

Division of Research
Graduate School of Business Administration
The University of Michigan

1979

A 16th CENTURY WORK ON
COMMUNICATION: PRECURSOR OF
MODERN BUSINESS COMMUNICATION

Working Paper No. 190

Herbert W. Hildebrandt

The University of Michigan

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

None of this material is to be quoted or
reproduced with the express permission
of the Division of Research

A 16th CENTURY WORK ON COMMUNICATION:
PRECURSOR OF MODERN BUSINESS COMMUNICATION

Herbert W. Hildebrandt

Graduate School of Business Administration
The University of Michigan

The historical roots of business communication, either theory or practice, cannot be definitely positioned. Instead, numerous works over time have contributed a momentum to theory and practice which continues to the present. Thus if such works exist it seems proper to view them, even for their brief prevailing value, noting their place in the history of business communication.

The genesis for theories of communication rests on the ancient oral rhetorical world with poetics, grammar, logic, even dictamen borrowing heavily from those oral concepts. In this paper our focus is on the latter: dictamen, ars dictandi, or dictaminis, i.e., the art of letter writing, man using the written word to communicate.

Works have traced the influences and theories of ancient, medieval, and Renaissance rhetorics. Few have given extensive scholarly time to dictamen. Only recently the American Business Communication Journal carried an article by Wolff¹ who briefly noted the place of letter writing in

the Medieval period, an immediate precursor to the theory and work I wish to discuss.

Today the visual and oral has replaced, in part, the extraordinary power of the written word. Not so in the Renaissance. Then idea movement was oral and written, the latter the medium for churchman, nobleman, or merchant. Thus there appeared in English a seminal work that tried to suggest theories, requirements, and examples of good written composition: Angell Day's The English Secretary or Method of Writing Epistles and Letters.²

The purpose of our paper is to suggest that Day wrote one of the earliest English statements on business communication, namely, the letter as it should be composed by secretaries and others in the 16th century. We will discuss three points: first, Angell Day as a writer of his period; second, etymological mutations that have occurred in the term secretary; and third, the 1599 edition of Day which represented both a theoretical and pragmatic work for communicators of the day.

Angell Day

No biography on Day exists. Only scattered secondary sources give us any idea as to his position as a writer in the Renaissance. What then was his training and schooling for writing the first original work in English on letter writing and the responsibilities of a secretary?

The Stationers' Register supplies the hint that early he may have become acquainted with the duties of an office

inasmuch as his father was a clerk:

"Thomas Duxsell Angell Daye the sonne of Thomas Daye of London parysshe clerke hath put hym self apprentice to Thomas Duxsell Cytizen and Stacioner of London from the feaste of the byrth of our Lorde god [25 December] 1563 Twelve yeres..."³

Only conjecture lies beyond the above. One knows that the apprenticeship to Duxsell lasted from 1563 to 1575, during which time Day read manuscripts while putting them into type, and was exposed to other publications which passed through his employer's hands.

Of his precise schooling we can only infer. If he did attend one of the London grammar schools--most likely--we know that composition and language training was preeminent; that grammar, rhetoric and logic exercises were characteristic of Saint Paul's, London, after which numerous grammar schools were patterned. A brief review of the course of study at St. Paul's, for example the tertia class, reveals the following:⁴

Monday	Morning	A part in the Grammar
	Afternoon	A Lesson in Ovid de Tristibus
Tuesday	Morning	A part in the Grammar
	Afternoon	A lesson in Erasmus Colloquia
	Exercise	
Wenesday	Morning	A part in the Grammar
	Afternoon	A Lesson in Nomenclatura
	Exercise	Some verses out of the Proverbs or Psalmes or English Dictamen
Thursday	Morning	A Part in the Grammar
	Afternoon	A Lesson in Ovid de Tristibus
	Exercise	Some verses out of the Proverbs or Psalmes

Fryday	A Repetition of what hath been Learned the whole weeke
Saturday	Some verses out of the Proverbs or Psalmes

Thus Wednesday included attention to letter writing while by implication additional time was also devoted to exercises, repetitions, similiar to the ancient lessons known as Progymnasmata or composition exercises. This latter concept Day will carry forward in his own work.

Day must also have been familiar with models for imitation, properly called formularies. His own education demanded that not only should he consciously imitate models, but create his own work with formularies as a guide. English and Latin formularies were prolific during his grammar school years and later. A few examples will suffice:

- Richard Taverner, The garden of Wysdom (1539)
Richard Rainolde, The Foundacions of Rhetorike (1563)
William Fullwood, The Enimie of Idlenesse (1568)
Abraham Flemming, A Panoplie of Epistles, Or, a
looking Glasse for the vnlearned
(1576)

Erasmus spawned many works concentrating on letter writing, beginning with his De conscribendis epistolis (1521) to be followed by works as Christopher Hegendorphinus' Methodus conscribendi epistolas (1537); Conrad Celtes' Methodus conficiendarum epistoharum (1537); Georgius Macropedius' Methodus de conscribendis epistolis (1580); Vives' De conscribendis epistolis (1537); Brandolini's

De ratione scribendi (1549); Verepaeus' De epistolis latine conscribendis (1592). Later we shall suggest which of these works Day depended upon.

Thus one may conclude that Day was exposed to rhetorical theory, was familiar with the rules of grammar, and knew that letter writing was founded on the ancient theories of rhetorical composition. He would support that tradition in his English Secretary.

Day wrote and translated several other works, seemingly unrelated to communication theory and practice. He translated a Greek romance entitled Daphnis and Chloe (1587)⁵ from a French version by Jacques Amyot who translated from the Greek. Beyond the above work and the Secretary, Day is said to have published a pamphlet entitled "Wonderfull Straunge Sightes seene in the Element ouer the citie of London" and an elegy on Sir Philip Sidney. You may judge his sonnet writing ability as a commendatory to an English translation of an Italian work by John Baptista Nenna:

My artless Muse (if any muse at all),
Couched in rude, in base, in home attire,
Not fitting thoughts or actions that aspire....

But sithe thy zeale to Honour Nenion
Whom thy desires haue broughte from forreine soile,
Hath beene one cause of this thy taken toile,
Vnwaited on with praise thou mayst not goe.
For lookers on that doe partake thy pleasure,
Must of thy vertue find the pretious treasure.⁶

In brief, Day's contribution to the history of communication through letter writing rests on his one significant work: his Secretary. It is first to the etymology of the term secretary that we shall now turn.

Secretary

Consistency in orthography and meaning of the term secretary severely wobbles during the Renaissance, and earlier. Day, for example, vacillates between "secretary," "secretarie," "scretory," or "secretorie," occasionally using different spellings on the same page. Such aberrations were common as the 16th century sought to codify English spellings as both the language of nobility and the common man moved into the Vernacular from Latin.

Day must have received criticism--and well he might--of the 1586 edition. Indeed, he publicly chastized the printer of the book for errors brought on by undue haste and pressures, Day promising that things will be better, subsequently. Little is better in 1599 with Day still upbraiding his printer for errors, but more mildly;

"And yet after this continued trauell vnto this present, you either in mine or in the printers escapes find any thing blame worthy, couer it I pray you as before you haue done with the vaile of your courtesie. The copies before this, haue bene I confesse erroneously many wayes deliuered, and this by the blottings and interlinings had in the former amendements hath peradventure also his escapes or mistakings: If any be, they are fewe I hope, and therefore the more easie to be tollerated. Onely correct where fault is, and the printer and I shalbe beholden vnto you."⁷

The inference here is that previous editions were disorganized--they were--and consistency in orthography and content were lacking.

Day is conservative. The OED⁸ lists three other spellings of "secretary" in addition to Day's variants; Day avoids them. While orthographic changes of "secretary" number eight, variants in the meaning of the the term are diverse. At least 16 variations are recorded in the OED, four of which find expression in Day's concept of a secretary's responsibilities as we shall now discuss.

Letter Writing. Day recognizes that great skill is needed in a secretary who must write for another. In fact he suggests this writing function as major: "...what great perfection is to be required in such a one, by whose title the same is deliuered, neither supposing the matter herein contained to appeare so sufficient, as perfectly thereby to enable what in the same function is to bee required, but because the orderly writing of Letters, being a principall part belonging to a Secretorie is by the Method."⁹ By this, he does not mean penmanship or, as he says, "ordering of the pen" as seemed to be the main understanding of others. Having said that, he does not wish to go too far afield because later in the book he suggests that "albeit the vse heereof is not the least part of manie other things incident to the same office."¹⁰ Thus letter writing is a viable function.

Secrecy. Day argues by analogy, suggesting that each house has a place for private matters to be stored and

discussed. So too the person who has access to that environment has certain responsibilities. Day, in his usual prolix manner, puts his discussion this way:

"The Closet in euerie house, as it is a re-
posement of secrets, so is it onlie (as I saide
before) at the owners, and no others commaundment:
The Secretorie, as hee is a keeper and conseruer
of secrets, so is hee by his Lorde or Maister, and
by none other to bee directed. To a Closet, there
belongeth properlie, a doore, a locke, and a key:
to a Secretorie, there appertaineth incidentlie,
Honestie, Care, and Fidelitie."¹¹

And further "... that he ought therein to be
as a thicke plated doore, where thought, without
extraordinarie violence no man may enter, but by
the locke which is the tongue, and that to be of
such efficacie, as whereof no counterfeit key
shoulde bee able to make a breach, without the
selfe same instrument that by the director thereof
is alwayes to be caried."¹²

Accounts. The OED suggests that secretarial responsibilities went beyond simple correspondence, including the keeping of records, transacting various other forms of business, and presumably handling financial matters. Thus secrecy and trust paralleled confidence in handling letters. Day supports the above concept, adding that fidelity in character should be present in a secretary.

Style of writing. Legal documents between the 15th and 17th century, and others, were characterized as being written in a secretarial style. Thus any kind of imitation of black letter type must have been clear in order of wording and penmanship. Day echoes such perfection, suggesting that "...it is requisite the Secretary, be for the perfection of his hand, in the varietie and neat deliuerie of his letters in writing, singularlie to be commended, that he haue with himselfe also therein a verie readie vse, quicke, and speedie conueyance for dispatch..."¹³

Thus Day is in step with both orthographic and semantic variations of the term secretary, but also receives a classification in the OED attributable only to him: the first book in English to have "secretary" in the title.¹⁴

The English Secretary

Two English texts preceded Day as works on formulary letter writing. The first was William Fullwood's The Enimie of Idlennesse (1568),¹⁵ written for the "right worshypful the Maister, Wardens, and Company of the Marchant Tayllors of London." While one could argue that the text represented the earliest English work for business writing, it is really not an original work but a translation of the French Le stile et maniere de composer, dicter, et escrire toute sorte d' epistres, ou lettres missiues, tant par response, que autrement, avec epitome de la pointuation francoise.¹⁶

The title page of Fullwood's work suggests the book's unoriginal character: The Enimie of Idlennesse: Teaching the

maner and stile how to endite... Set forth in English by William Fulwood Marchant.¹⁷ Four books made up the work:

Book I Involves principles of letter writing under the heading of instructions on how to "endyte" or fashion letters, divided into Letters of Doctrine, of Myrth, or of Grauitie.

Book II Twenty-three letters comprise translations of politicians and other celebrities of the period under the heading of "Companies of Sundry learned mens Letters and Epistles.

Book III Specimen letters comprise this section and include letters between father and son, wife and husband, a sister to her brother, and letters to daughters, mother, business associates, and others, under the heading of "howe to write by aunswere. . . ."

Book IV Only 28 pages are devoted to this section on love letters or as Fulwood says "containyng sundry Letters, belonging to Loue, as well in Verse as in Prose.

There is little originalty in a second English work on letter writing preceding Day: Abraham Fleming's A Panoplie of Epistles, Or, a looking Glasse for the Vnlearned. (1576)¹⁸ His unblemished claim to not being original is refreshing inasmuch as he got ideas "vysed of the best and the eloquentest Rhetoricians that haue liued in all ages, and haue beene famous in that facultie."¹⁹

Thus all letters are translations from 57 authors, a who's who of known persons as Vives, Erasmus, Macropedius, Hegendorphinus, Ascham, Cicero, Isocrates, Socrates, Brutus, Darius, Cyrus, Alexander, Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno. Originality was sparse, the work acting as a bridge between the world of Latin and the tentative steps of English as the basis for classroom exercises.

Angell Day in many respects was more original, more creative than the two preceding English translators. He eschews dependence, firmly stating that in English he has set a pathway "as the like wherof hath not at any time heretofore beene deliuered. Nowe first deuized, and newly published."²⁰ The earliest or 1586 edition of the Secretary states a specific admiration for Latin predecessors as Cicero, Lucian, and Politian. Furthermore, "others are plentifully extant, some also of the choysest and beste learned of late yeares, haue endeouored by writing to publishe in the Latine tongue, their sundry methodes touching the same, among whom Erasmus, euermore famous for his studies, and Macropedius at large. Lodouicus Viues and Hegindorphimus, learnedlye, yet brieflye each of them well approving the goodnes, in that by seuerall rules they haue distinguished the diuersities, ground and skilful directions thereof."²¹ By 1599 the above names are absent, the author makes no bow toward any source.

Rhetorical position of Day's Secretary

There is danger in trying to position any work on communication into a pattern. Only by hindsight can we see

that Day's philosophy of communication, as expressed in letter writing, fell into what Howell calls the Neo-Ciceronian period, or a reemphasis upon the tenets of invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery. Since Day fits into the genre of the written, one can immediately divorce him from the canons of memory and delivery. That leaves invention, arrangement, and style.

Invention or inventio had a meaning different in the Renaissance, and earlier, than today. Briefly, it meant searching out the topics which could serve as material for use within discourse. Aristotle suggested 28 such locations or loci;²² while Cicero²³ devoted portions of his Topica and the De inventione to invention. These were the ancients and progenitors of the period in which Day wrote. Hence any writer or communicator could not help but be influenced by this oral rhetorical tradition, including Day who reflected that influence and applied those precepts to the art of letter writing.

Arrangement, or dispositio, is more clearly seen in Day than invention. It is so because Day simply adapts the parts of an oration to his letters thereby firmly placing him in the school of Neo-Ciceronians who adhered to classical rhetoric. Let me offer a confirming quotation:

In such kind therefore of Epistles, rightly and with good skil to be handled, the learner shal vnderstand, that there are three things, by meanes whereof, for the needfull expressing and orderlie deliuerie of anie matter whatsoever, he must of necessitie be furnished. Inuention first, wherein plentifulle is searched and considered, what kind of matter, how much varietie of sentences, what sorts of figures, how many similitudes,

what approbations, diminutions, insinuations and circumstances are presentlie needefull, or furthering to the matter in handling. Then, Disposition, whereby is orderlie, cunninglie, and perfectlie laide downe and disposed, euerie matter and cause in his one order, proportion and place. Thirdlie, Eloquution, whose efficacie in speaches, neate, pure and elegant, is in the other Chapter vnder aptnes of words sufficientlie already described."²⁴

The preceding theme of Day is further amplified when he proposes that the parts of a letter are five--identical to the five parts of an oration.²⁵

Exordium A beginning or induction to the matter to be written of, which is not alwayes after one sort or fashion, but in diuerse maners...

Narratio Then Narratio, or Propositio, each seruing to or one effect, wherein is declared or proponed, Propositio in the one by plaine tearmes, in the other by inference, or comparison, the verie substance of the matter whatsoever to be handled.

Confirmatio Then Confirmatio, wherein are amplified or suggested many reasons, for the aggrauating or proof of any matter in question.

Confutatio After confutatio, whereby is diminished, disproued or auoided, whatsoever to bee supposed, objected or aggrauated.

Peroratio Lastlie, Peroratio, in which after a briefe recapitulation of that which hath beene vrged, the occasions thereof are immediatelie concluded.

By way of comparison, Quintilian, as a representative of the ancients, speaks about the exordium as an introduction to the subject on which the orator will speak; statement of facts or narratio suggests the nature of the subject on which the speaker will have to give judgment; verification or confirmatio implies proving the thesis as stated in the narratio; and peroration which some call the completion and others the conclusion.²⁶ Day's circuitous style summarized the ancient

canons of communication in this manner: "These are not altogether at all times vsed, but some or the most of them as occasion serueth, either admitted or reiected: besides which, others also are sometimes remembred. The vse whereof as in sundrie Epistles they may be deemed necessarie, shall in their seuerall examples hereafter perused, appeare more euidentlie and largely."²⁷

In addition, Day classifies his types of letters and headings similar to the types of ancient oratory, namely demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial, to which he adds, independently, a fourth category, the familiar.

Another comparison with the ancient rhetoricians is needed: his classification of the three major kinds of communicative styles. Day's own words serve as an introduction: "Now in as much as Eloquution is annexed vnto the stile, which euermore is also tied to the argument and substance of euerie Epistle: it is to be regarded what stile maie generallie bee deemed meetest for the common habit, wherein each of them maie ordinarlie be published. In the recording wherof, we do find three sorts, especiallie in all kinds of writing and speaking, to haue bene generallie commended."²⁸ He then goes on to record the three traditional oratorical styles of the Plain, the Middle and the Grand, paralleling tenets first noted in the ad Herennium,²⁹ the de Orator³⁰ and Quintilian.³¹ By analogy he proposes that the sublime style of writing is used with kings, princes, and other noble persons, along with themes which use figures of rhetoric.

The humble style is appropriate to the familiar letters, deals with simple subjects, indeed "sweepeth euen the very ground itselfe," while the mediocre--Day's word--is appropriate to letters as declamations, commentaries and to letters in general.

One final characteristic places Day in the stylistic or elocutio school of writers, the appearance in later editions of a section entitled "A Declaration of such Tropes, Figures and Schemes, as either vsually or for ornament sake are therein required." Style as Aristotle conceived it, emphasized clearness, correctness, appropriateness, and ornateness. Only later were their proliferations or ornament into indescribably complex configurations of language, helped by such writers as the author of the Rhetorica ad Herennium, Cicero's de Orator, Quintilian, Wilson, Talaeus, Fenner, Fraunce, Butler, Hoskins, Erasmus, Susenbrotus, Sherry, Peacham, Puttenham, and Day.³²

Day's subdivisions and methods of handling the figures we shall note in our next section. Here let me pause and suggest that Day was profoundly influenced by the principles of oratory. His originality was greater than the two preceding English writers on the art of letter writing, yet in step with the rhetorical traditions of his day. Direct dependence on the ancients is difficult to prove because Latin formularies on letter writing preceded him, some of which he may have used in school. His work therefore fits into two Renaissance schools of thought: formulary because he suggests

letters of imitation, and stylistic because he gives inordinate emphasis to the schemes and tropes, even as sidenotes, and an elaborate section to themselves.

Structure of Day's Secretary.

My discussion of the English Secretary is based on the 1599 edition because the first, 1586, contained only Part One while the later editions included three: letters, schemes and tropes, and the qualities of a secretary. But first I wish to view the idea movement of the section on letters.

Schoolboys, uneducated persons, secretaries to people of significance would have liked Day's organization. Theory precedes practice; discussion precedes example; headnotes precede sidenotes. When compared with his contemporaries, Day's purpose statements and organization is clear, usually complete with a divisio, possibly thereby suggesting why his work was so popular and went through numerous editions and printings.

Theory for Day was a restatement of his predecessors. He is not ashamed to suggest that many excellent authors have already written on the subject, yet he will make his own contribution. Three principles, firstly, should characterize a letter: aptness of words and sentences, brevity of speech, and comeliness in delivery. And although these qualities are not fully defined or developed, they serve as the basis for further discussion.

Secondly, he views the parts of a letter as wholly rhetorical, Day betraying his Classical dependence with

headnotes as "Oratory parts in epistle" and "Rhetoricall parts in Epistle."

While discussing background and before noting any full blown examples, he, thirdly, minutely examines the salutation, the farewell, the subscription, and the outward direction or estate level of persons receiving letters. Examples predominate; a kaleidoscope of directions, so minute that the reader of today would walk away from the exactitude demanded. For example, Day's suggestions for addressing an Archbishop and Chancellor read this way: "To the most reuerend Father in God, the L. Archbishop of Canturburie, or York, Primate of England, and Metropolitane his verie good grace. To the right reuerende Father in God, and my verie good Lorde, the L. Bishop of London. To the high and mightie Prince, L. Duke of B. his most noble grace. To the right honourable and my especiall good L. the Lorde Chauncellor, or Lord high Treasurer of England."³³

Fourthly, Day is elaborate in categorizing letters, quite consistently offering (1) a theoretical discussion followed with (2) examples that illustrate his theory. Today's scholars would find his 32 types of letters too discursive, too meandering, too tedious. Let me simplify in order to provide more historical background on which students, writers, businesspeople of the day based their correspondence.

Demonstrative letters

1. Descriptive -- a description of the goodness or value of a thing (3 e.g.)
2. Laudatorie -- praise of a person, deed, or thing (1 e.g.)
3. Vituperatorie -- dispraise of a person, deed, or thing (1 e.g.)

Deliberative letters

1. Hortatorie -- advising and counselling (3 e.g.)
2. Dehonoratorie -- dissuading (1 e.g.)
3. Swasorie -- similar to above (2 e.g.)
4. Disswasorie -- similar, with emphasis on the negative (2 e.g.)
5. Responsorie -- really familiar letter but discussed in deliberative section; depends heavily upon arguments presented in original (8 e.g.)
6. Conciliatorie -- desire to receive acquaintance, friendship, of person of higher stature (2 e.g.)
7. Reconciliatorie -- seeks reconciliation (2 e.g.)
8. Petitorie -- petitions to someone (6 e.g.)
9. Commendatorie -- similar to the above, courteous recommendation (6 e.g.)
10. Consolatorie -- notes to those who are grieved (4 e.g.)
11. Monitorie -- warnings to the unexperienced (3 e.g.)
12. Reprehensorie -- explaining faults of person (2 e.g.)
13. Amatorie -- letters of love (2 e.g.)

Judicial letters

1. Accusatorie -- accusation (2 e.g.)
2. Excusatorie -- excuses for action (1 e.g.)
3. Defensorie -- defense of actions (1 e.g.)
4. Expostulatorie -- reasoning, debating, or arguing for a cause (5 e.g.)
5. Exprobatorie -- vehement distain (2 e.g.)
6. Invective -- sharp and bitter statement against a person (4 e.g.)
7. Purgatorie -- no definition supplied (1 e.g.)
8. Comminatorie -- to threaten (2 e.g.)
9. Deprecatorie -- entreaty, requests of favor (3 e.g.)
10. Defensorie -- defense of position (1 e.g.)

Familiar letters

1. Narratorie -- general correspondence, discussion of affairs (3 e.g.)

2. Nunciatorie -- similar to the above (2 e.g.)
3. Remuneratorie -- gratitude for something received (4 e.g.)
4. Gratulatorie -- rejoicing over good fortune of another (3 e.g.)
5. Obiurgatorie -- rebuking actions of someone (1 e.g.)
6. Mandotorie -- most ordinary of all letters (4 e.g.)

From the above, the reader can grasp Day's methodology:

(1) a brief discussion of the type of letter; (2) an occasional transitional paragraph leading to the next type of letter; (3) a headnote to the exemplary letter; and (4) sidenotes which suggest either the figures of speech or the rhetorical divisions of the letter. One example will suffice. Genre of letter: deliberative; name of letter: commendatorie; headnote: "An example commendatorie, wherein is recommended to a noble man from his inferiour, the conditions and behaviours of a person;"³⁴ sidenotes: Narratio, Commendation of the party, Petition, Peroration. The sample letter then follows.

The letters for the most part are pragmatic, superior to the theory section which simply carries rhetoric over to letter writing. A usable business letter, for instance, is one entitled An example of an Epistle Accusatorie in the state of Coniecturall, from a merchant to the father of his seruant, with another example of a return letter by the father to the merchant.

But a pragmatic value of Day's letters lie in his final section entitled Epistles familiar. Here, one could suppose, titles as a son to his father; from one friend to another; servant or factor to his master; from an inferior to one far

his better; from a wife to her husband; from a master to his servant; from a man to his wife, would receive thorough reading.

Day gives up on love letters, his last exemplary section. Copies I have read show no more wear than other sections of the work, but for Day the task must have been uncomfortable. His preamble suggests that:

"And nowe the last of all these diuisions yet vnspoken of is Amatorie, whereof because the humours of all sortes with loue possessed, are so infinite and so great an vncertaintie in them remaineth, as that perchance euen in the verie writing of his letter, the louer himself is somtimes scarce certain of his own intended purpose therein, the lesse must of necessitie be the precepts of the same, for that in some of them wee require and entreate in others expostulate the matters and occasions falling in the necke therof...³⁵

Finally he confesses that he has had little experience in study of love letters "And howbeit the little experience I haue had of some conuersing in this kinde of studie, hath sufficientlie taught mee to knowe, that the verie instinct or settled impression of this kinde of fantasie is such a Schoolemaister to inuention, and so cunning a refiner of any well disposed conceit, as that with very small help, it thereby commonlie performeth much more than well could bee otherwise intended."³⁶ Smart man.

Figures of Speech in Day's Letters

Day is a figurist,³⁷ so called because editions after 1567 include a separate section entitled A Declaration of Al such Tropes, Figures or Schemes, as for excellencie and ornament in writing, are speciallie vsed in this Methode.³⁸

The motivation for including this section is clear when he remarks to the reader that "I haue now for better supplement of the learners knowledge, determined in this place to make a collection of them (the figures) all, remembering with my selfe, that vnto such as are vnexperienced in their particular applications, they shall be but of verie slender moment in their quotations, without also they may be instructed by example, how, where, and in what tearmes, wordes or cariage, they are vsed..."³⁹

The 93 figures of speech in the Secretary need not detain us long. Divisions and subdivisions are at the discretion of Day but parallel the traditional Greek and Latin dichotomy of schemes and tropes employed since antiquity. Thus tropes (variations of words or sentences) are divided into tropes of words (7) and tropes of sentences (9). Schemes (different ways of writing) he divides into schemes syntactical (21)--omitting orthographical--and schemes rhetorical of words (12), of thought (44).

Therefore, for Day, the figures are adjuncts to letters, stylistic devices that gave elegance to thought. One could hypothesize further that as more people left Latin for the Vernacular, the common man had to incorporate the flowers of

rhetoric into his communication when writing to persons of privilege: the merchant, politician, churchman, nobleman, master. Ordinary writing, plain writing would remind the common man of his lower class. Would it not be to the writer's benefit to secure an aristocrat's approval by using similar devices that would sound agreeable? The many letters of Day seem to suggest just that.⁴⁰

Character of a Secretary

Finally, 32 pages of the "Partes, place and office of a Secretorie" conclude Day's work. Modern readers will recognize little that is familiar. It too deserves little attention except as an historical statement.

Day feels he is original, in English. "Considering howe many woorthie and excellent men, not onely in our present age, but in manie years before vs haue liued, none of all which (though questionlesse furnished with verie great abilitie) haue to my certaine knowledge, euer written ought in our English tongue, touching this title:"⁴¹ Furthermore, he is completing a promise made in his first edition where he said a section on the secretary would be later included, basing his comments not only on observation, but actual service himself as a secretary. Thus his reasons for writing.

Absent in his discussion is what a secretary does, rather includes who he is, namely, the human qualities that a male should possess. Briefly, men--women are never mentioned--should possess qualities not unlike the gods themselves:

fidelity, humility, faithfulness, diligence, carefulness, industriousness, wittiness, studiousness, zealousness, discretion, energy, honesty, care, non-slothful, not given to drunkenness, and a host of other qualities too tedious to record. The man, not the responsibilities, occupy Day.

* * * *

It would be a mistake not to remark that Day is therefore a traditionalist communicator for his time, employing traditional concepts of rhetoric to his purposes of letter writing. Yet his originality is in implementing ancient communication theory, with examples, formularies, exercises which students, merchants, even the uneducated could use in their letter writing. That he was popular there is no doubt; his Secretary had numerous editions and printing between 1586 and 1625. He may never have thought of the term business communication, but in some way he made an early contribution to it.

Notes

1. Luella M. Wolff, "A Brief History of the Art of Dictamen: Medieval Origins of Business Letter Writing.:" Journal of Business Communication 16, No. 2 (Winter 1979), 3-11.
2. Angell Day, The English Secretarie (London 1586). The complete title page of the British Museum copy reads: The English Secretorie. Wherein is contayned, a Perfect Method, for the inditing of all manner of Epistles and familiar Letters, together with their diuersities enlarged by examples under their seuerall Tyttles. In which is layd forth a Path-waye, so apt, plaine and easie, to any learners capacity, as the like whereof hath not at any time heretofore beene deliuered. Nowe first deuized, and newly published, by Angel Daye. Altior fortuna Virtus. At London, Printed by Robert Walde-graue, and are to be solde by Richard Iones, dwelling at the Signe of the Rose and the Crowne, neere Vnto Holburn Bridge, 1586. Other editions I have viewed are those of 1587, 1585, 1599, 1607, 1621, 1614, 1625.
3. Edward Arber, ed., Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London (London 1875), reprinted by Peter Smith (1950) Vol. I, p. 98b. The DNB includes the above information, but adds the critical comment that the Secretary is "...a curious and entertaining manual of epistolary correspondences. See Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee, DNB (London 1978) Vol. V, p. 680.
4. Donald Lemen Clark, John Milton at St. Paul's School (New York 1948), p. 111.
5. The verbosity of Day parallels his contemporaries on the title page of the British Museum copy:

Daphnis and Chloe Excellently describing the weight of affection, the simplicitie of loue, the purport of honest meaning, the resolution of men, and disposition of Fate, finished in a Pastorall, and interlaced with the praises of a most peerlesse Princesse, wonderfull in Maiestie, and rare in perfection, celebrated within the same Pastorall, and therefore termed by the name of The Shepherds Holidiaie. By Angell Daye. Altior fortune virtus At London printed by Robert Waldegraue & are to be sold at his shop in Paules church-yard at the signe of the Crane 1587.

6. The complete title of British Museum copy: Nennio or a Treatise of Nobility: Wherein is discoursed what true Nobilitie is, with such qualities as are required in a perfect Gentleman. Written in Italian by that famous Doctor and worthy knight Sir John Baptista Nenna of Bari. Done into English by William Iones Gent. Printed by P.S. for Paule Linley, and Iohn Flasket, and are to be sold at their shop in Paules churchyard, at the Signe of the black Beare, 1595.
7. Day 1599. Sig. A3^V. Our dependence upon the 1599 edition is due to its accessibility and its inclusion of all three books originally planned by Day in the 1587 edition. See especially Angell Day, The English Secretary, reprinted by Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints (Gainesville 1967).
8. Oxford English Dictionary (OED) (Oxford 1933), reprinted 1970, Vol. 9, pp. 358-359.
9. Day 1599, Sig. A4^r.
10. Ibid., p. 102.
11. Ibid., p. 103.
12. Ibid., p. 124.
13. Ibid., p. 130.
14. OED, p. 359.
15. William Fulwood, The Enimie of Idlenesse: Teaching the maner and stile how to endite, compose and write all sorts of Epistles and Letters: as well by answer, as otherwise. Deuided into foure Bokes, no lesse pleasaunt than profitable. Set forth in English by William Fulwood Marchant, & c. The Contentes hereof appere in the Table at the latter ende of the Booke. An Enimie to Idleness, A frend to Exercise: By practise of the prudent pen, Loe here before thine eyes. Imprinted at London by Henry Bynneman, for Leonard Maylard Anno 1568.
16. See especially Katherine Gee Hornbeak, "The Complete Letter-Writer in English 1568-1800." Smith College Studies in Modern Languages 15, Nos. 3-4 (April-July 1934), p. 3; also Jean Robertson, The Art of Letter Writing (London 1942), pp. 13-14.
17. Fulwood 1568. Title page.

18. Abraham Fleming, *A Panoplie of Epistles, Or a looking Glasse for the vnlearned. Conteyning a perfecte plat-forme of inditing letters of all sorts, to persons of al estates and degrees, as well our superiours, as also our equall and inferiours: vsed of the best and the eloquentest Rhetoricians that haue liued in all ages, and haue beene famous in that facultie. Gathered and translated out of the Latine into English, by Abraham Fleming. Armat spina roses, melle tegunt apes. Imprinted at London, for Ralph Newberie, dwelling in Fletestrete a litle aboue the great Conduite. Annoia Vingineo partu 1576.*
19. Ibid., Title Page.
20. Day 1586. Title Page.
21. Ibid., p. 2.
22. Lane Cooper, trans., The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York 1932) 2.23.
23. Cicero, Topica; De inventione, trans. H.M. Hubbell (Cambridge 1949) Loeb Classical Library.
24. Day 1599, p. 9.
25. Ibid., p. 11.
26. See following appropriate sections in Quintilian, Institutes, trans. H.E. Butler (London 1953), Loeb Classical Library. 4.1.1-79; 4.2.1-132; 3.9.1-5; 6.1.1ff.
27. Day 1599, p. 11.
28. Ibid., p. 10.
29. Harry Caplan, Trans., Ad C. Herennium (London 1954) Loeb Classical Library, 4.8.11.
30. Cicero, De Oratore, trans. H. Rackham (London 1958) Loeb Classical Library. 3.177, 199, 212.
31. Quintilian 1953, 10.1.44; 12.10.63ff.
32. The following list is brief, but gives the reader additional works--contemporary with Day--which devoted space to a discussion of the figures: Erasmus, De dvplici copia verborvm ac rervm (London 1511); Susenbrotus, Epitome troporvm ac schematvm et grammaticorum & rhetorum (1540); Richard Sherry, A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes

(London 1550); Mosellanus, Tabylae de schematibvs et tropis in rhetorica (London 1573); Henry Peacham, The Garden of Eloquence (London 1577); Abraham Fraunce, The Arcadian Rhetorike (London 1588); John Hoskins, Directions for Speech and Style, (London 1599), ed. Hoyt H. Hudson (Princeton 1935).

33. Day 1599, p. 18.
34. Ibid., p. 102.
35. Ibid., p. 143.
36. Ibid., p. 144.
37. Sister Miriam Joseph Rauh, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language (New York 1947). p. 14.
38. Day 1599, p. 75.
39. Ibid., p. 76.
40. Howell (1956) raises a similar point with regard to oral style. See his comments p. 117-118.
41. Day 1599, p. 101.