

of these copies is thought to date from the seventeenth century. Both have been called Jane, and, if nothing else, show that Jane's posthumous image was built around her austere Protestantism by the Grey family. It is notable that they did not opt for a more flamboyant queenly image, as seen in the Streatham portrait.

The prominent feature of the Wrest Park portrait is the bouquet of flowers at Jane's neck. As discussed above, such floral prominence is rare in sixteenth century portraiture. The central flower is a gillyflower, this time in its guise as a clove pink. This has a double significance: pinks were a Grey badge;<sup>2</sup> but the gillyflower, as we have seen, was also the personal emblem of Jane's husband, Guildford Dudley. Tucked in behind the gillyflower are violets, as a symbol of true love and what may be ears of wheat for fertility. Another portrait in which flowers play a key role is a likeness of John Dudley, Jane's father-in-law. Unfortunately, the original portrait was stolen from Penshurst Place in 1976, and is only known through an engraving. We cannot be sure either what species the flowers are, or even if it shows Dudley. But, since we know floral badges were used by both the Grey and Dudley families, it must be significant that the floral theme appears to carry over into their portraiture. A Holbein drawing inscribed "Marchioness of Dorset" [Royal Collection]

(Margaret Wotton, Jane's grandmother) also shows the sitter holding flowers.<sup>3</sup> It may also be relevant that the jewellery Jane wears around her neck in the Wrest Park portrait is of an almost identical structure to the Yale miniature.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence, however, is the facial similarity between the Wrest Park panel and the Yale miniature. The facial structure is clearly similar, and it is worth noting that the nose in the Wrest Park version has been retouched to make the end smaller. It feels churlish to claim to have discovered not one but two new portraits of Jane, but the matching likeness cannot be overlooked. Can we now look with confidence on the face of England's 'nine day queen'?

BG AND DS

1 See for example *The Guardian* letters page, 21 November 2006.

2 See T E Scott-Ellis, *Banners, Standards and Badges from a Tudor manuscript in the College of Arms* (London, 1904).

3 Some sources call the sitter Jane's mother, Frances, but the presence of a painted copy of this picture, not by Holbein, with a Lumley cartellino strongly suggests the sitter is as listed in the Lumley inventory 'Of the Olde Marquesse of Dorsetsyster [sic] to Sir Edw: Wotton'.

## A PORTRAIT OF LADY JANE DORMER, LATER DUCHESS OF FERIA?

A large panel picture of a high-ranking Tudor woman at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (Fig. 56), attributed to Hans Eworth, has so far defied identification. It is remarkably similar to another Eworth portrait; *Mary I* in the collection of The Society of Antiquaries, London. These similarities include the three-quarter length motif and the position of the body, particularly of the hands. It is possible that such similarities influenced London art dealer John Webb in identifying the Fitzwilliam picture sitter as Mary I when he sold the picture to Francis Barchard in September, 1854. By 1941 that identification had been corrected, perhaps in an attempt to account for the youthful appearance of the Fitzwilliam picture sitter, and she was then identified as Mary I when Princess.

Two years after the Fitzwilliam Museum acquired the picture, in 1965, Sir Roy Strong acted as Curator

and Senior Researcher for an exhibition of works by Hans Eworth at the National Portrait Gallery, London, where he was also Director. In the exhibition catalogue, which Strong also wrote, the Fitzwilliam picture is for the first time publicly described as something other than a portrait of Queen Mary:

"The portrait bears little resemblance to authentic portraits of Mary Tudor and the sitter is clearly too young to be her at this date. The lady is of exalted rank and unmarried. This is alluded to in the jewel at her breast, which depicts Ahasuerus touching Esther, a typological parallel in the Old Testament of the Virgin..."

Other scholars have debated this view, including Dr Hugh Tait, a medievalist and former Deputy Keeper with the British Museum. He identified the Fitzwilliam sitter as Lady Anne Penruddocke, primarily based upon the formal similarities between this





Figure 56. Hans Eworth or Ewoutsz, *Unknown Lady* (detail), here suggested as possibly Jane Dormer.

portrait and a Eworth portrait of Lady Anne in the collection of Hazel Czernin, Baroness Howard de Walden. Yet, as J. Stephen Edwards has noted, Lady Anne was not of a sufficient rank and wealth to own the jewels seen in the Fitzwilliam portrait and the two ladies have a very different physical appearance. In 2005, however, Edwards claimed that the sitter is Lady Jane Grey. Nevertheless, there is little evidence that the sitter was Lady Jane Grey. Of the evidence within the picture—most notably the sitter's girdle prayer book with the letter 'D' on its face—there is no plausible link to be made with Lady Jane Grey. Further, the picture has been dated to 1557 by costume historian Janet Arnold, placing it well after Lady Jane's execution.

Although it may be impossible to ever conclusively identify the sitter of the Fitzwilliam portrait, the author suggests that, in light of the 'D' found on the prayerbook, it is possible that the sitter may be Lady Jane Dormer. The Dormer family was a prominent Catholic family in Tudor England, with ties to the Tudors going back to Flodden Field, where the Dormers distinguished themselves in battle. At the time that the Fitzwilliam picture was created (1550–57),

Jane Dormer was in her late teens and early twenties and unmarried. According to her biographer, she was courted by all of the eligible Catholic men of Mary's court and, finally, nearly two years before Mary died in 1558, Jane agreed to marry Don Gomez Suarez de Figueroa, Philip II's envoy in England, and later the Duke de Feria. She would marry him within a month of Mary's death.

Lady Jane was also related or otherwise linked with other Eworth portrait sitters including her cousin Mary Neville, Lady Dacre, whose unique double portrait by Eworth resides in the National Portrait Gallery, London. This places Eworth within Jane's circle, not only within the context of the court of Mary I, but also within Jane's extended family, during a time when she may well have wished to have a picture created to memorialize her engagement.

There are at least four other extant portraits which have been linked to Jane Dormer although, with the exception of the portrait attributed to Sanchez Coello at Burton Constable Hall, Yorkshire, none of them have been conclusively tied to her.

The author suggests that the similarities in the formal structure between The Society of Antiquaries portrait and the Fitzwilliam portrait are no accident; Jane Dormer was extremely close to the Queen, both in court and private connection, and was to be married to Philip II's close friend and representative in England. An image like the Fitzwilliam picture picks up on these relationships and cements them in visual terms.

HOPE WALKER, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY