii., p. 66.

House in 1877; but a similar picture with a few variations is at Cobham Hall. The Duke is therein represented as a young man, of middle stature, with long, fair hair and blue eyes. His expression is serious and gentle, and he looks scarcely fitted to battle with the stormy times in which his lot was cast. He is dressed in a handsome suit of black silk, with a deep lace collar, and wears the Garter. One hand rests on the head of a large dog, which tradition says saved his life during his travels, by waking him when attacked by robbers.* The Duchess, although not gifted with all the great beauty of her father, is yet always painted by Van Dyck as a handsome woman, with dark eyes and hair; but her features seem cast in a sterner mould than those of her husband.

The Duke of Lenox appears to have been made Keeper of Richmond House and Park, and to have been granted the site of the late Monastery of Sheen,† about February, 1637-8.‡ Soon after this his sister Lady Maltravers “was declared a Papist,” and his brother George Lord D’Aubigny secretly married about May, 1638, Lady Katherine Howard daughter of the Earl of Suffolk, who also changed her religion for his sake.§ The Duke, who was sincerely attached to the Church of England, and “well skilled in all its points,”|| must have been much annoyed at these

* Other portraits of the Duke, also by Van Dyck, are in the collections of the Duke of Buccleuch, Marquis of Bristol, Earls of Pembroke, Denbigh, Westmoreland, Carlisle, Dysart, Ashburnham, Clarendon, Craven, Verulam, and Leicester, Lord de l’Isle, and at the Louvre.

† *Commons’ Journals*, vol. iv., p. 683.

‡ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cccxxxii., No. 23.

§ *Strafford Letters*, vol. ii., p. 165.

|| Lloyd’s *Memoirs*, p. 334.

events. We are told that he brought up his young brothers Lord John and Lord Bernard as "very good Protestants," and they would appear to have been not only distinguished by their learning, but also by every manly virtue and accomplishment.* They were sent abroad by the Duke in January, 1638-9, to complete their education, as he had done himself, by travelling in foreign parts.†

When the King went northward against the Scots, in March, 1639, he took the Duke of Lenox with him in his coach. They started on the 27th, arrived at York on the 30th of March, and proceeded in May to Newcastle.‡ The Duke appears to have gone up to London on some business on April 23rd, but had returned to the King by May 23rd, when he took part in a conversation between the King and Sir Thomas Wilford, who reproached Charles with not calling a Parliament, on which the King angrily told him "there were fools in the last Parliament;" Sir Thomas said, "there were wise men as well, and would be again." The Duke probably thinking the conversation was growing too hot, stepped up and said, "How can you have a Parliament, the King being absent?" Sir Thomas on this rudely replied that they "would do well enough without him."§

The King made a grant to the Duke in May of an estate at Sutton Marsh in Lincolnshire, lately enclosed from the fens, but it was by no means a free gift, for the grant states that it was given "in consideration of £7,500 due by his Ma'tie to the Duke of

* Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i., p. 369.

† *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cccx., No. 81.

‡ Rushworth, part ii., p. 921.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cccexxii., No. 65.

Lenox.”* It never could have been a very profitable possession, as the Duke became almost at once involved in litigation respecting it, which lasted for many years.

The royal party left the “camp at the Birks” on the 22nd of June, and taking post at Berwick on the 28th of July, arrived at Theobalds, having “rid 260 miles in four days.”†

When the King called on his friends in this autumn to assist him with loans of money, Lenox at once came forward and offered £20,000. Sir Philip Warwick having made some remark to him that Hamilton and others holding more lucrative posts had excused themselves, the Duke smilingly replied, “I would serve the King in his person though I carry but his cloak, as well and as cheerfully as any in the greatest trust.”‡ The Duke increased this loan in January, 1639-40, to £30,000,§ but it was arranged that £10,000 should be repaid at Michaelmas.||

A dispute had arisen between the Duke and the Company of Merchant Adventurers, who farmed his Grace’s patent for the alnage duties on white cloths; as they declared they could no longer pay £2,600 per annum for this privilege, and petitioned the King to reduce the sum paid to £2000.¶ Charles however took the Duke’s part, although he would not allow the

* *Signet Office Docquet Book*, May, 1639.

† Rushworth, part ii., p. 949.

‡ Duncan Stewart’s *History of the Royal Family*, p. 157.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cccclv., No. 39.

|| The remaining £20,000 was honestly repaid by King Charles II in 1662.—*Domestic State Papers*, Charles II, vol. liii., No. 58.

¶ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cccclxxxviii., No. 55, and vol. cccclxi., No. 121.

Duke's officers in April, 1640, to stop all the ships laden with white cloths, as they attempted to do, but ordered the matter to be decided in the Exchequer Court.* Probably some arrangement for a compromise was made, as no more mention occurs of the affair. In another dispute with the felt makers, the King wrote to Bishop Juxon to direct that the case should be heard without delay, and that the Court of Exchequer was to shew "the alnager all lawful favour."†

The office of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports became vacant by the death of the Earl of Suffolk, and was given, in June, 1640, to the Duke of Lenox, an appointment which gave "little satisfaction,"‡ according to a letter from the Earl of Northumberland to his brother-in-law, the Earl of Leicester. The Duke was also jointly with Jerome, Earl of Portland, appointed Lord Lieutenant of Hants.§

The King had assembled the Peers in a great council at York this summer, to assist him in raising money to resist the Scotch army which had invaded England; but Lenox and the other Peers most devoted to the King could only recommend him to patch up a peace with the Scotch, and to summon another Parliament, known as "The Long Parliament," which met on the 3rd of November, 1640. The Duke of Lenox, sitting as Earl of March, seems to have been present at nearly all the debates of the next few months.|| It must have been a sad winter for him, as he saw his friends Strafford and Laud impeached and imprisoned, and

* *Domestic State Papers*, April, 1640 (uncalendaried).

† *Ibid.*, Charles I, ccccx., No. 186.

‡ *Sidney Letters*, p. 665.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. ccccxxii., No. 101.

|| *Lords' Journals*, vol. iv.

Finch and Windebanke obliged to fly the country to escape a like fate.

Principal Baillie, in his graphic description of Strafford's trial, mentions the Duke of Lenox as present, "sitting among the late Earls," and remarks that there were then no Dukes in the English Parliament, as Buckingham was still a boy.* Although present the Duke took an unwilling part in these proceedings, and we are told "vehemently opposed the condemnation and attainder of Strafford."†

In July it was determined to send the Queen Mother, Marie de Medicis, out of England, where her three years' residence had been very unpopular, and had, May says, cost the country £100 a day for her maintenance.‡ The Earl and Countess of Arundel were directed to escort her abroad, and it was arranged that she should sleep at Cobham Hall on her way to Dover. Sir Edward Nicholas instructed Sir John Pennington to take her across to Holland in the "Bonaventura," and tells him

"The Queene Mother goes Munday night to Cobham in Kent to remayne there until the wind shall serve for her Mat^{ties} transportation to Holland. The King and Queene will accompany the Queen Mother to Cobham."§

Marie de Medicis was then in very bad health, and her state of weakness so great that her journey was postponed from day to day, and she did not pay her promised visit to Cobham till the 13th of August, 1641, when she could only have been received by the Duchess, as the Duke had gone to Scotland with the

* Baillie's *Letters* vol. i., p. 314.

† Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i., p. 638.

‡ *Tracts on the Civil Wars*, vol. i., p. 31.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, 1641 (uncalendared).

King. Whether Queen Henrietta Maria accompanied her mother to Cobham we are not told, but Lord Arundel reported that the Queen Mother arrived at her next sleeping-place, Sittingbourne, on the 15th; she did not however embark from Dover before the 31st of August.*

Before the King started for Scotland he created the Duke of Lenox Duke of Richmond in the Peerage of England, probably as a compliment to his northern subjects; the fees paid by the Duke on this occasion to the King's servants amounted to £272.† The Duke took his seat under his new title in the House of Lords on Monday, August 9, the same day on which he started for Scotland, travelling in the King's own coach.‡ From Sidney Bere's interesting letters to Sir John Pennington, and from Baillie's Journal, we learn how the unfortunate Charles in vain endeavoured to conciliate his Scottish subjects, by listening to long sermons inflicted on him by the Presbyterian divines, and by allowing a Presbyterian minister to replace his own domestic chaplains. The King also went to the Parliament House every day, although they rudely refused to allow the Duke of Lenox to sit till he had sworn and signed "the covenant band and oath." The Duke seems to have acted on this visit to Scotland as Secretary of State, and the King wrote more than once to Sir Edward Nicholas, directing that all the royal correspondence should pass through his hands.§

The King, not being able to grant all the demands now made upon him by the Scotch, was supposed by

* *Domestic State Papers*, 1641 (uncalendared).

† *Ibid.*

‡ Nalson's *State Papers*, vol. ii., p. 436.

§ Evelyn's *Memoirs*, vol. iv., pp. 80, 87-92.

them to be under the evil influence of the Duke of Richmond (as he was now called) and William Murray, who, Baillie says, "were thought at that tyme to guide the Court much at their pleasure."*

The King returned from Scotland late in November, accompanied by the Duke of Richmond, and made a triumphant entry into London, being received by the Lord Mayor in state in Moorgate Fields. The Prince Palatine and the Duchess of Richmond were, on this occasion, in the royal coach, sitting opposite the King and Queen.†

The office of Lord Steward of the Household had become vacant, by the resignation of the Earl of Arundel; and we find from Bere and Smith's letters to Sir John Pennington that the Duke was appointed Lord Steward early in December, 1641.‡

The Duke was now vigorously attacked in Parliament, being, according to Clarendon, almost the only man about the King who had not stooped or made court to the popular party, and they now determined to remove him from the King, and from his office of Warden of the Cinque Ports.§ He was accused of having interfered in the last election for a member for Hythe, and of having directed his steward, Adrian Scroope,|| to protect Henry Percy, when he had incurred the displeasure of the Parliament. These charges having come to nothing, his enemies next fastened upon some words which he let drop in the House of

* Baillie's *Letters*, vol. i., p. 393.

† Rushworth, part iii., p. 429.

‡ *Domestic State Papers*, 1641 (un calendared).

§ Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i., p. 638.

|| Adrian Scroope afterwards sat on the trial of Charles I, and was executed as a regicide on October 17th, 1660.

Lords, "that if the House was to adjourn, he wished it might be for six months."* The Duke explained that when he spoke he thought that the House was up, and that he meant nothing serious; but he was required to withdraw, and a long debate followed, Lord Saye and Sele warmly took his part, and at last the House of Lords determined to look over the offence, on condition of his apologising to the House. Several Lords protested against the leniency of this sentence; and next day a violent debate took place in the Commons on the subject, and though he was energetically defended by his friends,† the House resolved, by a majority of 223 to 123, "that the Duke of Richmond is one of the malignant party, and an ill counsellor to his Majesty."‡

When Queen Henrietta Maria, with the young Princess of Orange, went to Holland taking with her the Crown jewels, the King, attended by the Duke of Richmond, accompanied them as far as Dover. On their return they were met at Canterbury by Hyde, with a letter from the House of Commons, to which the King having returned a sharp answer, Hyde persuaded the Duke of Richmond to take him into the King's room while he was undressing, that he might endeavour to persuade him to send a more conciliatory message.§ The King, the Prince of Wales, Prince Rupert, and the Duke of Richmond now started for the north; they left Theobalds on the 3rd of March, and arrived at Huntingdon on the 14th.|| Next morning

* *Lords' Journals*, vol. iv., pp. 549, 550.

† Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. i., p. 639.

‡ *Commons' Journals*, vol. ii., p. 400.

§ Clarendon's *Life*, p. 54.

|| Rushworth, part iii., p. 484.

the King paid a few hours' visit to the wonderful family of the late Nicholas Ferrar, at Little Gidding, who still kept up the religious observances and services instituted by him, and arranged their services so that the whole Psalter was repeated from beginning to end once in every day. When the King was shewn the chapel, not finding the images and a cross which were said to be there, he smiled and said to the Duke of Richmond, "I knew it full well that never any were in it, but what will not malice invent?" The Duke and Prince Rupert also smiled, and the Duke said, "Envy was quick sighted." The Duke, we are told, particularly admired a book of devotions which was being prepared by the Ferrars for the Prince of Wales. The King visited the almshouses established there for widows, and gave the Duke all the money he had in his purse (which happened to be five crowns won the night before from Prince Rupert at cards) to give to them. After taking leave of the Ferrars, the King is recorded to have seen a hare sitting, as he was riding away through the grounds, and called to the Duke "for his piece,"* which the Duke carried, "and shot it, to the great amusement of the Prince of Wales."

The Duke of Richmond is mentioned as having been with the King when he rode up to the gates of Hull, and summoned Sir John Hotham in vain to surrender the fortress.† Both the King and the Parliament now prepared for the impending struggle. The Duke at once summoned his three brothers to the royal standard. George Lord D'Aubigny, young, loyal, and enthusiastic, openly expressed his contempt

* Mayor's *Nicholas Ferrar*, p. 149.

† *Lords' Journals*, vol. v., p. 20.

for any man who could refuse to take up arms for the King, and joined him with a gallant band of 300 gentlemen. Lord John, who became a general of horse, and Lord Bernard, to whom was given the command of the King's own troop of guards, also joined him with numerous followers, and the three gallant brothers were all present at the battle of Edgehill, fought on October 23, 1642. Here the brave Lord Aubigny after receiving many wounds fell, and was carried by his brother Bernard to Abingdon, where he died, and was buried in Christ Church, Oxford.*

No time was lost by the Parliament in seizing the goods and property of the lords and gentlemen who had joined the King. The Duke of Richmond was especially exempted from all offers of pardon, his pensions, amounting to £3,400 a year, were stopped at the Court of Wards, his town house was ransacked, and the pictures and valuables sold.† It being reported to the House of Commons that there was a store of arms at Cobham, Colonel Sands proceeded there with two hundred troopers on the 20th of August, 1642. No resistance was made; "the lady through fear sent out word that the magazine should be given up." Five waggon loads of ammunition, and three Barbary horses valued at £200 each, were carried off.‡ Adrian Scroope, the Duke's steward, had received from him "express charge to take no steps to preserve his goods at Cobham," although there was a picture of his mother that Scroope told Sir Roger

* Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 321.

† *Commons' Journals*, vol. ii., p. 808; vol. iii., p. 369; vol. iv., p. 101.

‡ King's Pamphlets, No. lxxi., art. 10; No. lxxii., art. 33.

Twysden the Duke valued "above everything."* The Duke's estates were now all sequestered, and he must have been in straitened circumstances, although before this he had been a very wealthy man for those times. The Duke stated, when compounding for his estates, that his rental in England was £6,500,† and he was in possession of fee farm rents valued at £3,000 per annum.‡ To these must be added the Alnage duties which produced at least £2,000 a-year, and the emoluments from his offices of Lord Steward,§ Warden of the Cinque Ports, and Keeper of Richmond Park. Besides his English property, the Duke had large estates both in Ireland and Scotland, and the Feu duties of the Island of Islay, worth £500 a-year, had been granted to him in 1641.|| Although he never actually resigned his office of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, he had not been allowed to act for some time, but he was not formally superseded till 1645.¶

The Duke of Richmond followed the King's fortunes for the next few years, and accompanied him in all his journeys and adventures in the west of England. After the death of Falkland he took a more prominent part in affairs, and at one time,

* *Archæologia Cantiana*, Vol. II., p. 198.

† *Commons' Journals*, vol. v., p. 683.

‡ *Domestic State Papers*, Charles I, vol. cclxxii., No. 186.

§ The emoluments of the Lord Steward's office were, in King Charles I's time, valued at about £3,000 a-year.—*Historical MSS. Commission*, Sixth Report, p. 724.

|| The Feu duties of Islay were granted for a period of nineteen years at a time, but the grant was always renewed to the Duke's descendants till 1759, when John, third Earl of Darnley, failed to obtain a renewal of it from George II.—*Cobham MSS.*

¶ *Commons' Journals*, vol. iv., p. 111.

Sir Edward Walker tells us, presided over the Council of War, which met every day. He was with the King when he got secretly away from Oxford in June, 1644, and we find him, on October 9th, answering, on the King's behalf, a loyal address from the gentry of Somerset. He slept the next night at Bryanstone,* in the house of the heiress Elizabeth Rogers, who afterwards married his nephew, Charles Duke of Richmond.†

The Duke's home at Cobham was now entirely broken up, and the Duchess seems to have generally lived at Oxford, with the other ladies attached to the Court. She obtained permission, however, to leave Oxford on September 7, 1644, but was not to reside within twenty miles of London, nor to "expect any maintenance out of her lord's estate."‡

The Duke had to mourn the loss this year of another gallant brother, Lord John Stuart, "a young man of extraordinary hope,"§ who was wounded at the battle of Alresford, on March 29, 1644, and died five days after. He had performed prodigies of valour, and had two horses killed under him.|| He was buried in Christ Church, at Oxford, near his brother, Lord D'Aubigny.¶

After a vain attempt, by Commissioners sent to Oxford from both the English and Scotch Parliaments, to negotiate a peace with the King, (the failure of which Baillie ascribes to the Queen's party, among

* Walker's *Historical Discourses*, pp. 14, 23, 100-104.

† *Archæologia Cantiana*, Vol. XI., p. 253.

‡ *Lords' Journals*, vol. vi., p. 698.

§ Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 710.

|| Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 324.

¶ Sir William Dugdale's *Diary*, p. 64.

whom he reckons the Duke of Richmond,)* King Charles sent the Duke and the Earl of Southampton to London with his answer to the propositions made to him. Prince Rupert obtained a safe conduct for them from the Earl of Essex, and they arrived at Somerset House, which had been prepared for their reception, on the 14th of December, 1644,† and were allowed on the next day (Sunday) to have service performed according to the Liturgy, and Dr. Hammond preached before them. The King, we may suppose, had directed them to ascertain what friends to the Royal cause still remained in London, but Clarendon tells us, “few had the courage to visit them, only the Scotch Commissioners, as independent, made no scruple of visiting and being visited by them.” Several friendly conferences took place in the Painted Chamber. Richmond and Southampton suggested that, instead of treating with the King himself, sober men should be chosen from each side to discuss a treaty, who might meet at some third place. This being agreed on by both parties, Webb was sent by the Duke to Oxford to obtain the King’s consent. The Archbishop of Canterbury was now brought to trial, and the two lords were soon forced, by the ill feeling shewn to them, to leave London on December 24th.‡ The Duke was able to carry out his plan for a treaty between the King and the Parliament, and both English and Scotch Commissioners met the Royal Commissioners, over whom the Duke of Richmond presided, at Uxbridge on the 30th of January, 1644-5.§

* Baillie’s *Letters*, vol. ii., p. 244.

† *Lords’ Journals*, vol. vii., pp. 93, 94.

‡ Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 853.

Whitelocke’s *Memoirs*, page 127.

Safe conducts had been exchanged for both parties by the Earl of Essex and Prince Rupert, and we find, from a list given by the latter of the one hundred and eight persons sent from Oxford, that the Duke had a suite of eighteen servants, including Drs. Ferne and Harvey as chaplains, Thomas Webb, three cooks, a coachman named "Tom," a postilion, two footmen, two grooms, and six others, whose duties are not specified.*

The town of Uxbridge was divided between the two parties, and each had "a great inn in which to eat." The Duke of Richmond, as Lord Steward, "kept his table for the King's Commissioners."† He and the more moderate of the Parliamentary side, like the Earl of Pembroke, did all they could to make the treaty a success, and the Duke was on the best possible terms with the Scotch Commissioners, among whom was his own cousin, Sir Charles Erskine; but he discovered too late that the King was not sincere, and that he did not intend to make those concessions which could alone have secured peace. His letter to Richmond, written at this time, afterwards captured at Naseby, shews this when he says, "I hope I need not remind you to cajole well the Independents and Scots."‡

After twenty weary days and nights of hard work and useless discussion, the conference broke up, without achieving any results, and Richmond returned to Oxford, much disappointed and dissatisfied with the King's conduct, which had frustrated his hopes of making an honourable peace. The King noticed the

* *Lords' Journals*, vol. vii., pp. 150, 151.

† Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 865.

‡ *King's Cabinet Opened*, p. 25.

change of his countenance, and spoke on the subject to Lord Clarendon, who had at this time been formally admitted by the Duke to his friendship. The Duke had called him into the Royal bedchamber, and then, in a long speech, formally asked the King's consent to their being friends. The King said next day to Clarendon, speaking of the Duke, that he thought "his man Webb gave him ill counsel," and he begged Clarendon to find out why the Duke had left off attending the meetings of the Council for Secret Affairs, which then sat at Oriel College. The Duke, Lord Clarendon tells us, "had all the warmth and passions of a subject, a servant, and a friend to the King," but he was "a man of high spirit, and valued his very fidelity at the rate it was worth." On being pressed, he said that he believed the King had lost confidence in him, and he complained that the King was "not kind to him," which he attributed to his having shewn the King a letter from Lucy Countess of Carlisle, with whom he had corresponded before the treaty of Uxbridge, in hopes of bringing about an arrangement. The King had seemed suspicious about his dealings with this lady and others of the Parliamentary party, and the Duke felt that, if mistrusted, he could no longer be fit to share in the King's secret counsels; he added that he found the King trusted others more than him, meaning, according to Clarendon, "the power and credit that John Ashburnham had with the King."

Clarendon says that he was able to persuade the Duke to attend the Council again, but that he refused to dismiss Webb, who had served him so faithfully for many years. He adds that he could not succeed entirely in "removing the cloudiness" from the

King's and the Duke's countenances, but that no diminution of the Duke's duty to the King could be observed, and that the King's "kindness to him continued with many gracious evidences to his death."*

Whatever may have been his opinions on political matters, the Duke declined to leave his attendance on the King's person when the Prince of Wales, of whose Council he was the head, went to hold his Court in the west of England,† and he remained with the King during the year 1645. The Duchess seems to have been indisposed in the month of May, and obtained leave to go to Hampton Court to consult Sir Theodore Mayherne, the great physician of the day.‡

Lord Bernard Stuart, who still commanded the King's Guards, was now created Earl of Litchfield, but before his patent could be signed he was killed at Rowton Heath. The King, who witnessed the engagement from the walls of Chester, was deeply grieved at his death, and we can well imagine the sorrow and despair of the Duke when he saw the last of the three gallant brothers whom he had brought up from their early boyhood with such tender care, fall a useless sacrifice in this bloody and fratricidal war. The Earl of Lichfield is described as having been "of a most gentle, courteous and affable nature, and of a spirit and courage invincible."§ The Duke carried his body to Oxford, and buried him in Christ Church, close by his two brave brothers.||

* Clarendon's *Life*, p. 93.

† Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 930.

‡ *Commons' Journals*, vol. iv., p. 136.

§ Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 1070.

|| Sir William Dugdale's *Diary*, p. 84.

The Duke of Richmond had no heart for any more useless struggles against the overwhelming power which now ruled the country, and we are not surprised that in May, 1646, when the King left Oxford secretly, he, with the Earl of Lindsey, threw himself on the mercy of the Parliament. They addressed a joint letter to Sir Thomas Fairfax explaining their conduct. "After the departure of the King," they say, "we who have followed him in the relation of domestic servants would not remain in any place after him, to expose ourselves to doubtful construction with the Parliament," and finished by requesting to be allowed to go to London, or at least to their own homes. Fairfax enclosed this letter to the House of Lords, and expressed his opinion that no harm could be done by granting this request. The Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod was nevertheless sent to take Richmond and Lindsey into custody, and they were detained prisoners at Windsor* till the capitulation of Oxford in June, when it was expressly stipulated that they should be included in the Articles of Surrender. They were in consequence set at liberty, and allowed to compound for their estates within six months, at a rate not exceeding two years' rental.†

The Duke and Duchess were thus once more able to live at Cobham Hall, and the Duke succeeded in compounding for his estates by paying a fine of £8,576, having been allowed to deduct from their yearly value the interest on the incumbrances (£40,000). He obtained in May, 1647, an order from the Commissioners for compounding with Delinquents to put him into possession of his "property in Kent, Middle-

* *Lords' Journals*, vol. viii., p. 291, 301, 313, 331, 335.

† Whitelock's *Memoirs*, p. 213.

sex, York, Lincoln, Nottingham, Hunts, Berks, Beds, North^{on}, Wilts, Worcester, Hants, South^{on}, Surrey, Essex, Norfolk, and Cambridge.”* In August, 1648, he was formally pardoned by Parliament and his delinquency removed, half of his fine having then been paid.†

The Duke afterwards petitioned the House of Lords to remit the remainder of the fine, on account of the loss of his office of Warden of the Cinque Ports, which had not been considered when compounding for his estate, and the application would appear to have been favourably received.‡

Several letters to Sir Charles Erskine, written by the Duke and Duchess from Cobham, during the summer of 1647, are still preserved, and are on business connected with the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, as to which the King had employed the Duke as his “intermediary.”§ Clarendon also mentions him as being at Cobham in July, but says that he would soon join the King.|| When Charles I was taken from Holmby to Hampton Court by the army, the Duke of Richmond requested, and obtained, leave from Fairfax to pay his respects to his royal master on the journey at Hatfield.¶ This conduct of Fairfax, in allowing the Duke to see the King, was much disapproved of by the Parliament, and the Duke, finding this, left the King after a few days, but joined him again in August at Hampton Court. Here he

* *Royalist Composition Papers.*

† *Commons' Journals*, vol. v., p. 683.

‡ *Lords' Journals*, vol. x., p. 521.

§ *Historical MSS. Commission*, Fourth Report, p. 523.

|| *Clarendon State Papers*, vol. i., p. 383.

¶ *Lords' Journals*, vol. ix., p. 323.

with Hertford, Ormonde, and others, had hoped to be allowed to remain with the King, and to act as his Council, but the jealousy of the Parliament forced them again to leave. When the King escaped from Hampton Court he left behind him a letter to Colonel Whalley, in which he begged that a picture of the Princess of Orange might be sent to Lady D'Aubigny, and a favourite dog given to the Duke of Richmond.*

The Duke was often in London, and lived at this time in Wallingford House, Whitehall, belonging to his brother-in-law the Duke of Buckingham. Here, at midnight on February 27, 1647-8, the poor weak-minded Lord Cobham† came to take refuge from his wife. Webb, always keen for his master's interests, probably encouraged their dissensions, and the Duke allowed Lord Cobham to live nearly two years in his house hidden from his wife.‡ A letter of Cobham's to Webb proves that he had himself asked for a refuge there, but Webb contrived to persuade him, while living with the Duke, to sell Cliffe and Chalk and his other Kentish property to the Duke for about £14,000, a proceeding much commented on afterwards by Lady Cobham, in a Chancery suit which arose out of the matter.§

A rising took place in the spring of 1648 in Kent, and afterwards spread to Essex, but after the Duke's surrender to the Parliament, he always refused to engage in any plots,|| and he would seem to have

* *Lords' Journals*, vol. ix., p. 520.

† John Brooke, of Heckington, created Lord Cobham 20 Charles I. He was a first cousin of the unfortunate Henry, last Lord Cobham.

‡ *Archæologia Cantiana*, Vol. XI., p. 206.

§ *MS. Brief* at Cobham Hall.

|| Calendar of the *Clarendon State Papers*, vol. ii., No. 379.

remained quietly in London. The Duchess, however, had to mourn the death of her brother "the beautiful Francis Villiers," who was killed on the 9th of July in a skirmish near Kingston. The Duke of Buckingham, who had also joined the rising in favour of the King, managed to make his escape. The Duchess of Richmond obtained leave from Parliament on the 11th of July to write to her brother on this melancholy occasion.*

The Duke had early in July attempted to go to Cobham, but had been stopped at Lambeth, and his horses seized. He was able to procure an order from the House of Lords on the 7th of July to release his horses, and to allow him to pass to his house in Kent, and to reside there without molestation.†

One last and fruitless attempt at a treaty, between the King and the Parliament, was made in August 1648, at Newport in the Isle of Wight, and the King was allowed to have once more the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, and the Earls of Lindsey and Southampton to attend on him. When November came nothing had been settled, and it became evident that the army would not allow the Parliament to restore the King, on any terms. The Duke of Richmond had the melancholy satisfaction of being with the King during the last night he spent in the Isle of Wight, and Colonel Edward Cooke, by the Duke's orders, drew up a touching and interesting account of what passed, which was corrected by the Duke himself. It appears that, between seven and eight o'clock on the 29th of November, the King sent for the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Lindsey,

* *Lords' Journals*, vol. x., p. 375.

† *Ibid.*, vol. x., 367.

and Colonel Cooke (who were all together at the Duke's lodgings in Newport) and acquainted them that he had been informed that the army were going again to seize on his person. A long discussion followed as to what should be done, and the Duke and Lord Lindsey urged him to attempt to escape immediately, and to prove that it was still feasible, the Duke put on a long cloak and was taken by Colonel Cooke, who had the password, past all the guards without any remark. The King having originally given his word not to escape during the time of the treaty, could not be brought to consent, and sent Lindsey and Cooke home to bed. The Duke of Richmond, who was in waiting, remained with the King, but felt so anxious that he would not undress. At break of day a knocking was heard, and Lieut.-Colonel Cobbit appeared and ordered the King to start with him at once. The Duke of Richmond was only allowed to go with him for about two miles, when he "sadly took leave of the King, being scarce permitted to kiss his hand," and never saw his royal master alive again. The Duke and the other Lords at once left the Isle of Wight, and went to Titchfield, the Earl of Southampton's house.*

Lady D'Aubigny, the Duke's sister-in-law, after her husband's death had devoted her wit and great talents to the King's service, and had once narrowly escaped being put to death by the Parliament, having been imprisoned and ordered to be brought to trial, when she fortunately made her escape. She had, during the war, married James Lord Newburgh,† and had since conducted successfully the King's correspondence with

* Cooke's *Certain Passages at Newport in 1648*.

† Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. iii., p. 375.

the Queen. The King was allowed to dine at Bagshot Lodge with Lord and Lady Newburgh, on his way to Windsor, December 23, 1648, and they arranged a plan for his escape on a fleet horse belonging to them. The scheme, however, was frustrated, partly by the vigilance of Colonel Harrison who commanded the King's escort, and partly from the horse having been accidentally lamed that very morning.

The Duke attempted to see his royal cousin after his condemnation to death, but Sir Thomas Herbert tells us that the King said, in a kind message "to the Prince Elector and the other lords who loved him," that he hoped they would not take it ill if he refused to see any one but his own children, and urged them instead to pray for him. Amongst the tokens of remembrance bestowed upon his children and friends, King Charles on the last sad morning of his life sent his gold watch to the Duchess of Richmond.*

Several historians relate that Richmond, Hertford, Southampton, and Lindsey now in vain offered their lives in exchange for that of the King, urging that as Privy Councillors they were more responsible than he was for any so-called treasonable acts.† They, however, were only allowed the melancholy satisfaction of attending his body to the grave, and the Duke of Richmond was entrusted with the superintendence of his funeral in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, on the 9th of February, 1648-9.‡ Herbert and Mildmay had conveyed the King's body thither the night before,

* Sir Thomas Herbert's *Charles I*, p. 118 (edition 1702).

† Echard, p. 718; Lloyd, p. 194; Collins's *Peerage*, vol. i., p. 165.

‡ *Proceedings of the House of Commons*, Die Jovis, 8 Feb. 1648.

After stating that the house approved of Windsor as the place of burial of the late King, and allowing the Duke of Richmond,

and when the Duke of Richmond and the other lords arrived, the Duke is recorded to have caused the coffin to be opened to satisfy himself that it was indeed the corpse of his honoured and beloved master.* They found a place for the King in the same vault with Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, and buried him there in silence and tears, Colonel Whichcote, the stern and puritanical governor of Windsor Castle, having prevented Bishop Juxon from reading any funeral service over the Royal remains.

The Duke went home a broken-hearted man, and "never had his health or his spirits again."† "He pined away," says Lloyd, "in his house mourning for his Majesty's person, whom he would have died for,"‡ and never seems to have taken any further part in public affairs, nor even to have visited the exiled court at Breda.

One ray of light came to cheer these dark times, for the Duke and Duchess, who had been childless for twelve years, now rejoiced in the birth of a son, who was born in London in November, 1649, and was

Marquis of Hertford, Earl of Lindsey, Earl of Southampton, Dr. Juxon, and three servants each, to attend, the order proceeds, "Resolved. That it shall be left to the said Duke of Richmond to take order for the place of the King's burial to be in Windsor, either in Henry VIII his chapel or the choir, as they shall think fit, and that the circumstances and manner of the interment be wholly left to the Duke of Richmond, and that the said Committee do provide money for defraying the charge of the funeral not exceeding the sum of five hundred pounds." (*Commons' Journals*, vol. vi., p. 134).

* Sir Thomas Herbert's *Charles I*, p. 149, and England's *Black Tribunal*, 1720.

† Echard's *History of England*, p. 718.

‡ Lloyd's *Memoirs*, p. 236.

named Esmé after his grandfather. Lord Cobham, who was still living in the Duke's house, was one of his godfathers.* Another child, a daughter, was born in 1651, and baptized by the name of Mary at St. Martins in the Fields on the 10th of July. Thomas Webb, the Duke's faithful secretary and friend, died in October, 1649, and was buried in Cobham Church. From the inscription to his memory on a stone in the chancel we learn that he was aged forty-nine at the time of his death, and that he had married Elizabeth Woodhouse, who died during the siege of Oxford.

The Duke got into trouble in the year 1651 with the Committee of Sequestrations, apparently from having neglected to transfer the prebend of Leighton, worth about £200 per annum,† for the benefit of the ministers of the two parishes of that place, which he had agreed to do when compounding for his estates.‡ He was summoned several times before the Council of State, and it was seriously discussed whether he should be allowed to continue to reside at Cobham, but he was eventually permitted to return there, having on May 24th been "bailed on bond of £10,000, with sureties of £2,000 each, to appear when called upon." When he was next summoned he was too ill to appear, and wrote the following letter, the last we have from his hand, addressed to Lord Bradshaw, Lord President of the Council.§

My Lord

Vpon the occasion, now, of a second summons I must needs remember together, the civility I received in the first, and in

* *MS.* at Cobham.

† *Royalist Composition Papers*, G. 65, p. 496.

‡ *Commons' Journals*, vol. v., p. 683.

§ *Domestic State Papers*, October, 1651.

it. My present condition being not, at first, knowne, is, since, an occasion, to acknowledge more fauour. To which & your last orders, I shal pay my obseruance, with such respect as shal be answerable to all that in me lyes.

My Lord

Your Lo^{ps} most humble seruaut

J. RICHMOND AND LENOS.

Cobham Hall

October 21, 1651

at night.

On reading this letter and seeing a certificate from Dr. Chaberry respecting the state of his health, the Council at once wrote to excuse the Duke's further attendance on them.*

On the 26th of December the Council of State summoned him to appear before them on another matter. Charles I had given Dumbarton Castle to the Duke of Richmond in 1641, and he had appointed Sir Charles Erskine as governor. The castle was now besieged by General Monk, and Sir Charles wished to make conditions before surrendering. The Duke seems to have come to London, but was then taken ill and unable to wait on the Council, who were obliged to send Lieut.-General Fleetwood, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Nevill, to ask the Duke to send orders to Sir Charles to give up the Castle immediately. The Duke complied with this request, and wrote a letter to Sir Charles Erskine to that effect.† We find that in November, 1652, the Duke's affairs remained unsettled, and his case was still before the Commissioners for compounding.‡ The Duke continued to live quietly at home for the next two years. Baillie

* *Domestic State Papers*, 1651.

† *Ibid.*, December, 1651.

‡ *Commons' Journals*, vol. vii., p. 208.

mentions him for the last time in July, 1654, when talking of the ruined state of the Scotch nobility, "Lenox is living as a man buried in his house at Cobham." He was taken ill in March, 1655, of a quartan ague, and died on the 30th of that month, in the 44th year of his age,* "without the comfort," says Clarendon, "of seeing the resurrection of the Crown."† He was buried on the 18th of April in King Henry VII's Chapel in Westminster Abbey, in the same vault with his uncle Ludovic Duke of Richmond.‡

The Duchess found the Duke's affairs in much confusion,§ and in 1658 became so involved in debt that she was obliged to go to France to avoid her creditors, "great store of her servants were turned off, and her estate put into friends' hands to pay debts."|| Her son, the little Duke Esmé, was taken ill in Paris; he seems to have been bled by his physicians, and died on August 10, 1660. Probably "his most disconsolate mother," as she is called,¶ believed it was in consequence of their treatment. The inscription on his coffin-plate states that he died from "the

* Echard's *History of England*, p. 226.

† Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, vol. ii., p. 295.

‡ Chester's *Registers of Westminster Abbey*, p. 148.

§ We find from a private Act of Parliament (14 Car. II, No. 1), a copy of which is in the British Museum (*Harleian MS.*, 6805), that the mortgages on the Duke James's estate at the time of his death amounted to £24,500, £6000 of which was charged on his Kentish estates. By this Act a dowry of £20,000 (according to the Duke's will) was to be raised out of his estates for his daughter Lady Mary, for which her husband, the Earl of Arran, afterwards accepted the Leighton estate in exchange.

|| *Historical MSS. Commission*, Fifth Report, p. 145.

¶ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

cruelty of his physicians.”* He was buried on September 4, in the Richmond vault in Westminster Abbey.† The Duke’s only daughter, Lady Mary Stuart, also died young; she had married, on September 13, 1664, Richard Butler Earl of Arran, second son of the Duke of Ormonde, and died on July 4, 1667.‡ The Duchess of Richmond married, as her third husband, Colonel Thomas Howard, brother of the first Earl of Carlisle. She died in 1685, and was buried in the same vault with her second husband, the Duke of Richmond, and their son Esmé, in Westminster Abbey.§

* Stanley’s *Westminster Abbey*, 3rd edition, p. 620.

† Chester’s *Registers of Westminster Abbey*, p. 152.

‡ Lodge’s *Irish Peerage*, vol. ii., p. 38.

§ Chester’s *Registers of Westminster Abbey*.

