

Components of 16th-century letters

A case study of Thomas More's correspondence with Thomas Wolsey and
Margaret Roper

Jenni Lahtinen

Minor Subject Thesis

University of Turku

School of Languages and Translation Studies

English

May 2019

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin Originality Check service.

University of Turku

School of Languages and Translation Studies/Faculty of Humanities

LAHTINEN, JENNI: Components of 16th-century letters. A case study of Thomas More's correspondence with Thomas Wolsey and Margaret Roper

Minor subject thesis, 51 p., 8 p. appendices

English language, Language Learning and Teaching Degree Programme

May 2020

In this minor subject thesis are studied the correspondence of Thomas More from the point of view of letter-writing models. More's letters' form is compared to a model provided by Anneli Bergholm in her MA thesis from 2008. She suggested a more accurate model for 15th-century letters based on her study of previous letter models and family letter collections of the late 15th century.

The main purpose of this study is to find out whether the letter model for late 15th-century letters corresponds to the letters written at the beginning of the 16th century. In addition, as letters to two correspondents were examined, the goal was to find out whether there is difference between the letters to different correspondents and how does it show.

The material was chosen from letters More wrote in English to Thomas Wolsey and Margaret Roper. Altogether are studied 16 letters, eight letters from each correspondent. The letters are analysed by using the method of close reading. Bergholm's model consists of seven main elements and nine optional elements which a letter can contain. The analysis shows that the letters to different correspondents are different and that altogether More's letters do not follow the letter model Bergholm provided, save for a few elements.

Keywords: letter-writing, letter models, Thomas More, 16th-century correspondence

Table of Contents

List of tables

1 Introduction	1
2 Thomas More's relationships and correspondence	4
2.1 Thomas Wolsey	6
2.2 Margaret Roper	7
2.3 Other correspondence	8
3 Letter-writing and letter-writing models	9
3.1 Letter-writing	9
3.1.1 <i>Ars dictaminis</i>	9
3.1.2 Letter-writing in the 15 th -century England	9
3.2 Letter models and Bergholm's study	11
3.2.1 Letter models of Davis, Richardson, and Nevalainen	11
3.2.2 Bergholm's study and letter model	13
4 Research design	22
4.1 The objective of the thesis and the research questions	22
4.2 Methods	23
4.3 Primary material	23
5 Results	28
5.1 Form of the letters to Wolsey	29
5.2 Form of the letters to Roper	37
5.3 Comparison between the letters to Wolsey and Roper	44
5.4 Applicability of Bergholm's model to More's letters	45
6 Conclusion	48
References	50
Appendix I: An example of annotation of a letter	
Appendix II: A table declaring whether an element was found in a letter	
Appendix III: Finnish summary	

List of tables

Table 1 Letter models according to the Latin letter (Zweck 2018), Davis (1965), (Hall & Richardson (1984), Nevalainen (2001).	12
Table 2 Letter models according to the Latin letter (Zweck 2018), Davis (1965), (Hall & Richardson (1984), Nevalainen (2001) added with Bergholm’s model (2008).....	18
Table 3 The eight letters to Wolsey.....	26
Table 4 The eight letters to Roper	27

1 Introduction

Writing a letter in today's society might not be on everyone's minds, as messages are more and more delivered via electronic devices. However, even a present-day email has some components which in reality have been a part of letter-writing for a long time. In the same way as in an email one should know whom the message is to be sent, what is the topic of the message, what are the more detailed contents of the email, and who has sent the message, letters from medieval times and even earlier were composed of the same components.

In this minor subject thesis is studied the letter-writing of Thomas More (from now on also 'More'). More's letters to his daughter Margaret Roper (from now on also 'Roper') and to cardinal and lord chancellor Thomas Wolsey (from now on also 'Wolsey') are studied from the perspective of a letter model for personal private letters provided by Anneli Bergholm in her MA thesis from 2008. The focus of this study is on the form, i.e. different components, or elements, of a letter, such as the address, the date, and the signature, and not on the formulas, i.e. strict phrases, which should always appear in the same form, e.g. an opening formula "I have taken pen in hand" (example from Bergholm 2008, 38).

Before discussing the theoretical framework further, it should be explained who More was and why he should be studied. Ackroyd's (1998) biography on Thomas More offers insight into More's life. More can be thought to be one of the most important men in 16th-century England: in addition to having a career as a lawyer he was the personal chancellor to King Henry VIII for some years. He led a successful life and career until an unfortunate sequence of events when he had to decide between his conscience and the then newly proposed law. As for More's relationships, More's eldest daughter, Margaret Roper, was very dear to him. Their relationship has been mostly preserved only in the letters More sent to her, for, unfortunately, the letters written by Roper to More have not survived save for a few. More and Wolsey's relationship was more official, as they were both King Henry's subordinates. More was also the successor to the office of Lord Chancellor after Wolsey. More, his correspondence and his relationships to Wolsey and Roper are further discussed in chapter 2.

The theoretical framework is discussed in chapter 3. After a short presentation of the concept of *ars dictaminis* (i.e. the art of letter-writing) and the letter-writing in the 15th-century England in section 3.1, Bergholm's model, which she based on previously

proposed models of Norman Davis (1965), Hall (1908) and Malcolm Richardson (1984), and which were then further developed by Terttu Nevalainen (2001), is presented in section 3.2. In her analysis, Bergholm also used studies on letter formulas, i.e. the phrasing in different parts of a letter, however, these are not specifically examined in this study, except for some phrases which Bergholm has in her own model.

The primary material consists of letters More wrote to Wolsey and Roper. There are many letters in More's correspondence written to various people, but as they are written in Latin, or there is not as much consistency in the recipients as with the letters to Wolsey and Roper, they fall out of the scope of this study. Hence, the focus of this study is on the eight letters that More wrote to Roper in English and on eight letters (chosen from 21) that More wrote to Wolsey in English, counting altogether 16 letters. (see elaboration on choosing the letters in chapter 4.3). In addition, examining letters written to such different recipients gives an interesting point of view of comparison to the study.

The letters are studied by comparing the components in the 16 letters to the letter model provided by Bergholm (2008) in order to determine whether More's letters follow it. The research questions are as follows:

- 1) To what extent do the letters written by Thomas More to Thomas Wolsey and to Margaret Roper follow the 15th-century letter model that Anneli Bergholm provided in her MA thesis, i.e. can the 15th-century letter model be applied to the letters written in the beginning of the 16th century?
- 2) Is there a difference between the form of the letters written to Wolsey and Roper and how does it show?

After the sets of eight letters are studied, the results are compared to each other: are the components in the letters different depending on the recipient? As the relationship between More and Roper and More and Wolsey is quite different, I anticipate the letters to be quite different not only content-wise but also in the form. For example, would More be stay truer to the letter-writing custom in the more official letters written to Wolsey? Although the content of the letters is not the focus of this study, understanding the content facilitates the analysis of the components and helps explain or justify them.

This topic is ultimately motivated by my interest in the life of Margaret Roper, one of the best know women writers and translators (see e.g. Wynne-Davies 2007, 14–15), and her father Thomas More, who was leading the way in education and thought that

women too should have a proper chance at education (see e.g. Wynne-Davies 2007, 12, 14). In addition, as far as my searches suggest, the letters of Thomas More have not been studied in this manner before.

2 Thomas More's relationships and correspondence

Thomas More (1478–1535)¹, his life, correspondence and political influence can be read in various texts and editions. One of the first authors to write about More's life was William Roper, the husband of More's daughter, Margaret. An edited version of Roper's work *The Life of Sir Thomas More* (original version was not published until 1626, and several editions were made afterwards) was also used as a source in Peter Ackroyd's (1998) book *The Life of Thomas More*. This work offers insight not only to More's life but also to the life in general of a man (or a child) of More's status in London at that time. More lived during a time of change in England in the Tudor period. More was born into a wealthy and influential family in London: his father John More was a lawyer and later in his life also a judge in the king's court (Ackroyd 1998, 8). More's mother Agnes Graunger died at a young age, most likely when Thomas More was just a boy or a young adult (Ackroyd 1998, 9).

The letters which are studied in this minor thesis, were written before More was the Lord Chancellor of England, and after that. More was appointed as the Lord Chancellor of England in 1529, after Thomas Wolsey had resigned from the position (Ackroyd 1998, 280). As Lord Chancellor More was the closest to the king, on the highest official position (Wegemer 2001, 6). It seemed that everything was in place in More's life: Ackroyd's (1998) work portrays that in addition to a successful career he had a loving family, but his life would take a rather hard turn at the end. More and King Henry had a good understanding of each other for a long time, but when King Henry started to talk about divorcing Queen Catherine and marrying Anne Boleyn, in addition to him wanting to have more power in church, More and King Henry's relationship began to change (Ackroyd 1998, 351–352, 354–355). In the end, More had to choose between his faith and yielding to act so as to please the king, and he chose to follow his conscience rather than do what would save his life (Ackroyd 1998, 351–352, 354–355). In a manner he did this by the king's consent, for the king had once said to him, that he “shold fyrst loke vnto God and after God vnto hym” (Ackroyd 1998, 282). More's faith and opposition to the king's wishes ultimately led to his execution in 1535 after a year's imprisonment in the Tower of London (Ackroyd 1998).

Different aspects of Thomas More has been studied, among other his argumentation skills. For example, William Rockett's (2008) article offers insight into how precise More

¹ The exact birth year (1477 or 1478) has been debated. (Ackroyd 1998, 4)

was and had to be with his wordings; for example, he avoided offending the church and the king in rebuttals in delicate matters (Rockett 2008, 1074). More knew he had to take extra care, especially after he left the royal office, to not to give a reason for anyone to accuse him of treason or other punishable crime (Rockett 2008, 1075–1077).

Indeed, it was not More's writing or speaking that caused his demise but rather a sequence of events which began with an acquaintance of his – Elizabeth Barton, a religious clairvoyant (also referred to as the “Holy Maid of Kent” or the “Mad Nun of Kent”) (Ackroyd 1998, 327–329), who openly opposed the divorce of King Henry and Queen Catherine (Rockett 2008, 1077). Barton was accused of treasonous acts, but she could not be convicted at first because of the current treason law (Rockett 2008, 1081–1082). The case was later opened again after the treason law had been changed and the definition of treason had been broadened (*ibid.*).

As More and Barton were acquaintances, More was interrogated as well, but as he answered to the accusations in a manner that did not make himself culpable, his charges were dropped temporarily (Rockett 2008, 1082–1086). Most likely a short but effective clause (used on several occasions) helped More to lose accusations about him: he would state to his interlocutor or correspondent that he would not discuss the matters of the realm or the king with them (Rockett 2008, 1083, 1086). This was for example one reason why his relationship with Barton was not thought to be treasonous, because it led the accusers to think that More indeed did not talk about the matters of the kingdom with Barton (*ibid.*).

In More's writing could be seen the skill to use ingenious wordings and his explicit knowledge on political situations. For example, he had asked to see the attainder bill (i.e. a list of accused and what the accusations are) in which his name was written, and having read it he knew which acts and words were thought to be treasonous, and thus could avoid them (Rockett 2008, 1086). He had the advantage of knowing how to respond to the accusations and he could avoid conviction, but some others who were accused were not so fortunate, as they would not be careful in their wordings (Rockett 2008, 1086). As Rockett's (2008) statements were justified by More's argumentation skills in some of his letters (which are, however, not examined in this study), these examples can be used to hypothesise that also the form of More's other letters would be very precise.

However, in the end, More's writing and speaking skills were not enough. More could not acknowledge King Henry's supremacy over papal jurisdiction, or more accurately, King Henry's supremacy as the head of church (Rockett 2008, 1090). More

was, ultimately, a man of faith, and he was committed to the authority of Rome (Rockett 2008, 1088–1089). He thought of sovereignty and faith as separate subjects and in his mind they both had a certain power, but they could not be mixed (Rockett, 1089–1091). In the end it was his soul instead of his body for which he cared most, and therefore he could not accept the new bills regarding the king’s supremacy (Rockett, 1091).

Thomas More is a name which can be connected to various contexts, and he has intrigued researchers insomuch that a research institute dedicated to the study of Thomas More was founded – The Center for Thomas More Studies (CTMS), which functions under the University of Dallas. Their mission is to “advance the study and teaching of Thomas More’s life and writings, especially More’s understanding of liberty, law, and leading citizens” by publishing educational sources especially on their website (CTMS 2015a). There is also a journal dedicated to research on Thomas More, *Moreana*. However, it seems that More’s letter-writing from the point of view of letter models seem to not have been studied, although for example his contribution to the English language (see e.g. CTMS 2015b), relationships (e.g. Wegemer 2015), argumentation skills (e.g. Schildgen 2010) and Latin letters (e.g. McCutcheon 2015) have been studied.

2.1 Thomas Wolsey

Thomas Wolsey (1473–1530) was the Lord Chancellor of King Henry VIII before More. Ackroyd (1998) brings forth an interesting view about More’s attitude towards Wolsey before Wolsey was the chancellor. According to Ackroyd (1998, 32), the true nature of the attitude has been debated, as it is said that More despised or distrusted Wolsey because of his “uses of power and displays of pomp”, but at the same time More praised another person, Francis Bacon, who acted in a similar manner to Wolsey. It seems controversial that More praised Bacon but did not like Wolsey. Later, when Wolsey was a cardinal and the chancellor, More’s attitude against him seems to have been much more positive: More thought Wolsey to be an extraordinary chancellor, and even wrote two poems to him (ibid.). More and Wolsey did share religion and fought against the new thoughts of Luther (e.g. see Ackroyd 1998, 221–225). They both opposed his reformation ideas and tried to end the spreading of the ‘heresy’ before it even began (Ackroyd 1998, 271–272). More was also convinced that the trouble with outbreaks of the plague and lack of food was because God punished them “for the receypte of these pestilent bokes’ of heresy” (Ackroyd 1998, 272).

The letters written to Wolsey seem to be dealing mostly with business regarding the kingdom, at least the letters examined in this study. From the content of the letters can be interpreted that the letters written by More to Wolsey were ordered by the king. In fact, Ackroyd mentions that More was the regular mediator of the correspondence between King Henry and Wolsey, for which evidence can be found in the first surviving letter from 1519 (Ackroyd 1998, 199). During the period when the letters examined in this study were written, More was Wolsey's subordinate. At this time Wolsey was still the Lord Chancellor and More was the king's second secretary (before 1523), the Speaker of the parliament in 1523, and the chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (1525–1529) (Ackroyd 1998, 199, 231, 249).

2.2 Margaret Roper

Margaret Roper (née More) (1505–1544) was More's eldest daughter. She married a family friend, William Roper, although More was not happy that he was interested in Luther's religion (Ackroyd 1998, 227). Roper is one of the first women translators who published her works, for example *A Devout Treatise upon the Paternoster*, a translation of Erasmus' *Precatio Dominica* (see e.g. Wynne-Davies 2007, 15).²

Roper's life story is depicted as a rather sad one, as she loved his father dearly and she could not understand the fact that More would condemn himself to imprisonment. In some letters More sent to Roper this can be noticed from the way More answered to Roper, e.g. "But surely they all towched me neuer so nere, [...] in such vehement piteous maner labour to perswade vnto me, that thinge wherein I haue of pure necessite for respect vnto myne owne soule, so often gyuen you so precise answeere before." (letter no. 202 in Rogers 1947, 508–509), and on many occasions More tells her not to worry about him (e.g. "take no thoughte for me but praye for me as I doe and shall doe for you" (letter no. 216 in Rogers 1947, 555–559). Their relationship's depth and closeness can be seen from the letters More wrote to Roper, for example in the subscription (e.g. "Your tender louynge father, Thomas More, Knight.") and in the way More addresses Roper usually with "beloved child" (letter no. 202 in Rogers 1947, 508–509).

² Margaret Roper's life is depicted in more detail for example in John Guy's *A daughter's love* (2009).

2.3 Other correspondence

According to Rogers' (1947) edition of More's letters, he wrote letters to many people, both private personal letters and official letters. In Rogers (1947) there are altogether 218 letters presented, of which most of the letters have been written by Thomas More. There are some letters which have been subscribed by many, e.g. the letter no. 13: by Knight, More, Wilsher, Sampson, Hannibal, and Hewsten (in Rogers 1947, 23–24) and some which have been sent to many recipients, e.g. the letter no. 106: to his children and Margaret Gyge (in Rogers 1947, 255–257). The first letter to survive is written to John Holt in 1501 in Latin and the last one to Margaret Roper in 1535 in English, as is depicted in Rogers (1947).

3 Letter-writing and letter-writing models

The central frameworks and theories of this thesis are presented in this chapter. First is discussed letter-writing in general and in the context of 15th-century England (section 3.1). Secondly, the various letter models for medieval letters and the letter model which is used to analyse the primary material in this thesis are discussed (section 3.2). Thus, this chapter illustrates the environment in which the letters studied in this thesis were written and presents the tools for analysing and interpreting such letters.

3.1 Letter-writing

In this section the concept of the medieval letter-writing practice *ars dictaminis* is explained (section 3.1.1) and an introduction of the 15th-century England letter-writing practices is presented (section 3.1.2). The letter-writing forms are then elaborated in section 3.2 with reference to the letter-writing models.

3.1.1 *Ars dictaminis*

Ars dictaminis means the 'art of letter-writing'. *Ars dictaminis* has its origins in Ciceronian rhetoric and it was widely a tool in Latin *dictamen*, i.e. letter-writing, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it later spread to England as well (Richardson 1984, 208). *Ars dictaminis* and *dictamen* convey the more humanist art of letter-writing whereas *ars notaria* is separated from these two as it conveys the more bureaucratic and legal forms of letter-writing (Richardson 1984, 208–209).

In *ars dictaminis* the letter follows a five-part structure, which includes *salutatio*, *exordium*, *narration*, *petition*, and *conclusion* (Zweck 2018, 30). *Salutatio* functions as a greeting in the letter, and it included both the writer's and the recipient's name (Zweck 2018, 31). *Exordium* is the introduction and *narratio* informs of the main purpose of the letter (ibid.). *Narratio* could also include information that is already known about the topic of the letter (ibid.). *Petitio* is a request and *conclusio* functions as a summary of the main subject and could also include a formulaic farewell (ibid.).

3.1.2 Letter-writing in the 15th-century England

As More lived both in the 15th and the 16th centuries it would be reasonable to consider the customs of letter-writing in both periods, especially as Rogers' (1947) edition suggest

that More did not write letters before the change of the century (at least they have not survived). However, it might be that More's writing was mostly influenced by the 15th-century customs, as he was already 22 years old when the century changed. More most likely began to go to school at the age of seven, which was customary at that time (Ackroyd 1998, 17), so by the age of 22 he had learned and studied for 15 years. Furthermore, More began studies at the Oxford University at the age of fourteen, and supposedly letter-writing, i.e. *art dictamen*, was taught there (Rogers 1947, 35; 44). Although More studied at Oxford only for two years, it is possible that he familiarised himself with the art of letter-writing during this time. After Oxford he began studying law at New Inn and continued two years later at Lincoln's Inn (Ackroyd 1998, 50–56). In these Inns, which can be thought to be schools or universities for studying law at that time, a lot of studying consisted of learning works by heart (Ackroyd 1998, 53–54, 121).

According to Richardson (1984, 207), the letter-custom was not followed perfectly in England. This was the case especially at the beginning of the 15th century which was, according to Richardson, "one of the low points of this already none-too-distinguished history" of letter-writing (ibid.). Richardson (1984, 210–211) also argues that the *dictamen* and the English language walked hand in hand in influencing each other throughout the 15th century: as English gained a status of a prestigious language through the intended or unintended choices of King Henry V, English was used even more in letters, which then affected the form of letters as well as the mere number of letters written. Through this process the written English language became more and more standardized (Richardson 1984, 208). Richardson's (1984, 226) description of how the *dictamen* influenced English in the 15th century is quite illustrative: he paints a picture with his statement that "the *dictamen* carried everyday non-literary prose on its back until English prose style was mature enough linguistically and stylistically to walk on its own".

Richardson (1984, 208–209) also notes that before the 15th century the English letter-writing was closer to *ars notaria* rather than *ars dictaminis*, meaning that letter-writing in England was closer to the art of composing legal documents rather than a humanist letter. The humanist letter followed strict rules which varied depending on the purpose of the letter and the hierarchical status of the correspondents (Nevalainen 2001, 204). In the 14th century the private letter-writing in English had been hindered for a period, as the clerks were writing only in French or Latin (Richardson 1984, 209). Later the gap between private and public correspondence did narrow as the common people adopted the style in which the church and state were writing, although the common people

did not follow the style as straightforwardly (Richardson 1984, 209–210). Private letter-writing spread more again at the beginning of the 15th century when King Henry V started using English in his messages to his subjects (Richardson 1984, 210–211). This led to the "outburst" of letter-writing in English in the following fifty years, and thus such family letter collections as those of the Pastons, the Stonors, the Plumptons, the Trevelyans, and the Celys were born (Richardson 1984, 212).

3.2 Letter models and Bergholm's study

The letter models which Bergholm used in her study are introduced in section 3.2.1. Bergholm's study and her proposed letter model are discussed in more detail in section 3.2.2. As the analysis is done element by element, the elements of letter models are discussed element by element as well. Thus, in section 3.2.1, the letter models are discussed in a general manner, and to the elements of the different letter models are referred in section 3.2.2, while discussing a certain element.

3.2.1 Letter models of Davis, Richardson, and Nevalainen

The models of Davis (1965), Richardson (1984), and Nevalainen (2001) should be discussed together because they are tightly linked to each other, as Nevalainen's model is a mixed model of Davis' and Richardson's. Table 1 includes an illustration of these models, added with the conventional model of the Latin letter (as depicted in Zweck 2108, 31).

In his study, Davis analysed the language and the letter model of Chaucer's version of the letter from Troilus to Criseyde (Davis 1965). He compared Chaucer's version to the Italian version of Boccaccio and to the French version of Beauvau (Davis 1965, 233). Davis concentrated on the opening section of the letter and proposed a letter model with seven main elements, of which elements 3–7 can be summarized to one element of health, or to "hoping this finds you well as it leaves me at present" (Davis 1965, 236).

Hubert Hall discussed the parts of an English medieval letter and Richardson designed a model based on the discussion of Hall (Hall 1908, 270–280; Richardson 1984, 213–214). In fact, Bergholm (2008) used Richardson's model in her MA thesis and referred to it as "Hall and Richardson's model". As opposed to Davis' model, Richardson's model (as well as Hall's) concentrates on the whole letter. This is one reason why not all parts of Richardson's letter model are found in Bergholm's model, for

Richardson’s model includes parts which are found in the body text of the letter. These parts, which are not included in Bergholm’s model, are [4] Exposition (marked with ‘whereas’), [5] Disposition or Injunction (‘we are pleased by these presents to grant’ or ‘our will and pleasure’), and [6] Final Clause (Injunction ‘for it is our pleasure’ or Proviso ‘provided that’) (for further explanation of these parts see Richardson 1984, 213–214). Parts 1–3 and 7–9 are included in Bergholm’s model and are further explained in section 3.2.2.

Table 1 Letter models according to the Latin letter (Zweck 2018), Davis (1965), (Hall & Richardson (1984), Nevalainen (2001).

	Latin letter (Zweck 2018)	Davis (1965)	Richardson (1984) (based on Hall 1908)	Nevalainen (2001)
Beginning				Date & Place
	<i>salutatio</i>	Address	Address	Address & Salutation
		Commendation	Salutation	Health
		Health		Notification
	<i>exordium</i>		Notification	Notification
Middle	<i>narratio</i>		Exposition	
	<i>petitio</i>		Disposition or Injunction	
			Final Clause	
End	<i>conclusio</i>		Valediction or <i>Appreciato</i> ’	Valediction or <i>Appreciato</i> ’
			Attestation	
			Date	

The possible contents and purposes of each model’s sections were compared in order to place the five sections of the Latin letter in this table. For example, *conclusio* could include either a revision of the letter’s main subject or a formulaic farewell address (Zweck 2018, 31). Therefore, *conclusio* is part of both the middle part and the end part of the letter.

Nevalainen (2001, 211) made a comparative study of the models of Davis and Richardson using her own data of 80 personal letters. Nevalainen composed her own model called a

mixed dictaminal model with five different components: 1) Place and Date 2)–3) Salutation followed by Address 4) ‘Health’ formula, and 5) Valediction and *Appreciato* (‘And thus to Our Lord I comyt you’). In Nevalainen’s model place and date are combined into one, whereas in the other models place and date usually are separated into two different parts (‘Attestation’ and ‘Date’) (Nevalainen 2001, 211). Nevalainen’s model’s presentation in Bergholm (2008, 34–35) can be interpreted as justification for need of another model but is not in itself studied by Bergholm.

3.2.2 Bergholm’s study and letter model

In her MA thesis, Bergholm (2008) studied the family letters of Cely, Paston and Stonor. These letters written in the 15th century belong to the most prominent letter collections of the period (Richardson 1984, 212), and these kinds of letters usually deal with business between the correspondents, sometimes added with political or family news (Richardson 1980, 26). These kinds of letters could be categorised either as private or business letters, but as the distinction was not clear during this period (see e.g. *ibid.*), Bergholm (2008, 44) decided to call them private letters. Furthermore, as the letters which Bergholm (*ibid.*) used in her study have both correspondents from inside the core family and outside it, she prefers to call them personal letters instead of family letters.

Bergholm studied both the form and the formulas in the letters, i.e. which different parts of a letter can be distinguished, and which fixed phrases can be found in the letters. She used the letter models of Davis (1965) and Richardson (1984) and parts of Sánchez Roura’s model from 2001³ to analyse the family letters. Davis’ and Richardson’s models are frameworks of components which appear in a letter, for example an address or a notification of the main purpose of the letter. Sánchez Roura approaches the letters from the point view of different topics which secure the goodwill of the reader and does not specifically discuss the order in which these topics can occur (Bergholm 2008, 39). Therefore, Sánchez Roura’s ‘topics’ are not presented in tables 1 or 2. In order to analyse the formulas, i.e. fixed phrasings, in the family letters, Bergholm used the studies of Austin from 1973.

Bergholm’s aim was to discover which of the already developed models is the most accurate one and, based on her findings, she proposed her own model which would more accurately reflect the form and formulas of late 15th-century letters. Bergholm did not

³ Unfortunately, this article was not available, and instead in this study is referred to her article from 2002.

have any explicitly stated hypothesis about which of the models would be the most accurate one. However, it seems that she had the idea that a more accurate model could be composed, as she quotes Richardson (1984) on the point that there is no consensus of one letter model because the medieval English letters have not yet been properly studied (Bergholm 2008, 24). In her analysis she found out that none of the models perfectly reflected the forms of the family letters. The best results came from the Cely family letters with an 88,9% equivalence to the Hall & Richardson's model (as she called the model), a 60,8% equivalence to Sánchez Roura's model and a 40,6% equivalence to Davis' model (Bergholm 2008, 92). The Stonor family letters came close to these percentages and the Paston family letters were left a little bit farther behind (ibid.).

Bergholm's proposed letter model includes nine main elements and seven optional elements (Bergholm 2008, 92–93). She does not explicitly say what the percentage for the occurrence of each of these elements in the letters are, however, she does mention that the superscription and subscription have not been a part of the letter models before (Bergholm 2008, 93). She added them to her model as they are crucial to understanding the individuals in the correspondence (ibid.). She also mentions that the optional elements occur whenever these are needed, i.e. when the writer for some reason feels that they need to be added (ibid.).

Both the nine main elements and the optional elements of Bergholm's model are examined in this study. The nine main elements (1–9) and the optional elements (A–H) are presented below (Bergholm 2008, 92). In addition to possible formulas presented by other researchers, each section includes one example of material used in this study, i.e. of the letters to Wolsey or of the letters to Roper (numbers in bracket signify the row of the letter on which the data appears in Rogers (1947)). To the letters is referenced with the chosen abbreviation for each letter (see the tables 3 and 4 in section 4.3 for further details on the letters).

As Rogers (1947) does not explicitly explain how she presents the letters (she mostly comments on the orthography), I chose to count any writing that occurs before the first numbered line of the letter as Superscription and mark it as line -1 etc., omitting a line 0. While reading the examples one should note that they are copied from Rogers (1947) as strictly as possible, for example the italicizing has been preserved in the examples. In the examples might also occur some markings, which are additions of Rogers: <> means that something has been added, for example because of a burnt side of the letter (Rogers 1947, xii). Rogers (1947, xi) has edited the punctuation only slightly,

but as it has been changed, More's original punctuation cannot be interpreted from the examples. Parentheses are used occasionally, however, as Rogers does not mention using () as an editorial marking, it might be either an addition of a previous edition or More's own writing. Ultimately, this does not change this study's approach or results. Underlining has been added by me to emphasise the important part regarding the element discussed.

1 Superscription

Superscription is the first element of a letter, as it is usually written on the reverse side of the folded letter, i.e. dorse (Hall 1908, 279). As Bergholm stated in her study, superscription is rarely if ever thought to be a part of letter models. Hall mentioned superscription but he also mentioned that it was more of an earlier version of address, and that superscription would change into a subscription at some point (Hall 1908, 271–272). However, Bergholm sees superscription (and subscription) as separate and an important part of a letter as without superscription (and subscription) the correspondents may not be discovered (Bergholm 2008, 93).

(1) TO MY LORD LEGATS GRACE. (Wol1, -1)

2 Praise together with Address

According to both Davis' and Richardson's model, this part begins the letter (see e.g. Table 1 in section 3.2.1). This part simply informs to whom the letter is written. The descriptive noun (e.g. 'Father') is complemented often with 'right' + an adjective of respect (e.g. 'worshipful') (see e.g. Richardson 1984, 213). Nevalainen notes that address usually comes after salutation, although it can also be the other way around, and thus introduces address and salutation as [2–3] rather than separately [2] and [3] (Nevalainen 2001, 211).

(2) Your doughterly louying letter, my derely beloued childe (Ro5, 1–2)

3 Commendation (which also functions as a Salutation) + an expression of humility

Commendation is a greeting component which was an important part of a letter, (although, depending on the hierarchical positions of the correspondents, one could leave it out (see e.g. Richardson 1984, 214)) and in which, usually, the writer recommends

themselves to the reader (Sánchez Roura 2002, 260). Sánchez Roura (2002, 260–262) suggest other types commendation as well, for example a commendation in which the writer commends other people to the reader. Commendation in Davis’ model consists of three possible parts: [2] the commendation as the main part and two possible additions of either [2a] an expression of humility or [2b] a request for a blessing (Davis 1965, 236). Richardson’s model seems to be slightly simplified version of this, as he does not specifically mention humility or blessing as part of commendation (Richardson 1984, 213).

- (3) And thus mine owne good daughter haue *me recommended to my good beddefelowe and all my children, men, women and all, with all your babes and your nursis and all the maydes and all the seruantes, and all our kynne, and all our other frendes abrode.* (Ro 4, 157–162)

4 Health

Interestingly, Richardson does not mention health at all, but Davis (1965, 236) mentions as much as five different possibilities to include health in a letter: [3] asking about the recipient health, [4] prayer for the recipients health, [5] a deferential note about the writer’s health [6] reporting the writer’s good health, and [7] thanking God for good health. In Nevalainen’s model health is once again included.

- (4) Our Lorde be thanked, I am in good health of body (Ro2, 1–2)

5 Notification of the main purpose of the letter

Davis does not include notification in his model. However, both Richardson and Nevalainen consider notification to be a part of the beginning of the letter. Notification can be identified through phrases such as “You shall understand that” (Nevalainen 2001, 211).

- (5) Hit may lyke your good Grace to vndrestand, that (Woll1, 1)

6 Pious farewell or prayer

Pious farewell or prayer begins the end part of the letter (Richardson [7], Nevalainen [6]: ‘Valediction or *Appreciato*’).

- (6) And thus fare you hartely well for lacke of paper. (Ro2, 11–12)

7 Attestation

Attestation tells where the letter was written. Nevalainen puts both place and date under the same division [1]: “at London, the 19th day in Novembre, 1545” (Nevalainen 2001, 211). Richardson, however, separates place and date.

(7) At Okyng (Woll, 37)

8 Date

Date simply tells on which day the letter was written. Richardson’s includes the name of the ruling King: “the ____ day of ____ the year of the reign of our sovereign lord King ____ the ____” (Richardson 1984, 214). As mentioned earlier, Nevalainen combined date and place into one part which begins the letter.

(8) the vth day of July (Woll, 37)

9 Subscription (with a phrase specifying the writer’s relationship to the recipient)

In addition to Superscription, Subscription is an important part a letter as well, according to Bergholm (see above 1 Superscription). Therefore, she added Subscription into her letter model.

(9) Your moste humble seruauant and mooste bounden beedman Thomas More.
(Woll, 38–39)

The parts of Bergholm’s letter model are presented in the Table 2 next to the in Table 1 presented letter models. Even though Bergholm (2008, 97) stated that the previous letter models were not complete, the changes that Bergholm made were minor. The most evident changes are the addition of superscription and subscription.

Table 2 Letter models according to the Latin letter (Zweck 2018), Davis (1965), (Hall & Richardson (1984), Nevalainen (2001) added with Bergholm’s model (2008).

	Latin letter (Zweck 2018)	Davis (1965)	Richardson (1984) (based on Hall 1908)	Nevalainen (2001)	Bergholm (2008)
Beginning				Date & Place	Superscription
	<i>salutatio</i>	Address	Address	Address & Salutation	Praise together with Address
		Commendation	Salutation		Commendation i.e. Salutation + humility
		Health		Health	Health
			Notification	Notification	Notification
Middle	<i>exordium</i>				
	<i>narratio</i>		Exposition		
	<i>petitio</i>		Disposition or Injunction		
End	<i>conclusio</i>		Final Clause		
			Valediction or <i>Appreciato</i>	Valediction or <i>Appreciato</i>	Pious farewell or prayer
			Attestation		Attestation
			Date		Date
					Subscription

In addition to the main elements, Bergholm thought the following optional elements were worth mentioning. The origin of an element is presented in brackets as noted by Bergholm (2008, 92). In addition to possible formulas presented by other researchers, each section includes one example of my data, i.e. of the letters to Wolsey or of the letters to Roper (numbers in bracket signify the row of the letter on which the data appears in Rogers (1947)), or from previous researcher’s studies, in case there was no occurrences in my data. As many of these optional elements are found originally in Sánchez Roura’s model,

it should be reminded that her purpose was to study elements which deal with securing the goodwill of the reader, and thus the pragmatic concept of “face-threatening” is discussed at times. In simple terms, a face-threatening situation is a situation where either the sender or the receiver is put in negative or positive light, in order to achieve or approve of something (see e.g. Johnstone 2017, 165–166).

A Gratitude (Sánchez Roura)

A formula of gratitude is added to the letter only when it is thought to be necessary (Sánchez Roura 2002, 261). Sánchez Roura (ibid.) also mentions that as gratitude is a face-threatening act, a token of gratitude might show either positive or negative purpose from the writer.

- (10) I eftesonys moost humbly thanke your good Grace that hit liked your Grace so goodly wise to geve thankis to the Kingis Highnes (Wol4, 66–67)

B Acknowledgement of receipt (Sánchez Roura)

As gratitude, acknowledgement of receipt is a face-threatening act which can put the reader either in positive or negative light (Sánchez Roura 2002, 263). Basically, acknowledgement of receipt functions as notion that the writer has acknowledged the reader’s interests (Sánchez Roura 2002, 264).

- (11) Hit may lyke your good Grace to be aduertised that this day I received your Gracis lettres dated yesterday (Wol2, 1–2)

C Offer of service (Sánchez Roura)

Offer of service, also a face-threatening act, puts the reader in a position where they will have to either accept or reject the offer (Sánchez Roura 2002, 265). However, offer of service can be thought to be an act of politeness, which puts the reader in a good light (Bergholm 2008, 74–75).

- (12) And yf het ly in my power I schall do as moch that schal be vnto your plesure, as knoweth owre Lord, qwou send you good fortune wyth þe accomplichment off your goodly desyrys. (Sánchez Roura 2002, 266)

D Request for a service (Bergholm)

Bergholm (2008, 74) noticed that request for a service appeared in her data several times. As opposed to offer of service, request for a service is more face-threatening for the reader

(Bergholm 2008, 75). However, a request for a service can be mitigated by adding for example “when it pleases you” to the request (*ibid.*) (in italics here).

- (13) Wherein his Gracis opinion is, *if your Grace think hit good*, that your Grace should by your high wisdom devise some goodly way (Wol4, 32–34)

E End of news (Sánchez Roura)

End of news is a letter-ending face-threatening act which can be softened down by various ways, e.g. by adding “at this time” to the clause: “No mor to you at thys time” (Sánchez Roura 2002, 266).

- (14) It is now, my good doughter, late. (Ro5, 102)

F Request for letters (Austin)

A request for letters can be either direct or indirect (Bergholm 2008, 84). Example (15) shows an indirect request, as letters per se are not mentioned.

- (15) ... he commaunded me to sende theym vn to your Grace to be by your high wisdom farther considered and answeris to theym to be devised such as to your high prudence shlabbe sene convenient. (Wol8, 140–143)

G Plea of haste (Hall & Richardson)

This element is found at the end of a letter and it can be interpreted either as an excuse as a statement of fact (Richardson 1984, 217). Bergholm (2008, 28) notes that although Hall (1908, 277) and Richardson (1984, e.g. 214) name plea of haste a possible element in a letter, they do not mention it in the actual letter model.

- (16) ...the weche conowthe God, ho haue yow in ys kepynge, amen. Wrette at London in haste, the vj day of October. (Bergholm 2008, 53)

H Postscript (Bergholm)

The postscript, i.e. the endnote, is a part of text which is usually placed near the signature, i.e. the subscription, but it does not always appear in the end of the letter. (Bergholm 2008, e.g. 52). The following example is the last item of the letter, following the signature on line 13.

- (17) Ro2: Our Lorde keep me contianually true faithful and plaine, to the contrary whereof I beseche hym hartely neuer to suffer me lyue. For as longe lyfe (as I haue often tolde the Megge) I neither loke for, nor longe for, but am well content to goe, if God call me hence to morowe. And I thanke our Lorde I knowe no person lyuing that I wolde had one philippe for my sake: of which minde I am more gladde than of all th worlde beside. / Recommende me to your shrewde Wyll and mine other sonnes, and to John Harrys my frende, and your selfe knoweth to whom els, and to my shrewde wife aboue all, and God preserue you all, and make and keep you his seruauntes all. (14–24)

4 Research design

The objective of this thesis, i.e. the research questions, and the methods and the primary material are presented in more detail in this chapter.

4.1 The objective of the thesis and the research questions

The research questions of this study are:

- 1) To what extent do the letters written by Thomas More to Thomas Wolsey and to Margaret Roper follow the 15th-century letter model that Anneli Bergholm provided in her MA thesis, i.e. can the 15th-century letter model be applied to the letters written in the beginning of the 16th century?
- 2) Is there a difference between the form of the letters written to Wolsey and Roper and how does it show?

I argue that the 15th-century letter model should to at least some extent be applicable to the 16th-century letters as the model provided by Bergholm (2008) was formed based on letters from the end of the 15th century whereas the letters studied in this thesis were written at the beginning of the 16th century; the way of letter-writing most likely have not changed too much in this time. On the other hand, some differences could be expected, as the letters used in Bergholm's thesis were all from different writers whereas in my thesis all letters were written by one person. For example, if one considers Richardson's statement that already in the 15th-century letter-writing customs were not followed strictly (Richardson 1984, 207), not even one person might follow the customs that strictly. However, if one considers Sánchez Roura's (2002, 262) statement on personal styles "Richard almost always uses the personal, more direct construction when addressing his brother George", the results could be expected to be consistent. Furthermore, with one writer there might be less variation in the form, but as the two recipients are quite different, there might be a difference between the letters to the two recipients, especially because the nature of the letters are quite different: official letters to Wolsey and private letters to Roper (the nature of the letters is further discussed in section 4.3). In addition, an interesting point which cannot be left out is, that Bergholm (2008, 35) made a note that even her data might not fit perfectly within the models of medieval letters: if there had already been a change in writing customs by the end of the 15th century, the letters

she studied could be of the early modern period rather than of the (late) medieval period. However, as Bergholm's model reflects the conventions at the end of the 15th century, the model will most likely be adequate to analyse More's letters.

4.2 Methods

Bergholm's model is suitable for my needs as my purpose is to study the form of the letter, i.e. whether More's letters include parts of the letter model or not. Thus, a detailed analysis of the formulas is not needed. Furthermore, as the other three models were, according to Bergholm, not accurate enough, it is sensible to use the model she modified from the pre-existing ones.

One factor about the letter model used in this thesis must be acknowledged: as Bergholm's MA thesis is not a peer-reviewed publication, the results of this minor subject thesis should be viewed with careful consideration as well. However, as Bergholm seems to have worked with the previous research thoroughly and justly, and the analysis of her own data seems well justified, I feel comfortable using her model as the framework for my study. This study can also be seen as reviewing and evaluating Bergholm's model, as her model is used on new data, just as she did with the previous letter models.

Close reading and comparison with Bergholm's model were used to analyse the material. Close reading was necessarily to find all the possible elements in the letters. The found elements were then compared to Bergholm's model's elements. The primary material, i.e. the letters, is usable as is, but copies of the letters were printed from Rogers (1947) in order to facilitate the annotation and analysis: the forms were outlined and marked in the copies (see an example of annotation in Appendix I).

4.3 Primary material

The primary material of this study consists of 16 letters. More wrote eight letters to Roper during the years 1534–1535, while he was in prison, and the eight letters to Wolsey during the years 1519–1528. The letters were obtained from the edited hard copy of *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (Rogers 1947). She tried to stay as true as possible to More's spelling and writing style (Rogers 1947, x-xii). For example, she has not changed the length of the sentences, meaning that she has not cut one long sentence into two, even though the syntax would suggest that they are two different 'passages' (Rogers 1947, xi). She also used the spelling of the earliest manuscripts or printed books with only

some changes to orthography (Rogers 1947, x–xi). As the purpose is to analyse the form of the letter and not the syntax or orthography, Rogers’s copy is suitable for this study.

There were several factors that had to be taken into consideration while choosing the primary material. Firstly, it should be noted that there were some letters which were addressed to more than one person (e.g. letter no. 204, Rogers 1947, 511) or there were other writers in addition to More (e.g. letter no 13, Rogers 1947, 23–24); these letters were ignored even though More was one of the writers or Wolsey or Roper were one of the recipients. Secondly, the language of the letters was an important factor: as previously stated, many letters written by More (to any correspondent) were written in Latin which is why they fell out of the scope of this study. In Rogers (1947, see e.g. xvii–xix) there are altogether 21 letters written to Wolsey, all of which were written in English during the years 1519–1526. To Roper More wrote 13 letters of which 5⁴ letters were written in Latin. The 5 letters written in Latin were written presumably during the years 1518 and 1523 (*ibid.*).

The remaining eight English letters make one half of the primary material; the other half was chosen from the 21 letters written to Wolsey. As there are noticeably more letters written to Wolsey than to Roper, a decision had to be made regarding the number of letters to use in the analysis of the Wolsey letters. In addition to the first and last letter written to Wolsey (which were chosen to be able to see whether there is change between the first and last letter), I decided to choose the other six letters chronologically as evenly as possible, meaning that there would not be several letters from a short period of time, e.g. a month or even a year. I did this in order to get a wide view of More’s correspondence. Furthermore, the preliminary read-through suggested that the letters do not differ from each other considerably which is why there is no need to avoid or to prefer a certain period. It was also possible to choose the Wolsey letters so that the letters were written in different places. This aspect should be taken into account when analysing and discussing data, especially because all of the letters written to Roper were written in the Tower of London while imprisoned. However, this should provide an interesting angle into how More’s writing might change depending on the circumstances.

As Bergholm had categorised her material as personal private letters depending on the relationship and nature of the letters, the nature of this study’s material should be discussed as well, as the relationships of this study’s correspondents might offer deeper

⁴ Margaret married to William Roper in 1521, which is why the earlier letters are addressed to “Margaret More”.

insight into the form of the letters. The letters written to Wolsey seem to be quite different from the definition of private letter which Bergholm gives, as no family business or matters are discussed. Richardson's (1984, 212–213) statement, in which he mentions “the public and official use of English by the king, his government, and his law courts”, would suggest that the letters written to Wolsey are indeed public letters. These letters could be also categorised as personal letters rather than family letters, as More and Wolsey were not relatives. The letters written to Roper, however, could be categorised as family letters, and according to Bergholm's categorisation, private letters.

The letters to Wolsey and Roper that form the primary material are listed in tables 3 and 4. In addition to the recipient a code name for each letter, the letter number and pagination in Rogers (1947), the place of writing, the date, the number of lines, and the contents of the letter, based on my interpretation, are listed in the tables. Regarding the place and date of the letters written to Roper, it is unsure, where the information was received, as More did not write the date in the letters, and as in Rogers this is not explained.

Table 1 The eight letters to Wolsey

Codename	In Rogers	Place of writing	Date	Lines in Rogers
Wol1	77/156–157	Woking	5 Jul 1519	40
	A discussion on what should be done about the situation in Ireland, where the town of New Rosse has disturbed the city of Waterford.			
Wol2	109/258–261	Newhall	14 Sep 1522	78
	More forwards the contents of a letter sent by the lord of Shrousbery.			
Wol3	115/275–278	Easthampstead	26 Aug 1523	118
	A discussion on several matters, including a matter with the vice admiral, (presumably) France's emperor's ambassador, and a Thomas Murner.			
Wol4	121/286–288	Guildford	13 Sep 1523	74
	A concern towards the king of France is discussed.			
Wol5	127/299–301	Woodstock	30 Oct 1523	59
	More acknowledges the receipt of several letters and offers some answers to them.			
Wol6	136/311–314	Hertford	29 Nov 1524	90
	More informs Wolsey how King Henry interrupted More, when More was trying to inform King Henry of the contents of a letter which Wolsey had sent unto King Henry.			
Wol7	145/368–370	Stony Stratford	21 Sep 1526	56
	More informs Wolsey how grateful King Henry is for Wolsey's advice regarding a case with the earls of Anguysh and Arren.			
Wol8	161/388-394	Windsor	16 Mar 1528	148
	More informs Wolsey that King Henry had received a letter from Mr. de Iselsteyne, and he then continues to tell how the situation with the person who delivered the said letter unfolded, in addition to matters regarding the Spanish.			

Table 2 The eight letters to Roper

Codename	In Rogers	Place of writing	Date	Lines in Rogers
Ro1	200/501–507	Tower of London	c. 14 Apr 1534	159
	More informs Roper how he was arrested.			
Ro2	201/507–508	Tower of London	Apr-May? 1534	24
	More blesses all important people in his life and that he is content with the situation.			
Ro3	202/508–509	Tower of London	May? 1534	51
	More answers to Roper's letter saying how touched he was by it, and he also explains further his contentment in the situation.			
Ro4	210/540–544	Tower of London	1534	165
	More continues to explain his contentment, and why he refused to take the oath regarding the king's supremacy as the head of church in England.			
Ro5	211/544–547	Tower of London	1534	106
	More writes Roper how grateful he is for her letters, and he encourages Roper to stay strong.			
Ro6	214/550–554	Tower of London	2 or 3 May 1535	123
	More explains of a situation that happened at the Tower when he was questioned about the matters that had led to his imprisonment.			
Ro7	216/555–559	Tower of London	3 Jun 1535	151
	More explains about a hearing with the council.			
Ro8	218/563–565	Tower of London	5 Jul 1535	37
	More prays for all his relatives and friends, and bids everyone farewell.			

5 Results

The results of the study are presented first by each correspondent and by each element in section 5.1 (Wolsey) and 5.2 (Roper). These results are then compared in section 5.3 and the applicability of Bergholm's model to More's letters is discussed in section 5.4.

While analysing the material it became clear that the language of More differs somewhat from for example the letters studied by Bergholm. More rarely uses the conventional phrasing which has been suggested by studies on other letters. The difference can be seen in many ways, for example the way More begins the letters both to Wolsey and Roper, for in none of them More starts with an address as is outlined in previous studies. The address is embedded in the first sentence which also acts as the notification or the acknowledgment of receipt (address underlined), as can be seen from examples (18) and (19):

(18) Hit may lyke your good Grace to vnderstand that (Wol1, 1)

(19) If I wolde with my writing, (mine owne good daughter) (Ro4, 1–2)

Embedding could be seen elsewhere in the data as well, especially when analysing both the main parts and optional elements suggested by Bergholm. For example, the farewell in example (20) conveys both the pious farewell (underlined) and the end of news with a softening phrase (in italics):

(20) And thus fare you hartely well *for lacke of paper.* (Ro2, 11–12)

Therefore, the language had to be analysed somewhat closer than what was intended at the beginning of this study. This resulted in interesting notions, not only in More's word choices but also in the form of the letter. For example, sometimes commendation seems to be written at the end of the letter, as in example (21).

(21) I praye yow at tyme conveniente recomende me to my goode sonne Johan More. (Ro8, 31–32)

There were several intricate points which were somewhat more difficult to categorise. For example, the sentence in example (22) could be categorised either as a health component together with a pious farewell or only as a pious farewell.

(22) shalbe daily more and more bounden to pray for your Grace, whom our Lord longe preserve in honor and helth (Wol3, 113–115)

If one were to compare example (22) to the letter model provided by Bergholm, and other researchers, this would fall under the category of pious farewell, as prayers for and notification of health are part of the beginning of the letter. However, if one would analyse these clauses separately, the first clause could be categorised as a health component. Even though this is not a direct prayer for the recipient's health, it mostly correlates with part 4 of Davis' health component. In addition, it is possible that there is a continuum between this letter and the letter Wol1, in which More writes about Wolsey's health and medication. This would consolidate the interpretation that "shalbe daily more and more bounden to pray for your Grace" is in fact a health component.

Thus, it became clear during the analysis, that some of the main elements and the optional elements suggested by Bergholm could be found throughout the letter, and not at their "appointed" places, including the so-called middle part of the letter. These factors in mind the letters were analysed and the results were pondered. The next chapters provide a more thorough analysis and discussion on the letter model parts found in the letters to Wolsey (5.1), in the letters to Roper (5.2), a comparison between the letters to Wolsey and to Roper (5.3), and lastly is discussed the applicability of Bergholm's model to the letters analysed in this study (5.4). As before, to the letters and quotes is referred to with their shortened name, i.e. 'Wol' or 'Ro', the number of the letter, and the lines, which on the quote is found in Rogers (1947), in brackets.

5.1 Form of the letters to Wolsey

The letters written to Wolsey and the elements which were found in these letters are discussed in this part.

1 Superscription

There was only one instance of superscription to be found in the letters written to Wolsey (in Wol1: "TO MY LORD LEGATS GRACE." (-1)), according to the description that it used to appear on the dorse, i.e. the front side of the folded letter (Hall 1908, 279) (as envelopes were not used). The superscription seems to be on line -1 which would imply that it is not part of the actual letter and was written somewhere else than at the beginning

of the letter. However, if we were to consider the point that, according to Hall (1908, 271–272), the superscription found its place as a subscription, all letters except for Wol7 could be counted to have a superscription as well. In these letters, (counted in this study as postscript, as is later discussed in this section) there is with minor variations the phrase “to my lord legats Grace”, which is essentially the same as the superscription in Wol1.

2 Praise together with Address

The Address is one of the elements which appears in every letter written to Wolsey. It is not formulated in a way that it is said to usually appear (e.g. ‘Right worshipful’ as very first item in the letter) but it is always in the same form “your good Grace”. Furthermore, the address is always embedded in a sentence, which functions either as the notification (Wol1, Wol3, Wol6, Wol8) or as the acknowledgment of receipt (Wol2, Wol4, Wol5, Wol7), for example “Hit may lyke your good Grace to vndestand, that” (both the notification and the acknowledgment are written in this way, the categorisation of the notification and the acknowledgment are further discussed under *5 Notification of the main purpose of the letter* and *B Acknowledgment of receipt*). However, as this phrase appears right at the begin of the letter and is honorific, it does function as an address (see e.g. Davis 1965, 236).

3 Commendation (which also functions as a Salutation) + an expression of humility

The letters written to Wolsey contain no phrase which could be counted in as commendation. This is interesting, as both private and business letters of the 15th century are said to have this part almost always present (Richardson 1980, 24; 1984, 214). A reason for this might be that in the type of correspondence that takes place between a king (even though More is the actual sender, the content of the letters seems to be ordered by the king) and his subject, commendation is not used, or required. Furthermore, as it does not appear in any letter, it is a possibility that commendation is not considered a necessary component in this type of a letter.

4 Health

According to Davis’ categorisation of health phrases, some could be found in the letters written to Wolsey. Part 4 of Davis’s (1965, 236) model, “a prayer for the recipient’s health”, as a clear categorisation, seems to be the only health component to appear. These components appear in Wol1: “ye shall not faile of helth, which our Lord long preserue”

(36–37) (see also Richardson 1984, 213) and in Wol3: “whereby I and all myne, as the manyfold goodnes of your Grace hath all redy bound vs, shalbe dayly more and more bounden to pray for your Grace” (112–114). This might be categorised as the pious farewell or prayer of the end part of the letter as well, but as it seems to be a concern on Wolsey’s health, and a clear farewell follows this sentence (“whom our Lord longe preserve in honor and health” (114)), it seems to be more of a health phrase than a prayer.

There is also another comment on the recipient’s health in Wol1, which does not seem to fall under any category of Davis’s model. However, it is a clear comment of the recipient’s health: “your Grace is so well in helth” (33).

Intriguing is that the previous clauses appear at the end of the letter. This would suggest that they are more of a prayer than a part of the health component. There is, however, one clearer instance of a health component. In Wol6 the sentence “his Highnes shewed hym selfe v<ery> greatly glad of ioyfull of your Gracis helthe” (3–5) appears right at the beginning of the letter, embedded in the notification. Even though this instance as well is somewhat difficult to put into any of the categories of Davis, it would seem, that all these comments on Wolsey’s health are part of a continuum, in which an honest concern for Wolsey’s health is apparent.

5 Notification of the main purpose of the letter

The notification of the main purpose of the letter is possibly the most problematic element to analyse in the letters written to Wolsey. As More begins every letter to Wolsey with “hit may lyke your good Grace to vnderstand that“, or with a similar wording, it would be easy to count it as the notification. This is problematic, because as will also be discussed in the analysis of acknowledgment of receipt, many letters begin with an acknowledgment, but with the same wordings, e.g. in Wol2: “Hit may lyke your good Grace to be aduertised that this day I received your Gracis lettres dated ysterday” (1–2).

It was also difficult to categorise anything as “main purpose” of the letter, as in some letters several matters are discussed. Furthermore, More would use “hit may lyke your good Grace to vnderstand that“ several times in one letter, which all refer to a new topic. In fact, Wol3 has five different topics, as suggested by the examples (23–27):

- (23) Hit may lyke your good Grace to be aduerstised, that the Kingis Highnes yesterday received a lettre from his Viceadmira<ll>, dated on the see the xiiiith day of August; which lettre your G<race> shall receive with these presentis. (Wol3, 1-4)

- (24) Hit may ferther lyke your good Grace to vnderstand that the Kingis Grace mych alloweth your prudent answeare made vn to th'Emperors Embassiator vpon the saufconduicte (Wol3, 35–37)
- (25) Hit may ferther lyke your good Grace to be aduertised that one Thomas Murner, a Frere of Saynt Francisce o<rder>, which wrote a boke against Luther in defence of the Kingis boke, was owte of Almaine sent in to Engl<and> by the meane of a simple person, an Almaine naming hym selfe seruant vn to the Kingis Grace and affermyng vn to Murner that the King had gevyn hym in charge to desire Myrner to cum over to hym into En<gland>, and by thoccasion thereof, he is cummen over and hath n<ow> bene here a good while. (Wol3, 49–57)
- (26) Hit may lyke your Grace ferther to wite that the same simple person which caused Murner to cum in to Englan<d> is now cummen to the Cort and hath brought with hym a barons son of Almaygne, to whom he hath also persua<ded> that the Kingis Grace wold be glad to haue hym in his service. (Wol3, 70–74)
- (27) Hit may lyke your good Grace to vnderstand that at the contemplation of your Gracis lettres, the Kingis is graciously content that byside the c lie for my fe, for thoffice of the Speker of his Parleament, to be taken at the receipte of his Exchequer, I shall haue one other hundred oundis owt of his cofresm by thandis of the Tresorer of his Chambre (Wol3, 103–108)

In order to analyse whether the letters have a notification of the main purpose of the letter, the letters had to be read carefully and an understanding of the content of the letters had to be obtained. In the case of Wol3, even though some of the content is tightly entwined to each other, they fundamentally are separate things. For example, notifications 3 and 4 are tied together with a common character, Mr. Murner.

In the end, in five of eight (Wol1, Wol2, Wol3, Wol6, Wol7, Wol8) letters a notification for the main purpose of the letter was found.

6 Pious farewell or prayer

A pious farewell or prayer was found in all letters written to Wolsey, except for Wol2. In form they were very similar, e.g. referring to God, as is for example in Wol4: “And thus our Lord long preserve your good Grace in honor and helth” (60–61).

7 Attestation

Attestation was found in every letter right before the subscription, as is also shown by the letter-writing models. In these letters the attestation was always in form “at + place”, e.g. in Wol5: “At Woodstoke” (56).

8 Date

As well as the attestation, the date was found in every letter. Almost every letter was dated with the day and month (e.g. Wol6: “the xxixth day of Novembre (87)), except for one letter, which was dated as “the Fryday byfore All Hallowen Evyn” (Wol5, (56)).

9 Subscription (with a phrase specifying the writer’s relationship to the recipient)

The subscription appears in every letter, including a phrase which specifies the writer’s relationship to the recipient, including words such as orator, servant, or beadsman. These words imply the hierarchical status of More in relation to Wolsey. More was his subordinate, and such word choices were proper for these instances. In addition to the writer’s name, there were two different relations mentioned in every phrase, e.g. in Wol7: “Your Gracis humble orator and moost bounden bedeman. Thomas More.” (55–56).

A Gratitude (Sánchez Roura)

Gratitude tokens were found in five letters of eight (Wol3, Wol4, Wol5, Wol6, Wol7). In some letters there were several instances of showing gratitude. For example, in Wol7 there are three different gratitude tokens. In these letters the king is grateful for Wolsey’s advice about three different matters (examples 28–30).

- (28) Wherfor his Highnes mych approveth your Gracis moost prudent device concerning the seid Erlis to be entreteyned with sum good lettres and pleasuris from his Grace with good advice and counsaile to be geven vn to theym for such good, vertuose and politique ordre to be taken and vsed by theym for the good bringing vppe of the yong King (Wol7, 12–17)
- (29) geving to your Grace his moost affectuouse thankis for your diligent aduertisement of those good tidingis with your labor taken in the lettre by your Grace devised in his name to the Chauncellor of Poile. (Wol7, 39–42)
- (30) His Highnes also thinketh that it were neither honorable to his Grace nor to the French King that th’Emperors Embassiator shold be deteigned in Fraunce, and it semeth to me that the Kingis Grace somewhat doweith whither he be there deteigned against his will or not, but his Grace greatly alloweth and thanketh yours in the solliciting of his enlarging. (Wol7, 43–48)

Analysing gratitude in the letters written to Wolsey was interesting, because it became apparent that the gratitude is almost always not towards Wolsey from More but from King Henry to Wolsey. Only in Wol4 the second gratitude component is gratitude towards

Wolsey from More. Intriguingly, in this letter More is thanking Wolsey for Wolsey thanking the king.

- (31) I eftesonys moost humbly thanke your good Grace that hit liked your Grace so goodly wise to geve thankis to the Kingis Highnes for his bounteous liberalite at the contemplation of your Gracis lettres vsed vn to Mr. Tuke and me. (Wol4, 66–69)

Although gratitude is said to threaten the sender's, i.e. writer's, face (Sánchez Roura 2002, 261), in most of the cases here the sender and the one who is grateful, are different persons. Thus, More might not have been threatened in the way that is thought to happen when showing gratitude. In addition, by showing gratitude, the writer puts themselves in a position of feeling indebted to the recipient (ibid.). However, even if one thought of King Henry as the sender, and not More, it might be debatable to say that a king, by showing gratitude, would feel indebted to the reader, or that the reader would expect for anything in return.

B Acknowledgement of receipt (Sánchez Roura)

In three letters of eight (Wol2, Wol5, Wol7) an acknowledgment of receipt was found, and in Wol5 two different acknowledgments. There are two instances of More informing Wolsey that he has received the letter(s) and two instances where More informs Wolsey that he has received the letters and read them to the king. Wol5 includes both instances, as can be seen in examples (32) and (33):

- (32) Hit may lyke your good Grace to be aduertised that I haue presented and red vnto the Kingis Grace your Gracis lettre written vnto my selfe, dated the xxviith day of this present moneth with the lettre of my Lord Admirall, directed vn to the Kingis Highnes, dated at Newcastell the xxiiiith day of this moneth. (Wol5, 1–5)
- (33) For this day cam the post with your Gracis lettre written vn to me, dated the xxixth dau of this present moenth with the lettre of my Lord of Suffolke, dated in the cample at Camppyen, with diverse other lettres and copies conteyned in the same pacquet, all which I remit vn to your good Grace agayne with these presentis. (Wol5, 16–21)

C Offer of service (Sánchez Roura)

Any kind of offer for services does not appear in More's letters to Wolsey. According to Sánchez Roura (2002, 266–267), these offers appear in deferential letters, which would

imply that More too would have the opportunity to offer a service, as hierarchically More was inferior to Wolsey during the period which the examined letters were written. A reason why More did not offer any service could be the fact that More was conveying only the information that the king would want to relay, and that as the relationship between King Henry and Wolsey is not deferential, there was no fundamental basis for an offer of service.

D Request for a service (Bergholm)

There are many passages in the letters written to Wolsey that can be counted as requests for a service. These passages are found in Wol1, Wol3, Wol4, Wol6 and Wol8, and in one letter can occur more than one request (e.g. in Wol3 there are five different requests). These requests, however, are once again, not from the writer, More, but from King Henry. This would mean that the one that puts the recipient in a face-threatening situation is the king and not More. However, as the requests are from a king, it could be debated how much of a face-threatening act these requests are. Requesting does put the recipient in a situation where he must choose whether to execute these requests, but in this case one could think that refusing is not an option. In addition, all of the passages that can be interpreted as requests, are not direct requests to do something but rather reminders or advice not to do or mention something in future endeavours, such as in future letters to be written by Wolsey. One such request appears in Wol6 (82–85): “Iff it wold lyke your good Grace in eny letter which it should please your Grace here after to write hither, to make some mention and remembraunce of that mater”.

Bergholm makes in her MA thesis a point that the requests are usually mitigated (Bergholm 2008, 75). This occurs in More’s letters as well. The most prominent mitigation occurs in a paragraph in Wol3 where More requests, via the king’s order, that More is to be rewarded financially. First More explains as to who has ordered and why before stating the actual request, added with a referential statement “moost humble wise I besech your good Grace”, as can be seen in example (34):

- (34) Ferthermore hit may lyke your good Grace to vnderstand that at the contemplation of your Gracis lettrres, the Kingis Hignes is graciously content that byside the c li for my fe, for thoffice of the Speker of his Parleament, to be taken at the receipte of his Exchequer, I shall haue one other hundred poundis owt of his cofres by thandis of the Tresorer of his Chambre, wherfor in moost humble wise I besech your good Grace that as your graciouse favor

hath obteigned hit for me so it may lyke the same to write to Mr. Wiatt that he may deliver hit to such as I shall send for it (Wol3, 103–112)

However, when the request comes from the king, the mitigation might not occur at all or occurs only slightly, e.g in Wol6: “his Grace requyreth yours so to talke with hym” (63–64), which is quite straightforward, or in Wol8: “Which if your Grace conveniently may, than his Highnes very hartely reuireth your Grace that it may lyke you to appoint for his coadiutor his Gracis chappeleyn Mr. Stanley”, which has more mitigation items, underlined in the example.

E End of news (Sánchez Roura)

The end of news clause appears twice in the letters written to Wolsey, in Wol2 and in Wol8. Although they are formed differently that what for example Sánchez Roura (‘at this time’ Sánchez Roura 2002, 266) mentions, there is a softening part in both letters. The reason for ending the letter is justified a little differently in each letter: in Wol2 More tells that that was all that he remembered of the things he was meant to inform Wolsey about (“Thus mych I remember of the letter written vn to my Lord Steward...” (68–69)) and in Wol8 More directly says that this was all that the King had commanded him to report (“And thus mych the Kingis Highnes hath commauded me to wright vn to your good Grace concernyng this mater” (38–39)).

F Request for letters (Austin)

A request for letters appears only in one letter, and in that it is not a request to send letters to the writer, but rather to other correspondents. In this request there is embedded also a request for service, as King Henry needs Wolsey to answer to the other letters.

(35) he commauded me to sende theym vn to your Grace to be by your high wisdom farther considered and answeris to theym to be devised such as to your high prudence shlabbe sene convenient. (Wol8, 140–143)

G Plea of haste (Hall & Richardson)

In none of the letters written to Wolsey were any sort of plea of haste apparent. A reason for this could be that More would either always devote himself to each letter written so that he would have the need to excuse himself, or because it was not something that was common to add to the letter. As Sánchez Roura (2002, 268) suggests, a plea of haste

clause might have been used by some people, but it might not have been a letter-writing custom.

H Postscript (Bergholm)

In all letters a sort of postscript is apparent, and it is except for one (Wol4) always similarly formulated, e.g. as in Wol5: “To my Lord Legatis good Grace.” (59). Mostly the postscript is in the form in which a superscription is written (in Wol1 the superscription and the postscript are in effect the same). These postscripts could be categorised as the superscription, as the superscription usually informs of the recipient, but because these clauses were found at the end of the letter in Rogers (1947), right after the subscription, they were categorised as postscripts. In addition, the counting of lines in Rogers go on until these clauses, and as Rogers does not give any further explanation of her editing, it was interpreted as part of the end of the letter. Another fact that supports these clauses being the postscript and not the superscription, is that in one letter they both appear, and as previously explained, the superscription seems to be on line (-1) which would imply that it is not part of the actual letter.

In one letter (Wol4) there is a longer paragraph which occurs only after the attestation and date. In More’s letters, attestation, date and subscription in all other cases are right after each other, but in this one there is a paragraph between attestation and date, and the subscription. This could imply that More was already finishing the letter but remembered something that had to still be written. Interestingly, this letter still has the same clause which appears in other letters as well. However, this could also be a custom that varies depending on the sender, as Bergholm (2008, 93) had found varying instances in her study as well.

5.2 Form of the letters to Roper

The letters written to Roper and the elements which were found in these letters are discussed in this part.

I Superscription

A superscription was found in six letters of eight (Ro2, Ro3, Ro4, Ro5, Ro6, Ro7). The superscriptions are found before the actual letter on lines -1 to -2. Ro6 includes two lines: “OWR LORDE BLISSE YOU. / MY DERELY BELOUYD DOUGHTER.” (-1-2), and here can be also seen variations of the two types of superscription that More used in his

letters to Roper, the other being a blessing or prayer and the other one a clause that addresses the recipient.

2 Praise together with Address

In five letters of eight there was found a phrase which is more or less consistent with the description of an address, i.e. the descriptive noun is complemented with a respectful adjective (see e.g. Richardson 1984, 213). The address typically begins the first sentence of a letter, but in the letters written to Roper the address is usually embedded in the first sentence.

In many of the letters More addresses Roper throughout the letter and not only at the begin. For example, in Ro4 More addresses Roper 15 times. The address in the body of the text might not function in a similar manner as the address at the begin, however, it is an interesting notion, that More addresses Roper so many times in one letter. Usually the address is embedded in the first sentence of the letter, e.g.:

- (36) If I had not ben, my derely beloued doughter, at a firme an fast point (Ro3, 1–2)
- (37) And thus, mine owne good daughter, putting you finally in remembraunce (Ro4, 146–147)
- (38) And therefore am I not (Megge) so mad, as to warraunt my selfe to stande. (Ro4, 129–130)

As can be seen in the latter example, More on some occasions called Roper by her first name or by nickname, which could be explained by their close relationship.

3 Commendation (which also functions as a Salutation) + an expression of humility

Commendation appears in three letters (Ro2, Ro4, Ro8) of eight in the letters written to Roper. Only on one occasion the commendation is from More to Roper “Recommend me to your shrewde Wyll” (Ro2: 21), and on every other occasion More commends himself to a third party via the reader, which Sánchez Roura (2002, 260–261) categorises as a type 2 commendation. This type of commendation is present for example in Ro2 after More has recommended himself to Roper: “Recommend me to your shrewde Wyll and mine other sonnes, and to John Harrys my frende, and your selfe knoweth to whom els, and to my shrewde wife aboue all” (21–23).

None of the commendations are written where they are supposed to be written according to the letter-writing models. All of the commendations are written at the end of the letter, except for Ro8, in which there is two instances of type-2 commendation, the first on lines 3–4 (example (39)) and the second on the lines 31–32 (example (40)), which is written near the end of the letter.

(39) Recommende me whan you maye to my goode doughter Cecilye (Ro8, 3–4)

(40) I praye yow at tyme conveniente recomende me to my goode sonne Johan More. (Ro8, 31–32)

4 Health

A health component is present in two letters (Ro2 and Ro8). The first one can be categorised according to Davis' (1965, 236) model's part 6 (reporting the writer's good health) and 7 (thanking God for good health), although in reverse order: "Our Lorde be thanked, I am in good health of body" (Ro2: 1–2). The sentence in Ro8 can be categorised as a prayer to the recipient's health (category 4) (ibid.), although in this case More expands the prayer to the closest family and friends: "Owr Lorde blisse you goode dowghter and your goode husbände and your litle boye and all yours and all my children and all my godchildren and all owr freindis." (1–3). This sentence is somewhat problematic, for if it were written at the end of the letter, this could be categorised as a pious farewell or prayer. However, as this sentence begins the letter, it is more sensible to interpret it as a health component.

5 Notification of the main purpose of the letter

More does not use the common notification formula, which is used to imply that the next sentence informs the reader about the main purpose of the letters, in the letters written to Roper. However, in three letters of eight there are passages which imply of the main purpose of the letter. Two of them are fairly straightforward (examples (42) and (43)) and one can very loosely be categorised as notification (example (41)), if the content of the letter is considered.

(41) When I was before the Lordes at Lambeth, I was the first that was called in, all beit, Maister Doctour the Vicar of Croydon was come before me, and diuers others. (Ro1, 1–3)

- (42) I haue thou<ght> yt necessary to aduertise yow of the very trouth, to thende that yo<u> neyther conceyue more hope than the mater gyueth, lest vppon other torne yt might aggreue your heuynes, nor more <griefe and> fere than the mater gyueth of, on the tother syde. (Ro6, 8–12)
- (43) For asmuche, deerely beloued daughter, as it is likely that you either haue hearde or shortely shall heare that the Counsaile was here this day, and that I was before theim, I haue thought it necessary to sende you worde howe the mater standeth. (Ro7, 1–4)

6 Pious farewell or prayer

The pious farewell or prayer component is one of the most consistent elements to be found in the letters written to Roper. In all letters except for Ro1 this element is present. A reason why the first letter might be lacking this component might be because this was also the first letter that More wrote after being imprisoned, and he might not have had much time, or energy, to write according to the letter-writing customs.

Many of the components categorised as a pious farewell or prayer are built as described in the letter-writing models, but some were devised somewhat more freely. For example, if one compares the examples (44) and (45), the difference is evident:

- (44) And thus my deare daughter the blessed spirit of Christ for his tender mercy gouerne and guide you all, to his pleasure and your weale and confortes both body and soul. (Ro3, 47–49)
- (45) And yow with al yours, and my wyde and all my chylderne and all our other frendis both bodily and gostely hertely well to fare. And I pray yow and all them <pray for> me, and take no thought what so euer shall happen me. (Ro6, 116–119)

The example (44) can be categorised as a pious farewell and prayer, as it appears at the end of the letter, it begins with “and thus” and it has a reference to God . The example (45), on the other hand, has the phrase “hertely well to fare”, which indicates that this sentence’s function is to be a farewell.

Ro2 (examples (46–48)) and Ro8 (examples (49–53)) are interesting letters regarding the element of farewell, for there are several instances of a farewell. In Ro2 there are three and in Ro8 five different instances of farewell:

Ro2

- (46) our Lorde put them in to your minds, as I trust he doth, and better to, by his Holie Spirite: who blesse you and preserue you all (5–7)

- (47) And thus fare you hartely well for lacke of paper. (11–12)
- (48) and God preserue you all, and make and keep you his seruauntes all (123–124)
- Ro8
- (49) my goode doughter Cecilye, whom I beseche ovr Lorde to comforte, and I sende her my blessing and to all her children and pray her to praye for me (4–5)
- (50) Fare well my deere childe and praye for me, and I shall for you and all your freindes that we maie merily meete in heauen. (25–26)
- (51) my goode dowghter Clemente her algorisme stone and I sende her and my goode sonne and all hers Goddes blissinge and myne (29–30)
- (52) Ovr Lorde blisse him and his goode wife my louinge daughter (32–33)
- (53) And our Lorde blisse Thomas and Austen and all that thei shall haue. (36–37)

As Ro8 was the last letter More ever wrote in his lifetime, the extensive number of farewell elements might not be as curious as it would be in a letter written earlier in his lifetime. When one reads the farewells closely, one can see that every farewell is directed at different people (in example (50) the farewell is directed at Roper). The reason for three different farewells in Ro2 is harder to interpret. One reason could be that as Ro1 is purely information without any of the common beginning and ending elements of a letter, except for a loosely categorizable notification, More felt the need to write another letter. However, this matter can only be speculated.

There was one case in the letters written to Roper which could be categorised as commendation, but as this sort of type (commending the recipient to a third party) was not found in Sánchez Roura’s discussion, and the sentence is found at the end of the letter, it seems that it functions here rather as a pious farewell or prayer:

- (54) And therefore thus I commend you to the holy Trinitie, to gyde you, coumfort you and direct you with his Holy Spirite, and all yours and my wife with all my children and all our other frendes. (Ro5, 102–105)

7 Attestation

Attestation does not appear in any letters written to Roper. This is reasonable, as More was prisoned at the time, so there was little doubt where he resided at the time. However, another component, the farewell in Ro2 (“And thus fare you hartely well for lacke of paper.” (11–12)), suggests that the reason for not writing an attestation was to save space.

8 Date

Date is not written in any letter written to Roper. It is difficult to say why More left the date out, but one reason could be that as attestation and date are usually written together, and as he left the attestation out, he did not write date either. For example, in Nevalainen's model place, i.e. attestation, and date are categorised as one element (Nevalainen 2001, 211). However, it might have been left out to save space, as could have been with the attestation. In fact, at some point during his imprisonment all his writing materials (which were previously given to him) were taken from him (Ackroyd 1998, 361; 378).

9 Subscription (with a phrase specifying the writer's relationship to the recipient)

In five letters of eight is present a subscription. In most of them the relationship is specified (e.g. in Ro7: "Your tender louinge ffather, Thomas More Kg." (150–151)) but in two only More's name and title are written (e.g. in Ro2: "Thomas More, Knight." (13)).

A Gratitude (Sánchez Roura)

Gratitude appears in two of Roper's letters, in Ro4 (example (55)) and in Ro8 (examples (56) and (57)), which has two instances of gratitude. Both of Sánchez Roura's examples include the verb 'to thank', which does not appear in two these instances, however, the gratitude is clearly visible through other wordings (such as 'pleasure' and 'comfort'):

- (55) If I wolde with my writing, (mine owne good daughter) declare how much pleasure and comfort, your daughterlye louing letters wer vnto me a pecke of coles wolde not suffice to make me the pennes. (Ro4, 1–4)
- (56) I neuer like your maner towarde me better then when you kissed me laste for I loue when doughterly loue and deere charitie hathe no laisor to looke to worldely curtesye. (Ro8, 22–24)
- (57) Ro8: I thanke you for your greate coaste. (Ro8, 27)

B Acknowledgement of receipt (Sánchez Roura)

More acknowledges receipt of Roper's letters in three letters (Ro3, Ro4, Ro5). In Ro3 More refers to Roper's letters on two occasions: 1. "your lamentable letter had not a little abashed me" (3), 2. "Wherein as towchinge the pointes of your letter, I can make none answeere" (10–11).

C Offer of service (Sánchez Roura)

Offer of service does not occur in the letters written to Roper. This might be for the same reason as attestation and date are not written: More is in prison and there is not much that he could offer to do for Roper.

D Request for a service (Bergholm)

Request for a service is present in one letter (Ro8). In addition to hoping for praying on his behalf (which was not counted in as a request), there are some requests which in More asks Roper to forward some items (examples (58) and (59)) or demands (example (60)) to others.

(58) I sende her and handkercher (6–7)

(59) My goode dowgther Daunce hath the picture in parchemente that yow deliuered me from my Ladie Coniars, her name is on the backe side. Shewe her that I hertely pray her that you maye sende it in my name to her agyne for a token from me to praye for me. (7–11)

(60) to whom I praye him be goode, as he hathe greate cause, and that if the lande of myne come to his hande, he breake not my will concerninge his sister Daunce (33–36)

E End of news (Sánchez Roura)

End of news appears in two letters written to Roper, in Ro2: “And thus fare you hartely well for lacke of paper.” (11–12) and in Ro5: “It is now, my good doughter, late.” (102). The example of Ro2 functions also as a farewell, but as there is added a mitigating part, “for lacke of paper”, the passage can be categorised also as an element of end of news. Ro5 more clearly indicates with the mitigating phrase “it is late” the end of the letter.

F Request for letters (Austin)

There was no request for letters apparent in the letters written to Roper.

G Plea of haste (Hall & Richardson)

There was no plea of haste component in the letters written to Roper.

H Postscript (Bergholm)

In one letter of eight letters could a postscript be found. In Ro2, after the subscription, is a long passage of 10 lines, which makes almost a half of the whole letter.

5.3 Comparison between the letters to Wolsey and Roper

There are some similarities and some great differences between the letters written to Wolsey and Roper. In general, Wolsey's letters have more elements altogether (see Appendix II) and it would seem that when writing to Wolsey, More followed more accurately the conventions of letter-writing. By looking at the table Appendix II it becomes immediately clear that some elements were used in both sets consistently (such as the pious farewell or prayer) and some elements equally consistently were not used at all (such as the plea of haste). However, even in the letters to Wolsey More was not always quite consistent, for only two letters (Wol3, Wol6) have exactly the same elements. In addition, More uses superscription only with Roper except for one instance with Wolsey.

Addressing is one of the elements which are very differently portrayed. In Roper's letters More addresses Roper informally and sometimes even only with the name, omitting the descriptive noun and the respectful adjective. In Wolsey's letters More addresses Wolsey formally, always in the same manner ("your good Grace"). The most striking difference is that addressing Roper is present throughout the letters, sometimes embedded in another element, such as the notification, but addressing Wolsey can be analysed to happen only right at the begin at the letter in the notification or in the acknowledgment.

Of the main elements, commendation is present only in the letters written to Roper. This is intriguing if one considers the relationship between the correspondents and Sánchez Roura's (2002, 260) suggestion that commendation might be left out in case the writer is socially inferior to the recipient. In this case the letters should not in Roper's case include a commendation, if one thinks that a father is superior to his children, but in Wolsey's case they should, as More was Wolsey's subordinate at the time. On the other hand, Richardson (1984, 214) mentions that "virtually all private letters" have a commendation, which supports the fact that Roper's letters had a commendation in them. If one considers Wolsey's letters to be public, as is suggested by Bergholm's (2008, 44) categorisation that public letters are letters which are written to members outside a core family, and Richardson's (1984, 209) statement that the "distinction between public and private correspondence was blurred", it seems that More could have added a commendation to Wolsey's letters as well. As discussed already in 5.1, a reason More left

the commendation out of these letters might be because the letters were ordered by the king, and thus the social inferiority clause would hold, or that in this kind of correspondence commendation was not considered a necessary component.

Continuing with the main elements, the health component appears in both sets of letters very rarely. Notification of the main purpose of the letters appears in some letters but is rarer in Roper's letters. In both sets the address, the pious farewell or prayer, and the subscription appear consistently. Attestation and date differ the most between the sets of letters, for they appear in each letter to Wolsey but are written in none of the letters to Roper.

Similar in letters is that the optional elements occur quite rarely. However, the optional elements that do appear are almost the same in both sets: gratitude, acknowledgment of receipt, request for a service, end of news, request for letters, and the postscript. Of these the element 'request for letters' appears only in the letters written to Wolsey, others appearing in varying amounts in both sets. Wolsey's letters have altogether more occurrences, the most prominent difference being in the postscripts: all but one letter to Wolsey's have a postscript and only one letter to Roper has a postscript.

The similarities between the letters could be explained by the fact that as already by the 15th century the public and private correspondence was starting to mix (Richardson 1984, 209), at the beginning of the 16th century they were as or possibly even more mixed. In addition, the difference between private and business correspondence was not significant yet (Richardson 1980, 26), and private and public correspondence was blurred as well (Richardson 1984, 209). Further reasons for similarities and differences are discussed in the following section.

5.4 Applicability of Bergholm's model to More's letters

The results of this study are most likely highly affected by the relationship of the correspondents and the fact that the letters written to Roper were written under very unusual circumstances, which offers an interesting opportunity for pondering the letter-writing models. It would seem that Bergholm's model might be more suitable to analyse the public personal letters More wrote to Wolsey (or by extent to others with whom More the correspondence was official), but the more private family letters written to Roper seem to not support Bergholm's model. Only a few elements are used in a manner that can be called consistent, namely the superscription (in seven letter of eight), the pious farewell or prayer (in seven letters of eight), a praise with and address (in five letters of

eight) and the subscription (in five letters of eight). None of the optional elements were consistently used, but as Bergholm stated, these are elements, which can be added if case of need. However, there are some main elements which do not appear at all (attestation and date) or appear only a few times (commendation, health, notification of the main purpose of the letter). Richardson's (2001, 236) statement on the mid-16th-century letters might offer an explanation as to why Roper's letters seem to have so much less of the elements in them: "Outside of the recipients of a few classes of royal letters, English readers from the second half of the sixteenth century on (at the very latest) would have found dictaminal clichés very exotic indeed." This statement also implies that in royal letters such "dictaminal" clichés were still found, if not common.

However, there were some elements that usually are said to be found on such official letters, but in this study were rare. For example, Wolsey's letters did not have any passage that could be categorised as commendation and had only one passage with a superscription. This is interesting, because although superscription is not mentioned in other letter-writing models, it is discussed as an essential part of medieval letters (Hall 1908, Richardson 1984). Furthermore, as Bergholm had added superscription to her model, it was expected that superscription and commendation would be found in these letters. However, as Richardson discusses in his article from 2001 about the diminishing of the medieval letter-writing style in the 14th century, there must have happened some change already by the beginning of the 16th century, when the letters examined in this study were written. Unfortunately, the letters written to Roper seem to contradict this, at least to some extent, as seven letters include a superscription and three letters a commendation. However, this is not enough to prove or to even suggest that Bergholm's model follows a letter written to a close relative better than an official person, as every other element appears similarly or is even rarer. In addition, as the difference between public and private and personal and family letters is quite vague, as previously discussed, distinguishing the two sets (based on these factors) seems unimportant.

The optional elements are to be found to some extent in More's letters. As Bergholm explained, these are elements which are added to the letter only if necessary. Almost every optional element was found, at least once, in the examined letters, except for an offer of service or plea of haste. Although Bergholm had plea of haste in his optional elements, as Sánchez Roura (2002, 267–268) suggests, it might not particularly be a custom in letter-writing but rather is only used depending on the person. In other words, even if More would have felt that he had written the letter in haste or wanted to

excuse for a hastily written letter, as might not have been his style to write, he did not add any plea of haste. The other missing of the other optional element, offer of service, could be explained by the fact that More was mostly voicing the king's wishes in the letters to Wolsey, and as he was in prison while writing the letters to Roper, he could not have been able to perform any service.

A minor matter that could be changed in Bergholm's model is the attestation and date. It would seem that Nevalainen's (2001, 211) suggestion that place, i.e. attestation, and date were a single component, is more logical than separating the two elements, based on this study on More's letters, as on every occasion the attestation and date was present in the letter, they were presented in the same clause, almost as a single component.

6 Conclusion

The research questions of this study were:

- 1) To what extent do the letters written by Thomas More to Thomas Wolsey and to Margaret Roper follow the 15th-century letter model that Anneli Bergholm provided in her MA thesis, i.e. can the 15th-century letter model be applied to the letters written in the beginning of the 16th century?
- 2) Is there a difference between the form of the letters written to Wolsey and Roper and how does it show?

Bergholm's model is to an extent applicable to the letters examined in this study, but no letter followed the model perfectly. There was also a great difference between the letters written to Wolsey and to Roper. It seems that More followed some conventions in both letters (i.e. using a praise and address component and the pious farewell or prayer component), but both main and optional elements were more prominent in the letters written to Wolsey (six of nine main elements, i.e. the praise with and address, the notification, the pious farewell or prayer, the attestation, the date, and the subscription, were found in almost every letter to Wolsey but only two elements, i.e. the superscription and the pious farewell or prayer, were as prominent in Roper's letters). However, some of the main element were missing in almost every letter (i.e. superscription and commendation).

While analysing the data, it was apparent that there was no certain pattern, save for a few elements, in which More writes. Especially the letters written to Roper show only little or no evidence that More would practice letter-writing customs. Of course, More's circumstances were not convenient for using strict letter-writing conventions. Therefore, it would be interesting to analyse More's letter written to Roper before he was arrested. However, as the letters were written in Latin, the study would have to be conducted by someone with a working knowledge of Latin.

A more perfect study of More's writing in English could be conducted by studying all letters written to Wolsey. There was some coherence in the use of some elements of letter-writing but some elements, which are said to appear frequently in letters written in More's time, were absent. Validation for the evidence on More's following or not following the letter-writing customs could be obtained by studying the other letters as

well. In these letters could be included also letters written to other people in English, in order to see whether his style changes depending on the correspondent (in a different way than what was covered in this study).

Thus, it could be summarised, that this study offers many leads into further research, in addition to the answer to the research questions. More lived in a time when the English language was becoming more prestigious, letter-writing was going through changes and the difference between different types of correspondence was vague. In addition to the different style of writing, depending on the correspondent, this might be a reason why Bergholm's model as such is not best suited to analyse the English letters written by Thomas More.

References

PRIMARY MATERIAL

Rogers, Elizabeth Frances, ed. 1947. *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Ackroyd, Peter. 1998. *The Life of Thomas More*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Austin, Frances. 1973. „Epistolary Conventions in the Clift Family Correspondence.” *English Studies* 54, no. 9–22: 129–140.
- Bergholm, Anneli. 2008. “The Form and Formulas in Fifteenth Century English Personal Letters – A Study on a Selection of Cely, Paston, and Stonor Letters (ca. 1470 – 1490).” MA Thesis, University of Turku.
- Camargo, Martin. 2001. “The Waning of Medieval *Ars Dictaminis*.” *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 19, no. 2: 135–140. Accessed 1 October 2019. JSTOR.
- CTMS. 2015a. "About Us." *The Center for Thomas More Studies*. Accessed 9 October 2019. <https://www.thomasmorestudies.org//aboutctms.html>.
- CTMS. 2015b. “St. Thomas More’s Contribution to the English Language. *The Center for Thomas More Studies*. Accessed 12 May 2020.
- Davis, Norman. 1965. “The *Litera Troili* and English Letters.” *The Review of English Studies* 16, no. 63: 233–244. Accessed 25 September 2019. JSTOR.
- Diller, Hans-Jürgen, ed. 2001. *Towards a History of English as a History of Genres*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fischer, Olga & van der Wurff, Wim. 2006. „Syntax.“ In *A History of the English Language*, edited by Richard Hogg and David Denison, 109–198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guy, John. 2009. *A daughter’s love*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Hall, Hubert. 1908. *Studies in English Official Historical Documents*. Cambridge: University Press. Accessed 1 February 2020. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.hx12gx>.
- Hogg, Richard & Denison, David, eds. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnstone, Barbara. 2018. *Discourse Analysis*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell. EBSCO.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 2006. “Vocabulary.” In *A History of the English Language*, edited by Richard Hogg and David Denison, 199–270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCutcheon, Elizabeth. 2015. “The Humanism of Thomas More: Continuities and Transformations in his Latin Letters.” *Moreana* 52, no. 201/202: 359–382. ProQuest.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. 2001. "Continental conventions in early English correspondence." In *Towards a History of English as a History of Genres*, edited by Hans-Jürgen Diller and Manfred Görlach, 203–224. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006. *An Introduction to Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Newbold, W. Webster. 2008. “Traditional, Practical, Entertaining. Two Early English Letter Writing Manuals.” In *Rhetorica* 26, no. 3: 267–300. ProQuest.

- Richardson, Malcolm. 1980. "The Earliest Business Letters in English: An Overview." *The Journal of Business Communication* 17, no. 3: 19–31. Accessed 24 September 2019. JSTOR.
- Richardson, Malcolm. 1984. "The Dictamen and its Influence on Fifteenth-Century English Prose." *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 2, no. 3: 207–226. Accessed 24 September 2019. JSTOR.
- Richardson, Malcolm. 2001. "The Fading Influence of the Medieval *Ars Dictaminis* in England After 1400." *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 19, no. 2: 225–247. Accessed 24 September 2019. JSTOR.
- Rockett, William. 2008. "The Case against Thomas More." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 39, no. 4: 1065–1093. Accessed 23 March 2019. JSTOR.
- Sánchez Roura, Teresa. 2001. "What's Left of *captatio benevolentiae* in the Cely Letters?" *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 102, 3: 317–228.
- Sánchez Roura, Teresa. 2002. "The pragmatics of *captatio benevolentiae* in the Cely letters." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 3, no. 2: 253–272. Accessed 23 March 2020. Ingenta Connect.
- Schildgen, Brenda Deen. 2010. „Thomas More and the Defense of Images in the Dialogue Concerning Heresies." *Moreana* 47, no. 181/182: 235–256. ProQuest.
- Wegemer, Gerard. 2001. *Thomas More as Statesman: A Brief Sketch*. Accessed 30 April 2020. https://thomasmorestudies.org/docs/More_as_Statesman.pdf.
- Wegemer, Gerard. 2015. „The „Secret of his Heart”: What Was Thomas More’s?” *Moreana* 52, no. 199/200: 44–60. ProQuest.
- Wynne-Davies, Marion. 2007. *Women Writers and Familial Discourse in the English Renaissance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Accessed 29 April 2020. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utu.fi/10.1057/9780230592940>
- Zweck, Jordan. 2018. "Reconstructing the Anglo-Saxon *ars dictaminis*: Form, Vocabulary, and Immediacy." In *Epistolary Acts. Anglo-Saxon Letters and Early English Media*. 24–62. Accessed 1 February 2020. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. de Gruyter.

Appendix I: An example of annotation of a letter

Letter from Rogers (1947, 507-508)

#2

201. To Margaret Roper.

Bodleian MS. Ballard 72, fol. 84v
Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 17 D xiv, fol. 393v
Englysh Workes p.1430
Tres Thomae p.291, translation

Tower of London
(April-May? 1534)

A letter written with a cole by Sir Thomas More to his daughter Maistres Margaret Roper, within a while after he was prisoner in the Tower.

Supers. [MYNE OWNE GOOD DOUGHTER.] health 5+6

[Our Lorde be thanked, I am in good health of body, and in good quiet of minde: and of worldly thinges I no more desire then I haue. I besech hym make you all mery in the hope of heauen. And such thinges as I somewhat longed to talke with you all, concerninge the worlde to come, [our Lorde put them in to your mindes, as I trust he doth, and better to, by his Holie Spirite: who blesse you and preserue you all.] Writen with a cole by your tender louinge father, who in his pore prayers forgetteth none of you all, nor your babes, nor your nurses, nor your good husbandes, nor your good husbandes shrewde wiues, nor your fathers shrewde wyfe neyther, nor our other frendes. [And thus fare you hartely well for lacke of paper.] 5 Prayer 10

(Post.) (End of rows) [Thomas More, Knight.] Subs. 15

Our Lorde kepe me continually true faithful and plaine, to the contrary whereof I beseche hym hartely neuer to suffre me lyue. For as for longe lyfe (as I haue often tolde the Megge) I neither loke for, nor longe for, but am well content to goe, if God call

me hence to morowe. And I thanke our Lorde I knowe no person lyuing that I wolde had one philippe for my sake: of which minde I am more gladde than of all the worlde beside. 20

[Recommend me to your shrewde Wyll and mine other sonnes, and to John Harrys my frende, and your selfe knoweth to whome els, and to my shrewde wyfe aboute all, [and God preserue you all, and make and kepe you his seruauntes all.] Com. 15 Farewell

Appendix II: A table declaring whether an element was found in a letter

X = was found, - = was not found

	Wol1	Wol2	Wol3	Wol4	Wol5	Wol6	Wol7	Wol8	Ro1	Ro2	Ro3	Ro4	Ro5	Ro6	Ro7	Ro8
Superscription	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Praise + Address	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	-	X	X
Commendation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	X
Health	X	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	X
Notification	X	X	X	-	-	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	X	X	-
Pious farewell or prayer	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Attestation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Date	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subscription	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	X	-	X	X	X	-
Gratitude	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	X
Acknowledgment	-	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	X	-	-	-
Offer of service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Request for a service	X	-	X	X	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X
End of news	-	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	X	-	-	-
Request for letters	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Plea of haste	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Postscript	X	X	X	X	X	X	-	X	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix III: Finnish summary

1500-luvun kirjeiden osat

Tapaustutkimus Thomas Moren kirjeenvaihdosta Thomas Wolseyn ja Margaret Roperin kanssa

1 Johdanto

Nykyään, kun viestin välittäminen sähköistyy, ei kirjeiden kirjoittaminen ole enää monenkaan mielessä. Nykyisen sähköisen viestinvälittämisen taustalla kuitenkin on jo vuosisatoja sitten käytetyt kirjeen kirjoittamisen konventiot – kuten nykyäänkin, viestissä tuli käydä ilmi kenelle viesti on tarkoitettu, viestin aihe ja viestin lähettäjä.

Tässä sivuaineentutkielmassa tutkitaan 1400- ja 1500-lukujen taitteessa eläneen Thomas Moren (tästä lähin myös 'More') kirjeenvaihtoa. Tarkastelussa ovat kirjeet Thomas Wolseylle (tästä lähin myös 'Wolsey') sekä Margaret Roperille (tästä lähin myös 'Roper'). Moren suhdetta Wolseyhyn sekä Roperiin esitellään tarkemmin luvussa 2.

Kirjeiden, sekä julkisten että yksityisten, kirjoittaminen perustui vielä 1500-luvulla niin kutsuttuun kirjeenkirjoittamistaitoon nimeltä *ars dictaminis*. Kirjeiden kirjoittamisessa oli siis tietyntylaisia konventioita, joiden lähtökohtia esitellään luvussa 3 tarkemmin.

Kirjeissä tarkastellaan niiden muotoa suhteessa Anneli Bergholmin vuoden 2008 pro gradu -tutkielmassaan kehittämään kirjemalliin henkilökohtaisista yksityisistä kirjeistä. Bergholm tutki kirjeissä sekä niiden osia (esim. vastaanottaja, kirjeen aiheen selostus, allekirjoitus) että kiinteitä fraaseja, joita kirjeissä saattoi esiintyä. Tässä tutkimuksessa keskitytään kirjeen osiin eikä kiinteisiin fraaseihin. Tutkimuksen materiaali koostuu 16 kirjeestä, joista Wolseylle ja Roperille on kummallekin kirjoitettu kahdeksan kirjettä. Luvussa esitellään 4 tarkemmin tutkimusasetelma, mukaan lukien seuraavat tutkimuskysymykset:

- 1) Kuinka tarkasti Thomas Moren kirjoittamat kirjeet Thomas Wolseylle sekä Margaret Roperille noudattavat Anneli Bergholmin muotoilemaa 1400-luvun kirjemallia, toisin sanoen, voiko 1400-luvun kirjemallia hyödyntää 1500-luvun alun kirjeiden tutkimisessa?

- 2) Voiko Wolseylle ja Roperille kirjoitettujen kirjeiden mallissa huomata eroa ja miten se käy ilmi?

Vaikka Bergholmin tutkielmassa keskityttiin 1400-luvun loppupuolen kirjeenvaihtoon, olettamukseni on, että 1500-luvun alun kirjeet on luultavasti kirjoitettu pitkälti samojen konventioiden mukaan kuin tuolloinkin. Tätä sekä kirjemallien osasia tutkimusmateriaalissa käsitellään luvuissa 5.

2 Thomas Moren suhde Wolseyhyn ja Roperiin

Thomas More oli merkittävä henkilö 1500-luvun alun Englannissa: hän toimi muun muassa kuninkaan toinen ministeri ja kuningas Henrik VIII:n neuvonantajana (Ackroyd 1998, 199, 280). More olikin Wolseyn seuraaja kuninkaan neuvonantajana. Kirjeet, joita tässä tutkielmassa tutkitaan, ovat kirjoitettu aikana, jolloin Wolsey oli vielä neuvonantaja, ja More tämän alainen (ibid.). Heidän väleistään on kahdenlaisia ajatuksia: toisaalta on ajateltu, että More olisi inhonnut Wolseytä sen vuoksi, miten hän käytti valtaansa, mutta toisaalta Moren on kerrottu pitävänsä Wolseytä mahtavana neuvonantajana, ja Moren on jopa kerrottu kirjoittaneen Wolseylle runoja (Ackroyd 1998, 32).

Margaret Roper oli Moren vanhin tytär, josta tämä välitti syvästi. Tämä käy ilmi heidän kirjeenvaihdostaan, josta valitettavan vähän on säilynyt Roperin kirjoittamia kirjeitä. Moren kirjoittamissa kirjeissä heidän läheinen suhteensa käy ilmi esimerkiksi siitä, miten More kutsuu tyttärtään rakkaaksi tyttäreksen (”beloved child”) sekä allekirjoittaa kirjeen (”Your tender louynge father, Thomas More, Knight.”) (kirje nro. 202: Rogers 1947, 508–509).

3 Kirjeen kirjoittaminen ja kirjeen kirjoittamisen mallit

Tässä luvussa esitellään kirjeen kirjoittamisen lähtökohtia (3.1) sekä malleja (3.2), mukaan lukien mallin, jota käytetään tämän tutkielman materiaalin analysoinnissa.

3.1 *Ars dictaminis* ja 1400-luvun kirjeen kirjoittaminen Englannissa

Ars dictaminis, joka tarkoittaa kirjeen kirjoittamisen taitoa (tai taidetta) ja perustuu Ciceron retoriikkaan, on ollut latinankielisen kirjeen kirjoittamisen väline erityisesti 1100- ja 1200-luvuilla (Richardson 1984, 208). *Ars dictamen* voidaan jaotella esimerkiksi *dictameniin* sekä *notariaan*, joista jälkimmäinen on ollut käytössä erityisesti virallisten kirjeiden muotoilussa (Richardson 1984, 208–209). *Ars dictaminis* perinteisesti jaottuu

viiteen kirjeen osaan: *salutatio*, *exordium*, *narration*, *petition* sekä *conclusion* (Zweck 2018, 30). *Salutatio* on tervehdys, jossa ilmoitettiin sekä lähettäjän että vastaanottajan nimet, *exordium* on esittely, *narratio* ilmoittaa kirjeen pääsanoman, *petitio* on pyyntö ja *conclusio* tiivistää kirjeen sanoman sekä sisältää mahdollisen jäähyväisfraasin (Zweck 2018, 31).

Englannissa kirjeen kirjoittamisen konventioita ei ilmeisestikään seurattu kovin tarkasti ainakaan 1400-luvulla (Richardson 1984, 207). Englannissa kirjeen kirjoittamiseen vaikutti myös englannin kielen vahvistuminen kuningas Henrik V:n myötä, sillä hänen myötään sekä kirjeissä käytettävä kieli alkoi vaihtua englanniksi ja muoto alkoi muuttua niin, että julkisten ja yksityisten kirjeiden ero väheni (Richardson 1984, 208–211).

3.1 Kirjeen kirjoittamisen mallit

Bergholm tutki tutkielmassaan 1400-luvun kirjekokoelmia Davisin (1965), Richardsonin (1984) ja Nevalaisen (2001) kirjemallien pohjalta. Bergholm totesi, että nämä valmiit mallit eivät vastanneet tarpeeksi tarkasti 1400-luvun lopun kirjeiden muotoa, joten hän muotoili oman mallin aikaisempien mallien pohjalta. Bergholmin mallia suhteessa muihin malleihin voi tarkastella taulukosta 1. Taulukossa 1 esiintyvät pääelementit ovat otsikko, vastaanottaja ylistävin sanoin, suosittelu tai tervehdys, terveys, tiedonanto kirjeen aiheesta, hurskaat jäähyväiset tai rukous, paikka, päivämäärä sekä allekirjoitus.

Taulukossa 1 näkyvien pääelementtien lisäksi Bergholm ehdotti yhdeksää valinnaista elementtiä, jotka kirjoittaja voi tarpeen tullen lisätä tekstiin. Nämä ovat kiitollisuus, ilmoitus kirjeen ja tiedon vastaanottamisesta, palvelun tarjoaminen, palvelun pyytäminen, ilmoitus viestin päättymisestä, pyyntö kirjeistä, ilmoitus kiireestä, ja jälkikirjoitus.

Taulukko 1. Kirjemallit: latinalainen kirje (Zweck 2018), Davis (1965), (Hall &) Richardson (1984), Nevalainen (2001), Bergholm (2008). (suom. J.L.)

	latinal. kirje (Zweck 2018)	Davis (1965)	Richardson (1984) (pohjautuen Hall 1908)	Nevalainen (2001)	Bergholm (2008)
Alku					Otsikko
				Aika & paikka	
	<i>salutatio</i>	Vastaanottaja	Vastaanottaja	Vastaanottaja & tervehdys	Vastaanottaja + ylistys
		Suosittelu	Tervehdys		Suosittelu l. tervehdys + nöyryys
		Terveys		Terveys	Terveys
			Tiedonanto	Tiedonanto	Tiedonanto
	<i>exordium</i>				
Keskiosa	<i>narratio</i>		Selonteko		
	<i>petitio</i>		Määräys tai velvoite		
			Loppulauseke		
Loppi	<i>conclusio</i>		Hyvästijättö tai ' <i>appreciato</i> '	Hyvästijättö tai ' <i>appreciato</i> '	Hurskaat jäähyväiset tai rukous
			Paikka		Paikka
			Aika		Aika
					Allekirjoitus

4 Tutkimusasetelma

Tässä luvussa esitellään tutkimusongelma, tutkimusmateriaalit sekä tutkimusmenetelmä.

Tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on selvittää, päteekö 1500-luvun alussa kirjoitettuihin kirjeisiin 1400-luvun kirjemallin muoto. Oletuksena on, että se pätee, sillä Bergholmin malli perustuu 1400-luvun lopun kirjeiden perusteella tehtyihin päätelmiin. Mahdollista kuitenkin olisi myös, että malli ei päde tarkasti tutkimusmateriaalien eroavaisuuden

vuoksi: Bergholm tutki useiden eri kirjoittajien kirjeitä, kun tässä tutkielmassa tutkitaan yhden henkilön kirjoittamia kirjeitä. Näin ollen pohdittiin myös, eroavatko kahdelle eri vastaanottajalle lähetetyt kirjeet toisistaan ja miten tämä käy ilmi.

Tutkimusmateriaaliksi valikoitui yhteensä 16 kirjettä, joista kahdeksan hän kirjoitti Thomas Wolseylle ja kahdeksan Margaret Roperille. Kaiken kaikkiaan More kirjoittikin vain kahdeksan kirjettä Roperille, mutta Wolseyn kirjeiden kohdalla materiaali piti valikoida 21 kirjeen joukosta. Kun oli ensin valittu Moren ensimmäinen ja viimeinen Wolseylle kirjoittama kirje, muut kirjeet valittiin mahdollisimman tasaisin ajanjaksoin siltä väliltä. Kirjeiden analysoinnissa käytettiin lähilukua, tarkoittaen, että kirjeet luettiin tarkasti läpi, jotta mahdolliset kirjeen osat löytyvät. Vaikka tässä keskitytään kirjeen alku- ja loppuosiin, kirjeiden keskiosaa lukemalla voitiin varmistaa, ettei mitään jää huomaamatta. Samalla selvitettiin kirjeiden sisältöä, jotta kirjeiden mallia voidaan pohtia, onko sisällöllä merkitystä kirjeen malliin.

Kävikin ilmi, että Moren Wolseylle kirjoittamat kirjeet ovat kuninkaan määräämiä, toisin sanoen More usein kirjoitti Wolseylle kuninkaan ajatuksista ja kuninkaan toiveista Wolseylle. Roperille kirjoitetut kirjeet taas ovat kaikki kirjoitettu aikana, jolloin More oli vangittuna. Näin ollen kirjeet kirjoittamisen lähtökohdat ovat hyvinkin erilaisia: julkiset henkilökohtaiset (”public personal”) kirjeet Wolseylle ja yksityiset perhekirjeet (”personal family”) Roperille.

5 Tulokset ja niiden tarkastelu

Kirjeitä tutkiessa kävi ilmi, että Moren tapa kirjoittaa eroaa pitkälti kirjemallien yhteydessä ehdotetuista kirjoitusasuista. Tästä syystä lähiluku oli tärkeää, jotta pystyttiin määrittelemään mahdolliset kirjeen osat. Joissain tapauksissa kirjeen osat saattoivat olla myös limittäin, esimerkiksi vastaanottaja saattoi olla upotettuna ensimmäiseen virkkeeseen, joka toimi joko tiedonantona kirjeen aiheesta tai ilmoituksena kirjeen tai tiedon vastaanotosta. Jotkin elementit olivat haastavia kategorisoida, koska sisällön perusteella ne saattoivat esimerkiksi viitata terveyselementit, mutta paikka kirjeessä (eli kirjeen lopussa) viittaisi siihen, että kyseessä on hurskaat jäähyväiset tai rukous.

Liitteestä 2 (Appendix II) käy ilmi, mitkä osat esiintyivät missäkin kirjeessä. Liitteestä 2 käy myös ilmi se, miten epäjohdonmukaisesti More muotoilee kirjeensä. Eniten johdonmukaisuutta on Wolseyn kirjeissä, vaikkakin niistä puuttuu tärkeäksi osaksi sekä julkisia että yksityisiä kirjeitä koskeva suosittelu tervehdyksineen (”Commendation”), jota ilmennetään yleisesti ”I recommend me unto you” tai vastaavalla

lausekkeella (kts esim. Richardson 1984, 213 ”Salutation”). Päinvastoin Roperin kirjeistä suosittelu tervehdyksineen esiintyy useamman kerran. Syitä tähän eroon voi olla monia. Esimerkiksi, vaikka More oli Wolseyyn alainen, kirjoitti More kuninkaan käskystä. Tilanne on ongelmallinen, koska toisaalta More oli Wolseyyn alainen ja tällöin suosittelua käytetään, mutta toisaalta kirjeen takana on kuningas, jonka alainen Wolseyyn on (kts. esim. Sánchez Roura 2002, 259–260).

Wolseyyn kohdalla More käyttää johdonmukaisesti jokaisessa kirjeessä jäähyväislemenettä, kirjoittaa ajan sekä paikan ja allekirjoittaa kirjeen. Roperin kohdalla mikään osa ei esiinny kaikissa kirjeissä, mutta useimmiten niissäkin esiintyy vastaanottaja, jäähyväiset sekä allekirjoitus. Erona Wolseyyn ja Roperin kirjeiden kohdalla, suosittelun lisäksi, on otsikon käyttö: seitsemässä kirjeessä kahdeksasta Roperin kirjeestä esiintyy otsikko, kun taas Wolseyyn kohdalla vain yhdessä. Suhteellisen johdonmukaisesti More käyttää sekä Wolseyyn että Roperin kohdalla vastaanottajan nimeämistä sekä jäähyväisten kirjoittamista.

Valinnaiset elementit esiintyvät vähäiset materiaalissa, suurin osa niistäkin Wolseyyn kirjeissä. Suurin osa valinnaisista elementeistä on joko kiitollisuutta, palvelun pyytämistä tai jälkikirjoitusta. Roperin kirjeissä eniten esiintyy ilmoitus kirjeen tai tiedon vastaanottamisesta (kolmessa kirjeessä kahdeksasta).

Tulosten perusteella vaikuttaakin siltä, että 1500-luvun kirjeet eivät sovi täysin Bergholmin malliin. Yksikään kirje ei täydellisesti seuraa tätä mallia, ja vastaanottajien välilläkin on suuria eroja. Erot voi selittää joko hierarkialla tai sillä, että More kirjoittaessaan Roperille, ei ollut optimaalisessa tilassa. Tämän tutkielman tuloksia voisi vahvistaa, suuntaan tai toiseen, tutkimalla muita Moren kirjoittamia kirjeitä. Suuri osa hänen kirjoittamista kirjeistään on kirjoitettu latinaksi, mutta myös muita kirjeitä on kirjoitettu englanniksi, esimerkiksi muut Wolseylle kirjoitetut kirjeet. Kuitenkin tämän tutkimuksen perusteella voidaan todeta, että Moren kirjeet eivät johdonmukaisesti seuraa Bergholmin 1400-luvun lopun kirjeistä muovailemaa mallia.