



# EDWARD DE VERE NEWSLETTER NO. 64

Published by De Vere Press  
1340 Flemish Street  
Kelowna, B.C. V1Y 3R7 Canada

## Does the account of the Kenilworth entertainment in the *Princely Pleasures* show that the account in the *Langham Letter* is not an eye-witness account?

There are two contemporary accounts of the Earl of Leicester's entertainment for Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth in the summer of 1575. The first of these is the *Langham Letter*, the other is *The Princely Pleasures at the Courte at Kenelwoorth*, attributed to George Gascoigne (1542-1577), although on doubtful grounds, since the first edition of 1576 was printed anonymously and its author speaks of Gascoigne in the third person (Nichols 315; Prouty 87).

The central focus of the two accounts is quite different. The purpose of the *Princely Pleasures* is set out in a note from the printer, Richard Jones, to the Reader:

Being advertised (gentle Reader) that in this last Progresse hir Maiestie was (by the ryght noble Earle of Leycester) honorably and triumphantly receyved and entertained at his Castle of Kenelwoorth; and that sundry pleasaunt and poetically inventions were there expressed, aswell in verse as in prose. All which have been sundrie tymes demaunded for, aswell at my handes, as also of other printers; for that in deede, all studious and well disposed yong Gentlemen and others were desyrous to be partakers of those pleasures by a profitable publication: I thought meete to trye by all meanes possible if I might recover the true copies of the same, to gratifye all suche as had requyred them at my handes, or might hereafter bee styrrred with the lyke desire. And in fine, I have with much travayle and paine obtained the very true and perfect copies of all that were there presented and executed; over and besides, one morall and gallant devyce, which never

came to execution, although it were often in a readinesse. And these (being thus collected ) I have (for thy comoditie, gentle Reader), now published: the rather, because a report thereof lately imprinted by the name of The Pastime of the Progresse; which (in deede) doth nothing touch the particularitie of every commendable action, but generally reherseth hir Majestie's cheerefull entertainment in all places where shee passed: together with the exceeding Joye that her subjects had to see hir: which report made very many the more desirous to have this perfect copy: for that it plainely doth set downe every thing as it was in deede presented, at large: and further doth declare who was the aucthour and deviser of every poeme and invencion. So that I doubt not but it shall please and satisfy thee both with reason and contentacion: in full hope whereof I leave thee to the reading of the same, and promise to be styl occupied in publishing such workes as may be both for thy pleasure and commodite (Kuin 9-10).

In accordance with the purpose stated in the Printer's note, the *Princely Pleasures* sets out in full the text of all the poems and speeches presented in the course of the Kenilworth entertainment. The description of the shows and pageants themselves is, however, sharply curtailed, although there is sufficient detail to provide an adequate setting for the poems and speeches. In the *Letter*, on the other hand, the author provides detailed descriptions of the shows and pageants, while contenting himself with summaries of the poems and speeches. Thus, although a number of discrepancies appear when the two accounts are compared, these discrepancies are not as numerous as they might have been had both accounts given full descriptions of both these aspects of the Kenilworth entertainment. In the event, because of the different focus of the two accounts, the discrepancies are limited to five events in which the details in the *Letter*, and in the *Princely Pleas-*

ures, differ sharply. These five events are as follows:

**1. A welcoming ceremony on the Queen's arrival at Kenilworth on the evening of Saturday, July 9, consisting of the following elements:**

- (a) speeches by a Sibyl, a porter, the Lady of the Lake, and a poet;
- (b) a musical presentation featuring six giant trumpeters ranged on the wall of the gate;
- (c) a display of presents from seven gods on the seven posts of the bridge leading to the inner court of the Castle, explicated by a poem on a tablet mounted above the castle gate "mencioning theez Gods and their gyfts";
- (d) a fireworks display.

**2. A water pageant on July 18, elaborating the theme of "the deliverie of the Lady of the Lake" (Nichols 498). Its principal components included:**

- a) a prologue by Triton who appeared "uppon a swymming Mermayd";
- b) the routing of "Syr Bruse sauns pitee" by the mere presence of the Queen;
- c) a musical pageant featuring the Lady of the Lake and her nymphs floating "on moovabl Ilands" while Arion, "ryding aloft upon hiz olld freend the Dolphin", sang "a delectabl ditty of a song" accompanied by musicians hidden within the dolphin.

**3. A ceremony in which knighthood was conferred on Thomas Cecil, Henry Cobham, Thomas Stanhope, Arthur Bassett and Thomas Tresham.**

**4. A outdoor banquet in Wedgenock Park, accompanied by entertainment in the form of a "devise of Goddesses and Nymphes" (both of which were cancelled because of inclement weather).**

**5. A speech by Sylvanus on the Queen's departure from Kenilworth (of which no mention is made in the *Letter*).**

Only these five events -- the welcoming ceremony, the water pageant, the conferring of knighthood, the outdoor banquet in Wedgenock Park with its "devise of Goddesses and Nymphes", and Sylvanus' speech on the Queen's departure -- are dealt with in the *Letter* and in the *Princely Pleasures* in a manner which permits comparison between the two accounts. In consequence, it is these five events alone which serve as a touchstone for evaluating the *Letter's* claim that its author was an eye-witness to the

1575 Kenilworth entertainment.

It will be convenient to deal with the five events in sequence, beginning with the welcome given to the Queen on her arrival.

### The welcoming ceremony on July 9

There are numerous inconsistencies between the details of the welcoming ceremony given in the *Letter* and those given in *The Princely Pleasures*.

In the first place, the author of the *Letter* inaccurately summarizes the theme of the poem pronounced by a Sibyl who met the royal party "in the Park, about a flight shot from the Brayz and first gate of the Castl". According to the *Letter*, the Sibyl's speech consisted of:

a proper poezi in English ryme and meter; of effect, hoow great gladnes her gracious prezenz brought into every steed whear it pleazed her too cum, and specially now intoo that place that had so long longed after the same; ended with prophecy certeyn, of mooch and long prosperitee, health and felicitee (Kuin 39).

This summary seems reasonable enough, and has an air of verisimilitude; however, the poem, as printed in the *Princely Pleasures*, is substantially different. The thematic elements mentioned in the *Letter* are not to be found: there is no reference to other "steeds" which have been gladdened by the Queen's presence, nor of Kenilworth in particular having "so long longed after the same", and no specific prophecy of either "long prosperitee" or "health". Instead, these thematic elements are replaced by the Sibyl's prophecies that war will never disrupt Elizabeth's reign, and that, during her abode at Kenilworth, "nothing shall rest unsought" to bring her "pleasure" and "quyet":

All hayle, all hayle, thrice happy Prince; I am Sibylla she,  
Of future chaunce, and after happ foreshewing what shall be.  
As now the dewe of heavenly gifts full thick on you doth fall,  
Even so shall Vertue more and more augment your years withal.  
The rage of Warre, bound fast in chaines, shall never stirre ne move:  
But Peace shall governe all your daies, encreasing subjects love.  
You shall be called the Prince of Peace, and Peace shall be your shield,  
So that your eyes shall never see the broyls of bloody field.  
If perfect peace then glad your minde, he joyes above the rest

Which doth receive into his house so good and sweet a guest.  
And one thing more I shall foretell, as by my skill I know,  
Your coming is rejoiced at tenne thousand times and mo.  
And while your Highnes here abides, nothing shall rest unsought,  
That may bring pleasure to your mind, or quyet to your thought.  
And so passe forth in peace, O Prince, of high and worthy praise;  
The God that governs all in all, encrease your happy dayes (83).

After having "benignly" accepted the Sibyl's speech, the Queen then, according to the account in the *Letter*, "passed forth unto the next gate of the Brayz". Here the royal party was met by a porter, whose initial impatience at the appearance of unknown visitors quickly yielded to abject submission and the surrender of his keys when he "foound him self perced" at the "heroicall Soveraintie" of the royal guest:

Her Majesty . . . passed forth unto the next gate of the brayz, which (for the length, largnes and use (az well it may so serve) they call noow the Tytyard, whear a Porter, tall of parson, big of lim and stearn of coountinauns, wrapt also all in sylk, with club and keyz of quantitee according: had a roough speech full of passions in meter aply made too the purpose: whearby (az her highnes was cum within his ward) he burst out in a great pang of impaciens too see such uncooth trudging too and fro, such ridyng in and oout, with such dyn and noyz of talk within the charge of his offis: whearof he never saw the lyke nor had any warning afore, ne yet coold make too him self any cauz of the matter, at last upon better vieu and avisement az he preast too cum neerar: confessing anon that he foound him self perced at the prezens of a parsonage so evidently expressing an heroicall Soveraintie over all the hole estates, and hy degreez thear besyde: callmd hiz stormz, proclaymz open gates and free passage too all, yeeldes up hiz club, hiz keyz, hiz office and all, and on hiz kneez humbly praiz pardon of hiz ignorauns and impaciens: which her highnes graciously graunting, he cauzd hiz Trumpetoorz that stood upon the wall of the gate thear, too soound up a tune of wellcum (Kuin 39-40).

Again, although the foregoing account bears an air of verisimilitude, there is a marked inconsistency between it and the account found in the *Princely Pleasures*, where it is stated specifically that the porter was dressed as Hercules:

And when her Majestie entred the gate, there stood Hercules for Porter, who seemed to be amazed at such a presence upon such a sodain, profferred to stay them. And yet at last, being overcome by vieu of the rare beutie and princelie countenance of her Majestie, yeelded himselfe and his charge, presenting the keyes

unto her Highnesse with these words . . . (Nichols 490).

The assertion that the porter was attired as Hercules is repeated later in the *Princely Pleasures* in the report of the poetic dialogue between the wodewose and Echo:

Well, Hercules stood bie, why came he from his dorter?  
Or was it eke some monstrous man, appoynted for a Porter? (Nichols 496).

The author of the *Letter*, with his keen eye for the details of the porter's size and stern countenance could hardly have failed to notice the fact that the porter was garbed (presumably in the traditional lion's skin) as Hercules, yet he gives a completely different description of the porter's attire, claiming that he was "wrapt . . . all in sylk".

According to the *Letter*, the Queen was next greeted in verse at "the inner gate next the baze court of the Castl" by the Lady of the Lake, who pronounced a poem. Again, the *Letter* inaccurately summarizes a major theme, in this case by stating that the poem specifically mentions the fact that Kenilworth, throughout its long history, had been "most allweyz in the handes of the Earls of Leyceter":

[The Lady of the Lake] met her Majesty with a wel penned meter and matter after this sorte: First of the auncientee of the Castl, whoo had been ownerz of the same, een till this day, most allweyz in the handes of the Earls of Leyceter, hoow she had kept this Lake syns king Arthurz dayz, and noow understanding of her highnes hither cumming, thought it both offis and duty in humbl wyze too discover her and her estate: offering up the same, her Lake and pouour thearin, with promis of repair unto the Coourt (Kuin 40-1).

The full text of this poem from the *Princely Pleasures* is reprinted below. Although some of the individuals named in the poem as previous owners of Kenilworth were, in fact, Earls of Leicester, neither their titles nor the earldom itself are referred to, and there is certainly no emphasis laid upon the continuity of ownership of Kenilworth by the Earls of Leicester:

Though haste say on, let sute obtain some stay,  
(Most peerles Prince, the honour of your kinde),  
While that in short my state I doe display,

And yeelde you thanks for that which now I finde,  
Who erst have wished that death me hence had fet;  
If Gods not borne to die had ought death any det.

I am the Lady of this pleasant Lake,  
Who, since the time of great King Arthure's reigne,  
That here with royal Court abode did make,  
Have led a lowring life in restles paine,  
Till now, that this your THIRD arrival here,  
Doth cause me come abroad, and boldly thus appeare.

For after him such stormes this Castle shooke,  
By swarming Saxons first who scourge this land,  
As fourth of this my Poole I neer durst looke.  
Though Kenelme King of Merce did take in hand  
(As sorrowing to see it in deface)  
To reare these ruines up, and fortifie this place.

For straight by Danes and Normans all this Ile  
Was sore distrest, and conquered at last;  
Whose force this Castle felt, and I therewhile  
Did hide my head; and though it straighway past  
Unto Lord Sentloe's hands, I stode at bay,  
And never showed myselfe, but stil in keepe I lay.

The Earle Sir Moumford's force gave me no hart,  
Sir Edmund Crouchbacke's state, the Prince's sonne,  
Could not cause me out of my lake to part,  
Nor Roger Mortimer's ruffe, who first begun  
(As Arthur's heire) to keepe the table round,  
Could not comfort once my hart, or cause me come on ground.

Nor any owner els, not he that's now,  
(Such feare I felt againe some force to feele)  
Tyl now the Gods doe seeme themselves t'allow  
My comming forth, which at this time reveale  
By number due, that your thrice comming here  
Doth bode thrise happy hope, and voides the place from feare.

Wherefore I wil attend while you lodge here,  
(Most peereles Queene) to Court to make resort;  
And as my love to Arthure dyd appeere,  
So shal't to you in earnest and in sport.  
Passe on, Madame, you need no longer stand;  
The Lake, the Lodge, the Lord, are yours for to command (Kuin 85-6).

There is nothing implausible in the *Letter's* assumption that the Lady of the Lake would touch upon the fact that Kenilworth had, from its earliest history until the present day, been often in the hands of the Earls of Leicester. The only difficulty is that, if we accept the account in the *Princely Pleasures*, the poem spoken by the Lady of the Lake at Kenilworth in the summer of 1575 did not specifically mention this fact.

After being greeted by the Lady of the Lake, ac-

ording to the account in the *Letter*, the Queen rode "tooward the Castl gate" over a bridge "seaventy foot long" with "seaven posts on a syde" on which were placed gifts from seven gods. A poet spoke Latin verses which explicated these gifts; the verses were also printed on a ten foot square "Tabl" over the castle gate:

Over the Castl gate was thear fastened a Tabl beautifully garnisht aboove with her highness armes, and featly with Ivy wreathz boordred about: of a ten foot square, the ground blak, whearupon in large white Capitall Roman fayr written a Poem mencioning theez Gods and their gyfts thus presented untoo her highness; which, becauz it remaynd unremoved, at leyzure and pleazure I took it out, as folloeth.

AD MAIESTATEM REGIAM.  
Iupiter huc certos cernens TE tendere gressus,  
Coelicolas PRINCEPS actutum convocat omnes:  
Obsequium praestare iubet TIBI quenque benignum,  
Unde suas Sylvanus aves, Pomonaque fructus,  
Alma Ceres fruges, hilarantia vina Lyaeus,  
Neptunus pisces, tela et tutantia Mavors,  
Suave melos Phoebus, solidam longamque salutem,  
Dii TIBI REGINA haec (cum SIS DIGNISSIMA)  
prebent:  
Haec TIBI cum Domino dedit se et Werda Kenelmi.

All the Letterz that mencion her Majesty, which heer I put capitall, for reverens and honour wear thear made in golld. But for the night well spent, for that theez versez by torchlyght, coold not eazly be red, by a Poet thearfore in a long ceruleoous garment, with a syde and wyde sleevez Venecian wyze, drawen up to his elboz, his dooblet sleeves under that crimzen, nothing but sylk; a bay garland on hiz hed, and a skro in hiz hand, making fyrst an humble obeyzaunz at her highness cumming, and pointing unto every present az he spake, the same wear pronounced (Kuin 42-3).

The author of the *Letter* mentions only one set of verses, and is positive that the verses spoken by the poet were the same as those printed on the table over the castle gate. The author of the *Princely Pleasures*, on the other hand, says that there were two different sets of verses composed for this part of the welcoming ceremony; moreover, the verses he quotes are different from those quoted in the *Letter*:

Her Majesty, proceeding towards the inward Court, passed on a bridge, the which was rayled in on both sides. And in the toppes of the postes thereof were set sundrie presents, and giftes of provision: As wine, corne, frutes, fishes, fowles, instrements of musike, and weapons for martial defence. All which were expounded by an Actor, clad like a Poet, who pronounced

these verses in Latine:

Jupiter e summi dum vertice cernit Olympi,  
Junc princeps regina tuos te tendere gressus  
Scilicet eximiae succensus imagine formae,  
Et memor antiqui qui semper ferverat ignis,  
Siccine Caelicolae patientur turpitur (inquit)  
Muneris exortem reginam hoc visere castrum,  
Quod tam laeta subit? Reliqui sensere Tonantis:  
Imperium Superi pro se dat quisque libenter,  
Musiculas Sylvanus aves; Pomanaque poma,  
Fruges alma Ceres rorantia vina Lyaeus:  
Neptunus pisces, tela et tutantia Mavors,  
Haec (regina potens) Superi dat munera Divi:  
Ipse loci Dominus dat se Castrumque Kenelmi.

These verses were devised by Master Muncaster, and other verses to the very self same effect were devised by M. Paten, and fixed over the gate in a frame. I am not very sure whether these, or Master Paten's, were pronounced by the Author; but they were all to one effect (Nichols 492-3).

There is thus an interesting discrepancy between the version in the *Princely Pleasures* and that given in the *Letter*. The author of the *Princely Pleasures* reports with assurance that there were two different sets of verses, one composed by Mulcaster, and one by Patten; he quotes the Mulcaster verses, and expresses uncertainty as to which of the two sets of verses was "pronounced" by the poet. In contrast, the author of the *Letter* appears to be completely unaware of a second set of verses; he quotes verses different from those quoted in the *Princely Pleasures*, and states positively that the verses "pronounced" by the poet were identical with those printed on the table over the castle gate.

According to the *Letter*, the final component of the welcoming ceremony on Saturday, July 9 was a fireworks display. The first part of this display took place that evening at the conclusion of the welcoming ceremony:

So passing into the inner Court, her Majesty (that never rydez but alone) thear set dooun from her Pallfrey, waz conveyed up too chamber: when after, dyd follo so great a peal of gunz, and such lyghtnyng by fyer woork a long space toogether: as Jupiter woold sheaw himself too be no further behinde with hiz wellcoom, then the rest of hiz Gods: and that woold he have all the Cuntree to kno: for indeed the noy and flame wear hard and seen a twenty myle of (Kuin 43).

There was also a second spectacular fireworks display on the evening of Sunday, July 10, which the author of the *Letter* playfully characterizes as an afterthought to the previous day's welcome:

At night late, az though Jupiter last nyght, had forgot for bizness, or forborn for curtezy and quiet, part of hiz wellcoom unto her highness appointed: noow entring at fyrst intoo hiz purpoze moderatly (az mortallz doo) with a warning pees or too, proceding on with encreas, at last the Altitonant displayz me hiz mayn pooor: with blaz of burning darts, flying too and fro, leamz of starz coruscant, streamz and hayl of fiery sparks, lyghtenings of wyldefier a water and lond, flyght and shot of thunderbolts: all with such continuans, terrour and vehemency that the heavens thunderd, the waters sooured, the earth shook, in such sort surely, az had wee not been assured the fulminant deitee waz all but in amitee, and coold not ootherwiz witness hiz wellcoming untoo her highness, it woold have made me for my part, az hardy az I am, very vengeably afeard. This adoo lasted while hy midnight waz past (Kuin 43-4).

Finally, according to the *Letter*, there was a third fireworks display, which took place four days later on the evening of July 14, and which did not form part of the welcoming ceremony:

Az this sport [bear-baiting] was had a day time in the Castl, so waz thear abrode at night very straunge and sundry kindez of fyer woorks, compeld by cunningg too fly too and fro and too mount very hy intoo the ayr upward, and allso too burn unquenshabl in the water beneath: contrary ye wot, too fyerz kinde. This intermengld with a great peal of guns: which all gave, both too the ear and to the ey the greater grace and delight, for that with such order and art they wear temperd: tooching time and continuans, that waz about too oours space (Kuin 48).

The description in the *Princely Pleasures* is significantly different. In the first place, its author mentions only a single fireworks display, which apparently had no connection with the welcoming ceremony, and which took place on the evening of Sunday, July 10:

On the next day (being Sunday) there was nothing done until the evening, at which time there were fire-works shewed upon the water, the which were both strange and well executed; as sometimes, passing under the water a long space, when all men had thought they had been quenched, they would rise and mount out of the water againe, and burn very furiously untill they were utterly consumed (Kuin 89; Nichols 494).

There is thus a very material discrepancy between the two accounts. The *Letter* mentions three fireworks displays, the *Princely Pleasures* only one. The *Letter* says that unusual fireworks which burned "unquenshable in the water" were shown on July 14, while the *Princely Pleasures* says that these unusual fireworks were shown four days earlier, on July 10. The *Letter* says there was bear-baiting earlier on the day in question; the *Princely Pleasures* says there was "nothing done" on that day until the fireworks display in the evening. The descriptions of the fireworks displays are also strikingly different. The *Letter* describes spectacular fireworks on the 9th which could be "hard and seen a twenty myle of", followed, on the 10th, by another violent display ("the waters sooured, the earth shook") dominated by brilliant aerial fireworks ("blaz of burning darts, flying too and fro, leamz of starz coruscant, streamz and hayl of fiery sparks"). The third display in the *Letter* is also described as noisy, and visually brilliant: the fireworks are said to have mounted "very hy into the ayr upward", and to have been "intermengld with a great peal of guns", the whole affair lasting "aboout too oours space". In contrast, the *Princely Pleasures* describes only a rather subdued display of fireworks "shewed upon the water".

The date given in the *Princely Pleasures* for the unusual "underwater" fireworks (Sunday, July 10) is supported elsewhere in that work in the account of the Queen's meeting with the wodewose. According to the *Princely Pleasures*, the wodewose pageant functioned as a means of interpreting the allegorical significance of the events which had so far taken place:

Now to make some playner declaration, and rehearsall of all these things before her Majestie, on the X of Julie, there met her in the Forest, as she came from hunting, one clad like a Savage man, all in ivie . . . (Nichols 494).

At the outset of the dialogue, the wodewose recites a poem in which he asks Jupiter to explain:

[W]hat has moved these sundry shewes, which I of late did see? (Nichols 494).

Receiving no assistance from Jupiter, the wodewose repeats his request, this time to Echo:

. . . then tell me what was ment,  
By every shew that yet was seene; good Echo, be content (Nichols 495).

With the help of Echo's responses, the wodewose learns the significance of the Sybyl's prophecy, the giant trumpeters, the porter dressed as Hercules, the Lady of the Lake, and the gifts on the bridge (the giver of "all these gifts" being identified as Robert Dudley). The dialogue then continues with the following couplet:

What meant the fierie flames, which through the waves so flue?  
Can no colde answers quench desire? is that experience true? (Nichols 496).

In this couplet, the allegorical meaning of the unusual fireworks is elucidated: their re-emergence after having been seemingly quenched underwater is a sign that Robert Dudley's ardent "desire" to serve (and perhaps marry) the Queen cannot be quenched by "colde answers" on her part. The explanation would, however, have been pointless if the Queen had not yet seen these fireworks. The sequence of events in the *Princely Pleasures* is thus a logical one: the unusual "underwater" fireworks were shown on Sunday evening, and their allegorical meaning explained to the Queen by the wodewose on the following day [which, incidentally, the *Princely Pleasures* records incorrectly as July 10, but which would have to have been July 11].

In contrast, the author of the *Letter* has no knowledge of the special significance of these unusual "underwater" fireworks, and therefore sees nothing untoward in his claim that they were shown on July 14, three days after the Queen's meeting on July 11 with the wodewose.

We are thus faced with two accounts of the fireworks displays at Kenilworth which simply cannot be reconciled. If we accept the *Letter's* account, we must reject that found in the *Princely Pleasures*, including the relevant passage in the Echo/wodewose poetic dialogue. If, however, we accept the sequence of events in the *Princely Pleasures* and the validity of the text of the Echo/wodewose poem, we must reject the *Letter's* claim to be an eye-witness descrip-

tion of the Kenilworth entertainment of 1575.

### The water pageant on July 18

The *Letter's* report of the water pageant which took place on July 18 displays similar inconsistencies. According to the author of the *Letter*, the pageant opened with the appearance of Triton "uppon a swymming Mermayd":

Well, the game waz gotten, and her highnes returning: cam thear uppon a swymming Mermayd (that from top too tayl waz an eyghteen foot long) Triton, Neptunes blaster: whoo, with hiz trumpet foormed of a wrinkl'd weak, az her Majesty waz in sight, gave soound very shrill and sonorous, in sign he had an ambassy too pronouns: anon her highnes waz cummen upon the bridge, whearunto he made hiz fish to swim the swifter, and he then declared: how the supream salsipotent Monarch Neptune, the great God of the swelling Seaz, Prins of profunditees, and Sooverain Segnior of all Lakez, freshwaterz, Riverz, Creekes, and Goolphs: understanding hoow a cruell knight, one Syr Bruse sauns pitee, a mortall enmy untoo ladies of estate, had long lyen about the banks of this pool in wayt with hiz bands heer: too distress the lady of the lake. . . (Kuin 56-7).

The description in the *Princely Pleasures* is markedly different:

The next thing that was presented before her Majestie, was the deliverie of the Lady of the Lake; whereof the summe was this. Tryton, in likenesse of a mermaide, came towards the Queene's Majestie as she passed over the bridge, returning from hunting: and to her declared, that Neptune had sent him to her Highnes. . . (Nichols 498).

There is thus an irreconcilable difference between the two accounts. In the *Letter*, Triton appears riding on a remarkable 18-foot contrivance, a "swymming Mermayd". In the *Princely Pleasures*, there is no mention of this contrivance; instead, Triton appears costumed as a mermaid.

After Triton's prologue, the allegorical centerpiece of the water pageant took place: in accordance with Merlin's prophecy that the Lady of the Lake "coulede never be delivered but by the presence of a better maide than herselfe" (Nichols 498), the Lady's oppressor, "Syr Bruse sauns pitee", was forced to withdraw by reason of the Queen's mere presence upon

the bridge overlooking the lake. In the account in the *Letter*, the Lady of the Lake (with Triton nearby, still riding his "Mermaid") then approached the Queen to express her gratitude:

and the lady by and by, with her too Nymphs, floting upon her moovabl Ilands (Triton on hiz Mermayd skimming by) approched towards her highnes on the bridge: az well too declare that her Majesties prezens hath so graciously thus wrought her deliverauns, az also to excuze her not comming to coourt az she promist, and cheefly too prezent her Majesty (az a token of her duty and good hart) for her highness recreation with thiz gift, which was Arion that excellent and famouz Muzicien, in tyre and appoyntment straunge well seeming too hiz parson, ryding aloft upon hiz oold freend the Dolphin, (that from hed too tayl waz a foour and twenty foot long) and swymd hard by theez Ilands: heerwith Arion for theez great benefitez, after a feaw well couched woords untoo her Majesty of thanks gyving, in supplement of the same: beegan a delectabl ditty of a song wel apted too a melodious noiz, compounded of six severall instruments al coovert, casting soound from the Dolphins belly within, Arion the seaventh sittying thus singing (az I say) without (Kuin 57).

The account in the *Princely Pleasures* is similar at the outset: after the routing of Sir Bruce, the Lady of the Lake and her two nymphs approach the bridge "upon heapes of bulrushes". From this point on, however, the two accounts diverge widely. On the one hand, in the *Letter*, the Lady of the Lake thanks the Queen for her deliverance, makes her apologies for not having come to court, and specifically presents the Queen, for her "recreation", with a gift well suited to recreation, namely, "Arion, that excellent and famous musician". On the other hand, in the *Princely Pleasures*, the Lady merely pronounces a poem of thanks to the Queen, with no apology for having failed to come to court, nor, more importantly, any mention of the gift of Arion for "her highness recreation":

What worthy thankes might I poore maide expresse?  
Or thinke in heart, that is not justly due  
To thee (O Queene) which in my great distres,  
Succours hast sent, mine enemies to subdue?  
Not mine alone, but foe to Ladyes all,  
That tyrant Bruce sans pitie whom we call.

Untill this day, the Lake was never free  
From his assaults, and other of his knights;  
Untill such tyme as he did playnely see  
Thy presence dread, and feared of all wyghts.

Which made him yeeld, and all his bragging bands,  
Resigning all into thy princely hands.  
For which great grace of liberty obtayned,  
Not only I, but nymphs and sisters all  
Of this large Lake, with humble heart unfayned,  
Render thee thankes, and honour thee withall;  
And, for playne proof how much we do rejoyce,  
Expresse the same with tongue, with sound, and voice (Nichols 500).

Instead of Arion, Proteus now appears, and sings a song in which he excuses his bad voice:

From thence her Majestie passing yet further on the brydge, Protheus appeared, sitting on a dolphyn's back. And the dolphyn was conveyed upon a boate, so that the owers seemed to be his fynnes. Within the which dolphyn a consort of musicke was secretly placed, the which sounded: and Protheus, clearing his voyce, sang this song of congratulation, as well in the behalfe of the Lady distressed, as also in the behalfe of all the Nimphs and Gods of the Sea:

The Song of Protheus.

O noble Queene, give eare to this my floating Muse;  
And let the right of readie will my little skill excuse.  
Fore heardmen of the seas sing not the sweetest notes;  
The winds and waves do roare and crie, where Phoebus seldome floates:  
Yet, since I doe my best, in thankful wise to sing;  
Vouchsafe (good Queene) that calm consent, these words to you may bring.  
We yeeld you humble thanks, in mightie Neptune's name,  
Both for ourselves, and therewithall for yonder seemely dame.  
A dame whom none but you deliver could from thrall:  
Ne none but you deliver us from loitring life withall.  
She pined long in paine, as overorne with woes;  
And we consume in endless care, to fend her from her foes.  
Both which you set at large, most like a faithful freend;  
Your noble name be praisde therefore, and so my song I ende.

This song being ended, Protheus told the Queene's Majestie a pleasant tale of his deliverie, and the fishes which he had in charge. The devise of the Ladie of the Lake also was Master Hunnes; and surely, if it had bene executed according to the first invention, it had been a gallant shewe . . . (Nichols 500-1).

There is thus a further irreconcilable discrepancy between the *Letter's* claim that it was Arion "that excellent and famouz Muzicien" who rode upon a dolphin's back in the water pageant, and the claim in the *Princely Pleasures* that it was the sea god Proteus, with his bad voice. Nichols has suggested that "Proteus here assumes the character of Arion" (Nichols 501); however, it is clear that Proteus does nothing of the kind. In his song, Proteus specifi-

cally refers to himself as a "heardman of the seas" and excuses his "little skill" in singing. Moreover, after his song, he re-emphasizes his role as a sea-god and herder of sea-creatures when he tells the Queen "a pleasant tale of his deliverie, and the fishes which he had in charge".

On the other hand, the author of the *Letter* can hardly be faulted for expecting that the poet and musician Arion, not the sea god Proteus, would ride upon the dolphin's back in the water pageant at Kenilworth, since the image of Arion on the dolphin's back is firmly based in legend. The story goes that after acquiring great wealth in Italy, Arion was thrown overboard by greedy sailors on his return voyage to Corinth; however, it was his fortune to be carried to safety on the back of a dolphin which had been charmed by the song which the sailors had permitted Arion to sing before throwing him overboard (Harvey 42).

Moreover, the Arion device was used on at least one other occasion in Elizabethan pageantry:

There was a Spectacle presented to Queen Elizabeth upon the water, and amongst others, Harry Goldingham was to represent Arion upon the Dolphins backe, but finding his voice to be very hoarse and unpleasant when he came to performe it, he teares of his Disguise, and swears he was none of Arion not he, but eene honest Harry Goldingham; which blunt discoverie pleasd the Queene better, then if it had gone thorough in the right way; yet he could order his voice to an instrument exceeding well (Kuin 100).

The *Letter's* erroneous claim that it was Arion who appeared in the water pageant thus cannot be attributed to any confusion as to Arion's role, since the *Letter* correctly assigns to Arion the musician his usual role in legend and in Elizabethan pageantry. Moreover, there is ample evidence elsewhere in the *Letter* to show that its author would never have confused Arion with Proteus. In cataloguing the gifts contributed by the gods to the Kenilworth entertainment, for example, the *Letter* specifically credits Proteus with the show put on by the Italian tumbler ("Hiz Tumbler that coold by nymbleness cast him self intoo so many foorms and facionz") (Kuin 67); this apt comparison reveals the author's knowledge of the sea god Proteus' ability to assume a variety of



shapes (Harvey 350). In fact, the author's comprehensive knowledge of mythology is so evident throughout the *Letter* that it is superfluous to defend it.

As with the fireworks displays, we are thus presented with two accounts of the water pageant which cannot be reconciled. If we accept the account in the *Letter*, we must reject that found in the *Princely Pleasures*. If we accept the account in the *Princely Pleasures*, we must reject the *Letter's* purported eye-witness description of the water pageant.

### **The conferring of knighthoods**

According to the *Letter*, knighthood was conferred on five individuals on Monday, July 18:

A, stay a while, see a short wit: by my trooth I had allmost forgot. This day waz a day of grace besyde, whearin wear avauanced fyve Gentlemen of woorshippe unto the degree of knighthood. Syr Thomas Cecyll, sun and heyr untoo the right honorabl the Lord Treazorer, Syr Henry Cobham broother untoo the Lord Cobham, Syr Thomas Stanhop, Syr Arthur Basset, and Syr Thomas Tresham (Kuin 58).

Kuin points out, however, that it is highly unlikely that Sir Arthur Basset, Sheriff of Devon, was knighted at Kenilworth, since Basset "already appears as a knight on February 7th of this year, six months or so before his supposed elevation at Kenilworth" (Kuin 101).

Once again, a noticeable discrepancy, in this case between historical records and the version of events given in the *Letter*, leads to the conclusion that the author of the *Letter* was not an eye-witness to the events which he describes.

### **The outdoor banquet in Wedgenock Park with its "devise of Goddessez and Nymphes"**

The outdoor banquet and the accompanying "devise" were, as the *Letter* explains, not presented to the Queen because of inclement weather:

Wednesday [July 20], in the forenoon, preparacion was in hand for her Majesty too have supt in Wedgenall, a three myle west from the Castl. A goodly park of the

Queenz Majestyez: for that cauz, a fayr pavilion, and oother provision accordingly thyther sent and prepared: but by meanz of weather not to cleerly dispozed, the matter waz countermaunded again. That had her highnes hapned this day too have cummen abrode: there was made reddey a devise of goddessez and Nymphes: which az well for the ingenious argument, az for the well handling of it in rime and endighting woold undoooutedly have gaind great lyking and mooved no less delight. Of the particulariteez, whearof I ceas to entreat: least like the boongling carpentar, by missorting the peeceez, I mar a good frame in the bad setting up, or by my fond tempring afore hand embleamish the beauty, when it shoold be reard up indeede.

A this day allso waz thear such earnest tallk and appointment of remooving that I gave over my notyng, and harkened after my hors (Kuin 59).

The *Letter's* mention of these events suggests that its author was on the spot at Kenilworth to observe the preparations being made for the banquet, and its subsequent cancellation. There is, however, another possible explanation for his knowledge of the cancellation of the banquet. It now seems clear that all copies of the first edition of the Langham *Letter* perished when the *Letter* was suppressed in September, 1575 (see issue # 63 of the *Edward De Vere Newsletter*). What we have today are the second and third editions. It is therefore entirely possible that the (now lost) first edition of the *Letter* contained a fuller description of the outdoor banquet and the "devise of Goddessez and Nymphes", and that the author, having later discovered that the "devise" was never performed, deleted the descriptions from the second and third editions. In fact, the author almost says as much and, incidentally, reveals his respect for dramatic artistry, when he tactfully declines to further discuss the "devise of goddessez and Nymphes" on the ground that he might spoil its effect when it is ultimately presented.

The possibility that the first (now lost) edition of the *Letter* was not identical with the second may also go some way toward explaining the cryptic paragraph which immediately follows, with its talk of the court's abrupt removal from Kenilworth and the author's sudden decision to give up his note-taking. Jenkins has suggested that this uproar may have been occasioned by the Queen's discovery of Leicester's liaison with Lettice Knollys (Kuin 102). Whatever

the reason for the talk of "remooving", there is certainly the discreet suggestion of a contretemps of so serious a kind that the Queen actually considered departing from Kenilworth on Wednesday, July 20, the same day as the planned outdoor banquet and "devise" which were "countermaunded" "by means of weather not to cleerly dispozed" (the author perhaps refers to "emotional" storms). Moreover, strange as it may seem, after this point the author gives no further details of the Kenilworth entertainment itself; for the remaining half of the *Letter*, he concerns himself with other topics, such as the "ridiculous devise of an auncient minstrell", the gifts of the gods, the garden at Kenilworth, a digression on "onhood" and duality, a disquisition on the Earl of Leicester, and an account of his own daily routine. He explains this abrupt departure from his subject in the following manner:

Her highnes tarryed at Kyllingwoorth tyll the Wednesday after, being the .27. of this July, and nienteenth (inclusive) of her Majestiez cumming thither.

For which seaven daiz, perceyving my notez so slenderly aunswering: I took it less blame, too ceas and thearof too write yoo nothing at al, then in such matterz too write nothing likely. And so mooch the rather (az I have well bethoought me) that if I dyd but ruminat the dayz I have spoken of, I shall bring oout yet sumwhat more, meet for yoor appetite, (though a deinty tooth have ye) which I beleve yoor tender stomak will brook well inooch (Kuin 64).

We are thus asked to believe that the remaining seven days of the royal visit were filled with pageantry and spectacle similar to that which went before, but that the author has failed to make proper notes, and can therefore write "nothing likely". While we are free to accept the author's explanation, it seems entirely possible that there is some other, more reasonable, explanation, and that the author's remark represents a point at which the second edition of the *Letter* diverges from the (now lost) first edition. Whatever material there may have been in the lost first edition with respect to the events of July 20-27 appears to have been discretely removed, and replaced by these few cryptic paragraphs.

### Sylvanus' speech on the Queen's departure

No details of the Queen's departure from Kenilworth are given in the Langham *Letter*. However, the *Princely Pleasures* concludes with a nine-page description of an impromptu piece of pageantry devised by George Gascoigne for this occasion, in which Gascoigne assumed the role of Sylvanus:

The Queenes Majestie hasting her departure from thence, the Earle commanded Master Gascoigne to devise some farewel worth the presenting; whereupon he himselfe, clad like unto Sylvanus, God of the woods, and meeting her as she went on hunting, spake ex tempore, as followeth . . . (Nichols 515).

The foregoing remarks, with their discreet mention of the Queen "hasting her departure" and Gascoigne's ex tempore farewell pageant, raise further questions about the mysterious events of Wednesday, July 20. Moreover, the absence of any mention of this "show" in the Langham *Letter* argues strongly against the author's presence at Kenilworth. Had the author been present, he would surely have mentioned this event, particularly since, in his catalogue of the gods' contributions to the Kenilworth entertainment, he specifically identifies the gifts bestowed on the entertainment by Sylvanus, whom he there credits with nothing more than "plentifull provizion of fould for deynty viaunds" and "hiz pleazaunt and sweet synging byrds" (Kuin 67).

In the account of this farewell pageant in the *Princely Pleasures*, there is also an interesting description of the weather prior to the Queen's departure which further solidifies the impression that the author of the *Letter* was not present at Kenilworth. At the end of the pageant, Sylvanus points out to the Queen a holly bush, from which Deepdesire speaks a poem telling of the gods' sorrow on learning of the Queen's departure. In describing the depth of their grief at this unhappy event, Deepdesire offers, as proof, the storms and heavy rains of the past five days:

But, Queene, beleeve me nowe, although I do not sweare;  
Was never greefe, as I could gesse, which sat their harts so neere,  
As when they heard the newes, that you, O royal Queene,  
Would part from hence; and that to proove, it may full well be seene.  
For marke what teares they shed these five dayes past and gone;  
It was no rayne of honestie, it was great floods of mone.  
As, first, Diana wept such brynish bitter tears,  
That all hyr Nimphes dyd doubt hyr death; hyr face the signe yet beares.

Dame Flora fell on ground, and brusde hyr wofull breast:  
Yea, Pan dyd breake his oten pipes; Sylvanus and the rest,  
Which walke amid these woods, for greefe did rore and cry:  
And Jove, to shewe what mone he made, with thundring crackt the sky:  
O Queene, O worthy Queene, within these holts and hilles,  
Were never heard such grievous grones, nor seen such wofull wils  
(Nichols 521).

The significance of this description of five days of rain and storm, which directly contradicts the *Letter's* description of idyllic weather during the Queen's visit, seems never to have been appreciated. Deepdesire describes a forest, the haunt of Diana, which "yet beares" the sign of her "brynish bitter tears"; Flora's flowers fallen "on ground" and "brusde"; the crops, Pan's "oten pipes", flattened; and Jove's "thundering" cracking the sky. In contrast, in its catalogue of the gifts bestowed on the entertainment by the gods, the *Letter* credits Jupiter with "fayr weather" throughout the Queen's visit, apart from "a day or to of sum sweet shoourz" granted to Ceres "for rypening of her corn that waz so well set" (Kuin 65). Moreover, Luna is credited with "callm nights for quiet rest, and sylver moonshine, that nightly in deed shone for most of her Majestyez beeing thear", while Aeolus is commended for "hollding up hiz wyndez while her highnes at any tyme took pleazure on the water, and staying of tempests during abode heer", and the genius loci for "hiz tempring of all things within and withoout" (Kuin 66-7). The only real hint of unpleasant weather in the *Letter* is found in the comment that the banquet in the pavilion at Wedgenall, along with the accompanying entertainment of a "devise of Goddessez and Nymphes", had to be cancelled "by meanz of weather not to cleerly disposed", and, as mentioned earlier, that passage may represent a later revision.

Thus, the *Letter* presents a picture of idyllic summer weather throughout the Queen's visit -- weather broken only by a few "sweet shoourz" for ripening of the crops, and, on one occasion, being "not to cleerly disposed". On the other hand, the poem in the *Princely Pleasures* speaks of five days of storms and heavy rain severe enough to destroy the harvest. Making all possible allowances for poetic licence, the reader is still left with the distinct im-

pression that five days of rain and storm preceded the Queen's departure from Kenilworth. Once again, the discrepancy between the two accounts strongly suggests that the author of the Langham *Letter* was not an eye-witness to the Kenilworth entertainment of 1575.

To summarize, then, it was posited at the beginning of the present article that there are five events which are dealt with in the Langham *Letter* and in the *Princely Pleasures* in a manner which permits comparison between the two accounts. The descriptions of these five events can thus serve as a touchstone for evaluating the *Letter's* claim to be an eye-witness account of the Kenilworth entertainment.

In each case, comparison of the manner in which the *Letter* and the *Princely Pleasures* deal with these five events has shown that the accounts differ in ways which cannot be reconciled. Either the porter was dressed as Hercules (the *Princely Pleasures*), or he was garbed in silk (the *Letter*). Either there was a single fireworks display (the *Princely Pleasures*), or there were three fireworks displays (the *Letter*). Either the unusual "underwater" fireworks were shown on July 10 (the *Princely Pleasures*), or they were shown on July 14 (the *Letter*). Either Triton appeared attired as a mermaid (the *Princely Pleasures*), or he appeared riding on an 18-foot mermaid (the *Letter*). Either it was Proteus on the dolphin's back (the *Princely Pleasures*), or it was Arion (the *Letter*). Either there were five days of rain and storms (the *Princely Pleasures*), or the weather was idyllic (the *Letter*). Either the themes of the speeches and poems were as set out in the *Princely Pleasures*, or as set out in the *Letter*. We cannot accept both accounts. Either one account must be rejected, or the other.

The most reasonable explanation for the discrepancy between the two accounts is that the author of the Langham *Letter* was not present at Kenilworth in the summer of 1575. There is nothing inherently implausible about the account given in the *Letter*; on the contrary, events are reported with astonishing verisimilitude. It is only when an attempt is made to reconcile the details given in the *Letter* with the

account in the *Princely Pleasures* that it becomes clear that events did not take place as the author of the *Letter* says they did. This discrepancy can most readily be accounted for if the author of the *Letter* was sufficiently familiar with court life to be able to write a plausible account of the Kenilworth entertainment, but was not actually present at Kenilworth in the summer of 1575. In such a situation, the resulting account would bear an air of verisimilitude, but the fact that its author was not an eye-witness would betray itself in small details when, as in the present article, it is compared with other contemporary evidence.

What, then, is the true relationship between the Langham *Letter* and the *Princely Pleasures*?

If Oxford was, as has been suggested, the true author of the Langham *Letter*, then the following scenario perhaps merits consideration. Oxford wrote the Langham *Letter* in advance of the July 1575 entertainment at Kenilworth, and arranged with William Patten to have it published and distributed to members of the court circle while the entertainment was taking place. Because Oxford was away from England at the time, the details in the *Letter* reflect what he knew in advance of the plans for the July 1575 entertainment, but also reflect, to a large degree, the 1572 entertainment at Kenilworth, at which he was present.

All might have gone well but for certain events which Oxford could not have foreseen. In the first place, the weather in July 1575 was poor. Since many of the shows and spectacles were designed to take place outdoors, a number of them were perhaps cancelled due to inclement weather. The entertainment thus did not measure up to the version given in the *Letter*. But more importantly, there seems to have been an emotional contretemps between the Queen and Leicester while she was staying at Kenilworth. It has been suggested that she learned at that time of Leicester's affair with Lettice Knollys. The result appears to have been the Queen's abrupt departure from Kenilworth seven days before she was scheduled to leave.

This would account for the hastily put together departure ceremony performed by George Gascoigne, as described in the *Princely Pleasures*. It would also account for the fact that the author of the Langham *Letter* discreetly mentions the possibility of departure, and then says that there was nothing worth recording for the last seven days of the Queen's visit. It is known from William Patten's letter of September 10, 1575 that the original version of the *Letter* was suppressed. That original version may have contained descriptions of a full schedule of events for the nineteen days of the Queen's visit. However, the *Letter* as we now have it contains nothing for the final seven days. This suggests that when the *Letter* was eventually republished, Oxford, having learned what had really happened at Kenilworth in July 1575, deleted all mention of the final seven days of the Queen's scheduled visit, including any mention of a departure ceremony.

This scenario accords with the two reasons given by William Patten for the suppression of the original version of the *Letter*. Patten says that the putative author of the *Letter*, the Keeper of the Council Chamber, Robert Langham, was so pleased with the *Letter* at first (despite the liberties which had been taken with his name and reputation), that he wanted to obtain additional copies. Later, though, Langham complained about the *Letter*, and his complaints are one of the reasons given for its suppression. How did this come about? It would seem that before the contretemps between the Queen and Leicester, the *Letter* was likely regarded by everyone with approval and amusement. It was a diverting entertainment in itself. However, when the Queen abruptly departed from Kenilworth, the *Letter*, with its high-spirited depiction of events, became an unfortunate reminder of a celebration which had turned out to be a disaster, and Langham's attitude towards the *Letter* changed to suit the Queen and Leicester's attitude towards it. What had earlier pleased Langham immensely now became a matter for complaint.

This scenario works equally well for the second reason given by William Patten for the suppression of the original version of the *Letter*, i.e., "that the honourable entertainment be not turned into a jest". How

could the Langham *Letter* as we have it make a "jest" of the July 1575 entertainment? The answer is that it could not. The *Letter* could only make a jest and a mockery of the entertainment if the reality of the July 1575 entertainment had turned out to be a poor second to the account given of it in the *Letter*. If the weather in July 1575 was rainy, leading to the cancellation of planned events, and the Queen had an emotional row with Leicester which led to her departure from Kenilworth seven days earlier than scheduled, it is easy to see how the *Letter* might have provoked an angry reaction both on her part and on Leicester's which led to orders for its complete suppression.

How, then, did the *Letter* come to be republished on two separate occasions, and why was the *Princely Pleasures* published as well?

The *Princely Pleasures* appears to be a reaction to the Langham *Letter*. It provides an "official" version of the July 1575 entertainment, and there can be little doubt that its publication was approved by the Queen. After the suppression of the original version of the *Letter*, no-one would have had the temerity to print anything about the July 1575 entertainment without the Queen's express sanction.

As mentioned earlier, the *Princely Pleasures* was published with a preface dated March 26, 1576, in which the printer, Richard Jones, states that it contains "the very true and perfect copies" of all the speeches and poems as they were really performed at the July 1575 entertainment, not as they were depicted in "a report thereof lately printed". In his preface, Jones says:

And these (being thus collected ) I have (for thy comoditie, gentle Reader), now published: the rather, because a report thereof lately imprinted by the name of The Pastime of the Progresse; which (in deede) doth nothing touch the particularitie of every commendable action, but generally reherseth hir Majestie's cheerefull entertainment in all places where shee passed: together with the exceeding Joye that her subjects had to see hir: which report made very many the more desirous to have this perfect copy: for that it plainely doth set downe every thing as it was in deede presented, at large: and further doth declare who was the aucthour and deviser of every poeme and invencion (Kuin 9-10).

It seems likely that *The Pastime of the Progresse* mentioned by Jones was, in fact, the original suppressed version of the Langham *Letter*. The title under which the *Letter* was originally published is unknown; it could well have been *The Pastime of the Progresse*. Certainly, Jones' description of the *Pastime's* content fits that of the Langham *Letter*. Jones says that this "report lately printed" was not a true record of the particulars of the July 1575 entertainment, but rather a general rehearsal of the sort of entertainment customarily put on for the Queen during her progresses.

It may even have been Oxford himself who was responsible for the publication of the *Princely Pleasures* as a way of making amends for his unfortunate publication of a work which the Queen had ordered suppressed. The *Princely Pleasures* could have been Oxford's attempt to set the record straight in order to satisfy both the Queen and Leicester.

The question then remains as to why republication of the Langham *Letter* was permitted not once, but twice, after its initial suppression in 1575. The answer probably lies in the fact that the *Letter* is a minor masterpiece. It is immensely entertaining, and depicts the Queen and her court in a very favourable light. Eventually no doubt both the Queen and Leicester got over their pique, and realized that the *Letter* represented some of the best public relations material that had ever been written, or would ever likely be written, about them. Republication of the *Letter* was thus permitted sometime circa 1577, and again in about 1590, soon after the death of both Leicester and his brother Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick. At that time, it no doubt served as a memento of the "Camelot" period of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

## Works Cited

- Harvey, Paul. *The Oxford companion to classical literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Kuin, R.J.P. *Robert Langham: A letter*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983.
- Nichols, John. *The progresses and public processions of Queen Elizabeth*. Vol.1. New York: Franklin, 1823.
- Prouty, Charles Tyler. *George Gascoigne; Elizabethan courtier, soldier; and poet*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1942.