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CHAPTER I

PROLEGOMENA

In order to isolate the salient features of Roger Ascham's style and then to bring them into a legitimate focus, I must first re-examine some modern critical tenets and the literary environment in which Ascham wrote. My analysis need not begin with what has been written about English humanism. The relationship between humanism and literary practice is in many ways the subject of this work and will become apparent, at least as it pertains to Roger Ascham, in the following chapters. The most understanding survey of the major characteristics of humanism is still Douglas Bush's *The Renaissance and English Humanism*; Bush bases many of his observations of the English humanists on the opinions expressed by Ascham in *The Scholemaster*. But other areas of sixteenth-century concern have not fared so well; questions as basic as the definition of artistic prose, the standards of prose style affecting sixteenth-century writers, and even the nature of style as a critical concept have been more often vehicles for personal controversy than objects of critical inquiry. In this chapter I will attempt to explore these questions in a very general way: I do not pretend to establish new definitions by ignoring the findings of such
noteworthy scholars as Morris Croll, Ernst Curtius, and George Williamson; rather, I have tried to reorient some of their assumptions, providing what I believe is a sounder critical platform for an examination of style. My approach, like theirs, is to study the writers themselves, although I am more fortunate in that I have the pioneers in stylistic criticism to use as a check on my own conclusions.

I. Prose as Literary Art

The court, the church, and the universities all provided arenas for the upsetting conflicts of sixteenth-century England. Literary production and the standards of evaluating literary works suffered and grew in each of them. Tudor writers, adopting the classical presumption that art is an expression of learning,¹ matched it to the medieval one that learning serves, in Philip Sidney's words, "to lead and draw vs to as high a perfection as our degenerate soules, made worse by theyr clayey lodgings, can be capable of."² English writers formed standards of excellence based on learning and virtue, although the practicality of their own self-interests often caused individual interpretations of "learning" and "virtue" to vary. So heavy an emphasis on the academic and didactic sides of letters seems both unfortunate and aberrant now, but it was perfectly natural in Ascham's day. Before about 1530, Latin was virtually the only literary language, and well into Elizabeth's reign it
was still the standard. Most writers, because of the academic traditions of the universities and their nearly exclusive possession of libraries, were first scholars, then authors and clerics.

Yet at the same time that they felt the influence of academic discipline, even though their art grew out of classical studies, Tudor writers enjoyed unprecedented freedom of expression, at least before publication, and unheard-of liberty to advise and criticize the secular institutions of government. Although sometimes fatal, the new freedom arose from royal tolerance and earnest desire for advice—so much so that poets felt little need to disguise social criticism; they spoke directly to those they wished to educate. Although John Stubbs lost his hand for slander at Elizabeth's command, Spenser not only praised the queen, but questioned with only token equivocation, in works addressed to her, her judgment in managing affairs of state. Modern critics point to the ineffectuality of moralists like Sir Thomas Elyot, taking on a king of Henry VIII's stature but forced to talk in generalizations because of the dangers in too particular criticism of the court. Yet the transparency of More's, Elyot's, or Ascham's criticism suggests the access that these humanist scholars actually had, especially if one considers that in spite of their criticisms each of them received financial reward as a result of his literary efforts to educate contemporary society at the fountain of
its culture. The educational function of literature came out of the academies and into public service in the sixteenth century as it never had before.

"The ending end of all earthly learning," said Sidney, is "vertuous action" (Smith, I, 161). And in Tudor England, as learning moved out of its cloister, so virtue was extended beyond the doctrines of the church. The confusions of theological doctrine during the period of Tudor rule pressed upon politically dependent writers a secular morality only vaguely connected to established religion. Although details concerning control of the church, propriety of vestments, presence of the Host, even the language of the scripture shifted with each monarch or advisory council, Christian morality remained the same and coincided comfortably with the moral philosophy of the ancient pagans, especially Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero. The general result was a non-theological morality which Tudor authors could derive either from the Bible's Sapiential Books or from Cicero, as occasion or convenience demanded.

Lacking institutional stability and a native tradition of critical theory, Renaissance author-educators turned quite naturally to the newly found Rhetorica of Aristotle and the more familiar works of Cicero and Quintilian for guidelines to their art. These works are designed for political oratory, but oratory had ceased to be politically effective with the end of the Roman Republic, and its precepts came
to be adapted to academic exercise as they lost practical value. The significance of this change has been described by Ernst Curtius, who shows that the rules for oratory came to govern both prose and poetry during the middle ages, became indeed "the common denominator of literature in general" (p. 70).

The interest of Renaissance critics in the classics revitalized their sense of the importance of rhetorical rules in the formation of artistic prose and reconfirmed their application of those rules as well to poetry, under the premise that art must both delight and instruct even in the details of imagery, sound, and structure. Thus we find Sidney echoing both Quintilian and Horace in his definition of poetry, in which he also includes prose: "... it is not riming and versing that maketh a Poet ... But it is that fayning notable images of vertues, vices, or what els, with that delightfull teaching, which must be the right describing note to know a Poet by ..." (Smith, I, 160). And Gascoigne, less concerned with the philosophy than the technique of poetry, just as easily borrows the devices of rhetorical prose: "You may use the same Figures and Tropes in verse which are used in prose, and in my judgement they serve more aptly and have greater grace in verse than they have in prose."8 The conclusion to be drawn here is that Renaissance standards of literary excellence, although uncertain because of political and religious instability,
were based on classical prose theories, and that these standards arose from both a moral and an educative aim. If we are to criticize Renaissance prose, we must understand the Renaissance criteria which Tudor writers were trying to meet.

Yet another modern critical assumption hinders our approach to Renaissance prose. That is our distinction between literary and functional prose, between artistic language and that designed to communicate. During the sixteenth century, at least until after the appearance of Sidney's *Apologie*, no such distinction can be seen in the comments of those who write about prose. Both Aristotle and Cicero see prose generically as a more natural vehicle of communication than poetry, and hence both suggest that artistic strictures for prose ought to be looser than those for verse, though not so near ordinary speech that the writer affects, as Sidney echoes, "speaking (table talke fashion or like men in a dreame) words as they chanceably fall from the mouth" (Smith, I, 160). The aim of all prose is, by classical and humanist standards, to persuade to virtuous action. The most persuasive must be the most successfully artistic, so that there is no conflict between communicative function and art. A modern stance like J. R. Sutherland's that "Good prose is that which conveys a writer's ideas to the mind of the reader most fully and precisely, and with the least impediment or interruption"
would perhaps have seemed naive to More, Cheke, or Ascham, who looked rather to the persuasive end of prose than merely to the use of prose as a window to a man's thought. Contemplation is insufficient without action.

Only a few oblique references to a concept of non-literary prose occur before Sidney. Erasmus in his Ciceronianus (1528) may have made the distinction, but he seems to be thinking in terms of degree rather than of kinds of prose when he writes of Thomas More that "in his boyhood scarcely a trace of the better literature had crossed to England. Then the authority of his parents compelled him to learn English Law, the farthest possible from literature." And nearer Ascham's time, John Jewel, still an Oxford scholar, refers in the ironic Oratio contra Rhetoricam (1548) to his earlier attention to "eloquence and the reading of philosophy": perhaps an intentional division of kinds, but obscure at best. During Elizabeth's reign, especially in the period of Puritan controversy and the unpopular religious settlement, references to "pamphlets" and "tracts" begin to appear, with implications that they ought not to be considered literature; but the first clear critical distinction between literary art and functional writing seems to me to occur in Sidney's Apologie, with his ingenious differentiation of the preceptive philosophers, the factual historiographers, and the artistic poets. In his attempt to defend the aesthetic quality of poetry by
attributing moral priesthood to poets, Sidney is the first English writer expressly to emphasize the separateness of utility and art as aims of prose:

The Philosopher therefore and the Historian are they which would win the goal, the one by precept, the other by example. But both not having both, doe both halte. For the Philosopher, setting downe with thorny argument the bare rule, is so hard of utterance, and so mistie to be conceieved, that one that hath no other guide but him shall wade in him till he be olde before he shall finde sufficient cause to bee honest ... On the other side, the Historian, wanting the precept, is so tyed, not to what should bee but to what is, to the particuler truth of things and not to the general reason of things, that hys example draweth no necessary consequence ... 15

The philosopher and the historian are bound by what in the seventeenth century will be considered scientific principles. Their aims are functional, to reveal truth either by precept or by example; insofar as they employ art, Sidney suggests, they depart from the purity of their discipline. Increasingly after Sidney a gulf widens between functional prose, which more or less follows Sutherland's standards and, as expressed by Ascham, cares "not for wordes, but for matter,"16 and artistic prose. The course of the change is beyond the scope of this study. It is followed admirably by Robert Adolf in his The Rise of Modern Prose Style (Cambridge, Mass., 1968). What is significant is that when Roger Ascham wrote, no difference existed. Artistic prose was functional prose, and the critical question was how-well literary prose succeeded in its aim of "delightful teaching."17
What delights the twentieth-century critic is not always the same as what delighted his sixteenth-century counterpart. Manifesting itself clearly first in the attitudes of the Romantic poets, modern aesthetics tends to work against the sense of grace in form sought by Renaissance artists. The post-Romantic aesthetic might also be termed pre-classical in respect to form; the earlier Romantics rebelled against neo-classicism, looking instead of form, at theme or attitude for sources of art. The best art by post-Romantic standards is usually that which exposes most movingly or uniquely the universality of mutability or human frailty; some artists assert even the irrelevance of form itself. 

But this has come about partly by reaction. During the early period of the sixteenth century the details of English grammar and vocabulary were still in dispute and few educators felt that their native tongue was yet capable of beauty like that found in classical art. Lacking both past native tradition and present native language, writers felt a real need for the development of standards, the provision of forms of eloquence by which they might shape both English temperament and English expression to challenge the greatest art of history. The combination of great national ambition and an apparent need for a stable platform from which to build society with art acted in relationship with the growing opportunities for secular but idealistic scholarship.
which were made possible by the classical revival. The result was somewhat paradoxical in education, where idealism like that of Erasmus or Budé was rejected by the men it freed. Tudor humanists turned rather to the development of formal guides, testing learning by its practical application. In art, form was a sine qua non. Compared with the newly available classical poets, contemporary English literary art is again and again described as "rude and barbarous." Both by analogy with the direction of politics and education, and by doctrine from the classical authors, beauty lacks perfection without form, and literature fails without practical application. The form came from Aphthonius, Cicero, and Quintilian; the application, from the Christian ethic, reinforced by classical and Biblical prudential morality.

Dependence in varying degrees upon classical authors may be found throughout the sixteenth century. More's_Utopia_in Latin and his_History of King Richard III_in English reflect the techniques and doctrine of Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, Sallust, Tacitus, Cicero, and other classical authorities.19 William Roper, writing More's_Life during Ascham's productive period, shows definite evidence of familiarity with rhetorical techniques such as those described in_De Oratore, less with methods of ancient historians. Ascham himself is an outspoken advocate of Ciceronian imitation and some of his Latin letters are models of Ciceronian eloquence—so unequivocally did he praise Cicero as a literary guide for
students that he was early assigned the label of a Ciceronian, and his prose has been inaccurately placed in that rhetorical camp ever since.

Using classical oratorical doctrine for English literary standards of excellence brought the Tudors as much difficulty as using Sophistic doctrine had brought Cicero. With Greek or Latin works the only acknowledged masterpieces, the obvious method to obtain similar eloquence was to imitate Greek and Latin authors; but, as Cicero found, "to employ the same expressions profited me nothing, while to employ others was a positive hindrance, in that I was forming the habit of using the less appropriate," and, as Erasmus complained, "Even if I could attain perfection in portraying the figure of Ciceronian phrase, I should prefer a style of speaking more genuine. . . . I should not spurn elegance when it comes of its own free will." Cicero in Latin and Aristotle or Demosthenes in Greek were by general consensus the best writers in their languages, both in style and in wisdom. Yet even Ascham deprecates the "lowse grosnesse" in some of Cicero's work (p. 262), and many others complained as Erasmus did about the doctrine of imitatio followed in Tudor academic circles.

Form tends to be self-perpetuating. Dependence upon effective form breeds success, and success discourages innovation. Beginning with the publication of Erasmus' Ciceronianus an academic controversy arose in England which has been studied carefully by modern critics looking for
the impetus of the modern plain style, supposedly a rejection of Ciceronian eloquence in favor of a style "more genuine, more concise, more forceful, less ornate, and more masculine." The anti-Ciceronian controversy in England has, I believe, been somewhat exaggerated by Morris Croll and George Williamson in their attempts to define a single source for a complete cultural change. Many anti-Ciceronians can be found among sixteenth-century English scholars, but few writers whose practice meets Croll's definition of Ciceronianism: "non seulement l'admiration et l'imitation de Ciceron mais l'imitation exclusive de cet auteur." Even supposing Croll's definition too severe, one has difficulty confronting anyone in England who admits to being so slavish a Ciceronian; rather the enemy of the anti-Ciceronians seems to have been a tendency toward pedagogical stultification, as one might argue now against prescriptive grammar or repeated use of old lecture notes—no one tries consciously to promote these excesses, but they remain an enemy and a threat to those who fear extremes of rigidity. Most "Ciceronians," in fact, fail to qualify upon close examination. Ascham, for example, is considered a Ciceronian by both Croll and Williamson, yet his rhetorical style resembles more nearly Williamson's own definition of "pointed style" than it does Ciceronian periodicity, and although Ascham advocated imitation of Cicero, he also set up Plato, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Caesar, Terence, and many
other ancients as models, as well as his contemporary friend
and colleague Johann Sturm. Although Ascham was assigned a
place in the Ciceronian controversy by later critics, his
own opinion was that the whole argument was a matter for
"proude and enuious wittest" (p. 266). But he and nearly all
serious students of prose were convinced that some kind of
imitation is the key to greatness; perhaps the emotional
character of their desire for models is best expressed in a
letter from Cardinal Bembo to Gianfrancesco Pico:

How can you think that an idea of style is innately in
your mind? As for me, I can only declare that I saw
no form of style nor image of speaking in my mind till
I had brought it about by thoughtfully reading the
books of the ancients for many years and by long
practice. Before I did this, I used to look into my
mind and seek as from a mirror some shape from which
I could fashion what I wished. But there was no image
there. And when I tried to write, I was borne along
at random by no law and no judgment. None of those
things which you mention, no idea, no image guided me.25

Even more technical problems confronted Tudor writers
in their effort to base stylistic standards on the prin­
ciples of Greek and Latin oratory. One was the matter of
translating classical linguistic peculiarities into English
equivalents. Another was the transformation of oral method
into written technique. Renaissance writers enjoyed varying
success with these difficulties, and a brief examination of
their attempts will help us to interpret more accurately
the peculiarities of Tudor style.
II. The Translation of Latin into English Style

As more attention is paid to the rhetorical doctrine followed by Renaissance artists, more awareness of the problems they faced in following Cicero's or Quintilian's precepts has bewildered critics who see not only grammatical dissimilarities between Latin and English but also basic differences in the philosophy of language. Some immediate difficulties are obvious even to the average American student with his two years of high-school Latin. To begin with, Latin nouns are declinable, while English nouns are not; Latin writers of the Republic were never disturbed by the postponement of the verb to the end of a sentence, while such practice exasperates a modern reader; sentence elements only vaguely related to the main clause in Latin may be tucked into absolute constructions, reflecting their vagueness or detachment, whereas in English everything must be logically and grammatically connected; Latin writers distinguished between long and short vowels in a way that ordinary writers of English have never been able successfully to imitate. These and other disparities seem to the reflecting critic to pose problems that must deeply affect any study of a period during which, as in Ascham's time, most educated men wrote more easily in Latin than in English. Brian Vickers, in his recent study of Bacon's prose, argues with Croll's use of the word "ligature" in reference to English periodic syntax, and even
to his use of the word "period" to refer to English versions of rounded eloquence. English syntax, he contends, does not contain ligatures like those in Latin and cannot hope to reproduce such complexities as the figure homoioptoton (rhymed case endings), "nor of course the truly Ciceronian 'periodic' effect, by which the verb (and hence the meaning) is postponed to the very end of the sentence . . . ."26

These difficulties could indeed complicate attempts to imitate the ancients, but in fact they did not particularly bother Renaissance writers, with the exception of the vowel lengths involved in Latin meter, which I will consider separately below. It is true that English diction lacks the variety found in Latin's five or six noun case endings, but there is variety, and English writers could choose endings to rhyme just as their Roman predecessors had. The following fragment of a sentence of Thomas More's shows perfectly an English version of the figure homoioptoton, which Vickers supposes cannot be reproduced:

Neither to thatchioyuyn of temperanee in prosperitie/, nor to the purchasing of pacience in aduersitie/, nor to the dispising of worldly vanitie/, nor to the desiring of heauenly felicitie.27

English writers were of course free to take the elements of rhetoric which applied and either to adapt or to ignore the others depending on their individual abilities or preferences. Thomas Wilson in his Arte of Rhetoricke (1560) shows
no difficulty developing English equivalents for virtually all of Cicero's schemata. Rather than omit figures, he and other English rhetoricians included them all, but tended to judge the relative beauty of the figures as used in English. For example, Wilson complains of the overuse of homoiopctoton, which he calls "like endings": "I know some in this our time, do overmuch use them in their writings." And Gabriel Harvey felt that this and like devices, "similar cadences, terminations, and inflexions," were "sumwhat overmuch affectid of M. Aschā jn our vulgar Tongue." If there is a problem here, it is aesthetic, not practical. Most Renaissance complaints, like these two, refer to the effectiveness of Anglicized rhetoric rather than to the potential subtleties involved in deriving linguistic equivalence.

Syntactical differences were similarly countered, although more slowly, during the Tudor period. Early translators often rendered ablative absolutes literally, leaving anacolutha for readers to accept or puzzle over. Later writers substituted participial clauses or parentheses for detached Latin units with little difficulty. Verb placement, however, is more problematical. Even Latin writers after Cicero tended to put the verb near the subject rather than uniformly at the end of the period. Non-Ciceronian Renaissance Latin such as that of Erasmus or More reads almost like English syntactically except at its formal
heights. But even the Ciceronian imitators manage to effect suspension in English by using other predicate elements or by inverting the main elements so that the subject rather than the verb comes at the end of the sentence. Cicero placed the verb at the end because its strength rounded off the sentence dramatically; the subject and object share the verb's grammatical importance, however, and are equally suited for postponement in English, while predicate clauses are easily (and abundantly) used by Renaissance writers to place emphatic force at the end of the period. The following sentence, from Ascham's *Toxophilus*, though somewhat clumsily constructed, illustrates the method by which an English writer could create a rounded period. I have broken up the structural units so that the rise and fall of the period, moving from left to right and then back to the left, will be obvious.

And the labour of all which of the other | is best, both bycause it increaseseth strength, and | preserueth health moost, | beinge not vehement, but moderate, not ouerlaying any one partie but softly exercisinuge every parte as the armes and breastes the other partes | beinge not so paynfull for the labour | as pleasaunt for the pastyme, | which exercise by the judgement of the best physicians, | is most alowable.  

(p. 9)
s. But even the Ciceronian imitators manage to suspend in English by using other predicate terms or by inverting the main elements so that the subject rather than the verb comes at the end of the sentence. Cicero placed the verb at the end because its th rounded off the sentence dramatically; the subject and object share the verb's grammatical importance, and are equally suited for postponement in English, predicate clauses are easily (and abundantly) used by Renaissance writers to place emphatic force at the end of a sentence. The following sentence, from Ascham's "Ilus", though somewhat clumsily constructed, illustrates the method by which an English writer could create an emphatic period. I have broken up the structural units of the rise and fall of the period, moving from left to right and then back to the left, will be obvious.

labour which, is best, both because it increases strength, and preserveth health most, being not vehement, but moderate, not overlaying any one part with werysonnesse, but softly exercisyng euyry parte with equalnesse, as the armes and breastes with drawinge, the other partes with going, being not so paynfull for the labour as pleaseant for the pastyme, which exercise by the judgement of the best physicians, is most allowable.

(p. 9)
In this period elevation is created by more and more intense parallelism, and the suspension is effected in two ways: first, Ascham gradually returns in his modifying clauses more directly to the subject until finally he repeats the "which" of the very first clause and echoes both its "is" verb and the main clause's superlative "best" with "most allowable"; further, he suspends the period dramatically, if not always grammatically, by means of correlative conjunctions, present participles used appositively, and once by "as" used only as a connective particle ("as the arms . . ."). The total effect is certainly periodico, whether or not it is Ciceronian.

Such rhetorical practice as this is neither a commonplace nor a rarity in Ascham's prose. That Harvey or Wilson should disapprove of its overuse in English, but not in Latin, points out one interesting aesthetic difference between the two languages. Latin, because of its academic and artistic tradition, could tolerate much more embellishment than could English, which was felt too closely connected with commercial and domestic affairs and with natural thought processes to encompass the divergent properties of sincerity and efflorescence. In a 1545 letter to his student William Grindal concerning his work on Toxophilus, Ascham shows his sensitivity to this difference in the languages: "I am wholly in my Toxophilus: I have shelved Herodotus for the time being. If I had written Toxophilus
in Latin, I think I could have embellished my work tolerably; I would have had more regard for my reputation; but there are few who would read the book comfortably if it were in Latin."32 A cursory glance at the Latin poetry of the age will confirm this point for any modern reader; I will provide as example parallel passages from Marvell's Latin and English versions of "The Garden" (Hortus):

The Garden

Fair quiet, have I found thee here,  
And Innocence thy Sister dear!  
Mistaken long, I sought you then  
In busie Companies of Men.  
Your sacred Plants, if here below,  
Only among the Plants will grow.  
Society is all but rude,  
To this delicious Solitude.33

Hortus

Alma Quies, teneo te! & te Germana Quietis  
Simplicitas! Vos ergo diu per Templæ, per urbes,  
Quaesivi, Regum perque alta Palatia frustra.  
Sed vos Hortorum per opaca silentia longe  
Celarant Plantæ virides, & concolor Umbra.  
O! mihi si vestros liceat violasse recessus  
Erranti, lasso, & vitae melioris anhelo,  
Municipem servate novum, votoque politum,  
Frondosae Cives optate in florea Regna.  
Me quoque, vos Musae, &, te conscie testor  
Apollo, . . .34

This difference in the level at which language functions was for Tudor authors a matter of decorum. Their effort, as explained by virtually every writer of English through Sidney, was to raise the reputed level of English so that one might write as seriously and gracefully in his native tongue as he could in Latin, without fear for his own
reputation. At the time Sidney wrote his *Apologie* there was still some doubt about the status of English, but he speaks with confidence of the "excellent exercising of it."

I know some will say it is a mingled language. And why not so much the better, taking the best of both the other? Another will say it wanteth Grammer. Nay truly, it hath that praye, that it wanteth not Grammer: for Grammer it might haue, but it needes it not; beeing so easie of it selfe, and so voyd of those cumbersome differences of Cases, Genders, Moodes, and Tenses, which I thinke was a piece of the Tower of Babilons curse, that a man should be put to schoole to learne his mother-tongue. But for the yttering sweetly and properly the conceits of the minde, which is the end of speech, that hath it equally with any other tongue in the world: and is particulary happy in compositions of two or three words together, neere the Greeke, far beyond the Latine: which is one of the greatest beauties can be in a language. (Smith, I, 204)

His admirer Richard Carew exudes even more confidence in his *Epistle on the Excellency of the English Tongue* (1595?). After a long, often specious proof of his title's assertion, Carew concludes:

Againe, the longe wordes that wee borrowe, being inter-mingled with the shorte of our owne store, make up a perfitt harmonye, by culling from out which mixture (with Judgment) yow maye frame your speech according to the matter you must worke on, maifesticall, pleasaunte, delicate, or manly, more or lesse, in what sorte you please. Adde hereunto, that what soeuer grace any other Language carryeth, in Verse or Prose, in Tropes or Metaphors, in Ecchoes or Agnominations, they maye all be liuely and exactly represented in ours. (Smith, II, 293)

The only insurmountable difficulty met in the attempt to transfer classical art into English idiom occurred in the matter of rhythm. Even Carew is less confident here, saying only that, "... you shall finde that St. Phillip
Sidney, Mr. Stanihurst, and divers moe, have made use how far we are within compass of a fore imagined impossibility in that behalf" (Smith, II, 292). The impossibility, of course, was the successful implementation of quantitative meter into an accentual language. Most poets and critics of the period at least tried to develop a predictable system of metrics for English phonology, but most also gave up. Gascoigne is the only early theorist who accepts, however grudgingly, the natural iambic rhythm of English. The sixteenth-century controversy over quantitative meter has received a great deal of critical attention, and because it mainly concerns verse rather than prose rhythm, I will not go into it in detail.

A few attempts were made, notably, as Carew suggests, by Stanyhurst and Sidney, to apply quantity to prose rhythm, but such efforts were neither sustained nor effective. Stanyhurst, for example, developed a new orthography which he used in writing prose to indicate length rather than accent of syllables, but the effect was, as in poetry, straining on the reader and ultimately unsuccessful:

In the observation of quantities of syllables, soon happily wyl bee so stieflie tyed too thee ordinaunces of thee Latins, as what shal seeme too swarue from theyre maximes they wyl not stick too skore vp for errours. In which resolution such curious Priscianistes dooe attribute greater prerogatiue too thee Latin tongue than reason wyl affurd, and leasse libertye too oure language than nature may permit.

(Smith, I, 141-42)
Such extreme efforts at transmitting classical quantities to English prose were exceptions; the rule followed Cicero’s prescription for prose rhythm in De Oratore:

The orator links words and meaning together in such a manner as to unfold his thought in a rhythm that is at once bound and free. For after enclosing it in the bonds of form and balance, he loosens and releases it by altering the order, so that the words are neither tied together by a definite metrical law nor left so free as to wander uncontrolled. 35

English prose artists had little difficulty adapting such precepts to English. Their own experience with post-classical Latin was close enough to the English vernacular that few frustrations curbed their attention to the imitation of Latin prose. Morris Croll’s observation on the rhythm and movement of English oratorical prose is perhaps an appropriate conclusion to this examination:

Medieval Latin already shows exactly the English principle of decreasing length of period and strength of accents. That is, with no other change than from quantitative to accentual meter the difference between the Latin and the English principle is explained.

English, however, . . . adopts the principle alone as the essential feature of its cadence. That is, it abandons all metrical prescription, and aims only at achieving the kind of movement characteristic of classical and medieval cadence. 36

III. Rhetorical Style; Personal Style

In the preface to the eighth book of his Institutio, Quintilian offers a definition of good prose style for his students of later ages: “those words are the most satisfactory which give the best expression to the thoughts of
our mind and produce the effect which we desire upon the minds of our judges."\(^{37}\)

This definition consists of two elements which are compatible but not necessarily dependent upon each other; first, style is the expression of the thoughts of our minds. This half of the definition was approached by Seneca when he wrote "Oratio cultus animi est"—"Speech is the apparel of the soul."\(^{38}\) But in fact, if this element is taken alone it seems to contradict the other half of Quintilian's definition: style produces "the effect which we desire upon the minds of our judges." In this sense style is concocted and artificial. This definition suggests shaping the natural image of the mind until whatever is produced has a particular effect on the reader. This, of course, might be a satisfactory definition of art; but it produces a conflict in our understanding of style between the accurate expression of personality on the one hand, and a false—however attractive—manipulation on the other. Yet both descriptions equally represent the general sense of "style," leaving a writer free to choose a model for his style or to express honestly his mind, or to do sometimes one and sometimes the other. These alternatives were recognized in the sixteenth century and formed part of the Ciceronian controversy. Erasmus revealed his awareness of the division in *Ciceronianus*: "If you wish to express Cicero exactly, you cannot express yourself. If you do not express yourself,
your speech will be a false mirror and will be as absurd as if, by smearing your face with colors, you pretend to be Petronius instead of [yourself]."\(^{39}\)

Among modern students of artistic language, a polarity seems to be developing with reference to style. One extreme consists of the analysts of rhetoric. To them style is a branch of rhetoric, usually consisting of the figures of eloquence listed by Aristotle, Cicero, or the Tudor rhetoricians. Sister Miriam Joseph, in her study of Shakespeare's rhetoric, accepts Aristotle's opinion that style "cannot help having a small but real importance, whatever it is we have to expound to others,"\(^{40}\) and includes "elocution or style" as one of several topics under the heading of "general theory of composition." Similarly, E. P. J. Corbett, in his recent Rhetorical Analyses of Literary Works (New York, 1969), divides the essays of his volume so as to "reflect some of the traditional concerns of the rhetoricians: Argument, Arrangement, Audience, and Style" (vii), a formula he has also followed in his Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student (New York, 1965).

At the other extreme are the "stylisticians," including critics such as Louis T. Milic, who, in his "Unconscious Ordering In The Prose of Swift," pays no attention at all to what effects Swift tried to produce, but rather studies habitual use of language on the assumption that style consists of idiosyncratic selection of language features more
or less forced on a writer by his personality. Although their methods of stylistic analysis vary considerably, both Michael Riffaterre and Joan Webber agree on the need for a writer to individualize the formality of rhetoric before his use of language becomes valuable. According to Riffaterre: "As soon as elements from a literary language are used by an author for a definite effect, they become units of his style; and it is this particular realization of their value which is relevant, not their potential value in a standard system." Miss Webber, in the preface to her study of the prose of John Donne, expresses well the sensitivity sought by the stylistician at the non-rhetorical pole: "Without linguistic traditions that represent some shared certainties about man and the world, the writer is powerless. Without the ability to vary or transmute these traditions, he is also powerless, for then, become lifeless, they will rule him inhumanely."

There have been, of course, important compromises between style and rhetoric, including the early studies by Croll and Williamson, and the very recent study by Brian Vickers of the artistic significance of Shakespeare's use of some of the rhetorical figures. The combined approach, however, stirs up some complicated problems of categorization and logical consistency, part of which at least are indicated by the difficulty raised several times in this chapter of accurately using the most basic standard terms of
reference to style: Ciceronian and Senecan, or Asian and Attic. At the end of the first chapter of The Senean Amble, George Williamson asks a question which he never answers and which I believe is irrelevant to the study of style: "For the accurate definition of a prose style it is necessary to determine not only what figures are used but how they are used. Ascham the Ciceronian, Isocratean, and Euphuist in turn—and all by virtue of his figures of language or schemata verborum—is a case in point. How would the Ciceronianus have classified him? At least we may assume that Echo would not have answered 'Attic.'"45 Vickers takes issue with one aspect of Williamson's question, the assumption which pushes him too far into the rhetorical camp: "that is the attempt to define particular schools of style not on the basis of an analysis of the authors concerned . . . but on the rhetorical figures which are supposed to characterise them."46 Ascham's style certainly includes rhetorical figures, but the uniqueness of his style just as surely includes a much more individual use of language than rhetorical analysis alone can demonstrate.

I would take further issue with Williamson and Croll in their use of words like "Ciceronian" or "Attic" to describe anything but affected imitation of a particular classical writer's usage. Even Cicero in his Brutus demonstrates the confusion of the term "Attic"—which Attic orator ought it represent? Why not others? What is used
The same problem applies to individual attribution, such as "Ciceronian." We can define it, as Croll and others do, as florid, expansive, periodic, and so forth; but in so doing we ignore much which was most admired and imitated in Cicero's style, a style which Ascham and Cicero himself believed to cover all ranges from most plain to most eloquent. The same is true of "Senecan": Croll distinguishes two Senecan styles, the "pointed" and the "loose"; Janet Espiner-Scott considers only "stile pointu." Williamson has difficulty, finally accepting "pointed brevity or schematic antithesis" as Senecan; but he adds a new label—"Stoic"—to cover "plain brevity or plain antithesis," and then acknowledges the infeasibility of his definition: "This is to separate for analysis what was not distinguished in fact, for Seneca was a Stoic ... and in general to write with brevity was to write with point."50

Besides this sort of clumsiness inherent in using names or schools to identify individual style, previous criticism has also suffered from a confusion of association in such attributions. "Ciceronian" may be interpreted in three separate respects: first, an admirer and imitator of Cicero's prose technique; second, an adherent of Cicero's rhetorical doctrine; and third, a writer, regardless of his schooling, who writes in a balanced, elevated, periodic style, often suspending his meaning to the end of
his sentence and always conscious as much of his words as of his matter. Any one of these three is perhaps a legitimate use of the word "Ciceronian," but to use all three is at least confusing, and to use them without distinction is ultimately to waste the reader's time by leaving him to guess at the relevance of ambiguities. The same is true of any general label when applied to an individual instance, of course. Vickers carefully explains in his study of Bacon's style that he will use both conscious and unconscious elements of language and that he will complement Bacon's practice with his theory of style where available; but then he fails to maintain his distinction, giving as much weight to Bacon's statements regarding imitation as he does to Bacon's unconscious habits. By indiscriminately using stylistic theory (actually rhetorical theory) and practical idiosyncrasy, Vickers ought to come up with a dilemma occasionally, for example comparing Bacon's denouncement of imitations of Seneca's pointed style with his own practice in the first essays; but in fact he does not recognize any, because in drawing conclusions he confuses theory with practice.

While it is true that a writer's stated theory of artistic language or rhetorical imitation may be very helpful as an aid to perspective, it must be seen as a thing apart from his practice if the student of his style wants accuracy. Behind this conclusion lies my own assump-
tion about style, which I find falls near the "stylistician's pole." Style, as I understand the word in my own attempt at criticism, is the literary image of a writer's personality. For the sake of analysis it must be seen as an inference of the reader rather than as an expression of the writer. The difference in most cases is merely one of viewpoint, but occasionally the difference is greater. Milic talks of the "choices made by the writer from the 'non-distinctive' lexical and syntactic features of the language"; but if we limit our perception of style to the writer's choice, we limit too far. The purpose of analysis is to develop as complete as possible an understanding of the writer's artistic genius, his "shaping cause," in R. S. Crane's words, his "soul," in Leo Spitzer's. To do this, we cannot stop with his choices, but must include all that we see which helps to identify him, to explain what it is that makes him transmute the traditions of his language in the way he does. By studying personal style as we infer it, rather than affected or rhetorical style as the writer perpetrates it, I believe we arrive as close as possible to the real source of individual artistry.

But in order to analyze style inferentially, I must forsake the terminology and the methods of most of the stylisticians, developing method from what I see in the prose of my subject and terminology from a wider variety
of sources than the doctrines of rhetoric or imitation. Virtually every modern critic of prose style has faced the difficulty of selecting terminology and categories for his criticism which are specific enough to avoid impressionism, yet inherently meaningful enough to escape the confusions of neologism. Most have followed Spitzer in his use of linguistic terminology, or Croll and Williamson. Neither choice seems quite satisfactory to me in that each forces the language of another discipline to serve the needs of stylistics, often with results such as those I have just described in relation to the one word, "Ciceronian." Most critics agree that we need a new terminology for style, but at this point in the evolution of stylistics, invented schemes are almost certain to be obsolescent. My own approach has been to look to the characteristics which present themselves. Where the significance of the style has been the revelation of the writer's ontology, I have used the terms commonly employed in discussions of existential conceptions; where his sense of history is important, or his grammar gives clues to his personality, or his imagery, or obvious psychological traits, or where other aspects of the writer's intellect are to be inferred from the style, I have employed the appropriate vocabulary for each suggested approach. My hope is that by altering my vocabulary to fit the elements of language under scrutiny, the study will, as I believe it should, subordinate itself
to the subject, making the author's personality available to the reader with much more ease and just as much accuracy as previous attempts have managed to achieve. I have also avoided obvious categorical terms even if they evade the vagaries of "Ciceronianism," because my purpose has been to discover Ascham's uniqueness; his similarities with, say, humanist reformers, are obvious and interesting, but properly the subject of a broader study than this. The contexts of my inferences must also depend upon the environment of the writer, historical and literary, an environment which I have attempted to clarify in this chapter. This study, therefore, presents no new terminology, but adapts various schemes of language to the elements of the writer's style as they are most appropriate to my explication.

In the chapters that follow I have avoided or else carefully defined the more ambiguous terms often used in stylistic analysis, in order to avoid the confusion which their use in too many diverse situations has created. This break with even a young tradition should not be seen as a break with its founders; what I know about artistic language I have learned from Morris Croll. I hope rather to stand on his shoulders than in his shadow.
CHAPTER II

TOXOPHILUS

The Medicine of Contraries

Roger Ascham's first English work emerged from several conflicting influences upon his life as a scholar at St. John's College, Cambridge. Most fundamental, perhaps, was the split in the college faculty between conservative Yorkshiremen and more liberal southerners. St. John's had been established in 1516 by a Yorkshireman with the stipulation that half of the fellows and scholars were to be Northerners, and especially during the troubled years of the reign of Henry VIII this provision had the effect of polarizing political and religious factions, causing, beneath the public level of brilliant scholarship, such ill will and intrigue within the society of fellows that it seemed to some to jeopardize the very purpose of the college. In a general sense, the Northern scholars tended to be papist and reluctant to accept the innovations which were rapidly changing collegiate life. They taught from commentaries rather than original sources, extolled the Fathers of the Church, and when they published, wrote Latin commentaries on theological subjects. The "southern"
or "liberal" faction at St. John's could hardly have been more unlike the Northerners. Actually a scattering of temperaments, they tended to be Protestants of varying radicality, zealous purists in Greek and Latin scholarship, and iconoclasts with regard to the traditions of scholasticism. Most of them left behind them at least one practical treatise in English designed to improve some aspect of contemporary society.

Ascham, during his early years at Cambridge, did not quite fit into either faction. A Yorkshireman himself, he had natural ties with the Northern scholars, and his early activities suggest that he at least tried to adhere to their standards of scholarship. At the same time he eagerly embraced both Protestantism and John Cheke's guidance in the New Learning. This Northerner's admiration of the classics and his zealous moral tenacity fitted him very well for the southern group.

The outcome of Ascham's affinity to both groups was mixed. His conservative friends encouraged in him a devoted concern for moderation and an interest in pure scholarship; they also served their Protestant friend well during Mary Tudor's attempt to return the state to the Church of Rome. On the other hand, his liberal attractions were the impetus for the kind of literary prose he chose to write in English and the practical occasion for his opportunity and desire to write. However, before he felt
the advantages of his exposure to the tensions at St. John's, Ascham tasted some of its bitterness. In 1534 he nearly lost his fellowship by speaking too boldly against the Pope; his protestations concurred with sermons delivered by the university's vice-chancellor and commissioned by the king, but they offended Nicholas Metcalfe, master of St. John's, and others of the northern, Papist group in the society. In 1541, shortly before writing *Toxophilus*, Ascham ran into more trouble trying to produce a traditional work of the conservative humanist sort. Seeking patronage from the Archbishop of York, Edward Lee, he dedicated to the conservative bishop a translation into Latin of Oecumenius' commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to Titus. Lee was offended by something in the translation or in the commentary, apparently Oecumenius' acceptance of the later heretical concept of a married clergy. He chose to blame Ascham for the error, and although he was gracious enough to continue his support of the young Yorkshire scholar, he did not encourage any further involvement on Ascham's part with scholastic theology. In a letter to his friend John Redman about the affair, Ascham assumed a somewhat self-righteous stance (I, 44), but he was obviously stung by the bishop's disapproval; as late as 1544, while engaged with *Toxophilus*, he was still apologizing to the conservative Lee with the defensive concern for his reputation that is always discernible in his written work:
That I am not opinionated or inclined to novelties, the very method of my studies, engaged only in the lecturing on Aristotle, Plato, and Cicero according to a daily routine clearly demonstrates. My mind has always been so much disinclined from all books, whether in English or Latin, which introduce new doctrine, that except for the Psalms of David and the New Testament in Greek I have never employed any book about the Christian religion 'either great or small,' as Plato says. (Hatch, p. 68)

Such rebuffs were enough to commit Ascham to a middle course in his career. A practical scholar of his liberal inclination must avoid being pushed into either extreme if he were to achieve position and serve learning. Rather than denounce either group at St. John's, Ascham deplored the division itself. In a flyleaf dedication of his Oecumenius to his close friend John Seton in January, 1542, he discloses the extent of his concern, complaining that the men at St. John's, "who, divided in mind and will are eager to brawl and contend, not only shatter and violate the universal laws of God but also rend asunder and destroy the whole and excellent architecture of things as much as they can" (Hatch, p. 40). The separation into unreal and irrelevant extremes of the elements of scholarship left Ascham in the middle, seeking a more fundamentally worthwhile outlet for his learning.

By 1544 several of his friends had left the disrupted college, including Cheke, now tutor of Edward VI, and John Redman, who arranged for Ascham an ideal tutoring position with the children of Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy;
but Ascham refused both this offer and a similar one by Margaret Roper, the daughter of Sir Thomas More, claiming that despite the temptation he was too much accustomed to the quiet and freedom of the university to attempt the instabilities of court life and the burdens of pedagogy (Ryan, pp. 39-40). Very sensitive about his reputation, Ascham acknowledged in a letter to Redman that one reason for his refusal of Mountjoy’s offer was his fear that if he should try the job temporarily and quit, his colleagues would think him a deserter, ambitious, irresponsible, and worse. Furthermore, he feared, he would likely fall at court anyway (I, 36-42). His biographer, Ryan, finds in the same letter a fear that "some of his colleagues are beginning to find him wanting in serious purpose. 'I have betaken myself for some years to learning' he remarks, 'if not with very great profit, yet with no small pleasure.' Apparently doubtful that he had lived up to the promise of his youth," Ryan claims, "he dared not risk failure now in a new and uncertain enterprise" (Ryan, p. 40).

Ascham in his twenties was indeed very much concerned about his position and obviously wavering in doubt about whether to leave the factious but secure academic life for the greater promises, and greater dangers, of court. Toxophilus reflects his dilemma. His self-interest was complemented by the same national pride that affected so many of his contemporaries; yet his early acceptance of the
Protestant ideals of Cheke's New Learning and his realization amidst the contention at Cambridge that scholarship must have a practical end seem to have given him a flexibility of moral view usually inconsistent with nationalism—a flexibility which permitted and perhaps even caused the uniqueness of his treatise; for Toxophilus serves at the same time Ascham's self-interest and his genuine desire to honor both his king and his country. Toxophilus is not only the "art of the longbow"; it is Ascham's repudiation of narrow critics at St. John's who felt that a good scholar cannot also spend time at the marks. By demonstrating the benefits and practicality of shooting as a pastime, Ascham was justifying his own practice as well as promoting archery as a useful national sport for England. And by writing Toxophilus as an exposition of an art he was also proving himself an erudite scholar, as Walter Haddon appropriately observed in the commendatory verses published with the book:

Aschamus est author, magnū quē fecit Apollo
Arte sua, magnum Pallas & arte sua.
Docta man9 dedit hūc, dedit hūc mēs docta libellū.3

Out of all these conflicting influences and more came the style of the author of Toxophilus. In this book, in its structure, in the nature of its prose, these conflicts or their causes within his creative personality may be discerned. The characteristics of Ascham's style conflict with each other in Toxophilus, demonstrating the diffi-
culties he faced in establishing the direction of his life. Modesty exists, interrupted by self-conscious assertiveness; a bold willingness to face problems is moderated by Ascham's search to find a compromise for every extreme; confidence and practicality coincide with deliberation and a constant desire to avoid conflict; and in a larger, historical sense, Ascham's effort declares that classical scholarship must subserve a modern, thoroughly English, and useful end, specifically a manual on archery.

The form which Ascham has chosen for Toxophilus demonstrates clearly his constant desire to face problematical issues squarely. As a confrontative technique dialogue had traditionally permitted one point of view to triumph over another; for Ascham it provided a means of open examination leading not to the victory of one extreme but to a moderation of extremes and the dissolution of apparent opposition. Dialogue was not the only, but it was one of the more common forms for both classical and Renaissance books of instruction. Most often used for abstract subjects in ancient times, dialogue provided for Plato and other philosophers an informal and concrete setting with opportunities for metaphorical and analogical explanation of otherwise difficult (and sometimes extralogical) theories. Following Plato's example, most illustrative dialogue was one-sided and not very dramatic; for of the two characters one, like Socrates, was wise and patient in demonstration
while the other, like Gorgias, was self-satisfied, too positive, and due for a fall. The process of the conversation was most often that of dialectic argument, the wise teacher bringing the brash unbeliever step by logical (or analogical) step toward a better truth. In Rome, Cicero, possibly following Aristotle's example, altered the Platonic dialogue, making it less catechistic by dividing sections of his subject among the participants of the dialogue, permitting all to contribute some knowledge to the whole work. In the sixteenth century Erasmus provided the model for instructional dialogue in his *Colloquies* and *Ciceronianus* among many other works. Erasmus was more fair than Plato to the "wrong" side, permitting an eloquent opponent to bring out the best elements of the position finally denounced; yet while the conflicting arguments provide more dramatic interest than either Plato's or Cicero's methods, Erasmus' antagonists are ultimately from different worlds, coming together for the sake of argument and then parting forever, neither fully convinced by the other's reason unless by authorial contrivance to permit a harmonious conclusion.

Ascham's dialogue, even though he was familiar with all three of these types, is original. Most nearly following the method of Cicero's *De Oratore*, Ascham illustrates his theories through the conversation of two friends. The setting is an English copy of the opening of Plato's
Phaedrus, but the form permits Ascham to begin with an exposition of two apparently conflicting views, that of the lover of archery (Toxophilus) and that of the lover of scholarship (Philologus). Once Toxophilus has proven that no conflict need exist, Ascham, because his characters are friends, need not end the conversation as Plato or Erasmus might have done. In fact his avoidance of one-sided victory is his first departure from the usual convention. The only thing Toxophilus convinces Philologus of is that there was no argument to begin with. Once the conflict has ended, since the two are friends, Ascham can illustrate his principles through the speech of either character, providing a balance of exchange which sustains both interest and realism. In the second of the two books, where Ascham shifts from principles to techniques, the dialogue shifts as well from conversation to dialectic or catechism, often resembling in this section the more technical works of Plato. Dialogue as Ascham has used it provides an excellent vehicle to demonstrate initial conflict, to resolve the conflict by confrontation of the issues, and then to move step by step through the art of shooting. Toxophilus always maintains control of the conversation, but Ascham's adjustments of the proportions and purpose of the dialogue from debate through agreement to tutorial instruction create an artistic complexity not realized in the form of his predecessors.

Ascham's choice of dialogue for his work helps to
illustrate his consistent attempt to confront conflicting views and to resolve them toward a cooperative mean; the internal structure of the work, the order of its presentation, shows even more clearly how he naturally reaches toward opposing traditions in an effort to join them. Medieval books of sport, as Ryan points out, were conventionally divided into three sections describing the origin of the pastime, proving its commodity or usefulness, and explaining its equipment and techniques (p. 71). Ascham has maintained this organization, adding to it classical rhetorical topics for persuasive oratory, such as origin, necessity, profit (i.e., commodity), and practicability. But while he has depended on both classical and medieval aids for invention, Ascham has developed his own structural procedure for the book, adding modern practicality to the older systems. He has condensed the medieval tripartite structure into two books, and has emphasized commodity, dispersing the history of shooting by using historical proofs for specific arguments relating to commodity. Thus, out of sixteen divisions in book one, only one is devoted entirely to "the invention of shootinge," but in other segments Ascham informs the reader incidently of other details of its origin and history, as in the section, "God is pleased with stronge wepons and valyaunt feates of war": "The first statute & lawe that euer Dauld made after he was king, was this, that al y6 children of Israel shulde learne to shote, . . . And thus
we...plainelye...what...greate...use...of...shoting,...and...what...pro-
vision...even...from...the...begynnyng...of...the...worlde...for...shoting,...
was...amonge...the...Iewes'"...pp. 40-41)....The...emphasis...of...book...one
is...therefore...not...divided...between...origin...and...commodity;...rather...Ascham...suggests...that...origin...and...commodity...work
together,...that...history...illustrates...shooting's...modern...bene-
fits. The...result...is...a...sense...of...the...universal...esteem...and
continuing...advantages...of...the...sport. Ascham's...real...division
is...between...the...philosophy...and...the...practice...of...archery,
reflecting...a...lifelong...characteristic...of...establishing...his...own
precepts...for...any...rule...and...then...providing...practical...examples
for...real...application. And...so...he...argues...archery's...nature...and
importance...in...book...one,...devoting...the...second...book...to...practical
instruction.

Classical...rules...for...the...organization...of...persuasive
arguments...such...as...those...presented...in...book...one...of...Toxophilus
are...very...specific...and...most...of...them...debate...the...appropriateness...of...other...rhetorician's...lists. Generally...the...orators
called...for...an...introduction,...narration...of...the...issues,...perhaps
an...outline...of...the...order...of...arguments,...then...the...main...argument
followed...by...a...refutation...of...the...opponent's...case,...and...finally
a...conclusion. Some...included...as...appropriate...a...digression
(or...several)...to...interest...the...audience...with...variety...or...anec-
dote, so...long...as...the...digression...pertained...to...the...major
subject. In...Ascham's...time...this...partition...of...oratory...was
taught...in...every...school...and...observed...religiously...by...many
writers. His biographer asserts Ascham's accordance with the convention as well, although he identifies only exordium (introduction), confirmatio (argument for the subject), and refutatio (rebuttal of opponents). In fact, only an introduction and conclusion can be clearly recognized in Ascham's disposition of his material. Rather than outline his arguments at one point, Ascham provides frequent résumés of progress and forecasts of subsequent direction; rather than divide confirmatio and refutatio, Ascham through his dialogue form offers the case for and against each point as it enters the conversation of his characters. This method is more natural aesthetically, but it also reflects Ascham's unwillingness to permit contradictory arguments to sit without resolution. He cannot persuade his audience to one stance and then demolish the other; he must resolve the opposition toward the center as he proceeds. Moreover, should his resolution be questionable, each point, taken singly, is much too minor an element to bear the burden of the whole treatise.

A final aspect of Ascham's overall structure deserves inspection. That is the variation in form of arguments of the two books. The first is generally linear in its unfolding; Ascham moves without consistently logical sequence from the honesty of shooting to its origin, to its fitness for nobility, scholars, and finally (after a digression on schools), for all men. He then compares it with another
pastime, dicing, and goes on to show its advantages in war (with a digression on the virtue of obedience in soldiers) at some length, then its appropriateness "at home," and the disadvantages of failure to practise archery. His conclusion to Book One is a digression on the need to aim at perfection in order to attain the mean. The order of arguments is largely arbitrary and except for the sequence of the series on war and the placement of the digression on instruction in the schools, there is no necessary relationship between one argument and the next. The second book, on the contrary, is very tightly organized by categorical division resembling the two-part analysis of arguments recommended by Ascham's later correspondent, Peter Ramus, except that ultimately Ascham cannot abide the strictness of bipartite division and varies it at each extreme with a five-item category. The Table of Contents for the second book is reproduced here to demonstrate its perfect division and comprehensively correlative exposition. The break down of parallelism at the final stage is characteristic of Ascham's syntax throughout Toxophilus as well. The plan for Book Two shows Ascham's mastery of dialectic: analyzing his topic deductively, Ascham begins with the purpose of the technical instruction, hitting the mark. This is accomplished, as he has already established in the first book, by shooting straight and shooting the desired distance.
Hitting the mark is also accomplished by knowing the equipment—both that belonging to all men and that which each man owns himself—and by knowing the actions—both mental and physical—of an ideal archer. As he becomes most specific, however, Ascham departs from monotonous regularity in both plan and practice. The next stage, although divided in two in its abstract elements (general equipment, weather, and the target; action within a man—courage and lack of affect—).
ation), is split into five concrete units in both the equipment section and the one on action. Further, while otherwise following his plan at first, when Ascham arrives at weather and targets he defers consideration until he has finished describing all the "outside" actions. When he does take them up again, he talks only of the weather and nearly only of its subsidiary, the wind. Nor does he feel at all obliged to devote equal space to each element; he spends, for example, four pages on "weather," but only six lines on its counterpart, "Bold courage."

The difference in method of division in the two parts of Toxophilus might simply be due to the easier nature of the task of organizing concrete technique compared to that of ordering persuasive argument. But Ascham in fact had more guides for organizing argument than he did for arranging descriptive elements of a sport. That he chose to blend the divisions of the first book and separate those of the second reveals something of his individuality. In the area of argument Ascham works to join, to make a whole which will be useful and true. In the area of description, his interest is to make perfectly open and clear the actions and instruments involved, by separating them individually from the whole activity. Where there is no conflict, we see Ascham demonstrative, exact, even blunt; where controversy appears, we see him searching not for division but for compromise, for a complex blend of only apparently divergent
views.

Such assumptions about Ascham's character cannot, of course, be drawn solely from the broader structural plan of his work. Examining the most obvious and frequently recurring stylistic elements of *Toxophilus*, however, and pursuing more exactly the nature of Ascham's usage in detailed analysis of his expression, do permit a definition of the individuality which emerges as his style.

One of the first observations made by the reader of *Toxophilus* is the apparent humility of the writer. In his introduction, speaking of the art of writing by analogy with shooting, he reflects that "Some shooters take in hande stronger bowes, than they be able to mayntayne. This thyng maketh them sumtyme, to outshoote the marke, sumtyme to shote far wyde, and perchaunce hurte sume that looke on" (p. xv). He himself, he frequently asserts, is no expert, and perhaps ought not to write, but "although I had rather haue anie other to do it than my selfe, yet my selfe rather than no other" (p. 5). Such modesty seems at first conventional, but its recurrence and related echoes in less direct addresses to the reader begin to force upon the reader a sense of its genuineness.

Not only does Ascham use such direct disclaimers of pride as we have just seen, he comes hat in hand to the presence of nobility, excepting them, if they wish, from his audience: "In dede as for greate men, and greate mennes
matters, I lyst not greatlye to meddle" (p. 29). Especially indicative is Ascham's reference to himself in the text. He obviously wishes to emphasize his subject more than himself. The author's "I" is usually self-effacing or buried in the syntax where it becomes inconspicuous. Most commonly, when he refers to himself or asserts a personal opinion, Ascham inverts the word order, emphasizing the object or complement rather than the "I": "my minde is" (p. xiii), "By this matter I meane" (p. xii), "And these things I suppose be signes . . . " (p. 10), "And these reasons (as I suppose)" (p. 10). The use of parentheses to enclose and subordinate the "I" is also frequent, as in the last example and the following: ". . . they maye use suche exercises verye well (I suppose) as Galene him selfe doth allowe" (p. 19), "... he may hang vp his bowe (I warraunt you) for one season" (p. 21), "But Textor (I beshrowe him) hath almooste broughte vs from our communicati5" (p. 53).

In each case Ascham is submerging the "I"; yet, incongruously, the pronoun appears more often in Toxophilus than in any other contemporary English work. Ascham is very conscious of himself, very careful to discriminate his own conclusions from those of "some men" or ancient authors. Long before Bacon, Ascham trusts surely only that which he has observed, and only secondarily the opinions of classical authorities—when they agree with his way of thinking. "Ex-
not prove a thing why it shuld be so" (p. 9), says Toxophilus to his interlocutor, Philologus. And so a conflict arises as Ascham, attempting to focus on his subject, is forced to refer again and again to himself. His resolution, as may be inferred from the sentence fragments quoted above, is to invert the word order of most sentences which contain conclusions. The effect is sometimes awkward, but more often Ascham's practice of bringing the main element to the beginning of the sentence produces a simple, emphatic tone to his prose. Each point is briefly exposed before it is qualified and predicated, and Ascham's "I think" seems to follow rather as a concurrence than as an assertion. The following three examples are typical, although often Ascham practices the same sort of inversion without direct reference to himself or his persona:

By this matter I meane the shotyng in the long bowe, for English men: which thyng with all my hert I do wysh, and if I were of authoritie, I wolde counsel all the gentlemen and yomen of Englande, not to chaunge It with any other thyng. (p. xii)

Yet of al weapōs the best is, as Euripides doth say, wherewith least daunger of our self we maye hurt our enemye moost. And that is (as I suppose) artillarie. (p. 34)

Examples surely I haue marked very many: fro the beginnyng of tyme had in memorie of wrytyng, throughout all oūmune wealthe, & Empires of the worlde: wherof the mooste part I wyll passe ouer, lest I shoulde be tediouse: yet some I wyll touche, bycause they be notable, bothe for me to tell and you to heare. (p. 39)

In the final example Ascham refers to himself three times as an authority, and each time he avoids placing the "I"
foremost in its clause. As the work progresses the inverted form becomes habitual in Ascham's writing even though his growing confidence more often permits the observing "I" its customary place as subject; but here his subordination of self-reference stems from a natural and genuine humility slightly at odds with an equally honest awareness of the priority of self among authorities.

Ascham's modesty appears not only in personal effacement, but also in more general statements, where it becomes clear that he prefers cautious humility in all men. The analogy between shooting and writing on p. 47 above is an example; a clearer one is the following digression in which Ascham complains about those who seek to accomplish more than they are fit for:

Thus every archer must knowe, not onelye what bowe and shafte is fittest for him to shoote withall, but also what tyme & season is best for hym to shote in. And surely, in al other matters to, amonge al degrees of men, there is no man which doth any thing eyther more discretely for his commendation or yet more profitable for his aduantage, than he which wyll knowe perfecty for what matter and for what tyme he is moost apte and fit. (p. 109)

Ascham's advice to others against overreaching creates almost a refrain for the varied topics of Toxophilus. Given to moral generalization and digression, Ascham most often generalizes about misplaced ambitions. He himself, he declares in the preface (perhaps ignoring his unfortunate translation of Oecumenius), is careful not to start his career with too grand a subject:
And therfore did I take this little matter in hande, to assaye my selfe, and hereafter by the grace of God, if the judgement of wyse men, that looke on, thinke that I can do any good, I maye perchaunce caste my shafte amongst other, for better game. (p. xv)

Even years later, writing The Scholemaster ostensibly as a guide to the teaching of Latin, but actually as a commentary on English society, he excused a lack of deserved reputation: "And som also will nedes busie them selues in merueling, and adding thereunto unfrendlie taulke, why I, a man of good yeares, and of no ill place, I thanke God and my Prince, do make choise to spend soch tyme in writyng of trifles, as the schole of shoting, the Cockpitte, and this booke of the first Principles of Grammer, rather, than to take some weightie matter in hand, either of Religion, or Ciuill discipline." His answer is the same as his motive for writing Toxophilus: "Great shippes, require costlie tackling ... small boates, be neither verie chargeable in makyng, nor verie oft in great ieoperdie: and yet they cary many tymes, as good and costlie ware, as greater vessels do. A meane Argument, may easelie beare, the light burden of a small faute, and haue alwaize at hand, a ready excuse for ill handling: And, some praise it is, if it so chaunce, to be better indeede, than a man dare venture to seeme." Accordingly, Ascham in Toxophilus would have smaller men use light bows and try for accuracy rather than show poorly attempting to shoot far (pp. 109, 112). His most vehement complaint about the state of scholarship is that "... yf a man nowe a dayes haue two
sonnes, the one impotent, weke, sickly, lispynge, stuttynge, and stamerynge, or hauynge any misshape in hys bodye: what doth the father of suche one commonlye saye? This boye is fit for nothynge els, but to set to lernyng and make a prest of, as who would say, ye outcastes of the worlde, hauyng neyther countenaunce tounge nor wit... be good ynough to make those men of, whiche shall be appoynted to preache Goddes holye woorde, and minister hys blessed sacramentes, besydes other moost weyghtye matters in the common welthe put ofte tymes, and worthelye to learned mennes discretion and charge" (pp. 109-110). The man of modest ability has no business in public affairs. The successful man, and the one who would be of greatest service to the commonwealth, must avoid extremes either of countenance or of behavior. "Know thyself" means "learne to know what thou arte able, fitte, and apte vnto, and followe that" (p. 111).

Involved in keeping within the bounds of aptitude is Ascham's consistent attempt to avoid offense while at the same time fulfilling his rightful role as critic. Always sensitive about his public reputation, Ascham is careful not to expose himself to attack. He is quick to cover himself when he ventures to criticize others, both by generalizing and by weaving a web of logic behind which he feels safe. In the following typical passage, he moves to an uncomfortable extreme, marked by the colloquial proverb, and then backpedals: "This thing if a man take not heede
on, he maye chaunce haue cause to saye so of his fletcher, 
as in dressinge of meate is communelye spoken of Cookes: and 
that is, that God sendeth vs good fethers, but the deuyll 
noughtie Fletchers. Yf any fletchers heard me saye thus, 
they wolde not be angrye with me, except they were yll 
fletchers: and yet by reason, those fletchers too, ought 
rather to amend them selues for doing yll, then be angry 
with me for saying truth."\textsuperscript{10} Ascham's possible offense, 
cloaked in generalization, is both effective and safe; for 
only one willing to admit his complicity would dare reply.

Syntactically Ascham's tendency toward self-protect­
iveness occurs in several forms, but principally in sudden 
objectification or dramatic distance. Normally, as he 
demonstrates an undisputed principle or explores the history 
of some phase of shooting, Ascham in effect drops his 
persona and neglects Philologus, the interlocutor, who shows 
up again only to direct transitions or act momentarily as 
devil's advocate. However, when Ascham becomes too personally 
involved in a subject—especially one with which his 
intimacy might prove embarrassing—he frequently re-assumes 
his fictionalizing mask by inserting the vocative "Philologe."
An example of this defense occurs toward the end of the 
paragraph analyzed on p. 77 below. More common is Ascham's 
frequent use of alternative correlative clauses to intro­
duce paragraphs. The recurrent form is "although . . . 
yet . . . .", sometimes modified in the process of debate to
"I grant you . . . , but . . . ." The effect of this formula is to allow both sides while emphasizing the preferred one. Ascham virtually never uses this form to indicate a direct negation; he always uses it as a concession refocused to his own end by the "yet" clause. The result is that he seldom makes a flat, unqualified statement which could be used to embarrass him.

Throughout Toxophilus, Ascham's style reveals much more than the interplay between modesty and self-consciousness which has so far been described. It shows as well a struggle between youthful—or conservative—positivism and a trait related to Ascham's moderation, but best characterized as compromise. Positivism manifests itself in extremes, whether in the writer's desire to confront individual arguments openly and entirely or in his formulation of conclusions as a result of such confrontation; but compromise, too, deals with extremes. Ascham spends a great deal of effort and space defining apparently contrary positions only to dissolve them toward the center. Involved in this characteristic, common to all of Ascham's prose, is a syntactical formula recognized by virtually all of Ascham's literary critics as rhetorical antithesis. It is possible that these constructions caused Gabriel Harvey to label Ascham "noster Isocrates"; they are expressly the reason for Krapp's and Saintabury's conclusion that Ascham's style was a precursor of Euphuism. Antithetical balance
is now the most characteristic literary trait attributed to Ascham in general works on style or sixteenth-century literary history. Ironically, however, Ascham's "antitheses" as they occur throughout Toxophilus and even in his later works fit neither the rhetorical definitions nor the logical requirements of true contraries. As an introduction to the characteristic of compromise in Ascham's style, it will be worthwhile to look closely at the real nature of these opposites. A typical Ascham "antithesis" looks like this: "He yt doth mistrust is seldore beguiled. For although therby he shall not attaine to that which is best, yet by these meanes he shall at leaoste auoide yt whyche is worst" (p. 113). The contrast between "attain-avoid" and "best-worst" is obvious and is heightened by fairly strict parallelism. However, the "not" in the first clause reverses what appears antithetical, making the sense cumulative. It is framed in one of Ascham's "although . . . yet . . . " constructions, developing a concession rather than indicating an exclusion. The correlative nature of the two clauses further insures that they must be accepted as a bipartite unit rather than simply as two exclusive wholes. The intellectual effect of this "antithesis" is to draw the sense of each extreme toward a compromising mean: by refusing to trust, one will neither excel nor fail, but enjoy some intermediate state, presumably successful and, in context, close to the mark.
Ascham's friend, Thomas Wilson, describes "contrarietie" with the following example in his *Arte of Rhetorique* (1560):

"He is of a straunge nature as euer I saw, for to his frend he is churlish, to his foe he is gentle: giue him faire wordes and you offend him: checke him sharply, and you winne him" (pp. 199-200). Here the only significant relationship between the opposites is the wordplay itself; each pole could stand alone, and the writer's direct contrast in vocabulary emphasizes the extremes rather than moderating them. Wilson's own practice shows clearly the difference between true antithesis and Ascham's compromising correlatives. This is from the preface to the *Arte of Rhetorique*:

> What greater pride can there be, then for any man to thinke himself to be wiser, then all men liuing? Or what greater folly can be imagined, then for one to thinke, that all men will like, whatsoever he writeth? ... For in follie, I dare compare with the proudest, and in pride I dare match with him that is most foolish. (Sig. A4)

Again, in both antitheses, each member is coordinate, sharing only the weakest conjunction with its mate. The real comparison is held entirely by the parallel structure and the pride-folly extremity. In the second antithesis the negative parallelism is more complicated, involving also a **chiasmus** in folly—proudest : pride—most foolish. But this sort of binding, while striking, is literal and not conceptual. The purpose of true antithesis is to demonstrate opposition, not to weaken it.
Now let us look again at Ascham's practice, this time at an example fully as complicated and definitely as intentional as Wilson's:

Well, even as I will not commend their illness, so ought not you to dispraise their goodnesse. (p. 8)

Here the opposition appears in both verbs and objects, with, as well, an antagonism between each verb and its own object: commend--illness : dispraise--goodness. But even here the sense is to deny the extremes set out--to seek a compromise between commending evil and condemning good. It is the contrast which Ascham cannot tolerate. As in the first example, the two clauses are correlative rather than merely coordinate. They are inseparably joined, each must be seen in relation to the other, and Ascham's effort is to denounce both extremes for a median course. A final example of Ascham's pseudo-antithetical correlatives carries with it its own lesson:

The meane betwyxt bothe must be kept, a thing more pleasaunte to behoulde when it is done, than easie to be taught howe it shoulde be done. (p. 104)

Ascham effects compromise between extremes in the larger patterns of his treatise also. Again the dialogue form helps him, for he can easily and dramatically present two contrary opinions and then have his characters reach a compromising agreement. Usually, though, Philologus is used to temper Toxophilus' positive zeal in defense of his art. In this way, it appears, Ascham manages to be both
extreme and mean at the same time. In such cases he often seems amused at his own excesses, as in this excerpt from a dramatic defense of the honesty of archery as a pastime.

Toxophilus speaks first:

But here you will come in wt temporal man and scholer: I tell you plainlye, scholer or vscher, yea if I were .xx. scholers, I wolde thinke it were my dutie, bothe with exhortinge men to shote, and also with shotinge my selfe to helpe to set forwarde that thing which the kinge his wisdome, and his counsell, so greatlye laboureth to go forwarde: whiche thinge surelye they do, bycause they knowe it to be in warre, the defence and wal of our countrie, in peace, an exercice moost holsome for the body, a pastime moost honest for the mynde, and as I am able to proue my selfe, of all other moste fit and agreable with learninge and learned men.

PHI. If you can proue thl3 thing so playnly, as you speake it ernestly, th§ wil I, not only thinke as you do, but become a shooter and do as you do. But yet beware I saye, lest you for the great loue you bear towarde shotinge, blindlie ludge of shootinge. For loue & al other to ernest affections be not for nought paynted blinde. Take hede (I saye) . . .

(p. 11-12)

Toxophilus has become too violent and finally too close to exposing Ascham’s own problems with shooting. Philologus at first humorously jibes, but then seriously cautions him to avoid extremity if he would build a good case. Toxophilus then proceeds on a compromise tack in a more modest tone.

Other evidence of Ascham’s tendency to seek compromise appears in the ridicule with which he treats extremes, whether Galen’s calisthenics (p. 19), an archer’s follow-through (p. 103), or the quality of voices not tempered by musical instruction:
But when a man is alwaye in one tune, lyke an Humble bee, or els nowe vp in the top of the churche, nowe downe that no manne knoweth where to haue hym: or piping lyke a reede, or roring lyke a bull, as some lawyers do . . . these shall neuer greatly moue . . . .

For all voyces, great and small, base & shril, weke or softe, may be holpen and brought to a good poyn, by learnyng to synge. (p. 15)

Because Ascham so consistently seeks the mean in argument as well as language, such lists of extremity provide immediate humorous relief and Ascham need not reprimand any more directly than by showing that a practice is extreme. Even the archer's goal of hitting the mark is viewed as "couetinge to come nighest a moost perfite ende or meane standing betwixte .ii. extremes, eschewing shorte, or gone, or eithersyde wide" (p. 9). This approach to a subject is more than Aristotelian, although Ascham acknowledges his debt to Aristotle. It reflects a strong intellectual conservatism, which one might expect would keep Ascham from writing at all, as it might have had he not been prompted by more radical ambitions and his acute sense of the necessity for a public application of his values. Indeed, as he moves into the technical phase of his treatise, he draws his characters into a dialectic argument in which Philologus is hard put to convince Toxophilus (always Ascham's voice) that he ought to teach the steps to perfect shooting rather than just mediocre adeptness. Philologus' point is that only by understanding the nature of the extreme can a man attain a suitable degree within the mean, and further
that knowing that others cannot reach perfection encourages a man to overcome his competitors. Ultimately, however, Philologus fails to convince Toxophilus, who nevertheless accedes to teach perfection with these words: "And yet if I do it not beinge but a smale matter as you thynke, you wyll lacke frendeshyp in me, if I take it in hande and not bring it to passe as you would haue it, you myghte thynoke great w5t of wysdome in me" (p. 68). Still convinced that he ought not aim so high, Toxophilus gives in, fearing, as might be expected, the effect of failure on his reputation.

This striving for moderation and compromise, for what is "most fitting," causes moderation in the flow of Ascham's sentences as well. Ascham tends to put his emphasis and even his action into modifying words, rather than in nouns and verbs themselves. This practice tempers any possibility of excess force of movement, making progress necessarily more deliberate. Ascham's normal sequential progress comes not from the action of verbs but from conjunctions and connective particles such as "whereof" (and its relatives), "as," and "yet". The following sentence demonstrates most of these points clearly, while also showing how Ascham's syntax draws toward the mean in the same way that he advocates for men's actions:

And althoughe I knowe that some me shoote so stronge, that the deade woodes be lyghte ynough for them, and other some so weeke, that the lowse woodes be lykewyse for them bigge ynough yet generally for the moost parte of men, the meane is the best. And so to con-
oclude, that is alwayes beste for a man, whiche is metest for him. (p. 85)

The sentence is formed in one of Ascham's frequent "although . . . yet . . ." formulas, balancing two truths while preferring only one. The strongest transitive verb is "knowe" in the first clause, and except for the intransitive "shoot" (necessarily one of the most common verbs in the book) Ascham uses no other verb than "be" in two forms. The assertive force rests in words like "strong," "deade," "lykewyse," "yet," "and so," and "whiohe." Ascham even elides the expected repetition of "shoot" in the pseudo-antithesis of the first main clause. That "antithesis" is not strictly correlative here, but the cumulative "some--other" parallelism helps to integrate the two elements, which Ascham does not see as contradictory; for he resolves the apparent extremes in the final clause, by asserting that for most "the meane is the best." This statement he further qualifies, typically denying it the full force of its climactic position, with a definition of the significance of the mean--"that which is metest for him."

However thoroughly Ascham aimed at quiet compromise, he was just as fully pushed to expose apparent extremes, to examine them, to come to positive decisions about them. This aspect of his character caused his more conciliatory side both embarrassment and doubt. The permissiveness with which Ascham allows Toxophilus to reach occasional emotional extremes, so long as they are checked by Philologus,
has been mentioned above (pp. 53, 57-58). The nature of dialogue itself is, of course, confrontative, and by using it Ascham forced himself to face many problems easily avoided by Elyot in the _Governour_ or Wilson in his treatises. A good deal of Ascham's defensiveness coincides with this tendency to confront issues squarely in the process of resolving them, and the inherentness of this trait becomes apparent in various syntactical peculiarities. For instance, Ascham very seldom paraphrases or indirectly quotes a source. Rather than run a quotation smoothly into his text, he commonly brings his sentence to a full stop grammatically, punctuating with a colon or period, and then quotes directly a line from his source. The effect is blunt but also convincing. The quotation becomes a piece of evidence which the reader can, as it were, pick up and examine in order to evaluate. Ascham seems to be demonstrating complete confidence that this quotation expresses perfectly the point he is proving (or merely illustrating) and that the reader cannot feel otherwise after witnessing it. Oblique reference would be an incomplete presentation, one infers, and less than the whole truth.

The Troians had heedes of yron, as this verse spoken of Pandarus, sheweth:

_Vp to the pappe his string did he pull, his shaft to the harde yron._ _Iliados._ 4.

The Grecians had heedes of brasse, as Vlysses shaftes were heeded, when he slewe Antinous, and the other wowers of Penelope.

_Quite through a dore, flewe a shaftes with a brasse head._ _Odysse._ 21 (pp. 92-93)
Ascham is also one of the few writers of his age to give detailed and accurate citations for his sources.

But Ascham does not rely solely on quotations from authorities to force the reader—and himself—to confront evidence. One cause of the subordination of the "I" discussed above (pp. 47-50) is Ascham's practice of beginning a sentence with its most important element, placing it starkly and unqualified for just a moment before the reader and only then moving to put it into the context where he feels it belongs. The result is that Ascham uses very few initial subordinate clauses and that when he is discussing abstract concepts he uses the word "thyng" often to avoid awkward repetitions. Part of the apparent periodicity in Ascham's style is this tendency to put the most relevant part of the sentence first, then qualify it digressively or in a particular direction; as he moves further from his main point, he must either continue in that direction or work back to his starting place, affecting periodicity without really accomplishing it. The apparent balance of the sentence quoted in chapter one, page 17, above, illustrates perfectly this characteristic, as does the following, part of a panegyric on Sir John Cheke and a lament of his leaving Cambridge to tutor Edward VI:

The great hinderance of learning, in lackinge thys man greatly I shulde lament, if this discōmoditie of oures, were not ioyned with the oōmoditie & welth, of ye hole realme, for which purpose, our noble king full of wysedome hath called vp this excellent man full of
learnynge, to teache noble prince Edwarde, an office ful
of hope, conforte & solace to al true hertes of England:
For whome al England dayly doth praye, yt he passing
his Tutor in learnynge & knowledge, fologyng his father
in wisedome & felicitie, accordyng to yt example which
is set afore his eyes, may so set out and mayntayne
goddes worde to the abolishment of al papistry, the
confusion of al heresie, that therby he feared of his
ennemies, loued of al his subiectes, maye bring to his
own glory, immortal fame & memorie, to this realme,
welthe, honour & felicitie, to true and vnfayned
religion perpetuall peace, concorde and vnitie.

Ascham begins his sentence with a balanced parallel empha-
sizing the commodity in Cambridge's discommodity. The
concept is complex enough that in the following clause he
represents it more concretely as "which purpose," and since
this is his focal point he begins the clause with reference
to it. By the time he gets to "prince Edwarde," he is again
balancing two points, the "purpose" and the concept of
teaching. Here he drops "purpose" and uses the more con-
crete "office" to launch his series of benefits. The next
clause focuses back on Edward ("for whom") as Ascham
apparently realizes that he is getting off track; but in
qualifying his reference to Edward, Ascham is forced for
grammatical integrity to expand on the nearer concept of
prayer. The result is a short diatribe against papistry,
which Ascham seems almost desperately to turn back toward
both Edward and the benefit of the realm by means of a thick
coating of parallel series. Cheke, in the meantime, has
been lost from sight, as has archery long since.

Another, much more commonplace, passage further demon-
strates Ascham's habitual tendency to place his focal point at the beginning of a sentence; he thus qualifies secondary matters more readily and is forced into digression:

Now sir ye haue hearde howe a fether must be had, and that a goose fether onely. It foloweth of a yong gose and an oulde, and the residue belonging to a fether; which thing I wyll shortlye course ouer: wherof, when you knowe the properties, you maye fitte your shaftes according to your shotyng, which rule you must obserue in all other thynges too, bycause no one fashion or quantitie can be fitte for euery man, nomore than a shooe or a cote can be. (pp. 89-90)

Here Ascham re-emphasizes his point three times by condensing relatively abstract concepts: "which thing," "wherof," and "which rule." At each point he moves a step farther from his topic—first because "thing" is both too vague and too concrete a substitute for the two clauses preceding it for Ascham to keep their entirety in mind; second, and consequently, because he becomes less specific, slipping into a generalization on his favorite subject of seeking the most apt; and finally, because where he seeks to expand his thought, he has at hand not his main idea, which is at the beginning, but only a modification of it, such as "which rule." Having no way to return to his subject gracefully, Ascham simply jumps to his next sentence, "The oulde goose fether ...."

Ascham's sentences contain many connective particles, not true conjunctions, which give his progress an abruptness and push his subjects brusquely into consideration. Most frequent are "as," "which," and the present participle
used spuriously as an appositive modifier. A good example of the way in which Ascham's confrontative syntax works in counterpoint with the conciliatory correlatives occurs in the following sentence on the quality of shaft wood. The initial "As" here represents "what I mean by my last comment is . . .":

As it is better to haue a shafte a lytle to shorte than ouer longe, somewhat to lyght, than ouer lumpysshe, a lytle to small, than a greate deale to big, whiche thynge is not onely trewlye sayde in shootynge, but in all other thynges that euer man goeth aboute, as in eatynge, taulkyng, and all other thynges lyke, whych matter was onse excellentlye disputed vpon, in the Scooles, you knowe when. (p. 85)

By far the most artistically gratifying of Ascham's positive, or confrontative, traits involves his penchant for seeking evidence from the world around him. Although Ascham uses very little imagery, his prose is full of homely analogies and colorful lists in which he tries to build up quantitative proof of the validity of his observations. To make any point clear Ascham depends always on comparison, and as the study of his syntax has shown, he most often seeks likeness and correlation rather than disparity. In his attempt to define abstract or complex concepts Ascham turns to a more descriptive comparison than that offered by the contrasting parallels of his syntax. Many of his analogies are conventional—Ascham sought the practical clarity which was available in cliché expressions and so he frequently uses Renaissance commonplaces such as the com-
parison of youth with a young tree: "If the yonge tree growe croked, when it is oulde, a man shal rather breake it thā streyght it" (p. 28). While many of his analogies are trite, many are also strikingly original because they are derived from Ascham's own experiences. The following analogy is common enough, but used as an example of muscular coordination, it serves its purpose quietly and relevantly:

And a strong man not uséd to shote, hath his armes breste and shoulders, and other partes wherwith he shuld drawe stronglye, one hindering and stoppinge an other, euæ as a dosen stronge horses not uséd to the carté, lettes & troubles one another . . . . a stronge man not uséd to shoote, at a girde, can heue vp & plucke in súdeer many a good bowe, as wild horses at a brunte doth race & pluck in peces many a stronge carte. (p. 55)

Most of Ascham's analogies, as might be expected, act to demonstrate the correspondence between his subject (archery, scholarship, or even government) and everyday life. What applies in natural law also ought to apply to rulers, teachers, and shooters. Hence most of his figures deal with moderation, either by implication, as in the analogy of the horses above, or more explicitly. Playing one analogy against another, Toxophilus here refutes Philologus' contention that successful scholars, like good farmers, are those who "rise erliest, and come latest home, and are content to haue their diner and other drinckinges, broughte into the fielde to them, for feare of losing of time":

... contrariwise I herd my selfe a good husbande at his boke ones saye, that to omit studie somtyme of the daye, and somtyme of the yere, made asmoche for
the encrease of learning, as to let the land lie some-time fallow, maketh for better encrease of corne. This we see, if the land be plowed every year, the corne commeth thinne vp: the care is short, the grayne is small, and when it is brought into the barn and threshed, giveth very evil fault. So those which never leave poring on their books, haue oftentimes as thinne invention, as other poore men haue, and as small wit and weight in it as in other mens. (pp. 2-3)

By this simple and practical analogy Ascham speaks to the pedants at St. John's who, in their zeal for pure scholarship, refuse to join learning to living.

Ascham and Thomas Wilson, both students of John Cheke, followed their mentor in many of his doctrines. Wilson is famous for his criticism of "strange ynkehorne termes," and Ascham, too, denounced "strange wordes, as latin, french, and Italian, which do make all things darke and harde." Using his descriptive ability to make his own position--more moderate than Cheke's--clear, Ascham turns from the abstract with one of his remarkably vivid, if this time somewhat distasteful, analogies:

Ones I communed with a man whiche reasoned the englyshe tongue to be enryched and encreased by using strange words sayinge: Who wyll not prayse that feaste, where a man shall drinke at a diner, bothe wyne, ale and beere? Truely quod I, they be all good, euery one taken by hym selve alone, but if you putte Maluesye and sacke, read wyne and white, ale and beere, and al in one pot, you shall make a drynke, neyther easie to be knowen, nor yet holsom for the bodye. (p. xiv)

Correspondence may be proven by quantitative evidence as well as by commonplace analogy; and so Ascham's prose is filled with detailed and remarkably illustrative lists of both concrete and general observation. Here for example,
he emphasizes a coincidence he has noticed which seems to him to augment his conclusion that archery's virtue is its avoidance of extremes:

For firste the bowe must be gathered rounde, in drawyng it must come rounde compasse, the streyne muste be rounde, the stele rounde, the beste nocke rounde, the feather-shorne somewhat rounde, the shafte in flyenge, muste turne rounde, and if it flye far, it flyeth a round compace. (p. 91)

Lists, of course, tend to demonstrate extremes, and so they become tools of Ascham's ridicule in passages like those noted on p. 59 above; they may also be used to demonstrate the ugliness of a lack of moderation, and in the following excerpt Ascham outlines a very miserable, if only temporarily felt, image of the weakness of professed Christians:

... Christen men, which be on slepe made drunke with the frutcs of the flesh, as infidelitie, disobedience to Goddes worde, and heresie, grudge, euelwyll, stryfe, contention, and priuie enuye, coueytousnesse, oppression, vnmercifulnesse, with innumerable sortes of unspeakeable daylye bawdrye. (p. 48)

The attractiveness of Ascham's descriptive ability lies in his self-consciousness. Never do we see only a list; rather we see Ascham reacting to abundance, and the interplay of forces produces his art. George Cavendish, whose Life of Cardinal Wolsey is noted primarily for its vivid descriptions, seems especially flat when compared with Ascham. Taking a passage singled out for its colorfulness by his most recent editor, let us compare it with an equivalent description of Ascham's. Here is Cavendish:

Then passed he forward out of his own house at Westminister, passing through all London, over London Bridge,
having before him of gentlemen a great number, three in rank, in black velvet livery coats, and the most part of them with great chains of gold about their necks, and all his yeomen, with noblemen and gentlemen's servants, following him in French tawny livery coats; having embroidered upon their backs and breasts of the same coats these letters, T and O, under the Cardinal's hat. His sumpter mules, which were twenty in number and more, with his carts and other carriages of his train, were passed on before, conducted and guarded with a great number of bows and spears. He rode like a Cardinal, very sumptuously on a mule, trapped with crimson velvet upon velvet, and his stirrups of copper and gilt, and his spare mule following him with like apparel.  

And here is Ascham:

I trowe if I shoulde not lye, there is not halfe so muche crafte vsed in no one thinge in the worlde, as in this cursed thynge [deceit in gambling]. What false dise vse they? as dise stopped with quicksiluer and heares, dise of a vauntage, flattles, gourdes to chop and chaunge whan they lyste, to lette the trew dise fall vnder the table, & so take vp the false, and if they be true dise, what shyfte wil they make to set y® one of them with slyding, with cogging, with foysting, with coytinge as they call it. Howe wyll they vse these shiftes, whan they get a playne man that can no skyll of them? Howe will they go about, yf they perceyue an honest man haue money, which list not playe, to prouoke him to playe? They wyl seke his company, they wil let hym paye nought, yea and as I hearde a man ones saye that he dyd, they wil send for hym to some house & spend perchaunce, a crown on him, and at last wyll one begin to saye: what my masters, what shall we do? shall euerye man playe his .xii. d. whyles an apple roste in the fyre, and than we wyll drinke & departe. (p. 25)

These descriptions are very typical of their authors in several ways, including the obvious disparity in subject. Cavendish virtually counts as he describes, scanning the scene as though taking an inventory. His focus is upon physical numbers and physical wealth. He makes no comment to indicate his reaction to the spectacles he describes so often except the silent one of forcing the reader to see
the immense wealth of the scene even to the composition of the Cardinal's stirrups. His observation is amazingly detailed, but amazingly insensitive to the human elements or interrelationships of the figures he sees. Ascham is quite different. His main interest is directed exactly at what Cavendish misses. Ascham would describe life, not count numbers. For him what makes the scene worth noting is the interplay of its participants and the values he sees in the action he observes. He is interested in humanity and its physical reality. Consequently he describes the commonplace or the common elements of the rare. Later, he would describe his two views of the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire with amusing lack of decorum—once he had a cap on his head "like a great codpiece"; the next time, at dinner, "he had his head in his glass five times as long as any of us" (I, 267, 268). Even in this passage from Toxophilus he seems to delight in avoiding formality, adjusting the level of his vocabulary to the nature of the event he describes: the language he uses is the jargon of the gamblers he pictures, and it is by this technique of relative decorum that he brings the reader to accept the description entirely. Moreover, Ascham depends on his own reactions as a basis for what he describes. The rhetorical questions clearly indicate his amazed disapproval of the gambler's tricks, as do the ugly sounds of the names of the deceits. Ascham looks minutely not at the copper and gold of a Cardinal's
regalia but at homely items which catch our eyes convincingly—twelve pence, a roasting apple, an actual victim of the game. These small, isolated objects contrast with the rest of the description, producing drama and a combination of extremes characteristic of all of Ascham's prose.

Form and content cannot be separated successfully in accurate criticism any more than they are created separately by a writer. Certainly in Ascham's prose this is especially true. In many of the passages examined so far, as in the last, form moderates content, the two working in complementary fashion to convey the author's meaning, the weight of his opinion, or even the seriousness of his argument at any one point in his discourse. So Ascham, while demonstrating ideals in the art of shooting, at the same time admits that they are seldom attained, and his own inclinations extend this principle even to the moral applications of the sport. Nevertheless, careless or predetermined readers are likely to see only that side of a writer as complex as Ascham which satisfies their wants. Ascham's style is particularly susceptible to this sort of error because it is full of contradictory elements—because it is like the medicine of contraries which he prescribed for scholars in archery.\(^1^6\) Attempting to justify every precept, whether the choice of shaft wood or the legitimacy of his sport, Ascham constantly moves from the particular advantage of a practice to a moral rule for which it is an
exemplum. Consequently his prose is full of unlikely maxims demonstrating the universal validity of his proofs. At the same time, Ascham can seldom leave so positive a statement as a proverb unprotected—his defensive compulsion is too alert. The result is a general tendency in his prose to move from a relevant point toward a structured aphorism and then to qualify descriptively but digressively, often straining to return to the initial topic. The aphorisms stand out today, and must have especially in Ascham's time, when Erasmus' *Apothegmata* were best-sellers and everyone literate kept commonplace books of pithy sayings. But standing out, they are vulnerable to hasty acceptance or rejection. The artistic pseudo-antitheses, especially, seem to speak for Ascham as complete truths if they are not read in context or if their compromising tendency is misunderstood. Ascham, like some politicians, is frequently led by the attractive possibilities of neat phraseology to express at one point only a part of what he means, and however much he may work to mitigate his generalization in the next sentence or two, his detractors are not likely to notice. Usually his apparently positive comments do no harm or are trivial, as when he states that the color of an arrow's feather is hardly to be regarded but then works around to recommending gray for the cock feather and white for the others anyway. Sometimes, however, he is more misleading. At different points in *Toxophilus* he offers
the following divergent views: "That in shoting is best, y't prouoketh a man to vse shotinge moste: For muche vse maketh men shoote, bothe stronge & well"; and "Vse and custome separated from knowledge and learnynge, doth not onely hurt shootynge, but the moost weyghtye thynges in the world beside: And therfore I marusyle moche at those people whyche be the mayneteners of vses w'toute knowledge hauynge no other word in their mouthe but thys vse, vse, custome, custome." These aphoristic generalizations are not contradictory, but out of their larger, technical context they certainly seem to represent two very different philosophies and might appeal to two very differently biased readers. The apparent positivism in Ascham's style, as in the Bible and other manifestoes, permits out-of-context quotations for both sides of an argument. It is exactly this characteristic in his later work, The Scholemaster, which gave him a reputation as a leading promoter of overly "delicate and polished" Ciceronianism with the empiricists of the seventeenth century, when Francis Bacon misread Ascham on words and matter; and it also is what has made this reader of romances, gambler, and inveterate foreign traveller seem so priggish to twentieth-century readers.17

With so many contrasting and conflicting characteristics, Ascham's style as a recognizable entity does not appear in the clause or the sentence. His is a style of
greater proportion, of play between sentences and compromise between concepts. The paragraph is the unit of Ascham's style, and sometimes even paragraphs are indistinguishable, as form and content struggle back and forth for pages before Ascham is satisfied that conflict has been resolved. For a full sense of the way in which the conflicting elements of Ascham's prose work together to produce the unstable but identifiable whole that is his individual style in Toxophilus, the best course is to read and explicate carefully a few paragraphs of his work. That accomplished, Roger Ascham at age thirty will be in view.

But to be shorte, the best medicine for all sortes of men both high and lowe, yonge and oulde, to put awaye suche vnlawfull games is by the contrarye, lyke-wyse as all physicions do alowe in physike. So let youthe in steade of suche vnlefull games, whiche stande by ydlenesse; by solitarinesse, and corners, by night and darkenesse, by fortune & chaunce, by crafte and subtillie, vse suche pastimes as stand by labour; vpon the daye light, in open_syght of men, hauynge suche an ende as is come to by coning, rather then by crafte: and so shulde vertue encrease, and vice decaye. For contrayre pastimes, must nedes worke contrary mindes in men, as all other contrary thinges doo. (p. 30)

The unifying thread in this summary paragraph is the balance of opposites, which Ascham effects thematically and structurally. The paragraph develops in pairs of contrasting parallel elements which reflect constantly the opposition which Ascham would like to eliminate. As he progresses Ascham brings his opposites closer and closer together by extending the scope of their correspondence, until they are
seen by the reader to be perfectly equivalent except that one is preferable to the other. Ascham's disapproval of vice, as he typically sums up its characteristics in a list, pertains less to innate evil than to the lack of practical advantage, whereas the elements of shooting fairly breathe with healthy vitality. Ascham's resolution of these contraries, in line 11, is a conclusion based upon weighed evidence which he has observed and reacted to. His conclusion is characteristically moderate in its expression—virtue will "increase" and vice will "decay"—the real effect of the medicine of contraries will not be so extreme as the contraries themselves. And although Ascham clearly favors the more open extreme, his focus of interest is not on it here while it serves as an extreme but on the balance between the contraries, as the triple repetition in the final sentence (his first departure from pairs) indicates; the general subject to which Ascham returns is the action of contrariety, not the virtue of shooting.

The analogy in this paragraph is typically commonplace but relevant. Unless he can find an amusing human foible to expose, Ascham does not move far afield for his comparisons. Pushed to an extreme, the analogy might be questioned; if shooting is a medicinal contrary, isn't it rather a temporary help but too extreme itself to merit permanent adoption? Ascham has not overlooked this likeli-
hood; he puts this very argument into Philologus' mouth in the following paragraphs, so that he can distinguish between moderate remedies, "whiche purgeth softlye and slowlye," and temporary extremes, such as the enforcement of laws against gambling. Thus shooting as a medicine provides a counterbalancing extreme for vice, but remains for Ascham a median pastime and the more to be desired.

* * *

Thoughc these verses be very ernestlie wrytten, yet they do not halfe so grisely sette out the horyblenes of blasphemy, which suche gamners vse, as it is in dede, and as I haue hearde my selfe. For no man can wryte a thing so earnestlye, as when it is spokë wyth lesture, as learned men you knowe do saye. Howe will you thinke that suche furiousenes wyth woode countenaunces, and brenning eyes, with staringe and bragging, with heart redie to leape out of the belly for swelling, can be expressed ye tenth part, to the uttermost. Two men I herd my selfe, whose sayinges be far more grisely, than Chaucers verses. One, when he had lost his moneye, swere me God, from top to toe with one breath, that he had lost al his money for lacke of sweringe: The other, losyng his money, and heaping othes vpon othes, one in a nothers necke, moost horrible & not spekeable, was rebuked of an honest man whiche stode, by for so doynge, he by and by starynge him in the face, and clappynge his fiste with all his money he had, vpon the boorde, swere me by the flesshe of God, that if sweryng wouldes helpe him but one ace, he woude not leue one pece of god vnsworne, neyther wythin nor without. The remembrauce of this blasphemy Philologe, doth make me quake at the hart, & therefore I wyll speake no more of it. (p. 27)

This paragraph is one of Ascham's more carefully contrived passages, perhaps because it follows an extended quotation from Chaucer. The overall structure is very typical; he moves from an "although . . . yet . . ." correlative sentence of a cumulative nature into increasingly
structured phrases with several pseudo-antitheses, working finally to a climactic "neither . . . nor . . ." correlative at the end of sentence five. This progression shows particularly well the cumulative nature of Ascham's "antitheses." Rather than cancel each other, the pairs build on each other until the writer's point is overwhelmingly clear. At the height of his correlative development, Ascham backs off slightly to lessen the impact of the emphasis and to extricate himself from too close an involvement in such blasphemous doings (see pp. 28, 32 above). In the third sentence Ascham makes a good try at what he has just called impossible in the second; avoiding imagery, he depends only on the impact of crudely colloquial expressions such as "staring," "leap out of," and "belly" to create a remarkably "earnest" anecdotal description. The stark immediacy of his vocabulary is the key to the impact of the rest of the paragraph as well—Ascham in effect catalogues the blasphemies rather than merely alluding to them, and he repeats the word "swear" six times to represent the actual oath-taking. A sense of the subtlety of his use of structure may be seen in the apparently simple third sentence. The first parallel is a pair of nouns, the beginning of a prepositional suspension. Each is modified by an adjective, the second of which is a participle. This "ing" form is carried over to the second pair, "staringe and bragging" which are similar not only in form but also in phonemic quantity. The
third element breaks up the parallelism, for while it is also an object of "with," Ascham has given us an active phrase rather than a pair of nouns, retaining the long vowel and soft consonant of the preceding phrase in "heart" but then rushing through the lighter sounds of "redie to leape" to rest at the ugliness of "belly" and "swelling." It is obvious by now that Ascham always breaks up structure to soften extremity; often, as here, his moderation is the vehicle for his art. The last sentence of the paragraph is a similar tempering of extreme ornateness and too personal an involvement; Ascham as Toxophilus suddenly mentions Philologus with a start in order to effect authorial distance--it was, after all, Toxophilus who was in this den of evil, not Ascham. Although Toxophilus promises in his final qualification to drop the subject, the next paragraph contains more of the same, with innuendo in Philologus' comments about Toxophilus' participation in such games ("PHIL. And I suppose if ye had been a prentice at such games, you could not have said more of them than you have done . . . TOX. In deed, you may honestly gather that I hate them greatly . . . .")

This persuerse jugement of fathers as concernyng the fitnesse and vnfitnesse of their chyldren causeth the cõmon wealthe haue many vnfit ministers: And seyng that ministers be, as a man woulde say, instrumentes wherw the cõmonwealthe doeth worke all her matters wťall, I maruayle howe it chaūceth yt a pore shomaker hath so much wit, yť he will prepare no instrument for
his science neither knyfe nor aule, nor nothing els
whiche is not very fitte for him: the cōmon wealthe
can be content to take at a fonde fathers hande, the
rifraffe of the worlde, to make those instrumentes of,
wherw^al she shoulde worke y^e hiest matters vnder heauen.
And surely an aule of lead is not so vnprofitable in a
shomakers shop, as an vnfit minister, made of grosse
metal, is vnsemely in y^e cōmō welth. Fathers in olde
time among y^e noble Persians might not do wt theyr
childrē as they thought good, but as the judgement of
the cōmon wealth al wayes thought best. This fault of
fathers bringeth many a blot wt it, to the great de-
formitie of the common wealthe: & here surely I can
prayse gentlewomen which haue alwayes at hande theyr
glasses, to se if any thinge be amisse, & so will amende
it, yet the cōmon wealth hauing y^e glasse of knowlege
in every mans hand, doth se such vnoumlines in it: &
yet winketh at it. This faulte & many suche lyke,
myght be sone wyped awaye, yf fathers woulde bestow
their children on y^t thing alwayes, whervnto nature
hath ordained them moste apte & fit. For if youth be
grafted streyght, & not awrye, the hole cōmon welth wil
florish therafter. Whan this is done, than muste
every man beginne to be more ready to amende hym selfe,
than to checke an other, measuryng their matters with
that wise prouerbe of Apollo, Knowe thy selfe: that is
to saye, learne to knowe what thou arte able, fitte,
and apte vnto, and folowe that. (pp. 110-111)

This paragraph is notable for two elements: Ascham's
ubiquitous plea to "learne to knowe what thou arte able,
fitte, and apte vnto, and folowe that"; and the central
analogy, in which he characteristically equates the common-
wealth with "a pore shomaker," and state ministers with a
leather awl. As usual, Ascham looks to the everyday world
for his comparison, avoiding more decorous but less immed-
iate possibilities in favor of clarity and appreciable human
relevance. This paragraph is part of a digression, and both
subjects of the analogy are really removed from his theore-
etical archer; but they are removed to the poles, leaving
room at the center for the shooter, who is neither a poor
artisan nor an inept minister. Ascham's particularity of
description, however, makes the shoemaker more alive and
present than the badly chosen minister. His choice of
diction emphasizes delightfully the extremes he describes,
especially in the subtle paralleling of "rifraffe of the
world" with "hiest matters vnder heauen," and the obverse
"aul of lead" with "minister made of grosse metal (mettle)."
At this middle point of the paragraph (ll. 12-15), Ascham
has pushed to its furthest extension the nature of the
correspondence, as he did in lines 6-10 of the first
paragraph analyzed (p. 75) above. At this moment both
halves of his analogy form one undesirable extreme and he
very abruptly inserts another, corrective, extreme. Per­
haps because this Persian alternative is no more attractive
to him than the ill it would cure, Ascham says no more
about it. Rather he continues with a summary statement,
as usual binding the entire preceding matter up somewhat
too simply into "This fault" and continuing in a weak
generalization whose mixed, and characteristically trite,
metaphor robs it of any aphoristic value. The resumé has
given Ascham a new direction, however, which he pursues
into another analogy, an amused look at the preciosity
of gentlewomen, culminating in the indecorous colloquialism
"winketh at it."

Following the second analogy Ascham makes two attempts
to conclude the paragraph with a suitable maxim, first
particular, then general. His use of the Delphic proverb is the final, appropriate touch, for it permits a unifying glance back at the amending court ladies while at the same time providing a perfect source for Ascham’s personal and practical interpretation of ancient wisdom. 18

The immediacy created by the confrontative elements and the colloquial detail in Ascham’s style provides some of Ascham’s most beautiful prose by modern standards. Ascham uses very little imagery, offering only the commonplace analogies we have seen for illustration or proof. His art strikes one most where he allows simple experience to color his description, as in the anecdote in the paragraph on swearing or in the following portion of a very long but often quoted description of the nature of the wind.

To see the wynde, with a man his eyes, it is vnpossible, the nature of it is so fyne, and subtyle, yet this experience of the wynde had I ones my selfe, and that was in the great snowe that fell .iii. yeares agoo: I rode in the hye wyaye betwixt Topcliffe vpon Swale, and Borowe bridge, the wyayes beyng sumwhat trodden afore, by waye fayrynge men. The feeldes on bothe sides were playne and laye almost yarde depe with snowe, the nyght afore had ben a litle froste, so yt the snow was hard and crusted abowe. That morning the sun shone bright and clere, the winde was whistelinge a lofte, and sharpe accordynge to the tyme of the yeare. The snowe in the hye wyaye laye lowse and troden wyth horse feete: so as the wynde blewe, it toke the lowse snow with it, and made it so slide vpon the snowe in the felde whyche was harde and crusted by reason of the frost ouer nyght, that therby I myght se verye wel, the hole nature of the wynde as it blewe yt daye. And I had a great deelyte & pleasure to marke it, whyche maketh me noy far better to remember it. Sometime the wynd would be not past .ii. yeardes brode, and so it would carie the snowe as far as I could se. An other tyme the snow woulde blowe ouer haife the felde at
ones. Sometime the snowe woulde tomble softly, by
and by it would flye wonderfull fast. And thys I
perceyued also that ye wind goeth by streames & not
hole togethe. For I shoulde se one stream wyth in a
Score on me, th[a] the space of .ii. score no snow would
stirre, but after so muehe qu_condition of grounde, an
other streame of snow at the same very tyme should be
caryed lykewyse, but not equally. For the one would
stande stille when the other flew a pace, and so contyn-
ewe somtyme swiftelyr sometime slowlyr, sometime
broder, sometime narrower, as far as I coulde se. Nor
it flewe not streight, but sometime it crooked thys
wayne somtyme that ways, and somtyme it ran round
aboute in a compasse. And somtyme the snowe wold be
lyft clene from the ground vp in to the ayre, and by
& by it would be al olapt to the grounde as though
there had bene no winde at all, streightway it woulde
rise and flye agayne. (pp. 112-13)

Ascham's description of the snow is dazzling. His
genius for describing the commonplace beauty of his own
observation here reaches a level unattained in other contemp­
orary literature. In place of Elyot's half-realized
abstractions and Cavendish's accountant-like indexing, Ascham
brings the life and beauty of his own sensitive reaction.
He transmits the immediacy of his experience in several
ways. His syntax is curt; he employs virtually no sub­
ordinate clauses (ten in the entire passage); and his main
clauses are connected only by weak co-ordinate conjunctions
or by punctuation alone. Each clause--each descriptive
unit--exists by itself, joined with the next in linear
succession with the same kind of alternating movement that
is in the snow Ascham is describing.

Ascham begins with the kind of personal particularity
we are by now used to. He locates the scene very definitely
in time and place. Selected details like the snow's crust, the whistling wind, and the trodden snow in the highway accent the total experience like the apple roasting on the fire in an earlier anecdote. The repetitions throughout the passage hold it together with chains of concrete beauty: words like "snow," "trodden," "blow," "stream," keep the kinetic brilliance of the scene ever present, while the repetition of connective particles such as "sometyme . . . an other tyme" moves the progress of the description in time with the pace of the wind. Ascham uses a great deal of simple, contrasting parallelism emphasizing the variety and harmony of contrary movements in a totally tranquil experience. Structuring augments the poetry of the description, especially in lines 13-18 where Ascham's isocolonic parallelism approaches metrical regularity; but just as often the correspondences are conceptual rather than structural, indicated by the repetition of words rather than whole phrases (ll. 27-31, 34-41). Throughout the description Ascham breaks up his structure before it becomes too strict, focusing the reader's eye not on his prose but upon the sight as he remembers it. Yet the structure is there to give the form to beauty which makes it art. In this sort of description, Ascham's exploration and moderation of contraries best approaches his goal of performing a relevant ministry in England with the instruments of his learning.

Once he had committed his talents to the creation of
Toxophilus in English, Ascham had committed his scholarly life to one of action and application. "Surelie," he later wrote in The Scholemaster, "one example, is more valuable, both to good and ill, than xx. preceptes written in bookes" (p. 218). His next step was to accumulate experience to join with his learning so that he might provide such examples for the benefit of his fellow Englishmen. "What I would really like," he wrote to John Redman in 1544, "is a secretaryship to some ambassador on the continent." As it turned out Ascham obtained the very position he had wished for, with Sir Richard Morison at the court of Charles V. The Report of Germany was his next effort to relate the scholarly precepts he had learned at St. John's to the realities of contemporary life.
CHAPTER III

A REPORT OF GERMANY

The Causes of Tragedy

As the years passed after the publication and successful reception of Toxophilus, Roger Ascham inevitably attained greater security and comfort as a St. John's scholar, lecturer, and tutor. His many friends in court, scholars like Smith and Cheke and courtiers such as Paget, the Astleys, and Bishop Gardiner, gave Ascham a sense of familiarity in court activities without the attendant insecurity which affected each of these friends at one time or another before 1550. Yet while his way of life gradually ceased to cause him anxiety, it increasingly caused apprehension for those who tried to keep their comrade in line. President of the Society of Fellows and acting master of St. John's in 1547, Ascham was reprimanded by all of his superiors up to the chancellor of the University for permitting open debate on the legitimacy of private masses and the question of transubstantiation of the eucharist, a controversy just beginning to be the focus of Catholic-Protestant disagreement. He claimed that without open, discrete debate the questions could never be understood,
nor could men ever decide the meaning of the scriptures. He lost, temporarily. In 1548, however, after the death of William Grindal, Elizabeth's tutor and Ascham's protégé in Latin and Greek, Ascham was chosen by the princess to replace his previous student. Although modest in a letter to Cheke (I, 161) concerning his aptitude for the position, Ascham accepted Elizabeth's offer, only to meet with opposition from her guardian, Seymour, until the princess finally had her way. Beginning then somewhat awkwardly, Ascham quickly adapted to his court duties and continued as Elizabeth's tutor and secretary for nearly two years. In January of 1550, however, having again run afoul of some member of Elizabeth's retinue, Ascham was dismissed, without disgrace but certainly with a great deal of embarrassment and anger.

Still, Ascham retained his position as Public Orator at Cambridge as well as his fellowship; he was in no danger of ruin. By the summer of 1550 Cheke managed to arrange for him an appointment as secretary to Sir Richard Moryson, the new ambassador to the court of Charles V, then at Augsburg. In September Ascham headed for London after a vacation in Yorkshire, stopping by the way at Hatfield to restore himself to Elizabeth's favor.

The ambassadorial party left London the twenty-first of September, 1550, and Ascham's letters show him as excited as a school boy about his adventure. Beginning with
the stop at Canterbury, before crossing to France, he allows his descriptive powers free rein as he describes the course of their journey. He has made a special point, he says later in the trip, "to see all abbeys, friaries, churches, libraries, stationers for books, goldsmiths for old coins. I marked the manners, order, and raiment of each age: I marked the site, the building, the strength, the walls, the ditches, gates, ports, and havens of every town, and what opportunities either by water or land, each town set by" (I, 247). He would like to take all these experiences back to St. John's intact; "if I were with you at a problem fire, I would make you partakers of a great deal of my journey . . . . Our young gentlemen [In the ambassadorial party] were much desirous many times to go out with me, but more desirous quickly to bring me in again; thus I stopped more by them than they provoked by me left things I would gladly have seen" (I, 247). Yet the eager Ascham saw a great deal, and responded to what he saw. The remarkably detailed description of the wind in Toxophilus was a beginning—in his letters home Ascham demonstrates again and again the extent of his involvement as observer and his desire to transmit both the particularity of his observation and the essence of his involvement to his readers. His descriptions are never impartial, never totally detached, yet neither are they distorted by excessive reaction. Ascham relates his experiences as though he were a
s惊叹 at a good play, aware of the physical reality of what he sees, but enjoying the aesthetic or moral, but always empathetic, response the action calls for. In Brus­
sels he described for Edward Raven and his colleagues, in his usual diary-like sequence, a chance encounter with Eleonore, Dowager Queen of France:

5th Oct. We tarried at Brussels all the day: being Sunday, I went to the mass, more to see than for devotion, some of you will think. The regent was with the emperor at Augusta; but the French queen, the emperor's sister, was there: she came to mass clad very solemnly all in white cameric, a robe gathered in plaits wrought very fair as might be with needle white work, as white as a dove. A train of ladies followed her, as black and evil as she was white. Her mass was sung in prick-song by Frenchmen very cunningly, and a gentleman played at the organs excellently. A French whipit Sir John, bestirred himself so at the altar as I wished Patrick by to have learned some of his knacks . . . . The regent of Flanders had left at Brussels a sort of fair lusty young ladies; they came not out, but were kept in mew for fear of goshawks of Spain and France; yet they came to mass, and stood above in windows, as well content to show themselves, as we to see them . . . . They seemed boys rather than ladies, excellent to have played in tragedies. There was not one well-favoured amongst them, save one young lady, fair and well-favoured." (I, 245-46)

Ascham's sensitivity to color and to the moral impli­
cations of relationships makes this passage memorable; so does his roguish observation about the quality of the ladies at the mass. Both in the description of Eleonor and in that of her ladies, one detail is contrasted with the general picture to provide depth and moving variety to the whole scene: the queen's white against the black of her train; the one well-favoured lady among the "boys" of the
regent's harem.

Such comparison of detail, as well as more logical causal analysis, are commonly Ascham's methods of description and response throughout his travels. Constantly delighting the reader, he often inserts homely details and some of the little surprises of his trip, such as how many loaves of bread they could buy for two-pence or how at Cologne, "We, entering the town, had thought every man a butcher, for almost in every shop there hang an ox and half a dozen sheep" (I, 250, 252). But the main body of his account is a more serious attempt to give his colleagues a fair assessment of the state of affairs on the continent:

This know, there is no country here to be compared for all things with England. Beef is little, lean, tough, and dear, mutton likewise; a rare thing to see a hundred sheep in a flock. Capons be lean and little; pigeons naught; a partridge as ill, black, and tough; corn enough everywhere, and most wheat. Here is never no dearth, except corn fail. The people generally be much like the old Persians that Xenophon describes, content to live with bread, roots, and water; and for this matter, ye shall see round about the walls of every city, half a mile compass from the walls, gardens full of herbs and roots, whereby the cities most part do live. No herb is stolen, such justice is exercised. These countries be rich by labour and continuance of man, not by goodness of the soil. (I, 250)

This paragraph is typical of Ascham's observation during his travels. Arrested by the strangeness of the details, he first takes into account the oddities; then, as his gaze continues to scan the scene, these elements begin to join, suggesting new, more general, conclusions modified somewhat from his first response. Thus this paragraph
begins by pointing out the apparent poverty of the low-
lands but ends in appreciation of a different sort of wealth
of a more abstract character than Ascham had first con-
sidered. The honesty of his examination and his openness to
modification of premises make possible a continually growing
understanding and tolerance of his new environment, and an
ability to share this growth, reporting not only the sights
but also his evaluation of them.

Ascham could not have picked a more dramatic time to
become attached to the Emperor's court. The 1550's saw the
climax and the start of the denouement of Charles' hectic
reign—a period when nowhere in his vast empire was his
power secure, when his sovereignty was opposed by the
Protestants in Germany, by Henry II of France, by the Pope,
and by several of the Italian princes as well, not to
mention a continuing war with the Turks, whose leader picked
up lands and allies almost as fast as Charles lost them.
The dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in the form con-
trolled by Charles had been spreading for years, most
openly since the German acceptance of Luther's religion, a
turn of events of which the emperor's rival, France, took
advantage by offering alliances with the German dukes.
Unable to control the fringes of his empire and desperate
to return all Christendom to the Roman church, Charles could
do little to stop the transfers of power and loyalty. In
1552 his court was forced to flee from Innsbruck in great
embarrassment when the German Elector Maurice of Saxony marched near; and in 1553 the emperor had to abandon his siege of Metz, a city newly allied with France, for lack of results as well as funds.

Ascham realized the importance of the events he witnessed and kept careful notes on what he saw and heard. As Ambassador Moryson's secretary he was in good position to listen to the variety of opinions expressed by other ambassadors and officials at the Emperor's court representing foreign powers of varying loyalty and friendship; and he drew his conclusions at court, as he did those in his travels, only after surveying the evidence.

Although the English king was not directly involved in Charles' difficulty, he had vital interests in the state of Charles' empire, relying on the emperor's ability to keep peace for his own sovereignty as well as for the maintenance of English possessions on the continent and English trade arrangements. The English observers were therefore at once involved and detached. Ascham claims his impartiality in the Report of Germany in these terms: "I playing no part of no one side, but sittyng downe as indifferent looker on, neither Imperiall nor Frisch, but flat English do purpose with troth to report the matter" (p. 127). Yet, while it is true that Ascham's sympathies were "flat English," he was not quite an "indifferent looker on," for his inculcated sense of obedience to legitimate monarchy gave him a
definite respect for the Holy Roman Emperor, while his ardent Protestantism aligned him solidly with the German cause and against the Pope and the conniving King of France. Where the emperor and the German princes were in conflict Ascham was most objective and willing to find fault on both sides. In all of his observation, both in his letters and in the Report, Ascham virtually never lets his evaluations reflect emotional extremism. Except for those regarding the Pope his assessments are remarkably fair, and compared with other histories of his time even his outbursts and innuendos against Rome are decidedly moderate.3

A Report and Discourse written by Roger Ascham, of the affaires and state of Germany and the Emperour Charles his court, duryng certaine yeares while the sayd Roger was there, as it was published posthumously from the manuscripts left to Ascham's wife, is unfinished. Ascham's original plans for the work are partly expressed by him and may be in part surmised. In October, 1552, he mentions in a letter to Johann Sturm that he has been keeping a daily record of the singular events of the court since its flight from Innsbruck, some of which, because of his closeness to its affairs, he cannot now disclose (I, 338). By July of 1553, when the Report was underway, he explained its purpose more specifically for John Cheke:

I am now describing some of the causes for which Parma,
Salerno, Brandenburg, and Saxony have deserted the Emperor; then I am compiling an uninterrupted daily memoir of what occurred in the Emperor's court from the flight out of Innsbruck up to the abandoning of the siege of Metz ... In these affairs I follow the truth; I do not seek eloquence. In fact I am writing in English, for myself alone and my colleagues of the problem-fire, and so not for the daylight but for evening, so that we may while away the coming wintry nights among ourselves with recollections and pleasant discussion of these things. (I, 365; my translation)

From these statements and from references in the Report itself, we can conclude something about the projected form of the work, but his comments about its disposition seem contradicted by other evidence. Ascham obviously planned to begin his history with the fragment we now have, an analysis of the characters involved, their motives, and their relationships. He planned to follow this with a sequential narrative, like his letters home, of his own journey to the court at Augsburg, attempting to involve his readers in the atmosphere of the court. He would, he says, "as it were carry you, out of England with me ... even to the Emperours Court ... And I will let you see in what case it stode, and what thyngs were in doyng when we came first thether." Ascham's desire to engage his readers rather than merely to inform them, is clear: "After I wil cary you and that a pace, because the chiefest matters be throughly touched in this my former booke, through the greatest affaires of ij. yeares in this Court" (p. 169). The survey was to carry the progress through Duke Maurice's seizure of Augsburg, April 4, 1552. Be-
ginning with his movement toward Innsbruck and the flight of the court, May 20-23, Ascham planned to return to a daily record of events: "And theè because priuy practises, brast out into open sturres I might better marke thynges dayly then I could before. And so we will depart with the Emperour from Insburg, and see dayly what chaunces were wrought by feare and hope in this Court till hys Maistie left the siege of Metz, and came downe hether to Bruxels" (p. 169).

The Report, then, was to contain four sections: first, and most thorough, the general analysis we now have; second, a daily account of Ascham's journey to the Court and his impressions of it upon his arrival, taken from the journal from which he wrote his letters to St. John's; third, a detailed but brief account of the affairs of the Court from 1550 to 1552, stopping with the capture of Augsburg by Maurice and Albert of Brandenburg; finally, another daily record of events from the Innsbruck episode to the arrival of the court at Brussels, February 6, 1553. This plan is unique in historiography. Nowhere had any historian sought such variety in presentation as Ascham envisioned for his Report, such careful consideration of the relationship between form and content in historical narrative. Ascham is the only Renaissance historian to depart from a strict chronology in the unfolding of events. While Machiavelli or Comines, and later Sleidan and Bodin prac-
ticed some telescoping of time in order to emphasize certain periods over others, they were still restricted by the chronicler's custom of describing time by reference to events rather than describing the events themselves. Ascham's method of treating history as an analysis of character is a radical departure from the methods of his contemporaries. Besides his organizational innovations, Ascham is the only writer of his time to deal exclusively with current history, except for Paolo Giovio (Jovius), whose work was notoriously biased even for his own time, and whose failure may have influenced Ascham to write. Machiavelli, like some other Italian historians writing a complete, chronological national history, planned to include contemporary events in his Florentine History, but he never completed the work, and it stops with the death of Cosimo de Medici in 1492. Johannes Sleidan, Ascham's friend and correspondent, followed Ascham in 1560 with an account of the religious history of Europe since Luther's excommunication. Despite Ascham's acknowledged debts to Livy and Polybius, his own Report illustrates his ingenious efforts to seek more viable ways to make scholarship—or any orthodoxy—demonstrate a present reality not always in accord with conventions. Ascham was not a rebel, but he was certainly independent when honesty demanded, and was not afraid to be original in a time when tradition was a mainstay of culture.

Lacking all but the first of the Report's four parts,
we can only guess at the effect of the entire plan or whether indeed Ascham finished it during his leisure at Brussels. The diary-like form of his six narrative letters to St. John's, however, and the repetitions of description in them and in the Report give us a fair sense of the lively and sometimes indecorous detail we might have expected. We cannot be so sure about Ascham's plans for the disposition of the work. In spite of his modest protestation to Cheke about the casual nature of his report, Ascham has constructed a very artfully poised introduction which serves, as did the introduction to Toxophilus, as an apologia for the work's lack of school elegance and sets an informal tone for the entire discourse. Framed as a response to a letter from John Astley, the Report begins as an epistle, and so Ascham avoids the formal requirements of a public treatise. "I will," he warns Astley, "homely and rudely (yet not altogether disorderly) part privately unto you such notes of affairs as I privately marked for my selfe . . . . In declaryng to you these thyngs I will obserue onely the first two pointes of our wont communication; that is to my writyng I will set forward nothyng that is false, nor yet keepe backe any thyng that is true . . . . Therefore let my purpose of reportyng the troth as much content you, as the meane handlyng of the matter may mislike you" (p. 127).

But of course the very eloquence of Ascham's request
belies the modesty of his avowal. In fact, his address to Astley rather than Edward Raven or another of his St. John's colleagues contradicts his statement to Cheke. Astley was a member of Elizabeth's train, a courtier at Hatfield house. Although he was a good friend of Ascham's, no correspondence between them is known to exist save this published request and response. Enough of the peculiarities in the style of "Astley's" letter resemble Ascham's own style that it is not unreasonable to suppose that Ascham himself devised the letter as a means of introducing the Report, or at least rewrote a letter from Astley to serve as superficial excuse for writing (one could imagine Astley's surprise at receiving a fifty-page letter from his friend in Brussels!).

Further, the work contains other conventions of published material, such as section titles, marginal glosses, and internal reference to the surviving section as a "booke" (p. 169). Some of these might have been supplied by an editor, but others must be Ascham's. These, the unified structure of the work, and the finished state of its eloquence (however much Ascham denied using ornament), added to the contrived introduction, suggest strongly that the Report was meant for distribution to a wide and critical audience. Much literary work still escaped the surer immortality of the press in Ascham's day, but this evidence, in light of Ascham's opinion of Paolo Giovio's history and Sturm's encouragement that he write a history of the court's
activities (after it was in fact already begun), suggest that if Ascham had originally intended the work to be informal and for his friends' eyes only, he must have changed his mind before completing the version we now have. 8

Whatever Ascham's intentions, he had excellent reasons for delaying promulgation of his treatise. Simply on the surface of things, Ascham became very busy at about the time he was finishing the Report. Awaiting relief in Brussels, the Ambassadorial party learned suddenly of King Edward's death, and waited anxiously during the brief interregnum while reports of Northumberland's abortive attempt to crown Lady Jane Grey came to them from England. When they were recalled in August, it was because Mary, now securely enthroned, had appointed her own envoy to the emperor's court. Mary had remained loyal to the Roman church throughout the English Reformation and now reestablished national ties with the Pope and the other Catholic powers. As the Marian persecutions became organized, Ascham's strongly Protestant and openly anti-papist Report was hardly a wise choice for publication. Although he retained his fellowship and office of Public Orator at Cambridge, his main living had just been snatched away. His first interest was to get it back. Accordingly, while maintaining his Protestant views, he rather emphasized his secular and professional abilities in his communications with his old friend Gardiner, now Mary's most trusted advisor, and succeeded in gaining even more
security under Mary than he had enjoyed during the reigns of her predecessors. The Report was put away unfinished, and Ascham never returned to it.

Approaching the Report for analysis, then, one ought to keep in mind that its author was this time fully as involved in worldly events as he had been removed from them when he wrote Toxophilus; he is more aware, less defensive of his premises. Moreover, he is more mature than the author of Toxophilus, more firmly established as a scholar and generally as a contributing member of society; yet he is still careful to protect his interests. Ascham writes this time a serious, straightforward attempt at the art of historiography, for which many classical precedents stand as criteria of his own effort; but it is an attempt he feels confident that he is qualified to make. "What better commodotie to know the trouth any writer in Grecke, Latine or other young hath had, I can not perceiue, except onely Xenophon, Caesar, and Phillip Comines," he claims in his introduction (p. 127). As a result of his confidence and serious purpose one finds much less digression, or rather less severe digression. The narrative is adroit, plain, and fluent, while descriptive portraits are colored with Ascham's love of detail and structured according to his moral bias; yet his practice is more restrained here than in Toxophilus or the letters to St. John's. The center of his focus in the Report of Germany is, as it is in all his
work, the particular beauties and ugliness which must appear in a realistic portrait of human activity.

Ascham's tone, more accurately in this case the artistic projection of his point of view, is the first general stylistic element to strike the reader of the Report. His tone is intriguing and unique, because in the course of a history of the most important imperial events of his time, Ascham refuses to become pedantic or even formal in any traditional sense. His epistolary introduction provides an excuse for his informality, but it is only a device, a sort of technical apologia, not in itself the cause of Ascham's colloquial presentation. The straightforwardness in his tone is the same characteristic which prompted him in 1545 to write a dialogue on archery in English rather than an essay on some other, more dignified subject (by academic standards) in Latin. The elegance of classical language would have been easier for him than English, but it could not provide the directness of expression required by a "flat" Englishman trying to speak openly to his countrymen. Here, again in English, Ascham's topic is manifest and direct—he need not place his treasure in a deceptively trivial craft; his authority is obviously indisputable and no one would question the legitimacy or the value of a historiam sui temporis from his pen. Consequently the colloquiality of Ascham's style appears not, as it did so readily in Toxophilus, in deceptive triviality or irony but
in other details of the Report. The same openness which brought about his ill-fated sanction of religious debates at Cambridge has created the directness of his vision here.

One common touch is his very use of English. In the beautiful Latin letter in which Ascham described the contents of the Report to John Cheke, he wrote, "There was a time when I could have given a tolerable polish to these subjects even in Latin; but the stream of pure diction, drawn from those springs which you opened so plentifully to me and others, is now dried up: the whetstone of your learning and teaching once sharpened my style, but it is now blunted." Ascham is of course flattering Cheke here, but he is also drawing a distinction which is not altogether apologetic. Ascham has been writing and reading fluent Latin consistently even on the continent; his letters show that he can still polish his subject admirably in Latin. But he chooses not to. He separates polish, purity, and keenness from bluntness. He is no longer comfortable in the pure streams of elegance taught to him by Cheke; such extremes of refinement cannot endure long in a real world, and if Ascham is to apply his knowledge to real events he must seek a more natural and more comfortable medium than the ornate fluency of conventional Latin eloquence. As Ascham himself points out, More's History of Richard III is his only English precedent in the use of a "playne and open" style accommodated to the subject—a notable one,
but much more limited than Ascham's vision of the Report (p. 126). And yet the overwhelming trait in all of More's prose, Latin and English, is the same sort of antipedantic bluntness that appears in Ascham's English. In this respect at least the two are kindred souls.

Ascham's choice of the vernacular itself points toward his resistance to formality, but so does the plainness of his use of the language. In the Report Ascham is not faced, as he was in Toxophilus, with the task of argumentative persuasion. Consequently he can speak quietly and with more familiarity to his audience. This relaxation, coupled with Ascham's increased confidence in his ability and his concern with directly transmitting his observation, creates a stylistic irony: Ascham is much less self-conscious in the Report than he was in Toxophilus. The use of "I" noticeably diminishes in his prose, showing up principally only when he refers to himself as eye-witness testimony in support of a possibly challengeable point ("And this behaviour I marked well in hym when I dyned in his company at the siege of Metz . . ." [pp. 146-47]). Otherwise the "I" usually appears only when Ascham is excusing himself for excluding some material which perhaps ought to be present—that is, when he feels less certain of his course of action and so somewhat more self-conscious ("... which whole battaile because it is notable, I would here at length describe, but that I should wander to
farre from my purposd matter: and therfore I in an other
place, or els some other with better oportunitie shall at
large report the matter" \( \text{p. 1637} \).

Ascham's point of view as a private, interested, but
uncommitted observer is consistent. He looks most closely
at events which might arouse the curiosity of an informed
layman, a private individual not directly concerned with
the political moves of the court. Outlining the causes of
the Duke of Salerno's defection, for example, Ascham
spends the most space on the obnoxious way in which the
neighboring Viceroy of Naples treated his suitors, less on
Salerno's frustrations at the Emperor's hands, and practi­
cally none on the political realities of his alliance with
the Turks. Ascham seems to search out colorful and sensa­
tional details for his history, not misrepresenting fact
but emphasizing those points which appear to him most
interesting. In his letters, for example, Ascham describes
in detail the series of naval engagements surrounding the
imperial capture of Africa (Tunis) and the Turkish retal­
iation at Tripoli. In the Report he boils three pages (I,
310-12) down to one \( \text{p. 130} \), offering only this anecdote of
all the activities during the period: "... they within
\( \text{The city of Africa} \) yelded, on this condition to part safe
with bag and baggage which was graunted by the generall.
But assoone as the \text{Turkes} entred the towne they put old
& yong, man, woman, and child to the sword sauing two
hundred of the strongest men to be their Galley slaues for euer." This sort of excitement captures Ascham's attention more fully than the details of political maneuvering or even those of military skirmishes. Here Ascham differs most radically from even the more advanced historians of his day who, following the example of Bruni and Poggio, felt that accurate history ought to contain battle descriptions and invented speeches in order to transmit the tenor of events effectively. While Ascham does not lose accuracy, he does proportion his history to keep it interesting. A comparison of his exploitation of sensational elements will demonstrate his attempt to involve the reader in much more than intellectual chronology and political strategem. In October, 1551, Ascham wrote to Raven of a gruesome incident in the Turkish camp:

A noble gentleman of Ferdinand's court, which hath served stoutly against the Turks, was taken and brought to the Basha of Buda. Great ransom was proffered, but none received. Certain great dogs were kept hungry, and after many spites and villainies done to the gentleman in prison, he was brought forth, and tormentors appointed did cut gobbets of flesh from his body, even there where the villainy should grieve him more than the pain, and did cast these gobbets so cut to the dogs, that ate them in the gentleman's sight. When so many gobbets were cut off, and cast to the dogs, as life would afford, then the dogs were let loose, and so tore him all in pieces. (I, 309)

But if this seems gory, consider the revised version placed by Ascham into the Report:

The Bassa of Buda, tooke in a skirmish a gentleman of the kyng of Romanes; for whose delivery men for entreaty and money for hya raunson were sent to Buda.
The Bassa appointed a day to give them an answer, and at
time and place assigned, called for them and sent for
the gentleman likewise. And suddenly came out two hangmen
bare armed with great butchers knives in their hands
bringing with them certaine bandogges musled kept hungry
without meate of purpose: the Bassa bad them do their
feate: who coming to the gentleman stripped him naked,
and bound him to a piller, after with their knives they
cut of his flesh by gobbets and flang it to the dogges.
Thus ye poore gentlemãn suffred griefe great for ye payne,
but greater for the spight: nor so tormëted in feelyng
his fleshe mangled with kniues, as in seyng him selfe
peece meale deuoured by dogges. And thus as long as hee
felt any payne they cut him in collops, and after they
let their dogges lose vpon him to eate vp the residue
of him, that ye griefe which was ended in him being dead
might yet continue in his frendes lookyng on. (p. 131)

Ascham has rearranged the details to provide the greatest
dramatic effect. To begin with, he drops his original
elaboration concerning the gentleman's identity, for his
only function in the scene is as a pawn. Ascham wants the
emphasis on the action, not on the victim alone. The syntax
in the revised version is much more active. In the original
version the first seven transitive verbs (or verbals where
the auxiliary has been omitted) are all passive. In the
revised version, nine instead of seven verbs are used up
to the same point in the story and only one, the second, is
passive. The method of Ascham's expansion adds to the sus­
pense and so to the horror of the deed. Where the first
version simply reports that ransom was offered, "but none
received," in the second Ascham creates a dramatic, if
sinister, confrontation. We must wait with the messengers
to find the Bassa's decision, and even then the events
unfold for the reader as they might to the spectator of a
Roman tragedy, each more frightening in its implications and the climax most horrible of all. Ascham increases the tension almost a word at a time as he proceeds to describe "two hangmen"—"bare armed"—with "great butchers knives"—"in their hands"—and so on until the physical and rapid "stripped him naked and bound him to a pillar" breaks the scene into its grotesque activity. The worst of the description over, and apparently with the original version in his diary before him, Ascham provides relieving distance by structuring his syntax and moralizing on the irony of the situation. The skeleton of his contrasting but cumulative parallels is contained in the original ("the villainy should grieve him more than the pain"), but he expands it and complicates it, then extends the same parallel to the spectators of the execution as well. The direction of the revision is constantly toward heightened emotional involvement of the reader produced by the exploitation of the dramatic potential of details and the multiplied moral effect of aphoristic reflection.

Yet however much Ascham may amplify details, he uses his anecdotes functionally in his history. The account of the torture just described, for example, is only half of Ascham's attempt to show that not only the Turks but also the Christians have been bestial in their conduct of affairs. His conclusion, after describing a similar action by Christians upon three Turks, is that, "For these foule deedes
I am not so angry with the Turkes that began them as I am sorry for the Christen men that follow them" (p. 132). He also concludes that one must balance his judgment of the Turks with an honest understanding of their motives, too. Ascham ends his discussion of the Turks with a very favorable appraisal from a reputable witness. The long-range effect of his anecdote is to show that there is ugliness on both sides—that the Turks, like the Christians, are human.

Ascham's anecdotes and descriptions are much more apropos of his subject than are those of Sir Thomas Hoby, his former student, who also toured the continent during this period. In his travel journal, also posthumously published, Hoby like Ascham relates his experiences and occasional reflections on the events he has witnessed. The great difference between his observations and Ascham's is Hoby's lack of involvement. His detachment is so great as to suggest a lack of awareness. His description of Rome, for example—on his first visit—is disappointingly curt compared with Ascham's excitement in Cologne or Antwerp:

After Mr. Barker, Mr. Parker, Whitehorn and I had throughlie searched out suche antiquities as were here to bee seene from place to place, having bestowed all this time of our beeing here about the same, we thought it but losse of time to make anie longer abode here.\[15\]

Hoby expressed no feeling about his experience and would seem to have felt little beyond a bland intellectual curiosity about architecture, antiquities, and anecdotal history. His anecdotes, where they occur, aim at mild
titillation, and, contrary to Ascham's practice, they usually bear little relation to the primary subjects of his narrative. Of a near disaster on his way to Naples, Hoby writes:

In a little port under the hill lye manle times Moores and Turks with their foistes and other vesselles to take the passinger vesselles that goo betwixt Roome and Naples. And we were afterward enformed that this time laye ix, so that yf we had cum bye yt by daye as we did by night, we had bine all taken slaves. From hense we sailed to Gaieta . . . . (p. 27)

Again he neglects any opportunity to take artistic advantage of the close call, ignoring even the chance to elaborate about the practices of the Turks, such a universally favorite subject among Englishmen. When he does elaborate, Hoby is interested only in the story, not in its relevance to his exposition. The following anecdote is inserted without explanation into Hoby's description of Duke Maurice's capture of Innsbruck after the flight of the emperor:

Duke Maurice cam to Ynspruck, where he touched nothing that belonged not to the Emperor. Without the town on the other side of the river there dwellete on the hilles side in a faire house a gunfounder, on of the best in his science of all Christendom, a verie discreate and sober parson. This mann (as he told my brother the tale) had a xx great peecs of artillarie in hand for the Duke of Alava, which he minded to carie into Spaine. Upon these peecs the Duke had caawsed to be graven the armes of Philipp, Lansgrave of Hess, with his stile, which was the Emperor's prisoner, and all for a certain vain glorie that menn shuld beleve he had gotten them in the feeld by prowess of armes. The Lansgrave's sonn, who was in Duke Maurice hoost, seeing those peecs there with his father's armes upon them, ceased upon them and tooke them awaye with him, geving to the gunfounder's wyff an hundrethe crowncs to drinke. (pp. 80-81)
While Ascham might have been amused at the irony Hoby illustrates, he would not have included an incident so materially irrelevant in his own history. For Ascham the picturesque must also be useful for his greater purposes. He is therefore quick to give his personal evaluation of activities. His purpose is, as stated in the Astley letter, "markyng diligently and notyng truely" all the great affairs of the court (p. 124); but his observations are directed toward exposing the "miserable tragedie" he found (p. 128).

Ascham's willingness to evaluate ought not to be interpreted as an extravagance. His opinions are restrained, and he avoids extremities of emotion in his judgments. With the exception of his anti-papal feelings, he comes upon his subjects without firm preconceptions and never with so much as a hint of malice or insult toward a potential reader. Compare with Ascham's practice the favoritism of Giovio, the flattery of Machiavelli toward the Medicis, or even the prejudices of Ascham's own later compatriot, Spenser; in his polemic history, A View of the Present State of Ireland:

(The King's) only persone is often times in steade of an Armye to Contayne the vnrvly people from a thousandse evill occasions which that wretched kimgedome is for wante theareof daylye Carried into. The which when soo they make heade no lawes no penalties Cane restraine but that they doe in the violence of that furye treade downe and trample vnderfoote all bothe divine and hvmaine thinges and the lawes themselues they do speciallye rage at and rend in peces as moste repugnaunte to their libertye and naturall fredome which in their madness they affecte.16
Nowhere does Ascham's Report contain such blatant attributions of moral character as Spenser here indulges in. Ascham moralizes from observation; Spenser justifies moralization by modifying his observation. Ascham is much more restrained in his judgments, but honest enough to make them openly.

An ideal device for involving the reader in a work is imagery. Yet in the Report as in Toxophilus before it, Ascham employs remarkably few images. His goal is what the rhetoricians called enargia: "A man shall thincke not to be readyng but present in doyng of the same" (p. 126). To Ascham, unlike many English writers, this meant avoiding imagery except where it could serve a practical use; and of course Ascham refuses to climb in his imagery to an elevation beyond the comfortable acceptance of either himself or his readers. More metaphors appear in the Report of Germany than in Toxophilus, because the Report is a more serious work; but the figures Ascham uses are common, stock images used to clarify, or else they are obvious comparisons designed to identify correspondences. In the course of a single page near the beginning of the work, Ascham runs through four basic metaphors, disregarding the aesthetic consequences in his attempt to illustrate; yet none of the four is original or especially attractive. They compare the crumbling of the empire with a spring, a dramatic presentation, angling, and a sickness respectively.
The first two are uncomfortably combined in the following sentence:

And to keepe you no longer with my priuate talke from the matter it selfe, I will begyn at the sprynge of the matter from whence all these mischlefes dyd flow, the which now hath so overflown the most part of Christendome, as God onely from heauen must make an end of this miserable tragedie, wherein these two great Princes take such pleasure still to play. (p. 128)

Ascham tends to pick up metaphors when they present themselves and extend them until his material involves him too deeply or, as here, until another image happens along. But always his images are drawn from the average events of his life, not from alien sources. Fishing, brewery, games—these make up Ascham's metaphorical reserve; and while he may amuse the critic, he never shocks or misleads his reader with his choice. His real image is his subject—or rather its verbal counterparts, the example and the anecdote. Truth paints Ascham's picture for him, using as its medium his selective ability. As in Toxophilus Ascham picks out the heart of his example and surrounds it with a complex of detail which the reader must superimpose on his own imaginings to create a representation of the whole.

Such is the description of the gardens or shops of Cologne in his letters, (p. 90 above) and such is the nature of this one account in the Report:

Duke Ernestus, Marches Albert, and Lazarus Swendy sate at supper togethers: & as they were talkynge of ye Interim, the Marches soddenly brast out into a fury saying: what deuill? will ye Emperour neuer leaue striuynge with God in defacyng true Religiō and tossyng
the world in debarryng all mes liberties? addyng, that he was a Prince vnkynd to euery man, and kept touch with no mæ, that could forget all mens merites, & would deceiue whom soeuer he promised.

The Duke liked not this hoate talke in hys house and at his table, but sayd: Cosin you speake but merely, and not as you thincke, adding much the prayse of the Emperours gentlenes shewed to many, and of his promise kept withall. Well (quoth the Marches) if he had bene either kynde where men haue deserued or would haue performed that hee promised: neither should I at this tyme accuse hym, nor you haue sit here in this place to defende hym, for he promised to geue me this house with all the landes that thereto belongeth: but ye be affrayd, Cosin (quoth ye Marches) lest this talke be to loud, and so heard to farre of: when in deede if the Commissarie here, be so honest a man as I take him, and so true to his master as he should be, he will not fayle to say what he hath heard, and on the same addition Commissary I bryng thee good lucke, and drancke of vnto hym a great glasse of wine. (pp. 150-51)

In this anecdote Ascham uses the dramatic properties of a supposed conversation to draw three characters clearly and realistically. Both the marquis, Albert of Brandenburg, and the emperor's commissary, Lazarus Swendy, he has previously described; but here Ascham both proves the verity of his description and adds human depth to the characters, guiding the reader's insight. One sees the sullen, coarse Albert containing himself in the midst of false pleasantries until his sense of righteousness can tolerate no more. Upon his outburst the timid, syncophantic Ernest does everything possible for a frightened host to make light of such disrespectful language before the Emperor's own agent, the smooth and silent Lazarus Swendy. Yet Ascham shows us that however blunt Albert may be, he is also the wiser man in the honesty of his assessment and his
disdainful appraisal of Swendy. Nowhere in the account does Ascham spell out the characteristics he is portraying; rather, he outlines them, providing the focal details and allowing the reader to fill in the background. His spare delineation and avoidance of ornament accomplish the same effect in his prose that another contemporary artist, Hans Holbein, managed to achieve in his own sketched portraits of the great men of his time. Holbein is unique among contemporary artists in eschewing ornateness, in striving for a plain delineation in which the focal details project character as an impression of the viewer. His result is a more exact if less charming reality, for he, like Ascham, allows the observer to fit his own assumptions over the artist's detail. Any fakery is the spectator's, not the artist's.

The plainness of Ascham's description is reflected in, and partly created by, the syntactical looseness of his narrative. Word order, like imagery, ushers the reader through the real events rather than lecturing to him about them. This is what Ascham meant when he told Cheke that the Report was a work for evenings at fireside, not for work days. It would not do to present this report in stylized lectures. The form of Ascham's narrative resembles Morris Croll's description of the loose style of the seventeenth century. 17 His long sentences contain series of coordinate clauses, joined by simple conjunctions. Any
subordination proceeds from clauses well into the period, coming as it were spontaneously from the writer's concentration on his subject and its implications. This combination of parataxis and hypotaxis is sometimes cumbersome, causing Ascham to stray from his initial subject in digressions or to repeat himself in order to hold onto his subject. It often leads to inconclusive statements which more or less force the writer to summarize aphoristically. But the uneven character of the syntax, sometimes rambling, then collected into aphorism before rambling again, effects, long before Montaigne or Sir Thomas Browne employed "baroque" techniques, a spontaneity of expression which is the hallmark of open, honest thought. As was the case in Toxophilus, it is difficult to separate a single sentence in the Report, for each one depends heavily on those around it; the following description of the outbreak of hostilities in Parma will serve as an example of the loose style of the Report's narrative:

The Byshop seyng that he must either begyn the mischief or els it would not on so fast as he wished to have it, set lustely vpon it: and first cited Octauio, after excommunicated him, and shortly after besieged Parma ayded both with m§ and money by the Emperour: which thynge the French kyng began to stomach, thincKyng that y® Emperour dyd offer him both wrong & dishonor in not suffring him beyng a kyng to helpe a poore man that fled to his ayde. And thus these two princes first helping others began by litle and litle to fall out them selues. (p. 135)

Ascham's expression works in clusters of emphasis, held together by participles in the manner familiar from Toxo-
philus. Having molded one clause, he looks to its posterior elements for a springboard for expansion; hence each major element depends from a subordinate unit of the preceding clause. It is through these participial suspensions that Ascham's syntax progresses, but the location of their origin is responsible for continued digressive tendencies. In this case Ascham moves from a cluster involving the Pope ("Byshop") and mischief to a verb phrase amplifying the subordinate concept of the dispatch required to accomplish the mischief. This brings about the tripartite list of actions, suggesting the Pope's suddenness by its multiplicity. The third action, however, is the only one which spurs a new cluster, "ayded with m§"; but this cluster rather than the original one is modified by the next clause, "which thyng . . . ." Ascham has now strayed from the Pope to the Emperor, and the concept of the Emperor's aid has reminded him of the antagonism this brought to the French king. The next cluster of phrases depends on the French king, then, and in order to end the period Ascham is forced into a general summary, aphoristic in its irony, concerning only the Emperor and the King. In this period as in many of Ascham's, each concept runs into the next, each is qualified only after it has been presented in a barer essence than the writer finally settles on. Only the whole collection of sentences can be taken as the whole expression of the writer. Ascham sees complexity and will not reduce it to
simplistic extremes; he still seeks moderation in his own outlook and an honest transmutation of physical action to verbal expression.

Yet moderation is not so pervasive a characteristic of the Report as it is of Toxophilus. Much of Ascham's syntax is plain, but while that plainness represents an honest attempt to reproduce the truth and a refusal to sacrifice fact to rigidity in art, nevertheless the most obvious change in his syntax from Toxophilus to the Report is an increase in structuring, with less tendency toward conceptual compromise than before. Structured syntax is not continuous in the Report, but it is persistent. In the process of a fresh reading by a twentieth-century audience, Ascham's artifice seems both unnatural and, worse, inconsistent with the plainness I have examined above. The two types of style, plain and ornate, seem to strive against each other for the reader's involvement. The grating produces an apparent deficiency of style, a syntax which distracts the reader in its unevenness. Thus in the following passage Ascham shifts from loose narrative into structured eloquence:

... for in ye former warres of Germany being on ye Emperours side he fell into the handes of Duke John Fridericke of Saxony, which chance he is charged sore withall by Luice de Auila and that with so spightfull and open a mouth, as moused the Marches to offer hym the combat as I sayd before. He is now most courageous in hardest adventures, most cherefull in present ieo-perdy, and most paynefull in greatest labours: hauyng no souldier vnder him, that can better away with heate
and cold or longer suffer hunger and thirst then he him selfe. His apparell is soildier like, better known by his feare doynges then by his gay goyng: His soildiours feare him for his stoutnes, and loue him for his liberallitie: which winneth to him authoritie fit for a stout Captaine, and worketh in them obediciéce due to good soildiours. (p. 147)

The second half of this passage, beginning with "He is now most courageous . . .," is disappointingly rigid when it is compared with Ascham's blunter narrative or wonderfully indecorous descriptions. It is stiff and relatively unfeeling, and Ascham had obviously chosen his diction and syntax more for artistic convenience than for an honest representation of truth. If, however, we grant Ascham certain assumptions his colleagues would have allowed, much of this conflict will dissolve and these two apparently contradictory styles may be seen to work, at least by Renaissance standards of art, in a complementary fashion. The first assumption is expressly stated by Ascham in his espousal of stylistic standards at the beginning of the Report: "The stile must be alwayes playne and open: yet sometime higher and lower as matters do ryse and fall" (p. 126). Style must reflect the significance of the event described. When the subject becomes elevated so ought the style. A corollary of this assumption tells the sensitive modern reader that style will also become more elevated as the author's emotions become more involved in his discourse, both because he holds a dear subject in high regard and for the psychological reason that makes us all "climb up on a
soap box" and "orate" whenever we get upset about any topic. We can expect Ascham's prose to become more rhetorical—and very naturally—whenever his subject is grand or whenever he feels an especially strong personal involvement in his discourse.

A second assumption, also present in Ascham's statement on style, is that art ought to be a pleasant experience for the observer, either by involving him empathetically ("not to be readyng but present in doyng") or by presenting beauty in the demonstration of relationships of which he was not previously aware. In the Report Ascham's plain style provides the energetic involvement in the episodic narrative, while for elevation, beauty, and moral lessons he turns characteristically to contrasting parallels in passages of static description and evaluation. The plain style is for factual description of events; the structured, for impressionistic portraits. These static sections, usually sketches of the characters involved or analyses of their actions, concurrently deal with the most elevated subject matter—the royal personages—and so the heightening of style here is doubly appropriate from a sixteenth-century standpoint if it is uneven from ours. The following passage describes Duke Maurice of Saxony after his breach with the Emperor:

Hetherto the Germaines much mislyked the doynges of Duke Maurice. But after that he had felt him selfe so unkyndly abused as for his good service to be made the
betrayer of his father, he tooke such matters in hand & brought them so to passe, as he recouered the loue of his countrey and purchased such hate of his enemies, as the Spanyardes tooke their displeasure from all other, and bestowed wholly vpon the Duke Maurice; and yet he bare him selfe with such wit, and courage agaynst them, as they had alwayes cause to feare hym and never occasion to contemne hym: Yea if he had liued he would sooner men thinke haue driuen all Spanyardes out of Germany, then they should haue hurt hym in Saxony, for he had ioyned vnto him such strength, and there was in him such pollicie, as they durst neuer haue come vppon him with power, nor neuer should haue gone beyond hym with wit.

Ascham uses such parallels because of the dignity of his subject; further, the contrasting elements help him to show in a slightly simplified way the great change which had taken place in Maurice—a change which was for Ascham to the good. Both intense feeling and elevation of subject bring about the structured balance of concepts in his style. Each of the main characters of the history is introduced in a similarly ornate way. Of the Prince of Salerno Ascham says:

This Prince in this court is much beloued for his getlenes and openly praised for his wisedome, & greatly lamented for his fortune, who before tyme hath done so good and faythfull seruice to the Emperour: that I haue heard some in this Court say, which loue the Emperour well and serue him in good place, that their master hath done the Prince so much wrong, as he could do no leasce then he dyd . . . . (pp. 139-40)

The cumulative parallels take on the aspect of conventional panegyric, but Ascham is sincere in his evaluations. His description of the much admired Duke John Frederick of Saxony, for example, coincides in its details with Hoby's sketch of the Duke in his journal. According to Hoby,
The example of constancie and verie mirrour of true magnanimitie in these our daies to all princes, died this yere Jhon Fridericke, Duke of Saxonie, a mann for his singular virtues, faithfull meaning, and true dealing with all men, no less prayesed emong his enemes than his lyff missed emong his frendes, and lamented of bothe. And such a on as with stowtnes of mind alwais prefarred an uncorrupt and stedfast lyving before the continually threatenings of a shamefull death, whiche he was manie times nighe unto. So that neyther threatenings nor faire promises of libertie or great worldlie siniories were of anie force at all to make his mind and conscience to annye manne's appetite or desire flexible or easie to be entreated. (p. 97)

Hoby's eulogy demonstrates the convention of balanced structure. As he relates the virtues of the duke, he is careful to swing from one pole to the other, providing genuine antitheses as he progresses from virtue through reputation to acts in a creditable formal manner. The polarities are a means not only of beauty but also of amplification; Hoby appears to be covering all possible ground as he shifts from one extreme to the other. And, as in Ascham's praise of the Prince of Salerno, one wonders about the sincerity of the adulation. As he draws to the end of his comment, Hoby is so committed to parallel structure that he breaks the last three important words into tautological pairs solely for the rhythmical effect.

Ascham's praise of John Frederick appears nearly identical on the surface. The parallels are there, scanning the possibilities of physical description (missed by Hoby), virtues, reputation, and acts for a complete achievement in the rhetorical tradition. Yet Ascham's praise is quite
Duke John Fredericke is now 50 yeares of age, so byg of personage as a very strong horse is scarce able to beare hym & yet is he a great deale bygger in all kynde of vertues, in wisedome, iustice, liberalitie, stoutnes, temperancy in hym self, and humanltie towards others, in all affaires, and either fortunes using a singular truth and stedfastnes: so that Luise de Avila, and the Secretary of Ferrare who wrote the story of the first warres in Germany, and professe to be his ernest enemies both for matters of state and also of Religion, were so compelled by his worthynes to say the truth as though theyr onely purpose had bene to write his prayse. He was five yeares prisoner in this Court, where he wan such loue of all men, as the Spanyardes now say: they would as gladly fight to set hym vp agayne as euer they dyd to pull hym downe: For they see that he is wise in all his doynges, iust in all hys dealynge, lowly to the meanest, princely with the biggest, and excellyng gentle to all, whom no aduersitie could euer moue, nor pollicy at any tyme entice to shrinke from God and his word. (p. 153)

To begin with, Ascham is nowhere near so concose as Hoby, because he uses concrete examples where Hoby is general. Where Hoby mentions "ennemies," Ascham identifies the Spaniards, those in the Emperor's court, and de Avila specifically as people won by the Duke's character. Ascham brings evidence to prove his conclusions even in panegyric. A further difference also contributing to the increased length of Ascham's praise is his reluctance to settle for extreme pairs of parallel traits. He is more likely to list a series of details in parallel than to settle for two opposites. Thus where Hoby introduces John Frederick's virtues as "constancie" and "magnanimitie," Ascham extends them to "wisedome, iustice, liberalitie, stoutnes, temperancy . . . humanltie . . . truth and stedfastnes."
Ascham's practice is to break down the whole into as many details as will appropriately show its complexity. Hoby, on the other hand, is content to provide the simpler extremes and allow the reader, if he wishes, to fill in between them. The result is that Ascham seems both more accurate and more sincere in his praise, since he has enumerated carefully the parts and has brought evidence to support them. Moreover, he virtually never resorts to tautology to provide the appearance of complexity which we see in Hoby. The complexity is in the subject itself, not merely in the writer's expression.

Aware of these differences, we can more easily realize that while Ascham does employ structured phrasing to beautify and emphasize his opinions, he exercises a great deal of responsibility and restraint in his use of it. He limits his ornateness to parallelism at various levels (contrasting phrases, series, occasional alliteration), showing by his structure connections and correspondences between concepts which the reader might not be expected otherwise to recognize as contiguous. While Ascham divides whole entities—such as John Frederick's "worthynes"—into piece-meal segments, he does this to show the complex and cumulative interrelationship of these lesser, more significant elements; almost never does he divide in order to indicate disparity or real contrariety. Ascham's elevation is functional in these respects and not merely
ornate. Moreover, while he imparts the formality of structure to his prose, he avoids other trappings or ornateness, such as Latinate diction, orotundity of sentence construction, or euphemism. His parallels serve to augment his descriptive ability by permitting the form of unity to show through the concrete multiplicity of his enumerative evidence.

When they are compared with passages from Toxophilus, Ascham's elevated analyses show themselves less moderate than his early work, less inclined toward compromise. Their characteristic sense now is cumulative, rather than conciliatory, yet still Ascham avoids the extremity of true antithesis and ignores opportunities for personal distortion or invective. He never exhibits emotion of the sort that Spenser demonstrates, referring to the common people of Ireland or the "vniust and tiranous rule of Harold an Vsurper." Nor does Ascham bog himself down in the cumbersome periodicity of Alexander Barclay, Nicholas Smith, or William Roper, who here speaks of Thomas More's difficulties with his sovereign:

And because he was of a pleasant disposition, it pleased the King and Queen after the council had supped, at the time of their supper, for their pleasure commonly to call for him to be merry with them. Whom when he perceived so much in his talk to delight that he could not once in a month get leave to go home to his wife and children, whose company he most desired, and to be absent from the court two days together but that he should be thither sent for again—he, much misliking this restraint of his liberty, began thereupon somewhat to dissemble his nature, and so by little and little from
his former accustomed mirth to disuse himself, that he was of them from thenceforth at such seasons no more so ordinarily sent for.21

In the context of serious literature of his time, Ascham's most elevated and emotional expression is really quite moderate. His greatest concern is an accurate investigation into the causes of the spectacle he has observed.

The structure of the Report, so independent of chronology, is unique among contemporary histories and points out more clearly than Toxophilus Ascham's sense of the significance of time. In Toxophilus he was not concerned with time except in a vague way to distinguish between antiquity and the present or, once concerned with a single period of history, to accept the traditional sequences associated with it. In Toxophilus he had no qualms about moving from Xenophon to Plutarch to Sallust to Euripides, in order, for his historical defense of shooting (pp. 33-34); he was willing to combine the remote age of Apollo with the days of Adam to make a more important point about the nobility of archery's origin (p. 7). Events or eras could be isolated for Ascham's close scrutiny in accordance with his own purposes. In the Report time is much more important, but still Ascham shows no particular interest in the movement of history. He deals with the present and pushes back from it only as far as he must to clarify present events and relationships. Thus he discusses Duke Maurice's childhood in the house of John Frederick to illustrate one
cause of Maurice's present behavior, his apparent "betrayal" of the German princes in his alliance with the emperor. He speaks of the father of Albert of Brandenberg only to explain the stoutness of the son, "whose father was Cassimirus descended from the kynges of Pole, and for his noblenes agaynst the Turke called Achilles Germanicus: and thercfore might very well engender such a hoate Pirrhus" (p. 146).

Ascham is not ignorant of time; recent events are very accurately pinpointed chronologically, a practice seldom followed by the best contemporary historians. Further, his proposed diary section of the Report, if we can suppose it to have been like the daily entries in his letters, suggests a careful ordering of events in sequence. But these accounts, although in order, would nevertheless be individual elements of the total work—isolated details which Ascham focuses on and describes as scenes in a drama, analyzing each as it comes, but only after presenting the part of the Report we do have, a look at history based not on time but on the actors involved. For Ascham time is of little consequence—rather actions and their results are important, and because those results happen to occur in temporal sequence, they are called history. Unlike other historians, Ascham looks to history not for the sequence, nor for what happened in one place or to one power over a period of time; he wants to observe an event happening in the immediacy of the present tense, to see what it is, why
it happens, and who is involved in order to learn something of moral value from the experience of observing. Ascham studies existence in a moral abstract, but with human expression; what he sees in Germany is the corruption of a holy empire, and so he tries to find the human cause of it: the vices which have weakened the men who, like the victims of gambling in *Toxophilus*, have fallen from perfection into meanness because they are human.

It is no wonder then that as Ascham, an observer caught up in these events and almost playing a part in them, watches great men fall, he finds in their actions a "miserable tragedie" and accounts for the origins of their personal difficulties by isolating over-simplified but inherent faults. Each of the actors in this drama he has witnessed is in a sense a tragic hero of Sophoclean proportions, and Ascham sees them in very nearly these terms. The greatest character, Charles, fell because of the greatest vice, "vnkyndnes"; "in myne opinion & as the matter it selfe shall well proue it, vnkyndnes was the very sede, whereof all these troubles dyd grow" (p. 128). As Ryan points out in his biography, wherever Ascham speaks of the emperor, he repeats the word "vnkyndnes" (Ryan, 172-175), even though he frequently refers to Charles' wisdom and goodness in specific contexts. The effect is to create a wise and good king with a singular flaw, in the classical manner. Maurice, in the same way, is ambitious; in the
longest digression in his Report Ascham examines the vice of ambition and the ruin it can bring to nations as well as to men. Albert of Brandenberg suffers from an excess of virtue, "to stout a courage" (p. 149), and so on. Ascham is not so naive as to accept these single flaws as the only causes of the turmoil of the period he describes. Rather they are the "seeds" or "springs"--the original causes or contributing factors within the men--from which or along with which other incidents developed and reactions sprang in increasing complexity to produce ultimately the cataclysms of Augsburg and Innsbruck.

Yet theatrical imagery, absent altogether from Toxophilus, is frequent here. Beginning with his reference to "this miserable tragedie, wherein these two great Princes take such pleasure still to play" (p. 128), Ascham again and again alludes to playing or acting. Animadverting about false advisors at court who turn princes' ears, he complains: "But see when the great man is gone and hath playd his part, fooles and flatterers be stil vpon the stage. Such liue in all worldes, such laugh in all miseries: such Daui and Getae, haue alwayes the longest partes: and go out who shal they tary in place still" (p. 159). And later he denounces railers who "are euer procuryng either secretly with raylyng billes, or openly with tauntyng songes, or els some scoffing commom play" (p. 159). Even in closing he explains to Astley his
emphasis on characters rather than chronology—"Hetherto I have followed the order of persons which hath caused me somewhat to disorder both time and matter"—and claims an artistic license to break the unities of "places, time, and persons" (p. 168).

Certainly Ascham saw in a real sense that what he witnessed was moral art in life. His plan of presentation reflects this realization, as does his imagery and the increased artifice in his descriptions of the "order of persons" and the vices they were prey to. If Ascham is less moderate in the Report of Germany, it is because tragedy is less conducive to moderation.

It would have been very easy for Ascham to think of the events he observed as a tragedy—as an art form with a moral lesson for those who would perceive it with him; for not only in art does he find morality. He seeks a moral lesson from every experience in life. His desire as an observer and teacher, one which fits him so well to be an English humanist, is essentially that which he attributes to the historian: "to marke diligently the causes, counsels, actes, and issues in all great attemptes: And in causes, what is iust or vnjust: in counsels, what is purposed wisely or rashly: in actes, what is done courageously or fayntly: And of every issue, to note some generall lesson of wisedome & warines, for lyke matters in time to come" (p. 126).
And so in the Report even more than in Toxophilus, Ascham chooses the moral aphorism as an appropriate expression of concluded truth, and makes a point of finishing his observations with proverbial sentences. He habitually generalizes in ethical terms, whereas most historians form generalizations out of inherent numerical totals. Whereas Machiavelli expresses physical trends in his general reflections ("The ineradicable hostility which naturally exists between the people and the nobles is caused by the one wishing to rule and the other to resist"), Ascham assimilates occurrences into moral imperatives—lessons demonstrating good, or evil, or prudent action. Ascham's concerns are predominantly metaphysical, while neither Machiavelli or Ascham's own countryman, Sir Thomas Elyot rise beyond the physical. Machiavelli never manages complete abstraction of principles, moral or historical. His level of abstraction is always limited by his subject, so that he always generalizes in social terms. Instead of independent principles, he can be expected to speak of phenomena in particular social tendencies, without moral consideration and without projection of a moral rule. This inherent amorality in his generalization is precisely what causes Ascham to dislike him so intensely. Machiavelli can say, for example, "Nations, as a rule, when making a change in their system of government pass from order to disorder, and afterwards
from disorder to order, because nature permits no stabil-
ity in human affairs . . . Hence it has been observed
by wise men that arms take precedence of letters, and that
captains are more needed in cities and countries than
philosophers" (Florentine History, p. 183). Ascham would
never merely collect occurrences to form such a general
truth; rather his generalization, moralized and univer-
salized beyond the particular social context, would be,
"And here a writer may learne, of Princes affaires a good
lesson to beware of parcialitie either in flattery, or
spight" (p. 145). Machiavelli and his sort, according to
Ascham, are able only "to thincke say and do what soeuer
may serue best for profite or pleasure." This policy is
anathema to the English humanist; those who follow it,
failing to grasp the "lesson of wisedome & warines, for
lyke matters in time to come," are merely "earnest setters
forth of present tyme: with consciences confirmed with
Machiauelles doctrine" (p. 160).

More consistently than his fellow Englishmen, Ascham
is able to maintain his abstract moral conceptualizations
and to control them. He avoids the sort of allegory which
substitutes for abstraction that is used by Chaucer before
him and Spenser after. His conceptualization surpasses in
its sophistication the primitive abstractions of Thomas
Elyot, who consistently resorts to concrete descriptions of
representative human action in order to depict moral prin-
ciples, as "Affability . . . is in sundry wise, but most properly, where a man is facile or easy to be spoken unto. It is also where a man speaketh courteously." In another treatment of morality, Elyot misses Ascham's sense of universal generalization entirely: "He is unkind which denyeth to have received any benefit that indeed he hath received" (Governor, p. 152). Here Elyot depends upon a concrete image of a man acting to impart his generalization, while Ascham can speak of unkindness as a universal entity, using imagery only with regard to its particular function ("seed of misery"), but not resorting to imagery or personification to identify it or to maintain his grasp of the concept; furthermore he conceives of it ambivalently, both as a vice and as a characteristic trait of the emperor's behavior. Of ambition, Ascham can write, "0 Lord how many worthy men hath this one vice beareft from good common weales" (p. 157), sensing both a peculiar entity in the vice and at the same time its existence as a part of man's nature. The virtue of worthy writing, in line with his moral conceptualization, he explains as an imperative: "First, point was, to write nothyng false: next, to be bold to say any truth, wherby is auoyded two great faultes, flattery and hatred" (p. 126). In all of these examples the ethical sense is an inherent concomitant of action and needs no figurative translation.24

The most significant changes between the style of
Toxophilus and that of the Report of Germany reflect the growing moralization of Ascham's perception of general truths and his ability to maintain them in focus as universal abstracts, beyond the restrictions of either human action or social institutions. In Toxophilus his aphoristic attempts were muted by concrete qualifications, and his more complicated conceptualizations were often distorted by awkward attempts at concretization (e.g., the frequent gathering of whole passages into "This thing," or "which practice"—see the example quoted on p. 65 above). In the Report aphorisms are more finished, seldom dissipated by post facto qualifications; his correlative parallels contrast with increasing tension, closer to antithesis than before, losing much of their earlier compromising tendency. The Report contains only two extensive digressions, on ambition and avarice, whereas the earlier work was riddled with tangential considerations—on the Turks, the state of schools, or the benefits of music in education—always moral in Toxophilus but expressed in institutional, concrete terms; Ascham considered observable effects rather than abstract causes in Toxophilus. Whereas he exposed particular symptoms of disease in 1545, he studied abstract causes of tragedy in 1553.

The Report must have excited those of Ascham's friends who managed to see the manuscript. It not only brought news of the "recent sturres," but it also exploited the
dramatic essence of the actions Ascham observed. The Report provided much of the realism of an eye-witness account while maintaining artistic standards. Moreover it provided serious literature with a personal approach to the selection of detail which constitutes an innovative break with traditional standards of decorum—one of Ascham's chief technical contributions to English prose. The Report is not so enjoyable today as it was when Ascham returned to England, for the events and the characters it describes are obscure and often inaccurately presented by modern, scientific standards of historiography. The shifting levels of style seem to grate on each other; the names and places interrupt for modern readers the otherwise fascinating descriptions. It fails to satisfy by either historical or artistic standards. But the more one becomes familiar with the times and with the work, the more one appreciates both the art and the artist. Ascham is notable in the Report for honesty, informality, seriousness of purpose, and both control and acknowledgment of his Protestant bias. Compared with Machiavelli, Giovio, Sleidan, and Comines, he wrote good history; and he wrote incomparable vernacular prose, using scholarship and history together to provide an art and a truth to guide the real men of his day through the real life of his day.

Although he wanted to return to Cambridge after his three years on the continent, Ascham couldn't stay there in
the atmosphere of pure scholarship. Soon after his return he became Latin secretary to the queen and patiently and quietly served as court scholar until his favorite patron and princess, Elizabeth, became queen in 1558. Shortly after that, enjoying the freedom, prestige, and security he had sought for years, Ascham began work on a "poore Scholehouse" in which he could set forth his own ideas about the uses of scholarship and, even more important, the relationship he sought between scholarship and society—his most famous English work, The Scholemaster.
In November of 1559 Ascham visited a prominent friend of his, the lawyer Richard Goodrich. He found the advocate deeply depressed at a betrayal of trust by supposed friends—so depressed that a psychosomatic illness had nearly taken his life. As Ascham tried to cheer Goodrich, the lawyer asked only that his scholarly comrade write an epitaph revealing the unkindness suffered at the hands of friends. Coming away, Ascham decided that instead of an epitaph he would first try a remedy, and accordingly he wrote Goodrich a letter, excerpts of which follow:

Sir, being this other day with you, I did, as I thought, both see in your face the state of your body, and also perceive in your talk the case of your mind. I was glad to see in your eye and colour a true return, in mine own opinion, of your health again: I was sorry to hear by your talk, that you made the faults of others your own harm. I am rather sorry with you so doing than blame you for so thinking. I know well you do it neither for lack of wisdom, nor for want of honesty. For I never heard tell, that great thought did greatly trouble any man, except he were both wise and honest: and that fools and ill men be never heartily touched with any kind of care or thought.

* * *

Whencesoever we begin to be thoroughly sorry for our unkindness towards God, then must needs end all sorrow for any man's unkindness toward us. For these two
sorrows be so contrary that they cannot by any possibility remain in our body. The joy that cometh to the heart by sorrowing for our sins will not suffer any sorrow to remain in the heart for the injuries of men.

... when [Plato and Cicero] saw their country would not be holpen by good advice, nor ought to be compelled by any violence (for to prince, parent, or country at any time violence is not to be offered): they wisely withdrew themselves from dealing with the commonwealth, and wholly gave themselves to private life and quiet study... (II, 20-23)

In this letter Ascham reveals the concerns which would occupy his mind throughout the period which saw the composition of The Scholemaster. Although the Report of Germany had been syntactically more structured than Toxophilus, this letter shows Ascham even further inclined to match parallel concepts as artfully as possible. His concern with form does not exceed his desire to express correspondences which he actually sees, but he permits himself a great deal more art in this consolatory letter of 1559 than he did in any composition of the early years of the decade. The pair of phrases, "both see in your face the state of your body, and also perceive in your talk the case of your mind," is nearly perfect in rhythmical balance and achieves exact syllabic equation. Ascham's softening of rhythmic correspondence is the nature of his art here, for by altering meter he avoids excessively mechanical construction of the sort practiced later by the Euphuists. Artifice breaks down to demonstrate its kinship with imperfect reality. Thus Ascham substitutes the bisyllabic "perceive" for "see" and the more finite "mind" for "body,"
preparing for it by a shift in sound ("talk" is the only unlike vowel sound before the last word in the second phrase; it is the signal that a contrast is taking shape). The parallels continue intertwined as the consolation progresses, always with some variation moderating artifice sufficiently to produce art: "I was glad to see in your eye and colour . . . ; I was sorry to hear by your talk . . . ; I am rather sorry with you so doing than blame you for so thinking" (italics indicate variations in absolute regularity). Form, its possibilities, and alternatives obviously fascinate Ascham in this letter.

Still, we see some of the moderation of the author of Toxophilus here, and in the solution he offers Goodrich ("Whensoever we begin to be thoroughly sorry for our unkindness towards God; . . . then must needs end all sorrow for any man's unkindness toward us. For these two sorrows be so contrary that they cannot by any possibility remain in our body"), Ascham exhibits his perpetual inclination toward the dissolution of apparent contraries; here, however, he shows what might be the result of his maturer reflection. Although he removes the contraries from conflict, he does not resolve the issue into a harmony; rather he is content to accept a paradox—albeit a common religious expression—wherein the contemplation of a dilemma is in itself the negation of the impasse. Rather than reconcile the contraries, Ascham suggests that
Another concern evident in the Report remains with Ascham here. Along with his appreciation of form, he is more and more deeply committed to civil order and total loyalty. His allusion to the withdrawal of Cicero and Plato from society suggests that Ascham is not merely an ardent nationalist. Countries can be wrong and individuals right. But never, for Ascham, is there a justification for open opposition to a duly established authority. It is true that members of the establishment seek to preserve their security by preserving the establishment. It is also true that certain of the stylistic traits present in The Scholemaster generally accompany a conservative mind. The complication involved in attributing such general labels, however, is that to maintain the categorization one must overlook exceptions. In Ascham's style there are many exceptions. The character he has displayed in Toxophilus and the Report of Germany, while moderate, is hardly conservative in its constant confrontation of obstacles, its emphasis on observation and reconciliation, its tolerance, and its awareness of the evil of artificial polarization. Yet it contains elements which, if ascendent, might cause or announce conservatism. As Ascham becomes older and more secure, some of these traits begin to show more prominence than they have previously. His increased formalization of art, his emphasis on loyalty
and order, a re-emergence of earlier tendencies toward defensiveness—these characteristics and others which will appear in the course of this chapter point out some of the changes in Ascham's character. But also present are the more exciting elements of his style—the color and detail of description, the colloquial homeliness of his address, his constant attempt to maintain an awareness of the complexity of truth when it is reduced from moral generalization to specific example. It is here that Ascham has the greatest difficulty; his struggle to maintain a tolerant objectivity is one of the most fascinating aspects of the style of The Scholemaster.

Ascham's purpose in writing The Scholemaster is confused by the diversity of his own statements, in the preface and elsewhere in the text, and the structure of the work itself. The title, which consolidates several of Ascham's comments about the book even though it may not be in his own words, claims that the book will teach the "plaine and perfite way of teachyng children, to vnderstand, write, and speake, the Latin tong" (p. 171). In fact, only about five pages deal directly with this subject. Most of the first book contains an exposition of Ascham's moral philosophy as it applies to English society, in three general sections dealing with the need for gentleness in academic instruction, a converse need for firmness in moral discipline, and the dangers of "Italianization" of
English youth. The second book, while more unified, is directed at accomplished scholars of Latin and contains sophisticated arguments on the development of polished Latin style.

The second book, which has so little to do with either the first or Ascham's avowed motives for writing, was composed soon before his death, during a period of recurrent illness which he seemed to realize was fatal. It contains the essence of his continuing discussions with continental humanists such as John Sturm and Bishop Osorio, a sort of written résumé of his achievements and ambitions as a classical scholar, inscribed when he began to suspect that he would be unable to accomplish his plans.

The first book was written in 1563, then laid aside. It was taken up again in about 1567, the year before Ascham's death, and revised before being joined to the second, more technical book. Ascham gives some hint of his own attitude toward his work in the preface, written shortly before he died: "I thought to prepare some little treatise for a New year's gift that Christmas [of 1563]. But, as it chanceth to busy builders, so, in building thys my poore Scholehouse (the rather because the forme of it is somewhat new, and differing from others) the worke rose dailie higher and wider, than I thought it would at the beginnings" (pp. 178-79). In this, his first direct reference to the book, Ascham speaks of it as a creation.
of his own, a "small cotage, poore for the stuffe, and rude for the workemanship" (p. 179), but one taking on more of his own character as it developed. The Scholemaster, then, is the "scholehouse" as well--a forum providing the ideal atmosphere for education, or at least the best its builder could provide--besides whatever academic instruction Ascham as teacher would deliver. This ambivalence in which the schoolmaster is both building and builder, and the book is a house for itself as both text and teacher, might be accidental on Ascham's part. One remembers the flowing spring which becomes dramatic tragedy in the Report (p. 112, above; Report, p. 128), for example. But it seems rather to represent another of his natural tendencies. He seems here to be extending an observed correspondence as far as he can, by means of metaphor, to show the pervasiveness of its truth. The nature of the correspondence appears here and in other statements of the preface, indeed of the entire work. To begin with, the book does not house itself directly. The book as cover and pages and print is a container of Ascham's thought and expression, qualities which exist quite apart from the physical elements which keep them for the reader. But Ascham's thought and expression do not exist apart from himself. They are the parts of him which complete his functions in England as teacher and follower of Christ's doctrine. Thus his metaphor represents the extension of
himself through expressed thought into the schoolhouse which is his book.

The Scholemaster, as it contains the expression of Ascham the schoolmaster, is a testament of his human values; it is also a testament in another sense: "For, seing at my death, I am not like to leaue [my children] any great store of liuing, therefore in my life time, I thought good to bequeath vnto thē, in this little booke, as in my Will and Testament, the right waie to good learning: which if they followe, with the feare of God, they shall verie well cum to sufficiencie of liulinge" (p. 180). Ascham sees the work as an inheritance for his children, to serve in lieu of a material estate like those accumulated by many courtiers. As a guide for their upbringing, it would serve in his stead after his death, a proxy guardian of value commensurable with the security of a financial inheritance. Moreover, the book might serve materially as well, if it proved to be as successful as Toxophilus had been, for Ascham could expect an income from its publication--either from sale or from an increase in the royal pension he already enjoyed as a result of his first book; and the reputation derived would be helpful to his children as they sought their own patronage in later years. As an extension of his functional self and as a testament to his children and colleagues, The Scholemaster was Ascham's fulfillment of his obligations to the three
levels of society he valued: his family, his country, and his profession. It has the two very serious and immutable purposes of representing the man himself and providing a legacy for his heirs.

Considering the crucial nature of the work for Ascham, it is no wonder that his style should reveal strain in the author's expression, especially in those portions of the work added before his death. His premonition of death would have its effect, too. In 1568 he wrote to Cecil, "I have been near death this past year," and Ryan claims that he "long had felt death at hand" (p. 242). These very severe influences on his outlook, besides any natural tendency toward regimentation of opinion, are sufficient explanation for a style which is more extreme in its characteristics, less flexible in its constructions, more intense in its personal expression, and more wholly directed toward the clarification and total justification of the premises of the author. Ascham has, of course, always attempted to define or justify his observations by extensive comparisons with real things. In the past, his interest has been to demonstrate the scope of correspondence; now, more often, it is to prove beyond refutation the absoluteness of his truth.

Ascham's whole concern in his *Scholemaster* is with English society. As author he represents himself in the book as an experienced courtier of the Tudor rather than
the more frivolous Elizabethan cut. Yet he is not merely a scholar in residence. He wrote to Sturm of the book—or rather of the character of the schoolmaster—that it was "not imported from Greece or Italy, but born in this barbarous isle, . . . not a Cantabrigian, but a Windsorian; a courtier, not an academician" (II, 175, trans. Ryan, p. 244). And apparently his own title for the book reflected the same attitude, for the entry by John Day in the Stationer's Register refers to "the scholemaster of Wynsore made by master ASKECHAM."3 He is, he says in the book, a man "of no ill place" (p. 217), and we see in his letters that he knew how to obtain his own ends and to look after the interests of his friends without over-reaching.4 As courtier he sees his duty to combine political with academic authority in order to promote Protestant moral improvement in the governors of England, a motivation praiseworthy in More's time and even in the days when Sir John Cheke was a member of the King's privy council, but one which was going out of style by the 1560's, as Ascham was aware and as his complaints in his book attest. He is no longer the world traveler and eager student of men's ways of the Report of Germany. Although as a scholar he has an international coterie of correspondents, he has re-established himself as a minister to the English people. "I write in English, and to Englishmen" (p. 194) he says in The Scholemaster, just as in Toxophilus he had written
"Englishe matter in the Englishe tongue, for Englishe men" (p. x). Ascham's whole periphery is English society as it is and ought to be. Where his attention moves beyond England, it is to specific individuals—such as Sturm, Osorio, the Cardinal of Arras—or to localities, which obtain an identity limited by their relationship to England as Ascham sees it. Even Italy, which warranted Ascham's praises in bygone years, is seen only in the perspective of its temptations to English youth.5

Although his concern is national, the working limit of Ascham's attention is drawn more narrowly, especially in the revised version, around the court of Elizabeth.6 The court is convenient for Ascham as a representative of English life—more so, one feels, in the final version than at the time of the writing of the manuscript. The court becomes not a microcosm but a paradigm for the whole English society. As in Toxophilus he emphasizes strongly the example set by the grand figures at court: "For as you great ones use to do, so all meane men loue to do" (p. 220). By addressing himself to the court and, for the ostensible purpose of the treatise, to the young courtiers looking for tutors for their children, Ascham hoped to work on the whole society with a much more manageable tool. By perfecting the paradigm, he aimed at a pervasive effect, feeling that "surelie, one example, is more valuable, both to good and ill, than xx. preceptes
written in bookes" (p. 218); the intensification of his effort as he revised his work shows that he came to seek a broader and deeper effect as he progressed. "In going forward," he confessed, "I found the site so good, as I was lothe to glue it ouer," as the work "rose dailie higher and wider, than I thought it would at the beginninge" (p. 179). And so in the final version Ascham searches farther into the dark corners of court life to expose more clearly the widespread presence of the failings he sees in the nation's paradigm example, and one senses that these failings seem even more universal the more committed he becomes to his course. This accounts in part for the increase in the vehemence of his abuse.

As in all of his writing, Ascham works in terms of observation and reaction. Yet, a change has occurred over the years in the nature of his procedure. In Toxophilus Ascham seems to be searching for bits of data from which he can hypothesize. He picks up evidence of all sorts, rejecting none, but trying instead to find some way in which all elements will fit together. In the Report of Germany, we see Ascham looking at both of two sides. That is, in the manner of a liberal he chooses a definite side or posture, but tolerates and even sometimes applauds the other side. He has come even farther along in the Schole-master. He is now committed totally to one way of life, one set of values, and so, yielding to his natural pen-
chant for displaying the whole truth, he shows it in the only way a biased writer can: he presents the good arguments for his side and the bad effects of the other. This course produces much narrower— even blinder— observation than we are used to in Ascham. At times it even bespeaks a disappointment of the promise of his youth or the eagerness of his German travels. But it is the natural practice of men who are absolutely certain they are right. It is the way of Isaiah and Amos and of Martin Marprelate and Milton as well as of thousands of foolish preachers.

But even in this practice Ascham differs from many others by qualifying the extent of the evils he sees and even occasionally acknowledging the good motives of evil-doers. One nearly habitual usage is his insertion of the mitigating word "common" in his denunciations, with a shadow of the qualifying effect of Toxophilus's correlative subordinate qualifications. To say that something "commonly" happens is at least to acknowledge some exceptions. While the same word might be used by a more timid writer to broaden accusations, Ascham uses it as a kind of off-hand escape clause for his victims. Thus in condemning those schoolmasters who are too harsh on slow learners, Ascham says, "For commonlie, many scholemasters, some, as I haue seen, moe, as I haue heard tell, be of so crooked a nature, as, when they meete with a hard witted scholer, they rather breake him then bowe him, rather marre him, then
mend him" (p. 188). This use appears to be an honest, if casual, attempt to soften a possibly extreme statement, but in the same passage (about two pages) Ascham uses the word "commonly" or "common" eight times, a few of which are excerpted here: "For this I know, not onelie by reading of bookes in my studie, but also by experience of life, abrode in the world, that those, which be commonly the wisest, the best learned, and best men also, when they be olde, were never commonly the quickest of witte, when they were yonge .... Quicke wittes commonly, be apte to take, vnaptte to keepe .... And theryfore the quickest wittes commonly may proue the best Poetes, but not the wisest Orators" (pp. 188-89). The generalizations Ascham presents here are extreme and inaccurate because they are too absolute. The only agent of qualification is the word "commonlie," which is so overworked that it is practically overwhelmed by Ascham's exaggeration. Still it is there as evidence of a habit of mind which refuses to accept the extreme in any position without some acknowledg-ment of the realities of individual variation, and this is the habit we have watched in all of Ascham's English work.

One other significant qualification is much less frequent than "commonly" but similar in its attempt to redress an obvious excess. An example occurs at the end of Ascham's violent attack on Italianate mannerisms in
the English court. As in a few other instances, Ascham
takes time out to admit the existence of some honorable
exceptions to the evil he has castigated, yet in the
process of his "exception" he refuses to bend enough to
make the allowance count:

... with bargaines of wearing colours, floures, and
herbes, to breede occasion of ofter meeting of him and
her, and bolder talking of this and that &c. And
although I haue seene some, innocent of all ill, and
stayde in all honestie, that haue vsed these things
without all harme, without all suspicion of harme, yet
these knackes were brought first into England by them,
that learned thence before in Italie in Circes Court; and
how Courtlie curtesses so euer they be counted now, yet,
if the meaning and maners of some that do use them, were
somewhat amended, it were no great hurt, neither to
them selues, nor to others. (pp. 235-36)

Ascham does try to make exceptions, but his presentation
in The Scholemaster is overwhelmingly positive compared
to that of his previous works.

As his attitude is much more solidly structured, so
is his language. Yet, as we have seen earlier, Ascham
eschews structure for its own sake. In Toxophilus and the
Report of Germany, he frequently breaks up potentially
excessive parallelism. He resorts to a perfect balance
only when demonstrating a perfect correspondence. That he
still seeks variety within structure is evident in the
Goodrich letter already examined at the beginning of this
chapter. In The Scholemaster, in spite of the growing
solidification of his ideas, Ascham continually works
toward a plain, colloquial style whose art is in the
intricacies of subtle progression rather than the stagnation of determined absolutism. He retains from his earlier years an innate, digressive tendency to pursue well-made points by adding increasingly specific examples of their truth or applicability. The digressiveness in his personal evaluation has created in effect two separate styles in *The Scholemaster*. These styles sometimes conflict; when they are compatible, they interact in much the same way that Ascham's correlative clauses once did, each member complementing the other, forming a complicated whole which represents a joining of apparent opposites—in this case, opposite styles. Generally, one style is sophisticated, somewhat general in reference, balanced in phrasal construction, subtle in parallelism and rhythms, rather inactive verbally. The other is more colloquial, specific in diction and reference, looser in syntax, replete with defensive parentheses, extreme in both attribution and structure, and more consistently transitive in its predication than the first. The one is a language of eloquence; the other, of aggressive reaction.7

The first, more controlled, style is for the most part the style in which the 1563 draft was written. It is personal in its approach to the reader, but it displays Ascham's love of language and his fascination with its artistic possibilities. Some of his rhetorical play resembles closely that noted in the letter to Goodrich. In
that letter he shifted emphasis gradually as he developed parallels with a progressive effect. In *The Scholemaster*, too, he experiments with increasingly subtle concatenations of repetition or suggested correlation, as in this sentence, which I have broken down to demonstrate the shifts as they occur:

```
I write not to hurte any, but
to proffit som:
to accuse none, but
to monish soch,
who, allured by ill counsell, and
following ill example,
cotrarie to their
good bry
against their owne
good nat
yield ouermoch to thies folies
```

The core of the sentence is contained in the first two lines of the diagram; but Ascham embroiders by artful subordination, dropping into a new parallelism as soon as he has established the old, at almost every step developing the next parallel out of the final words of the former one. The effect on structure is to avoid excess—while in content he shifts a defense of his motives into an accusation of weakness.

The overlapping nature of Ascham's structural parallelism is not always so prominent, for it fits very neatly into his usual loose syntax. In the following paragraph the same characteristic is present and in fact governs the logical progress, but the shift from one cluster to the next is less obvious than above:
t letter he shifted emphasis gradually as he developed
allels with a progressive effect. In The Scholemaster,
, he experiments with increasingly subtle concatenations
repetition or suggested correlation, as in this sentence,
ch I have broken down to demonstrate the shifts as they

write not to hurte any, but
to proffit som:
to accuse none, but
to monish soch,

who, | allured by ill counsell, and | following ill example,
contrarie to their good bryning vp, and
against their owne good nature,
yeld overmoch to thies folies and faultes. (p. 208)
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is less obvious than above:
This discipline was well known, and diligently used, among the Graecians, and old Romans, as doth appear in Aristophanes, Isocrates, and Plato, and also in the Comedies of Plautus; where we see that children were under the rule of three persons: Praeceptore, Paedagogus, Parente: the scholemaster taught him learning with all gentleness; the Governor corrected his manners, with much sharpenss: The father, held the stern of his whole obedience: And so, he that used to teach, did not commonly use to beate, but remitted that over to an other man's charge. But what shall we saie, when now in our days, the scholemaster is used, both for Praeceptor in learning, and Paedagogus in manners. Surelie, I wold he shold not confound their offices, but discreetlie use the dewtie of both so, that neither ill touches shold be left unpunished, nor gentlesse in teaching anie wise omitted. And he shall well do both, if wiselie he do appointe diversitie of tyme, & separate place, for either purpose: vsing alwaies soch discrete moderation, as the scholehouse should be counted a sanctuarie against feare: and verie well learning, a common pardon for ill doing, if the fault, of it selfe be not ouer heinous. (pp. 202-03)

The second sentence, beginning "the scholemaster taught . . ." comes closest to perfect balance in structure, but even here Ascham breaks up the third element into a subordinate phrase which provides transition to his conclusion ("And so, he . . ."). Again in the final sentence, as aphoristic parallelism begins to reach an aesthetic limit, Ascham breaks the structure with a qualifying exception in the form of a subordinate clause.

Ascham's parallelism is most often effected at the phrase level of his syntax. It is produced by repeating unimportant words in the same order while changing the ones which give most meaning to the passage. Yet often he produces a continuity by simpler repetitions which permit
him to avoid the monotony of too many identical phrases.
   In the following paragraph he uses a variety of methods to create simultaneously both continuity and progression:

   Take hede therafore, ye great ones in ye Court, yea though ye be ye greatest of all, take hede, what ye do, take hede how ye liue. For as you great ones use to do, so all meane men loue to do. You be in deed, makers or marrers, of all men maners within the Realme. For though God hath placed yow, to be cheife in making of lawes, to beare greatest authoritie, to commaund all others: yet God doth order, that all your lawes, all your authoritie, all your commaundementes, do not halfe so much with meane men, as doth your example and maner of liuinge. And for example even in the greatest matter, if yow your selues do serue God glaedly and orderlie for conscience sake, not coldlie, and somtyme for maner sake, you carie all the Courte with yow, and the whole Realme beside, earnestlie and orderlie to do the same. If yow do otherwise, yow be the onelie authors, of all misorders in Religion, not onelie to the Courte, but to all England beside. Infinite shall be made cold in Religion by your example, that neuer were hurt by reading of bookes. (p. 220)

This example, while still demonstrative of Ascham's reserved style, immediately precedes a transition into the other, more vehement one. It is the first paragraph in a long passage added to the early draft. His parallelism here includes alliteration, word repetition, and similarity in phrase structure. Ascham begins by setting up an admonitory rhythm with "Take hede," which is repeated regularly until he substitutes "indeed" for it and picks up a more superficial "m" alliteration. Woven into the original rhythm are several repetitive echoes: first, an almost facetious play on "ye," with alternate forms "ye" and "yea" providing sight rhymes of an uncomfortable sort. Further,
Ascham develops a repetitive series with the emphatic words, "do" and "great," playing "great" off against "mean." The alliteration of "mean men" leads, perhaps accidentally, into the too extreme "makers or marrers, of all mens maners."; and at this point, having maintained all of this ornament at once within the space of three short sentences, Ascham appears to sense that he has allowed artifice too much dominance, and he drops all of his figures at the start of the next sentence. He begins his use of rhetorical figures for emphasis, but they continue as ornaments until he recognizes excess and moderates it. In the sentence beginning "For God . . . " he again establishes a structure in the tripartite series "laws," "authority," and "command," which he purposely keeps from perfect parallelism at first. Then he embellishes it through repetition of the words in exactly parallel phrases and lapses into his "m" alliteration again with "moch with meane men, as doth your example and maner." In the next section of the paragraph Ascham shifts his figures, but he has by now elevated his style sufficiently to play openly with correspondences, yoking his ideas by repeating words like "orderly," "coldly," and "sake." Sometimes he employs parallel phrasal structure and sometimes single words bear the weight of unification.

Such rhetorical play, common in the sixteenth century as ornament, retains for Ascham its functional purposes.

While he does occasionally indulge himself in rhetorical
whimsy, his art is nevertheless conceived of as a tool for persuasion or to demonstrate philosophical premises. In this paragraph, for example, Ascham is trying very hard to prove the correspondence between the example set by the court and the actions of "all England beside." This whole paragraph and the excited one following it in the second version are specific elaborations expanding Ascham's interpretation of the great ones in court to make his observation apply to "all yong Ientlemen, the whole Court, all London, the whole Realme" (p. 221).

This paragraph represents Ascham's more sophisticated style in other ways as well. Lacking imagery, it depends on both rhetorical figures and the clarity of its emphasis to enlighten the reader. None of Ascham's verbs could be characterized as forceful; rather he depends on nouns or adverbs such as "makers," "marrers," "orderly," "earnestly," and "coldly" to provide the force of his assertion. Yet the paragraph has a strong transitive thrust. More of Ascham's subjects act on objects than in previous works; fewer simply exist. Most of Ascham's development of parallelism occurs at the ends of clauses, reflecting the spontaneity of his elaboration, but interestingly, and in accord with his increasingly preset disposition, he uses exactly as many subordinate clauses to begin sentences as he does to end them. That is, his thought is more established and he can therefore often suspend the main thrust
of his sentence to consider a minor point first, without losing the gist of his thought in the meantime.

Such a style is characteristic of Ascham in the few "working" passages of *The Scholemaster*—those in which he actually gives technical advice concerning the teaching of Latin; it is also the style of his considered and benevolent digressions and general observations. But such observations infallibly lead Ascham to specific examples for proof of his own perspicacity, and in the explication of these examples he develops the style which I have characterized as reactionary.

And in meaner matters, if three or four great ones in Court, will needs outrage in apparel, in huge hose, in monstrous hats, in gaurishe colors, let the Prince Proclame, make Lawes, order, punishe, commaund euerie gate in London daily to be watched, let all good men beside do euerie where what they can, surelie the misorder of apparell in mean men abrode, shall never be amended, except the greatest in Court will order and mend them selues first. (pp. 220-221)

Such examples are, to begin with, condemnatory and abusive. They expose specific incidences which demonstrate the faults or evils about which Ascham in his more serene mood has warned. As he comes closer to the faults he becomes obviously more upset, emphasizing trivial points such as the wearing of hose when his real concern is with matters of religion and civil morality. Further, he exaggerates his accounts—sometimes in contradiction of more controlled statements—and often settles into long strings of mech-
anically structured parallels:

"[Italianated Englishmen] geuing themselves vp to vanitie, shakinge of the motions of Grace, driuing from them the feare of God, and running headlong into all sinne, first, lustelie contemne God, than scornefullie mooke his worde, and also spitefullie hate and hurte all well willers thereof. Than they haue in more reuerence, the triumphes of Petrarche: than the Genesis of Moses: They make more accounte of Tullies offices, than S. Paules epistles: of a tale in Bocace, than a storie of the Bible . . . ."

(p. 232)

These series serve to enforce the appearance of universality. The evil has in effect saturated to this extent or in all these respects and more if there were space, for the list is after all only representative of the whole truth. Ascham's lists when used like this reflect a heightened emotional state which lacks the moderating influence evident in his quieter, more controlled prose. These passages employ a variety of methods of railery—direct abuse, sarcasm, ridicule, even accusations of heresy—but all are similar in their concrete diction, scatterings of colloquiality, and long, rambling sentences interspersed with short staccato clauses. Most of them also contain at some point a defense of the author's motives or a patronizing exception to the exaggerated polarizations effected. A similar defensiveness was noted in Toxophilus at points of critical observation as well, but it is generally absent in the Report, where Ascham's own experience and assumptions are already so much a part of the fabric of the account that further statements of justi-
fication would be obvious redundancies. In The Scholemaster such an apology often marks the end of the aggressive passage and a return, however brief, to a more moderate appraisal of the subject of the book or at least one of the main digressions. The excited passages have nearly all been added in the final version, or else they have been expanded or otherwise re-arranged to emphasize much more boldly Ascham's fear of and disgust with some bad practice. The exaggerated parallels of the passage quoted on p. 158, for example, appear in this quieter version in the manuscript of 1563:

Than thel, delyueryd from the fear of god, shakyng of the motyons of grace, & lett louse to all synne, first, lustlye contemne God, next spitefullye mock his worde: than thel haue in more Reverence the Tryumphes of petrarch imperfect then the Genes of Moyses. (fol. 74v-75r)

In another place, Ascham first wrote of court flatterers: "Their companie, their taulke, their ouer great experience in mischief, doth easelie corrupt the best natures, and best brought vp wyttes. Therfor if wise fathers, be not as well ware . . ." (fol. 60r). The parallelism here is already well marked; in the final version, however, he has added nearly a whole page of violent abuse, beginning like the manuscript but soon launching into even more extreme parallels:

Their companie, their taulke, their ouer great experience in mischief, doth easelie corrupt the best natures, and best brought vp wyttes.

But I meruell the lesse, that thies misorders
be emonges som in the Court, for commonlie in the
countrie also euerie where, innocencie is gone:
Bashfulnesse is banished: mooch presumtion in
youth: small authoritie in aige: Reuerence is
neglected: deceities be confounde: and to be
shorte, disobedience doth ouerflowe the banke of
good order, almoaste in euerie place, almoaste in
euere degree of man. (pp. 208-09)

The increased concern for discipline and order
apparent here is evident also in the following insertion,
which, though it lacks the extreme of the preceding ex­
ample, still depends upon firm structure for its enun­
ciation. The manuscript reads, "In these fewe lynes, I
haue wrapped vp, the most tediouse parte of all Grammer:
wh after this sort, the master shall teache w'tout all
erroure, and the scholer shall learne without great payne.
The m' being lead by so sure a guyde, & the scholer being
brought into so playn & easie a way. Let your scholer be
neuer affrayde . . ." (fol. 48v). At the same point
Ascham has added the following conditions:

... part of Grammer: and also the ground of almost
all the Rewles, that are so busilie taught by the
Master, and so hardlie learned by the Scholer, in all
common Scholes: which after this sort . . . easie a
waie. And therefore, we do not contemne Rewles, but
we gladlie teach Rewles: and teach them, more plainlie,
sensiblie, and orderlie, than they be commonlie taught
in common Scholes . . . . This is a lively and perfite
waie of teaching of Rewles: where the common waie,
vaed in common Scholes, . . . is tedious for the
Master, hard for the Scholer, colde and vnoumfortable
for them bothe. Let your Scholer . . . . (p. 184)

Ascham has re-ordered his material in other ways as well.
Translating an excerpt of Isocrates' Areopagiticus, he
shapes the sense from a plea for more noble ideals in
moral instruction into a praise of "private discipline" in youth and a desire for more governors like those of early Athens, who "had more regard, that their yougthe, by good order should not offend, than how, by lawe, they might be punished."11

A notable consistency in these alterations—especially in the addition of the defense of rules and in the translation of Isocrates—is Ascham's increased insistence upon the need not only in teacher-student relationships but in all English society for order and discipline. This preoccupation, while intensified considerably by the time of the second draft, was with Ascham throughout the composition of The Scholemaster. His references to order, discipline, rules, right method, and synonymous ends are too numerous to detail. "Order," like "commonly," is a habitual word in Ascham's vocabulary, and he uses it whenever he is asserting his own solution to any moral problem of society. Conversely, "misorder," "confusion," and "faction" are words most often used to describe attributes of present social evils or threats.

Most critics of The Scholemaster have suggested that Ascham's fear of Italianization stemmed from an exaggerated awareness of the lechery and wantonness of Italian cities and the lure which this licentiousness provided for young Englishmen abroad.12 In fact, while Ascham does condemn the seductive attractions of Italian books, sensual
pleasures are only vaguely included and not specifically elaborated among his fears. His emphasis throughout the long section on Italianate Englishmen is on their threat to "good order"—especially religious orthodoxy and civil obedience. His warning on the books, for example, is this: "Ten Sermons at Paulus Crosse do not so much good for mouyng me to trewe doctrine, as one of those bookes do harme, with inticing men to ill liying. Yea, I say farther, those bookes, tend not so much to corrupt honest liyng, as they do, to subuert trewe Religion" (p. 230). His characterization of the Italianates consistently refers to their wily circumventing of laws and civil order, only off-hand to more carnal sins. In a typical listing summary of his arguments on the subject, Ascham includes "filthy liyng" only at the end as one aspect of ill manners. The whole list emphasizes his greater concern about the evils of division, confusion, and faction:

If some yet do not well understand, what is an English man Italianated, I will plainlie tell him. He, that by liying, & traueling in Itaille, bringeth home into Engild out of Itaille, the Religion, the learning, the policie, the experience, the maners of Itaille. That is to say, for Religion, Papistrie or worse: for learnyng, lesse commonly than they caried out with them: for policie, a factious hart, a discoursing head, a mynde to medle in all mens matters: for experience, plentie of new mischieues neuer knowne in England before: for maners, varietie of vanities, and chaunge of filthy liyng. (p. 229)

A close relationship binds the increase of Ascham's syntactical structure at points of greatest vehemence with
This abiding concern about order. His view of present disorder is not apocalyptic; at its darkest is it universal ("I meruell the lesse, that thies misorders be emonges som in the Court, for commonlie in the countrie also euerie where, innocencie is gone . . .") but never beyond correction. Ascham's optimistic conviction that proper instruction and guidance will right England's moral wrongs demands admiration and sympathy, considering both his appraisal of the extent of the factious influences he recognizes and his certainty of their eventual effect on his country if they go unchecked. His fears are not born of religious conviction, but are perhaps understandable reactions to the slipperiness of court life, the terrible convulsions of the English church—still creating problems of adherence to doctrine as Ascham wrote—and his own fears, as death approached, for the future security of his family. Whatever the immediate causes, Ascham clung to order as the only hope for English society and saw as the role of the schoolmaster the inculcation of that saving virtue. Never does he speak explicitly of the teacher as the saviour of society; rather it is a directing assumption. In his praise of the learning of Queen Elizabeth he approaches expression of his assumption in this passage added to his final version:

Amongst all the benefites yt God hath blessed me with all, next the knowledge of Christes true Religion, I counte this the greatest, that it pleased God to call
me, to be one poore minister in settyng forward these excellent giftes of learnyng in this most excellent Prince. Whose onely example, if the rest of our nobilitie would follow, than might England be, for learnyng and wisedome in nobilitie, a spectacle to all the world beside. (pp. 219-20)

One might expect, in light of Ascham's predilection for aphorism in both Toxophilus and the Report, that this new, intense concern for order and his concentration on paradigms would bring about an insufferable increase in neat, proverbial truths. This does not occur in The Scholemaster, however. Aphorism is present in abundance, but the overall structuring is sufficiently more pronounced in this work that the aphorisms are actually less obvious than before. More evident is Ascham's increased use of another characteristic element, the summary. Hardly a page of The Scholemaster goes by without some recapitulation of points made, with greater regularity than even good hand-book fashion would dictate. Frequently he repetitively summarizes the same argument, continuing after each summary to provide a specific example, then feeling obliged to regroup once more, and so on. These are the successive summaries for one discussion of only three pages' duration:

And thus, will in children, wiselie wrought withall, maie easelie be won to be verie well willing to learne. And witte in children, by nature, namelee memorie, the onelie keie and keper of all learning, is readiest to receive, and surest to kepe anie maner of thing, that is learned in yougth. (p. 200)

* * *

Therfore, if to the goodnes of nature, be ioyned the
wisedome of the teacher, in leading yong wittes into a
right and plaine waie of learnyng, surelie, children,
kept vp in Gods feare, and gouerned by his grace, maie
most easelie be brought well to serue God and contrey
both by vertue and wisedome. (p. 200)

Therefore, to loue or to hate, to like or contemne, to
plie this waie or that waie to good or to bad, ye shall
haue as ye vse a child in his youth. (p. 201)

Each of these résumés takes on an increasingly moral
tone, which spurs Ascham's wariness; accordingly, he
digresses for a page on the need for moral discipline as
well as instruction for youth, and then he again sums up,
including now emphatically the point of his digression,
before moving on:

And thus the children, kept vp in Gods feare, and
preserued by his grace, finding paine in ill doing,
and pleasure in well studdyng, shold easelie be
brought to honestie of life, and perfitenes of
learning, the onelie marke, that good and wise fathers
do wish and labour, that their children, shold most
bouselie, and carefullie shot'at. (p. 203)

Constant summarization, of course, reflects an in­
tensely felt need to be perfectly clear. Such a need, in
turn, bespeaks a fear of being misunderstood, and hence
an attempt to forestall criticism by placing the entire
continuum of an argument before the judge—the reader—
who, presumably then seeing things exactly as the author
does, cannot help agreeing unless he is irrationally
hostile.13

In Ascham's expression, this sensitivity to criticism
takes two other forms as well—forms related to the sum-
maries just examined: the first, a minor element of the
style of The Scholemaster, is very obvious in Toxophilus, where Ascham was less sure of his audience and his subject. It consists of an exaggerated tendency to explicate a premise or elaborate and extend a proof beyond both artistic and logical necessity. In Toxophilus this insistent holding-on caused a great deal of anti-climax and occasional unintentional digression. In The Scholemaster it appears most clearly as successive re-statements, with intended greater clarity, of the same point in different words or at different levels of particularity. In spite of its relative and causal conjunctions the following paragraph consists of nothing more than five re-statements of the same principle:

Fonde scholemasters, neither can understand, nor will follow this good counsel of Socrates, but wise ryders, in their office, can and will do both: which is the onelie cause, that commonly, the yong gentlemen of England, go so unwillinglie to schole, and run so fast to the stable: For in verie deede fond scholemasters, by feare, do beate into the, the hatred of learning, and wise riders, by ientle allurements, do breed vp in them, the ioue of riding. They finde feare, & bondage in scholes, They feele libertie and freedome in stables: which causeth them, vtterlie to abhore the one, and most gladlie to haunt the other.14

The second manifestation of Ascham's sensitivity to the potential hostility of his audience appears in his perpetual recourse to defense of his motives. Having gotten to a remarkable extreme in his abuse of court faddists, for example, Ascham both calms down and washes his hands with this conciliation: "Would to God, this taulke were not trewe, and that som mens doinges were not
thus: I write not to hurte any, but to proffit som: to accuse none, but to monish soch, who, allured by ill counsell, and following ill example, cōtrarie to their good bringyng vp, and against their owne good nature, yeld ouermooh to thies folies and faultes: I know many servuing men of good order, and well staide" (p. 208). Defensiveness is a practice common in colloquial speech where the speaker has no evidence at hand to support his contentions. It is also a common feature in polemic controversies in which writers expect to be vilified by at least part of their audience and so feel the need to answer criticisms while they have the public ear. Many of the personal references in Milton's anti-prelatical tracts, for example, demonstrate his urge to vindicate his motives by proving his own worth before his opponents malign his character.15 Similarly, the prefaces to Ben Jonson's plays are full of half-serious protestations of motive, as in the address "To the Reader" before The Alchemist: "I speak not this out of a hope to do good on any man against his will; for I know, if it were put to the question of theirs [i.e., worse writer's plays] and mine, the worse would find more suffrages, because the most favour common errors. But I give them this warning, that there is a great difference between those that (to gain the opinion of copy) utter all they can, however unfitly, and those that use selection and mean. For it is only the disease of the
unskilful to think rude things greater than polish'd, or scatter'd more numerous than compos'd."

The difference between Milton and Jonson on the one hand, and Ascham on the other, is that Ascham is not involved in a controversy except insofar as he initiates one by controverting existing customs. He has no particular adversary, and so no particular reason to expect hostility from his audience, especially since this is his first attempt to reach them.

Defensiveness is a ubiquitous characteristic of Ascham's prose from Toxophilus on. In the earlier work, his uncertainty and distrust of his audience, composed partly of those scholars at St. John's who disapproved of the time he spent shooting, is an obvious explanation for his edginess. At the time of writing The Scholemaster, Ascham had developed a grave concern for the future of his country and a sense of responsibility for saving it. Defensive statements are most common—indeed they can be identified in some form in nearly every case—in passages of heightened emotional fervor; they occur whenever Ascham seems uncertain either of his own logical soundness or of the support of his audience; that is, where he feels that he has overstepped his desired course of modesty and objectivity. Thus, condemning the practices of the universities during Mary's reign, Ascham finally claims in somewhat exaggerated terms that fellows were chosen for unscholarly reasons: "he was, fellow good enough for their tyme, if he
could were a gowne and a tipet cumlie, and haue hys crowne shorne faire and roundlie, and could turne his Portesse and pie readilie"; but at this point Ascham backs down: "whiche I speake not to reproue any order either of apparell, or other dewtie, that may be well and indifferentlie vsed, but to note the miserie of that time, whan the benefites provided for learning were so fowlie misused" (p. 281).

Following his discouraged comparison of the allurements of riding teachers with the severity of schoolmasters on page 166 above, Ascham feels required, perhaps with justification, to clarify his intention: "And I do not write this, that in exhorting to the one, I would dissuade yong gentlemen from the other: yea I am sorie, with all my harte, that they be giuen no more to riding than they be . . . " (p. 199).

At one point, Ascham attacks the attire of young noblemen at court, rising to complain of certain "courtlie men" who failed to back a group trying to enforce more orderly rules for dress in London. Moving to an even more personal concern, he exhorts "noble men in the Court" to take up shooting as a commodious example for their countrymen, but he goes overboard in his zeal to correct the manners of great men: "What praise shold they wynne to themselues, what commoditie shold they bring to their contrey, that would thus deserue to be pointed at: Beholde, there goeth, the author of good order, the guide of
good men. I cold say more, and yet not ouermuch." But
Ascham has said ouermuch, and immediately he defends him-
self against a blow he feels aimed at him:

But perchance, som will say, I haue stepte to farre, out of my schole, into the common welthe, from teaching a yong scholer, to monishe greate and noble men: yet I trust good and wise men will thinke and judge of me, that my minde was, not so mough, to be busie and bold with them, that be great now, as to glie trewe advice to them, that may be great hereafter. Who, if they do, as I wishe them to do, how great so euer they be now, by blood and other mens meanes, they shall becom a greate deale greater hereafter, by learninge, vertue, and their owne deserets: which is trewe praise, right worthiness, and verle Nobilitie in deede. Yet, if som will needes press me, that I am to bold with great men, & stray to farre from my matter, I will aunswere them with S. Paul, siue perc
ontetionem [sic], siue quocund. modo, modo Christus praedicetur, &c. euen so, whether in place, or out of place, with my matter, or beside my matter, if I can hereby either prouoke the good, or staye the ill, I shall thinke my writing herein well imployed.

This excuse, especially in the final stand after the quotation from St. Paul, shows a conflict between belli-
gerance and control. It is the retort of a man who has meant well but has somehow gone too far, yet is unwilling to retract what he believes is true, however out of place it may be. Ascham is all for the good of the country, and if he has infringed on other cherished traditions in his zeal for order, at least he has meant well.

There are other ways in which Ascham shows a rather cynical awareness that because what he is doing is vitally important, any successful method, open or not, is justified in order to communicate most effectively a doctrine which
seems unpopular and which his readers might not willingly receive if they recognized it at the outset. Ironically, in the urgency of his desire to present his whole case clearly, Ascham sometimes resorts to the use of a mask. I refer here to Ascham's intentional employment of digression as a vehicle for his philosophy—his use of a Latin grammar to teach the need for moral discipline, his appearance of triviality in the course of serious attempts at moral persuasion. Of course it is evident by now that Ascham is too honest even to lie about his strategies of persuasion, and so we see his justification for triviality in The Scholemaster itself. In one respect, he says, the small book saves him from criticism of overreaching; in another, it is a more successful way of presenting valuable truths without risking the stormy censure of a hostile audience:

And som also will nedes busie them selues in merueling, and adding thereunto vnfrendlie taulke, why I, a man of good yeares, and of no ill place, I thanke God and my Prince, do make choise to spend soch tyme in writyng of trifles, as the schole of shoting, the Cockpitte, and this booke of the first Principles of Grammer, rather, than to take some weightie matter in hand, either of Religion, or Ciuill discipline. Wise men I know, will well allow of my choise herein:

... For, great shippes, require costlie tackling, and also afterward dangerous goverment: Small boates, be neither verie chargeable in makynge, nor verie oft in great ieoperdie; and yet they cary many tymes, as good and costlie ware, as greater vessels do. A meane Argument, may easelie beare, the light burden of a small faute, and haue alwaise at hand, a ready excuse for ill handling: And, some praise it is, if it so chaunce, to be better in deede, than a man dare venture to seeme. (pp. 217-18)
Ascham seems to feel a definite sense of alienation—a recognition that an English society with the weaknesses he sees is not only evil but also hostile to his premises, and so must be deceived, cajoled, or even harangued if he is to get his point across. Perfectly in accordance with this alienation is the fact that almost each time Ascham directly addresses his audience, he does so in spite, contempt, or at best in a patronizing tone: "The fault is in your selues, ye noble mens sonnes, and therefore ye desere the greater blame" (p. 205); "It is your shame, (I speake to you all, you yong Ientlemen of England) that one mayd should go beyond you all" (p. 219); "Therefore thou, that shotest at perfection in the Latin tong, thinke not thy selfe wiser than Tullie was" (p. 273). Ascham certainly avoids either reverence toward or confidence in the reader; he values his own opinion and aims at his own mark, refusing to accommodate the fancies of his readers when he faces them directly, and recognizing their identities only when they are in his way.

The characteristics which I have been describing do not explain all of The Scholemaster. They do explain what is present in Ascham's later style which was not especially evident in the style of Ascham's other works. Such conservative characteristics exist here along with previously established traits, such as Ascham's delight in colloquial earthy analogies and his keen selection of descriptive
detail. Quick witted students, he says, "be like trees, that shew forth, faire blossoms & broad leaves in spring time, but bring out small and not long lasting fruite in harvest time: and that onelie soch, as fall, and rotte, before they be ripe, and so neuer, or seldom, cum to any good at all" (pp. 189-90)

Thies yong scholers be chosen commonlie, as yong apples be chosen by children, in a faire garden about S. Iames tyde: a child will chose a sweeting, because It is presentlie faire and pleasant, and refuse a Runnet, because it is than grene, hard, and sowre, whan the one, if it be eaten, doth breed, both wormes and ill humors: the other if it stand his tyme, be ordered and kepte as it should, is holsom of it self, and helpeth to the good digestion of other meates: Sweetinges, will receyue wormes, rotte, and dye on the tree, and neuer or seldom cum to the gathering for good and lasting store. (p. 192)

Among his delightful descriptions, his account of a visit to Lady Jane Grey stands out for all readers of The Schole-master. What makes it unique is the simple beauty Ascham produces by selecting only the most significant features for attention, but referring along the way to the incidental details which stick in the mind of the sensitive observer: "Before I went into Germanie, I came to Brodegate in Lecetershire, to take my leaue of that noble Ladie Jane Grey, to whom I was exceeding much beholdinge. Hir parentes, the Duke and Duches, with all the houshold, Gentlemen and Gentlewomen, were huntinge in the Parke: I founde her, in her Chamber, readinge Phaedon Platonis in Greeke, and that with as much delite, as som ientleman wold read a merie tale in Bocase" (p. 201). Only the two persons,
former teacher and accomplished pupil, and Plato's Phaedo are present; the hustle of the hunt is outside somewhere, excluded from Ascham's more valuable intellectual experience of the moment. The scene is described in short, quick sentences like the strokes of a painter's brush; parallelism is dropped as Ascham allows the quietness of simple diction to create the picture. Yet, once into his anecdote, Ascham permits his urge to list the details a chance to create its own effects, and we see Lady Jane complaining very amusingly and graphically of the severity of her parent's authority:

For whē I am in presence either of father or mother, whether I speake, kepe silence, sit, stand, or go, eate, drinke, be merie, or sad, be sowyng, plaifying, dauncing, or doing anie thing els, I must do it, as it were, in soch weight, mesure, and number, even so perfitelie, as God made the world, or else I am so sharplie taunted, so cruellie threatened, yea presentlie some tymes, with pinches, nippes, and bobbes, and other waies, which I will not name, for the honor I beare them, so without measure misordered, that I thinke my selfe in hell. (pp. 201-02)

Beyond Ascham's colloquial art in metaphor and description, The Scholemaster also demonstrates, as do his earlier works, the open honesty of much of his thought and his expression, as may be seen in his predominantly loose sentence structure and lack of elevated diction. Ascham speaks to noblemen at a common level without pretense. He has tried to seek the mean as he did from the very first, but less successfully; he has tried to qualify and moderate his most extreme statements, but often
weakly or out of habit. In this difficulty especially he has suffered historically, for the fault of absolute generalization mentioned in chapter three is much more obvious in The Scholemaster than it was in the Report. Ascham does qualify his imperative generalizations, but often the qualifications are insufficient to balance the emphasis of his more aggressive assertions. Richard Mulcaster, Ascham's contemporary and the teacher of Spenser and Lancelot Andrewes, was misled by Ascham's positivism regarding excessive mathematical specializations to suppose that Ascham was denouncing mathematics as a discipline. In his Positions, he wonders scornfully how a student of Cheke, who promoted the study of mathematics, could so completely "mislike the mathematical sciences."\(^1\) This misreading is especially ironic, since Ascham even lectured in mathematics at Cambridge (Ryan, pp. 25-27); but in the passage to which Mulcaster refers, Ascham brings on the misunderstanding by swallowing up his qualifications in an indulgence of condemnatory abuse directed at "Mathematicall heades, which be onely and wholy bent to those sciences." His censure is just, but he appears to be attacking mathematics and music generally, rather than excesses, and so Mulcaster took it.

I have pointed out the confusion over Ascham's objection to Italianate Englishmen (pp. 161-2 above). A more damaging, long lasting misrepresentation of Ascham's
opinion was made by Bacon in the *Advancement of Learning*. The passage denouncing Ascham as one who values words more than matter is famous. It goes in part:

... men began to hunt more after words than matters; more after the choiceness of phrase, and the round and clean composition of the sentence, and the sweet falling of the clauses, and the varying and illustration of their works with tropes and figures, than after the weight of matter, worth of subject, soundness of argument, life of invention, or depth of judgement. Then grew the flowing and watery vein of Osorius, the Portugal bishop, to be in price. Then did Sturmius spend such infinite and curious pains upon Cicero the Orator, and Hermogenes the Rhetorian, besides his own books of Periods and Imitation, and the like. Then did Car of Cambridge and Ascham with their lectures and writings almost deify Cicero and Demosthenes, and allure all young men that were studious unto that delicate and polished kind of learning.10

Ascham, of course, as I have shown in chapter one and as this entire study has shown, certainly did not believe what Bacon says he did. What Ascham says is,

Ye know not, what hurt ye do to learning, that care not for wordes, but for matter, and so make a deuorse betwixt the tong and the hart. For marke all aiges: looke upon the whole course of both the Greeke and Latin tonge, and ye shall surelie finde, that, whan apte and good wordes began to be neglected, and properties of those two tonges to be confounded, than also began, ill deedes to spring: strange maners to oppresse good orders, newe and fond opinions to struie with olde and trewe doctrine, first in Philosophie: and after in Religion: right judgement of all thinges to be peruered, and so vertue with learning is contenmed, and studie left of: of ill thoughtes cummeth peruerse judgement: of ill deedes springeth lewde taulke. Which fower misordres, as they mar mans life, so destroy they good learning withall. (pp. 265-66)

In the first sentence, it is clear that Ascham wants to join words and matter; but, sensing that the danger is
neglect of words, he puts his emphasis there, getting more and more carried away on his old theme of order, until he is indeed extreme and quite off his subject. In the general context of his statement, Ascham is on Bacon's side, "For good and choice meates, be no more requisite for helthie bodies, than proper and apte wordes be for good matters, and also plaine and sensible utterance for the best and depest reasons: in which two pointes standeth perfite eloquence" (p. 265). Earlier in the book he explicitly condemns the very practice of which he is accused by Bacon: "This is, to seeme, and not to bee: except it be, to be bolde without shame, rashe without skill, full of wordes without witte" (p. 185). Bacon may certainly be criticized for picking unfairly on Ascham, and reading him out of context; but again, as in the other instances noted, the extreme absoluteness of his generalizations puts Ascham in a position to be misread. His frequent defensive qualifications suggest that he was at least partly aware of this fault and trying to correct it. Still it survived to illustrate an inflexibility of attitude much more prominent in the schoolmaster of Windsor than had existed in the character of the Fellow of St. John's in 1545.

What we see in The Scholemaster is Ascham grasping for a "trimme" world—a well-ordered England, which will offer security for him and his heirs, those he sees
following him in the enjoyment of the traditions of religious doctrine and academic values which he understands as right for England. It is imperative to him that the virtues he sees in the doctrines available to the English be made a part of the practice of life. His own study has taught him that the surest direction of all pursuits for excellence is toward discipline and order. He constantly attempts to maintain an awareness of the complexity of truth as he reduces it from moral generalization to specific doctrinal example, but time is short for Ascham, and order or disorder keeps getting tied up in obvious trappings like Italian books or sloppy hose. There is something sad in Ascham's repeated attempts to clarify the seriousness of his purposes and his recurrent degeneration into trivial particularities when he had in mind at first such serious principles. Ascham is at his best when warmly describing the good qualities of those whom he admires—John Cheke, Elizabeth, Jane Grey. He is most amusing, but most pathetic, when railing against the eccentricities of court manners. Yet throughout The Schoolmaster the strength of his honesty and his straightforward address to his subject give a rough beauty which complements and enhances the effect of his fluent and eloquent rhetoric. Ascham's achievement lies in his moderation of art, in his ability to let his art reflect the soul of the man who used it.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

At this point it is expected and desirable that I consolidate the preceding three chapters into a brief and usable definition of the style of Roger Ascham. However, if these chapters show us anything, it is that while Ascham's style maintains a certain consistency of development, it is never quite the same in one work as it is in the next. His style reflects his growth, and its most recognizable trait is its development as the style follows the author through his life. If we are to find the man in his style, we must, like Ascham, accept complexity and avoid simplistic extremes.

The style of *Toxophilus* demonstrates a young scholar's concern with knowledge—with evidence and proof, with preference for the real before the academic. Chapter II demonstrates how carefully Ascham avoided neat "truths" by reconciling apparent contradictions and joining apparently exclusive alternatives. His syntax moves by correlative statements, each depending upon the next; none can accurately be singled out arbitrarily as representing the whole truth. Ascham smothers his inclination toward rhe-
torical aphorism by incessantly qualifying and extending generalizations with anticlimactic and often digressive concrete examples. These qualifications defend him from attack by dissipating the clarity of his pronouncements, but they also demonstrate his eagerness to apply his conclusive thought to life in order to illuminate to the furthest degree possible the extent of the correspondences he sees among the objects of his perceptive experience. His image is the analogy, and his figures he draws from the everyday life of common men. His object is not to dignify with rhetoric but to clarify. His syntax is loose and exploratory, filled with lists of evidence and heightened by graphic descriptions of observed phenomena which are delivered in colloquial plainness with an emphasis on the truth of the spectacle rather than the glory of the art. Ascham's tendency to progress correlatively inclines him to the use of matched pairs in description, but he never permits the structure to become predominant; in syntax as well as in thematic considerations, the vehicle of Ascham's art is moderation, and his effort moves in search of that which is "most apt and fit." Differentiating the various elements he found in Ascham's prose, Morris Croll chose to characterize Toxophilus as written by Ascham "in the light, popular vein so well suited to his genius." He refers, of course, to Ascham's close connection with the reality of common experience as we have witnessed it in his
imagery, his forays of evidence-gathering, and his steadfast avoidance of elevated extremes of diction or clausal structure. The popular vein seen by Croll is the most obvious manifestation of the young Ascham's commitment of his talents to the application of academic theories for the benefits of ordinary human action.

By the time he wrote the fragment of the Report of Germany left to us, Ascham's commitment to a life spanning both contemplation and action was firm, and the Report was his first opportunity to put his theories into practice as an undisputed expert on his subject. In this work as in Toxophilus, Ascham's reaction to observation stands out as a significant stylistic trait. His narrative is full of description—of places, of events, and most noticeably, of persons. Evidence in the Report is no longer merely being accumulated, however; it is selected to support evaluations which, more than in the previous work, are a part of Ascham's purpose and procedure. The correlatives of Ascham's syntax tend to be cumulative now rather than conciliatory, and their yoking is sometimes tense, although they still lack the extremes of antithesis commonly attributed to his style. Specifically, Ascham has assumed a posture in the Report; consequently sides are taken and opposed in the development of his history. Yet still he is careful not to accept extremes or to warp the character of his observation. Choosing one side, he sees both its
faults and the virtues of the other. Ascham seeks a moral lesson from every experience of life. He wants to observe events as they happen in order to learn something of moral value from the experience of observing. While his sense of morality is influenced by the newly emerging Protestant ethic, he seeks in the Report to define morality by evaluating the actions of princes rather than to apply preconceived rules at the expense of accurate reportage. Naturally the elements most characteristic in the style of the Report include the development of the aphorism, no longer choked by complicating evidence as in Toxophilus but now more often left to stand as a conclusive moral proverb; and concomitantly Ascham demonstrates an improved ability to manage abstract thought comfortably in the process of developing moral conclusions. Here, although we may not accept the direction of Ascham's moralization, we must admire his facility at metaphysical contemplation when it is compared with the limited attempts which mark the expression of many of his contemporaries. Ascham is not bound to allegorize his principles or to express them in concrete representations as he did in Toxophilus in guise of human actions or social institutions. Yet Ascham retains in the Report a remarkable informality, in his loose sentence structure (with the exception of elevated portraits of the actors in the drama he observed), his colloquial anecdotes and analogies, his attention to inci-
dental but colorful details, and the honesty of his reaction to events. The seriousness of his purpose, while dictating artful portraits of the characters who represented his moral findings, also required a straightforward, unpretentious exposition of honest reaction, a realism which only unaffected language can impart to the expression of an individual's observation.

The years between the Report and The Scholemaster were difficult ones for both Ascham and England. Society was not moving in the direction in which he had hoped to guide it, and Ascham's final work can be seen both as an attempt to correct failings and as the promulgation of an educational theory. Ascham stresses the value of examples in The Scholemaster, and an important way in which this work's style differs from that of his previous ones is that the evidence and magnificently detailed description modern readers look forward to are now used as exempla for preconceived moral principles to which Ascham adheres more consistently than he has before. Subordinate elements of his syntax seldom explore, more often reveal additional examples to support his warnings. Frequently Ascham is led from his serious assertions into detailed but trivial digressions as he adds examples or repetitively rephrases generalizations. In The Scholemaster he is less able than before to maintain an awareness of the complexity of truth. His examples reduce abstraction to specific doctrinal
lessons with constant emphasis on the need for order in society and the evils of factionalism or other symptoms of disorder. Frequently Ascham's characteristic moderation appears only in habitual constructions or rather weak attempts to generalize the objects of his attacks.

Yet much of his earlier style remains present in *The Scholemaster*. In parts, especially those written in the early, 1563, draft, he maintains a fine control over the art of his sentence structure, moderating potential extremes by revealing latent complexity. As in his other works, he illustrates his principles by means of earthy analogies, using images drawn from the experience of real people rather than borrowing from myth. In description he is selective and spare of detail, as always permitting the reader to imagine much of the scene or character he unfolds by focusing only on the dramatic highlights and adding minutiae impressionistically, often, however, listing particularities at length to suggest both complexity and the inclusive appropriateness of his example. When he is not describing but rather asserting moral principles, Ascham yields to absoluteness more than before. The aphoristic tendency begun in *Toxophilus* and developed in the *Report* is sometimes abused in *The Scholemaster*, for example when Ascham leaves generalizations open to misreading by expanding from general statements digressively, leaving theses somewhat imperfectly defined as what is
said in calmness is forgotten in anger. Ironically, while Ascham is in *The Scholemaster* most sensitive to the potential hostility of his audience, he is at the same time least careful to keep his generalizations in context to avoid critical misrepresentation, of which he has been frequently a victim.

Tucker Brooke is wrong, then, to say that Ascham's works "vary in everything but style."\(^2\) Not only does his style change, but change is its most distinguishable attribute. The difference in style among Ascham's three English works is evolutionary, not aberrant. Seen in analysis as a reflection of the course of his life, his style provides rather a reassurance of general impressions than any surprising revelations. Ascham's mind narrows toward the end of his life as he becomes convinced that he has found the truths he was obviously searching for in *Toxophilus*. That these truths do not coincide with the practice of life which he sees naturally disturbs him, and so *The Scholemaster* is a troubled work, full of conflicts in its elements of style as well as in its purposes and its content. Seeing himself as a "guide of good men" (p. 222), Ascham assumes a responsibility to preserve in England the doctrines of Protestant humanism as they began to reveal themselves to him during his service with Morison and as they appear in the style of the *Report of Germany*. The result is a radical shift in the structural
elements of his style from Toxophilus through to The Scholemaster. In the first work we see Ascham involved in the destruction of false simplicity by reconciling antitheses, joining contraries, dissipating polarizations. In The Scholemaster are passages of extreme structural rigidity, more frequent if not consistent antitheses, recurrent options for order and harmony, and denunciation of complexity and the confusion it brings. Moderation, the very theme of Toxophilus, is submerged in The Scholemaster, appearing most clearly only in habitual remnants of Ascham's former concern to avoid absolutism—a trait which has itself become an important element in the style of his last work.

Many aspects of Ascham's language do remain as constant threads to indicate the continuity of the man's identity in spite of the changes in his life and his style. In all of his work he observes life and then reacts to what he sees. A driving concern to communicate the relationship between social activity and academic or moral theory marks the root of Ascham's literary intellect. Even beyond the dogmatic precepts of The Scholemaster, his work and his style are constantly moral in the sense that he reveals a commitment—a mission—to improve the lot of English society by making men aware of both the potentials and the pitfalls of human behavior. If the emphasis in the early years is on observation and in the later ones,
on reaction, that is natural for a man of Ascham's involve-
ment in teaching. However absolute or rigid the elements
of his style in The Scholemaster, Ascham throughout his
life holds moderation--of practice or of expression--as
an abiding standard of excellence. Where it submerges in
his theme, it remains in his art and explains the appeal
of his best prose by modern standards. And even in his
later work Ascham aims at moderation, which comes to mean
for him sobriety, discipline, and quiet excellence in the
face of extremes of either pretentious brilliance or
imported foppishness. If his style could be characterized
by a single word, that word would rest somewhere between
honesty and unpretentiousness. The consistent plainness
of his syntax, his willingness to explore contradictions and
dilemmas, and his avoidance of masking imagery all reflect
great honesty in this man who all his life praised the
activity of daylight, and open places, "whiche be ordyned
of God for honeste thynges" (p. 24). By the same token,
the spontaneity of his usual expression, the consistent
impulse to push aphorisms and analogies to their furthest
point of explication not for amplification but for
clarification, his use of the language of "flat English-
men," refusing to embellish vernacular prose with the
obvious garments of rhetoric, and most particularly his
adoption of common, everyday experiences for his descript-
tive imagery--all these point to his unpretentiousness, to
that character in his style which Morris Croll called "a bourgeois ideal." Ascham is ultimately an empiricist, looking first to physical reality for evidence and then inducing precepts. To read only The Scholemaster is to see Ascham deducing examples from premises in the scholastic way, but to do that is to ignore the accumulative procedures of Toxophilus and the Report of Germany which produced the assumptions of his last work. His interest is not in established systems until he has established them himself from observation.

Ascham's contributions to English rhetoric are among the most studied aspects of his prose. My point in this study, obviously, has not been to analyze Ascham's effect on the language, but rather to seek Ascham himself as his language reveals him. Still, what appears here can suggest some possibilities for the direction of more systematic studies of the language as far as Ascham is concerned. As I pointed out in Chapter I, many critics have used Ascham's command of rhetoric and his interest in Isocrates as indicators of his total style. Recent critics have rediscovered rhetoric with a fascination not unlike that of some sixteenth-century schoolmasters, and have over-emphasized both its importance as a literary tool and its influence upon the thinking of subsequent generations. Summing up the achievements of Ascham's style, Ryan concludes that "his attempt to render the vernacular eloquent
was not entirely successful because he does tend to overwork the Gorgianic figures in the most obvious situations" (p. 283). Such a statement, while it accords with most linguistic criticism of Ascham's style, stands almost directly opposed to the picture of Ascham which has emerged in this study. I do not suggest that Ascham ignored the Gorgianic figures (isocolon, paroemion, parison)—in fact I have pointed out in several places his mastery of them as well as other figures of rhetoric. Ascham was well grounded in the figures used so excessively by the young Elizabethan writers of his last years. Morris Croll, writing about one of them, gives a better perspective of the importance of rhetoric and its influence on writers' styles, when he says, "Euphuism is not the product of humanist imitation of the ancients, ... it is, on the other hand, a survival of the 'rhetoric of the schools.' The schemata of medieval Latin, revivified by being translated into the popular speech, enjoyed a brief new career of glory, to fall into their final disgrace and desuetude before the conquering advance of naturalism and modern thought at the end of the sixteenth century."4

Seen in this light, rhetoric was not a foreign scheme fitted somewhat ineptly onto the vernacular. It was a present, working basis of expression which enjoyed temporary emphasis as an ornament rather than as a tool in somewhat the same fashion that eye-glasses are designed
and worn today. Croll feels that the humanists "tried to check their course /i.e., of the schemata/, or confine their use within the limits of good taste," and I believe that this is a more sensible way to look at Ascham's use of rhetoric. Ryan sees the figures from a modern stance which holds them as "obvious" and so distasteful. But he is looking backwards. Ascham's contribution is most apparent where he eloquently avoids the obvious use of such figures. They are there and natural already in serious prose, but he controls them; he overcomes them in some places, uses them (for example in expressing correspondences) in others. Hence, it is not a weakness that he employed them; rather it is a strength that he recognized their limitations and managed to restrain them or to avoid them altogether and still create art. As Saintsbury has suggested more relevantly, Ascham's excellence lies not in ornate patterns of phrasing but in his mastery of the "undulations" of a plain vernacular style with "good working and fair ornamental qualities." That is, Ascham was master of, not slave to, the figures of rhetoric and his use of them was a moderation rather than an extreme of formal expression.

If Ascham's style, or any one else's for that matter, is analyzed to provide an understanding of the creative roots of his intellect, "it is not quite relevant to inquire into its success or failure. Insofar as it reveals
a creditable picture of the artist, it is successful however good or bad the art. To historians of the language or the literature, a style is successful if it influences other styles; to aestheticians, a style is successful if it creates a form harmonious with content or if it originates a new, viable concept of art. To grammarians, style is most successful when it communicates most effectively, when the parts of language work together to describe the author's thought. In all of these respects Ascham can be both praised and blamed, and the evidence for conclusions may be found in this study. Again, the findings are not startling. In the young author of Toxophilus we find self-consciousness and some lack of control of the elements of style, such as subordination, but also more fundamental ones, such as the recognizable fact that much of Ascham's "best" prose in Toxophilus seems to spring from accidents of subject or felicity of wit. In the Report of Germany we see Ascham's style working most smoothly, the self used now as authority, the ornate complementing the plain, the elevated varying the colloquial, and the particular lending credence to the abstract. The Scholemaster, containing some of Ascham's most artistic, moderated prose, is uneven; its two styles do not match as do those of the Report--yet in the awkwardness of their juxtaposition they point out the man and his concerns even better than a more uniform expression might have.
My analysis of The Scholemaster varies considerably from previous general pictures of Ascham taken from the same work. I believe that the difference is one of approach. Ascham is most often read in anthologized excerpts or by scholars looking for data to support general historical conclusions. His prose, it is true, is full of beautiful, detailed descriptions of Renaissance England, and these passages—Cecil's table and his sprezzatura, Elizabeth's mastery of Greek, Lady Jane Grey's unaffected enthusiasm for learning—have received the most critical attention. The sense of Ascham which results is incomplete. The style of these accounts is regularly the subdued, colloquial, controlled element of Ascham's writing. What is ignored is Ascham angry and disappointed, digressive and intolerant; and most important, what is neglected is the combined effect of both styles as Ascham struggles to maintain uniformity and objectivity but has a hard time of it in the end.

He was not alone in his difficulty. Croll has noted a similar narrowing of outlook in other English humanists, going so far as to claim that "of Cheke, Wilson, and Ascham... it is not unfair to say that they gave up to party what was meant for mankind: they devoted their learning to the cause of the Protestant Reformation. Their first aim in education was to train up defenders of the Elizabethan settlement, and to maintain that sound native
sentiment of morality which they regarded as the best
bulwark against foreign ideals of conduct and methods of
thought." Ascham's concerns, of course, antedate the
Elizabethan settlement, and his bulwark was constructed
against general factionalism more nearly than foreigners,
but the essence of Croll's statement reveals his awareness
of much the same limitations as we have seen in the style
of *The Scholemaster*. Douglas Bush, too, attempting to
define the peculiar English and Christian variations of
Renaissance humanism, found them in the shift of cultural
goals from scholastic purity toward less profound but more
practical education: "The broad aim was training in
virtue and good letters, the special aim was preparing
young men for public life." He concluded that "the main
impulse of Tudor humanism . . . was not that life should
be given up to classical learning but that classical
learning should be an aid to the practical Christian
life." This study confirms from a different direction
the findings of both Bush and Croll, and demonstrates how
completely Ascham's style reflects his humanist intellect.
Bush, of course, did not see the goals of humanism as giving
up to party what was meant for mankind. But if we did not
see in English educational aims a narrowness as well as a
practicality, we would miss some of the conflict which
appears in the elements of Ascham's style. The short-
sightedness is there, in *The Scholemaster*, in the intolerant
moral stance from which Ascham lashes out at his recalcitrant students, the young gentlemen of England. His rhetorical and syntactical excesses, his over-use of generalization, the positivism of many of his sentences, and especially his obsession with order—all bespeak his urgent desire to teach his own concept of virtuous public action to an apparently heedless generation.

In Ascham's humanism authority rests in the experienced observer rather than in the texts he uses to teach Latin. A significant difference between the styles of Ascham and his earlier colleague, Thomas Elyot, is to be found here. One might even go back as far as More for comparison. Each of these three men recognized a need for order in a successful and good society. In More's writing, one sees a recognition that order is present in the divine scheme of things. There is order because there is justice. The Utopia is a sort of parable, revealing for men what is already extant so that they may use it. Men's failure to recognize and accord with justly ordered existence is perhaps their greatest weakness. Elyot, however, does not see order as an eternal presence. Rather he fears, from his sense of plenitude, that without a moral order, men risk chaos. The Governour therefore provides a system of virtue for society based upon the utilitarian wisdom of classical and Biblical sources. In Elyot's subsequent works one sees more and more a sense of the
need to get authoritative, prudential wisdom transmitted, to set up classical precedents as immediate usable sources for contemporary action, even wholly without interpretation or commentary. But while Elyot strove to transmit the old order, Ascham set about establishing his own form of intellectual order, moving in the Report of Germany and The Scholemaster away from the classics and trying more and more to get his own evaluation across to his readers. The classics and Christian doctrine were his precedents for commitment to a discipline of virtue, but he tried to re-define virtue and order in modern terms, based upon the only authority modern man knows—himself. If he fell short of his aims, perhaps he anticipated the possibility in Toxophilus when he claimed, "Every wyse man, yt wisely wold learn any thyng, shal chiefly go aboute yt whervunto he knoweth wel he shal neuer come" (pp. 64-65).

Ascham never stopped to ask about himself in his writing. He was not ready to inquire about either his right to assume authority or the relationship of man and world which his assumption suggested. Yet in his prose we can see not only the changes of an individual, but perhaps as well signs of changes in the expressive consciousness of an age. Starting modestly to urge a national sense of identity, cautious and moderate in his first steps, Ascham by the end of his life had a greatly enlarged sense of the individuality of self. He moved himself out
of parentheses in *The Report of Germany* to become an authoritative, expert witness; in *The Scholemaster*, he has become an originator of systems as well. Freed from the scheme of order envisioned by More and Elyot, Ascham sought a new discipline, a new order, showing in the divergencies of his style some of the characteristics soon to be found distinguishing the varied points of view of Gosson and Sidney, of Nashe and Harvey, of Martin Marprelate and Hooker—and ultimately, perhaps, the separated Puritan and Anglican styles of the seventeenth century.
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Chapter I: Prolegomena

1Ernst Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. W. R. Trask (New York, 1953), pp. 36-42. Subsequent references to this edition will appear in the text.


3E.g., in the Fairie Queene, II, xff; see also the Shepheardes Calender, "February" eclogue. For a possible reference to Stubbs's punishment, see Eq V, xxv-xxvi.

4R. S. Sylvester, for example, reviewing a recent work on Elyot in Renaissance News, XIV (1961), 178-81.

5These compensations are catalogued under the writers' names in Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, The Dictionary of National Biography, 63 vols. (London, 1885-1900).

Quintilian's *Institutio* was discovered in 1416 by Poggio Bracciolini, who brought knowledge of it to England in 1418; a complete MS. of *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator* was found in 1421 by Landriani, while Poggio was in England (John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. Cambridge, 1903, 1908), II, 27, 31. Izora Scott, in *Controversies Over the Imitation of Cicero* (New York, 1910) incorrectly ascribes the discovery of *De Oratore* to Poggio. Ascham in a letter of 1551 mentions that he and Sturm are reading *Rhetoric*, apparently for the first time in a reliable edition (The Whole Works of Roger Ascham, ed. J. A. Giles, 3 vols. in 4 London, 1864-65), I, 315-16; subsequent references to this edition will appear in the text, cited by volume and page number only).


"Eloquence" is a common Renaissance word for artistic prose when distinguished from poetry, as Jewel does in his...
speech.


14 Sidney wrote in 1583; in 1579 Lodge, in his *Defence of Poetry*, had still included history as a part of poetry (Smith, I, 77).

15 Smith, I, 164; see also I, 168.

16 The *Scholemaster*, in Roger Ascham: *English Works*, ed. William Aldis Wright (Cambridge, 1904), p. 265. This is my primary source for Ascham's work; all subsequent references to any of Ascham's works in this edition will appear in the text, cited by page number alone.

17 Sidney, *Apologie*, Smith, I, 160. See also note 19 to Chapter III, below, for mention of similar critical assumptions made by Machiavelli and Thomas Nichol.

18 The many directions in modern literary and critical experiment deny any generalization such as this complete accuracy. But rejection of established forms is one reason
for the dispersion of effort. One sees evidence of the
gradual shift in interest from form to attitude in criticism
at different levels. O. B. Hardison, in The Enduring Mon-
ument (Chapel Hill, 1962), sees the lack of structural cri-
teria in modern aesthetics as an obstacle which each modern
poet must overcome each time he writes. Arthur Miller has
emphasized the importance in modern tragedy of a revelation
of human frailty, saying, "The quality in such plays that
does shake us . . . derives from the underlying fear of
being displaced, the disaster inherent in being torn away
from our chosen image of what and who we are in this world.
Among us today this fear is as strong, and perhaps stronger,
than it ever was" (The New York Times, February 27, 1949,
sect. II, p.1). Another modern critic allies himself with
Croce in asserting the inapplicability of standards of form
in judging works of art:

"A discussion of tragedy is confronted at the outset
with the strenuous objections of Croce, who would have
no truck with genres. 'Art is one,' he wrote in his
famous Britannica article, 'and cannot be divided.' For
convenience, he would allow the division of Shakespeare's
plays into tragedies, comedies, and histories, but he
warned of the dogmatism that lay in any further refin-
ing of distinctions . . . . No artist, he said, will
submit to the servitude of the traditional definition:
that a tragedy must have a subject of a certain kind,
characters of a certain kind, and a plot of a certain
kind and length. Each work of art is a world in itself,
'a creation, not a reflection, a monument, not a docu-
ment.' The concepts do not exist 'in a transcendent
region' but only in innumerable specific works. To ask
of a given work 'is it a tragedy?' or 'does it obey the
laws of tragedy?' is irrelevant and impertinent"
(Richard B. Sewall, "The Tragic Form," Essays in Criti-


Ibid. Erasmus' protestations against rhetorical excess provide the most common evidence for the critics.


Scott, Controversies, 11, 9; also translated by Croll in "Muret and the History of Attic Prose," p. 118, n.9.

27 Quoted by Williamson, p. 115.


30 As in this statement of grammarian Robert Whittinton, from his translation of Erasmus' De Civilitate Morum Puerarium (London, 1532), Sig. B3v-4r: "The greater that fortune is the more amiable and gentyl be. We muste pardone meane persons to take a delight in a meane, to consolacyon of their pouertie."

31 Attributed by Quintilian Inst. ix. 4. 26.


Ibid., I, 34. A literal translation is:

Fair Quiet, I hold you! And you, sister of Quiet, Innocence! You a long time in temples, in cities
I sought in vain, and in the palaces of kings.
But you in the shaded silences of gardens, far off,
The green plants and like-colored shadow hide.
Oh, if I am ever allowed to profane your retreats,
Wandering about, faint, and panting for a better life,
Preserve your new citizen, and me, having attained my wish,
Leafy citizens, accept in the flowery kingdom.
Me also, you Muses—and I call you, omniscient Apollo, as witness . . .


De Oratore 111.44.175-76.


Quintilian Inst. viii.p.32.

Epistle 115. In early editions, such as that echoed by Jonson in Discoveries, this expression was corrupted to "Oratio vultus animi est"; in Epistle 114 Seneca accepts the Greek proverb "Talis hominibus fuit oratio, qualis vita": "A man's speech reflects the quality of his life."

Scott, Ciceronianus, p. 78.


In The Computer and Literary Style, ed. Jacob Leed (Kent, Ohio, 1966) pp. 82-83.


Williamson, p. 31.

Francis Bacon, p. 13; yet Vickers himself, in his work on Shakespeare, attempts at least an individual, if not a school, definition on the basis of rhetorical figures.

Brutus 284-88.

Ascham in *The Scholemaster*, p. 285; Cicer in *Orator* 69-72, 102-04.

"Seneque dans la prose anglaise de More à Lyly (1500-1580)," *Revue de Littérature Comparée*, XXIV (1956), 177-95.

Williamson, p. 60.


R. S. Crane, *The Languages of Criticism and the Struc-
Chapter II: Toxophilus

1Lawrence V. Ryan, Roger Ascham (Stanford, 1963), p. 16. Ryan's is the only documented biography of Ascham and is the primary source of my references to facts of Ascham's life. Subsequent references to his edition will appear in the text as "Ryan" with page numbers.

2See pp. 34-35 below; Ryan indicates that Ascham's early friendships at St. John's were predominantly among the Northern faction (pp. 16-18 et passim).

3"Ascham is the author, whom Apollo made great
In his art, and Pallas in hers.
A learned hand provided this, a learned mind produced this book." (p. viii; my translation)

4Cicero Epistolae Ad Familiares 1.9.23: "I have written, as I said, in the manner of Aristotle— at least I have aimed at that— three books of debate and discussion entitled De Oratore."

5E.g., Ion, parts of The Republic (notably iv.421-32), and, as Ryan has noted, the De Partitione of Cicero. Ryan points out the popularity of this "catechetical" dialogue in medieval works as well (p. 76).

6The topics may be found in Aristotle's Rhetoric or in Cicero De Inventione. The Table of Contents of the first
book of *Toxophilus* resembles the examples of topical analysis found in many rhetorical handbooks, such as Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*. Ryan demonstrates, perhaps too simply, the general correspondence between Ascham's organization and Wilson's illustration of some of the topics of deliberative oration.

7Ascham's awareness of this convenience is demonstrated in the discussion on pp. 50-51, below.

8He lectured in dialectic at Cambridge and expressed his especial interest in it and rhetoric. See Ryan, pp. 25-26.

9Pp. 217-18. In a letter to his friend and patron, Bishop Stephen Gardiner thanking him for introducing *Toxophilus* to the king's council, Ascham claims, "I have written in English because its use was not beyond my power and because it is useful and not pernicious to anyone" (Hatch, p. 135).

10P. 91; see also similar reprimands, pp. xvi, 5, 76.

11As Cavendish does here: "Although the worshipful gentlemen being in his company provoked all that they could do thereto, yet he would not consent, desiring them to be contented" (*The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey*, in *Two Early Tudor Lives*, ed. Richard S. Sylvester and Davis P. Harding, New Haven, Conn., 19627, p. 147). Compare this
with Ascham's use of the same formula on p. 55, below, as a concession.


14 The Arte of Rhetorique, p. 162.


16 The passage is quoted on p. 75, below.
See pp. 175-77, below, for a fuller discussion of this problem with reference to The Scholemaster.

This proverb is ascribed to Apollo's Delphic oracle by Plutarch. Appropriately, the oracle bore another maxim equally suited to Ascham's temperament: "Nothing too much."

It occurs in the paragraph compared with Cavendish's prose on p. 71, above.

The sentence contains six phrases averaging twelve syllables apiece, with anapestic rhythm of five and six feet per phrase. The departures from absolute regularity soften the poetic effect without denying it.
Chapter III: A Report of Germany

1Ryan, p. 92; in 1549, after Ascham had left Cambridge, debates were finally ordered by the crown. Biographical data in the following pages are either taken from or supported by Ryan, pp. 90-154, and will not be cited in the text.

2Ryan, p. 110; his letters for the next year are full of references to someone's underhandedness as he writes to friends both at home and abroad to intercede for him with Elizabeth.

3For a detailed evaluation of Ascham's performance as historian by both contemporary and modern standards, see Walter F. Staton, "Roger Ascham's Theory of History-Writing," SP, LVI (1959), 125-37. Other comparisons are noted in the course of this chapter.

4Plutarch had attempted character studies earlier in the comparative structure of his Lives, but in the individual histories he relied upon the standard method of chronologically reported incidents. Never did he vary his method of presentation to suit his subject.

5Ascham uses Giovio as an example of how not to write history in the Report (p. 126); an anonymous contemporary
critic said of Giovio, "When he put a history on sale he reaped a richer reward from lies than any other man from telling the truth" (Beatrice Reynolds, "Latin Historiography: A Survey 1400-1600," SR, II 1957, p. 50).


7The evidence for attributing the letter to Ascham includes the word "trimme," an idiosyncrasy discussed in Chapter IV, p. 177 below, the repetition of "commodities," another favorite word, syntactical inversions such as those discussed in Chapter II, pp. 48-50, the correlative parallels, the adverse reference to the emperor's "extreme shiftes," and the convenient springboard the letter gives Ascham to explain the causes of Charles' difficulties: breaches of loyalty apparently inexplicable to the uninformed observer.

8Sturm's suggestion, "Quin tu historiam scribis, Aschame, qui tam belle historiae leges nosti? non adulor; vere dico officii tui esse historiam scribere" (I, 372), was dated July 22, 1553. Ascham's letter to Cheke describing the Report had been written July 7.

9Ascham has been alternately accused and exonerated of selling out to the papists during Mary's reign because of the apparent inconsistency of his position as her Latin secretary while so many other Protestants were martyred or
exiled. In fact, Mary tolerated many Protestants at all levels. She tended to depose only her outspoken opponents or those with a known history of anti-papist activity. Ascham never questioned her sovereignty and had long been a faithful servant of the Tudor family. His writing shows his sense of a dichotomy between worldly and spiritual loyalties, and he always sides with legitimate monarchy in worldly matters, however he may personally feel. Note his high opinion of John Frederick for pledging his life to Charles V, but his soul to Christ (I, 244), a similar praise of Duke Ernestus' loyalty to his church in the face of imperial censure in the *Report* (p. 150), and his animadversion on those "which, to see a mass freely in Flanders, are content to forsake, like slaves, their country" (I, 248). Ascham was by no means unique in his freedom; another confirmed Protestant, much more conspicuous than Ascham, who enjoyed a successful career during Mary's reign was Sir Philip Hoby, professional diplomat, older brother of Sir Thomas Hoby, and Morison's predecessor at Charles' court. He held various important ambassadorial posts for Mary. Ascham also enjoyed some protection from his old friend Gardiner, now Mary's chief advisor.

10I, 365-66; translated I, lxxix.

11For a comparison of Latin and English artistic conventions, refer to the two versions of Marvell's "The
The occurrence is about 45% of that in *Toxophilus*.

Pp. 130-31; this condensation is also cited by Staton, p. 137.

Machiavelli's *Florentine History* acknowledges both predecessors at the outset and contains long, invented orations as well as details of Italian military campaigns. Staton describes these elements of "humanist histories," pp. 128-29.


Cf. my discussions in Chapters II and IV on the frequent misreading of Ascham by critics of his opinions.
because of similar forms of this trait in Toxophilus and The Scholemaster (pp. 72-74, 175-77).

19This is, of course, the Horatian dulce et utile concept discussed in Chapter I. Ascham here calls it "describing liuely" and noting "some generall lesson of wisedom & wariness" (p. 126); Machiavelli in his Florentine History also acknowledges this principle of historical art by complaining that Bruni and Poggio "have failed to convey anything either instructive or pleasing to their readers . . . . If anything teaches or pleases in history it is that which is described in detail" (trans. W. K. Marriott London, 1907, p. 1). That the principle applied in England as well may be seen in the claim of Thomas Nichol in his 1550 translation of Thucydides' Peloponnesian War that "in steede of Tristrams, Girons, and Lancelotes and other, which do fylle bookes wyth dreames, and wherin many haue euill bestowed theyr good houres, ye haue, by the benefyt of the Kynge, no lesse frutefull than pleasante passetyme, for to knowe what people were Pericles, Nycias, Antigonus, Lysimachus . . . and many other sage and valyant Capitaynes." Cited in Henry Burrowes Lathrop, Translations From the Classics Into English From Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620 (New York, 1967), p. 86.

20Variorum, IX, 47.

Although less refined semantically, Ascham's moral imperative is no more naive than Toynbee's.
Chapter IV: The Scholemaster

1A draft of this version, possibly partly in Ascham's handwriting, survives as British Museum MS. Royal B. XXIV, Art. 2, fol. 47-78. I am indebted to Professor Albert J. Kuhn for procuring a microfilm copy of this MS., which I refer to in this chapter by folio number alone. This document is described by George B. Parks, "The First Draft of Ascham's Scholemaster," HLQ, I(1938), 313-27.

2This benefit was fully exploited by Ascham's son, Giles. See Ryan, p. 288.


4Ascham was able to gain a position in the service of the Earl of Warwick for his brother-in-law, Christopher Howe, in about 1562 (Ryan, p. 234); in his letter to Howe he offers some very practical advice on how to advance in favor with an employer and what practices to avoid. He also managed to save his wife's mother from a mortgage foreclosure by assuming the debt and ultimately convincing Elizabeth to pay it for him (II, 47; Ryan, p. 240). Many of his letters to and from continental scholars during the 1560's suggest that Ascham was either offering or finding patron-
age for their students in England (II, passim).

Ascham's concept of Italy seems even further restricted to Venice, by his own admission the only Italian city he had visited (pp. 234-35); as a free city Venice had close ties with England and also a great deal more tolerance for various ways of life than many other states under firmer papal or imperial control. George B. Parks, in "The First Italianate Englishmen," SR, VIII (1961), 197-216, points out that several English travellers were appalled by the liberties they observed there (pp. 205-06), although most nevertheless praised the Italians. Ascham limits his attention to Italy in The Scholemaster to its adverse effects on young English travellers.

At several places in the second draft he has added specific references to the court or to English gentlemen, as "yet I heare saie, some yong gentlemen, count it their shame to be counted learned" (NS. fol. 63r), cf. "yet I heare saie, some yong Ientlemen of oures, count it . . . ." (p. 213); or "wise men shold carefullie see the steppes of yougthe surelie staide by good order, in that most slipperie tyme of youth" (fol. 72r), cf. "... in that most slipperie tyme: and speciallie in the Courte, a place most dangerous for yougthe to liue in" (p. 222).

The development of these styles can be witnessed in the succession of Ascham's works. One notes the germ of
the aggressive element in the inverted word order of some passages of *Toxophilus* (see Chapter II, pp. 62-65), as well as in the transmission of involvement in his reaction to the material elements of described scenes. In the *Report* both characteristics are more obvious, although also more functional.

8 Although "ye" plays a part in the visual accumulation, it cannot have added to the phonetic echoes in the sentence.

9 See Chapter III, pp. 117-19, 124-25, above, for a discussion of similar tendencies in the *Report*, also in passages denouncing evil practices.

10 But Ascham's emphatic assertions in the *Report* of his certainty of otherwise unsupported facts are definitely manifestations of the same trait.

11 P. 211; cf. Isocrates *Areopagiticus* 37, 43-49. In *Toxophilus*, Ascham had recommended stricter laws as well (p. 31).

12 E.g., Parks, "The First Italianate Englishmen," and Ryan.

13 This is the same characteristic which motivated Richard Nixon to blame the news media for his 1960 campaign defeat: he felt sincerely that if his viewpoint had only gotten across in its entirety, the people must have sup-
ported him; since they did not, it must have been the getting across, not the viewpoint, which was at fault. Even as President, Nixon's fear of being misunderstood is seen in his habitual preface under fire. "Now let me make one point perfectly clear . . . ."

14 Pp. 198-99. The paragraph used on p. 154, above, as an example of parallelism progresses in much the same way by moving from cause to effect and back again until Ascham feels certain he has made his point; and the résumés on pp. 164-65 of course exhibit the same characteristics.

15 See, for example, the passages studied by Joan Webber in The Eloquent "I" (Madison, Wisc., 1968), pp. 184, 205-10, 287, n. 13.

16 English Drama, 1580-1642, ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke and Nathaniel Burton Paradise (Boston, 1933), p. 575. See also the prologue to Volpone, 11. 9-18, and the letter to Sir Francis Stuart preceding Epicoene in the same edition.


19 Significantly, Ascham has a special liking for this word. It appears six times in the Report and six more times
in *The Scholemaster*. Moreover, as George Parks has pointed out, sixteen instances of the same word were deleted from the first draft, either by Ascham or by his posthumous editor.
Chapter V: Conclusion


4. Ibid., p. 295.


8. After writing the Governour, Elyot wrote more technical works and spent much of his later life translating Greek and Latin moral philosophy (e.g., The Doctrinal of Princes, from Isocrates' treatise to Nicocles) or anthologizing moral sententiae (e.g., The Bankette of Sapience).
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