



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of '*Our late most excellent viceroy*': *Irish Responses to the Death of the Duke of Rutland in 1787*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/132625/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Wilson, R orcid.org/0000-0003-2099-5896 (2019) '*Our late most excellent viceroy*': *Irish Responses to the Death of the Duke of Rutland in 1787*. *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 42 (1). pp. 67-83. ISSN 1754-0194

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12590>

© 2018 British Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Wilson, R (2018) '*Our late most excellent viceroy*': *Irish Responses to the Death of the Duke of Rutland in 1787*. *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*. ISSN 1754-0194, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/1754-0208.12590>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**“Our late most excellent viceroy”: Irish responses to the death of the Duke of Rutland
in 1787**

It is with inexpressible concern we announce, that his Grace the Duke of Rutland’s disease baffled all the powers of medicine, and the skill of the most able physicians; for on Wednesday night, about the hour of nine, he departed this life, at the Lodge in the Phoenix-Park. From his many amiable and social virtues his death is universally regretted, and his loss will be severely felt by the whole nation, as well as by many to whom his generosity and charitable disposition have often afforded relief.¹

This death notice, marking the passing of Charles Manners, 4th Duke of Rutland and Lord Lieutenant (or viceroy) of Ireland on 24 October 1787 is remarkable for two reasons. First, it is a masterclass in discretion and political news management, deftly glossing over Rutland’s flaws and presenting him as a paragon of virtue, forever beloved by his adopted people and cruelly struck down by ill health. The reality was more complicated. Second, it marks the beginning of an extraordinary reaction on the part of the Irish (particularly Dubliners) to the loss of their viceroy, which culminated the following month in one of the most extravagant funeral processions the country had ever seen. It is this reaction and the reasons behind it with which this article is concerned. It will analyse the unique and spectacular events between Rutland’s demise and the departure of his remains from Irish shores, situating them within the broader context of Anglo-Irish relations in the 1780s and the Duke’s sometimes turbulent vicereignty, final illness and death. The treatment of his body and memory and the funeral procession afforded him deliberately mimicked and even surpassed the measures taken to mark royal deaths in London, yet remained distinctly Irish, a clash which mirrored a greater conflict within the Irish national psyche between those who wished to foster a

¹ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 25 October 1787.

uniquely Irish identity and those who sought to protect the relationship with England and remain British. This article will demonstrate that it was these competing desires, alongside genuine affection for Rutland and issues of national vanity and self-esteem, which precipitated the similarities to and divergences from the English model.

Rutland has been of little interest to historians. Though the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* and the *Dictionary of Irish Biography* contain brief entries on him, he has been the subject of only one article (concerning his appointment of the poet, George Crabbe, as his chaplain in 1782) while a recent biography split its attention between Charles and his brother, Lord Robert Manners, almost passing over the Lord Lieutenant's death and funeral.² By comparison the historiography on death and mourning practices in Ireland and England is better developed, but often focuses on the centuries before and after the eighteenth.³ Even scholarship on contemporary royal funerals is surprisingly patchy, with references to the eighteenth century usually incorporated into much broader surveys of the

² *Oxford DNB* (Manners, Charles, Fourth Duke of Rutland (1754–1787)); *Dictionary of Irish Biography* (Manners, Charles (1754–87)); R. B. Hatch, 'George Crabbe, the Duke of Rutland and the Tories,' *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 24, no. 96 (1973): 429–43; David Rutland and Emma Ellis, *Resolution: Two Brothers. A Nation in Crisis. A World at War* (London: Head of Zeus, 2017).

³ Raymond Gillespie, 'Funerals and Society in Early Seventeenth Century Ireland,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 115 (1985): 86–91; Clodagh Tait, *Death, Burial and Commemoration in Ireland, 1550–1650* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Patricia Lysaght, 'Hospitality at Wakes and Funerals in Ireland from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century: Some Evidence from the Written Record,' *Folklore* 114, no. 3 (2003): 403–26; Jane Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), ch. 16; Elaine Hoysted, 'Visualising the Privileged Status of Motherhood: The Commemoration of Women in Irish Funerary Monuments, c. 1600–1650,' in *Irish Fine Art in the Early Modern Period: New Perspectives on Artistic Practice, 1620–1820*, eds Jane Fenlon, Ruth Kenny, Caroline Pegum and Brendan Rooney (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2016), 218–47. A rare work on the eighteenth century is Patrick Walsh, 'Politics, Patriotism and Posterity: The Funeral of William Conolly in 1729,' in *Grave Matters: Death and Dying in Dublin 1500 to the Present*, eds Lisa Marie Griffith and Ciaran Wallace (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2016), 115–27. For the English literature, see Clare Gittings, *Death, Burial and the Individual in Early Modern England* (Kent: Routledge, 1984); Ralph Houlbrooke, ed., *Death, Ritual and Bereavement* (London: Routledge, 1989); Julian Litten, *The English Way of Death: The Common Funeral Since 1450* (London: Robert Hale, 1992); David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage and Death: Ritual, Religion and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), chs 17–20; Ralph Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion and the Family in England, 1480–1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings, eds, *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); Teerapa Pirohakul, 'The Funeral in England in the Long Eighteenth Century' (PhD diss., London School of Economics and Political Science, 2015).

early-modern and modern periods and few case studies in existence.⁴ This examination of Rutland's case will therefore augment a number of historiographical categories, though its primary focus will be the Anglo-Irish relationship, rather than a history of funerary customs.

Rutland became Lord Lieutenant on 11 February 1784 at the age of twenty-nine and arrived in Dublin thirteen days later, followed in April by his wife, Mary (now Ireland's vicereine) and their children.⁵ Almost immediately there was trouble as anger swelled amongst the Dublin populace at the Irish Parliament's recent rejection of suggested protection duties and parliamentary reforms and at a new tax imposed to maintain the capital's streets.⁶ The Irish House of Commons was stormed by rioters on 5 April and soon after there were insurrections in Kilkenny coupled with the publication of a series of 'inflammatory handbills' and threats to tar and feather Rutland himself. The viceroy responded by deploying troops to quell the disorder and offering rewards to any who helped catch those who had attacked Parliament and published the 'handbills'.⁷ By May he felt he had overcome the worst of the problems writing of the 'perfect quiet established in this metropolis', though he conceded that the peace was only kept by a strong military presence.⁸ In London his conduct and the results it produced were a 'matter of great astonishment to all here, and of the greatest credit to your Grace', who many had feared was too young and inexperienced to handle the 'ticklish'

⁴ Paul S. Fritz, 'From "Public" to "Private": The Royal Funerals in England, 1500–1830,' in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*, ed. Joachim Whaley (London: Europa Publications, 1981), 61–79; Paul S. Fritz, 'The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England 1685–1830,' *Eighteenth Century Studies* 15, no. 3 (1982): 291–316; Robin Eagles, "'No More to be Said": Reactions to the Death of Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales,' *Historical Research* 80, no. 209 (2007): 346–67; Michael Schaich, 'The Funerals of British Monarchy,' in *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Michael Schaich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 421–50; Matthias Range, *British Royal and State Funerals: Music and Ceremonial Since Elizabeth I* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2016).

⁵ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 25 October 1787; Lord Sydney to the Duke of Rutland, 4 and 5 April 1784, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland ... Preserved at Belvoir Castle* [hereafter *HMC Rutland*], vol. 3 (London, 1894), 85.

⁶ James Kelly, *Prelude to Union: Anglo-Irish Politics in the 1780s* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1992), 80–81.

⁷ Duke of Rutland to Lord Sydney, 8 April 1784, *HMC Rutland*, 3: 86–87.

⁸ Duke of Rutland to Lord Sydney, 8 May 1784, *HMC Rutland*, 3: 93; Duke of Rutland to Lord [?], 30 June 1784, *HMC Rutland*, 3: 116; Duke of Rutland to General Pitt, 15 July 1784, *HMC Rutland*, 3: 124; Duke of Rutland to Lord Sydney, 16 July 1784, *HMC Rutland*, 3: 125.

situation across the Irish Sea.⁹ Further difficulties followed in 1785 when Prime Minister William Pitt sought to bring about a commercial union between Britain and Ireland. After the initial proposals were heavily amended by the English administration they met with fierce opposition in Ireland and though the bill passed its first reading in the Dublin parliament, the margin was so narrow that the plan had to be abandoned, a humiliating defeat for both the viceroy and Pitt.¹⁰ In the face of these problems it is little wonder that even the most diplomatic of commentators had to admit that ‘some unpopularity attached to the Duke of Rutland in the early part of his Grace’s administration’ and had he died two years earlier it seems inconceivable that there would have been any great show of public grief.¹¹ Over the remainder of his viceroyalty however, he effected a remarkable turnaround in the field of Irish public opinion.

This turnaround was thanks in large part to Rutland’s personal charm. He convinced many in Ireland ‘that their real welfare was his only end’ and left behind the impression that ‘He admired, and always spoke in the highest terms of, the generosity, hospitality and politeness of the people of this country’.¹² He and his wife excelled in the social arena and together they were ‘reckoned the handsomest couple in Ireland’, with a viceregal establishment at Dublin Castle deemed ‘much more brilliant and hospitable than that of the monarch’.¹³ Tours around the country (including one to Cork in the autumn of 1785) further increased their popularity and helped to ameliorate the problems of the preceding eighteen months, as did their philanthropic efforts amongst the poor and Mary’s patronage of Irish

⁹ Daniel Pulteney to the Duke of Rutland, 26 May 1784, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 97; Earl Cornwallis to Lieutenant Colonel Ross, 23 February 1784, *Correspondence of Charles, first Marquis Cornwallis*, ed. Charles Ross, vol. 1 (London: John Murray, 1859), 167.

¹⁰ S. J. Connolly, *Divided Kingdom: Ireland 1630–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 421–22.

¹¹ *Public Characters of 1800–1801* (Dublin, J. Moore, 1801), 196.

¹² *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 30 October 1787.

¹³ Jonah Barrington, *Historic Memoirs of Ireland ...* (London: R. Bentley, for H. Colburn, 1833), 2: 225, 216. See also Martyn J. Powell, *The Politics of Consumption in Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 150–51.

shopkeepers and clothing manufacturers.¹⁴ By the time of Charles's death affection for him was at an all-time high and Attorney General John Fitzgibbon wrote that Rutland 'was more beloved by all ranks of people in this country, than any man who has been in his station'.¹⁵ Despite these improvements in his reputation however, the Lord Lieutenant still had his detractors. Though he successfully handled parliamentary reforms, reduced the political involvement of the Irish Volunteers (a Protestant military force outside state control) and enjoyed a remarkably quiet parliamentary session in 1786, his measures were not universally liked.¹⁶ The *Dublin Evening Post* criticised his economic policies and wrote that he 'possessed no degree of political abilities, and was by no means remarkable for attention to business'.¹⁷ Yet the paper conceded that he had 'all those social qualities which constitute an agreeable companion'¹⁸ and wrote that 'Though we have never approved of the Administration of his Grace the Duke of Rutland, and have reprobated many of its acts ... it shall ever be our object to discriminate between the MEASURE and the MAN'.¹⁹ Other newspapers echoed these sentiments, noting that 'however the public may be divided respecting the measures of his administration, there appears a unanimity as to their opinion of his private character'.²⁰

Notwithstanding this posthumous praise of his 'private character', Rutland's hedonistic lifestyle had in fact been a source of continual problems. The Duke of Leinster wrote scathingly in 1785 that 'as for His Grace, provided he gets his skin full of claret, he

¹⁴ Thomas Forrest to Lady Donaghmore, 1 November 1785, Public Record Office of Northern Ireland (hereafter PRONI), Donoughmore Papers, T3459/C/2/152. On the Duchess's early and sustained patronage of Irish manufacturers see *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 17–20 April 1784; *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, 12 June 1786; *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 6 October 1787. On the Rutlands' philanthropic endeavours, see *Morning Post and Daily Advertiser* (London), 18 June 1784.

¹⁵ John Fitzgibbon to William Eden, 18 November 1787, PRONI, Sneyd Papers, T3229/1/6.

¹⁶ James Kelly, 'Residential and Non-Residential Lords Lieutenant – The Viceroyalty 1703–90,' *The Irish Lord Lieutenancy, c.1541–1922*, eds Peter Gray and Olwen Purdue (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2012), 88; Idem, 'Select Documents XLIII: A Secret Return of the Volunteers of Ireland in 1784,' *Irish Historical Studies* 26, no. 103 (1989): 268–292.

¹⁷ *Dublin Evening Post*, 30 October 1787. Quote from *Dublin Evening Post*, 27 October 1787.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 27 October 1787.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 01 November 1787.

²⁰ *Saunders's News-Letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 26 October 1787.

cares little about anything else' and the endless parties Charles and Mary indulged in led to a brush with death for the viceroy as early as December 1784 when he almost succumbed to a 'bilious fever', sending the King and the British government into a tailspin as they debated what to do if he died.²¹ The Duchess's health was little better and she was so ill by the spring of 1787 that she returned to England with some of the children to recuperate.²² She encouraged her husband to follow but he refused, explaining that it would require the appointment of Lord Justices to manage Irish affairs in his absence.²³

For much of the eighteenth century Lords Lieutenant had visited Ireland only for parliamentary sessions (about six months out of every two years), leaving teams of Lord Justices, usually three in number, to run the country the rest of the time. These men had proved susceptible to what Rutland termed 'cabals and factions' however and could build power bases to rival those of the mostly absent viceroys, problems which were only resolved in the 1760s when the Lords Lieutenant began to reside in Ireland for the duration of their terms of office.²⁴ Rutland apparently feared that the post, which had already changed hands five times during the 1780s, was too unstable and its occupant too vulnerable to attempts to undermine his authority, to withstand another bout of absenteeism. Instead of visiting England, he therefore elected to undertake a whirlwind tour of the northern half of Ireland.

This tour began on 3 July 1787 and over the next three months Rutland travelled constantly, spending most of his time drunk and keeping hours which one disapproving

²¹ Duke of Leinster to Lord Carlisle, 13 June 1785, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the Earl of Carlisle, Preserved at Castle Howard* (London, 1897), 642–43; William Pitt to George III, 5 December 1784, *The Later Correspondence of George III*, ed. Arthur Aspinall, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), no. 154.

²² Dr Robert Knox to the Duke of Rutland, 1 October 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 424; Earl of Tyrone to the Duke of Rutland, 15 May 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 390; *General Evening Post* (London), 5–8 May 1787.

²³ Duke of Rutland to the Duchess of Rutland, 18 June 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 394.

²⁴ *Ibid.*; Gray and Purdue, eds, *The Irish Lord Lieutenancy*, 235. For a more detailed overview of the office of Lord Justice see Charles Ivar McGrath, 'Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century Governance and the Viceroyalty,' in *The Irish Lord Lieutenancy*, 48–56; Kelly, 'Residential and Non-Residential Lords Lieutenant', 68–75; A.P.W. Malcomson, 'John Foster and the Speakership of the Irish House of Commons,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature* 72 (1972): 285.

observer called ‘most shocking to the constitution’.²⁵ His own journal hints at the toll this punishing regime took. In County Mayo he ‘caught a violent cold by remaining late on the water’ and remained ill ‘during my whole continuance in the county of Galway’.²⁶ He was still unwell when he arrived back in the capital, complaining on 3 October that this same ailment had left him with ‘a constant succession of head-aches’ and unable to attend to business as assiduously as he would have liked.²⁷ What he took to be a cold however was in fact far more serious and his condition gradually deteriorated over the next three weeks.²⁸ During this time newspapers provided constant updates on his progress and crowds gathered in the courtyard of Dublin Castle, seeking information.²⁹ When news finally came of his death, aged just thirty-three, there was a genuine sense of shock and regret at the loss of one so young who had provided a rare sense of stability by remaining in post longer than so many of his immediate predecessors.³⁰ There was also the question of what to do next.

The loss of a resident Lord Lieutenant was unprecedented, the nearest equivalents being the deaths of Lord Deputy Henry Capel in 1696, of vicereine Lady Townshend in 1770, and of various Lord Justices over the course of the century. None were especially recent however, nor had Capel or Townshend’s deaths elicited much attention from Dublin newspapers or other forms of popular expression.³¹ Consequently they were of little help in determining how Rutland should be mourned. Complicating matters further was the power

²⁵ Journal of the Duke of Rutland’s Tour in the North of Ireland, 3 July 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 419–23; Walter Jones to Lord Hervey, 26 October 1787, Suffolk Record Office, Hervey Family Archives, MS 941/55/3. Quote from John Dubourdieu to the Bishop of Derry, 24 July 1787, PRONI, Hervey-Bruce Papers, D2798/3/51.

²⁶ Journal of the Duke of Rutland’s Tour in the North of Ireland, 3 July 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 423.

²⁷ Duke of Rutland to Lord Sydney, 3 October 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 426.

²⁸ For early reports that he was improving, see Thomas Orde to the Duke of Rutland, 7 October 1787, HMC *Rutland*, 3: 427.

²⁹ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 16 and 23 October 1787; *Dublin Evening Post*, 25 October 1787; *Finn’s Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 27 October 1787.

³⁰ Though some hyperbole can be assumed, newspapers reported that there was a general countenance of grief amongst Dublin’s population the day after Rutland’s death. *Dublin Journal*, 27–30 October 1787; *Dublin Evening Post*, 25 October 1787; *Finn’s Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 27 October 1787.

³¹ Lord Capel died at Chapelizod on 30 May 1696. See *Oxford DNB* (Capel, Henry, Baron Capel of Tewkesbury (bap. 1638, d. 1696)). Lady Townshend died at Leixlip Castle on 14 September 1770. See *Oxford DNB* (Townshend, George, first Marquess Townshend (1724–1807)). On the difference between the titles of Lord Deputy and Lord Lieutenant, see Ciaran Brady, ‘Viceroys? The Irish Chief Governors 1541–1641,’ in *The Irish Lord Lieutenancy*, eds Gray and Purdue, 15–18.

vacuum at the top of Irish politics. The Irish parliament was not in session and letters sent by the Speaker of the House of Commons, John Foster, immediately after the viceroy's death describe officials 'rummaging the books' to discover how their forbears had proceeded upon the death of Capel and after the loss of Lord Justice Baron Cutts, who had died in Dublin in 1707.³² It was not until the 3 November that the immediate impasse was remedied, ironically by the very thing Rutland had stayed in Ireland to prevent, the revival of the office of Lord Justice. It was given to its three traditional holders, the Speaker (Foster), the Lord Chancellor (Viscount Lifford), and the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, Richard Robinson. With Robinson in England however, only Foster and Lifford were sworn in at Dublin Castle and together they managed Irish affairs until 16 December when the Marquis of Buckingham arrived as the new viceroy.³³

Buckingham's appointment followed intense speculation in the press as to who the new viceroy would be and some grumbling from the *Dublin Evening Post* that the choice of replacement mattered little for 'the same *measures* will be persevered in so long as the present Premier [Pitt] continues to hold the reins of state in the sister country'.³⁴ There were no calls for the eradication of the post however and in the absence of any viable alternative for ruling Ireland there was no doubt that it would be filled. William III had attempted to manage the country using Lord Justices only in the 1690s, an experiment which failed thanks to their infighting and the difficulty of finding politically able noblemen willing to undertake the task.³⁵ In any case many in Ireland took pride in the Lord Lieutenancy. The *Belfast Newsletter* called it 'an important station' while the *Dublin Journal* referred to it as 'the most

³² John Foster to Viscount Pery, 25 October 1787, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, the Earl of Lindsey, the Earl of Onslow, Lord Emly, Theodore J. Hare Esq., and James Round, Esq., M.P.* (London, 1895), 194; *Oxford DNB* (Cutts, John, Baron Cutts of Gowran (1660/61–1707)).

³³ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 3 November 1787; *General Evening Post* (London), 10–13 November 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 7 November 1787; *Oxford DNB* (Grenville, George Nugent-Temple-, first Marquess of Buckingham (1753–1813)). Buckingham had previously been viceroy from 1782 to 1783 whilst Lord Temple.

³⁴ *Dublin Evening Post*, 30 October 1787.

³⁵ McGrath, 48–56.

dignified employment that a subject can possess'.³⁶ Despite its flaws, the position survived until 1922.

With no Lord Justices in place until ten days after Rutland's death and no member of his family in Ireland save several of his young children, initially the country lacked anyone to take the lead in formal mourning. Nevertheless, within hours there were indications that the Lord Lieutenant's demise would be marked with an unusual degree of grandeur. On 25 October newspapers wrote of their expectation of 'a general mourning immediately', a move which would have required Ireland's inhabitants to don black clothing, possibly for weeks or months on end and which was normally called for only upon the death of a member of the British royal family, most recently the King's aunt, Princess Amelia, in 1786.³⁷ In the event this expensive and unpopular measure was not implemented, though many of general mourning's less burdensome dictates were.³⁸ Shopkeepers closed their doors, all ships on the river 'wore their pendants and ensigns half hoisted' and Smock Alley Theatre delayed opening for the winter season ultimately until Rutland's remains had left the country.³⁹ Again, such measures were expected upon the death of royalty, though even then there could be a reluctance to implement them. In 1759 for instance, after the death of the Princess Royal (and Princess of Orange by marriage) the Dublin playhouses had stubbornly remained open.⁴⁰ Rutland was not a distant and unfamiliar royal however. He and his wife had lived in Dublin, patronised Irish businesses and attended performances at Smock Alley and this personal connection likely influenced the decision of retailers and theatre managers to suspend their

³⁶ *Belfast Newsletter*, 30 October–02 November 1787; *Dublin Journal*, 30 October–01 November 1787.

³⁷ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 25 October 1787; *General Evening Post* (London), 2–7 November 1786.

³⁸ On the unpopularity of general mourning in Ireland see *Saunders's News-Letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 10 November 1787. On the expense of mourning clothes, see Toby Barnard, *Making the Grand Figure: Lives and Possessions in Ireland, 1641–1770* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 269–70.

³⁹ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 25 and 27 October 1787; John C. Greene, *Theatre in Dublin, 1745–1820: A Calendar of Performances*, vol. 4 (Bethlehem [PA]: Lehigh University Press, 2011), 2456.

⁴⁰ Greene, 1: 556.

businesses quickly and apparently voluntarily, despite the financial repercussions.⁴¹ For others, the death of the Lord Lieutenant represented an economic opportunity and soon there were elegies, articles, and monodies which sang Rutland's praises and smoothed away the more unsavoury elements of his lifestyle, depicting him as temperate in his private life and given to drinking only when the demands of his post required it.⁴²

In contrast to this flurry of activity amongst the press and the commercial world, official signs of mourning were relatively muted. At Dublin Castle the flag was lowered to half-mast, the Lord Justices did not undertake state celebrations to mark the occasion of William III's birth on 4 November and the Duke's household staff went into mourning, but the body was not removed from the Lodge in Phoenix Park and no funeral arrangements were made while instructions were awaited from England.⁴³ An autopsy carried out on the morning after Rutland's death revealed that 'his liver appeared so much decayed and wasted, as to render his recovery impossible', confirming that it was indeed the Duke's heavy drinking which had brought about his end.⁴⁴ Rutland was then embalmed and placed in a series of coffins. The innermost was cedar, lined with satin. Next came lead (a must in cases where a funeral could not take place immediately) and finally mahogany, 'elegantly decorated'. Together the three cost a reported £250.⁴⁵ At this point, everything stopped. Messengers were sent to the Duke's family in England and news of his death reached London on 29 October.⁴⁶ At first it was decided that Rutland's chaplain and secretary, William Preston, Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, would travel to Ireland to oversee the transport of the body back to

⁴¹ On the Rutlands' theatrical patronage see Greene, vols 3 and 4 (*passim*).

⁴² *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 30 October 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 31 October 1787; *Dublin Evening Post*, 08 November 1787; John Macaulay, *A Monody on the Death of the Late Duke of Rutland* (Dublin: W. Sleater, 1787); *The Mourners: A Sketch from Life. In Memory of His Excellency Charles Manners, Duke of Rutland, Late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland* (Dublin: R. Marchbank, 1787).

⁴³ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 27 and 30 October 1787; *London Chronicle*, 13–15 November 1787; *World and Fashionable Advertiser* (London), 5 November 1787; *Saunders's News-Letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 05 and 06 November 1787.

⁴⁴ *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 07 November 1787.

⁴⁵ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 1 November 1787; *Walker's Hibernian Magazine, or Compendium of Entertaining Knowledge* (1787), 561; Cressy, 426–27.

⁴⁶ George III to William Pitt, 29 October 1787, *Later Correspondence of George III*, 1: no. 410.

England. When he fell ill however, Colonel Pouchen, Rutland's steward, was ordered to escort the corpse home instead.⁴⁷

The disparity between the political establishment's limited response and hasty pause in activities and the freedom with which the press and private businesses decided upon and implemented their own reactions to Rutland's death, was acute. While the latter could do as they liked, the Dublin Castle administration was frozen by some uncomfortable political realities. A statute dating to the reign of Henry VIII did allow the Irish Privy Council to appoint interim Lord Justices upon the death of the Chief Governor and had been used after Capel's death in 1696, but only in the face of considerable disagreement amongst Irish politicians as to its validity.⁴⁸ It was perhaps for this reason and to avoid offending England and upsetting the delicate balance of the Anglo-Irish relationship, that it was not invoked in 1787. In addition a new viceroy could not be chosen by anyone but the British government, leaving the Irish political system in limbo and emphasising the fact that despite being a kingdom in its own right and having gained legislative independence, Ireland remained politically subservient to England.⁴⁹

The differences between the capacity and willingness of the political and the public spheres to act continued as attention turned to the possibility of a funeral procession. Once again the press led the way with local newspapers calling for a procession as early as 27 October. The administration was unable to commit to it though until the Lord Justices were in place, with Speaker Foster put in charge of the arrangements.⁵⁰ It was only on 6 November (by which time a boat dispatched from England to take Rutland's corpse home had arrived in Dublin Bay), that the Board of Works issued orders to prepare the Great Committee Room in

⁴⁷ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 27 October and 1 November 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 7 November 1787; *Dublin Journal*, 01–03 November 1787.

⁴⁸ McGrath, 51–52; *Dublin Journal*, 25–27 October 1787.

⁴⁹ For a discussion of the legal limitations of the 1782 constitution, see Connolly, 420–22, 486–87.

⁵⁰ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 27 October and 20 November 1787.

the House of Lords for the Duke's lying in state.⁵¹ Fifteen hundred yards of black baize was purchased to drape several rooms in the building with another 300 yards of 'superfine black cloth' acquired to hang in the Great Chamber itself.⁵² When the preparations were complete the viceroy was placed in a final coffin on 12 November before leaving Phoenix Park for the last time.⁵³ Known as the state coffin, it too was made of mahogany 'and superbly decorated with ornaments beautifully chased and gilt'. On its lid was a breast plate 'in the form of a heart, encircled with a border of oak leaves, also chased and gilt' and bearing an inscription listing Rutland's titles and offices along with the dates of his birth and death.⁵⁴ The effort put into creating this coffin is one indication of the affection in which Rutland was held by the Irish, however it also suggests another reason for the elaborate farewell they provided, a desire to show off to the English. Historians have long been aware that funerals were used by individuals and families to indicate their social status but in Rutland's case the reputation and pride of an entire country came under scrutiny, raising the stakes and by extension the corresponding fuss and expenditure.⁵⁵ With the addition of the state coffin he now reposed in four caskets (one more than was given to George II in 1760) and a correspondent from Dublin bragged that the outermost of these would 'exhibit the skill of our Irish artists in a conspicuous point of view' for 'a handsomer mortuary has not entered the dreary mansion of departed greatness in this kingdom for many a year'.⁵⁶ The English may have been less impressed when the time came to transport this 'mortuary' for burial. The state coffin was eight feet, two inches long and together with its contents weighed a staggering 1700 lbs. Even

⁵¹ *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 7 November 1787; *Public Advertiser* (London), 14 November 1787; *London Chronicle*, 15–17 November 1787.

⁵² *Public Advertiser* (London), 14 November 1787.

⁵³ *St James's Chronicle or the British Evening Post* (London), 17–20 November 1787.

⁵⁴ *Walker's Hibernian Magazine* (1787), 561. For other descriptions of the coffin see *Dublin Journal*, 13–15 November 1787; *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, 16 November 1787.

⁵⁵ Cressy, 449–54; Susan Vincent, *Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Berg, 2003), 62, 68; Pirohakul, 69, 72; Peter Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660–1730* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Methuen, 1989), 311–14; Walsh, 115–27. *Saunders's News-Letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 12 November 1787.

⁵⁶ *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer*, 04–06 November 1760; *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, 16 November 1787.

with the help of a purpose-built, reinforced ‘state hearse’ sent from Ireland, those charged with shifting Rutland’s remains struggled with their task.⁵⁷

At 3 A.M. on 13 November Rutland was quietly conveyed to the House of Lords for his lying in state. The *Freeman’s Journal* described it as follows:

The body rests upon an elevated platform, at the South end of the Great Committee-room of the House of Lords; at the head of the coffin is an elegant coronet, which rests upon a cushion; on each side stand six mutes, and six stands, each containing five wax tapers.

Over the body is erected an elegant canopy, supported by four pillars, on the top of which are placed five black plumes, the whole of the canopy being covered with black cloth; on each side of the upper part hang four escutcheons of his Grace’s arms, and at the foot two; also the like number hang at the lower part of the canopy.

The great vestibule [*sic*] fronting College Green, the robing-room, and the passage laid out to College Green, are all hung with black, decorated with escutcheons, and lighted with wax.

Upon each wall of the Committee-room hangs a large escutcheon of his Grace’s arms, painted upon a shield proper; and in the robing-room hang also the same of a small size, all round which room are placed two tiers of wax tapers.

Every exertion has been put in motion to render the whole of this melancholy exhibition as magnificently awful [*sic*] as possible, which has been crowned with success.⁵⁸

A railed passageway was set up and members of the public were allowed to file past this ‘exhibition’ to pay their respects between the hours of 10 A.M. and 4 P.M., and 6 P.M. and 10

⁵⁷ *London Chronicle*, 29 November–1 December 1787. For a discussion of contemporary coffin design, see Harold Mytum, ‘Artefacts of Mortuary Practice: Industrialisation, Choice and the Individual,’ in *The Importance of British Material Culture to Historical Archaeology*, ed. Alasdair Brooks (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2016): 274–304.

⁵⁸ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 15 November 1787. See also Sir Boyle Roche to Scrope Bernard, 17 November 1787, PRONI, Papers of Scrope Bernard, T2627/6/4/14. The arrangements may be seen in a print published in *Walker’s Hibernian Magazine*, (1787), 561.

P.M., during which time an additional two aides de camp and two gentlemen of the bedchamber stood guard. Viewers were required to be ‘decently dressed’ (a stipulation presumably designed to deter the poorest and create a suitably impressive and sombre tone) but no entrance fee was charged and the event was remarkable for its social inclusivity, welcoming those of ‘all descriptions’.⁵⁹

Given his aristocratic rank, the fact that Rutland lay in state and that his coffin was available for public viewings was not unusual, nor was it a uniquely Irish practice. The tradition of watching over the dead before burial was centuries old and only the year before the Duke of Northumberland was laid out and viewed by the public in Northumberland House in a room which was similarly decorated to that in which Rutland lay.⁶⁰ What marked out the viceroy’s case as something special was the venue. His official residence in Ireland was Dublin Castle and early reports suggested that this was where he would be brought, as Lady Townshend had been seventeen years earlier.⁶¹ In England, the House of Lords was generally reserved for royalty and the use of the Irish equivalent sent the clearest sign yet that Rutland was being treated like a king.⁶² Also unusual was the length of time the body remained *in situ*, a full four days. While only three had originally been planned (conditions on the river in Dublin forced the funeral to be slightly delayed) even seventy-two hours would have been abnormally long, for royals (including monarchs) were granted just one day.⁶³ As mentioned, the ship destined to take the body back to England had arrived in Dublin in the first week of November and the length of time Rutland’s body remained at Phoenix Lodge indicates that he was not transferred to the House of Lords until the

⁵⁹ *Walker’s Hibernian Magazine*, (1787), 561. First quote from *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 13 November 1787. Second quote from *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 27 November 1787.

⁶⁰ Cressy, 427–28; *Morning Herald* (London), 20 June 1786.

⁶¹ *Dublin Evening Post*, 25 October 1787; *Bingley’s Weekly Journal Or the Universal Gazette* (London), 22 September 1770.

⁶² *General Advertiser* (London), 4 November 1786; *Morning Herald* (London), 6 November 1786; *General Evening Post* (London), 9–11 November 1786.

⁶³ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 13 November 1787; *Dublin Evening Post*, 10 November 1787.

arrangements for his funeral were complete. This suggests that a lengthy lying in state was a deliberate choice, made to ensure that the maximum number of people could see and admire the spectacle and to emphasise the political and social importance of the viceroyalty by showing it greater respect than was accorded even to royalty. There remained some lines which were not crossed however and the coffin was draped in the crimson of nobility, not the purple of monarchy.⁶⁴

The task of organising the funeral procession was immense but there were precedents to guide the way. The details of royal funerals had been well publicised over the years in newspaper reports, while state funerals were an unusual but not unheard of practice in Ireland. Lord Justice Richard Ingoldsby was accorded such an honour in 1712 for instance, as was General Thomas Pearce, head of the King's forces in Ireland, in 1739. There had also been an ostentatious funeral in 1729 for William Conolly, former Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, a procession for Lady Townshend in 1770, and a large military funeral for Lieutenant Colonel Edward Hawke in October 1773.⁶⁵ In organising Rutland's funeral, Foster showed an awareness of all of these examples. The result was a seamless blend of English and Irish, regal and military and it offered something for the most patriotic Irish, as well as Anglophiles.

The procession took place on 17 November and according to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 'exceeded every thing of the kind ever exhibited in this country'.⁶⁶ Interest amongst the press and general public was intense and Foster may have felt under pressure to arrange a spectacular show which would outshine anything seen in England in recent years. In the days beforehand newspapers produced detailed descriptions of who would participate

⁶⁴ Sir Boyle Roche to Scrope Bernard, 17 November 1787, PRONI, Papers of Scrope Bernard, T2627/6/4/14.

⁶⁵ *The Form of the Proceeding to the Funeral of Lieutenant General Ingoldsby ...* (Dublin, Francis Dickson, 1712); J. T. Gilbert, *History of the City of Dublin*, vol. 1 (Dublin: James Duffy, 1854), 126–27; *Oxford DNB* (Ingoldsby, Richard (1664/5–1712)); *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 31 January 1739; Walsh, 115–27; *Middlesex Journal or Chronicle of Liberty*, 22–25 September 1770; *Universal Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure* (1773), 272.

⁶⁶ *Gentleman's Magazine* (1787), 1016.

and in what order they would proceed and unusually an official order was published (from which the descriptions of the procession presented here are drawn, unless otherwise stated).⁶⁷ Incorporating both land and water elements, the streets along which it was to pass were closed to all other traffic from 9 A.M. and the bulk of the official participants were required to assemble at Mansion House on Dawson Street an hour earlier.⁶⁸ Public business was suspended for the day and the procession was scheduled to begin at 10 A.M., though some sources reported that it was 11 A.M. or even noon before it got underway.⁶⁹ This decision conflicted with English practices where funerals, particularly those of royalty, had been predominantly night-time affairs since the early seventeenth century and continued to be so throughout the eighteenth.⁷⁰ In Ireland however there was a greater tradition of holding state funerals during daylight hours. General Ingoldsby's began at 1 P.M. and the body of Lieutenant Colonel Hawke reached Christ Church Cathedral at 3 P.M. indicating a considerably earlier start time. Similarly Lady Townshend's procession began in the morning, allowing her body to be transferred from land to sea before nightfall, something which must have been a concern in November 1787 too, for sunset was at 4 P.M.⁷¹ Daylight funerals also encouraged the attendance of the populace by making it easier to see and fully appreciate the splendour of the occasion and at Rutland's procession 'the multitude of spectators was innumerable'.⁷²

⁶⁷ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 13 November 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 14 November 1787; *The Order of the Procession which is to Attend the Remains of the Late Duke of Rutland, Late Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland, to the Water Side, 1787*, PRONI, Bury/Charleville Papers, T3069/O/4. Searches produced only one other such order, that for General Ingoldsby. *Form of the Proceeding to the Funeral of Lieutenant General Ingoldsby*. For other descriptions of the funeral see *Saunders's News-letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 19 November 1787; *Belfast Newsletter*, 16–20 November 1787; *Dublin Journal*, 17–20 November 1787.

⁶⁸ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 13 and 15 November 1787.

⁶⁹ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 13 November 1787; *London Gazette*, 20 November 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 24 November 1787; *Universal Magazine* (1787), 276; *Walker's Hibernian Magazine* (1787), 561.

⁷⁰ Houlbrooke, *Death, Religion and the Family*, 272, 274; Pirohakul, 82; Range, 111, 115, 136, 156, 195.

⁷¹ Gilbert, 1: 126; *Universal Magazine* (1787), 272; *Middlesex Journal or Chronicle of Liberty*, 22–25 September 1770; 'Time and Date,' accessed 7 May 2017, <https://www.timeanddate.com/>.

⁷² *Saunders's News-letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 19 November 1787.

Leaving from the House of Lords, the cortege first passed down Grafton Street, then Nassau Street, Dawson Street, round the edge of St Stephen's Green and onto King Street, William Street, Church Lane, Dame Street, and Parliament Street. From there it crossed Essex Bridge to Capel Street and carried on through Mary Street, Henry Street, Sackville Street, Summer Hill, and Circular Road before coming to the platform on the North Wall. At its head was an extensive military escort including artillery, the Battalion Companies of five separate regiments (all with their own drums and fifes and their arms reversed to indicate a military funeral), five further companies of grenadiers (again with arms reversed), and an assortment of high level army and naval officials, many on horseback.⁷³ The provision of such military honours at state and royal funerals was not unusual in itself, but the sheer number of personnel involved made Rutland's case exceptional. This may have been intended as a mark of respect, more likely it was designed to increase the grandiose nature of the procession, the rest of which was equally ostentatious.⁷⁴

Following the escort were a large number of state officials, members of the viceregal household, and mourning horses led by grooms, equerries and army Captains. One such Captain carried 'The Standard on a Lance, with the Order of the Garter', followed immediately by a mourning horse 'covered with black Cloth, caparisoned with his Grace's Arms, surrounded with the Order of the Garter with Plumes before and behind'. Soon after came another Captain carrying 'The Standard, with the Order of Saint Patrick on a Lance' and a little later the officers of the Order of St Patrick themselves. The presence of both Orders was appropriate given that Rutland had been a Knight of the Garter and Grand Master of the Order of St Patrick, however they also mirrored the participation of the Knights of the

⁷³ On the rules governing military funerals, including the use of reversed arms, see *Rules and Regulations for the Manual and Platoon Exercises, Formations, Field-Exercise and Movements of His Majesty's Forces ...* (London: War Office, 1807), 121–24.

⁷⁴ For other military funerals, see *Form of the Proceeding to the Funeral of Lieutenant General Ingoldsby*; *London Daily Post and General Advertiser*, 31 January 1739; *Middlesex Journal or Chronicle of Liberty*, 22–25 September 1770.

Garter, Thistle, and Bath in the funerals of monarchs and consorts.⁷⁵ Numerous mourners in black cloaks, hatbands, gloves, and scarves increased the numbers further, the scarves having been made using several thousand yards of fine Irish linen bought by the Board of Works at the same time as the cloth for draping the House of Lords. Sources differ as to how many were produced, but figures range from 5,000 to 6,000 and they were distributed as part of an Irish custom which dated back to at least the funerals of Colonel George Goves and William Conolly in the 1720s.⁷⁶

Closer to the body was the 'Master of his Majesty's Riding Horse' and a gentleman usher 'carrying the Coronet on a Crimson Velvet Cushion', while around the coffin were twenty-four 'Yeoman of the Guards with Escutcheons on their Halberts', several aides de camp, and two pages. Immediately following were representations of the Duke's lineage, his riderless Horse of State, a mourning chariot, the Lord Justices (who served as chief mourners) and their entourages. Next came the peers of the realm in order of precedence, further members of the military and the household, Privy councillors, judges, MPs, and a huge number of civil and religious officials. At the rear were the 'Masters and Wardens of the several Corporations', the 'establishment of the Royal Hospital', and a squadron of horse. The noise throughout the day must have been considerable for mixed throughout the procession was an array of drums and trumpets, the 'Bands of Musick of the several Regiments', and choirs next to the body singing a funeral dirge. Elsewhere in the city, muffled church bells rang dead peals and in Phoenix Park minute guns were fired from 6 A.M.

⁷⁵ On the appearance of Knights of the various orders at the funerals of Queen Caroline and George II, see *London Gazette*, 20–24 December 1737; *London Chronicle*, 8–11 November 1760.

⁷⁶ *Public Advertiser* (London), 14 November 1787; *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 8 November 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 10 November 1787; Walsh, 119.

until the procession ended.⁷⁷ Finally, for security and in order ‘to preserve order and decorum’ there were ‘both civil and military guards’ on every street corner along the route.⁷⁸

Altogether, Rutland’s cortege stretched for over three miles.⁷⁹ This was incredibly long, particularly given the time of year and the uncertainty of the weather. Ingoldsby’s procession encompassed only nine streets and in England it was common for royal processions to be so brief that the entire route could be floored, railed in, and topped by a roof or a canopy, as had been done for Queen Caroline in December 1737 and George II in November 1760. These processions preceded church services and interments though, during which lengthy marches through Westminster Abbey created additional opportunities to witness and participate in the funeral. In Dublin those not conveying the body to England had no such ceremonies to view or contribute to, making the procession of far greater interest and importance.⁸⁰ The absence of an indoor service also accounts for the presence of the choirs on Dublin’s streets who would otherwise have met the body upon its arrival at church.⁸¹

Upon reaching the waterside the coffin was received with military honours then hoisted onto a barge using a specially constructed crane as Handel’s ‘Dead March’ from *Saul* (1739) was played by the assembled bands.⁸² Once the body was on the barge three volleys were fired by the troops of the garrison (another military touch, usually done after the funeral service) and the naval portion of the day began.⁸³ This was managed by Sir Alexander Schomberg, Commander of the *Dorset*, the ship charged with conveying the remains back to England and was taken just as seriously as the land procession.⁸⁴ The barge, its oars and even its tug boats were painted black and the former ‘ornamented with various escutcheons of his

⁷⁷ *The Order of the Procession which is to Attend the Remains of the Late Duke of Rutland, Late Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland, to the Water Side, 1787*, PRONI, Bury/Charleville Papers, T3069/O/4; *World and Fashionable Advertiser* (London), 26 November 1787.

⁷⁸ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 15 November 1787.

⁷⁹ *Finn’s Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 24 November 1787.

⁸⁰ Gilbert, 1: 126; Range, 157–59, 180; *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer*, 4–6 November 1760.

⁸¹ Range, 114, 118; Gilbert, 1: 127; *Universal Magazine* (1787), 272.

⁸² *Finn’s Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 21 November 1787; *London Gazette*, 20–24 November 1787.

⁸³ *London Chronicle*, 22–24 November 1787; *Rules and Regulations*, 124.

⁸⁴ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 17 November 1787.

Grace's arms'. The sailors on each of the boats were dressed in white with black arm and hat bands made of crepe and black scarves, and the body was placed 'under a canopy, covered with Black Cloth, ornamented with various Banners and Escutcheons'.⁸⁵ The short route from the waterside to the *Dorset* was lined with other boats and once the coffin had been transferred to the yacht at about 5 P.M. it was placed in the state apartments on-board. These too had been draped in black and decorated 'with banners, escutcheons and arms of our late Viceroy'.⁸⁶ Throughout this process minute guns were fired from the North Wall, the ships on the river flew their flags at half-mast and the *Dorset* and its escort boat, the *Perseus* frigate, fired minute guns from the moment the barge came into view of the yacht until the body was on-board.⁸⁷ The provision of the *Perseus*, a Man of War ship, to escort Rutland back to England was a source of great pride for the local press. The *Freeman's Journal* called it a 'distinguished mark of respect heretofore shewn only to vessels where illustrious personages of the blood royal are aboard' and boasted that 'never perhaps were more distinguished honours paid to any deceased Nobleman in these kingdoms than to our late Viceroy'.⁸⁸ To them the use of the *Perseus* was a sign that the prestige of the viceroy and by extension Ireland, was being recognised by the British establishment and that the two countries were now equal. Whether this was actually the intent behind the gesture remains to be seen. Once the remains were on the *Dorset*, the crew 'hoisted a jack at her fore-top-mast-head, and fired two stern chase guns', signalling to the artillery on the North Wall that they could stop firing and return to their barracks. Then, after a slight delay caused by the tides, they set sail for Parkgate the following day. From there Rutland was taken to Bottesford where he was finally laid to rest on 25 November.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ *London Gazette*, 20–24 November 1787.

⁸⁶ *London Chronicle*, 22–24 November 1787.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; *London Gazette*, 20–24 November 1787.

⁸⁸ *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 17 November 1787.

⁸⁹ *London Chronicle*, 22–24 November 1787 and 29 November–1 December 1787; *Dublin Journal*, 20–22 November 1787. Quote from *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser*, 1 December 1787.

Reflecting on the procession contemporaries agreed that the entire operation had gone remarkably smoothly. Sir Boyle Roche (who was stuck at home with gout, but who later received a blow by blow account of the day from his wife) complained that the decision of the officers of the viceregal household to travel in carriages rather than riding or walking, meant that the procession would make ‘a better figure in the newspaper than it did in reality’. Yet he remained satisfied with the overall result, calling it a ‘magnificent and [woeful?] sight – and better conducted than was expected in a country where the management of pompous procession is little understood’.⁹⁰ John Fitzgibbon wrote that he had never attended ‘a ceremony so awful [*sic*] and affecting’. He was pleased though, that while thousands had attended the route, there were no disturbances, only ‘the most profound and melancholy silence’ (presumably he was not counting the din from the drums, bands, and choirs).⁹¹ Sackville Hamilton, who was the Under Secretary at Dublin Castle, echoed Roche’s sentiment that the whole affair had gone off unexpectedly well, but what made him happier still was that ‘particular care was taken to prevent imposition and to keep the expense within proper bounds’, as the new viceroy had directed.⁹²

The exact cost of Rutland’s funeral is unavailable, however a payment of £6363 6s. 7½d. was made to John Cooper, a clerk from the Treasury Office in Dublin Castle, on 10 January 1788 ‘to be by him applied in defraying the several Expenses attending the Funeral of the Late Duke of Rutland’.⁹³ In addition £105 16s. 5d. was paid to Alexander Schomberg ‘for his trouble and Expense’ in transporting Rutland’s body to Parkgate, making a total of £6469 3s. ½d.⁹⁴ It is unknown precisely how most of this money was spent but given the amount involved it is reasonable to assume that it paid for the procession and perhaps the

⁹⁰ Sir Boyle Roche to Scrope Bernard, 17 November 1787, PRONI, Scrope Bernard Papers, T2627/6/4/14.

⁹¹ John Fitzgibbon to William Eden, 18 November 1787, PRONI, Sneyd Papers, T3229/1/6.

⁹² Sackville Hamilton to Scrope Bernard, 19 November 1787, PRONI, Scrope Bernard Papers, T2627/6/3/3.

⁹³ *Journals of the House of Commons, of the Kingdom of Ireland, From the Eighteenth Day of May, 1613 [–1794]*, vol. 26 (1789), 176. Though the warrant was not issued until 10 January, the money was ordered to be paid to Cooper by a letter from the King on 15 December.

⁹⁴ *Journals of the House of Commons, of the Kingdom of Ireland*, vol. 25 (1788), 284.

expenses incurred in embalming the body, transporting it to the House of Lords, the lying in state, and even the £250 spent on the first three coffins and the extra cost of the state coffin. Contextualising this sum is challenging given the lack of a church ceremony or interment in Ireland but it was a vast amount. Aristocratic funerals were generally decreasing in cost during the eighteenth century with one recent study showing a mean price in England of just £108.⁹⁵ Once again it is royalty which provides a more satisfactory point of comparison. Upon Prince Frederick's death in 1751 'tradesmen's bills for the basic furnishings of the funeral' came to £2396 5s. 4½d., with £1213 7s. 3d. spent in 1757 for Princess Caroline, £2946 7s. 7d. for George II in 1760, and £1280 8s. 11d. for the dowager Princess of Wales in 1772. These sums seem low next to what was spent on Rutland, however total costs for Frederick's funeral ceremony, including mourning apparel, came to a more impressive £16,500 and the effect of inflation over the course of several decades must be taken into account.⁹⁶ Hamilton's idea of 'proper bounds' is therefore very interesting. The funeral cost roughly a third of the entire annual salary for the Lord Lieutenant at this time (which was £20,000 Irish, or around £18,500 British) and no doubt many would have considered it the height of extravagance, but to Hamilton's mind it was no less than was suitable for the occasion.⁹⁷ If there were any doubts that the event was intended to outshine anything seen in Britain, they were dispelled by the *Saunders News-letter* two days after the event. Rutland's funeral it wrote, 'was the grandest pageant of the kind ever seen in the British empire' and (they believed), so much more impressive than regal funerals in England that 'an attested copy of its order and ceremonial is now preparing in our College of Arms, to be transmitted

⁹⁵ Pirohakul, 62. For some examples of funeral expenditure lower down the social ladder in eighteenth-century Ireland, see Barnard, 264–66.

⁹⁶ Eagles, 359–60.

⁹⁷ K. Theodore Hoppen, *Governing Hibernia: British Politicians and Ireland, 1800–1921* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016): 44–45. This salary was still not enough to cover expenditure and viceroys regularly had to dip into their personal fortunes to make ends meet.

to the office of Garter King of Arms in London, as a correct precedent for such mournful occasions.’⁹⁸

A sense of competition with England and the genuine affection for Rutland already discussed were not the only factors which shaped the response of the Irish to the Lord Lieutenant’s death. Both Irish and English commentators had long treated viceregal families as surrogate royalty, often referring to viceroys and their wives as Kings and Queens of Ireland and this continued after the Duke’s death with newspapers calling the period before Buckingham’s appointment an ‘interregnum’ as they mulled over who would ‘succeed’.⁹⁹ This conflation of royalty and viceregency could likewise be seen in the physical trappings of the Lord Lieutenancy and even English newspapers noted that ‘In point of state splendour, real power and dignity, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland comes nearer to the grandeur and majesty of a King, than any Vice-Roy in the universe’.¹⁰⁰ When viewed through this lens the extravagance of the viceregal funeral therefore becomes a dramatic, but perfectly logical extension of long-standing precedents.

There was also political hay to be made from Rutland’s almost-royal funeral. Those in favour of the British regime in Ireland argued that what was done to glorify Ireland’s proxy-king glorified the real one by association, ‘evinced their loyalty and affection to the best of Sovereigns, by this testimony of their high respect for his illustrious Representative’.¹⁰¹ The *Dublin Journal* even argued that it was a matter of national security that no ruler be sent quietly to the grave ‘lest the order of subordination in the various classes of the people should be deranged, and respect for the ruling power changed to contempt, or at best dwindled into

⁹⁸ *Saunders’s News-letter and Daily Advertiser* (Dublin), 19 November 1787.

⁹⁹ Jonathan Swift to Lady Worsley, 19 August 1730 in *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D. D.*, ed. David Woolley, vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 304; Baron Hervey to Stephen Fox, 14 August 1731 in *Lord Hervey and his Friends 1726–38*, ed. the Earl of Ilchester (London: John Murray, 1950), 76; *Finn’s Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 31 October and 7 November 1787; *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 27 October 1787.

¹⁰⁰ *London Packet or New Lloyd’s Evening Post*, 26–29 October 1787.

¹⁰¹ *Freeman’s Journal* (Dublin), 20 November 1787.

indifference'.¹⁰² Conversely, the repeated uses of royal symbolism could be seen as another attempt by those opposed to continued British rule to reinforce the idea of parity between two separate kingdoms. This would help to explain the decision taken by some newspapers in the days after the viceroy's death to downplay down his Englishness and instead claim him as an Irishman, providing exhaustive accounts of his lineage which showed his descent from King Diarmud McMurchad of Leinster who had died in 1171 and later gained the dubious reputation of being 'the instigator of English involvement in Ireland', having requested help from Henry II to recover his Irish lands in 1166.¹⁰³ Under normal circumstances he would have been an embarrassing ancestor for a viceroy to have. In Rutland's case however, even such tenuous claims to Irish heritage were valuable, allowing him to be depicted him as an Irish prince entitled in his own right to the royal treatment he was receiving and serving as a subtle reminder of a time when Ireland had been independent of English control and a hint that it could be again.

Ultimately, Rutland's death and its aftermath had highlighted one of the underlying problems in the Anglo-Irish relationship of the 1780s; after the legislative changes of 1782 and before the Union of 1801 many in the Irish press and commercial spheres believed the country to have greater political freedom from and equality with Britain than was actually the case. Initially this led to a disconnect between their reactions to Charles's passing and those of the political establishment, with the former exhibiting signs of state mourning immediately and the latter settling for a more restrained response until contact had been made with England. Eventually those calling for the grandest and most sophisticated of send offs were granted their wish, yet the unmistakably regal manner in which Rutland's body, lying in state and funeral procession were managed met with conflicting interpretations. For some,

¹⁰² *Dublin Journal*, 30 October–01 November 1787.

¹⁰³ *Dublin Evening Post*, 25 October 1787; *Freeman's Journal* (Dublin), 25 October 1787; *Finn's Leinster Journal* (Kilkenny), 27 October 1787. Quote from *Oxford DNB* (Mac Murchada, Diarmait (Dermot MacMurrough; called Diarmait na nGall] (c.1110–1171)).

they were an exercise in Irish national pride and competitiveness with England. For others they represented a chance to reiterate their loyalty to Britain. What was beyond dispute though was the widespread affection in which Rutland was held, nor did this fade once his remains had been sent to England. With no grave available, the Irish could not place a funerary monument at the site of his burial, but as a final gesture of respect a fountain originally planned by the Duke himself was erected in Merrion Square in Dublin in 1791 bearing reliefs of Charles and his Duchess and dedicated to his memory.¹⁰⁴ Though now in poor condition and no longer functioning, it remains in place to this day, a lasting reminder of the extraordinary events which unfolded in 1787 when Ireland lost its viceroy.

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Drew, 'The Stolen Fountain and Rutland Monument of Merrion Square, Dublin,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 5th ser., 7, no. 2 (1897), 179–81.