



QUEEN ELIZABETH'S PROCESSION TO BLACKFRIARS.

From a painting at Sherborne, Dorset: reproduced by permission of Wingfield Digby, Esq. and the Editor of *Country Life*.

A PROCESSION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH
TO BLACKFRIARS.

By the VISCOUNT DILLON, M.A. D.C.L. F.S.A.

In 1866 the late Sir George Scharf contributed to the *Archaeological Journal* a paper on the subject of two pictures supposed to be identical and purporting to represent the royal procession of queen Elizabeth to visit the right honourable Henry Carey lord Hunsdon, and others.¹

Sir George's paper referred to the picture shown at Manchester by lord Digby's permission in 1857, and also seen in the Tudor exhibition of 1890 (plate 1). The paper proved that Virtue's description of this picture was erroneous, and that in fact the subject was the attendance of the queen at the marriage in 1600 of Anne Russell, one of her maids of honour to lord Herbert, son of the earl of Worcester.²

The change of date from about 1571 to 1600 naturally greatly disturbed the attributions of many of the portraits assigned by Virtue, for twenty-nine years makes many changes. Sir George then gave the following as the names of the men (from left to right) : lord Howard of Walden, the earl of Nottingham, the earl of Cumberland, lord Hunsdon, lord Cobham, lord Herbert of Cardiff, the earl of Worcester, Sir Walter Raleigh, lord Herbert, and the bridegroom. As to the ladies Sir George did not venture on more than two or three suggestions, such as lady Cobham, and the countess of Nottingham.

¹ *Archaeol. Journ.* xxiii, 131.

² This marriage had been arranged with the queen's approval in April.

It may seem presumptuous to question the accuracy of so great an authority on portraiture as our old friend and Fellow Sir George Scharf, but since his death in 1892, part X of the *Calendar of the Hatfield Papers* was published in 1904, and in that volume we have information which suggests some variation from his list. There is also a letter of 24th June, 1600, printed in the Camden Society's Chamberlain letters, which apparently escaped his notice, although he refers to an earlier one of 13th June in the same volume.

As regards the Hatfield papers, in a letter written by lady Russell to Sir Robert Cecil on 21st April, she asks him to get the queen to let her fetch Anne away for altogether the Monday after St. George's day 'that she may take physic for her eyes, which in truth be very ill, before the time of her marriage, which I mean shall be before the Pentecost' (11th June). Lady Russell also asks that 'the bonds of matrimony be asked in her majesty's chapel.' 'And therefore good Mr. Secretary let her be asked by your commandment the next Sunday in any wise.'

There is another letter at Hatfield calendared as of about 9th June, containing many details as to the wedding, which was to take place and did take place on 16th June.

Lady Russell says: 'I mean God willing on the 9th June, being Monday next, to fetch home my bride. I entreat none but such as be of the bride's and bridegroom's blood and alliance to supper that night. The earl of Worcester with his countess, the earl of Cumberland with his lady, the lady of Warwick, the earl of Bedford with his lady will sup here. If it please you to do the like and as my husband to command as the master of my house for that supper and to bring my lord Thomas and my lord Cobham with you, being of our blood, and your servants (and) lord Thomas' men and my lord Cobham, to be commanded to wait and bring up meat that supper, I will trouble you no longer than for a supper time that night till the same day sevensnight, being the 16th of June, which God willing shall be the marriage day. . . . I and my lord Barkley's wife, with other knights' ladies and gentlewomen, accompanied with the earl of Cumberland, Sir Henry Lee, Sir



NO. I. PORTRAIT OF SIR HENRY LEE, K.G. AT DITCHLEY, OXON.

To face page 70.



NO. 2. THE EARL OF NOTTINGHAM, K.G. AT
HAMPTON COURT.

PLATE II.

Anthony Cope and others do mean to go on Monday morning to fetch away my virgins. You thought that I should never have bidden you to my marriage. But now you see it pleases God otherwise. Where [sic] I pray you dispose yourself to be very merry and to command as master of the house. For your welcome shall be in the superlative degree. Your most loving Aunt.'

The next letter in point of date is that of 13th June, from John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, in which he says: 'We shall have the great marriage on Monday at the lady Russells where it is saide the quene will vouchsafe her presence, and lie at the lord chamberlain's or the lord Cobham's whose marriage is thought likewise shalbe then consummated if it be not don alreedy.'¹

Again on 24th June Chamberlain writes: 'I doubt not but you have heard of the great marriage at the lady Russells where the quene was present, being caried from the waterside in a curious chaire and lodged at the lord Cobham's.'

One more letter may be quoted from the Hatfield papers. It is of 8th December, 1600, and lady Russell writes to Sir Robert Cecil: 'I would come by boat and visit you, only to see how you do, though my heart will not yet serve me to come to court, to fill place. I there [sic] shall come in with tears by remembrances of her that is gone....² PS. I am such a beggar in debt since the marriage of my daughter your cousin, as I am not able to keep coach-horses in town nor to hire any, and therefore mean to come by water. You must not blame my beggary, for then you shall mar my marriage for ever.'

Before considering the persons referred to in the foregoing letters, it may be interesting to note those mentioned by contemporary writers as present at the wedding. Rowland Whyte, writing on 23rd June to Sir Robert

¹ As a matter of fact lord Cobham's marriage did not take place till the 27th May, 1601, when he was contracted in marriage to Frances the daughter of the earl of Nottingham and widow of Henry earl of Kildare.

² This was a daughter Elizabeth who, like Anne, had been maid of honour to the queen, and in March, 1599, lady Russell refers to 'Bess's almost six years' service.' Elizabeth Russell died 2nd July, 1600.

Sidney, enumerates lord Herbert and his wife (the bride and bridegroom); lord Cobham 'who provided the lectica, made like a litter, for the queen'; lady Russell, the bride's mother; lord Herbert of Cardiff, who with lord Cobham led the bride to the church; and the earls of Rutland and Cumberland, who led her from the church. Then in a letter of 14th June by the same writer, the following 'ladies who danced, my lady Doritye, Mrs. Fetton, Mrs. Carey, Mrs. Onslow, Mrs. Southwell, Mrs. Bess Russell, Mrs. Darcy, my lady Blanche Somerset.'

John Chamberlain, in his letter of 13th June to Dudley Carleton, mentions lady Russell, lord Hunsdon, and lord Cobham (where the queen was lodged).

Of the men named by lady Russell the following notes will explain their presence at the wedding.

Edward fourth earl of Worcester¹ was father of lord Herbert, the bridegroom, later fifth earl, and of lord Thomas, later lord Somerset of Cassell. George earl of Cumberland² had been in the guardianship of Francis second earl of Bedford, whose daughter, lady Margaret, he married. Edward third earl of Bedford was nephew of the dowager lady Russell, and married Lucy, daughter of John lord Harrington of Exton.

Sir Robert Cecil, later lord Salisbury, was nephew of the dowager lady Russell, his wife Elizabeth being sister to lord Cobham, the host of the queen and of the wedding party.

Sir Henry Lee,³ through the Cookes of Gidea hall, was second cousin once removed to the dowager lady Russell. Sir Anthony Cope, beyond being a great friend of Sir Henry Lee and of the dowager, was no relation.

Of the ladies named by the dowager, the countesses of Bedford and of Cumberland were respectively niece of the dowager and aunt of the bride. The lady of Warwick, widow of Ambrose Dudley earl of Warwick, was sister of the dowager. Lady Berkeley was Elizabeth Stanhope, dowager lady Townshend and aunt of Sir John Townshend

¹ K.G. 1593.

² K.G. 1592.

³ K.G. 1597.

who had married Anne, granddaughter of lady Bacon, sister of the dowager lady Russell. This was a far-off and complicated relationship.

Miss Bess Russell, one of the lady dancers at the wedding, was Elizabeth Russell, sister of the bride. She died 2nd July in the same year, and is 'her that is gone' in lady Russell's letter of 8th December, 1600.

The company actually present has now been disposed of, and it is only necessary to refer to the persons suggested by Sir George Scharf. The earl of Nottingham, as we have shown, is not mentioned by any contemporary authority, nor were Sir Walter Raleigh nor Camden the historian. Lord Hunsdon as lord chamberlain may have been present officially, and lord Herbert of Cardiff, who, according to Rowland Whyte, led the bride from the church, was no relation on either side. The earl of Rutland also was only connected by the fact that his aunt, lady Elizabeth Manners, married Sir William Cecil, later earl of Exeter.

The chief difficulty now is to account for the six knights of the Garter seen in the picture, and it is suggested that in place of the earl of Nottingham we should place Sir Henry Lee, K.G. In 1600 he was 69 years of age, while the earl was 64. In support of this idea we may compare a portrait of Sir Henry Lee in 1602, now at Ditchley, Oxon. (plate II, no. 1) and the figure of the earl as seen in the picture at Sherborne.

As to the six knights of the Garter seen in the picture, George earl of Cumberland received the order in 1592; the earl of Worcester in 1593; lord Hunsdon in 1597, the same year as did Sir Henry Lee; lord Cobham in 1599. This accounts for five, and if we may suppose that the picture was painted somewhat later than the event recorded (not as Virtue wrongly stated about 1580), we have Sir Robert Cecil, later earl of Salisbury and knight of the Garter in 1605.

By the courtesy of Mr. Wingfield Digby, and the kind assistance of the editor of *Country Life*, a reproduction of a photograph taken for that paper is given here (plate I)

with a reproduction of Sir Henry Lee¹ at Ditchley (plate II, no. 1). It will be seen that the Sherborne picture may as well represent the knight who was present as the earl (plate II, no. 2) who is neither noted as present nor had any claim on the score of blood or alliance.

It may be of interest to note that, although the two pictures referred to above have not as yet come together, still those who are curious in the matter may see careful reproductions of both in the third volume of the Walpole Society's publications.

¹ Dated 1602 when he was 71; the earl of Nottingham was 66.