

## CHAPTER 5

# Scotland and Ireland, 1632–1640

Despite Hamilton's marriage into an English family in 1620, despite his hereditary English peerage as earl of Cambridge (normally associated with princes of the blood)<sup>1</sup> and despite his permanent residence in London between 1628 and 1642, he remained inextricably linked to Scotland. The popular myth that Hamilton disliked Scotland cannot be sustained before 1638 from the surviving evidence. While in Scotland in early 1628 and in 1634, Hamilton complained to the king that he would rather be at court, yet the comment was couched in terms of a servant's desire to be with his master.<sup>2</sup> Certainly in 1638 Hamilton declared his native country a 'miserabil place' and he was rumoured to have considered selling up and moving all his interests to England.<sup>3</sup> At the same time he asked the king that in the event of his death at the hands of the Covenanters his children should be married in England.<sup>4</sup> Ten years later, after his failed invasion of England, he asked the executors of his estate to do the exact opposite.<sup>5</sup> In both instances Hamilton was faced with a situation over which he no longer had control.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the current Hanover royal family, Prince William, the next in line to the throne after his father King Charles III, is duke of Cambridge.

<sup>2</sup> For 1628 see chapter 1 and for 1634 see below. But for an example NRS GD 406/1/97 (Hamilton to Charles I, 29 March 1628).

<sup>3</sup> S.R. Gardiner, ed., *The Hamilton Papers* (Camden Soc., 1880), 60 (Hamilton to Charles I, 27 November 1638); NRS GD 406/1/1023 (Lauderdale to Hamilton, 31 October 1639); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Rawlinson D. 857, fos.37r–38v, unfol. ([Newsletter? written by an Englishman in Edinburgh?] 'The Severall passages at the Assembly at Edenborough 18 August 1639').

<sup>4</sup> NRS GD 406/1/326/1-2 (Hamilton to Charles I, 27 November 1638). In this letter Hamilton also declared 'nixt hell I heate this place', but it was in the context of putting himself forward as a Scottish lord deputy. Hamilton had to be very careful how he phrased suggestions like this to the king, given his proximity to the Scottish crown.

<sup>5</sup> In his Will, Hamilton instructed his executors to ensure that his eldest daughter Anne was married to James, Lord Paisley, the earl of Abercorn's eldest son, Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 91/109/M14/3/4 (12 June 1648).

---

### How to cite this book chapter:

Scally, J. 2024. *The Polar Star: James, First Duke of Hamilton (1606–1649)*. Pp. 97–128. London: Ubiquity Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/bcx.f>. License: CC BY-NC 4.0

A more accurate picture can be found between these two melodramatic extremes. Although Hamilton competed with the elite of the English nobility he did it as 3<sup>rd</sup> marquis of Hamilton, the king's cousin, one of the ancient Scottish peerage and potential claimant to the Scottish throne. There was no attempt to sever any of the ancient Hamilton kinship connections in Scotland in favour of a stake in England. He was the only member of his family to marry into the English nobility.<sup>6</sup> Before 1638 Hamilton owned no land in England, but remained one of the biggest landowners in Scotland. By contrast, he was a commercial entrepreneur and monopolist in England. The limited evidence that has survived about his household suggests that it was predominantly staffed by Scots and Hamiltons in particular.<sup>7</sup> His personal counsel, attendants and men of business retain anonymity precisely because they were normally all called Hamilton. We have for example Sir John Hamilton of Broomhill, one of the marquis's right hand men who acted as confidential secretary and negotiator, and who was married to the 2<sup>nd</sup> marquis's 'natural' daughter.<sup>8</sup> Equally important was Sir James Hamilton, one of his colonels in Germany, who supervised Hamilton's affairs while he was away from court.<sup>9</sup> We also have a John Hamilton, procuring payments for horses at the sign manual and signet office in 1632.<sup>10</sup> This was probably the same man, styled 'of Hampton Court' in a bond of 1637,<sup>11</sup> whom Hamilton entrusted with the great seal of Scotland in 1641.<sup>12</sup> At court in 1638 a Thomas Hamilton shuttled the marquis's letters from Edinburgh between the earl of Stirling and Archbishop Laud.<sup>13</sup> Above all, the key man of business in Hamilton's public and private interests in Scotland was Sir John Hamilton of Orbiston, clerk register, collector-general depute of the 1633 taxations and justice-clerk from 1636.<sup>14</sup>

This chapter will argue that Hamilton's continued use of a mainly Scottish household, servants and men of business was mirrored in his active involvement in many (but not all) matters relating to Scotland. The main objective will be to gauge the degree of that involvement and to identify the

<sup>6</sup> Hamilton had one brother William and four sisters Anna, Margaret, Mary and Margaret who was 'natural'. William married Elizabeth Maxwell, daughter of James, later earl of Dirleton; Anna married Hugh, Lord Montgomery (later 7<sup>th</sup> earl of Eglinton); Margaret married John, 10<sup>th</sup> Lord Lindsay of the Byres (later 1st earl of Lindsay, 1633–42 and earl of Crawford-Lindsay, 1642–78); Mary married James, Master of Drumlanrig (later 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Queensberry); and Margaret married Sir John Hamilton of Broomhill (later 1<sup>st</sup> Lord Belhaven).

<sup>7</sup> One undated list of 28 household men, probably drawn up after 1643, records almost all Scots surnames with nineteen Hamiltons. However, this may have been Hamilton's household between late 1646–1648, when he was almost permanently in Scotland and therefore more likely to have a Scottish household, Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD/100/3/M2/109.

<sup>8</sup> See chapters 2 and 4; NRS GD 406/1/318 (Stirling to Hamilton, 4 December [1635]). For Broomhill at court, T. Thompson, ed., *Diary of Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, 1632–1645*. (Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh 1843), p.40. Broomhill was finally raised to the peerage on 18 December 1647 as Lord Belhaven. He was at first styled of Broomhill, but later became known as of Biel. His father was one of the many bastards of James, 1<sup>st</sup> Lord Hamilton. Later, as Lord Belhaven, he faked his own death on 31 July 1652 and reappeared again in January 1659, G.E.C[ockayne], *Complete Peerage*, ii, 93. As a result he has caused considerable confusion: see for example, D. Mathew, *Scotland Under Charles I* (London, 1955), p.235 note 1, quoting Scotstarvet.

<sup>9</sup> NRS GD 406/1/318 (Stirling to Hamilton, 4 December [1635]). In 1631 Sir James, along with George Melville, received a commission to seize all falsely dyed silks in England, Wales and Ireland with all the benefits, procured at the sign manual and signet office by Hamilton, TNA, SO 3/10 April 1631. Sir James accompanied Hamilton on the 1639 expedition against the Covenanters and acted as his secretary, Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 80–83. He was probably also one of his colonels in Germany, chapter 2, pp.25–26.

<sup>10</sup> TNA, SO 3/10 unfol, July 1632.

<sup>11</sup> Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 90/73/F1/80 (Bond between Hamilton and John Hamilton of Hampton Court with David Moorhead, October 1637).

<sup>12</sup> Gardiner, *History of England*, x, 5 and notes. It was probably this Hamilton who in May 1636 received £500 for the king's special service and an annual pension for the same amount, *CSPD 1635–36*, 403 ([Copy] Docquet).

<sup>13</sup> NRS GD 406/1/592 (Stirling to Hamilton, 8 June 1638).

<sup>14</sup> Orbiston was involved in every aspect of Hamilton's affairs in Scotland: estates, the national taxation granted in 1633 and worked regularly with Hamilton's supporters and business acquaintances, see for example NRS GD 406/1/285, 282. For the justice-clerk's appointment, Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p.48.

other Scots at court and in Edinburgh with whom the marquis interacted. An attempt will also be made to grasp the thistle and suggest answers to a few questions of some importance. How was Scottish policy formulated at court and what influence did Hamilton have? Was Burnet's assertion that Hamilton was 'the great patron of all Scotsmen at court' yet another exaggeration? We shall also present a case study of Hamilton's activities as collector general of the taxations granted to Charles I in the Scottish parliament of 1633. As a further balance to Hamilton's activities in England discussed in the previous chapter, we shall take a brief look at his attempt to build up an interest in Ireland, the third of Charles's three kingdoms.

## I

From St Martin's Lane in London on 16 April 1632 the Scottish master of requests, Sir James Galloway, wrote a long letter to Hamilton in Germany lamenting his inability to get business done in the marquis's absence. Yet although Galloway wrote under a cloud that would only lift on Hamilton's return, he acknowledged the marquis's efforts from afar:

I am told by Sr James Ramsay that your L. has been lately pleased to descend to the remembrance of my business to his Matie & the honoring of me forder by some lynes of your Lps. It was not a single but a manifold favor to pull up so meane a servant & his petty business to the memory & considera[ti]on of so great a Prince, bot inspeciall att such a distance & in the greatest throng of your owne & his Maties State & forrayne affaires.<sup>15</sup>

Even if he had not surrounded himself with Scots in Germany, Hamilton would have been unlikely to forget his countrymen.<sup>16</sup> Research by Keith Brown and Neil Cuddy removes the necessity of providing a sketch of all the Scots at court, but some contextualisation and comments are necessary.<sup>17</sup> Although Hamilton had clients and ambitions throughout the court, it was the king's Bedchamber that he perceived as the cockpit of government.<sup>18</sup> While in Germany, for example, his correspondence was aimed primarily at the earl of Carlisle, groom of the stool, and Will Murray, groom of the Bedchamber.<sup>19</sup> That both men were fellow Scotsmen and political associates demands equal emphasis. The most important Scots in the peacetime Bedchamber were Hamilton, Lennox, Carlisle, Will Murray and Patrick Maule of Panmure. The other Scots, such as Robert, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Ancram, John, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Annandale and James Maxwell, exerted limited political muscle but were nevertheless useful patrons and enjoyed considerable financial benefits.<sup>20</sup> James Maxwell, for

<sup>15</sup> Galloway's pension was £1,000 in arrears and his problems seem to have been compounded by Viscount Stirling, NRS GD 406/1/270 (Galloway to Hamilton, 16 April 1632). Things looked up, however, when Hamilton returned as Galloway received £500 from the 1633 taxation, see below. He was also made a gentleman of the privy chamber on 5 October 1634, TNA, L.C., 5/134, p.19.

<sup>16</sup> See chapter 2, *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> K.M. Brown, 'Courtiers and Cavaliers: service, anglicization and loyalty among the royalist nobility', in John Morrill, ed., *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context*. (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.155–192; Brown, 'Aristocratic Finances and the Origins of the Scottish Revolution', *English Historical Review*, civ, (January 1989), pp.46–87. For Neil Cuddy, 'The king's chambers, the Bedchamber of James I in Administration and Politics, 1603–1625' (University of Oxford D.Phil 1987); 'The Revival of the entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625' pp.173–225 in Starkey ed., *The English Court* (London 1987); 'Anglo-Scottish Union and the court of James I, 1603–1625' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, January 1990, pp.107–124.

<sup>18</sup> David Ramsay and Sir Alexander Hamilton were both gentlemen of the privy chamber, see chapter 1. For Hamilton's efforts to build a broader power base outside the Bedchamber, chapter 4 pp.77–79.

<sup>19</sup> Chapter 2, pp.41–42.

<sup>20</sup> Ancram and Annandale were slightly older, the former, as Sir Robert Ker, came from prince Charles's Bedchamber, while the latter was a pre-1603 groom of the privy chamber. At court under James, ironically as plain John Murray, Annandale had a great deal of influence in Scots affairs and had land in all three kingdoms, J. Haig, ed., *The Historical Works of Sir James Balfour* (4 vols. Edinburgh, 1825), i, 227–228. Ancram's influence appears to have been at

instance, was a particularly successful entrepreneur and had strong links with Hamilton. Hamilton's father had secured Maxwell's place for him in the Bedchamber in 1620,<sup>21</sup> and Hamilton's brother, Lord William Hamilton, later 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Lanark, married Maxwell's daughter, Elizabeth, in 1638.<sup>22</sup> Outside the Bedchamber, two important Scots in Hamilton's network were James, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Roxburgh, and William, 6<sup>th</sup> earl of Morton, lord treasurer between 1630 and 1636. Like Carlisle and Will Murray, Morton and Roxburgh supported Hamilton while he was in Germany and the connection endured at least until 1641.<sup>23</sup>

The closest parallel Scot with Hamilton at court and the most frequently underrated,<sup>24</sup> though clearly a rising star, was James, 4<sup>th</sup> duke of Lennox and 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of March.<sup>25</sup> Lennox and Hamilton were princes of the blood and thus occupied that rarefied place around the king. The Van Dyck portrait of Lennox, seated with his hunting dog, contrasts with the active and more statesmanlike portraits of Hamilton and Wentworth by the same artist. The projected image is of indolence, of 'the archetypal Caroline courtier.'<sup>26</sup> Yet this is misleading, for although Lennox was never as powerful a political figure as Hamilton or Wentworth, he did not sit around all day patting a dog. He was six years younger than Hamilton, and twelve years younger than Charles, and he became a gentleman of the Bedchamber in 1625 at the age of fourteen. Even at that early age he began building up a clientele and to that end formed an alliance with another rising star, Sir John Stewart of Traquair. Stewart and his father-in-law David, Lord Carnegie, later earl of Southesk, were two of the overseers of the duke's Scottish estate.<sup>27</sup> Lennox made them and the earl of Linlithgow his Scottish counsel in 1633.<sup>28</sup> From court in early 1625 the future lord treasurer of Scotland revealingly described his and the naive young duke's ambitions:

I have, evir since my cumming hear, ha[u]ntid my lord Duik of Lennox much, and finds him soe kynd and foruward in any thing concernes myself, that no[t] only hes he undertakin to doe my busines, but hes bein verie earnest uith me that no man sould be a speaker to His Majestie in anything concernes me but he only; and is so confident to get all done, that he hes protestid both particularlie to my self, as alsoe to Sir Robert Ker (quhom I use in all my busines), that in cais His Majestie sall not give uay to this his first suite for me, he sall nevir troubill him uith any thing concernes himself. I have desyred not only to be made a barron but alsoe a commissioner for the borders.<sup>29</sup>

---

its height principally before, and a few years after, Charles became king, see Laing, *Correspondence of Ancrum and Lothian* (2 vols, Edinburgh 1875), i, *passim*, esp. 8–9.

<sup>21</sup> Brown, 'Courtiers and Cavaliers', p.166.

<sup>22</sup> Maxwell was a particularly successful entrepreneur and it was probably the promise of a substantial dowry which clinched the marriage deal, G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, iv, 386–387.

<sup>23</sup> Roxburgh, along with Haddington and Buccleuch, were cited by Ochiltree as the prime movers along with Hamilton of the plot of 1631, *State Trials*, iii, 435–436.

<sup>24</sup> See Brown, 'Courtiers and Cavaliers', pp.158–160. Lennox was born and educated in England, but was clearly recognised as being a Scot by origin and was labelled as such, which Clarendon, predictably enough, viewed as a 'disadvantage,' Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, ii, 161.

<sup>25</sup> Earl of March was the English title. He inherited another English title, that of baron Clifton, on 21 August 1637 on the death of his mother, G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vii, 609.

<sup>26</sup> Brown, 'Courtiers and Cavaliers', p.159.

<sup>27</sup> W. Fraser, *History of the Carnegies, Earls of Southesk and of their kindred* (2 vols. Edinburgh 1867), i, 86–90 (Stewart to Carnegie, [March] 1624/25); Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 12 /7 (Traquair to Lennox, [1635]). The earl of Angus and Lord Cochrane were also administrators of the Lennox estate, *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 7 /1 (Lennox to Linlithgow, Southesk and Traquair, 9 October 1633).

<sup>29</sup> Fraser, *Carnegies*, i, 87–90 (Stewart to Carnegie, [March] 1624/25). Stewart reported the day before Lennox had 'fullie settlid uith my lord marquis' (the 2<sup>nd</sup> marquis) and as a result appeared to have been in a buoyant mood. The 2<sup>nd</sup> marquis was appointed lord steward of the household in 1624, a place vacated by the death of Lennox's father and the arrangement between Lennox and Hamilton may well have concerned that.

Between 1625 and 1636 the alliance strengthened, and Traquair's regular trips to court normally included a private meeting with the duke.<sup>30</sup> Significantly, in January 1637 Robert Baillie commented on the 'great credit' Traquair had with Lennox.<sup>31</sup> More to the point, it was to Lennox that Traquair repeatedly turned between 1637 and 1642 for support as he was dragged down by the Covenanters.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, Traquair continued to manage the duke's Scottish estates at least until 1655.<sup>33</sup>

Meanwhile, up to 1642, Lennox consolidated his position at court and built up a powerful economic base in England. He was made a grandee of Spain in 1632, a privy councillor in Scotland and England and a knight of the Garter in 1633.<sup>34</sup> In 1641 he was created duke of Richmond and lord steward of the household.<sup>35</sup> Underpinning these honours was a steady stream of royal grants of manors and pensions in England,<sup>36</sup> ambitions in Ireland<sup>37</sup> and a lucrative marriage to the duke of Buckingham's widowed daughter on 3 August 1637. Lennox was also active in politics. In contrast to Hamilton, he appears to have been pro-Spanish and allied to Lord Treasurer Portland.<sup>38</sup> In May 1634 he successfully defended Portland from a powerful attack headed by Laud and Lord Keeper Coventry.<sup>39</sup> Shortly before he died Portland recommended first Lennox, then his son Lord Weston (who was married to Lennox's sister),<sup>40</sup> to the king's care.<sup>41</sup> This evidence helps to explain Lennox's support for Bishop Williams of Lincoln in July 1637 when the latter defied Laud's religious policy. It would be difficult to explain the duke's support for Williams in terms of

<sup>30</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 7/2 (Lennox to Traquair, 8 January 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/3 (Thomas Webb to Traquair, 8 January 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/4 (Webb to Traquair, 9 January 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/5 (Lennox to Traquair, 10 January 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/7 (Lennox to Linlithgow, Southesk and Traquair, 7 March 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/8 (Lennox to Traquair, 18 March 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/9 (Webb to Traquair, 18 March 1633/4); *Ibid.*, 7/10 (Instructions for the duke's Scottish affairs [in Traquair's hand, signed by Lennox] [n.d. 1634]); NRS GD 406/1/777 (Traquair to Hamilton, 31 May [1633]). See also below. Thomas Webb was Lennox's secretary.

<sup>31</sup> D. Laing, ed., *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637–62* (3 vols. Edinburgh, 1841–42), i, 11 (29 January 1636/7). At the time of this letter it was rumoured that Traquair had been called to court to help persuade Lennox to marry the duke of Buckingham's daughter recently widowed following the death of Pembroke's son, *Ibid.* See below.

<sup>32</sup> See chapter 6, but for a few examples, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 12/19 (Traquair to Charles, 25 September, 1637); *Ibid.*, 7/11 (Lennox to Traquair, 2 April 1639); *Ibid.*, 12/38 (Traquair to Lennox, 17 July 1641). The friendship and favours between the two also continued, *Ibid.*, 7/13 (Webb to Traquair, [27 April 1643]). But from late 1643 the contact dried up, however, Webb wrote to Traquair in 1646 to inform him that Lennox had recently contracted a strong friendship with the marquis of Argyll, *Ibid.*, 7/14 (Webb to Traquair, 1 August 1646).

<sup>33</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 12/7 (Traquair to Lennox, [1635?]); *Ibid.*, 12/45 (Traquair to Mr [Hayhor?], 16 February 1655/6).

<sup>34</sup> He was sworn of the English council on 28 July 1633, TNA, P.C., 2/43, 178. The Scottish council in the summer of 1633, *RPCS 2nd Series 1633–35*, p.vi; knight of the Garter, nominated 18 April, installed 6 November, G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vii, 609.

<sup>35</sup> G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vii, 609.

<sup>36</sup> In November 1637, a number of accumulated rents in several English counties amounting to £1,497 was passed from the crown to Lennox. When added to similar lands previously passed the total came to £3,000 per annum. A tenure in socage of east Greenwich was also mentioned, *CSPD 1637*, 595–596 (Accumulated Rents, 30 November 1637). The marriage portion was worth £20,000, G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vii, 609. For the wedding, *CSPD 1637*, 535.

<sup>37</sup> In 1634, Lennox was pressing to have a large part, if not the whole, of Connaught granted to him, much to Wentworth's annoyance, S.C.L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/ fol.63 (Wentworth to Portland, 14 March 1633/4).

<sup>38</sup> Conway mocked both Lennox's Scottish origins and his pro-Spanish tendencies, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 47 (Conway to Wentworth, 22 January 1636/7). Lennox was described as the chief patron of Henry Percy, the earl of Northumberland's brother, *Ibid.*, ii, 363 (Conway to Wentworth, 20 January 1634/5).

<sup>39</sup> Lennox was assisted by his future mother-in-law the duchess of Buckingham, *CSPV 1632–36*, 223. It was rumoured that Holland, Carlisle and Dorset lined up behind Laud and Coventry.

<sup>40</sup> *CSPV 1632–36*. Jerome, Lord Weston had been involved in the French letter affair in opposition to Holland and Goring which is consistent with the above, see chapter 4, p.79.

<sup>41</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 389 (Garrard to Wentworth, 17 March 1634/5).

religious rapport as both Lennox's political connections and his marriage suggest Catholic sympathies, therefore we should perhaps view it as another example of his opposition to Laud.<sup>42</sup>

The Portland link partly explains why no correspondence between Hamilton and Lennox has survived between 1632 and 1637 and the fact that they were almost always together in the king's bedchamber.<sup>43</sup> But it is also clear that they operated within conflicting political networks in this period.<sup>44</sup> Lennox's marriage into the Villiers family in 1637, however, brought him closer to the marquis. Indeed, Hamilton told Traquair a few days after the wedding that he was now 'tyed in a neirer degree to be his Lo[rds]p[']s servant then formerly, the which I shall really be.'<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless, the duke and the marquis were never close friends, though they occasionally collaborated on Scottish matters, for example, over securing the appointment of James, Lord Almond, later earl of Callander, to the Privy Council in 1638.<sup>46</sup> Notwithstanding all this, both men enjoyed certain similarities in character, for as Hamilton had been described by the earl of Ancrum as 'very frendly and constant where he takes', so the earl of Carlisle had described Lennox as 'a dragon friend to him he loves'.<sup>47</sup>

Above all, the man who became Hamilton's main ally and political collaborator in the later 1630s was his brother and protegee, Lord William Hamilton. Born on 14 December 1616, the same year his father took up residence at court, Lord William had a different upbringing from his brother James, ten years his senior. For he followed a more traditional path for the Scottish nobility, being educated at the University of Glasgow and from thence, in March 1633, he travelled to France to complete his education.<sup>48</sup> Interestingly, the accounts reveal that the two year stay in France was paid for by what appears to be the sale of armaments, including over 1,000 pistols, by Hamilton clients.<sup>49</sup> Lord William left France in May 1635 and, though he spent some time in Scotland, he eventually settled into a life at court with his brother.<sup>50</sup> Lord William had chambers at Wallingford

<sup>42</sup> Lennox apparently begged the king on his knees five times to show clemency to Williams, TNA, SP 16/363/119 (Rossingham newsletter, 13 July 1637). The entry in the CSPD mistakes Hamilton for Lennox, in fact the original clearly shows it to be the 'lord duke', *CSPD 1637*, 311. For the widespread rumours of the duke's popish inclinations reaching Scotland, Baillie, *Letters*, i, 74–5.

<sup>43</sup> For an example of Lennox and Hamilton together in the bedchamber with Charles, G. Albion, *Charles I and the Court of Rome* (Louvain 1933), p.240.

<sup>44</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, i, 478–479 (Conway to Wentworth, 14 November 1635). In which is described a collaboration between Hamilton and Holland against Lennox 'their common enemy', prompted it seems by Lennox's amorous intentions towards the countess of Carlisle.

<sup>45</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 8/2 (Hamilton to Traquair, 6 August 1637). This letter should perhaps be contrasted with Hamilton's letter to Lord Feilding the morning after the wedding, where he is clearly irritated that the celebrations went on for so long, thus denying Hamilton the opportunity to present Feilding's letter to the king: 'and this morning he [Charles] is lykly to lye so long a bed as I dou belive ther will be no tyme for him to dou anie busines sines he gooes to richmout to denner', W.R.O., Feilding of Newhnam Paddox MSS, CR 2017/C1/86 (Hamilton to Feilding, 4/14 August [1637]).

<sup>46</sup> Typically, Lennox had at first refused to back Hamilton's promotion of Almond, but eventually relented, NRS GD 406/1/420 (Lennox to Hamilton, 20 June 1638). They also came together to block the bishop of Ross's ambitions for lay office, see below.

<sup>47</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 7/14 (Webb to Traquair, 1 August 1646). This was obviously said in retrospect by Lennox's secretary. For Ancrum's comment on Hamilton, chapter 4, p.73.

<sup>48</sup> G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vi, 263. Lord William, aged 16, was accompanied by his governor Mr Henry Maule [of Melgum?], Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 90/73/F1/56/1 (Account book of expenditure by Lord William Hamilton, France 10 March 1633–8 May 1635 [unfol.]). In 1634, Lord William was staying in Paris with one Benjamin Janniques, *HMC, Hamilton Supplementary*, 36–7 (Janniques to Hamilton, 17 April 1634).

<sup>49</sup> Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 90/73/F1/56/1 (Account book of expenditure by Lord William Hamilton, France 10 March 1633–8 May 1635). Broomhill contributed 235 Spanish pistols, Sir John Setone, lieutenant of the French guards gave 600 pistols plus £2,721. Colonel Gunne gave £3,000 and Colonel Alexander Hamilton £300. This constituted the bulk of the charge of £13,074 which was subsequently spent during the two year stay. Some of the pistols may have come from Hamilton's former army.

<sup>50</sup> Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 90/93/ F1/56/2 (Account book of expenditure by Lord William Hamilton, 28 July 1635–12 April 1636). Places mentioned in the accounts include Bagshot, Royston, Edinburgh and Haddington.

House (the marquis's London residence), his own coach, servants and, like his brother, spent a large amount of his income on clothes.<sup>51</sup> Hamilton applied to his mother to contribute towards Lord William's fortune and must have been disappointed when she offered only £20,000 Scots.<sup>52</sup>

An opening at court came in early 1637 on the establishment of young Prince Charles's household, and Lord William was made master of the horse.<sup>53</sup> In the absence of a secure fortune, he was married on 26 May 1638 to a rich heiress, Elizabeth Maxwell, daughter of James Maxwell (later earl of Dirleton), gentleman of the king's Bedchamber.<sup>54</sup> A royal pension of 4,000 merks a year followed a month later.<sup>55</sup> After nearly being made earl of Roseberrie in 1638 (Charles signed the patent, then tore it in disgust, at the dowager marchioness's Covenanted activities),<sup>56</sup> Lord William was created on 31 March 1639, earl of Lanark, Lord Machanshire and Polmont.<sup>57</sup> A year later, on the death of the earl of Stirling, Lanark was made secretary of state for Scotland at court,<sup>58</sup> sat in the Short Parliament as MP for Portsmouth and was made an English privy councillor.<sup>59</sup> Hamilton's guiding hand is evident throughout Lanark's rise,<sup>60</sup> and, as secretary of state, Lanark probably continued to live with his brother at Wallingford House.<sup>61</sup>

At the opposite end of the Island, Hamilton's contacts in the administration in Edinburgh, that is, the Privy Council and Exchequer, were, in order of importance: Sir John Hamilton of Orbiston; Thomas, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Haddington, lord privy seal until 1637; Robert, earl of Roxburgh, lord privy seal from 1637; William, 6<sup>th</sup> earl of Morton lord treasurer (1630–36); John, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Traquair, deputy treasurer and lord treasurer from 1636; David, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Southesk; John, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Lauderdale; Sir James Galloway, master of requests; and Sir Thomas Hope, lord advocate. There are problems in placing some individuals either in London or Edinburgh, for some, such as Morton, Roxburgh and perhaps even Traquair, split their time between the two places. Yet the fact that we can list those who worked with Hamilton does not mean that relations were never strained. The gradient

---

See also, NRS GD 406/1/9660; GD 406/1/408 (Anna Cunningham, dowager duchess of Hamilton to Hamilton, [n.d., 1636–37?]).

<sup>51</sup> Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 90/93/F1/56/2 (Account book of expenditure by Lord William Hamilton, 17 September 1637–30 September 1638). Lord William spent a particularly large amount of money on masking suites. Most of Lord William's income came from Hamilton's merchants, chamberlains of the Scottish estates and other Hamiltonian men of business.

<sup>52</sup> NRS GD 406/1/408 (Anna Cunningham, dowager duchess of Hamilton to Hamilton, [n.d., 1636–37?]). The duchess offered many excuses for the low amount. Lord William appears to have been short of money, GD 406/1/8338 (Lord William to 'Master [Patrick] Wood', 26 May 1636) in which he asks for a loan of £25. Wood was a prominent Scottish merchant.

<sup>53</sup> Knowler, *Strafford Letters*, ii, 148 (Garrard to Wentworth, 7 February 1637).

<sup>54</sup> See above, note 6.

<sup>55</sup> NRS GD 406/M9/50 (Letter of grant, 26 June 1638).

<sup>56</sup> Apparently Charles was so angry that the dowager marchioness of Hamilton had mobilised the Hamilton estates in support of the Covenanters that when the patent was passed to him he signed it then tore it, Baillie, *Letters*, i, 98. The patent survives and has a six inch tear running through the king's signature towards the middle of the letter, NRS GD 406/1/6598 (letter patent creating Lord William, earl of Roseberrie, [n.d., 1639]).

<sup>57</sup> G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vi, 263.

<sup>58</sup> NRS GD 406/L2/153 (Letter under great seal, 15 March 1639/40). There is also an undated warrant, probably from 1640, appointing Lanark sole secretary, GD 406/M 9/318. Lanark's former governor, Harry Maule, became keeper of the king's signet under Lanark, NRS GD 406/M9/28/11. Lanark's secretary was John Squire, Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p.156.

<sup>59</sup> G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, vi, 263. See also chapter 4, p.71.

<sup>60</sup> For example, in April 1639, Charles wrote to Hamilton 'for your Brother, certainelie if you had forgotten him, I should not, but have remembered my owel engagements', NRS GD 406/1/10531 (Charles to Hamilton, 2 April 1639).

<sup>61</sup> On 24 October 1637, letters from Scotland were brought to Lord William to his chamber at Wallingford House. On 26 June 1638 Lord William had 'matting' and 'hangings' put into his chamber, suggesting permanence, Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 90/93/F1/56/3 (Account book by Henry Maule for Lord William Hamilton, 17 September 1637–30 September 1638). James Maxwell began contributing money to Lord William about the beginning of 1639, Hamilton MSS, Lennoxlove, TD 90/93/F1/56/4, 5, 6 (Account books by Henry Maule for Lord William Hamilton, 1638–1640).

of personal affinity is something which must be particularly emphasised in Scottish politics. The kinship/client relationship between Orbiston and Hamilton was on the opposite end of the scale to that between Hope and Hamilton. Pressure could break both, but much more would be needed to break the former than the latter.

Hamilton's relationship with Traquair is a case in point. The bulk of the surviving evidence allows us to build up a strong case for seeing these two key men working closely together on numerous projects, including the redrafting of Hamilton's taxation contract in 1633–34,<sup>62</sup> the civil disorder problem in Aberdeen in 1635–36,<sup>63</sup> and the English breaches of the Anglo-Scottish salt agreement in 1637.<sup>64</sup> The Hamilton/Traquair pipeline between 1633 and 1637 was a key element in the operation of Scottish government.<sup>65</sup> We shall see also that they formed a formidable double-act between 1638 and 1639 when, pursuing a policy of damage limitation to the Scottish crown, they stopped the troubles spinning more out of control than they did.<sup>66</sup> Above all, this supports a neat package of alliance between the two most pragmatic, business-like politicians in Charles's Scottish government. And to a large degree, most of the Hamilton/Traquair correspondence points in that direction.<sup>67</sup> Yet when we turn to other evidence we hit a brick wall. Lennox and, as a back-up, Ancram, were probably Traquair's main Scottish patrons at court. Laud was also favourably disposed to Traquair, and though it is easier to view the Scottish episcopate as the sole agents of Laud's involvement north of the Tweed, he also interfered via Traquair.<sup>68</sup>

Let us muddy the water even further. Hamilton appears not to have been particularly close to Laud, Weston nor Lennox but he worked closely with Traquair and relied on Will Murray. However, a lot of people relied on Murray, and Traquair seems to have been another, as the following letter from Murray to Traquair in January 1637 illustrates:

Some few dayes after your departure hence I moved the Marquis upon a fayre oportunity to second some generalls in your behalf wch he not only refused but told me playnly your carriage in my L[ord] Murrays busines had beene suche to him ase obliged him rather to the contrary, this hath forced me since to take my owne times wch I dare say have beene so seasonable you shall neede no greate mans assistance towards the attaining any reasonable demaund, My Lord Amount [Almond] hath desired my recommendation to you wch being a man of honour & so muche my friend I could not deny.<sup>69</sup>

Perhaps Lennox was not at court on this occasion and Hamilton was asked to fill the gap. Or perhaps Lennox and Traquair had fallen out over some unknown business similar to that which had temporarily driven a wedge between Hamilton and Traquair. Shuffle the cards again and a year later we have Hamilton, Murray and Lennox all pushing to have Almond appointed to the Scottish

<sup>62</sup> See below.

<sup>63</sup> NRS GD 406/1/984 (Traquair to Hamilton, 13 August 1635); GD 406/1/345 (Privy Council [Scotland] to Charles I, 2 December 1636) and below.

<sup>64</sup> NRS GD 406/1/357 (Traquair to Hamilton, 3 January 1636/7).

<sup>65</sup> See for example, NRS GD 406/1/777 (Traquair to Hamilton, 31 May [1633]) and below.

<sup>66</sup> See chapter 6, *passim*.

<sup>67</sup> For one of the best examples of this case where each of the key issues in Scottish government are discussed showing a high degree of collaboration, NRS GD 406/1/1012 (Traquair to Hamilton, [July (before 23 of) 1637]). For the possible reply, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 8/2 (Hamilton to Traquair, 6 August 1637).

<sup>68</sup> See for example, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 12/5 (Laud to Traquair, 6 April 1634) in which Laud gives Traquair 'hearty thanks for ye Bishops, and some other grave divines that are made Justices of the Peace'. In another letter, Laud comments on the Balmerino case, the disorders in the highlands, the earl of Antrim's ambitions in Kintyre and lastly, he thanks Traquair for assisting the bishop and deane of Edinburgh 'wth their Houses', *Ibid*, 11/18 (Laud to Traquair, 14 March 1634[?]); *Ibid*, 12/9 (Laud to Traquair, [? January 1636]).

<sup>69</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 12/8 (Murray to Traquair, 18 January 1636[/?]). The most recent case the earl of Murray was involved in was a dispute between him and James Home, *Ibid*, 11/22 (Morton to Traquair, [?] January 1636[/?]).

Privy Council.<sup>70</sup> Therefore it is with these pitfalls in mind that we discuss the relationship between individuals in Scottish affairs, relationships which were strained further by absentee monarchy, hereditary feuds and the general cut and thrust of Scottish politics. And this was before the new prayer book had arrived in Edinburgh.

## II

When Hamilton returned from Germany in November 1632 a political scandal was brewing in Scotland, which would see Charles's chief minister in Edinburgh toppled. It was one of the marquis's first political acts on returning from Germany to acquiesce in the fall of Menteith. It remains unclear why William Graham, 7<sup>th</sup> earl of Menteith, president of the Privy Council and justice general of Scotland, started rummaging around in his charter chest, though it was a common preoccupation in the wake of the revocation scheme. As a result, between 1630 and 1631, he persuaded the king to change his title from Menteith to Strathearn in recognition of his descent from Euphemia Ross, Robert II's second wife.<sup>71</sup> The problem was that the children of Elizabeth Mure, Robert II's first wife, from whom Charles I was descended, were born out of wedlock, though legitimised by the pope and parliament. Needless to say, the succession through Elizabeth Mure was secure, but it was a delicate matter and Menteith's motives were open to misinterpretation. Unable to resist the temptation, a phalanx of ill-wishers emerged including Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, director of Chancery, Archibald Acheson, secretary of state in Edinburgh, and Sir James Skene of Curriehall, president of the College of Justice. Crucially, Traquair eventually joined this group and permission was secured in May 1633 for a committee to be set up to investigate allegations that Menteith boasted he had a right to the Scottish crown. Hamilton has never been convincingly linked with Menteith's demise, though given his proximity to the crown, it would have been in his own interest to uphold the Stuart line.<sup>72</sup>

Hamilton's part in Menteith's fall illustrates the essence of his political craft. It was others that forwarded the charges and investigated the treasonous allegations, while Hamilton passed the information to the king.<sup>73</sup> The committee considered the case at the same time the king was on his slow progress to Edinburgh for his coronation.<sup>74</sup> The earl of Morton was Hamilton's main contact in the committee in Edinburgh. Morton became convinced of Menteith's guilt<sup>75</sup> and while Hamilton was

<sup>70</sup> See above and for Murray's involvement, NRS GD 406/1/421 (Murray to Hamilton, 21 June 1638).

<sup>71</sup> The genealogical origins are outlined in M. Lee jr, *The Road to Revolution: Scotland under Charles I, 1625–37* (Urbana 1985), pp.119–121. See also, *Complete Peerage*, viii, 659–675, esp. 673–675. Charles I was descended from the children of Robert II's first marriage. The rough narrative on which this paragraph is based is drawn from Lee, *Road to Revolution*, pp.119–125; A. I. MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement* (Edinburgh 1991), pp.82–84.

<sup>72</sup> A few hostile contemporary accounts later linked Hamilton with it just as they linked him with every other political intrigue. A hostile English pamphleteer in 1641 implicated Hamilton, Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 257. A footnote in Lee, *Road to Revolution*, p.144 note 6 mentions Peter Heylin's claim that Hamilton was involved in Menteith's fall, Peter Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London 1671), pp.347–51.

<sup>73</sup> NRS GD 406/1/777 (Traquair to Hamilton, 31 May [1633]). This is another excellent example of the Hamilton/Traquair pipeline which operated during the thirties. Hamilton's mother, the dowager marchioness, was apparently to be called as a witness, but Traquair thought that she would be reluctant to give evidence. However Traquair's father-in-law David, Lord Carnegie (later earl of Southesk) had already deponed that he clearly heard Menteith speaking the words. I would hope at some point in the future to do something on Menteith's fall.

<sup>74</sup> The king's letter and commission to investigate the affair was dated 1 May and the committee sent the depositions to court on 21 May, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 11/15 (Dupplin, Morton, archbishop of Glasgow, Haddington, Lauderdale, Viscount Ayr and Sir John Hay to Charles I, 21 May 1633). For more detail on the case, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 29/11–31.

<sup>75</sup> NLS, Morton Papers MS 79/24 (Morton to Hamilton, 13 May 1633); *Ibid*, 79/20 (Morton to Hamilton, 21 May 1633); *Ibid*, 79/21 (Morton to Hamilton, 31 May 1633). Sir James Skene was called to give evidence before the committee and sent an account to Hamilton, NRS GD 406/1/253 (30 May 1633).

more circumspect than his friend, he nevertheless allowed the minister to fall.<sup>76</sup> The marquis cautioned Morton not to get carried away, however, and suggested, 'I think pardouns is most estmed (or att leaist oght tou be) efter legall conviktioun.'<sup>77</sup> Menteith was confined to his house during the king's visit and in October was found guilty as charged, consequently being stripped of his offices and pension a month later.<sup>78</sup> Hamilton later procured and administered £4,000 of a £10,000 grant to repay the expenses which Menteith had incurred while in royal service.<sup>79</sup> Throughout the 1630s Menteith, by then earl of Airth, considered Hamilton one of his greatest friends in the Scottish administration.<sup>80</sup> Three points are worthy of note from all this. First, Hamilton did not lift a finger to help Menteith until after he was removed from office; second, the vacuum left by Menteith was filled by Hamilton and Traquair; third, Hamilton largely worked behind the scenes in the whole affair and although he let Menteith fall he retained his goodwill.

As Charles approached Edinburgh in the summer of 1633, Hamilton was in a secure position, liaising with the Menteith committee and, in consultation with Traquair, brokering the scramble for honours anticipated during the visit.<sup>81</sup> Inevitably, Hamilton was prominent throughout the king's time in Edinburgh. In the state entry into Edinburgh on 15 June 1633, Hamilton, emblematically, rode just behind the king, with the Scottish contingent in front of them and the English behind.<sup>82</sup> That was the pattern for the rest of the visit although he played no formal role in the coronation ceremony on 18 June.<sup>83</sup> Hamilton's position as the most important Scot at court was underlined when the king named him as one of the lords of articles and as collector general of the taxations granted in parliament. For Hamilton this meant a guarantee of financial security and a prominent part in the administration of the Exchequer.<sup>84</sup> What it led to indirectly was a series of complicated political manoeuvres which culminated in the eclipse of George Hay, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Kinnoull, lord chancellor.

The key to unlocking this affair is the former crown lawyer William Haig. He is best remembered as the man who penned the Supplication (which was never presented) to the king by the discontented element in parliament in 1633 against the methods used to have legislation passed en bloc without consultation.<sup>85</sup> However, we are more interested in Haig as the expert on Scottish

<sup>76</sup> NLS, Morton Papers MS 79/20 (Morton to Hamilton, 21 May 1633).

<sup>77</sup> NLS, Morton Papers MS 79/87 (Hamilton to Morton, 25 May 1633). In July Charles assured Airth of his 'lyf and fofaitour' if he made a satisfactory confession, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 29/30 (Statement by Charles I [in Traquair's hand, signed by the king], 14 July 1633).

<sup>78</sup> C. Rogers, ed., *The Earl of Stirling's Register of Royal Letters Relative to the Affairs of Scotland and Nova Scotia from 1615–1635* (2 vols, Edinburgh 1885), ii, 680–681 (Charles I to Chancellor Kinnoull, 6 October 1633); Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 29/15 (Traquair to Charles I, [23 October 1633]). At the Privy Council meeting on 8 November Menteith was stripped of all offices, pensions and honours and confined to his house, *RPCS, 2nd series, 1633–35*, 139–141. Hamilton was in Edinburgh, but did not attend the meeting, though he was present the day before when he presented the letter for his kinsman, Lord Binning, to be admitted to the council, *Ibid.*, 137–139.

<sup>79</sup> NRS GD 406/1/281 (Airth to Hamilton, 6 February 1633/4); GD 406/1/391 (Airth to Hamilton, 6 October 1637). The total royal grant of £10,000 to Airth is outlined in NRS GD 406/F1/118/3 (Precept for earl of Airth, 4 July 1635).

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*; NRS GD 406/1/413 (Airth to Hamilton, 19 January 1637/8). As well as doling money out to Airth, Hamilton also had the confinement order lifted, probably in late 1637.

<sup>81</sup> NLS, Morton Papers MS 79/20 (Morton to Hamilton, 21 May 1633); *Ibid.*, 79/87 (Hamilton to Morton, 25 May 1633); *Ibid.*, 79/88 (Hamilton to Morton, 26 May 1633).

<sup>82</sup> Balfour, *Historical Works*, iv, 354–356.

<sup>83</sup> For the articles, *Ibid.*, 381–382. For an interesting discussion of the wider political implications of the coronation see, J. Morrill, 'The National Covenant in Its British Context' in Morrill, ed., *The Scottish National Covenant*, pp.2–4. For a detailed narrative of the coronation, John, 3<sup>rd</sup> marquess of Bute, *Scottish Coronations* (London, 1902), pp.63–189. As master of the horse, Hamilton was prominent in the procession to Holyrood, but, unlike Charles's coronation in England when he carried the sword, he performed no role in the ceremony.

<sup>84</sup> See section III of this chapter for a study of Hamilton's efforts as a tax collector.

<sup>85</sup> For a discussion of the Supplication see, MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, pp.135–138.

fiscal matters, desperate to have Hamilton make him clerk of the taxation.<sup>86</sup> Through a number of intermediaries, Haig tried to entice Hamilton with a veiled promise that he could increase the tax revenue by a third,<sup>87</sup> and with revelations that Haig's enemy, chancellor Kinnoul, the collector for the taxation of 1630, had stopped Hamilton's commission for the new taxation at the great seal.<sup>88</sup> On 16 December 1633, after receiving permission from the king, Hamilton called Haig before the Privy Council to reveal his proposal for the taxation. In the end, Haig's scheme, that the sheriffs should gather in the taxes, was rejected as wholly impractical.<sup>89</sup> Thus Haig was discredited long before it became known in the spring of 1634 that he penned the aforementioned Supplication against the king's parliamentary tactics.<sup>90</sup> Nevertheless, his suggestions on 'tempering' the chancellor's power were probably employed by the marquis.<sup>91</sup>

Kinnoul's opposition affords us a clear view of those who supported Hamilton in the Scottish administration. Hamilton's main backers were a mixture of the old and new: the earls of Traquair, Haddington, Southesk, Sir Patrick Hepburne, Sir John Hamilton of Orbiston, Sir Thomas Hope and Sir Lewis Stewart.<sup>92</sup> The tactics used were simple. First, in late 1633 a commission was set up to investigate the chancellor's taxation accounts, and second, in April 1634 a new commission for Hamilton's extraordinary taxation was drawn up.<sup>93</sup> Both actions were a threat to the chancellor's authority, and in desperation he travelled to court in late 1634 to present his own accounts and his version of events to the king.<sup>94</sup> The reception this 'ald cankered gootische man' got at court is not recorded but it is perhaps significant that he died of apoplexy in London on 16 December 1634.<sup>95</sup> However, Kinnoul's demise benefited the clergy not the laity, as Charles quickly confirmed John Spottiswood, archbishop of St. Andrews, as the new lord chancellor.<sup>96</sup> Thus, within eighteen months the two most important figures in the Scottish government were replaced by a layman and a cleric.

Throughout his career at court Hamilton received a steady stream of requests for intercession with the absentee king. For example in July 1629 the Scottish bishops asked him to assist the commissioner they had sent to secure the king's approval of the acts of their convention.<sup>97</sup> In late 1633 and 1634 Hamilton was petitioned by his mother, the dowager marchioness, the earl of Wemyss and Alexander Bruce to oppose the increased levy on coal exported from the Forth.<sup>98</sup> In

<sup>86</sup> NRS GD 406/1/256 (Haig to Hamilton, 15 July, 1633). As a crown lawyer, Haig had been commissioned to investigate abuses in tax collection though his findings were eventually shelved by the Privy Council under pressure from Chancellor Hay (Kinnoul), MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, p.150, note 24.

<sup>87</sup> NRS GD 406/2/F1/53/15 ('Noate of sum particulars to be considered by my lo. marquis in the matter of taxations', [July 1633]); GD 406/2/F1/53/17 (endorsed 'hages ansuers', [July 1633 ?]).

<sup>88</sup> Haig used Hamilton's kinsman the 1<sup>st</sup> Lord Binning, later 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Haddington, and Sir Alexander Gibson of Durie, NRS GD 406/1/255 (Haig to Hamilton, 23 July 1633). See also NRS GD 406/1/256 (Haig to Hamilton, 15 July 1633).

<sup>89</sup> NRS GD 406/F1/53/20 ('Nott of that quhilk wee doune touchting Master haig 16 december 1633'); NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November–16 January [1633–1634]), p.12, entry for 16 December.

<sup>90</sup> *HMC, 9th Report*, (Traquair), 262, no.288(1) Deposition by Lord Balmerino, 9 June 1634; MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, p.137.

<sup>91</sup> NRS GD 406/1/255; NRS GD 406/1/258 (Haig to Hamilton, 26 August 1633).

<sup>92</sup> NRS GD 406/1/285 (Hepburne to Hamilton, 4 April 1634); NRS GD 406/1/998.

<sup>93</sup> NRS GD 406/1/998 (Traquair to Hamilton, 21 November 1633); NRS GD 406/1/285.

<sup>94</sup> NRS GD 406/1/998.

<sup>95</sup> *DNB*, xxv, 260. The king had called Kinnoul an 'ald cankered gootische man' on his recent visit to Scotland.

<sup>96</sup> Lee, *Road to Revolution*, p.154–155. Spottiswood had been after the chancellorship for a number of years, *Ibid*, p.32.

<sup>97</sup> NRS GD 406/1/240 (archbishop of St Andrews and seven bishops to Hamilton, 28 July 1629). The bishops prefaced the request thus, 'Wee have understood by the Bishop of Rosse the forward and constant affection yor l[ordshi]p hath shewed for the treuth of God and the maintaining of the same against the adversaries.' Perhaps significantly, no further requests of this type from the Scottish episcopate, either as a group or individually, have survived in the Hamilton papers prior to the troubles.

<sup>98</sup> The levy was to be increased from one to six shillings per chalder. Interestingly, Charles did not consult the Privy Council on how much the levy should be raised by, but only instructed them to execute it. The petitioners also reminded Hamilton that he had a personal interest therein, NRS GD 406/1/11139 (Wemyss to Hamilton, 6 March

the same year both the lords of Session and the provost and baillies of Edinburgh asked Hamilton to smooth the way for their commissioners at court.<sup>99</sup> The marquis of Huntly solicited Hamilton's aid in March 1635 following his revenge against the Crichtons over the death of his son John, Lord Melgum, in the burning of Frendraught.<sup>100</sup> And there were the perennial requests for Hamilton to secure payment of pensions or fees owed by the Scottish king. The Calvinist lord advocate, Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, and the Catholic lord high constable of Scotland (and justice-general at Balmerino's trial) William, 10<sup>th</sup> earl of Erroll, were two amongst the many who tried to get payment through Hamilton's mediation.<sup>101</sup>

In other ways too Hamilton was perceived as one of the main conduits at court through which royal patronage could flow. Sir Thomas Hope's aspirations were not untypical. As well as using Hamilton to help secure his pension arrears, Hope sought help to promote his family and protect his position in the Scottish administration. Of equal significance was the fact that Hope not only targeted Hamilton, but most of the other Scots at court.<sup>102</sup> Naturally, there was a pecking order. In February 1634, for example, Hope sent a breviat of the proceedings in the justice court against Lord Balmerino to the king via Patrick Maule of Panmure who was also instructed to show the papers to Hamilton, Roxburgh and Stirling.<sup>103</sup> Panmure, a gentleman of the Bedchamber, was Hope's main supporter at court, but for the bigger things it seemed that Hamilton had to be involved.<sup>104</sup> One of Hope's fondest ambitions was to have one of his sons, Alexander, employed at court.<sup>105</sup> The campaign began on 31 December 1633 when Hamilton, in Edinburgh, permitted Alexander to carry some taxation letters to court and present them to the king.<sup>106</sup> For the next year the advocate's son got his face known around court by delivering letters while Hamilton waited for an opening.<sup>107</sup> In early December 1634, Alexander was sworn in as an extraordinary carver.<sup>108</sup> The move to have him made an ordinary carver took another two years and there was competition from the lord chamberlain, the earl of Pembroke, who backed Mungo Murray. In the end Alexander got the place<sup>109</sup> through a combination of Hamilton's influence and a payment of £150 to Pembroke's secretary who then persuaded his master to drop the Murray suit.<sup>110</sup>

---

1633/4); GD 406/1/11138 (Bruce to Hamilton, 6 March 1633/4). The request from his mother was referred to in another letter asking him to oppose the levy, NRS GD 406/1/278 (Alexander [Bruce] to Hamilton, 11 November [1633?]).

<sup>99</sup> NRS GD 406/1/284 (earl of Haddington to Hamilton, 12 March 1633/4); GD 406/1/286 (provost and baillies of Edinburgh to Hamilton, 1 April 1634).

<sup>100</sup> NRS GD 406/1/324 (Huntly to Hamilton, 7 March 1634/5). The investigation into the Frendraught affair can be followed in *RPCS, 2nd series, 1630–32, Ibid, 1633–35 passim*. See also *DNB*, xii, 189.

<sup>101</sup> NRS GD 406/1/262 (Hope to Hamilton, 31 December 1633); GD 406/1/295 (Hope to Hamilton, 29 August 1634); Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p.15. The earl of Erroll petitioned Hamilton from his deathbed, GD 406/1/346 (Erroll to Hamilton, 15 December 1636), and the earl's wife kept up the pressure after Erroll died. GD 406/1/362 (Anna Lyone, countess of Erroll to Hamilton, 8 February 1636/7). For similar requests from others see above note 15 (Galloway) and GD 406/1/281 (earl of Airth to Hamilton, 6 February 1633/4).

<sup>102</sup> Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p.14.

<sup>103</sup> Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p.17. For another example, *Ibid*, 13.

<sup>104</sup> Hope quite literally involved Panmure in just about every communication he made to the court, Thompson, *Diary of Hope, passim*.

<sup>105</sup> This can be followed through, Thompson, *Diary of Hope, passim* and below.

<sup>106</sup> NRS GD 406/1/262 (Hope to [Hamilton], 31 December 1633). A letter of the same date from Hope to Charles praised Hamilton's skill as a tax collector and asked that Alexander be taken into royal service, GD 406/1/261.

<sup>107</sup> NRS GD 406/1/295 (Hope to Hamilton, 29 August 1634); Thompson, *Diary of Hope, passim*. See also, GD 406/1/294 (Hope to Hamilton, 24 August 1634).

<sup>108</sup> Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p. 16, 'Item, that my sone at Windsor was sworn be his maiestie in extraordinar carver'.

<sup>109</sup> Diary entry, 23 September 1636, 'Memo-This day, at Windsor, my sone sworne ordiner carver to his sacred Maj, in place of Mr. John Cokburn.', Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p.47.

<sup>110</sup> NRS GD 406/1/344 (Hope to Hamilton, 3 September 1636); Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, pp.45–46, 49. Alexander went on to a pension of £200, a knighthood and a marriage to Anna Bell, *Ibid*, pp.143, 155, 181.

On a different tack, Hamilton also helped to apply ointment to the abrasive wranglings within the Scottish administration in Edinburgh. A feature of Scottish politics during the 1630s was the frostiness between the laity and the prelates. Yet there were also divisions within the laity, seen most clearly in the long running antagonism between the lord treasurer and the lord advocate.<sup>111</sup> The lord advocate's diary is littered with pithy comments concerning clashes with Traquair over pension arrears and cases in the Privy Council.<sup>112</sup> On 1 August 1636 Hamilton and Panmure arrived in Edinburgh, and that night Panmure brought Traquair and Hope together and the differences were settled.<sup>113</sup> It did not last, however, for by the end of the year Hope petitioned Hamilton, Roxburgh and Panmure to look into rumours that Traquair had asked the king to have him replaced.<sup>114</sup> In his letter to Hamilton, the advocate enclosed a note, presumably containing some dirt on Traquair, for which he begged 'silente and secretie for to reseit ... of this kynd is nott a cryme not espiabill'.<sup>115</sup> Hamilton was involved to an even greater degree in another long running, though less acrimonious, dispute between Thomas, 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Haddington, and the earl of Roxburgh, concerning the fate of the incumbent writers to the privy seal following Roxburgh's succession to the office on the death of Haddington's father.<sup>116</sup>

So far this examination of Hamilton's Scottish dimension has highlighted some important points. First, the marquis was willing to listen to and to aid individuals across the political spectrum. John Campbell, Lord Loudoun, thanked Hamilton in May 1633 as 'the first and only procurer' of Loudoun's patent to be an earl.<sup>117</sup> As a cautioner for the earl of Airth's estate, Loudoun was also able to secure Hamilton's aid to have the legal protection on the estate lifted so as to enable Loudoun and Airth's other debtors to receive satisfaction.<sup>118</sup> As usual, Hamilton tried to strike a balance, and it is in this context that we should view his procuring of £4,000 for Airth, thereby allowing Loudoun, and probably another cautioner (Lord Lorne),<sup>119</sup> to get some payment without ruining Airth's estate. Hamilton was also friendly enough with Lorne to sell him his lands in Kintyre in December 1633 for 50,000 merks.<sup>120</sup> Second, Hamilton worked with subtlety, as with the fall of Menteith. He put a distance between himself and those filing the charges, but nevertheless allowed it to happen. Yet if someone proved an obvious enemy – such as the ageing earl of Kinnoul – Hamilton could adopt a defiant pose and marshal his supporters. In general, then, we have a picture of Hamilton as someone who, as Lord Feilding's chaplain observed, carried himself 'evenly'.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>111</sup> In October 1634, Charles insisted that Hope confer with Traquair in Session, Council and Exchequer before sending papers to court, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 3/45 (Charles to Hope, [ ] October 1634). For a similar order a few years later, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 4/78 (Charles to Hope, 17 May 1637).

<sup>112</sup> See for example, Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, pp.11–13, 17–18, 23, 26–27 and below.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 45–46. Panmure brought the two parties together but Hamilton was certainly aware of the animosity and Panmure may have been working to Hamilton's brief, though it is difficult to prove. The earl of Southesk was also involved, *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, pp.51–52.

<sup>115</sup> NRS GD 406/1/348 (Hope to Hamilton, 27 December 1636). Hope described Hamilton as his 'anchor in tyme of stormes'. Chancellor Spottiswood intervened in January 1637 after another clash in council, in a desire to keep it from the king, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 11/34 (Chancellor to Traquair, 27 January 1636/7). The acrimony continued, however, and Southesk and Sir James Carmichael (treasurer depute) supervised another meeting between the two on 3 April 1637, Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, pp.54–58.

<sup>116</sup> NRS GD 406/1/732 (Charles to Hamilton, 25 May 1638).

<sup>117</sup> NRS GD 406/1/252 (Loudoun to Hamilton, 27 May 1633). It was a delayed patent, however, and, because of Loudoun's support of Rothes and the discontented group in parliament, he did not become a full earl until 1641.

<sup>118</sup> NRS GD 406/1/305 (Loudoun to Hamilton, 13 March 1634/5); NRS GD 406/1/302 (Loudoun to Hamilton, 31 January 1635/6).

<sup>119</sup> NRS GD 406/1/302. It was Lorne who was on his way to court to press Loudoun's (a Campbell kinsman), and probably Lorne's, case to have the protection lifted.

<sup>120</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November–16 January [1633–1634]), p.13.

<sup>121</sup> See chapter 4, p.73.

The decision of the covenanter leadership to address letters to Lennox, Hamilton and Morton, 'being the most eminent of this nation, and by whose mediation as true Patriots we expect much good,' after the Privy Council in Edinburgh had failed to meet their needs, illustrated whom the political nation perceived to occupy the top tier in the Scottish king's counsels at court.<sup>122</sup> The final sentence of a similar letter of April 1638 encapsulated the tensions inherent in absentee monarchy: 'Being confident that your L[ordshi]ps will be no less then your interests to share in all these goodes so heartlie wished to you by us.'<sup>123</sup> Yet though the Covenanters hit the mark when they targeted this trio, they simplified the arrangement at court in relation to the formulation and execution of Scottish policy – and it is to an examination of that puzzle that we must now turn.

### III

On 10 July 1638 the lord deputy of Ireland wrote to the lord admiral of England expressing his views on the troubles in Scotland. To Wentworth 'the gallant Gospellers' in Edinburgh highlighted the dangerous consequences of the method of Stuart rule towards Scotland:

Again it is more dangerous, because it falls upon us unexpected, which hath been in great Part occasioned by that unhappy Principle of State, practised as well by his Majesty as by his blessed Father, of keeping secret and distinct all the Affairs and constitution of that Crown from the Privity and knowledge of the Council of England, in so much as no Man was intrusted or knew anything, but those of their own Nation, which was in effect to continue them two kingdoms still.<sup>124</sup>

Ten years earlier Hamilton had written from Scotland to his father-in-law, the earl of Denbigh, in England telling of a conversation held with the earl of Morton that afternoon:

he tould me that at tibouls my Lo: Duck [duke] tould him that the king that is with god meant to heave ane parlament in Scotland and ment to mak him his visroy.<sup>125</sup>

It seems clear that Hamilton did not mean that Buckingham would be a viceroy on the Elizabethan Irish model, but that James intended him to be his commissioner in the projected Scottish parliament.<sup>126</sup> Either way, Wentworth would have approved, yet whether Hamilton or indeed Charles would have been as enthusiastic is highly unlikely. When looked at separately the above statements are misleading; when put together they sum up early Stuart policy towards Scotland. Wentworth was wrong to say that no Englishmen had a say in Scottish affairs for clearly Buckingham and later Laud did. But these were only two, and Laud was concerned primarily with ecclesiastical matters, at least until 1638.

The English Privy Council, as Wentworth rightly pointed out, had no remit to discuss Scottish affairs; it had about six Scottish members who we have seen formed a marginal group and, like

<sup>122</sup> NLS, Morton MSS 80/80 (Covenanter Lords to Lennox, Hamilton and Morton, 13 March 1637/8).

<sup>123</sup> NRS GD 406/1/522 (Montrose, Rothés and Cassilis to Lennox, Hamilton and Morton, 28 April 1638). Has ever so much been said in so few words?

<sup>124</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 190 (Wentworth to Northumberland, 30 July 1638).

<sup>125</sup> W.R.O., Feilding of Newnham Paddox MSS, CR 2017/C1/55 (Hamilton to Denbigh, [late 1627 or early 1628]). It is difficult to tell from the letter whether Hamilton approved or disapproved.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.* This letter is ambiguous, because Hamilton continues the letter, 'with all he [Buckingham] said that he wouold be willing to doue This king all the searvis that he could bot he wouold [sheurlie] be for he shuld be imploit to geat monie to me by that meins for he kneu tou weil hou much he [afirt ?] my father had gottin by that meins'. This suggests that James intended Buckingham to be his commissioner, like Hamilton's father had been in 1621, rather than viceroy.

the nine Englishmen on the Scottish Privy Council, were merely ‘British’ window dressing.<sup>127</sup> The Scots at court certainly took a greater part in English affairs than the English did in Scottish affairs. Crucially however, after Buckingham’s death the area where an Englishman did meddle, domestic religion, was the area where the Scots regarded themselves as having a purer product compared with their larger southern neighbour. David Calderwood spoke for many when he positioned his country’s Reformed religion in a global context:

Scotland was never comparable in wealth and worldly honours to many other Nations. The Evangel was the Crown of her glorie, & set this Realme above all the Nations and Kingdoms of the Earth ...<sup>128</sup>

Laud could joke to Wentworth about the amount of time he spent in ordering ecclesiastical affairs north of the Tweed, but it was something the Scots did not find amusing.<sup>129</sup> Laud aside, the burden of Scottish affairs during Charles’s reign fell on the shoulders of Scotsmen based at court and in Edinburgh.

What most obviously strikes one is the fact that Charles, king of Scotland, lived in England and only visited his northern kingdom twice during his reign, in 1633 and 1641, and in between visits he twice tried to invade it. Just as there was some tension in this record, so there was in the system of rule favoured by Charles I. Following the union of the crowns there was very little institutional change to the Scottish system of government to deal with the added strain of absentee monarchy. The Privy Council remained in Edinburgh where an inner core, the cabinet council, may have steered policy.<sup>130</sup> By contrast, the Scottish court became a wing of the British king’s retinue, only partly integrated into the larger household and even less into the institutions of English government.

The formulation of Scottish policy at court lacked an institutional base or a formal record. We cannot even say with certainty where meetings on Scottish affairs were held and who attended them. On 13 April 1633, at short notice, the king decided to hear an acrimonious case between the earl of Holland and Jerome, Lord Weston, in the English Privy Council. Because there was no prior warning, some interested parties were caught off guard and arrived at the meeting late. Hamilton was one of the latecomers and, revealingly, arrived with the earls of Morton and Strathearn.<sup>131</sup> At that time Morton (lord treasurer) and Strathearn (president of the Privy Council) were the two most important laymen in Scottish affairs. Similarly, later in the 1630s there are examples of Hamilton, Morton and, by this time, Traquair, signing the same English Privy Council letters and attending the same meetings.<sup>132</sup> With more certainty, we can say that Laud and the Scottish

<sup>127</sup> For the Scots on the English Council, see chapter 4, p.90. The nine Englishmen were sworn of the Scots counsel during the king’s visit in 1633. They were the earls of Portland, Arundel, Pembroke, Salisbury, Holland, Suffolk; and Laud, Sir Henry Vane and Sir John Coke, *RPCS, 2nd series, 1633–35*, p.vi.

<sup>128</sup> David Calderwood, *The True History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1678), p.534. For the Covenanter’s confirmation of the elite state of the kirk, in conversation with Hamilton, Conrad Russell, ‘The British Problem and the English Civil War,’ *History*, vol.72, 1987, p.405.

<sup>129</sup> ‘I was fain to write nine letters yesterday into Scotland. I think you have a Plot to see, whether I will be Universalis Episcopus, that you and your Brethren may take occasion to call me Anti-Christ.’ Knowler, *Strafford’s Letters*, i, 271 (Laud to Wentworth, 3 July 1634).

<sup>130</sup> In 1621, Calderwood talked of a group of councillors who met to formulate policy before each parliament day, ‘The Cabinet Council met daily in the Abbey, by six in the morning, and sat until nine, to dresse matters, that were to be treated among the Lords of the Articles’, *The True History*, p.776. Sir Thomas Hope mentions ‘the Cabinet Counsell’ of which he was not a member, despite being king’s advocate and a privy councillor. The cabinet counsel does not appear to have been one of the committees of the Privy Council, like for example, the Committee of the North, Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, pp.34–35.

<sup>131</sup> TNA, PC 2/42, p.565. Wimbledon, Falkland, Newburgh and the vice chamberlain of the household also arrived late, though the three Scots are recorded together.

<sup>132</sup> For meetings, TNA, PC 2/47, p.330 and other refs. For letters signed not normally on the day of council meetings, TNA, PC 2/47, p.327 (21 April 1637), PC 2/47, p.425 (18 May, 1637), PC 2/49, p.126 (25 April 1638) and other refs.

episcopate primarily dealt with ecclesiastical matters while lay matters were conducted by both the laity and the bishops in their increasingly civil employments.<sup>133</sup>

Charles had the reputation of being a stickler for formality so we can presume that he tabled ordinary Scottish business into his week, probably with the Scottish secretary when he was at court presenting business at set audiences.<sup>134</sup> Equally, however, there would have been flexibility and anyone who had the king's ear, Hamilton and Will Murray for example, could initiate Scottish matters anytime, anywhere. Thus a gradient of counsel and audience would have operated where Scottish business was discussed in the formality of the presence or withdrawing chamber, or in the more informal environment of the bedchamber.<sup>135</sup> Scottish ecclesiastical matters could have been conducted anywhere from the king's bedchamber to Lambeth palace. Fundamentally, the formulation of policy had an ad hoc element to it. On 12 February 1628, Charles informed Hamilton of the latest developments in the revocation, namely that he had devised 'a forme of submission, by advice of some noblemen and others interested therein, whoe wer present at our Court for the time'.<sup>136</sup> The advisers in this case appear to have been the strange mix of the earl of Nithsdale, Sir James Fullarton, gentleman of the Bedchamber, Sir George Elphinstone, justice-clerk, Sir Robert MacLellan of Bombie and later Lord Ochiltree, Mr Robert Johnstone and the earl of Menteith.<sup>137</sup>

Historians have accorded Hamilton a prominent role in the formulation of Scottish policy at court. Clarendon recalled that Charles, from early in the Personal Rule, was 'absolutely advised' on all Scottish affairs 'by the sole counsel of the marquis of Hamilton', and Clarendon has been followed by Gardiner and others.<sup>138</sup> This view needs some readjustment, even from what has already been presented. Just as it is difficult to reconstruct how Scottish business was conducted at court before 1638, so it is misleading to accord Hamilton such a monopoly. The troubles catapulted Hamilton and Scotland to prominence in the politics of the three kingdoms, but we should be wary of giving that same weight to Hamilton in Scottish affairs before 1638 largely on the jaundiced, retrospective ruminations of Clarendon. A pecking order existed, and Hamilton may well have been at the top of it, but he was not the sole counsel.<sup>139</sup> Scottish ecclesiastical affairs were certainly outwith his counsel, and much more besides. By his own choice, he had little to do with the revocation scheme and the Commission for Surrenders and Teinds, or at least as little to do with it that would not anger the king.<sup>140</sup> It took him until 1636 to make his final surrender, a surrender that left him with the lucrative superiority of the lands and barony of Lesmahagow in

<sup>133</sup> By 1637 ten out of the fourteen Scottish bishops were on the Privy Council, *RPCS 2nd Series, 1635–37*, pp.vi–vii. For their steadily rising influence from the beginning of Charles's reign, *Ibid*, 1625–27, pp.v–ccii, esp.pp.li–lv; *Ibid*, 1627–1628, pp.v–viii; *Ibid*, 1630–32, p.vii; *Ibid*, 1632–35, pp.vi–vii.

<sup>134</sup> The Scottish secretary at court, William, earl of Stirling was not at court all the time, but came when he had business to transact with the king. During the troubles he told Hamilton that he would exceptionally 'waite constantlie at court', NRS GD 406/1/593 (Stirling to Hamilton, 12 June 1638). See also, NRS GD 406/1/376 (Stirling to Hamilton, 14 June [1638]).

<sup>135</sup> See Donald, *Uncounselled*, p.16, for meetings on the revocation held in the withdrawing chamber at Whitehall.

<sup>136</sup> Rogers, *Stirling's Register*, i, 252 (Charles to Hamilton, 12 February 1627/8).

<sup>137</sup> Donald, *Uncounselled*, p.18. For Menteith, S.R.O, GD 406/1/93 (Charles I to Hamilton, 11 February 1627/8). For a detailed discussion of the revocation scheme see MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, pp.49–101; MacInnes, 'Organisation' (PhD Glasgow), i, chapters 4–6. Charles was more generous about the breadth of the counsel that he took on the revocation scheme in his public pronouncement after 1638, Charles I [W. Balcanquhal], *A Large Declaration concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland* (London 1639), p.6.

<sup>138</sup> Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, i, 107; Gardiner, *England*, vii, 297; MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, pp.40, 89–90.

<sup>139</sup> For Traquair using Patrick Maule to deliver letters to the king and Hamilton's presence at their delivery and central role in formulation of a reply, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 11/9 (Patrick Maule to Traquair, 19 March 1634); *Ibid*, (Traquair to Charles I, [4 September 1634]). Although there is quite a lot of material relating to Scotland before 1638 in the Hamilton Papers there is not enough to sustain Clarendon's statement, especially given the mushrooming of the archive in 1638. In saying that, however, it is clear that the Hamilton archive has probably been sifted and some correspondence has not survived for other reasons.

<sup>140</sup> See chapter 1, pp.17–18.

return for giving up the equally valuable feu duty and lordship of the abbacy of Arbroath.<sup>141</sup> It was a compromise in which the king and Hamilton had conceded something, though it took nearly ten years to thrash out.

Just as Lennox was Hamilton's parallel figure at court, so was Traquair his parallel figure in Edinburgh. Like Lennox, Traquair requires revision. The most important point is that Traquair, from an early stage, realised that mastery of the court was a necessary prelude to realising his ambitions in Edinburgh. At the beginning of 1637 Baillie described Traquair as 'a great courteour' and there is little reason to doubt him.<sup>142</sup> We have already seen that Traquair sought English and Scottish supporters at court and was a member of the English Privy Council. A lot has been said about Scottish affairs worsening after 1633 because there was no heir to the Anglo-Scottish shuttle diplomacy epitomised by the earls of Dunbar and Menteith.<sup>143</sup> This is one of the larger stretches on the road to the Covenanting movement's revolution. What has not been said is that Traquair was probably just as well known at court as Dunbar and Menteith, and was likewise an assiduous traveller – normally twice a year – between Edinburgh and Whitehall. For example, during April–June and October–November 1635 Traquair resided at court.<sup>144</sup>

The problem was less that Traquair was not at court enough, but that the bishop of Ross was probably just as well known, and as well connected at court as Traquair.<sup>145</sup> When Laud secured the appointment of William Juxon, bishop of London, as treasurer of England in 1636, Ross hoped that Morton's demission of the same post in Scotland would tempt the archbishop to back Ross for a clerical double. Significantly, it was Lennox and Hamilton, rarely collaborators, who had blocked the move and sponsored Traquair for the treasurership who thereafter became 'a thorn' in the Scottish episcopacy's 'side'.<sup>146</sup> Ross hated Traquair and boasted in the summer of 1636 that he and the other bishops intended reducing the lord treasurer to the status of the earl of Airth, formerly Menteith.<sup>147</sup> The concentration on absentee monarchy creating a political gulf exacerbated by the fall of commuter Menteith, has caused us to neglect the fact that the 1630s in Scotland also featured a battle between the laity and the bishops. The dispute, pure and simple, was over the latter's encroachment into temporal spheres backed by the king, Laud and the revocation scheme. A blend of all these elements came together over the Lindores abbey grant that flared up in 1635, the year before Ross eyed the treasurership.

<sup>141</sup> Grantham Lincs., Tollemache MSS, 5258 (Petition of Anne, duchess of Hamilton to Charles II, [post 1660]). Resignation proceedings started in the summer before, British Library, Additional MSS, 23,112 fol.10r (Charles to Sir Thomas Hope, 27 July 1635); Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 11/31 (Roxburgh to Traquair, 11 December 1636). I am grateful to Allan MacInnes for a discussion of Lesmahagow.

<sup>142</sup> Baillie, *Letters*, i, 11 (29 January 1636/7). For another view see Brown, 'Courtiers and Cavaliers', p.172.

<sup>143</sup> MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, p.86. And with more emphasis, Lee, *Road to Revolution*, p.126, 150.

<sup>144</sup> Thompson, *Diary of Hope*, p. 22, diary entry records Traquair leaving for court on 31 March 1635 and he may have been back in Edinburgh by 3 June, p.24. On 7 October, Traquair went to court, p.29 and arrived back in Edinburgh on 19 November, pp.31–32. Even when reconstructing Traquair's movements from one source, Hope's diary, we find him at court regularly. 1634, Traquair at court 8 February–13 June, pp. 7, 11. And went to court again on 27 December, p.18. 1636, Traquair at court 14 March–23 May, 17 September–4 November, pp.40, 43, 47, 49. 1637, Traquair at court 8 (?) April–27 May, pp.59, 61. 1638, Traquair at court 17 January–14 February, 29 March–15 May, pp.70, 72. When he was not at court himself Traquair regularly sent his servants and other bearers, for example, *Ibid*, pp. 11, 16, 34, 52, 64. In addition, Hope regularly sent letters and dispatches to Traquair at court, *Ibid*, pp.8, 23, 24, 30, 31, 40, 42, 48.

<sup>145</sup> Hope seemed less interested in recording when the bishops went to court, than his sparring partner Traquair, though see for example, *Diary of Hope*, pp.22–23, 46; Baillie, *Letters*, i, 4. For Brechin going to court, *Diary of Hope*, p.37.

<sup>146</sup> Baillie, *Letters*, i, 7.

<sup>147</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 12/14 (Henriette Stuart, marchioness of Huntly to Traquair, 7 August 1636). To others Ross, in the same spirit, said 'that gif all projectis held good thaer wald be greate alteratiounes in the state and government within sex moneths', *Ibid*, 12/16 (Sir Alexander Gibson of Durie to Traquair, 12 April 1637); *Ibid*, 12/17 (Sir Lewis Stuart to Traquair, 13 April 1637). See also below.

The Lindores affair was a dry run for what happened a few years later with the attempted introduction of the prayer book.<sup>148</sup> The furore was caused by Charles passing under his own hand a grant of the erected temporal lordship of the abbacy of Lindores to the minister of Liberton, Andrew Learmonth, entitling him to reduce and annul all agreements made by the previous secular lord with the vassals or heritors.<sup>149</sup> By this grant Learmonth would be created an abbot with temporal power, vassals and (most importantly) he could claim by precedent a place in parliament and a voice in the Court of Session. This was something completely different from Charles's professed policy in the revocation scheme of endowing a few bishoprics, augmenting ministers' stipends and negotiating the vassal arrangement away from the erected temporal lord to the king. Writing to Hamilton from Edinburgh, the ageing earl of Roxburgh refused to believe that the king had passed the grant 'with oppin eyis', saying it had created an unprecedented panic 'that every abacie shall have abot and every abot woot [vote] in parleament and of theis abotis aucht [eight] shall be set in the sestionne so the heagh court of parleament and the judecatorie shall be roullit be our claergis.'<sup>150</sup> On 17 June 1635 the earl of Haddington barely concealed his rage that such a grant could have got through, for it ridiculed the revocation and the efforts of the Commission for Surrenders, contradicted what the king had promised in the parliament of 1633 and threatened 'all heritors holding lands and teinds of any erection.'<sup>151</sup> The hypocrisy, and the popery, of the grant was not lost on the old lawyer who broadened the horizons of such a policy at the close of his diatribe to Hamilton:

His majesties comissio[n]ors determination and acts of the last parlement are printed. Englishmen can reade them and understand Scots. If they heare and see what was pretended and promised and heare by publick report how things now are like they may perchance think more-mor they will speake.<sup>152</sup>

On 21 June, Traquair bluntly told Hamilton that the grant was illegal and would overthrow the revocation scheme.<sup>153</sup> He went on to stress that no-one in the administration supported the grant 'except the Bishops' who confidently pointed to it as a forerunner of radical change:

Sume of ye greatest & most understanding amongst ye Bishopes hes not spaired to say yt in despyt of all yt will say the contrarie yey sall be master of ye haill teyndes and Church Landes in Scotland befor tuo yeares pas: and yt they sall have eight Abbotes sitting in Session. Only I will beg your Lops favor to say, yt if our master resolve to mak yis gud to them he will goe near to mak yem master of ye best half of Scotland.<sup>154</sup>

It was no coincidence that three days after the date on Traquair's letter Charles, perhaps with Hamilton waving these three letters under his nose, assented to Traquair's stopping of the Lindores' grant in the Scottish Exchequer.<sup>155</sup> The Lindores grant affair has received little attention,

<sup>148</sup> This reconstruction of the Learmonth presentation has been taken from, Grantham, Lincs, Tollemache MSS, 5264 ([Petition of privy council to Charles I, [1635]]; *Ibid*, 5265 (Petition for new grant to Lord Lindores (?), [1635?]); NRS GD 406/1/315 (Haddington to Hamilton, 17 June 1635); GD 406/1/354 (Roxburgh to Hamilton, [before 24 June 1635]); GD 406/1/8217 (Traquair to Hamilton, 21 June [1635]).

<sup>149</sup> Traquair observed that 'the signator was without ayer dait or dokat', NRS GD 406/1/8217.

<sup>150</sup> NRS GD 406/1/354 (Roxburgh to Hamilton, [before 24 June 1635]). The clergy used to have eight of the fifteen seats on Session, an overall majority.

<sup>151</sup> NRS GD 406/1/315 (Haddington to Hamilton, 17 June 1635).

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid*. Only after reading this long letter about five times is one struck by the fury which it conveys.

<sup>153</sup> NRS GD 406/1/8217.

<sup>154</sup> NRS GD 406/1/8217.

<sup>155</sup> A few days after the grant was halted, the marquis assured Traquair that Charles would thank him with his own letter and 'simed weri will plesead with your prosidings, and trust me, itt is our fa[u]lts if the B[isho]p[s] eayis be not

but it is a crucial event containing many of the elements that help to explain the reception of the equally ill-advised prayer book a few years later.

In a general sense, then, we must re-assess Hamilton's contribution to the formulation of Scottish policy at court prior to the troubles. Most importantly, and contrary to previous opinion, Hamilton did not enjoy a free hand in giving Scottish counsel at court, though in lay matters he played a key role. The Lindores abbey grant bears the stamp of Charles I, but not of Hamilton, and when Hamilton was informed of its reception in Scotland he steered the king away from it. It is also clear that he knew nothing about the grant until the barrage of letters from Edinburgh.<sup>156</sup> Hamilton worked with laymen on lay matters according to the king's brief. If he interfered in ecclesiastical matters it was to stem the encroachment of the Scottish episcopate into civil office, seen most vividly in his alliance with Lennox to block the bishop of Ross's move for the treasurership.

It is now time to turn to a case study of Hamilton's position as collector general of the taxations granted in the parliament of 1633. In thus sharpening the focus in this final section on Scotland we can analyse in depth how government worked in Edinburgh and how effectively Hamilton influenced it.

#### IV

As well as being a sign of royal favour, Hamilton's nomination as collector general of the 1633 taxations represented a means to have the sixteen year wine tack bestowed upon him in 1631 returned to the crown.<sup>157</sup> Traquair and Hamilton hammered out a deal<sup>158</sup> in which the marquis agreed to surrender the wine tack (estimated to be worth £60,000 when it was granted in 1631)<sup>159</sup> for £40,000, which would be paid out of the taxations. As well as the £40,000 for the wine tack, the contract between the king and Hamilton revealed that other payments were to be made from the taxations.<sup>160</sup> First, a crown debt of 300,000 merks to William Dick was to be honoured;<sup>161</sup> second, 52,000 merks per annum was to be paid to the earl of Morton in compensation for his temporary loss of the tack of Orkney and Shetland;<sup>162</sup> third, the Scottish master of requests, Sir James Galloway, was to receive a one-off gift of £500.<sup>163</sup> Until these obligations had been fulfilled Hamilton was granted all of the taxations. In the event of his death before the taxes were fully collected, Hamilton nominated the earl of Southesk and Sir John Hamilton of Orbiston to execute the contract.<sup>164</sup>

---

opened', Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 8/13 (Hamilton to Traquair, 28 June [1635]). Charles gave his approval to the grant being stopped in Exchequer on 24 June, MacInnes, *Covenanting Movement*, p.91.

<sup>156</sup> Hamilton's reply to Traquair's letter bears this out, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 8/13 (Hamilton to Traquair, 28 June [1635]).

<sup>157</sup> Grantham, Lincs., Tollemache Papers, 3747 ('Reasons why the excyse should be brought to the Ex[cheque]r'). This paper gives a few general reasons why Hamilton was made collector-general.

<sup>158</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 29/15 ([Copy] Traquair to Charles I, [23 October] 1633); NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November 1633–16 January 1633/4), p.5 [Hamilton's pagination]. It was the earl of Southesk who suggested the figure of £40,000, *Ibid.*, p.7. Traquair had initially offered £30,000, but Hamilton wanted £40,000 and so Southesk must have backed Hamilton, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 41/5 (Memorandum by Traquair, [1634?]).

<sup>159</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 5/9 ('Instructions ... anent the marq of hamilton', [1633]).

<sup>160</sup> NRS GD 406/2/M9/29 (Contract between Charles I and Hamilton for 1633 taxations, 12 July 1633). This contract is about five foot long and one foot wide. It is printed in *RPCS, 2nd series, 1633–35*, pp.305–316. See also, NRS GD 406/2/M9/30 (letter of Gift to Hamilton, 18 December 1634).

<sup>161</sup> NRS GD 406/F1/53/1 (Contract between Charles I and Hamilton, [?]July 1634).

<sup>162</sup> The pension to Morton was to be paid from 1635 from the taxation and was compensation for his loss of the tack of the earldom of Orkney and lordship of Shetland to William and John Dick on 3rd November 1629 for eight years, *RPCS, 2nd series, 1633–35*, p.310.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, p.311. Galloway received the gift as reward for devising the 2 of 10 tax, NRS GD 406/F1/53/2.

<sup>164</sup> *RPCS, 2nd series, 1633–35*, 314.

Unfortunately, the burdens on the taxation did not remain static, as Charles continued to approve further payments. For example, about a year after the contract was signed, the king added a £4,000 payment to the earl of Airth.<sup>165</sup> Sir Hugh Wallace of Craigie was one of the first to make a submission in October 1629 under the terms of the Revocation scheme by surrendering his heritable offices to the crown for £20,000 Scots.<sup>166</sup> Yet even in the face of the king's persistent demands the Exchequer never paid out. In 1637 it was left to Hamilton to honour the sum from the tax revenues.<sup>167</sup> Therefore, despite the legal assurance of the contract of July 1634, Hamilton was in command of a leaky boat.<sup>168</sup> What one immediately notices is that the clerical estate benefited more than any other by the king's bounty through gifts and exemptions.<sup>169</sup> Sometime after 1634 Hamilton drew up a schedule of fees and payments which showed that the burdens on the taxation had increased considerably.<sup>170</sup> The king had borrowed £16,516, the earl of Stirling and the bishop of Dunblane were to be paid £600, the archbishop of St Andrews £750, poor ministers were to receive £1,800 and so on. The total burdens, including administrative fees for tax officials, was calculated by the marquis at £90,117.<sup>171</sup> As a balance to the schedule of burdens Hamilton also drew up a schedule estimating that the taxations were worth £98,890.<sup>172</sup> So, even with the leakages, Hamilton's tax administration managed to keep afloat.

Three main forms of taxation had been granted: an ordinary, an extraordinary and a 2 of 10 (2% to the crown on all loans transacted in Scotland). Of the three, the ordinary taxation was the largest and, along with the less lucrative extraordinary taxation, ran for six terms from Martinmas 1634 to Martinmas 1639. It was imposed on all landholders from dukes to freeholders and with the same hierarchical scale on the spiritual estate and the burghs.<sup>173</sup> Although Hamilton threw himself into his role as collector general<sup>174</sup> and remained in Scotland between November 1633 and early January 1634 to execute his duties, it was apparent that once the project was up and running he would return to court.<sup>175</sup> As with the re-writing of the commission for the extraordinary taxation in the wake of Chancellor Kinnoul's opposition, Hamilton had to rely heavily on collaborators and deputies to protect his interests. As noted above, the two most important men were Sir John Hamilton of Orbiston, who was made general collector depute,<sup>176</sup> and the earl of Southesk, privy councillor, commissioner of the Exchequer<sup>177</sup> and father-in-law to the earl of Traquair. Behind

<sup>165</sup> NRS GD 406/F2/118/3 (Precept for earl of Airth, 4 July 1635). Charles had decided to pay Airth a total of £10,000 for his outlays while in royal service.

<sup>166</sup> NRS GD 406/1/289 (Charles to Morton and Traquair, 2 May 1634); NRS GD 406/1/292 (Commissioners of the Exchequer to Charles, 26 August 1634); NRS GD 406/1/299 (Charles to Morton and Traquair, 24 November 1634).

<sup>167</sup> NRS GD 406/F1/64/1, fol.24 v (Compt. of the Ordinary taxation, 1633: 2, 3, 4, terms).

<sup>168</sup> Sir Thomas Hope was also trying to get a £2,000 gift from 1630 paid out of the 2 of 10, Innerleithen, 41/14 ('forme of ane warrant' addressed to Hamilton, [1633–34]); *Ibid.*, 24/8 ([Hope ?] to Charles I, [1633–34]).

<sup>169</sup> For the exemption of the bishop of Dunblane, dean of the chapel royal, NRS GD 406/F1/53/21 ([Copy] Charles to Sir Thomas Hope, 15 October 1633), and see below.

<sup>170</sup> NRS GD 406/F1/53/2 ('Particulars uher with this Taxatioune is bourdened', [n.d.]).

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.* Top of Hamilton's list was the £40,000 he was due for surrendering the wine tack. Hamilton's own fee as collector-general was 10,000 merks yearly or for the whole six years, £3,500.

<sup>172</sup> Hamilton broke the taxations down thus: £50,000 for the ordinary taxation, £10,000 for the extraordinary, £8,890 for the 'superplus of the ordinari taxatioun' and £30,000 for the 2 of 10. He also added marginalia to the effect that it was highly unlikely that all of this sum would be collected, NRS GD 406/F1/53/13 ('the Charge of the Taxation', [n.d.]). See next paragraph for more on the different taxes.

<sup>173</sup> The ordinary taxation payment was to be thirty shillings for 'everie pound land of old extent', NRS GD 406/F1/59/25 (Proclamation about the taxation, 8 June 1633).

<sup>174</sup> The Hamilton papers contain numerous taxation papers some of which are in Hamilton's hand or have been annotated or signed by him, see for example, NRS GD 406/F1/53/2, 13; GD 406/F1/66.

<sup>175</sup> NRS GD 406/1/10090 (Charles I to Hamilton, 31 July 1633).

<sup>176</sup> NRS GD 406/F1/53/16.

<sup>177</sup> A list of the commissioners of the Exchequer can be found at, NRS GD 406/F1/53/6. It was almost certainly Hamilton who had Southesk sworn onto the Exchequer on 16 November, NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November–3 January [1633–1634]), p.4.

these two came the formidable trio of Traquair, Morton and Roxburgh who all strongly backed Hamilton.<sup>178</sup> Those directly on the Hamilton payroll included Orbiston, Adam Hepburne, clerk of the taxation and nine collector-deputes with additionally Sir John Hay, clerk register acting as collector-depute for the five Scottish burghs.<sup>179</sup> As well as these, numerous payments were due to sundry minor officials in the Scottish administration such as William Butter, clerk of the Exchequer, James Prymrose, clerk to the Privy Council, and Alexander Kinneir, keeper of the register of hornings.<sup>180</sup> Such was the scale of the network that Hamilton became head of a fiscal administration grafted onto the main instruments of government.

Similarly, as collector-general with power to administer the revenue as he liked, Hamilton was in the enviable position of being in charge of a large reserve of cash outwith the empty Scottish Exchequer. For example, Charles authorised Hamilton to use the 2 of 10 tax without it going into the Exchequer.<sup>181</sup> Although Charles continued to authorise payments out of the tax revenues, a lot of these were bestowed upon people of whom Hamilton approved. Thus friends like Morton, Sir John Hamilton of Orbiston, Sir James Galloway and the ubiquitous David Ramsay received money directly from Hamilton's tax reserves.<sup>182</sup> As collector-general, Hamilton received a yearly fee of 10,000 merks.<sup>183</sup> Furthermore, he also seemed to have regularly used his stake in the taxations to pay interest on loans, as collateral for further loans, and for making personal payments to friends and clients.<sup>184</sup>

Hamilton had been in the king's coach when Charles made his speedy exit from Scotland after the coronation and parliament, but he was obliged to return a few months later to negotiate the compositions for the taxations.<sup>185</sup> He kept a journal of his visit to Edinburgh between 6 November 1633 and 6 January 1634, and from that we can reconstruct his movements with unusual accuracy.<sup>186</sup> The journal is a closely written 8,000 word daily diary of the marquis's meetings with various parties who compounded for the taxes, as well as an account of other engagements with friends and collaborators.<sup>187</sup> The journal throws into sharp relief that Traquair was emerging as the most important minister in Scotland and that Hamilton worked happily with him,

<sup>178</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 29/15 (Traquair to Charles I, [23 October 1633]) and below.

<sup>179</sup> The collector-deputes were Alexander Brody, Walter Robertson, George Monorgan [sic], John Hamilton, Robert Barclay, John [Yair], Alexander Ogilvie and James Esplin, NRS GD 406/F1/53/7 (List of collector-deputes). These were the same men apart from John Hamilton who were collector-deputes for the last taxations in 1630, NRS GD 406/F1/53/10 (List of collector-deputes, 1630).

<sup>180</sup> For a detailed list of those to be paid, NRS GD 406/F1/64/1, fol.21r–v. (Compt. of the Ordinary taxation, 1633: 2,3,4, terms); NRS GD 406/F1/64/2, fol.17r–v. (Compt. of the Extraordinary taxation, 1633).

<sup>181</sup> NRS GD 406/1/10470 (Charles to Hamilton, 28 October 1633). This was allowed as long as the sums taken were deducted from the composition for the wine tack.

<sup>182</sup> In 1635 Orbiston was granted £250 sterling p.a. for the next 3 years, NRS GD 406/F1/53/16 ('Copie of the warrants signed by the king ...'). NRS GD 406/F1/64/1 fol.24 v, payment to David Ramsay of £14,880 Scots owed by the king to his deceased brother Sir James Ramsay.

<sup>183</sup> NRS GD 406/F1/53/16 ('Copie of the warrants signed by the king ...').

<sup>184</sup> See for example, NRS GD 406/F1/69/1-11; NRS GD 406/F1/80/2-6. It is difficult to be absolutely certain about this as it is often not clear whether Orbiston used money from the Hamilton estate or the taxation. The evidence suggests that when Hamilton did use the taxation resources it was normally from his own yearly fee of 10,000 merks, yet again it is difficult to tell. A large detailed account by Orbiston covering 1634–36 appears to conflate taxation business with personal business, NRS GD 406/F1/66 ('Compt. between Hamilton and John Hamilton of Orbestoun, 8 August 1636'[unfol.]).

<sup>185</sup> Balfour, *Historical Works*, iv, 380; *CSPV, 1632–36*, p.132. Hamilton, Lennox 'and three other great lords, no more, attended on his Maj. on this very hurried and almost flying journey.' Apparently the journey was done by relays of coaches so that Charles could surprise the queen.

<sup>186</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November–6 January [1633–1634]).

<sup>187</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November–3 January [1633–1634], endorsed on the back 'my jurnall wils I was in Scotland'). The main part of the journal is composed on four large unbound sheets, and is easily followed by Hamilton's own pagination. There is another sheet, GD 406/1/723/5x, which appears to be a part of a larger journal which Hamilton composed on his return to Scotland in June 1634. The rest of the June/July journal does not appear to have survived.

hand-in-glove. Hamilton showed his court dispatches to Traquair, dined with him and they had frequent private meetings at each others lodgings.<sup>188</sup> Hamilton also consulted Traquair before conferring some of the taxation places that fell within his gift.<sup>189</sup> On 31 December Hamilton began his journey back to court, staying overnight at Lauderdale's then at Roxburgh's residences, and he was accompanied on the way by Traquair.<sup>190</sup> From the journal we can reconstruct a clear pattern of political collaboration with Hamilton and Traquair at the centre and Morton, Haddington, Orbiston, Southesk, Roxburgh and Lauderdale orbiting them.<sup>191</sup> Nowhere in the journal is there any mention of the bishops.

Hamilton's conduct during the tax negotiations is also revealing. For although Charles had issued a brief enabling him to negotiate the 2 of 10 compositions on his own, Hamilton opted to engage the advice of the Exchequer,<sup>192</sup> as the task was 'to[o] greatt a bourding for me to beir a lone'.<sup>193</sup> Initially then, Hamilton sought a broad consensus for negotiating the compositions despite Chancellor Kinnoul dragging his feet; so, as Hamilton and Southesk received the compositions, they put them before the Exchequer for discussion. The journal shows that Hamilton had done his homework on the compositions that the various groups (the towns, burghs, court of session, college of Justice etc.) had to pay and unilaterally rejected many offers for being too low.<sup>194</sup> Eventually, with the help of Southesk and Traquair, he wrung out offers which were acceptable to both the Exchequer and the king, but not before a good deal of arm-twisting.

In the collector-general's first letter to the king, a week after his arrival in Edinburgh, he complained of the low compositions being offered. With considerable dexterity Hamilton presented himself as the loyal servant incurring censure while carrying out royal service. Speaking of the compounders as a whole Hamilton concluded:

I dare be bould to affirme to youre Matie that thir was never more studie or more concurred in wone particulare then in this to defra[u]de your Matie of that w[h]ich is justly yours ... neither is ther any thing left unthocht of and practised to make your Maties servand employed in this obnoxious and odious to youre subjectes.<sup>195</sup>

Charles had clearly been affronted at the discontented voices in parliament earlier in the year,<sup>196</sup> and Hamilton's summary of the political nation's unwillingness to provide funds would not have softened the king's attitude.<sup>197</sup> Although it is true that many of the first offers were low, the negotiators were testing Hamilton's mettle and the second offers were higher with most promising to pay in advance.<sup>198</sup> Yet Hamilton chose to draw a gloomy picture lit by only a single shaft of light, himself. Significantly, it was Hamilton the courtier who wielded the pen in this and most of his other

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid*, pp.2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid*, p.13.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid*, p.13.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid*, *passim*.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid*, p.3; NRS GD 406/1/10090 (Charles to Hamilton, 31 July 1633).

<sup>193</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November-3 January [1633-1634]), p.3. Those who were called to the first meeting were Kinnoul, Traquair, Lauderdale, Haddington, Sir John Hay and Sir Thomas Hope.

<sup>194</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November-3 January [1633-1634]), pp.3, 5, 6, 8, 11. For Hamilton's homework on previous taxations and Exchequer affairs see, NRS GD 406/F1/53/1-23, *passim*; but especially F1/3, 5, 6, 15, 18, 23.

<sup>195</sup> NRS GD 406/1/10471 (Hamilton to [Charles], 13 November 1633).

<sup>196</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November-3 January [1633-1634]), p.13.

<sup>197</sup> Hamilton appears to have adopted the same stance in hounding those who tried to ante-date bonds to avoid paying the 2 in 10, NRS GD 406/1/261 (Hope to Charles, 31 December 1633); GD 406/1/262 (Hope to [Hamilton], 31 December 1633); NLS., Ch. (Charters and other formal documents), 15151, (Decreit, 18 December 1633).

<sup>198</sup> For example Glasgow firstly offered £5,000 Scots p.a. for the three years of the 2 in 10, but eventually agreed on £20,000 Scots for the three years to be submitted at the next term, NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November-3 January [1633-1634]) p.6, 11. The other negotiations can be followed through, *Ibid*, p.6, 7, 9, 10, 11.

letters to the king. This is an important point that comes up time and again when weighing the tone and content of Hamilton's letters to the king. Of course, it is also the case that Hamilton knew the king very well, and understood the language, emphasis and diplomacy – or not – required to achieve his desired outcome. This finely-tuned skill would be tested to the limit from 1638.

Hamilton went about his role as collector-general with vigour and intended to contrast his efficient tax gathering administration with his predecessor chancellor Kinnoul's shoddy efforts. He took a lead role in the commission set up in 1634 'for rectifying abuses in the exchequer.'<sup>199</sup> Traquair's manifest dislike for Kinnoul meant that he and Hamilton were, once again, pushing in the same direction.<sup>200</sup> Hamilton's efforts in the commission were applauded by Morton, Sir Thomas Hope, Traquair and the king, yet as the investigation dragged on through the summer Hamilton appears to have been keen to return to court.<sup>201</sup> And there was the rub, for there was a tension between Hamilton as the efficient minister in Scottish affairs if it meant that he had also to play the role of absentee courtier. Charles felt it too; and, for example, during Hamilton's earlier stint in Edinburgh negotiating the tax returns, the king ordered him quickly 'home' once the compositions were agreed.<sup>202</sup>

One way around the problem was for Hamilton to visit Scotland during the king's summer progress when most of the court had dispersed. Hamilton chose this option for the Exchequer commission in 1634 and for the audit of the taxations in 1636.<sup>203</sup> The composition of the audit commission illustrated how members of the clerical estate were increasingly being appointed to lay offices. Of the 21 auditors chosen by the king on 21 June 1636, seven were clerics: the lord chancellor, John, archbishop of St Andrews, Patrick, archbishop of Glasgow and five bishops.<sup>204</sup> Analysis of these bewildering accounts show that the discharge or burdens to be met, including fees, non-payment and gifts, exceeded the charge by £669,235 Scots<sup>205</sup> which, when balanced to the former account of £545,053 Scots left £124,181 Scots owing to Hamilton.<sup>206</sup> These figures are not as important as the reaction from the auditors who found that by Hamilton's:

care and exact diligence greater founds are brought in and more tymelie payment made of the saidis taxat[i]ons then hes bein at any tyme heretofore.<sup>207</sup>

Hamilton's tax administration continued to collect until 1639 when the Covenanters took control of government. By that time the marquis had received most of his £40,000 for the wine tack,

<sup>199</sup> The commission had ten members: Kinnoul, St Andrews, Morton, Haddington, Hamilton, Stirling, Traquair, Roxburgh, bishop of Ross, Sir John Hay and Sir Thomas Hope, NRS GD 406/1/291. It was Hamilton who brought the commission's remit to Edinburgh and who was to report the commission's findings to the king, NRS GD 406/F1/53/4 ('The Artickles concerning the in talking of the accomptis of o[u]r bypast lait taxaouns gevin under o[u]r hand to James Marquis of hamilton'); NRS GD 406/1/10476 (Charles to Hamilton, 30 June 1634). Traquair did not start the commission until Hamilton and the bishop of Ross, who were both at court, had arrived in Edinburgh, Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 29/2 (Traquair to Charles I, [?] June [1634]).

<sup>200</sup> NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal, 6 November–6 January [1633–1634]), p.6, entry for 23 November.

<sup>201</sup> NRS GD 406/1/10476 (Charles to Hamilton, 30 June 1634); GD 406/1/10802 (Charles to Commissioners of the Exchequer, 20 July 1634); GD 406/1/293 (Hope to Charles, 26 August 1634).

<sup>202</sup> NRS GD 406/1/10474 (Charles to Hamilton, 5 December 1633).

<sup>203</sup> W.R.O., Feilding of Newnham Paddox MSS, CR 2017/C1/62 (Hamilton to Feilding, 17 July 1636).

<sup>204</sup> NRS Exchequer Accounts, E. 65/16 (Account of the collector of Taxation (ordinary) granted in 1633), fol.1r. The bishops were, David of Edinburgh, Thomas of Galloway, John of Ross, Adam of Aberdeen and Walter of Brechin. The lay auditors were the earls of Traquair (lord treasurer), Haddington (privy seal), Wintoun, Roxburgh, Lauderdale, Stirling, Southesk, Lords Lorne and Alexander, Sir John Hay of Barro (clerk register), Sir Thomas Hope (advocate), Sir Robert Spottiswood of Dunipace (president of the session), Sir William Elphinstone (justice general), Sir James McGill of Cranston Riddel and Sir James Lermonth.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*, fol.38r.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, fol.38v–39r. The account for the 2 of 10 can be found at NRS Exchequer Accounts, E. 65/17 (Compt. of the 2 of 10).

<sup>207</sup> NRS GD 406/1/10092 (Commissioners for the audit to Charles I, 3 August 1636).

though a considerable amount of revenue remained uncollected.<sup>208</sup> In Hamilton's pocket almanac for 1639, he inserted a note in the page reserved for January as follows:

Ther uill be auing me by his Ma[jes]t[ie] 89,000 and sume oodes and by the Contrie to his Ma[jes]t[ie] 910,000 and sume odes. Tou yeire taxsatiounes yett remains, uich uill a mont unto 200,000 pound besydes the extraordinare, uich uill not att most exseid 10,000 pound by the yeir.<sup>209</sup>

As usual with Hamilton it is almost impossible to detect any emotion, whether hope or despondency, but evidently the fate of his tax administration was prominent in his mind as he began to prepare the first war effort against the Covenanters. Indeed, long after Hamilton's death his family continued to try and recover the £124,181 Scots still owed to him from the taxation.<sup>210</sup>

The conclusions we can draw from this case study are essentially five. First, Hamilton's position as collector-general allowed him to control the flow of a substantial financial reserve separate from the beleaguered Scottish Exchequer. Second, it strengthened his position with key ministers in Edinburgh and allowed him to install his own friends and collaborators in some positions of influence. Third, he displayed a tendency to delegate responsibility, to draw ministers into the decision making process even though Charles, characteristically, supplied him with a remit to operate unilaterally. Fourth, the audit of the accounts at mid-term showed Hamilton to be a competent collector general, perhaps not as 'thorough' as Laud and Wentworth, but efficient nevertheless. Fifth, there was tangible tension and discontent in Scotland across a range of issues from the revocation, the rise of the Bishops into civil affairs, to taxation and the putative changes in religious practice. In the years up to the Prayer Book launch Hamilton was in Scotland regularly and would have been no stranger to the growing discontent. Even so, he chose to present those he encountered during the tax negotiations in a poor light to the king, possibly increasing his monarch's view that many of his subjects across his three kingdoms were disrespectful and disobedient.

## V

The third of Charles's kingdoms, Ireland, was the one most open to colonisation/exploitation by natives of his other two kingdoms.<sup>211</sup> This came under various guises: civilisation, religious Reformation and the need to keep a popish backdoor to England closed.<sup>212</sup> Elements of these economic,

<sup>208</sup> For the wine tack see, NRS Exchequer Accounts, E. 65/16 (Account of the collector of Taxation (ordinary) granted in 1633), fol.30v.

<sup>209</sup> Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS, TD 91/109/M3/1 (Hamilton's almanac, 1639). Obviously these numbers are all pounds Scots.

<sup>210</sup> NRS GD 406/F2/118/27 (Petition of William, 3<sup>rd</sup> duke of Hamilton to Charles II, [post 1660]); NRS GD 406/F2/118/28 (Information for duke of Hamilton about the taxation 1633, [post 1660]); GD 406/F2/118/29 (Proclamation about taxation 1633, 24 March 1674), allowing the collection of taxes until the 3<sup>rd</sup> duke received the aforementioned sum; GD 406/F2/118/30 ('Advocates opinion concerning my interest on the Taxations 1633 discharged by proclamation 1674', [n.d]); GD 406/F2/118/33 (Account of sums remaining due to 3<sup>rd</sup> duke from the taxation of 1633, [post 1663]). The rent calculated between 1639–1663 brought the sum to £243,217 Scots, of which the 3<sup>rd</sup> duke had received £77,716, therefore £165,500 remained outstanding.

<sup>211</sup> T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, F.J. Byrne, eds., *A New History of Ireland, vol.III 1534–1691* (Oxford, 1976), pp.1–287 esp. pp.187–269; T.W. Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609–41. The City of London and the Plantation in Ulster* (Belfast, 1939); M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Ireland and Scotland, 1638 to 1648' in John Morrill ed., *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context 1638–41* (Edinburgh, 1990). One of the most spectacular cases is recounted in T. O. Ranger, 'Richard Boyle and the making of an Irish fortune, 1588–1614', *Irish Historical Studies*, vol.x, no.39 (March 1957), pp.257–297.

<sup>212</sup> These are common themes in Irish historical studies, see for example, A. Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625–42* (London, 1966), p.26; Moody et al, *New History*, p. 233; W. E. H. Lecky, *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century* (5 vols. London 1892), i, pp.1–39, esp. pp.10–13; K. S. Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land, the Adventurers'*

religious and political factors may have motivated Hamilton to seek a stake in Ireland, but the main factor was self-interest: a desire to have a stake in Ireland commensurate with that which he already enjoyed in Scotland and England. It was Hamilton's misfortune that Thomas, Viscount Wentworth was lord deputy when he turned his attention to Ireland in 1635.<sup>213</sup> Wentworth was rabidly anti-Scottish, believing that the Ulster Scots in particular, because of their numbers and religion, were a threat to English hegemony in Ireland.<sup>214</sup> Thus, throughout the 1630s, Wentworth tried to block the further encroachment of Scots into Ireland whilst falsely casting himself as the guardian of the public good against private interest.<sup>215</sup>

From 1635 those who found themselves on the wrong side of the lord deputy would find themselves on the right side of Hamilton.<sup>216</sup> Yet given our analysis of Hamilton's activities in England and Scotland, it seemed to be that the antagonism with Wentworth conformed to established political groupings at court. Wentworth's main supporters at court, Laud and Cottington, were never close to Hamilton. Equally, Hamilton's friendship with the earl of Holland and Will Murray predates their collusion against the lord deputy. On the other hand, Randal MacDonnell, viscount Dunluce and later 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Antrim, can be linked to Hamilton from February 1635<sup>217</sup> and with more certainty through Dunluce's marriage to the duchess of Buckingham in April of the same year.<sup>218</sup> A year later, the 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Antrim, Dunluce's father, and one of the largest landowners in

---

*in the Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland* (Oxford, 1971), pp.1–29; M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Ireland and the Monarchy in the Early Stuart Multiple Kingdom' *The Historical Journal*, 34, 2 (1991), pp.279–295, esp.p.283.

<sup>213</sup> We can link Hamilton with Ireland prior to 1635. In 1629 lord deputy Falkland thanked Hamilton for protecting him at court, NRS GD 406/1/239 (Falkland to Hamilton, 3 June 1629). Five days later, Falkland asked Hamilton to confirm whether he owned a 'great ship and her Pinnace' manned by Scotsmen who claimed they had a commission from Hamilton to clear the coast of pirates, NRS GD 406/1/238. Hamilton had spent most of his self-imposed exile on Arran in 1628 fitting out privateers to be used against the French, see chapter 1, p.18.

<sup>214</sup> C.V. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth, first earl of Strafford 1593–1641. A Revaluation* (London, 1961), pp.248–249; M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Strafford, the Ulster-Scots and the covenanters,' *Irish Historical Studies*, xviii, (September 1973), pp.524–551. There are numerous examples of Wentworth's attitude to the Scots which comes across forcibly in both the Strafford MSS and Knowler, see for example, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/fol.63 (Wentworth to Portland, 14 March 1633/4) where he likens the enquiries of the earls of Kinnoul, Morton, Mar and the duke of Lennox about the proposed plantations of Connaught and Ormond as 'prostituted to all mens pretences'. Nevertheless, he did occasionally help the duke of Lennox and the earl of Carlisle, J. P. Cooper, 'The Fortune of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford' in G. Aylmer and J. Morrill eds. *Land, Men and Beliefs* (London, 1983), pp.166–7.

<sup>215</sup> For Wentworth blocking the earl of Ancram, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 183 (Ancram to Wentworth, 10 July 1638) and downright prejudice against the earl of Annandale, *Ibid*, ii, 196 (Wentworth to Laud, 7 August 1638). For his blocking a grant of lands in Ormond to Carlisle, *Calendar of State Papers Ireland. 1625–32*, 531, 536. I owe the last reference to Billy Kelly. For Wentworth's own commercial and landed gains in Ireland, see H. F. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland, 1633–41* (Manchester, 1959 repr. Cambridge 1989), pp.171–184; Cooper, 'Fortune of Strafford', pp.165–175. For Hamilton casting himself in a similar role during the taxation negotiations in Scotland, see above p.118.

<sup>216</sup> Hamilton also crossed swords with Wentworth in England over the latter's lease of the lucrative alum farm. Hamilton's client, William Richardson, claimed that Wentworth was defrauding the crown over the lease, and was backed by Philip Burlamachi, Cooper, 'Fortune of Strafford', pp.162–5.

<sup>217</sup> At that date the 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Antrim informed Hamilton that he had recently purchased some land for his son, Lord Dunluce, from the lord of Kintyre (Lorne's half brother). Lorne was going to court to oppose the purchase and Antrim asked Hamilton to assist his son against Lorne, NRS GD 406/1/283 (Antrim to Hamilton, 10 February 1634/5). Ironically, Hamilton had sold most of his lands in Kintyre to Lorne in December 1633 for 50,000 merks, NRS GD 406/1/723 (Hamilton's Journal), p.13. It is not known whether Hamilton supported the MacDonald purchase against Lorne, but the deal did not go through. Jane Ohlmeyer, 'A Seventeenth-Century Survivor: the Political Career of Randal Macdonnell, first Marquis and second Earl of Antrim' (unpublished Trinity College, Dublin 1990), p.89 note 13.

<sup>218</sup> Hamilton's wife was the duchess's niece. For the marriage, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, i, 413 (Garrard to Wentworth, 14 April 1635). Charles was not amused at this turn of events, *Ibid*, i, 413, but eventually thawed, *Ibid*, i, 427. When assessing Hamilton's relationship with Dunluce following his marriage to Buckingham's widow, we must consider it initially in terms of Hamilton aiding the duchess and protecting the duke's heirs. Laud was similarly motivated, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 169 (Laud to Wentworth, 14 May 1638), as was the king.

Ulster, petitioned Hamilton to take his son under his wing at court.<sup>219</sup> How far Hamilton heeded the 1<sup>st</sup> earl's request is difficult to recover, but certainly by 1638 the marquis was renting Wallingford House from the duchess and Dunluce, now 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Antrim.<sup>220</sup> As a man who laid great emphasis on familial relations, Hamilton patronised Antrim<sup>221</sup> in the years before the Scottish troubles, but also as a way into Ireland in the face of the lord deputy's dogged opposition.

Hamilton's first route into Ireland followed a conventional path which led to enquiries regarding the projected 120,000 acre plantation of Connaught.<sup>222</sup> In his first letter to the lord deputy, carried by Sir George Hamilton, the 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Abercorn's son,<sup>223</sup> Hamilton attempted to kill two birds with one stone by pre-empting Wentworth's conditions on absenteeism and finding a niche for his sibling protege:<sup>224</sup>

[I am] desirous that a Brother of mine should live and labour under your Government. To effect this I have become a suitor to his Majesty for some Proportion of land in the Plantation of Connaght ... But before I proceed further in it ... let me know if I should obtain a greater Proportion than the fifteen hundred acres contained in the conditions (of which I make no doubt) if that would prove not prejudicial to his Majesty's service.<sup>225</sup>

If Hamilton intended that Lord William should live in Ireland then he was following in the footsteps of the Catholic earls of Abercorn, a cadet branch of the Hamiltons, who had successfully established an estate in Strabane, County Tyrone under James I.<sup>226</sup> It is a fair indication of the relationship between Charles's lord deputy and master of the horse that it took Wentworth over six months to reply to Hamilton's enquiry.<sup>227</sup> In his letter the lord deputy stressed that the plantation would 'not answere expectation' as the aim was to secure 'a constant good renew to the crowne' to help 'this kingdome to defray itself.' Roughly speaking, Hamilton represented personal profit and Wentworth public good.<sup>228</sup>

<sup>219</sup> NRS GD 406/1/333 (Antrim to Hamilton, 22 April 1636). For the land ownership, Jane Ohlmeyer, 'Strafford, the "The Londonderry Business" and the new "British History"', in J.F. Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), p.214.

<sup>220</sup> Lennoxlove, Hamilton MSS TD/90/93/F1/47/20 (Account book entry for six months rental of £75, 14 December 1638). Also *Ibid.*, F1/47/38, six months rent paid on 6 September, 1639.

<sup>221</sup> In an undated letter from York House, Antrim thanked Hamilton for his favour in a recent letter which prompted the earl to reply with typical hyperbole, 'My lord give me leave to tell you (out of my affection) that I value more your friendship then if you could place me in the former possessions of my Ancestors.' NRS GD 406/1/1376 (Antrim to Hamilton, 7 July [1637?]). In their later correspondence Antrim often described himself as Hamilton's 'creature', See for example, NRS GD 406/1/1154 (Antrim to Hamilton, 17 March 1639/40).

<sup>222</sup> For the projected size of the plantation, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/197r (Wentworth to Charles I, 9 May 1635).

<sup>223</sup> Sir George Hamilton was also looking for a portion in Connaught and was supported by Hamilton, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.9/part II/305 (Coke to Wentworth, 30 September 1635). Sir George Hamilton was also the earl of Ormond's brother-in-law and would therefore have enjoyed the deputy's support. I am grateful to Billy Kelly for this point.

<sup>224</sup> NRS GD 406/M1/38 ('Conditions ... for the plantation of Cannough[t],' [1634–35]); S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/95r. (Wentworth to Charles I, 26 May 1634) in answer to the king's concerning suits for the plantations of Connaught and Ormond, *Ibid.*, 3/94 v.

<sup>225</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters.*, i, 472 (Hamilton to Wentworth, 7 October 1635). Hamilton's draft of this letter can be found at, NRS GD 406/1/246, written at 'Sibolds' ie. Theobalds.

<sup>226</sup> The lands were the middle portion of the land of Shean and the great proportion of the land of Downealong. Sir Thomas Boyd was the Abercorn undertaker. The 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Abercorn died in 1618 and in 1624–5 the Irish lands were put in trust for his sons Claud, Lord Strabane and Sir George Hamilton. Claude got all the lands except Downealong which went to Sir George, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS vol.4/94–5 (Charles I to Wentworth, 5 June 1637) and *Ibid.*, vol.4/95 (Petition of Claud and Sir George Hamilton). Portland supported the earl of Abercorn in the thirties, *Ibid.*, vol.3/137v. (Portland to Wentworth, [October 1634]).

<sup>227</sup> NRS GD 406/1/350 (Wentworth to Hamilton, 10 April 1636). Wentworth lamely claimed that he had received the letter 'in thes very few dayes'.

<sup>228</sup> Hamilton and the other Scots' intentions did not accord with Wentworth's plan that the plantations would only succeed if the grantees lived on the property and, furthermore, that future ventures in Ireland would accord with

A year after the lord deputy's tardy reply, Hamilton opened a second front by procuring a direct grant of 'certain surrounded and deserted lands' and royal fishings around the bays of Killelagh and Strangford in County Down near the big Scottish plantations.<sup>229</sup> This time the problem was not that the grant would prove unprofitable, but that it was already granted to Thomas, 4<sup>th</sup> Lord Cromwell and viscount Lecale, one of Wentworth's political collaborators in the Irish parliament of 1634 and whose signature was second on the death warrant of Viscount Mountnorris, the vice-treasurer, in December 1635.<sup>230</sup> At first Hamilton traded letters with both Wentworth and Cromwell, arguing that his grant was passed on 4 March 1637 and Cromwell's on 7 May 1637.<sup>231</sup> In fact, Cromwell's grant had not only been passed in May 1636 but was a confirmation of an identical grant of 7 August 1618.<sup>232</sup> Hamilton did not have a leg to stand on, yet he refused to give way. Undeterred, he then unsuccessfully tried to acquire a grant of those lands which Cromwell told him were undrainable, despite the fact that he would be surrounded on all sides by Cromwell's property!<sup>233</sup> With partial justification, Hamilton blamed the lord deputy for these setbacks as a letter from Conway to Wentworth illustrates:

I believe that my Lord of Holland is no more your friend than he was; for I heard, that he said, that you writ to my Lord Marquis the basest and most submiss Letters that ever he saw: And this advice will not only serve you for my Lord of Holland, but for my Lord Marquis, who is not a man to be trusted further than it will be for his Profit.<sup>234</sup>

Hamilton's third and most ambitious attempt to gain a substantial interest in Ireland developed alongside these failures.<sup>235</sup> He was aware that Wentworth had a quarter share in the Irish customs farm, and so any attempt to acquire an interest there would cause a collision with the

---

the policy of 'thorough' and pay their way, Kearney, *Strafford*, pp. 168, 178. I am grateful to Billy Kelly for discussions on this. Wentworth gave a similar, but less dismissive, reply to the earl of Mar perhaps with some justification since he asked for 20,000 acres, *HMC, Mar and Kellie*, 193–4 (Wentworth to Mar, 13 March 1634/5). Hamilton's treatment may be contrasted with Lord Cottington's enquiry about Connaught on behalf of chief justice Finch's brother, S. C. L., WW, *Strafford MSS*, vol.3/214 (Wentworth to Cottington, 18 July 1635).

<sup>229</sup> TNA, SO 3/11, unfol., March 1636/7; *CSP Ire.*, 1633–47, 152 (Charles I to lord deputy, 4 March 1636/7). For the proximity to the big Scottish plantations, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 254 (Wentworth to Charles I, 5 December 1638).

<sup>230</sup> For supporting the lord deputy in the parliament of 1634, Cromwell was rewarded with a trip to court in 1635 to kiss the king's hand and have an unspecified suit passed, S. C. L., WW, *Strafford MSS*, vol.9/part II/267 (Coke to Wentworth, 16 February 1634/5); *Ibid.*, vol.9/part II/283 (Coke to Wentworth, 25 May 1635). Hamilton had his own copy of Mountnorris's death warrant, NRS GD 406/M1/30.

<sup>231</sup> Hamilton's was clearly registered in the signet office in March 1637, see note 237 below, Cromwell's was registered in May 1636, TNA, SO3/11 unfol., May 1636. See also *CSP Ire.*, 1633–47, 128 (Charles to lord deputy, 7 May 1636); NRS GD 406/1/377 (Wentworth and commissioners for his majestie's revenue, 31 July 1637); GD 406/1/10086 (Hamilton to Wentworth, 30 August 1637).

<sup>232</sup> *CSP Ire.*, 1633–47, 128 (Charles to lord deputy, 7 May 1636). Hamilton's grant included the bay of Killelagh, Cromwell's did not, but Hamilton or his agents did not fasten onto this.

<sup>233</sup> Cromwell told Hamilton that he intended to drain 400 acres of the area saying the rest could not be drained by 'al the kings of Europ[e]', NRS GD 406/1/384 (Cromwell to Hamilton, 3 August 1637); GD 406/1/387 (Hamilton to Cromwell, 2 September 1637); GD 406/1/8381 (Hamilton to Wentworth and the commissioners for his majesties revenue, [after 3 August 1637]); GD 406/1/8377 ([Draft] Hamilton to Cromwell, [after 3 August 1637]). One of Hamilton's agents in Ireland, Edward Kendall, sent information and mobilised support, NRS GD 406/1/381, 383 (Kendall to Hamilton, both dated 28 July 1637). This may have been the man of the same surname who worked on behalf of the earl of Arundel in Ireland, and therefore had already fallen foul of Wentworth in his dispute with Arundel, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 29–30 (Wentworth to Arundel, August 1636). I owe the last point and reference to Billy Kelly.

<sup>234</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 125 (Conway to Wentworth, [n.d. 1637]). By describing Hamilton as one who was only out for personal profit, Conway reiterated Wentworth's own feelings about the marquis's reasons for intervention in Ireland.

<sup>235</sup> Hamilton also had his eye on acquiring land in the projected plantations of Tipperary, Ormond, Sligo, Monaghan and Roscommon, NRS GD 406/1/512 (Memorandum of counties in Ireland to be planted, [n.d. 1637?]).

lord deputy.<sup>236</sup> As a judge in the Star Chamber trial in 1635 against the city of London's mismanagement of the Londonderry plantation, Hamilton had acquired first hand knowledge of the area's commercial potential.<sup>237</sup> Consequently, in 1637 he led a consortium to bid for the lands and customs of Londonderry taken from the London corporation.<sup>238</sup> The bid was compiled in some secrecy probably to avoid an early confrontation with the lord deputy.<sup>239</sup>

The core of the group was essentially an anti-Wentworth clique in the king's Bedchamber comprising Hamilton, Will Murray and probably the earl of Holland.<sup>240</sup> Holland cannot be directly connected to the venture but his hatred of Wentworth, along with his close political and commercial collaboration with Hamilton, suggests that he may have been a player, or at least a strong supporter.<sup>241</sup> Outside the Bedchamber the 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Antrim, James Hamilton, Viscount Clandeboyne and Robert Barr of Malon were involved on the ground. One memorandum in the Hamilton papers suggested that Antrim and Clandeboyne were willing as 'two that have the best meanes in the province of Ulster' to stand sureties for part of the venture.<sup>242</sup> Certainly, Antrim had recently tried to procure land in the Derry area,<sup>243</sup> and the consortium used his agent Archibald Stewart in the later stages of the deal.<sup>244</sup>

The most interesting figure in this affair, however, was Robert Barr of Malon,<sup>245</sup> one of Hamilton's agents in Ireland.<sup>246</sup> Barr was a Scottish presbyterian planter with land in Ulster. He was also an ambitious customs entrepreneur and religious conventicler.<sup>247</sup> Barr was very well connected at court and his earlier schemes for increasing the Irish customs revenue were supported by

<sup>236</sup> Kearney, *Strafford*, p.165, 159–168.

<sup>237</sup> T. W. Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609–41: the City of London and the Plantation of Ulster* (Belfast, 1939), pp.357–369, esp. pp.357–358. Equally, by voting to revoke the Londoners patent Hamilton helped promote the area's availability.

<sup>238</sup> For a detailed analysis of the 'Londonderry Business', Jane Ohlmeyer, 'Strafford, the "The Londonderry Business" and the new 'British History"', in J.F. Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp.209–229.

<sup>239</sup> This may be why much of the material in the Hamilton Archive relating to the bid is unsigned, undated and rarely mentions specific names, see for example, memoranda sent to Hamilton, NRS GD 406/M1/324, 33.

<sup>240</sup> For Will Murray's involvement, NRS GD 406/1/421 (Murray to Hamilton, 21 June 1638) and for an example of his and Holland's poor relations with Wentworth, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 189 (Wentworth to Charles, 28 July 1638).

<sup>241</sup> In October 1637, Hamilton, Pembroke and Sir David Kirke procured a grant of Newfoundland, TNA, SO3/11 (October 1637).

<sup>242</sup> Clandeboyne appears, along with Antrim, to have offered their bonds as sureties for some of the purchase, NRS GD 406/M1/324 ('A memorandum for the most noble lord Marquis of hambleton.' [n.d. 1637]). Interestingly, Clandeboyne had previously owned the fishings of the Bann and Lough Foyle, George Hill, *An Historical Account of the Plantation in Ulster, 1608–1620* (Belfast, 1877), pp.100, 171, 177.

<sup>243</sup> The Macdonalds had previously owned land in the Derry area. Before his death in December 1636, the 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Antrim had tried unsuccessfully to get Hamilton to have the 3,000 acres around the town of Cultram [Culmore?] (worth £1,500) which he had surrendered to the Londoners restored to him, NRS GD 406/2/M1/277 ('Reasons that may induce his Matie to take the Earle of Antrim's Peticon into his gracious Consideration,' [before December 1636]). This paper also mentions viscount Dunluce's abortive attempt to buy land in Kintyre, which was thwarted by Lorne. See also, Ohlmeyer, 'Strafford and the "Londonderry Business"', pp.214–215.

<sup>244</sup> See below. For his part, Antrim may have been promised a portion of the lands that the Macdonalds had formerly owned around Culmore or a stake in the customs farm. See above. Antrim was disappointed when the Derry offer collapsed: 'The losse of London Derrie shall never trouble me, onlie I shall want an occasion daylie to serve you', S.R.O, GD 406/1/652 (Antrim to Hamilton, 14 January 1638/9).

<sup>245</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 227 (Henry, Bishop Lesley of Down to Wentworth, 18 October 1638). The writer talks of a non-conformist Robert Barr of Malone.

<sup>246</sup> *CSP Ire., 1633–47*, 181–182 (John Bramhall, bishop of Derry to Laud, 23 February 1637/8); Wedgwood, *Strafford*, pp.248–249; Perceval-Maxwell, 'Strafford, the Ulster-Scots', p.530; M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Ireland and Scotland, 1638–1648' in Morrill, ed., *The Scottish National Covenant*, p.195.

<sup>247</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 227 (Henry Dunensis, Bishop Lesley to Wentworth, 18 October 1638); S. C. L., W.W., *Strafford MSS*, vol.3/part 1/fol.193r. (Wentworth to Cottington, 10 April 1635); *CSP Ire., 1633–47*, 181–182 (John Bramhall, bishop of Derry to Laud, 23 February 1637/8). His land was in Co. Downe.

Lord Treasurer Portland.<sup>248</sup> Sometime before Portland's death in March 1635, Barr moved into Hamilton's circle and worked closely with Will Murray.<sup>249</sup> At court, Barr promoted his proposals on Irish customs reform, petitioned against the lord deputy,<sup>250</sup> met the king twice and secured royal authority to travel freely between Ireland and England.<sup>251</sup> If Hamilton's bid was successful, it seems that Barr was to be made keeper of Culmore Castle, which overlooks the entrance to the river Foyle, and run the Londonderry customs farm.<sup>252</sup> Furthermore, it appears that Barr also submitted at least one offer for part of the Scottish customs farm and was supported by Patrick Maule of Panmure.<sup>253</sup>

From the evidence it is clear that Hamilton was engaged in a campaign to overthrow the lord deputy's Irish customs farm, with Londonderry the immediate goal. Anyone with a scheme to wrest the customs farm from Wentworth's grasp would find patrons in Hamilton, Holland and Will Murray. Hamilton was interested in any aspect of the excise that posed a potential threat to the lord deputy. For example, around 1635–6 he was behind an unsuccessful attempt to purchase the Irish tobacco farm.<sup>254</sup> At around the same time he and Holland lent support to Wilmot and Mountnorris's schemes for the management of the Irish customs, as well as shielding one of the Galway agents, Patrick Darcy, from Wentworth's displeasure.<sup>255</sup> A few years later, in early 1638, his friend Lord Goring offered Hamilton a quarter share (£2,000) and leadership of a company he was organising with Sir Edmund Verney and Sir Ralph Clare to run the English tobacco farm.<sup>256</sup> Such was the marquis's growing interest in Ireland that he even planned a trip there, probably in 1638, but he was forced to travel to Scotland instead.<sup>257</sup>

Not surprisingly, Wentworth did not take this lying down. A stream of letters to Laud, Cottington and the king lambasted the Derry consortium for its smear tactics, epitomised by Barr.<sup>258</sup> Wentworth poured most of his scalding anti-Scottish invective upon Barr, probably because he

<sup>248</sup> S. C. L., WW., *Strafford MSS*, vol.3/part 1/fol.193r. (Wentworth to Cottington, 10 April 1635).

<sup>249</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 136–7. Wentworth was furious that Murray was part of 'this Inquisition' as he had earlier – around 1633 – paid him £800 to pass from a suit for the remembrancers office in Ireland for which the lord deputy received no thanks, *Ibid.*

<sup>250</sup> S. C. L., WW., *Strafford MSS*, vol.3/part 1/fol.193r. (Wentworth to Cottington, 10 April 1635). See also, *Ibid.*, vol. 9/ii/143.

<sup>251</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 107 (Wentworth to Laud, 27 September 1637); *Ibid.*, ii, 126 (Laud to Wentworth, 24 October 1637).

<sup>252</sup> Hamilton was advised to include the patronage of Culmore castle on the river of Lough Foyle in the offer where the traffic from Derry port could be monitored, NRS GD 406/M9/37 ('What yor Lop is to desier of his Matie when yor Lops pattent is to be passed', [n.d. 1637]). Barr petitioned the king to be keeper of Culmore Castle, *CSP Ire., Add. 1625–60*, p.321 ([n.d.]); *CSP Ire., 1633–47*, p.181–182 (John Bramhall, bishop of Derry to Laud, 23 February 1637/8).

<sup>253</sup> Innerleithen, Traquair MSS, 11/11 (Morton to [Traquair], 2 March [?1636–38]). Morton was surprised that Traquair was not involved, given his strong friendship with Barr.

<sup>254</sup> Cooper, 'Fortune of Strafford', p.169–70. Strafford had a major interest in the Irish tobacco farm and retained it, despite Hamilton's efforts, *Ibid.* At the same time Hamilton and Holland may have been behind another group including Robert Barr, Mountnorris, Sir James Galloway, Will Murray and Patrick Darcy who were putting together an offer for the entire Irish customs farm, Lady Burghclere, *Strafford* (2 vols. London 1931), i, 34–35.

<sup>255</sup> Moody et al, *New History*, pp.254–256. Darcy was, significantly, also involved in proposals for customs reform in Ireland while he was at court, Kearney, *Strafford*, p.94. For more on Darcy being on the wrong side of Wentworth, *Ibid.*, pp.92–94, 193, 212.

<sup>256</sup> The company initially had the Irish tobacco farm included in their lease, but it was withdrawn. Even if Hamilton did not want to put down the £2,000 stake, it would be done for him and he would still get the same benefit. It is not known whether Hamilton accepted the offer, NRS GD 406/1/7536 (Goring to Verney, 1 February 1637/8 {with an attached paper detailing the quarter share}). Others were involved with Goring, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 141 (Garrard to Wentworth, 16 December 1637). Goring's patent was cancelled sometime in 1638, *Ibid.*, ii, 181 (Garrard to Wentworth, [n.d. 1638]).

<sup>257</sup> NRS, GD 406/1/652 (Antrim to Hamilton, 14 January 1638/9).

<sup>258</sup> See for example, S. C. L., WW., *Strafford MSS*, vol.3/part 1/fol.193r. (Wentworth to Cottington, 10 April 1635); *Ibid.*, vol.3/part 1/195v–197v (Wentworth to Charles I, 9 May 1635); *Ibid.*, vol.3/part 1/fol.239v (Wentworth to Charles I, 10 January 1635/6); Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 107, (Wentworth to Laud, 27 September 1637).

knew the nationality of the majority behind the scheme.<sup>259</sup> But in the face of the influence of Hamilton, Will Murray and Holland there was only a limited amount that Wentworth could do. Moreover, such was Wentworth's ability to raise hackles that individuals outside the consortium, such as Lord Wilmot, Viscount Mountnorris, and Sir Piers Crosby, joined in the cacophony against him.<sup>260</sup>

Pursuing this broad strategy, Hamilton sifted the incoming reports on Londonderry and prepared his offer. Hamilton had to weigh the advice carefully as some of it varied considerably. One paper suggested that, if Charles demurred on Coleraine and surrounding lands, Hamilton should double the existing rent from £500 to £1,000 to secure it.<sup>261</sup> A later paper, in the hand of Antrim's agent, Archibald Stewart, written after Hamilton had submitted his first offer, suggested that the total Londonderry package was worth £18,000 a year.<sup>262</sup> By contrast, in an earlier paper Hamilton put his own estimates in the margin and came to a total figure of £5,200 a year as opposed to the £10,200 suggested by the compiler of that particular report.<sup>263</sup> Hamilton's own figure was clearly too low, and, when he had composed a formal offer, he upped the ante to £9,200.<sup>264</sup> It is certain that he had to further increase that figure for in December 1637 Charles boasted to Wentworth that he had been offered £12,000 yearly plus a £10,000 entry fine from two or three different companies of undertakers.<sup>265</sup>

It seems beyond doubt that Hamilton was behind one of these companies and their offer was being taken very seriously by the king. In the first place, Wentworth was convinced the offer came from a Scottish consortium, warning Charles that acceptance would mean the total control of Ulster by the Scots and the virtual collapse of the Derry customs farm.<sup>266</sup> In his reply, Charles ignored Wentworth's anti-Scottish utterings and informed him that the 'proposers', now a single company, had offered to leave out the Derry customs which they valued at £3,000, consequently reducing their offer to £9,000.<sup>267</sup> Hamilton had been advised in two separate reports to ask for a reduction of £3,000 on the lease if the customs were left out which links the lead bid

<sup>259</sup> Wentworth rarely named names, instead, he angrily boasted that he knew the identity of the consortium leaders, see for example, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/part 1/fol.248; *Ibid*, fol.193r. (Wentworth to Cottington, 10 April 1635). Barr was, for example, a 'Scottish Pedler,' a 'petty chapman.' Wentworth tempered his anti-Scottish comments when writing to the king.

<sup>260</sup> Interestingly, Aidan Clarke has suggested that in 1635, Sir Piers Crosby and Viscount Mountnorris had links with the anti-Wentworth group at court, and that was the reason 'the ringleader, Lord Mountnorris, was court-martialled in December 1635,' A. Clarke, 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590–1646: Wentworth's 'tawney ribbon,' *Irish Historical Studies*, xxvi, no.102 (November 1988), p.144. For Wilmot supporting Barr's petition against Wentworth, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/part 1/fol.197r (Wentworth to Cottington, 9 May 1635).

<sup>261</sup> NRS GD 406/M1/324 (Memorandum for ... hambleton, [n.d.]).

<sup>262</sup> NRS GD 406/1/359 (Stewart to Hamilton, 1 February 1637/8). This advice must have been sent to Hamilton after Charles had received the first offers for the Londonderry lease, see below. Stewart made no mention of the impact on customs revenue if relations with Spain deteriorated. Stewart's estimate for the customs was corroborated in another paper, though it suggested that Hamilton should request this figure if the Derry customs were separated from the Londonderry package and joined to the General customs farm, NRS GD 406/M1/295. Stewart's yearly figure for the customs should be compared with Wentworth's average £1,365, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/part 1/321 (Wentworth to Charles, [?] May 1638).

<sup>263</sup> It is accepted that these were probably the figures Hamilton considered offering for the different parts of Londonderry rather than what they were worth. Hamilton put the customs at £1,000, NRS GD 406/1/501 (Instructions for ... Hamilton concerning the farming of Londonderry).

<sup>264</sup> NRS GD 406/M1/33 ('My offer unto yor Matie for the County of Londonderry ...', [Copy] [n.d.]).

<sup>265</sup> S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/part 1/307v–309r (Charles I to Wentworth, 29 January 1637/8?). The offer is at fol.309r dated December 1637.

<sup>266</sup> *Ibid*, vol.3/part 1/310–311 (Wentworth to Charles, 27 February 1637/8). Wentworth's argument was that the English were law abiding, loyal subjects, unlike the Scots. He also said that the Londonderry customs would be virtually ruined.

<sup>267</sup> *Ibid*, vol.3/part 1/319r (Charles to Wentworth, 31 April 1638), the proposers had also offered to farm the customs out for £3,500! Archibald Stewart's advice may have been sought after the initial offer went in and Wentworth complained about the effect on the Derry customs, NRS GD 406/1/359 (Stewart to Hamilton, 1 February 1637/8).

to him.<sup>268</sup> The timing of the reduced offer aligns with Hamilton's movements, for it was made a few weeks before he went to Scotland as royal commissioner. Once he left for Edinburgh the consortium lost momentum and slowly fizzled out.<sup>269</sup> In fact, Charles rejected all the bids in November 1638 and put the Londonderry business into a commission for settling it to the crown's 'best advantage'.<sup>270</sup>

Thus Hamilton's repeated attempts to gain an interest in Ireland between 1635 and 1638 failed. It was in large part due to the lord deputy's Anglophile policy. In the case of the Cromwell dispute, Hamilton must take most of the blame for excessive stubbornness when he was boxed in, literally. The Londonderry business was a more even contest with Hamilton and Murray, with Antrim's support, versus Wentworth. What tilted the balance the deputy's way was the Scottish troubles. Wentworth scared Charles with warnings of Scots in Ulster mirroring the attitudes of their co-religionists at home.<sup>271</sup> Robert Barr's visits to Edinburgh and enthusiastic promotion of the Covenant in Ulster was grist to the deputy's mill.<sup>272</sup> Meanwhile Hamilton, ironically, was forced to turn his attention from Londonderry to Edinburgh armed with a near impossible brief.

Going into the Scottish troubles, Charles I had a royal commissioner for Scotland who deeply resented the lord deputy of Ireland.<sup>273</sup> And the feeling of hostility was mutual. Not only that, but the Scots at home and in Ulster were equally bitter towards the lord deputy, long before Charles recalled him in late 1639 for the second mobilisation against the Covenanters.<sup>274</sup> From the second half of 1639 Hamilton and Wentworth were forced to work together and both attempted to bury the hatchet. For example, Hamilton, along with Northumberland, supported Wentworth during his investiture as earl of Strafford in January 1640.<sup>275</sup> Yet one had only to scratch the surface and the antipathy re-appeared. However, faced with the collapse of the second mobilisation and a Scots army forcing the calling of an English parliament, Strafford looked to soothe former enemies, amongst them the marquis of Hamilton. In a remarkable volte face, he tried to find him

<sup>268</sup> See above. The reports are NRS GD 406/1/359 and GD 406/2/M1/295.

<sup>269</sup> Writing from York house, Antrim lamented, 'By your absence I find a slow advancement in londonderrie busines and if you doe not spure Wil Murray our hopes of it may faile,' NRS GD 406/1/1156 (Antrim to Hamilton, 11 June 1638). Will Murray seemed a little more hopeful; writing ten days later he commented, 'For London Derry it receives some delay by reason of my Lord Cottingtons newnes in the busines who must be satisfied but I hope all shall go well'. NRS GD 406/1/421. Cottington, under Charles's orders, was probably examining the viability of the consortium's offer. Later in the year, Antrim claimed that Wentworth was not assisting the opposers of the consortium's bid which contradicts most of the other evidence and, once again, lays the earl's political judgement open to question, NRS GD 406/1/653/1-2 (Antrim to Hamilton, 13 October 1638).

<sup>270</sup> For more detail on the four bids and Charles's decision, see Ohlmeyer, 'Strafford [and] "The Londonderry Business"' in Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth* (1996), pp.216–223, and table of bids in appendix at p.229.

<sup>271</sup> J. Bliss, ed., *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud* (8 vols. Oxford, 1860), vii, 439 (Laud to Wentworth, 30 May 1638). The archbishop agreed with Wentworth in this as in many other things.

<sup>272</sup> Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 227 (Lesley, bishop of Downe to Wentworth, 18 October 1638); *Ibid*, 229 (Wentworth to Charles I, 1 November 1638), for a MSS copy of this letter, S. C. L., WW., Strafford MSS, vol.3/part II/12. Some evidence suggests that Barr in Edinburgh and Clotworthy in London were employed to work the deputy's ruin, T.D. Whitaker, ed., *The Life and Original Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, the friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p.228 (Deciphered account of a conspiracy to ruin the lord deputy). Wentworth eventually caught up with Barr in May 1639: Barr, characteristically perhaps, acknowledged his fault, asked pardon, and was released! Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 341 (Wentworth to Coke, 18 May 1639).

<sup>273</sup> See for example, Knowler, *Strafford's Letters*, ii, 250 (Wentworth to Laud, 27 November 1638).

<sup>274</sup> For the Scots hatred of Wentworth before his recall, *Ibid*, ii, 195–6 (Wentworth to Laud, 7 August 1638). In a letter to Windebank, Wentworth revealed that his spy in Edinburgh, Mr Willoughby (an ensign in the Irish army), told him that the Scots 'universally hates me most extremely, and threaten some personal Mischief unto me,' *Ibid*, ii, 269 (Wentworth to Windebank, 6 January 1638/9). For Willoughby, *Ibid*, ii, 271 (Wentworth to Laud, 12 January 1638/9). On a lighter note, the Ulster Scots had even tried to get Wentworth's chaplain to sign the Covenant, S. C. L., W. W., Strafford MSS, vol.3/part I/339 (Wentworth to Charles I, 28 July 1638).

<sup>275</sup> *CSPD, Add. 1625–49*, 616 (Order of Ceremonial, 12 January 1639/40); Loomie, ed., *Ceremonies of Charles I*, p.271.

a choice grant in Ireland.<sup>276</sup> After a few failures,<sup>277</sup> he anxiously wrote to Sir George Radcliffe on 5 November, two days after the opening of the Long Parliament, 'If that for my L[or]d Marquesse do not take, I desire you to look out some other thinge for him, and use diligence therein.'<sup>278</sup> Charles I was not the only one persuaded to change his mind by the Scottish army's presence in England.

---

<sup>276</sup> In April 1640, Hamilton was still working through others to get into Ireland, though Strafford was no longer an obstacle, Whitaker, *Correspondence of Radcliffe*, 198–199 (Strafford to Radcliffe, 7 April 1640).

<sup>277</sup> *Ibid.*, 210–213 (Radcliffe to Strafford, 28 October 1640). It seems that Radcliffe was trying to get Hamilton land in Bermingham's countrie, and perhaps Galway (which was opposed by Clanrickard). In despair Radcliffe exclaimed, 'What shall we now doe for the Marquis?' *Ibid.*

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, 204–206 (Strafford to Radcliffe, 5 November 1640).