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A Stylistic Analysis of the Pragmatics of *thou* in Early Modern English Dialogues

Abstract

This study investigates the changing pragmatics of *thou* in Early Modern English dialogues. It considers the contexts in which *thou* and *you* are used with singular reference, analyses in detail the motivation for shifts from one form to the other within an exchange and how the use of the forms *thou* and *you* collocates with address terms and epithets in a broad range of constructed and authentic texts.

The study is data-driven. Texts in the Corpus of English Dialogues featuring inflected forms of *thou* are identified and the unmarked usage of the speaker to the addressee is established by a close reading of these texts. Motivation for switches to marked usage of *thou* and singular *you* is assessed from the context. Address terms and affective epithets collocating with *thou* and singular *you* are noted to trace diachronic usage. A comparison is made between usage in drama and non-drama texts. The findings show that *thou*-usage connotes affect not only in Shakespearean drama, as has previously been proposed, but also in a wide range of texts throughout the period studied.

The study presents a new pragmaphilological model with a finding that the process of pronoun switching frequently acts as a pragmatic marker. The study establishes that features influencing change of use are speaker’s change of topic, speaker’s change of stance on the topic and speaker’s change of perception of the persona of the addressee. In comparison with *you*, *thou* is used as an address term with diminishing frequency throughout the whole period. It is used more frequently in collocation with affective epithets than with address terms. It continues in use with an affective function in drama texts until the end of the period. The switching of address pronouns is motivated. The pragmatics of *thou* is understood through its switching behaviour with *you*. 
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A Stylistic Analysis of the Pragmatics of *thou* in Early Modern English Dialogues

Chapter 1 Aims & Objectives

This is a qualitative and quantitative study investigating the changing pragmatics of *thou* in Early Modern English dialogues. It considers the contexts in which *thou* and *you* were used with singular reference, analyses the motivation for shifts from one form to the other within an exchange and analyses how the use of the forms *thou* and *you* collocates with address terms and epithets in a range of constructed and authentic texts.

In Old English *thou* was the second person singular personal pronoun in the nominative case and *ye* was the plural form. The use of the plural form in singular contexts developed in the Middle English period probably initially in formal contexts (Hogg 2002:20). This usage probably came into English via Latin and French texts written in twelfth-century England (Johnson 1966:261). Horobin & Smith suggest that by the Middle English period, ‘*thou* was not only singular but also intimate and *ye* was regarded as more formal as well as plural’ with the distinction being ‘roughly comparable with the *tu/vous* distinction in present day French’ (2002:112). Analyses of contemporary texts, however, have shown that the distinction is more subtle than intimacy and formality with *ye/you* being: ‘not so much ‘polite’ as ‘not impolite’; it is not so much ‘formal’ as ‘not informal’ (Quirk 1986:7). By the end of the Early Modern English period Lowth considers that ‘*thou* in the polite, and even in the familiar style is disused, and the plural *you* is employed instead of it,’ with *thou* being restricted to ‘the serious and solemn style,’ that is, the register of poetry and sermons ([1762]1799:vi).

Ulrich Busse, author of a comprehensive study of *thou/you* variation in the Shakespeare corpus, suggests:

If two linguistic forms in a specific language co-occur at a given time it is from the point of view of economy in language very likely that they are not semantically identical – at least in their connotations, or since we deal with a set of closed-class elements that acquire meaning through their capacity of anaphoric reference, or their pragmatic value, we may assume that they are
neither in free variation nor in complementary distribution ... but that there is a certain overlap in function in that they should not be viewed as if in a clear-cut binary division but as if on a sliding scale. (2002:8)

In order to investigate the changing significance of the second person pronoun in Early Modern English, I have analysed the Corpus of English Dialogues 1560-1760, a computerized corpus of constructed and authentic dialogues compiled by Merja Kytö of Uppsala University and Jonathan Culpeper of Lancaster University. The analysis adopts a diachronic form-to-function model in which the pertinent question is, according to Fitzmaurice & Taavitsainen (2007:15): ‘What are the constraints on ways in which meaning can change while form remains constant?’ Therefore, one of my objectives is:

**to discover the contexts in which the forms thou and you were used with singular reference.**

My second objective is:

**to determine the motivation for shifts from one form to the other within an exchange or within a single utterance.**

My aim is to make my study data-driven rather than hypothesis-driven. Rather than considering features that had already been proposed as potential determinants in the selection of thou/you, my approach is to identify the phenomenon of switching from one form to another with singular reference and then to assess possible causes. In this way, I hope to answer the Fish criticism of stylistic analysis (1979:129): that it ‘was always arbitrary, less a matter of something demonstrated than of something assumed before the fact or imposed after it.’ Fish asserts that ‘the goal of stylistics – an objective account of form and meaning – is an impossible one’. It would be possible only if it were possible to ‘point to a formal structure without already having invoked some interpretative principle’ (1979:130).

---

1 Henceforth CED.
Concepts and Terminology

Deixis

The choice of the variant is likely to be significant. With this choice the speaker indicates or points to some aspect of the addressee. This pointing feature, which serves to ‘express distinctions in terms of orientation within the immediate context of an utterance’ (Trask 1993:75), is termed ‘deixis’ from the Greek for ‘pointing’ (Wales 2001:99). Bussmann defines deixis (1996:116) as ‘linguistic expressions that refer to the personal, temporal or spatial aspect of any given utterance act and whose designation is therefore dependent on the context of the speech situation’ [added emphasis].

Quotations in the *Oxford English Dictionary*² under the definition to thou as a speech act verb, to address someone as thou, in the Early Modern English period suggest that it was regarded as the marked form of the thou/you pair that is: the use of a singular form to a single addressee invited comment. Before the seventeenth century, the comments indicated that it was perceived as implying lack of social deference:

- **c1450** in Aungier *Syon* (1840) 297 None of hyghenesse schal thou another in spekyng.
- **c1530** *Hickscorner* (1905) 149 Avaunt, caitiff, dost thou thou me! I am come of good kin I tell thee!

and that thou was the common form of address to God, making the use of you in this context worthy of comment:

- **1564-78** W. BULLEIN *Dial.agst. Pest.* (1888) 5 He thous not God, but you[s] hym.

Markedness

Because both thou and you were perceived as marked and invited comment in certain contexts, it seems appropriate to pursue the objectives above using the concept of markedness. This concept was first postulated in terms of phonological opposition by Trubetzkoy ascribing to phonetic features (such as voicing) opposed actual values, either positive or negative and extended to grammar and lexis by Jakobson

---

² Henceforth OED.
Grammatical and lexical features may have opposed values which may add a level of connotation to their strictly referential content. According to Trask (1993:167) the marked form of a variable is:

1 a form or construction differing from another with which it stands in a paradigmatic relationship (the unmarked form) by the presence of additional morphological material.

2 a form or construction which is regarded as less central or less natural than a competing one on any of various grounds, such as lower frequency, more limited distribution, more overt morphological marking, greater semantic specificity or greater rarity in languages generally.

An example of the first category is the addition of the suffix –ess to a noun to denote a female person. Trask gives the example hostess, which is marked with respect to host.

Bussmann defines markedness as:

the distinction between what is neutral, natural or expected (which is) unmarked and what departs from the neutral along some specified parameter (that is) marked. (1998:295)

He suggests that in semantics prototypes are unmarked categories. As an example of his second category Trask gives the noun drake as being marked with respect to its superordinate duck. We can develop this as: all ducks are ducks but not all ducks are drakes, thus, as a hyponym of duck, drake, is the marked form. Wales (2001:243) notes that when the female gender is explicitly marked on nouns, as in English, and the unmarked form is used ‘with generic as well as male reference,’ there is concern that this may be ‘taken evaluatively, with connotations of “abnormality” or inferiority.’

**Markedness Shift**

Markedness shift (Trask 1993:167) is ‘the historical process by which the more marked of two competing forms becomes less marked and vice versa.’ Markedness shift occurred in modern British English with reference to an apparatus for receiving radio signals. This was originally termed wireless with US usage radio as the
marked form in British English. Quotations from the OED illustrate the process by which the term *wireless* became marked:

1927 T. E. Lawrence *Let. 4 Oct.* (1938) 543 *We have no wireless,* and I don’t look at papers.

1936 King Edward VIII in *Manch. Guardian Weekly 6 Mar.* 185/1 Science has made it possible for me..to speak to you all over the radio.

1941 W. H. Auden *New Year Let.*ii. 36 He moves on tiptoe round the room, Turns on the radio to mark Isolde’s Sehnsucht for the dark.

1944 K. Douglas *Alamein to Zem Zem* (1946) 49 The wirelesses in the new tanks had to be checked.

1968 *New Society 22 Aug.* 265/2 Non-U radio/U wireless is no longer true; the U call it a radio too.

1971 *Daily Tel.* 13 May 7/1, I used to stand alone in front of that big brown box that used to be called a ‘wireless’ and conduct symphony concerts.

With the *thou*/you variants the plural form *you* began to be applied as a marked form with singular reference and progressively ousted the singular form *thou* until this form itself became marked. During this process some *thou*/you usage acquired evaluative connotation. Subsequently markedness reversal occurred when the direction of the shift seemed to change in certain contexts.

Shapiro notes (1983:15-17) that ‘markedness is a species of interpretant’ also that ‘one part of the referential field must be represented by the unmarked term of an opposition’ (e.g. *duck*), ‘but the remaining part may be represented by either the marked or the unmarked term’ (e.g. *duck* or *drake*). It seems likely that a change in the linguistic variant referring to an addressee connotes some aspect of the status of that addressee. It is not only that the ‘precise characterisation of markedness is a matter of some controversy’ (Trask 1993), but also the fact that the history of the second-person pronoun system ‘is intricate and not well understood’ (Lass 1999:148), that motivates the present investigation.

The controversy over the characterisation of markedness seems to arise over Jakobson’s definition of meaning as ‘an intrinsic property given by the linguistic system itself, not by external reality’ (Jakobson 1967:671 in Andrews 1990:14). As Andrews states (1990:148) ‘generally, conceptual features in grammar and morphology cannot reverse synchronically if the fundamental premises of Jakobsonian markedness theory, as Jacobson himself developed them for morphology, are accepted.’ Since they do appear to reverse synchronically
according to the data in the CED, this suggests that meaning, or some feature of it, may be found in external reality; that is in language use as a pragmatic feature. Basing her argument on conceptual features as the basis of meaning, Andrews refutes Waugh’s example of the lexical pair *male/female* to illustrate markedness reversal (1990:151). Waugh suggests (1982:310) that ‘female’ is marked for occupation in the context of doctor or professor, since, in Western culture and until relatively recently at least, the general assumption would have been that doctors and professors would have been male. Similarly ‘male’ would be marked for secretary or nurse. Andrews considers that this example misdefines categories of extra-linguistic experience such as gender and animacy as semantic invariants.

I suggest that markedness is not only semantic, however, but may also be pragmatic. Andrews goes on to claim (1990:156) that, ‘acknowledging the marked nature of the “feminine” form allows one only to assume, based on our experience of extra-linguistic reality, that the marking is something like “a being who is perceived as having feminine gender and all this entails”’. She questions why if ‘feminine’ forms are marked for ‘femaleness’ the lexeme ‘she’ also refers to ‘ships, planes, hurricanes and gay men.’ The answer, I propose, is that these entities are not beings ‘perceived as having feminine gender and all this entails’ but entities with perceived female characteristics. Andrews suggests though that the fact that hurricanes in the US are now given both male and female proper names and that ‘pronominal usage now corresponds to the gender indicated by the proper noun ... shows that pronominal gender is defined within the linguistic system itself; the pronoun agrees with the lexical or grammatical gender of its referent.’ There seems no reason why it would not agree, whether the femaleness were a semantic invariant or a pragmatic component.

Pronoun usage does agree with the gender indicated by the proper noun in hurricane naming but how does an inanimate object acquire the features of animacy and feminine gender? The explanation is suggested on a meteorological website, as is the subsequent change to the custom of alternating male and female names for tropical storms:

... in the 1940s ... when short-wave radio came into general use for the transmission of weather forecasts and warnings to shipping and aviation ...
giving hurricanes nicknames was a very simple and quick way of identifying a particular storm from one day to the next. In 1953 the National Weather Service began using female names for storms. For many years hurricanes and other tropical storms bore only girls' names. In that era when political correctness had never been heard of, the exclusively male meteorological community in the USA considered female names appropriate for such unpredictable and dangerous phenomena. In the 1970s the growing numbers of female meteorologists began to object to such a sexist practice, and from 1978 onwards girls' and boys' names alternated. (history of hurricane names weatheronline)

I would suggest connotation rather than entailment as the deciding feature. Tropical storms are ‘unpredictable and dangerous’, features perceived as characteristically female by the ‘exclusively male meteorological community’.

Shapiro explains the concept of markedness assimilation (1983:84) as occurring when ‘the normally unmarked value for a given feature occurs in an unmarked (simultaneous or sequential) context, and the normally marked value in the marked context.’ Andrews views this as a circular argument (1990:146), since one must first assume what is marked and unmarked. In the case of thou/you distinction Shapiro’s claim does seem to be valid, since the thou variant, which ultimately became marked in conversational use, has survived in the marked contexts of poetry, prayer and ritual. Haiman (1980) asserts that the significance of markedness assimilation is that it recognises that markedness relates to context. He illustrates this with the example of a bilingual speaker who speaks French at home and English in the office. Were he to change this to speak English at home and French in the office, this would be for him marked behaviour. ‘Neither language and neither context is in itself marked; what may be either marked or neutral is only the relationship between the two’ (Haiman 1980:529). The bilingual speaker’s habitual usage would be the default unmarked usage. A switch to the other language would be marked and probably motivated. Haiman rejects as ‘insufficiently specific’ the idea that you forms can be explained as examples of markedness assimilation (1980:529fn). He notes that the morphological distinction between familiar and polite forms of address exists in other European languages. In some you is the plural form and an icon of power. In others you is in the third person singular or plural form connoting distance. ‘These are all marked with respect to the second singular addressee, as are the first person and the genitive case but neither of these is ever found as a signal of polite address’
(Haiman 1980:529fn). He does not give examples here but, assuming that the first person and genitive case he suggests relate to ‘the hospital we,’ as in ‘how are we today? how is our arm feeling?’ asked of a patient by a (rather patronising) doctor, these could be cited as examples of markedness assimilation. They do not signal polite address but are a marked expression of singularity connoting a further aspect of the thou/you variable, solidarity, in the marked context of a medical interview.

In his study of markedness as an evaluative feature, Battistella (1990:2) defines semantic markedness as ‘a relation between a very specific linguistic sign (the marked term) and a sign that is unspecified for the grammatical or conceptual feature in question.’ The unmarked term (1990:4) ‘will be more broadly defined, carry less information and is a conceptual default value unless the marked term is specifically indicated.’ Further markedness relations are not fixed but, significantly for the present study, depend on the ‘language-internal evaluation of the terms of an opposition’ and ‘context may have the effect of reversing markedness relations.’ According to these criteria thou may be defined as the marked term in the CED. The distribution criteria for unmarked forms cited by Battistella are considered in the present analysis. He discounts text frequency as a test for unmarkedness because of what he terms the ‘type/token fallacy’, that is ‘greater text frequency may indicate frequency of use of a particular category rather than its semantic properties’ (1990:38). The danger of relying on counting tokens is illustrated in the CED texts. A bare quantitative analysis reveals nothing more than quantity:

You, you, you, shall we fetch a kennell of Beagles that may cry nothing but you, you, you, you. For we are wearie of it.

[1595 1CWARNE]

Because of space constraint, this study concentrates on those texts in the CED in which thou, the postulated marked term, features. The second defining feature of unmarkedness, broader distribution or involvement in a greater number of contexts than the marked value, though noted, is not considered in detail.

The third distributional criterion noted by Battistella (1990:38), neutralisation, relates to the wider application of the unmarked term, in this case you, to the general ‘not-implying T[hou]’ and the specific ‘implying not-T[hou]’ (Jakobson 1957 cited

3 See chapter 2 Brown & Gilman’s (1964) Power & Solidarity model.
in Battistella 1990). This is relevant to a consideration of markedness reversal, a concept defined by Battistella (1990:58):

markedness values reverse when a marked term’s referent comes to be the expected or general member of an opposition and the unmarked term’s referent becomes the unexpected. Then the feature value distinguishing the marked element becomes the new unmarked value, reversing its previous status.

Levinson relates markedness and markedness reversal to Grice’s (1975) model of Generalized Conversational Implicature (2000:31):

Grice’s Second Maxim of Quantity: Do not make your contribution more informative than is required, from which can be deduced, ‘if what is simply described can be presumed to be stereotypically exemplified, then what is described in a marked or unusual way should be presumed to contrast with that stereotypical or normal exemplification’ and ‘one need not say what can be taken for granted,’ so that ‘what’s said in an abnormal way isn’t normal ... or a marked message indicates a marked situation.’

Battistella applied markedness to a brief survey of the *thou*/*you* variable in English (1990). He suggests that *thou*/*you* developed from a number distinction to the use in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries of the singular *you* to superiors to express deference. *Thou* then became unspecified for deference giving either no indication of deference or purposeful nondeference with the feature [nondeferential] as the unmarked feature value. Shortly after this *thou* came to signify ‘close family relationships, intimacy and shared values and in some cases contempt,’ (1990:175) thus constituting a shift and a re-evaluation of the [deferential]/[nondeferential] opposition.

After the establishment of *you* to indicate extreme politeness to social superiors, the usage would spread and the social meaning would weaken in a process of semantic bleaching to politeness rather than social superiority. Battistella suggests that this involved a parallel shift of the component [nondeferential], ‘since one term of an opposition cannot be changed without changing the other as well.’

Andrews (1990:158) disputes the inevitability of this shift citing the example of *bad* in BEV [AAVE] which may now mean *good* i.e. *bad* [negative] has been extended to *bad* [positive] but the reverse does not apply, since *good* [positive] remains unchanged. Andrews considers this shift a ‘contextual variant meaning.’ I consider the difference to be that, whereas *bad* and *good* are distinguished only by the presence or absence of the feature [positive], so that *bad* may now be [-positive]/[+positive], *thou* and *you* may be distinguished by several different features.
connote familiarity as either intimacy or impoliteness, depending on the context. The semantic bleaching noted by Battistella is the stage at which the vertical semantic of social status connoted by you extended to include the horizontal semantic of familiarity and distance. The next stage would be markedness reversal as you became generalised and unmarked for neutral address and thou narrowed becoming marked. Eventually, the feature value [deferential] (1990:178) would ‘no longer apply in the pronoun system.’ The consequence of this markedness switch is not only that these variants thou/you with singular reference co-existed in Early Modern English but that in some contexts they appeared to be interchangeable within one exchange and even within one utterance.

**Grammaticalisation, Subjectification & Pragmaticalisation**

In their study of the influence of language on human thought, Mühlhäusler & Harré note (1990:133) that a Japanese-speaker ‘must learn the local hierarchies of respect and condescension and where he or she belongs within them,’ since ‘without that knowledge grammatically correct choice of person-referring words cannot be made’ [original emphasis]. Levinson (1994:5), in offering several potential definitions of pragmatics, finds ‘those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language’ to be a feature of pragmatics, that is, of ‘language in use’. For a feature of the context to be linguistically encoded, it must be:

- intentionally communicated
- conventionally associated with the linguistic form in question
- a member of a contrast set, the other members of which encode different features
- subject to regular grammatical processes (1994:11)

These features apply to the second-person pronoun in Modern French when the plural form of the verb may be used with a singular reference so that ‘morphological agreement’ can make ‘distinctions not overtly made by the pronouns themselves’ (Levinson 1994). Where there is ‘no overt distinction between second person singular polite and second person plural pronouns the finite verbs will agree in both cases with the superficially plural pronoun’ (Levinson 1994:70). With the ‘polite plural’ (semantically singular but plural in surface structure), the distinction is
morphologically marked, with noun-like predicates agreeing with the real-world number, whereas the grammatical subject is plural as in sentence (a) (Comrie 1975:409). The French examples here illustrate this, but it applies also to the English translations. Sentence (b) is ambiguous as to number in both English and French:

a) Vous êtes le professeur?
   Are you the teacher?

b) Vous parlez français?
   Do you speak French?

Sentences (c) and (d) have the same truth conditions (singular addressee) but express a difference in interlocutor social relationship (Levinson 1994:129):

c) Tu es le professeur

d) Vous êtes le professeur

whereas both have the same form and singular reference in Modern English:

   You are the teacher

This encoding of social relationship within the address term vous in Modern French and in the you variant of Early Modern English means that, with a singular addressee, the pronoun has the sense [+singular +honorific]. That is: the social relationship is grammaticalised. Levinson defines such a system as a ‘referent honorific system, where the referent happens to be the addressee’ (1994:90).

Levinson finds that his next proposed definition of pragmatics (1994:12) as ‘the study of all those aspects of meaning not captured in a semantic theory’ or ‘meaning minus semantics’ (1994:28) reveals a problem with his previous definition of ‘language in use’. If pragmatics is concerned only with grammatically encoded aspects of context, the meaning encoded in the you of the thou/you variants would be only ‘social distance or superiority’. Additional sociolinguistic features of use such as regional variation, age and sex would account for which speakers would give you to which addressees. These sociolinguistic features would need to be considered, however, to account for switches in use. The pragmatic aspect would encode only the social locating of the addressee by the speaker. Levinson’s third and fourth definitions of pragmatics as ‘the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding’ and ‘the study of the ability
of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be
appropriate’ relate to the ability of the addressee to identify marked usage, that is:
unexpected or inappropriate usage. The sociolinguistic features of the exchange
would need to be considered in identifying expected, unmarked usage in a particular
context in order to determine what constitutes marked usage in a particular context.
Levinson’s further suggestion concerns features that are indicative of, or influenced
by, some aspect of markedness: ‘pragmatics is the study of deixis (at least in part),
implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and aspects of discourse structure.’

The grammatical encoding of [singular][honorific] in the use of the plural second
person pronoun you to social superiors is attested in Middle English. By the Early
Modern English period use of you to a single addressee had spread to interlocutors of
similar social status so that the encoding appeared to have become [singular][polite].
This development illustrates the phenomenon of subjectification in the application of
the singular you. Initially you denoted only plurality. Its use with singular reference
in Middle English encoded the speaker’s attitude of deference to the addressee,
which outweighed the real-world situation of singularity. Traugott explains the
process of subjectification as a:

mechanism whereby meanings come over time to encode or externalise the
SP/W’s [speaker/writer’s] perspectives and attitudes as constrained by the
communicative world of the speech event, rather than by the so-called “real-
world” characteristics of the event or situation referred to (2003:126)

The change to encoding [+polite] in Early Modern English reflects speaker attention
to the addressee’s self-perception or face. This is intersubjectification, defined by
Traugott as a:

mechanism whereby meanings become more centred on the addressee ... [becoming] over time to encode or externalise implicatures regarding SP/W’s
attention to the ‘self’ of AD/R [addressee/reader] in both an epistemic and a

There was a progression from a process of subjectification in Middle English to one
of intersubjectification in Early Modern English. Thus ‘the locutionary agent’s
expression of himself and his own attitudes and beliefs’ (Lyons 1982:102) by the use
of an honorific pronoun to connote deference developed into consideration of the
addressee’s self-perception or face, exemplified by the use of a ‘polite’ address term.
Traugott’s research into grammaticalisation and subjectification postulates these tendencies in the process of semantic change (1989:34):

Tendency I: Meanings based in the external described situation > meanings based in the internal evaluative/perceptual/cognitive described situation

Tendency II: Meanings based in the external or internal described situation > meanings based in the textual and metalinguistic situation

Tendency III: Meanings tend to become increasingly based in the speaker’s subjective belief state/attitude towards the proposition

Traugott (1989:31) illustrates the rise of epistemic meanings with reference to modal auxiliaries, assertive speech act verbs and modal adverbs. She shows that they all ‘develop from less to more strongly subjective epistemicity.’ This agrees with my finding of the development of singular you in the CED data. The more subjective evaluation becomes (Tendency III), the greater its potential to influence the structure of the text and to perform a linguistic act, such as a focus shift (both of which are Tendency II). It seems that intersubjectification (Tendency III) reinforces the tendency of usage in context to connote subjective epistemicity sufficiently strong to influence the interpretation of the utterance (meaning based in the textual and metalinguistic situation).

Traugott’s postulated Tendencies are exemplified in the diachronic development of the thou/you variants. Under Tendency I, you acquired the evaluative concept of deference and under Tendency III that of politeness. Tendency II, discourse deixis indicating topic shift or development as a function of thou/you switching is investigated in the current study. The thou/you pronoun in this context undergoes a process of pragmaticalisation. Such an element, according to Jucker (2002:216), ‘loses its semantic or truth-conditional meaning (semantic bleaching) and at the same time increases its potential for conversational implicatures and its attitudinal meaning (pragmatic strengthening).’ Frank-Job (2006:361) defines pragmatisation as a process by which ‘a word form, in a given context, changes its propositional meaning in favor of an essentially metacommunicative, discourse interactional meaning.’ Because thou and you are used synchronically with singular

---

5 ‘Epistemics have to do with knowledge and belief about possibilities, probabilities,’ whereas ‘deonitics have to do with will, obligation and permission’ (Traugott 1989:32).

6 See tables and discussions of unmarked address in chapters 4, 5 and 6, particularly the discussion in chapter 5 on the consequences of the misapplication of intersubjectivity.
reference in the CED texts, both forms have undergone semantic bleaching and consequent pragmatic strengthening. When they are used interchangeably by the same speaker to the same addressee, this marks a change in perception of some aspect of the exchange. The switch functions as a pragmatic marker.

**Pragmatic Markers**

Jucker finds discourse markers in Early Modern English a particularly productive area of study in historical pragmatics (2002:210-230). He notes they include terms such as *merry* and *why*. These may be semantically bleached and are syntactically detachable from the sentence, but there is little agreement as to which elements should be included in this category.

Discourse markers are indicators of thematic discontinuities and thus work as episode-boundary markers. My discovery that *thou/you* in markedness reversal may also connote thematic discontinuity led me to investigate them as discourse markers.\(^7\) Since it transpires that a *thou/you* switch may also have interpersonal connotation, I adopt the broader term pragmatic markers.

The term ‘pragmatic marker’ is generally applied to single lexical items such as: *ah, anyway, but, now, well,* to phrases such as: *I say, I mean, you know, let’s see,* and less frequently to morphosyntactic forms such as the use of the historic present tense. Because the terminology in the literature is so varied, I retain the original usage in all references cited, whilst rejecting immediately the term ‘particle’ in relation to *thou/you* usage, as this tends to be generally used to refer to interjections. I have taken as a point of reference the classification of pragmatic markers that Brinton derived from a general overview of current research. Brinton lists their characteristics as being (1996:33):

- predominantly a feature of oral rather than written discourse, as this tends to be less formal and more impromptu
- stigmatized as a sign of disfluency
- often phonologically reduced,
- they form a separate tone group
- often sentence-initial

\(^7\) See discussion and tables in chapter 7.
have little or no propositional meaning
may be separate from syntactic structure and have no clear grammatical function
seem to be optional rather than obligatory
do not derive from a single word class.

A further characteristic of pragmatic markers is their multi-functionality (Brinton 1996:37) as they operate on morphophonemic, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic levels simultaneously, as well as textually and inter-personally. This multi-functionality induces me to classify thou/you switching as a pragmatic marker. All of the other features proposed by Brinton describe the interjections, conjunctions and set phrases that are typically studied as pragmatic markers. The pronouns you and thou in Early Modern English have an interpersonal evaluative function per se. The switching of the pronouns you and thou within a text or within a single utterance, however, has a textual function of foregrounding the usage to mark some aspect of significance.

The functions of pragmatic markers listed by Brinton fall into two categories. Those I find applicable to thou/you switching are:

Textual
- to mark a boundary in discourse,
- to indicate a new topic or partial shift in topic, or the resumption of an earlier topic,
- to indicate new or old information

Interpersonal
- subjectively, to express a response or reaction to some aspect of the discourse
- interpersonally, to effect co-operation, sharing or intimacy between speaker and hearer, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing deference, or saving face.

Fraser develops his concept of markers in a series of papers: Pragmatic Markers (1996), Discourse Markers (1999) and Topic Orientation Markers (2009). He assesses the function of pragmatic markers in the grammar of the sentence, that is, how they contribute to sentence meaning e.g. without those features of performance and context that contribute to the interpretation of an utterance. Pragmatic markers (Fraser 1996:168) constitute the non-propositional part of the sentence meaning.
They are ‘the linguistically encoded clues which signal the speaker’s potential communicative intentions.’ There are four types. The pragmatic marker is emboldened.

1) The basic marker signals the force of the message by means of sentence mood and lexical expression:

a) *I regret* that he is still here.

b) *Admittedly,* I was taken in.

c) The cat is very sick.

Although Fraser does not specifically say this, his analysis implies that some pragmatic marker is an implicit component of any sentence. Whilst it is apparent from his examples that (a) is an expression of regret and (b) an admission, sentence (c) has no lexical basic marker. This is because ‘its declarative mood signals that it is the expression of belief (a claim, a report) that the state of the world expressed by the propositional content is true.’ Thus, sentence (c) would not include a Pragmatic Marker under Brinton’s general classification.

2) The commentary marker provides a comment on the basic message:

*Supidly,* Sara didn’t fax the correct form in on time.

3) The discourse message signals the relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse (but I find that markers are not exclusively anaphoric):

*Jacob was very tired. So, he left early.*

4) The parallel marker (see immediately below) signals a message additional to the basic message:

*John, you are very noisy*

These last three pragmatic marker categories are optional and do not overlap in function.

Of particular interest in a study of the *thou/you* variants is Fraser’s category of parallel markers ‘whose function is to signal an entire message in addition to the basic message’ (1996:185). One class of these is vocative markers such as: ‘standard titles, occupation name, general nouns, pronominal forms’ (1996:185).
The use of a vocative, i.e. an address term, sends the message that the speaker is explicitly categorising the addressee (Fraser 1996:185). In a study of Early Modern English, I would add relationship terms, which are less frequently used as vocatives in Modern English.

In his subsequent study of discourse markers, Fraser (1999) excludes vocatives, ‘since they signal a message in addition to the primary message conveyed by the sentence, and do not signal a relationship between segments’ (1999:942). In Hallidayan social semiotic terms, they are interpersonal as the speaker ‘intrudes himself into the context of the situation, both expressing his own attitudes and judgements and seeking to influence the attitudes and behaviour of others’ (Halliday 2007:184). ‘They must be treated as pragmatic idioms, which constitute an entire, separate message’ (Fraser 1999:943). In his later study on topic orientation markers (2009:892), Fraser incorporates parallel markers into the category of commentary markers ‘by which the speaker can convey an attitude towards either the action or state represented in the segment or [to] an individual’ (2009:891). The examples he gives, however, comment on the proposition and not on an individual:

a) **Frankly**, you should see a doctor.

b) **Amazingly**, John made it home before dark.

c) **Apparently**, he won’t go.

I am not aware of this category of parallel markers being studied elsewhere. Where I have found parallel markers mentioned, there is little elaboration. Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen (2009:7-8) cite the category in Fraser’s proposed taxonomy of pragmatic markers: ‘parallel markers (including some vocatives) where the message signalled is different from the basic message ... can be illustrated by vocatives.’

It may be that parallel markers generally and their sub-category of vocative markers particularly are more significant in a variety such as Early Modern English that has the capacity to express dual categorisation to the addressee rather than a variety such as Modern English that has lost this facility. Consider Fraser’s example:

   Waiter, please bring me another fork.
‘By using one of these vocative forms, for example waiter, the speaker is explicitly sending the message that the addressee of this message is the waiter’ (Fraser 1996:185). There are two concurrent, messages within one utterance: You are the waiter + I am asking you to bring me another fork. Fraser does not suggest that this connotes evaluation. It has the potential to do so, however, in Modern English. My intuition is that, if the speaker needed to attract the waiter’s attention, this utterance would not be perceived as patronising. If, on the other hand, the waiter was already aware that the speaker was addressing him, the use of this address term could be perceived as a device to emphasise their relative unequal social status. In the CED texts the addition of the second person pronoun in this request would inevitably position the addressee in relation to the speaker. In Modern English, the parallelism in Fraser’s terminology presumably derives from the speaker’s construction of the addressee in the address term and in the illocutionary force of the proposition. There are two parallel messages.

In his study of pragmatic markers, Fraser has a parallel marker sub-category of solidarity markers (1996:186) These are address terms indicating either solidarity:

My friend, we simply have got to get our act together ...

or lack of solidarity (unsolidarity):

Look, birdbrain, this has been sitting in the “in box” for over a week ...

It is not apparent from these sentences out of context if the apparently friendly address my friend does connote solidity. It may connote irony.8 Similarly, the apparently abusive epithet birdbrain may constitute banter9 in an offer of help to a close friend. It would not be apparent either in such sentences in Early Modern English taken out of context. In the context of an Early Modern English conversational exchange, however, the evaluative function of the thou/you variable in conjunction with an address term would constitute not two separate and parallel

---

8 irony: an implied reversal of the evaluative meaning of the utterance (rather than of the propositional/ideational meaning (Partington 2007:1547).

9 OED banter: good humoured ridicule. Similar to Partington’s teasing (2008:773) ‘hedged critical evaluation, an FTA that violates the Gricean maxim of Quality as it is (supposedly) not meant to threaten the hearer’s face; it is (apparently) a fictional face attack ... teasing and banter is best viewed as a form of conflict management, whereby potential real conflict is diffused and defused by playing it out, by converting it into ludic combat’ (2008:789).
messages but one re-enforced inter-subjective message. Additionally, had there been a switch in the speaker’s use of the variant to an addressee, this would, like Fraser’s discourse markers (1996:186) constitute a further procedural message to the addressee on how the utterance was to be interpreted. Switches would, like discourse markers, function as ‘topic change markers, contrastive markers, elaborative markers and inferential markers’ (1996:187).

Terminology for this function varies across studies. The term *evaluative marker* seems inadequate, since it relates only to the interpersonal aspect of the relationship between the interlocutors. *Discourse marker* is more wide-ranging. It includes the subjective aspect of inter-personal usage and the textual component but does not appear to account for the evaluative component. It seems, therefore, that the term *pragmatic marker* should be applied to *thou/you* shifting, for want of anything better, as this feature implicitly functions as a pragmatic marker in Early Modern English.

A further proposed type of pragmatic marker is discourse management markers ‘which signal a meta-comment on the structure of the discourse’ (Fraser 2009:893). Of these the sub-category of topic orientation markers seems relevant to *thou/you* shifting. They may signal the intention to digress from the present topic or to introduce a new topic (2009:893). Attention markers (*and, now, oh, well, then*) which may occur before topic orientation markers, signal a coming topic change but not usually the nature of that change. They also frequently signal a switch to marked *thou/you* usage in which the persona of the addressee undergoes restructuring motivated generally by changing affect. Attention markers in collocation with *thou/you* shifting are, therefore, noted in my analysis of the CED texts.

**Deixis and Affect**

My third objective is:

*to investigate how the use of the forms *thou* and *you* collocates with address terms and epithets and what this may imply about their changing significance in the Early Modern English period.*

---

10 Although, writing of discourse markers in Early Modern English, Jucker finds that many ‘are used with increasingly interpersonal functions that express the speaker’s emotions and attitudes towards the addressee’ (2002:230).
Lyons, assessing deixis as a form of ‘gestural reference’ (1995:303), proposes the term ‘pure deixis’ with reference to the first-person and second-person personal pronouns in (Modern) English, since ‘they refer to the locutionary agent and the addressee without conveying any additional information about them.’ He contrasts this with third-person singular pronouns which ‘are impure deictics: they encode the distinctions of meaning which are traditionally associated with the terms “masculine”, “feminine” and “neuter”.’ Such distinctions do not relate to the spatio-temporal role or location of the referent and are, therefore, not fully deictic, since they ‘encode the speaker’s assumptions about the entity in question’ (1995:308). This is ‘secondary deixis’ involving the displacement of the primary deixis spatio-temporal dimensions with emotional or attitudinal dimensions. This feature is found in languages with the *thou/*you distinction and may express ‘relatively stable interpersonal relations’ (social deixis or in the CED unmarked usage). A switch in the use of the *thou/*you variants may express the ‘speaker’s change of mood or attitude’ (personal deixis, which I have termed affect). Lyons terms this merging of social and expressive meaning ‘socio-expressive’ (1995:310). Such usage, ‘social deixis’, is ‘concerned with the grammaticalisation or encoding in language structure of social information’ (Levinson 1994:93).

‘Affective meaning’ is given in Bussmann as another term for ‘connotation’ (1996:96) and defined as ‘the emotive component of a linguistic expression which is superimposed upon its basic meaning and which – in contrast to the static conceptual meaning – is difficult to describe generally and context independently’ [added emphasis]. I would suggest, however, that ‘affect’ is a hyponym of ‘connotation’, since ‘connotation’ includes the component of social evaluation, whereas ‘affect’ includes individual speaker evaluation. Bussmann defines ‘denotation’ (1996:118) as ‘the constant, abstract, and basic meaning of a linguistic expression independent of context and situation [added emphasis], as opposed to the connotative, i.e. subjectively variable, emotive components of meaning.’

**Evaluation of Connotation & Expression of Affect**

The use of *thou* in this seventeenth century quotation connotes negative affect when it collocates with pejorative address terms. The terms *viper* and *traitor* generally
connote pejoration:

1603 COKE in Hargrave *State Trials* (1776) I. 216 All that Lord Cobham did was by thy instigation, thou viper, for I thou thee, thou Traitor! (OED)

*Traitor* according to the OED has the referential or denotational, ‘constant’ or ‘basic’, meaning of:

One who betrays any person that trusts him, or any duty entrusted to him;
One who is false to his allegiance to his sovereign or to the government of his country;
One adjudged guilty of treason.

From the mini-corpus of quotations in the OED containing the term *traitor* it is possible to evaluate the social perception (connotation) attributed to the term by native speakers firstly from its early application to Judas Iscariot:

c1375 Sc. Leg. Saints vii. (Jacobus Min.) 29 þat wekit tratore Iudas

and from the inclusion of collocations such as: *untrue, infamy, disloyal* together with several examples of the term *false*. These contribute to the construction of pejorative connotation. The verb *betray* frequently collocated with the term *traitor* is similarly early attested with reference to the betrayal of Jesus by Judas:

c1275 *Passion Our Lord* 93 in *O.E. Misc.*, On me scal bi–traye – þat nv is vre yuere

and collocates with the terms: *faithless, punishment, much wrong ’d* all of which connote negative social perception.

*Betray* in the OED is defined as:

To give up to, or place in the power of an enemy,
To be or prove false to (a trust or him who trusts one); to be disloyal to;

OED definitions for the terms *traitor* and *betray* both have the component *false*, which is defined in the OED as, *erroneous, wrong*, further contributing to the perception of them as having negative connotation.

In figurative use *viper* is similarly pejorative according to the quotations given in the OED and has the negatively evaluated component *false*.

fig. A venomous, malignant, or spiteful person; a villain or scoundrel
a false or treacherous person.

The quotation is repeated here for clarity:
COKE in Hargrave *State Trials* (1776) 1. 216 All that Lord Cobham did was by thy instigation, thou viper, for I thou thee, thou Traitor!

The implication of 'for I thou thee' is that such usage is worthy of comment. Sir Edward Coke is emphasising to Walter Raleigh that he is not addressing him as you, the conventionally polite term. The implication is that, because Coke identifies Raleigh with these pejorative epithets, viper and traitor, he addresses him with the term thou rather than the term you, which generally connotes politeness, therefore for Coke, the speaker, in this context [added emphasis], this address term expresses his negative feeling towards Raleigh (possibly adopted for professional legal reasons). It is the evaluative component of his address - the affect.

As this is a study of address rather than case, I do not consider the variability of the Early Modern English plural ye/you. The study analyses the connotation of the use to a single addressee of the previously plural form you and more particularly the connotation of the continued use of the previous singular form thou when the previously plural form was apparently superseding it. I refer to all parts of the thou paradigm as thou and employ you for all components of the you paradigm.

### Table 1:1 Diachronic Paradigms of Second Person Personal Pronouns


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>þu</td>
<td>ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative/Dative</td>
<td>þe</td>
<td>eow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>þin</td>
<td>eower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>thou/thow</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative/Dative</td>
<td>the(e)</td>
<td>you/yow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>thy(n)(e)</td>
<td>your(e)(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Modern English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>thou ~ ye → you</td>
<td>ye → you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative/Dative</td>
<td>thee ~ you</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>thy/thine → thy ~ your</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thine ~ yours</td>
<td>yours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 ‘Thou, ye and so on had special uses in ME. The distinction was roughly comparable with the *tu/vous* distinction in present-day French; in ME *thou* was not only singular but also intimate and *ye* was regarded as more formal as well as plural.’ (Horobin & Smith 2002:112)
Chapter 2 Review of Previous Studies

In the Preface to the Third Edition of his *Shakespearian Grammar* Abbott notes (1883:xxiii) that ‘the interesting distinction between *thou* and *you* ... has not hitherto attracted the attention of readers,’ though adding that he subsequently discovered that Skeat had discussed this. This indicates that, by the time Skeat and Abbott were writing, the distinction was probably imperceptible to contemporary audiences and even to contemporary readers. Shakespearean texts exist in differing editions compiled by different seventeenth-century editors. These reveal contemporary perceptions of usage and some have differing *thou*/*you* usage in the same context. Some of these are discussed in the present study, as is the hypothesis that in the early seventeenth century, the period when various editions of Shakespeare’s texts were issued, the *thou*/*you* distinction was already blurred.

More interesting are texts revised by the original author in which the *thou*/*you* usage is changed. Partridge notes Jonson’s revision of his original 1598 edition of his play, *Every Man in His Humour*, which he reissued in 1616. A comparative study of these two texts could reveal if there is a motive for the changes. Partridge says only that Jonson modified ‘the literary flavour’ of his original text and ‘in doing so, lost some nice distinctions by inconsistently changing *thou* to *you*.’ This implication is that by the end of the sixteenth century *you* had become colloquial usage and *thou* was perceived as ‘the high-flown language of pseudo-rhetoric’ (1969:27).

Contemporary Early Modern English comments seem to suggest that, in the sixteenth century, *you* was perceived as a polite singular address term and that at the beginning of the seventeenth century, *thou* was perceived to connote affect. Cooper, a seventeenth century grammarian, (1685:121 cited in Lass 1999:150) refers to affect with reference to *thou* and *ye*. He claims ‘pro *thou*, *thee* and *ye* dicimus *you* in communi sermone, nisi emphatice, fastidiose, vel blande dicimus *thou* [in ordinary speech we say *you* for *thou*, *thee* and *ye*, but emphatically, contemptuously or caressingly we say *thou]*’. Cooper suggests the use of *thou* could express not only the speaker’s feeling of disdain (*fastidiose*) or flattery (*blande*) but, more interestingly, he implies that it could also function as a discourse marker by indicating a change of emphasis (*emphatice*).
Quotations in the OED show that *thou* is also considered to typify Quaker usage:

1664 PEPSY Diary 11 Jan, She [a Quakeress] thou’d him [the king] all along.
1682 R. WARE Foex & Firebrands II. 103 He .. Quaker-like, thou’d and thee’d Oliver.

George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, reports in his Journal ([1694] 1904) that Quakers perceived their general use of *thou* to connote social equality:

1648-49 Moreover, when the Lord sent me forth into the world, He forbade me to put off my hat to any, high or low; and I was required to Thee and Thou all men and women, without any respect to rich or poor, great or small.

and reports several instances of adverse reaction to his addressing strangers as *thou*:

1651-2 Thence I passed on through the country, and came at night to an inn where was a company of rude people. I bade the woman of the house, if she had any meat, to bring me some; but because I said Thee and Thou to her, she looked strangely on me.

1661-2 ... we were often beaten and abused, and sometimes in danger of our lives, for using those words to some proud men, who would say, "What! you ill-bred clown, do you Thou me?"

In his *Grammar of the English Language* (1653) Wallis’s opinion on the implication of *thou* usage is: ‘to use the singular in addressing someone usually implies disrespect or close familiarity’ (Kemp trans. 1972:323) and a 1655 criticism of Quaker usage includes the feature of affect:

we maintain that thou from superiors to inferiors is proper, as a sign of command; from equals to equals is passable as a note of familiarity; but from inferiors to superiors if proceeding from ignorance, hath a smack of clownishness; if from affectation a tone of contempt. (Fuller 1655 in Partridge 1969:24)

Abbott (1870:154) includes affect in his assessment of the connotation of *thou* in Elizabethan English, suggesting it was,

the pronoun of
(1) affection towards friends
(2) good-humoured superiority to servants, and
(3) contempt or anger to strangers. It had, however, already fallen somewhat into disuse, and, being regarded as archaic, was naturally adopted
(4) in the higher poetic style and in the language of solemn prayer.

Since Abbott suggests (1870:154) that *thou* in Elizabethan English may be used without offence to servants: ‘the pronoun of good-humoured superiority to servants,’ it presumably would cause offence if used to one’s social superiors. The need for
courage to one’s social superiors was stressed in an Elizabethan courtesy book (cited in Replogle 1987:110):

And let this stand for a general rule; that whatsoever familiarity a nobleman shall show to any his inferiour, yea, though he professe to make him his equall friend; let the inferiour still beware of using himself rudely, saucily, or carelessly, especially in the presence of others. (S.R. tr. The Court of Civill Courtesie (London 1591), sig B

Speaker care was needed, however, over Abbott’s third category; *contempt or anger to strangers* (1870:154), since the problem was often being able to recognise one’s social superiors: (cited in Replogle 1987:105)

For if wee meete with a man, we never sawe before: with whom, uppon some occasion, it behoves us to talke: without examining wel his worthing, most commonly, that wee may not offend in to litle, we give him to much, and call him Gentleman, and otherwhile Sir, although he be but some Souter or Barber, or other such stuffe: and all bycause he is appareled neate, somewhat gentleman lyke. (Giovanni della Casa, *Galateo or a Treatise of Manners* tr. R. Peterson 1576, p43)

The perceived danger of giving offence may well have been a driver of change. This echoes the claims by both Partridge and Wales concerning the gradual spread of the *you* of politeness and deference with singular reference. ‘By 1600,’ suggests Partridge (1969:25), ‘the distinctions seem to have become too subtle for the average person to observe, as are the uses of *shall* and *will* in modern English. A contributory cause of the breakdown may have been the rise in social position of the middle and lower classes.’ Wales also attributes the marginalisation of *thou* to the rising prestige of the London dialect among the rising middle classes (1996:76), who would be anxious to avoid the socially stigmatised rural dialects with their use of *thou*-forms ‘inherited from Old English’ being imported into London by immigrant workers from the surrounding countryside.

By 1762 Lowth considered that *thou* had fallen out of use except in ‘the solemn style’ (i.e. poetic style), where it gives rise to ‘great impropriety’ and ‘grammatical inconvenience’ in the matter of verb agreement, so that Pope’s:

O thou my voice inspire,
Who touch’d Isiah’s hallow’d lips with fire!

indispensably ought to be ... you, who touched, or thou, who touchedst, or didst touch. In order to avoid this grammatical inconvenience, the two distinct forms of thou and you, are often used promiscuously by our modern poets, in the same paragraph, and even in the same sentence, very inelegantly and improperly. (Lowth [1762] 1799:34)
Brown & Gilman – Power and Solidarity semantic

One of the first studies of the pragmatics of the second-person pronouns, elaborated by subsequent researchers, is the Brown and Gilman nonreciprocal Power Semantic model in which the superior gives *thou* and receives *you*. They suggest this developed in Middle English (1964:255). Pronominal address was reciprocal between equals, with the upper classes exchanging mutual *you* and the lower classes mutual *thou*. Other European languages had similar usage but, according to Brown and Gilman, the use of the *thou/you* variants was always more fluid in English. They attribute a growing use of a reciprocal solidarity semantic to growing social mobility (1964:264). They suggest that one of the factors contributing to the gradual loss of *thou* was a popular reaction against the radicalism of Quakers and Levellers and antagonism at their ‘violations of decorum’ (1964:266). George Fox, the Founder of the Quaker movement, in his *Journal* cited above describes the reaction he received to his perceived inappropriate universal use of *thou*. His *Journal* was published in 1651 and the Quaker movement founded in the 1650s. My analysis of authentic spoken data (chapter 4) reveals declining use before this period, so, while Quaker usage may have been seen as over-familiar and a possible threat to social stability, it seems unlikely that reaction to it was an influential factor in changing use, rather a reflection of the already established perception of what constituted appropriate use. Brown and Gilman (1964:273) attribute deviation from the power semantic model as an expression of attitude or emotion (that is: affect) and suggest that these were the *thou* of contempt or anger and the *you* of admiration or respect.

In her response to Brown and Gilman, Wales (1983:115) suggests that, since the initial changing use was from one of number, with *you* to a single interlocutor assuming a new connotation of deference, as *you* became more fashionable, *thou* would be likely to remain in private discourse, the register in which emotion is more

---

12 Brown & Gilman’s horizontal axis of social status in their Power and Solidarity model (1964) was developed by Friedrich (1966) into Group Membership comprising seven ‘cultural rules and principles’ and three transient variables: ‘topic of the discourse, context of the speech event and emotional solidarity.’ Shifts in these last three function as the retractable expressive shifts discussed in Brown & Gilman’s return to the topic in their paper on politeness theory (1989). Where there was a retractable shift in the pronoun of address between speakers with apparent positive affect, I found that there was frequently a connotation of temporary solidarity of purpose (Appendix 1). I term this feature *affinity*. 
likely. Affection and anger would, therefore, be expressed by thou. This was happening at the end of the fourteenth century (Wales 1983:115). Contrary to the suggestion by Brown and Gilman (1964:264) that a growing reciprocal solidarity semantic developed as a reflection of growing social mobility, Wales proposes that degrees of difference (1983:122) would give rise to a simpler uni-dimensional model of politeness. Her finding that in the Shakespeare plays (1983:121) thou forms are fewer than you forms, with infrequent mutual thou usage and momentary shifts from you to thou occurring more frequently than shifts from thou to you suggests that, even in the constructed language of literature as well as in natural dialogue, thou was becoming semantically marked. This cannot be easily explained in terms of power or solidarity semantics because thou can be associated with ‘meanings of contempt or anger’ and you with ‘momentary feelings of admiration and respect’ (Wales 1983:110). Determining the motivation for the switch from one term to the other forms one of the objectives of the current study.

In his assessment of literary usage in Middle English (1066-1476), Blake (1992:539) suggests that the genre is significant; the ‘thou of intimacy’ having been ‘largely abandoned’ in the Paston letters (1425-c1495), thou is left as a ‘mark of contempt or as a social marker’. You is prevalent in courtly romances. When thou occurs, it is ‘usually a sign of high emotional tension’, though shifts are infrequent in this genre and ‘liable to corruption in scribal transmission’. This last possibility suggests a further line of investigation. In the case of deposition texts in the CED, such apparently corrupted transmission may occur hundreds of years after the first written record of the speech event.

**Paston Letters**

Lass’s résumé of the diachronic change from thou to you (1999:11) is that

the you versus thou distinction is first pragmaticised, [with] the old singulars attracted toward more intimate and familiar uses, and the plurals [becoming] polite or honorific [until] by the eighteenth century only invariable you remains except in special registers like verse or religious discourse.

He proposes (1999:150) that, since ‘characters are not independent of their author’s linguistic habits, as evidence, the speech of literary characters is only as good as
authorial observation of the speech of others.’ He, therefore, considers personal correspondence as a more informative source of diachronic change. He finds the style in the fifteenth century to be formal and the usual pronoun you, but this gradually changes in the sixteenth century. He observes that letters in the fifteenth century even between family members tended to relate mainly to business topics and to be written in a formal style with the ‘pronoun of choice’ being you (1999:151). This supports my hypothesis that topic change could influence usage, since in more personal correspondence of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries he finds that pronoun usage tended to vary according to the topic. He analyses the pronoun variation within a letter from Katherine Paston to her son in 1624 and finds that the use of the thou/you variants is influenced by the emotional tone and topic of the text with thou relating to her personal feelings and you to external matters of business. A second letter he considers is from Henry Oxinden written to his wife in 1662. Lass again charts the changing ‘key’ from impersonal to heightened emotion illustrated by the changing thou/you usage. This seems to imply, suggests Lass, that the thou/you contrast eventually became one of [spatial] deixis, with you as the distal (distant from speaker) and thou the proximal (speaker–oriented) form. The use of thou tended to ‘be restricted to an immediate, factual or real present’ and you for ‘business, social superiors and unreal conditions, such as verbs of guessing and conjecture.’ But this was only a tendency ‘even among members of the same social class at the same time’ (1999:153).

Evaluating these same letters from a sociolinguistic approach Nevalainen appears to suggest the determining features for the use of thou to be affect: ‘a mother writing to her child, or spouses expressing their mutual affection’ and regional variation; ‘both writers come from rural areas.’ She notes that ‘even these writers alternate between two pronouns within one and the same letter’ but does not attempt to account for this (2006:79).

The gradual replacement in most registers of thou with you is a process of morphological change. The majority of thou/you studies have attempted to explain this change through the analysis of extralinguistic factors such as: text type, the social status of speakers, speaker gender, the influence of regional dialect and the social relationship of the speakers. Lass (1999:185), however, remains ‘sceptical of
any social explanation for a structural change (rather than its propagation)’. Since its introduction, it seems that the *thou*/*you* contrast has always been one of social deixis. I propose that this contrast was eventually grammaticalised as discourse deixis to function as an indicator of thematic discontinuity, as Lass found in his samples of personal correspondence and which he termed ‘change of key’ (1999:152). (See also: Wales (1983:115) ‘a shift in emotional key’; B. Busse (2006:47) ‘dynamic tenor’; Calvo (1992:16) ‘discourse markers’). I propose that the *thou*/*you* variable does function as an indicator of thematic discontinuity and thus works as an episode boundary.

**Shakespeare Corpus**

**Linguistic & Extra Linguistic Motivation**

Most previous studies of the *thou*/*you* variants in Early Modern English have concentrated on the Shakespeare corpus, principally because it has been seen as the most accessible data. Both linguistic and extralinguistic factors have been considered. One linguistic process proposed as expediting the loss of *thou* has been the simplification of the second person singular verb ending. This seems to be the feature that Abbott refers to as ‘euphony’. He says (1870:158) ‘In almost all cases where *thou* and *you* appear at first sight indiscriminately used, further considerations show some change of thought, or some influence of euphony sufficient to account for the change of pronoun.’ He suggests that *thou* indicative of affection towards friends may be modified [i.e.changed to *you*] by ‘euphony or fluctuations of feeling.’ He finds that in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* Valentine’s switch to address Proteus with *you* ‘as soon as they begin to jest’ after their initial reciprocal use of *thou* is because ‘*thou* art is found too seriously ponderous’:

Pro. ... and in thy danger,
(If euer danger doe enuiron thee) 20
Commend thy grievance to my holy prayers,
For I will be thy beades-man, Valentine.
Val. That's on some shallow Storie of deepe loue, 25
How yong Leander crost the Hellespont.
Pro. That's a deepe Storie, of a deeper loue,
For he was more then ouer-shooes in loue.
Val. 'Tis true; for you are ouer-boottes\textsuperscript{13} in loue,
And yet you neuer swom the Hellespont.\textsuperscript{30}
Pro. Ouer the Bootes? nay giue me not the Boots.
Val. No, I will not; for it boots thee not.

(TG of V act 1:i First Folio 1623)

Valentine concludes their jesting over the expression ‘over shoes, over boots’ with further wordplay ‘it boots thee not’ (line 32), suggesting that use of thou does not connote seriousness. Wales says of the concept euphony, ‘it is hard to imagine a term less critically useful and more highly subjective and impressionistic ... what is euphonious depends on the critic’s ear’ (2001:138). It is difficult to appreciate in what way Abbott felt thou art to be ‘ponderous’, though his later comments suggest that it is the second-person singular verb ending that he considered awkward; ‘it is partly euphony, which makes Gloucester use you’ (to Lear in IV:vi 10 and 24). The use of thou in lines 29-30 would not change the prosody:

Val. 'Tis true; for thou art ouer-bootes in loue,
And yet thou neuer swomst the Hellespont.\textsuperscript{30}

but perhaps Abbott has reservations about thou co-occurring with the sibilants in ‘swomst the Hellespont’. The fact that Valentine and Proteus continue exchanging you until their leave-taking when they switch to thou, suggests that Abbott’s second category, ‘fluctuations of feeling’, is involved here. The two protagonists begin with the familiar thou of address. Their discussion turns acrimonious from line 25. Proteus has said that he will pray upon a book he loves for Valentine’s safety and success on his adventures. Valentine is disparaging about the sort of ‘shallow’ love-story book he assumes Proteus will pray on. Proteus protests, that, on the contrary, Leander crossing the Hellespont is a deep story of a deeper love, since Leander was ‘more than over shoes in love.’ Valentine completes the phrase, ‘over shoes, over boots,’ but it is unlikely that this is merely in jest as Abbott suggests. His use of you to Proteus seems a definite, distancing ‘fluctuation of feeling’ to a friend who is so foolish as to be in love.

Abbott (1870:154) proposes a contrary motivation for Hotspur’s switch from his customary use of thou to his wife to you ‘when he becomes serious’ (line 947).

\textsuperscript{13}OED ‘over shoes, over boots’: expressing reckless continuance in a course already begun.
Hotspur switches to the distancing you when he admonishes his wife for questioning him. He signals this with the pragmatic marker\textsuperscript{14} but in line 947 and the switch back to thou with for in line 955.

Hot. Come, wilt thou see me ride?
And when I am a horsebacke I will sweare
I loue thee infinitely. But harke you Kate,
I must not haue you henceforth question me
Whither I go, nor reason where about,
Whither I must, I must, and to conclude

This euening must I leaue you gentle Kate,
I know you wise, but yet no farther wise
Then Harry Percies wife, constant you are,
But yet a woman, and for secrecy
No Lady closer, for I well beleeeue
Thou wilt not utter what thou dost not know,
And so far wil I trust thee gentle Kate.

It seems unlikely that thou art was ‘seriously ponderous’ and you was ‘used in jest’ in The Two Gentlemen of Verona, whereas you was used to indicate serious address by Hotspur. The switch to you connoted affective distancing in both contexts. The most likely explanation for the variation seems to be Abbott’s proposed ‘fluctuation of feeling.’

Partridge considers the fact that Jonson uses thou more sparingly than Shakespeare may indicate that you ‘was gradually becoming the ordinary parlance of the day’, but does not substantiate his claim that ‘Shakespeare’s fondness for thou must have been archaic or the result of a Warwickshire dialect habit which he brought to London’ (1969:25). Partridge’s further claim that social distinctions in the use of the pronouns were well preserved before 1590 but seem to have become too subtle to be appreciated by 1600 is not substantiated by contemporary comments on usage. Falstaff is perceived as mad for transgressing the norms of deferential address to the King.

Falstaff: Save thy Grace, King Hall, my Royall Hall!
Pistol: The heavens thee guarde and keepe, most royall Impe of Fame!
Falstaff: ‘Save thee, my sweet Boy!
King: My Lord Chiefe Justice, speake to that vain man.
Chief Justice: Have you your wits? Know you what ‘tis you speake?
First Folio 1623 Shakespeare 2 Henry IV V:v 41-46

\textsuperscript{14}Pragmatic markers are emboldened.
In Jonson’s work Partridge finds *thou* generally restricted to friendly banter. He also notes, ‘elderly gentlemen are, however, moodily whimsical in their uses of the modes of address to children and servants’ (1969:25).

Torsten Dahl, cited in Partridge (1969:25), shows how spatial deixis reflects social deixis:

I suggest that *thou* implies approach, *you* distance. If a person wishes to make an affectionate or urgent appeal, if he steps forward, as it were, to voice rebuke or displeasure, nay, to utter a threat, *thou* comes readily to his tongue. The implications of *you*, on the other hand, are to be looked for in the senses of ‘aloofness’ and ‘deference’ of the word ‘distance’. A speaker who is in a huff, who deprecates something, uses the same pronoun as the person that wishes to address another in a respectful manner.

The implication of movement is significant here. I suggest it is not the case that the social relationship of interlocutors is fixed in terms of a vertical axis of social rank and a horizontal axis of distance/proximity. If this were so, a speaker’s *thou*/*you* usage to the same addressee would not change during an exchange or even within one utterance. The fact that it does change is indicative of a speaker’s changing viewpoint relative to the addressee, or to the topic or situation of the utterance. Speakers orientate themselves linguistically relative to these factors by means of deictic expressions, such as the ‘you’ pronouns. The changing personal deixis between the interlocutors connotated in the changing *thou*/*you* use between speaker and addressee implies spatial deixis. One can visualise characters on the stage approaching each other and moving apart as their address terms change.

Quirk considers that the *thou*/*you* variation in Shakespeare’s plays is often explained as *you* representing polite, formal usage whilst *thou* was familiar or insulting (1986:7). He sees this as a gross oversimplification and suggests that the modern linguistic contrast of marked and unmarked members can give us a truer picture. He suggests that, as *you* is usually stylistically the unmarked form, *thou* can operate in a wide variety of contrasts with *you*. 
Quirk cites Sir Toby Belch’s advice to his drinking companion, Sir Andrew Aguecheek, in *Twelfth Night* (First Folio Act III:ii) on the best way to challenge his rival for Olivia,

> taunt him with the license of Inke: if *thou*  
> *thou*’st him some thrice, it shall not be amisse  
> ... Let there bee gaulle e-nough  
> in *thy* inke.

The implication here is that it would be offensive for Sir Andrew to address his rival, Cesari, as *thou*. Quirk suggests that, since Sir Andrew addresses Sir Toby as *you* throughout and since another gentleman, Fabian, and Sir Andrew exchange *you*, Sir Toby’s *thou* to Sir Andrew connotes ‘more than a suggestion of contempt’ (1986:7). Sir Toby addresses Sir Andrew as *you* once (Act I:iii):

> Toby: Accost Sir Andrew, accost.  
> Andrew: What’s that?  
> Toby: My Neeces Chamber-maid.  
> Andrew [Maria in original]: Good Mistris accost. I desire better acquaintance  
> Maria: My name is Mary sir  
> Andrew: Good mistris Mary, accost.  
> Toby: *You* mistake knight: Accost, is front her, boord her, woe her, assayle her

and thereafter as *thou*. Maria and Sir Toby have previously been discussing Sir Andrew as ‘a foolish knight’, so I propose that this exchange alone in which Sir Andrew displays his naïveté is unlikely to have influenced Sir Toby’s usage. When Sir Andrew and Cesario meet as for a fight provoked by Sir Toby (Act III:iv), Sir Toby addresses Sir Andrew with the formal *you*:

> Come Sir Andrew, there’s no remedie, the Gentleman  
> will for his honors sake have one bowt with *you*:

This reflects a change in their social relationship, as Sir Toby, having tricked the two protagonists into believing a fight is inevitable, adopts the role of impartial observer, rather than that of Sir Andrew’s drinking companion.

Several circumstances may influence the choice of address term; a widely proposed one being the expression of contempt, but it seems to me that Sir Toby’s non-reciprocal use of *thou* to Sir Andrew is a reflection of their social status relating to age. As Olivia’s uncle, Sir Toby is presumably older than Sir Andrew, which would license this non-reciprocal usage. In addition, although Sir Toby has no great respect for Sir Andrew’s intellect, referring to him as a *Clodde-pole* [i.e. a blockhead] (Act
III:iv), he frequently addresses Sir Andrew with the positive term, *knight* and as *deere venom*.

Sir Toby’s usage to other characters changes as a reflection of their changing relationships. Initially he addresses Maria, his niece’s maid, as *you* but this changes to *thou* when they conspire together to deceive Malvolio. He addresses the Clown as *you* until the Clown assumes the persona of the Parson in furtherance of their deception of Malvolio. Then Sir Toby changes his address to *thou*. I suggest that these changes reflect solidarity – not of social status – but of purpose, which I term *affinity*. As relationships between the characters change, this is reflected in their changing use of address terms. It is these synchronic changes that illustrate the pragmatic implication of the choice of the variant.

Salmon proposes that ‘for the colloquial spoken language ... there is only one possible source ... which we find in dramatic texts’ (1987:265). Dramatic texts may not provide an authentic account of natural conversation but that is surely not their objective. Salmon concedes (1987:266) that drama may be ‘a selective and inadequate representation of speech’ but asserts, ‘all those features of language which indicate *one speaker’s awareness of another*, and his *linguistic reactions to given situations*, will undoubtedly be present’ [added emphasis]. Mazzon claims, ‘theatrical works mimic spoken interaction relatively more faithfully than other types of literary works’ (2002:223). In his discussion of gender distinction in the use of discourse markers Blake (2002:298) says, ‘it is uncertain how far Shakespeare’s usage is typical of his time,’ and this applies to other linguistic features. We cannot know exactly what the selection of the *thou*/*you* variants connoted to contemporary audiences. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that it had some significance.

Mulholland ([1967] 1987:154) suggests that, since both *you* and *thou* can be used in the singular and both *you* and *ye* can be used as subject or complement, number and case do not determine the choice of the pronoun. Previous research has considered contextual or attitudinal grounds as motivation for the usage, where, ‘in a context of *you*-expectation *th* can be used as an affective index.’ Since ‘the definition of expectation has been left rather vague,’ she considers it necessary first to investigate

---

15 See footnote 13, page 26.
the possibility of linguistic motivation. In her exploratory paper, she analyses the
texts of *Much Ado About Nothing* (1600) and *King Lear* (1603-16) to assess the
singular use of *thou/you* personal pronouns in the contexts of open and closed class
verbs to determine if there is a systemic influence behind the choice of the form
(1987:155). In *Much Ado About Nothing* she finds a preponderance of *you* forms,
which is more pronounced when they are the subjects of lexical verbs in statements
and questions, but she could not determine if this was linguistically motivated. In
*King Lear* the ratio of *thou:you* was much higher, notably in the category ‘subject
before closed verb’, in which there were more occurrences of *thou* than *you*.
Mulholland suggests that additional grammatical analysis is needed on the whole
Shakespeare corpus in order to determine if the use of the *thou/you* variable is

Mulholland then assesses what she terms the ‘permanent connections’ of social class
and sex in her two texts to ‘ascertain the majority forms’. Such forms can only be
seen as pragmatically significant once a study of the whole corpus has established
which form is the norm or unmarked form in a given context. McIntosh, in his paper
on *As You Like It* (1963:68-81, in Mulholland 1987), has labelled *thou* as the
‘unmarked form’ and *you* as the ‘marked form’. He concludes that Rosalind is
characterised as markedly reserved by her use of a majority of *you* forms. Had he
identified *thou* as the marked form, however, her cousin, Celia, who used more *thou*
forms, would have been categorised as outgoing and emotional. Mulholland
concludes that further investigation is needed (1987:161) to determine the motivation
for the choice of *thou/you*. McIntosh’s findings demonstrate the need for
microanalysis. It is not enough to identify a form as marked during a period of
transition. It is necessary to determine which particular form is marked in context,
where context includes interpersonal and textual relationships.

Barber’s (1987) findings of *thou/you* usage in *Richard III* contradict Mulholland’s
view that there is a lack of evidence to support the view that members of the lower
orders use reciprocal *thou*. He cites features such as the reciprocal use of prose
(1987:163) by Clarence’s murderers to identify them as lower class. Barber finds
that they regularly use reciprocal *thou*. He investigates the use of the *thou/you*
variants with open and closed class verbs and combines his data with that from
Mulholland’s earlier study. From this he finds that *thou* is more favoured with closed-class verbs and postulates that, rather than the grammatical construction (open or closed class verbs) determining the choice of pronoun, the pronoun may be chosen on ‘social or emotional grounds’ and that ‘this choice may then influence the grammatical construction [class of verb] used’ (1987:176). Ulrich Busse (2002:288), however, finds that ‘no firm evidence for an intralinguistic conditioning of the variation could be proved empirically.’ Mulholland lists as closed-class the primary auxiliary verbs *be, have, do* and the modal auxiliaries *shall, will, should, could, would, may, might, must* and *ought* together with the non-auxiliary uses of *be* and *have* (1987:154). Since closed class verbs reflect speaker judgement, Barber’s assessment seems more likely.

Barber does not, however, agree with Mulholland’s finding of *you* as the ‘generally accepted’ unmarked form among the upper classes ‘except from father to daughter and possibly from women to their female servants’ (1987:176). He finds that in *Richard III*, in which most of the conversation is between characters of noble rank, *thou* usage outweighs *you* usage in a ratio of around 54:46. In the Shakespeare corpus as a whole, he suggests (1987:177), there is probably no great difference in frequency between *thou* and singular *you*. His résumé of the varying *thou*/*you* usage by the characters in *Richard III* suggests that choice of the variant may be motivated by relative social status and age, but that changing affective relationships may also have been significant. He enters the common caveat (see also Hope 2003:77) that ‘in drama, because of its concentration of emotional tension and its tendency to present scenes of confrontation, *Thou* appeared much more frequently’ (Barber 1987:177). Barber’s finding that in *Richard III* certain respectful vocatives collocate exclusively with *you* and certain abusive vocatives collocate always with *thou* and never with *you* (1987:174) was not repeated when a similar investigation was made of the CED data (Appendix 2).

**Personal preference**

Calvo attempts to demonstrate that ‘in dramatic texts ... the choice may have been entirely a matter of personal preference between two pronouns which denoted second person singular reference and did not connote much.’ In a comparative study
of two texts of *Hamlet*: the Quarto of 1603, Q1, believed to be a reported text reconstructed from memory, and the Quarto of 1604-5, Q2, thought to be directly descended from Shakespeare’s text, she finds discrepancies of *thou*/you usage: ‘it is possible to find lines which are present in both texts and which are identical except for the choice of pronoun’ (1996:18). She finds it difficult to account for these inconsistencies.

Since Quirk (1971:71 & 1986:8) considers that the selection of *thou* and the subsequent reversion to *you* must be meaningful, Calvo offers possible reasons for her finding. It may be attributable to a compositor error or free variation and the vagaries of speaker’s idiolect (1996:17-21). Her tentative conclusion is that, if we assume the ‘superior literary talent of William Shakespeare’, when the apparently authentic version does not demonstrate affective sensitivity in its selection of the variant, the implication is perhaps to ‘question the importance of the *thou* of affection.’ The danger of this approach is that there are too many variables to establish a definitive finding. As far as I am aware, we cannot know if any of the extant texts can be identified as the definitive Shakespeare text, so cannot say which text we expect to show ‘greater artistic merit and superior literary talent’ (1996:19).

Calvo’s approach is then to analyse each use of *thou* as though it were intended to connote affect and then, when not all usages conform to this expectation, to conclude that not all pronoun shifts are meaningful. A more constructive approach in shift analysis would be to consider each individual occurrence in context and to attempt to account for the motivation for its use.

She analyses several scenes from *Hamlet*. In Polonius’s report to the King and Queen (Act II:ii) the (apparently reconstructed) text in Q1 could be construed as indirect or reported speech that is: Polonius spoke to his daughter to this effect,

Q1 Cor: Now when I saw this letter thus I bespake my maiden:  
Lord Hamlet is a Prince out of *your* starre,

whereas the Q2 (apparently authentic Shakespearean text) represents direct speech: these are the actual words he used.

Q2 Pol: And my young Mistris thus I did bespeake,  
Lord Hamlet is a prince out of *thy* star

---

16 Polonius in Q2 = Coramnis in Q1.
If the compilers of Q1 were ignorant of the potential nuances of *thou* as a connotation of affection in this context, as Calvo suggests, presumably the contemporary audience would have been similarly ignorant and there would have been no pragmatic inference in the variant. Her argument depends on the assumption that Shakespeare was the author of Q2, whereas Q1 was a ‘memorial reconstruction’ by others ‘for pecuniary profit’. Her analysis assumes that an apparent sensitivity to the *thou* of affection in Q2 is a reflection of Shakespeare’s ‘artistic merit and superior literary talent’. This, she suggests, becomes problematic in her next example when the ‘pirate’ Q1 text employs the ‘non-neutral *thou* of supposedly emotional overtones and superior literary achievement,’ whereas the supposed ‘Shakespeare’ text employs the ‘neutral *you*.’

When Hamlet has seen his father’s ghost and Gertrude (the Queen) begins to suspect that he is mad, in Q1 the Queen, who has not seen the Ghost, ‘addresses Hamlet with a pronoun which shows her emotional state, her confusion when she hears her son holding a conversation with the air, her sadness when she suspects he might be after all really insane’ (1996:19)

```
Queene: Alas, it is the weaknesse of thy braine,  
Which makes they tongue to blazon thy heart’s griefe  
Q1 ‘pirated’ text

Ger. This is the very coynage of your braine, 
This bodilesse creation extacie is very cunning in.  
Q2 ‘Shakespeare’
```

Calvo suggests, ‘we are forced to grant that the pirates improved Shakespeare’s choice of pronoun’ (1996:19). This seems too simple an explanation, as it is misleading to analyse one isolated utterance. There is not one emotional focus in this scene. Instead it is a scene of changing emotions, which are expressed in the Queen’s changing use of address pronoun to Hamlet. One needs, therefore, to consider the whole exchange (in this case the whole of Act III:iv). Most of the Queen’s addresses to Hamlet use *thou*. She begins with affectionate *thou* but distances herself with *you* to rebuke his perceived impoliteness:
Q2 (presumed Shakespeare)

Ger. Hamlet, thou hast thy father much offended.
Ham. Mother, you haue my father much offended.
Ger. Come, come, you answere with an idle tongue ... Haue you forgot me?

This reverts to a fearful thou when she fears Hamlet may murder her

Ger. What wilt thou doe, thou wilt not murther me,
Helpe how

and when he does murder Polonius

Ger. O me, what hast thou done?

She becomes angry when Hamlet appears to be about to make an accusation against her

Ger. What haue I done, that thou dar'st wagge thy tongue
In noise so rude against me?

and reacts with sorrow to his long emotive speeches, in which he accuses her of murdering his father

Ger. O Hamlet speake no more,
Thou turnst my very eyes into my soule,

When she hears him in conversation with the Ghost, who is invisible to her, she recoils at his apparent insanity, though her affection is still apparent when she addresses him as ‘gentle sonne’ and refers to ‘thy distemper’,

Ger. Alas how i'st with you?
That you doe bend your eye on vacancie,
And with th'incorporall ayre doe hold discourse,
Foorth at your eyes your spirits wildly peep,
And as the sleeping souldiers in th'alarme,
Your bedded haire like life in excrements
Start vp and stand an end, o gentle sonne
Vpon the heat and flame of thy distemper
Sprinkle coole patience, whereon doe you looke?

Ger. To whom doe you speake this?

Ger. This is the very coynage of your braine,
This bodilesse creation extacie is very cunning in.
This utterance concludes the subject of his conversation with the Ghost. In the remainder of the scene, the Queen is moved by Hamlet’s plea for her to repent and reverts to emotive thou:

Ger O Hamlet thou hast cleft my hart in twaine.

Ger: Be thou assur’d, if words were made of breath
And breath of life, I haue no life to breath
What thou hast sayd to me.

Next Calvo analyses the scene in which Hamlet discusses his proposed play with the players. Here, claims Calvo, the so-called pirated text (Q1) ‘is, on artistic grounds, better than the text of Q2’ (the supposed authentic Shakespearean text), if the use of thou is explained as the thou of affection [added emphasis]. ‘We are again forced to grant that Q1 improves Q2’s choice of pronoun, since in Q1 Hamlet addresses one of the players with the thou of affection and conspiratorial intimacy’ (1996:20). Calvo does not explain why she assesses this usage as the thou of affect, and her argument seems circular. There is no question of one version being ‘better’ than the other. The usage here could just as reasonably be interpreted as one of number and status. In Q1 (the ‘pirated text’) Hamlet’s address to one of the players, probably not with ‘the thou of affection and conspiratorial intimacy’, but with the thou of number, is separate from his addresses to the group. In Q2 Hamlet appears to ask one player if the group of players could perform the play. In Q1 Hamlet asks the group of players if they can perform the play and then asks the single player if he could perform ‘some dozen or sixteene lines.’

**Quarto 2** (presumed Shakespeare)

Ham. Follow him friends, weele heare a play to morrowe; dost thou hear me old friend, can you play the murther of Gonzago?
Play. I my Lord.
Ham. Weele hate to morrowe night, you could for neede study a speech of some dozen lines, or sixeene lines, which I would set downe and insert in't, could you not?
Play. I my Lord.
Ham. Very well, followe that Lord, & looke you mock him not.
My good friends, Ile leaue you tell night, you are welcome to Elsonoure.

**Quarto 1** (presumed ‘pirated’ text)

Ham. Come hither maisters, can you not play the murder of Gonsago?
Players Yes my Lord.
Ham. And could'st not thou for a neede study me
Some dozen or sixteene lines,
Which I would set downe and insert?
Players Yes very easily my good Lord.
Ham. 'tis well, I thanke you: follow that lord:
And doe you heare sirs? take heede you mocke him not.
Gentlemen, for your kindnes I thanke you,
And for a time I would desire you leaue me.

‘Not many would agree, though, with the suggestion that the pirates, the thieves who stole the text of Hamlet and memorially reconstructed it, actually improved Shakespeare’s text’ (Calvo 1996:20). The issue is not one of ‘improvement’ but of what the variants connote. The changing use of variants in the Q2 version connotes a varied range of emotions.

Calvo’s final example concerns Hamlet’s instruction to the players:

later in the play when Hamlet meets the player again to give him the speech and the instructions on how to perform it, we find that the reported text has a pronoun shift from thou to you. This is one of those single pronominal shifts which when it is thought to come from Shakespeare’s pen is attributed to his mastery at expressing temporary or ‘fleeting’ moods (1996:20).

Q2 shows no pronominal shifts. I suggest that this may be due to number rather than mood. In Q2 Hamlet addresses the group of players throughout and warns them against employing the delivery of ‘many of our players’, who are possibly fellow troupe members. In Q1 Hamlet addresses a single player ‘as I taught thee’ to whom he then directs non-possessive generic you:17

Mary and you mouth it, as a many of your players do

that is: ‘If one mouths it as many players do.’ This is not to claim my analysis as the only possible one but demonstrates the need for close contextual analysis. Isolated instances of pronoun variation reveal little.

Q2 [presumed Shakespeare]
Enter Hamlet, and three of the Players. [added emphasis]

Ham. Speake the speech I pray you as I pronoun'd it to you, trippingly on the tongue, but if you mouth it as many of our Players do,
I had as liue the towne cryer spoke my lines, nor doe not saw the ayre too much with your hand thus, but vse all gently, for in the very torrent tempest, and as I may say, whirlwind of your passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance, that may giue it smoothnesse,

17 Wales terms this your 2 and suggests an interpretation of ‘the players like you/the profession to which you belong’ as appropriate here, indicating ‘a close affinity between your (pl.) and your 2 proper [i.e. non-possessive use] (1985:9).
Enter Hamlet and the Players.

Ham. Pronounce me this speech trippingly a the tongue
as I taught thee,
Mary and you mouth it, as a many of your players do
I'de rather heare a towne bull bellow,
Then such a fellow speake my lines.
Nor do not saw the aire thus with your hands,
But giue euery thing his action with temperance.

Calvo’s (1996) proposal that ‘in dramatic texts ... the choice may have been entirely
a matter of personal preference between two pronouns which denoted second person
singular reference and did not connote much,’ is all the more remarkable when one
considers her earlier paper18 in which she proposed that the thou/you shift ‘performs
a signalling function in the global organisation of the dramatic dialogue (1992:26)
i.e. a discourse marker.

Politeness Theory

Brown and Gilman’s application of politeness theory to Shakespearean tragedies
(1989:178) finds that the combination of status and affect is inadequate to explain all
instances of thou and you. Citing the scene between the two gravediggers in Hamlet
v:i they say that these two characters mostly exchange thou but that ‘each also says
you once and, indeed, there is a shift within a single speech’ (1989:178). They
comment:

Someone really devoted to the principle that “motive-less anything is un-
Shakespearean” (Kittredge 1916:49) could perhaps think of subtle
gravediggerly moods that would explain these shifts, but that does not seem to
be the right way to go. We think it wiser to assume that a simple pair involves
a simple contrast (in this case, distance) and assign complications to context.
One form (thou) always expresses less distance, the other (you) more, in
relation to each other, but, in context, there are many uses we cannot explicitly
account for.

It is unfortunate that Brown and Gilman do not elaborate on why an attempt to
explain shifts that do not fit their status/affect model is not ‘the right way to go’.

---

18 This study in which Calvo (1992) suggests that you and thou ‘may be operating as discourse
markers and as social markers in the negotiation of social identities’ came to my attention after the
present draft was completed. I acknowledge Calvo’s priority. She says that her aim was not to
offer a ‘new magic formula for the pronouns of address ... rather to question the validity of some
extant approaches.’ The present study explores both of these aims over a wider range of sources
than the text of As You Like It that gave rise to Calvo’s original suggestion.
Shifts within a single speech are common in the drama section of the CED and involve a diverse range of characters other than gravediggers. Brown and Gilman’s proposal to ‘assign complications to context’ seems to dismiss the very method that could suggest an explanation for these apparently motiveless shifts: that is a consideration of the context of the utterance where ‘non-fixed factors’ are to be found (Hope 1994:63).

I offer the following contrasting analysis of the extract to which they refer (*Hamlet* v:i) in which I ‘apply complications to context’:

The two gravediggers, who are labelled as Clowns, that is, of the lower orders, discuss the Coroner’s decision to afford a Christian burial to Ophelia.

The First Clown asks:

*Is she to be buried in Christian burial that
wilfully seeks her own salvation?*

to which the Second Clown replies:

*I tell thee she is*

This is the unmarked usage of the *thou* form between two characters from the lower orders. The First Clown tries to rationalise the Coroner’s decision to permit a Christian burial to an apparent suicide:

*... she drowned herself wittingly*

to which the Second Clown responds:

*Nay, but hear you, goodman delver, ...*

The First Clown responds with

*Give me leave. Here lies the water; good: here
stands the man; good; if the man go to this water,
and drown himself, it is, will he, nill he, he
goes, ... mark you that;*

and the Second Clown concludes:

*Will you ha’ the truth on’t? If this had not been
a gentlewoman, she should have been buried out o’
Christian burial.*
In this exchange the two characters are involved in a general discussion about the legal definition of suicide in which they address each other as you. The First Clown then comments:

Why, there thou say'st:

turning the topic from the general to this particular event. He continues to use thou in discussing the Second Clown’s understanding of Scripture:

How dost thou understand the Scripture?
... I like thy wit well,

The ‘shift within a single speech’ (1989:178) that Brown and Gilman seem to regard as the decisive factor in attributing all variations from unmarked usage to the ragbag of ‘context’ is partially explicable by analysing marked usage as a discourse feature. This is the ‘change of key’ model suggested by Lass (1999:152).

The First Clown addresses the Second Clown (whom he has previously addressed as thou):

Cudgel thy brains no more about it, for your dull ass will not mend his pace with beating; and, when you are asked this question next, say ‘a grave-maker: ‘the houses he makes last till doomsday. Go, get thee to Yaughan: fetch me a stoup of liquor.

The switch to your in the first line is not the possessive pronoun but generic your, used to ‘express a general truth in an informal, colloquial way (Hope 2003:82) implying: ‘that you know of’.19

The second usage of you in this utterance is the one example that is potentially more problematic:

when you are asked this question next, say a grave-maker.

Here you could be interpreted as an indefinite generic personal pronoun but this seems unlikely, as the instruction seems to be specific to the gravedigger. To me the likely motive for the switch seems to link second person address to the speaker’s...

19 Attested with this connotation OED 1550 J. Coke Deb. Heraldes Eng. & Fraunce sig. Ivi”, In Fraunce..the most parte of your speritual men..be symple persons, hedge priestes not lerned.
construction of the addressee’s persona. When the First Clown advises the Second Clown how to respond to a question from a third party, he adopts the appropriate socially deictic form of the questioner. As fellow workers of low social status, the two gravediggers exchange *thou*. An outsider posing a question to one of the gravediggers may address him as *you*.

Brown and Gilman’s objective in this paper (1989) was not to account for synchronic or diachronic variation in *thou*/*you* usage, rather to assess the hypothesised determinants of politeness in four Shakespearean tragedies. They refer to the claim by ‘casual grammars’ that *you* is the polite and *thou* the familiar form of singular address, making *thou*/*you* usage relevant to their politeness study (1989:177). They take ‘unemotional’ usage to relate to social status but say that an ‘expressive corollary’ must be added to account for unexpected or marked usage (1989:177). Ultimately, they dismiss *thou* and *you* as of little importance in ‘scoring speech for politeness’, since some usage shifts cannot be explained and, where usage can be explained, ‘in many of the clear cases that follow the status rule, the pronoun of address, an obligatory aspect of speech, is automatic and ever-present and so does not function to redress an FTA’ (1989:179) [that is: a Face Threatening Act or impoliteness]. So, in order to indicate status, there must be an appropriate pronoun of address. If this appropriate unmarked form is used, they suggest, it does not function to redress any concomitant impoliteness. This does not, however, allow for usage shifts between interlocutors within an exchange or even within one utterance. This is a feature I investigate in my analysis of CED texts with the hypothesis that one of the functions of such shifts may be to redress impoliteness or otherwise influence or reflect changing affect.

**Significance of context**

Hope’s study of the second person personal pronoun in Shakespearean plays finds (2003:73) that ‘the basic factor determining choice ... is social relationship: *th*-forms are used *down* the social hierarchy; *y*-forms *up* it. Social equals usually exchange mutual *y*-forms.’ Two systems govern choice: this ‘relatively fixed social semantic’ and ‘an unfixed emotional or affective semantic.’ The first system constitutes the norm, that is the unmarked usage, but when the second is applied consideration must
be given to ‘the broad social context and the immediate context of the discourse.’ This is the objective of the current study. In his 1994 study of Court Records (discussed later), Hope finds that when exchanges do shift, there is a motivated shift from you to thou. In his analysis of Shakespeare’s usage, Hope considers it likely that ‘Early Modern drama generally, and Shakespeare especially, over-represent the frequency of th-forms,’ which were highly marked in contemporary Court Records. An interesting suggestion is that Henry VIII, believed to have been a collaboration with John Fletcher (Hope 2003:81) and to have been first performed not long before 1613 (Gillespie 1994:791), demonstrates ‘an almost complete avoidance of th-forms,’ which is unusual for both playwrights in their other work. Hope considers that this demonstrates an avoidance of possible archaic usage in order to depict more accurately contemporary usage.

In his much more comprehensive study of the thou/you variants in the Shakespeare corpus Ulrich Busse (2002) rejects the hypothesis proposed by Mulholland that open and closed class verbs influence thou/you choice. Instead, he adopts the approach defined by Jacobs & Jucker (1995:11) as pragmaphilology, that is a detailed analysis of, ‘the contextual aspects of historical texts, including the addressers and addressees, their social and personal relationship, the physical and social setting of text production and text reception, and the goal(s) of the text.’ In assessing potentially significant factors such as the ‘geographical location and socio-economic status of the participants’ to assess how these correlate with thou/you usage,’ Busse considers Brown and Gilman’s application of power semantics and politeness theory too restricted in their approach to account for the wide range of contexts in which thou/you variation is found.

Busse finds a lower use of thou than you in the comedies, where the majority of characters are of the middle and lower orders, compared with the tragedies (2002:58) but suggests that this is attributable to the greater emotive usage in the tragedies rather than to social status. He disagrees with Wales (1983) and Taavitsainen (1997) who consider thou to be the unmarked form among the lower orders. Since he finds thou more frequent than you in Shakespeare’s verse and since verse is the marked genre, Busse suggests that thou is marked in contrast to you and signals emotive stance rather than power semantics. Hope has a similar finding on the proportion of
thou/you usage in the comedies and the tragedies (1994:63) but ‘no consistent relationship between genre and numbers’ and concludes ‘non-fixed factors are in operation here again’. I take ‘non-fixed’ to mean pragmatic. The problem with the Brown and Gilman model of sociolinguistic variables is that it does not account for such ‘non-fixed’ changes of use within an exchange or even within a single utterance. Such changes are much more common in the drama texts than in the Court Records in the CED corpus, so may well not be representative of authentic conversational use. Even so, these changes merit study, since they possibly imply a specific contemporary interpretation lost to later audiences.

Ulrich Busse (2002:32) contrasts Brown and Gilman’s (1989) model of social rank as a permanent feature with the concept of social identity. Social identity has to be negotiated between speakers and allows the selection of more than one social identity at the same time in the course of one single interaction allowing shifting pronouns to be interpreted as indirect social markers in their function of in- or out-group markers. Calvo has such shifts as marking discourse boundaries by indicating changes in topic in addition to affect (1992:5-27). Lass (1999:153) suggests that by the 1660s ‘the thou and you contrast finally became a deictic one: you is the distal pronoun, thou the proximal.’ Thou tends to be used when ‘the topic is within the “charmed circle” of a relationship, and restricted to an immediate, factual or real present.’ This deictic motivation for variation coincides with my findings from the CED texts, though I find a more intricate pattern of variation than that proposed by Lass. This is particularly evident in the drama texts.

In her study of Shakespeare’s use of Markedness Reversal, Bruti suggests that pronoun switching between the same interlocutors is marked usage and that it indicates change from social or emotional remoteness to closeness and vice versa, so that markedness is context-dependent i.e. pragmatic rather than systemic or paradigmatic (2000:25): ‘It is not so much a question of frequency, as rather a situationally bound or situationally determined selection which establishes which option is natural or unnatural along a sliding scale of possibilities.’

Bruti makes the proposal (echoed by Hope 2003:77) that two interacting systems govern the choice of the thou/you: the basic determining factor of social relationship
and an unfixed emotional or affective semantic (2000:35). This is illustrated by the exchange between Henry V and Katherine of France (*Henry V*) who begin with the reciprocal *you* relevant to their social status. Henry moves to *thou* in the wooing scene but reverts to *you* when Katherine does not reciprocate his usage. This markedness reversal, says Bruti, is on the axis of affect rather than that of social status (2000:36).

**Chivalric and Exalted Register**

Jucker’s ‘situational context’ features in address to monarchs, who may on occasion be addressed with *thou*. Hope (2003:80) gives an example of what he terms ‘chivalric’ use where the French herald addresses Henry V as *thou* when offering him the opportunity to surrender before the battle:

```
Once more I come to know of thee King Harry,
If for thy Ransom thou wilt now compound,
Before thy most assured Overthrow:
Henry V IV:iii
```

This usage is common in Shakespeare’s history plays when challenges are issued. In his study on addressing the king as *thou* in Shakespeare’s plays, Lock (2008:120-142) suggests that the use of *thou* as an address to those who exercise ‘sovereign power’ (henceforth ‘kings’) is universally perceived as a Face-Threatening Act (FTA). This is not necessarily true. Such *thou* usage could be considered a feature of an exalted register in which the address is directed to the office itself rather than to the holder of the office.  

Lock categorises the use of *thou* to kings in Shakespeare’s plays as:

- *situation-positive* – when T(hou) is conventionally permitted e.g. by suppliants
- *affect-positive* – unconventional but non-hostile emotive use of T(hou)
- *situation negative* – intended FTA, usually denying or challenging the king’s authority
- *affect negative* – hostile emotive use that is insulting but not insubordinate

---

20 This seems to be similar to Friedrich’s assessment of the use of *ty* to their landlord by Russian serfs: ‘*vy* generally did symbolize greater power but when the greatness passed a certain point the speaker switched back to what might be called the *ty* of total subordination or of an intimacy that could not be jeopardized’. He notes Pitt-Rivers’ point that ‘total subordination implies intimacy, whereas formal social usage implies social distance which obtains where respect might conceivably be denied’ (Friedrich 1966:237-238). As with address to God in Middle and Early Modern English Traugott’s model of subjectification does not apply in these instances because it is inconceivable that respect should be denied.
Appropriate usage depends on the speaker correctly identifying both his addressee and the situation of the exchange. Sovereigns in particular have two personae: public and private. Falstaff’s error (2 Henry IV) is in publically addressing his old friend Prince Hal in an affect-positive manner, ‘Save thee my sweet boy.’ Henry, as the king he has become, reacts to this as an affect-negative address and instructs the Lord Chief Justice to respond, since it would be beneath the dignity of a king to respond to such an informal approach:

Falstaff: ‘Save thee, my sweet Boy!
King: My Lord Chiefe Justice, speake to that vain man.
Chief Justice: Have you your wits? Know you what ’tis you speake?
First Folio 1623  Shakespeare 2 Henry IV V:v 44-46

The effect of a private/public persona dichotomy is seen in the drama comedy texts in the CED when high-status males tend to address their wives and daughters as you in public but may use thou in private.

A further example of the effect of dual personae occurs in the final scene of Richard II. The victorious Bolingbroke addresses his supporters, Northumberland and Fitzwater as thou when they bring him news of their victories on his behalf. Then Northumberland’s son, Percy, enters with his prisoner, the Bishop of Carlisle, an opponent of Bolingbroke. As the holder of the office of the Bishopric of Carlisle, the prisoner is addressed with the formal you but the man, in whom Bolingbroke has seen ‘high sparks of honour’, receives the more intimate thou.

Q1 1597 [Folio 1 1623 same thou/you usage]
King: Carleil, this is your doome;
Choose out some secret place, some reuerent roome
More than thou hast, and with it ioy thy life:
So as thou liu'st in peace, die free from strife,
For though mine enemy thou hast euer beene,
High sparkes of honour in thee haue I seene.

Lock (2008) finds that the two positive categories account for the majority of thou usages in Shakespeare, with situation-positive the most common type. The speaker may signal deference in some way as a prelude to using thou, thus identifying the utterance as being non face-threatening. Lock lists formal speech acts such as vows, oaths, swearing, promises, surrenders, resignations and blessings as involving situation-positive thou. He suggests that supplication, which also motivates thou, is
part of a negotiation process and may involve additional politeness strategies such as kneeling. In the final scene of *Richard II*, not only the nobles but also Sir Pierce Exton address the victorious Bolingbroke as *thou* in reporting the defeat of the latter’s opponents and in deference to his new status as King. Exton, however, reverts to *you* when Bolingbroke condemns his murder of Richard. This, says Lock, expresses Exton’s ‘incredulity, anger or disappointment, certainly a strong negative affect.’ In the ‘high style’ of this final scene, exemplified by *thou* and rhyming couplets, the use of the (by this time) unmarked *you* becomes marked and therefore significant.

Q1 1597 [Folio 1 1623 same *thou*/*you* usage]

Enter Exton with the coffin.

Exton: Great King, within this coffin I present
*Thy* buried feare: herein all breathlesse lies
The mightiest of *thy* greatest enemies,
Richard of Burdeaux, by me hither brought.

King: Exton, I thanke thee not, for *thou* hast wrought
A deed of slaughter with *thy* fatall hand,
Vpon my head and all this famous Land.

Exton. From *your* owne mouth my *Lo.* did I this deed.

**Address Terms and Epithets**

Bruti hypothesises that the meaning of the *thou*/*you* variants in the Shakespeare corpus (2000:33) may ‘often be confirmed or disconfirmed by the accompanying epithets ...’

Those instances of you which occur with either offensive or appreciating terms take on the meaning encoded by the epithets themselves. For example: Ah, you sweet little rogue, you! Doll Tearsheet to Falstaff (2HIV, II:iv) sweet and little mitigate the negative meaning of rogue and turn it into a positive evaluation.

Other scholars see this as problematic. Barber (1987:170) suggests a character’s usage may be hypocritical, and ‘then reveal[s] his true feelings in an aside or a soliloquy.’ Furthermore (1987:171) ‘the use of *You* may be mock-polite or ironical, and may then be followed by a switch to a more normal *Thou*.’ Ulrich Busse also has reservations over Brown and Gilman’s claim that that pronoun use is predictable from address terms. This is partly because of the possibility of ‘either ironic, mock-polite and flattering uses of language, where the nominally polite form is employed.
to convey the opposite and also cases that do not seek to minimise an FTA, but rather to maximise it’ (Busse 2002:186).

Beatrix Busse (2006) investigates the meanings of vocatives in a corpus of seventeen Shakespeare plays. These are the categories I term address terms and epithets. She applies a range of theories, linguistic, literary and cultural in her comprehensive study, defining *vocative* as ‘a direct attitudinal adjunct-like form of address, which is realised as a nominal group or head alone’ (2006:12). Her application of Halliday’s theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics leads to her finding that ‘vocatives in Shakespeare construe interpersonal, textual and experiential meanings’ (2006:15). She concludes ‘a switch from one vocative to another when speaker and listener remain constant is both textually and interpersonally noteworthy. As a conjunctive adjunct, a vocative may serve as a discourse marker, indicating a change in topic or cohesion’ (2006:453).

I attempt to resolve the question of the significance of epithets in the analysis of the collocation of the *thou/you* variants by applying Jucker’s proposed model (2000a). He suggests that a data analysis that distinguishes between a default or unmarked usage and deviations from the default is ‘too static’ (2000a:161). A micro-pragmatic analysis is required (Jucker 2000a:158) to investigate a third consideration in addition to the social status a speaker occupies in a society and their social role in relation to their interlocutor (Brown & Gilman’s 1960, vertical and horizontal axes of power and solidarity). This consideration is the momentary situational context that may include a temporary disruption to the status quo. Important though social roles are, Jucker views the *thou/you* distinction not solely as ‘a social default with stylistic variations’ (2000a:159) but as dependent also on ‘the situational context ... [that] includes more temporary balances of power, which may disrupt the other two balances.’ In a period of transition, each conversational exchange has its own marked usage. A diachronic analysis will reveal a direction of change but detailed synchronic analysis is necessary to attempt to explain that change.

**Witness Depositions**

In his study of evidence from depositions from the ecclesiastical court of Durham in the 1560s, Hope (1994:141) challenges Brown and Gilman’s assertion (1989:159)
that dramatic texts provide the only available evidence on colloquial speech of the
period. Depositions, being dictated to court clerks by witnesses and litigants and
‘written down at the time’ are ‘closer to spoken language than other written forms.’
The data is from the initial actual conversations rather than subsequent court
transcripts and Hope considers that, since they mainly constitute cases of
defamation, attention is likely to have been paid to the actual words used (1994:143).
‘It is striking to note, following this point, that in those cases where there are
multiple accounts of the same conversation, the accounts almost always preserve
identical pronoun forms’ (1994:143). This is contrary to my findings from my
analysis of the depositions\(^\text{21}\) in the CED corpus. Where they do not preserve them, it
may be because this is a progressive change, implying a progressive loss of
awareness of implicature.

In the depositions, Hope finds none of the multiple shifts that are relatively common
in Shakespeare (1994:144). This agrees with my findings for depositions in the
CED. He suggests (1994:148) that in Court Records *thou* is the marked form in
1560 and that its usage is always motivated but this may be a case of participants
reporting what they expect to hear. In a period of transition, unless usage is strongly
marked, perhaps it passes unremarked.

**Corpus of English Dialogues Study**

In a previous study of the CED Walker (2007) aims to account for *thou*/*you* variation
across the period 1560-1760 and to investigate the difference in usage between male
and female speakers. She assesses the influence of extra-linguistic factors such as
speakers’ social status on the basis of sex, age and rank, the social distance between
them and their addressees, their social role and the emotion, level of formality and
context of the dialogue. She notes the finding from previous research that *thou*
would tend to be used to those of lower social status and these recipients would use
*you* to social superiors. Social distance and formality would promote the use of *you*,
whereas strong emotion would encourage *thou*. She cites Busse’s finding (2002)
from his study of the Shakespeare corpus that the genre of the text influences
*thou*/*you* distribution.

\(^{21}\) Chapter 4.
Walker selects her data by constructing sociolinguistically comparable sub-corpora from the CED (2007:66), comprising texts having both male and female speakers. For each of the three text types witness depositions, trials and drama she undertakes a macro analysis, that is a quantitative analysis, for sex, age and rank and a micro analysis in which she illustrates qualitatively the use of thou and discusses ‘the possible motivation behind each example, while noting which of the sex, age and rank parameters are at work in each case’ (2007:80). My reservation about this approach is its apparent assumption that the sex of the speaker may be significant in thou/you usage. In examining all thou usage I intend to avoid any presupposition about its interpretation.

Seventeenth Century Drama & Prose Fiction

Another study not based on Shakespearean texts is that by Johnson who analyses a corpus of 33 drama comedies and 14 works of popular fiction from the seventeenth century to determine the influence of rank on thou/you variation. Walker finds that Johnson’s quantitative results validate her findings. Johnson categorises speakers into three broad social types: upper class (approximately equivalent to A-C1 in Walker’s classification), middle class (approximately equivalent to Walker’s C2-D categories) and lower class (approximately E-G in Walker’s categories). She finds ‘counting the number of occurrences of you and thou in the speech of those who are described with sufficient fullness to be treated as social types, leads to the conclusion that analysis is all but impossible’ (1966:264). This suggests that rank may be too narrow a category for analysis. She finds you employed ironically and thou to express intimacy or to address an inferior, but takes the fact that ‘you may frequently be found in circumstances where thou might be expected and at times thou where we should expect to find you,’ demonstrates ‘the meaninglessness of the distinction between them’ (1966:266).

Johnson finds that the three classes employed the pronouns of address with relative frequencies that are ‘extremely erratic; their variability immediately suggests that the distinction [i.e. difference] between you and thou had become meaningless in the seventeenth century’ (1966:265). She claims the upper classes use more thou throughout, though this is only apparent in her statistics for the first half of the 17th century.

---

22 Discussed in Chapter 3.
century; ‘this maintenance of the distinction by the better educated ... would also seem to imply that you and thou are employed in free variation’ (1966:265). She does not substantiate her claim that the ‘upper class’ is ‘better educated’ and therefore more aware of prescriptive use.

Johnson finds throughout the period use of singular you to connote respect or irony and thou to connote emotion or intimacy, to address an inferior or reciprocally among the lower class. ‘However, further demonstrating the meaninglessness of the distinction [i.e. difference] between them, you may frequently be found in circumstances where thou might be expected to occur and thou where we should expect to find you’ (1966:266). Johnson concludes that we cannot determine why you replaced thou. This is presumably because she describes usage but attempts to account for it only in terms of rank. This limits her study as a qualitative analysis.

**Pronoun Switching**

Mühlhäusler & Harré’s (1990) study of pronouns and their reference to social relationships finds Brown & Gilman’s influential proposed power (later ‘status’)/solidarity axes to be inadequate in categorising the thou/you choice. They add the following minimum list of categories for consideration: ‘rank, status, office, generation, formality, informality, public discourse, private discourse, intimacy, social distance, high degree of emotional excitement’ and cite Goodenough’s concept (1965, in Mühlhäusler & Harré 1990:132 ) of ‘differentiated social persona’ as an attempt to combine all of these. Most studies of pronoun switching of which I am aware deal with Shakespearean drama. Several scholars have commented on this phenomenon with the implication that further investigation would be useful. In a brief analysis of King Lear’s dialogues with his daughters McIntosh (1963:54) notes that a Shakespearean character may shift from a more formal pronominal mode to thou:

- because of a surge of personal satisfaction with, or affection towards, the person addressed;

- because of a surge of feelings of quite the opposite kind: anger, contempt, or the like.
He mentions, though does not account for, a ‘counter-move from singular to plural’ in Celia’s address to her cousin, Rosalind in *As You Like It* (1963:55).

Brown & Gilman note an ‘expressive shift’ (1989:177) in their study of politeness in four Shakespearean tragedies and propose a corollary to their status rule: “in cases where *you* is expected, the occurrence of *thou* indicates that the speaker is emotionally aroused”. ‘This amounts to making *you* the unmarked or default form and *thou* a form marked for effect’ (Mulholland 1987). The shift differs from that found in French or German where a mutual change from *you* to *thou* connotes a permanent change in the relationship. Retractibility of the shift from *you* to *thou* identifies it as a temporary expression of emotion whether negative or positive. Since they take *you* to be the unmarked form, they do not consider *thou>**you* shifts.

Barber (1976:208) does find markedness reversal in a selection of passages from Early Modern English texts: ‘*thou* is used, even in situations where *you* would be normal, when the emotional temperature rises ... either to indicate intimacy, affection, tenderness ... [or] to show, anger, contempt, disgust. The reverse is also true: *you* may become the insulting and hostile form.’ He notes that most ‘switches from one to the other even within a single sentence ... are motivated: there is a change of tone or attitude in the speaker’ (1976:210). In a later analysis of *you* and *thou* in *Richard III*, however, (1987:172) he finds that some switches ‘seem to have no great significance ... some of these fluctuations may be significant ... but some appear not to be.’ One interesting observation (1976:212) is that *thou* continues to be used at the end of the seventeenth century in addresses to the reader, even when the dedicatee may be addressed as *you*. Perhaps this literary device of implied intimacy is intended to draw the unknown reader in to the privileged context of a private conversation with the narrator; a social deictic feature connoting shared assumptions.

In her re-appraisal of Brown & Gilman (1983:115) Wales finds that ‘not all switches ... can be easily explained ... in terms of shifts of social attitude or feeling’ but may well function ‘almost like a prosody, to indicate a shift in emotional ‘key’.’ Lass similarly has the concept of a change of ‘key’ (1999:152). In a brief assessment of sixteenth and seventeenth century personal correspondence he finds that the choice
of variant within one letter changes according to topic. Lass finds that the *thou*/you contrast eventually became deictic, not only as a reflection of the speaker/addressee relationship with *you* as the distal pronoun and *thou* as the proximal but with *thou* also as a reflection of immediate, factual topics and *you* of ‘unreal conditions (verbs of guessing, conjecture etc)’ (1999:153). Calvo, in a study of *As You Like It*, finds that shifts of address cannot always ‘be directly related to a character’s emotional outbursts nor to a negation of social identities’ (1992:22). Instead, in some contexts *you* and *thou* appear to function as discourse markers that indicate ‘the presence of boundaries of the supra-sentential organisation of the dramatic dialogue’ (1992:16). She finds that at times they have a textual function in that there are passages where “the shift from one pronominal form to another seems to have ... been exploited by Shakespeare to differentiate two intertwined conversational topics or to mark the boundary between two distinct sections in a dramatic dialogue’ (1992:26).23

**Pronoun Switching in other languages**

Friedrich’s study of the nineteenth century Russian second-person pronoun system finds that it, like that of Early Modern English, has been influenced by French usage. As in Medieval England, where aspiring gentlemen spoke French ‘for to be i-tolde of’ (Higden [1350] in Freeborn 1998:258), in nineteenth century Russia, literary French ‘was well spoken even by much of the provincial gentry’ (Friedrich 1966:223), so that (Leroy-Beaulieu 1881:361 cited in Friedrich 1966:223) ‘Le français était devenu une sorte de passeport mondain’ [French had become a sort of world passport] and Friedrich claims ‘French determined Russian pronominal usage.’ In his study of the Russian use of second person pronouns Friedrich’s system is also more sensitive than Brown & Gilman’s broad two dimensions. He itemises various biological and social considerations (roughly equivalent to Brown & Gilman’s ‘status’ category) and group membership (roughly Brown & Gilman’s ‘solidarity’). Friedrich found two textual variables to influence *thou*/you (*ty*/vy) usage in Russian (1966:231). These were implicit in all speech events:

- Topic of the discourse: involving code switching according to the formality of the theme
- Context of the speech event: which influences the degree of formality

---

23 Tables in chapter 7: *Pragmatic Factors motivating thou/you switching in different text types* illustrate this function in the CED.
Of particular significance is *Emotional Solidarity*, that is the sympathy and antipathy between the two speakers. ‘A mutual formal *vy* may be retained between close friends as a form of respect, while intonation and gestures signalled affection,\(^{24}\) whereas *ty* could be used to signal contempt or incipient violence or other emotions that were neither intimacy nor respect’ (1966:231). Solidarity differs from the other variables in that ‘it relates to individual emotion and does not consist so obviously of cultural rules and principles’ (1966:231).

Friedrich suggests ‘it is difficult to predict behavior within an actual system in terms of a simple continuum between the *ty* of “like-mindedness” (as in Brown & Gilman 1964) and the *vy* of “weak solidarity”’ (1966:231). A switch to *ty* was often unconscious and ‘did not necessarily evoke or reflect a mutual restructuring of the relationship’ (1966:248). A switch may be motivated by surprise, fear, drunkenness, despair, insanity, lack of contact with reality. In fact, Friedrich suggests, it ‘often symbolized an outlook on man and society characteristic of the insane, the senile, hermits and extreme revolutionaries, notably terrorists.’ He does add (1966:252) ‘the role of emotion was comparatively great in the Russian way of life’ and does not propose his categories as universal. Most of his study concerns contemporary Russian society and a consideration of how second person pronoun usage co-varies with aspects of Russian social culture. His data is from a corpus of novels of Russian Realism. He says ‘the Russian novel was always ‘realistic’ in its concern with burning moral and political issues, with differences of social or bureaucratic status, and with the nature of human thought and emotion’ (1966:216).

In their review of research into the function of pronoun choice as an expression of social relations in different languages Mühlhäusler & Harré conclude (1990:141) ‘the uses of *ty* are plainly not to be accounted for by its role as the pronoun either of solidarity or of condescension. It is as much, or more, the pronoun of surprise, upset, derangement and strong emotion of every kind, both hate and love, anger and tenderness.’ I rarely encountered such strong emotion in my corpus probably because Friedrich’s data is from [tragic] Russian novels of the Romantic period, whereas the fictional dialogue I investigated in my corpus is from comedy drama and

\(^{24}\) Friedrich’s corpus is 19th and early 20th century Russian novels, thus he has access to such extralinguistic data rarely available in the CED trials and comedy drama texts.
didactic texts, in neither of which would one expect to find heightened emotion depicted as realism. Where heightened emotion does occur in the CED it often gives rise to pronoun switching. Friedrich’s finding (1966:249) that the use of *ty* symbolized extreme social dislocation does not correspond to my general finding that *thou* in Early Modern English connotes some aspect of intimacy. It is not to be expected that the negative social features he found will be reflected in Early Modern English drama comedies, which differ from his data diachronically and in genre and social context. My findings do agree with Friedrich, however, that a sudden switch in usage must be significant: ‘the many cases of switching symbolized some realignment, or a change in relative power, or simply the addition or subtraction of a component’ (1966:239).

A study of modern Polish second person pronoun usage shows (Stone 1981 in Mühlhäusler & Harré 1990:147) that ‘with the exception of classroom discourse and warder-convict conversation in prisons, the dimension that Brown & Gilman (mis)called “power” (namely, the polarity between expressions of deference and reciprocal displays of condescension) does not exist.’ The Polish system seems rather to have an rural/urban divide with the more intimate rural variants *ty* (singular) and *wy* (plural) connoting familiarity rather than friendship (the latter being Brown & Gilman’s ‘solidarity’ of which Stone finds no evidence) and the urban intimate/formal singular *ty/Pan* (where the latter denotes the address term ‘Mister’) and the urban intimate/formal plural *wy/Panowie*. Mühlhäusler & Harré (1990:146) conclude that the choice is socially driven and depends particularly on ‘status, rank and class’. There is evidence (1990:150) of Brown & Gilman’s ‘expressive shift’ when ‘the emotional tone becomes intense or there is a marked change in degree of intimacy (and sometimes this is a matter of topic) or both’.

---

25 See especially Appendix 3, Apostrophe & Personification, use of *you* in Apostrophe.
Chapter 3 Data & Methodology

Given that my objectives were to discover the contexts in which thou and you were used with singular reference, the motivation for shifts from one variant to the other and how the variants collocated with address terms and epithets, the Corpus of English Dialogues 1560-1760, provided appropriate data. Its purpose is to explore ‘spoken interaction of the Early Modern English period’ (Kytö & Walker 2006:9). The corpus brings together different text types so that it is possible to investigate authentic usage, prescribed usage and the stylistic effect of the potential subversion of these. The dialogues were selected to constitute a representative sample of natural spoken Early Modern English. They include speakers of both sexes and of a range of social ranks. Where possible the earliest available printed version of a text was used, since the objective was to represent linguistic authenticity. Later editions of constructed texts tend to aim for literary style and authentic dialogues may be censored. The two superordinate text categories are authentic dialogue and constructed dialogue. Authentic dialogue comprises written records of real speech events written at the time of the speech event. This includes trial proceedings and witness depositions. Constructed dialogue comprises: drama comedy, didactic works including language teaching, and prose fiction. I have not included prose fiction in my analysis. This is because it seemed to be the genre most unlike authentic dialogue because of the potentially multiple levels of discourse structure in which indirect speech is filtered through a narrator with lexis and deixis appropriate to the narrator. Furthermore, this increased the proportion of authentic dialogue in my data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum narratorial intervention</th>
<th>Authentic dialogue</th>
<th>Constructed dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trial Proceedings</td>
<td>285,660 words</td>
<td>Drama Comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238,590 words</td>
<td>Didactic Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Other</td>
<td>162,250 words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Language Teaching</td>
<td>74,390 words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>25,970 words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Depositions</td>
<td>172,940 words</td>
<td>Prose Fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458,600</td>
<td>223,890 words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3:1 Overall structure of the CED and word counts for each text type (Kytö & Walker 2006)
A potential problem in a historical pragmatic analysis is the extent to which one can rely on the authenticity of the data. Fries referred to this as the problem of ‘bad data’ (1998:85). Where possible the earliest available printed version of constructed dialogue texts was used in the CED, except for the one Shakespeare text for which the 1623 First Folio version was used in preference to the earlier so-called ‘bad’ quarto of 1602.  

A significant comment in the Guide to the CED (2006:27) relates to trial and deposition texts; many contemporaneous records were in manuscript form. Funding for the transcription of these was not available. Therefore, later printed versions were used, with the concomitant risk of editorial interference. Commenting elsewhere (2003:228) Kytö and Walker, the authors of the Guide, list other potential hazards in the attempt to find authentic speech data: direct speech in a text may have been recorded in and reconstructed from an unknown note form instead of shorthand; in depositions witness testimony is generally represented by the scribe as indirect speech mixed with formulaic words and legal phrases, so that the actual speech has to be reconstructed. There is also the possibility of scribal or editorial error. Partisan reporters may modify the published text. A text printed from a manuscript may have transcription errors. This is significant in the present study, as ‘many editions – when compared with the original manuscripts – have been found to omit/add or switch the pronouns you and thou, which might well affect overall findings in a quantitative linguistic study’ (2003:235). It is particularly significant in a qualitative study where my objective is to account for speakers’ variation in their thou/you usage. Ideally, I should follow the advice given (2003:241) and compare the deposition texts in the CED with the original manuscripts. Unfortunately, time constraints prevented this.

**Text Types**

**Authentic Dialogue - Trial Proceedings**

The Guide to the Corpus describes the trial texts as ‘taken down by an official scribe, or an observer who is not otherwise involved in the proceedings.’ ‘Scribal

---

26 See chapter 2 for discussion of the Q1 and Q2 versions of Hamlet.
intervention’ notes the Guide, ‘tends to be limited to speaker identification, or to explanatory comments on the proceedings’ (2006:20). Trial texts and witness depositions are both categorised by Jucker (2007) as ‘retrospective’ texts.

**Authentic Dialogue - Witness Depositions**

‘Depositions are records of the spoken testimony of a witness (or defendant or plaintiff) usually taken down by a scribe before the case is heard in court (but we also include texts in which the record is made during the court hearing’) (Kytö & Walker 2006:21). The testimony is generally third-person narrative with considerable scribal intervention, most frustratingly where the scribe censors the text, for example when ‘wyd-arst hoore’ is rendered as ‘- hoore’.27 ‘Direct speech can occur when the witness cites earlier speech events that may then be rendered verbatim by the scribe’ (2006:21).

**Reliability of Data**

Although the two superordinate CED dialogue categories are termed in the Guide (2006:12) ‘Authentic’ and ‘Constructed’, it is questionable just how authentic or spontaneous the dialogue of witness depositions and trials can be. The spoken word recorded in the texts has passed through at least one intermediary in being transferred from the spoken to the written medium. We cannot know what changes the scribe has made. He may have misheard the evidence. He may have adjusted what he heard to a version that he considers appropriate. Cusack (1998:7) says of depositions, ‘formal summaries give the alleged defamatory words in both second and third person form, since thou art a whore and she is a whore are equally actionable.’ Problems with the authenticity of the text arise because, although there is a first-person narrative as subject matter, this is rendered into reported speech in the third person and may then undergo further expansion (Cusack 1998:93). The response may be disguised as ‘a freely offered statement’ so that it is difficult to know ‘whether the wording is the witness’s own, or whether it was fed to them by an unrecorded question, or, indeed, whether all the words are from the interrogation, with the witness’s yea, aye or yes being expanded to include the question’ (1998:97).

---

27 This also is instructive: presumably the epithet wyd-arst was considered to be more offensive than the term hoore and, as Cusack notes (1998), it is only necessary to record the term that actually constitutes defamation.
Jucker (2000b:27) looks at the case of the trial of Lady Alice Lisle. Barter, her servant, relates to the Lord Chief Justice a conversation he had with her several weeks previously in which the written text relates he addressed her as Madam and she addressed him as thou. Lady Lisle was charged with High Treason. How the interlocutors addressed each other is not significant for the outcome of the trial. It may be that Lady Lisle addressed him as thou. It may be that Barter or the Clerk of the Court changed the address term to what they felt appropriate. We cannot know.

In the case of depositions sometimes we have an indication that deponents have modified their evidence. Cusack (1998:97) finds evidence ‘that clerks in general carry out with scrupulous care their task of setting down what the deponent said.’ She cites a case from 1644 in which both husband and wife made depositions:

Deposition of Robert Wyard, deponent said: Villaine what are you doeing heare
Deposition of Eleanor Wyard, his wife, her husband said: O thou wicked Rogue what art thou doeing

The deponents had come upon Nathaniell Moore allegedly ‘buggering a calf’. This gives rise to the question of why the deponents differ in their reporting of what Robert Wyard said. It may be that Robert felt that his more formal language was more appropriate to the environment of the court, given that he reported that he then said to Moore,

Villaine you have done ynough to bee hang’d

It may be that Eleanor Wyard was more outraged than her husband and that this coloured her recollection of what she felt would have been an appropriate response to Moore in the context of the incident. She deposed that her husband’s response to Moore was,

thou hast done that which thou must hang ffor

From a twenty-first century perspective, it seems more likely that Eleanor’s is the accurate reporting and that her husband’s language was not as moderate and formal as he purports.

In a paper assessing the reliability of written records of depositions and trials, Kytö & Walker (2003) warn not only against the problem noted by Cusack (1998:93) of the accuracy of the initial recording of the speech, but also against the possibility of
the corruption of the text by subsequent editors and the potential of this leading to ‘erroneous conclusions’ in pragmatic research. They cite the example from the Courts of Durham [1573 1WDURHA Sample 14 CED], ‘Quarrelling and Fighting in the Church and Churchyard of Stannington’. In this, several witnesses give a very similar account of the conduct of an argument. Where they differ is in their reporting of the use of the second-person pronoun. Pragmatically, this influences the interpretation of the participants’ perception of the incident and of each other. Kytö & Walker report that the nineteenth century printed edition used as the source by the CED (1845)\(^{28}\) does not, unfortunately, follow the original manuscript. The manuscript consistently uses \(y\)\(^{y}\) to represent \(thou\) but the later edition is not consistent in its transcription and has a confused attribution of \(you\) and \(thou\) to the participants. This, suggest Kytö & Walker (2003:235), ‘might well affect overall findings in a quantitative linguistic study.’

It is perhaps significant that the two informants\(^{29}\) to whom \(you\) is erroneously attributed by the nineteenth-century editors are the vicar and the bailiff, who would be of higher social status than John Rosse to whom they attribute the use of \(thou\). Perhaps this influences their transcription. Kytö & Walker (2003:241) note that text editors in the nineteenth century were compiling texts for legal and historical interest rather than for linguistic research, so perhaps the \(thou/you\) variant was of no interest to them at all. Given that the speaker may be charged with defamation for the employment of abusive or defamatory words but not with impoliteness for the perceived inappropriate use of an address pronoun, more confidence can be placed on the reporting accuracy of actionable epithets than on that of the accompanying pronoun.

On the question of the authenticity of data Jucker (2000b:20) examines Koch’s model of the embedding of communicative situations in court records. Koch argues for a distinction between the language medium (phonic or graphic) and the conceptualization of the language of immediacy and the language of distance. The

\(^{28}\) Quarrelling and Fighting in the Church and Churchyard of Stannington [1573 1WDURHA] Sample 14 CED, Raine ed. Depositions and Other Ecclesiastical Proceedings from the Courts of Durham, 1845.

\(^{29}\) ‘Informants’ report the speech of others to the Court. ‘Speakers’ are the actual producers of the utterance.
extremes of these are the phonic code as a language of immediacy, typical of ‘everyday spontaneous interaction’ (Koch 1999:411) and the graphic code of distance that of complex legal documents. This range of communicative situations has a range of characteristic features. Jucker elucidates (2000b:25) how Koch applies his model to court records. I have added further interpretation in Figure 3.1.

**Figure 3.1 The Discourse Structure of Court Texts**
(adapted from Koch 1999:400, 411)

The process by which the natural language of initial spoken utterance A is recorded as written formal text D

**Interpretation of Diagram**

S→H (W)
S = primary communication act, spontaneous face-to-face conversation A, addressed by Speaker to Hearer H and possibly overheard by Witness (W)

S’ i.e. H or W → H’(W’)
S’=Secondary communication in the Courtroom B, by the original Hearer or Witness as plaintiff or witness. The original utterance is quoted as ‘literally as possible’.
This Secondary communication is directed to H’ the questioner in Court and is heard by the secondary Witness W’, the Clerk of the Court, who records it in writing as Statement S” to be available as a tertiary communication act for later Readers R”, who receive it as a written document D in the formal legal language of communicative distance.

Within this report is the secondary communication act of the statement S’ given orally to the Court ‘which presumably tends towards communicative immediacy A’ (Koch 1999:411) but is amended by Jucker (2007) to B, being more likely, as the language of courtroom interaction, to be in the language of distance in the spoken code. This is recorded at level II, area C and transcribed into the language of immediacy in the written code.

Some features of the written record may be recorded in Latin. Indeed, Cusack notes the use in Church Courts of ‘standard documents with a set pro-forma framework in Latin, prepared in advance with blanks left at appropriate places into which the details of particular case could be entered ... and only the abuse itself is on record’ (1998:7). Koch characterises this ‘primary communication act S’ as having ‘a very pronounced communicative immediacy’ (1999:411).

He explains that ‘it is on account of their emotionality and spontaneity that the utterances themselves become justiciable ... and there is an attempt to reproduce the utterances as authentically as possible with regard to the specific language and conceptionable aspects’ (Koch 1999:411). Because of this it is generally assumed that the text in the secondary communication act received and recorded by S” is authentic. The power of memory and the honesty of the witness S’ are relevant variables, as is the difference between reported and direct speech (Koch 1999:412).

It is apparent that some exchanges in the CED depositions texts are not validly interpreted as authentic conversation, since the witness is concerned with the illocutionary force of the utterance reported rather than with the precise terms in which it was framed. An informant, Margareta Gravenour, reports Randull
Ramshea’s utterance to Sybil Blakhurst as: 
"if euer I marry any, I will Marry the", the same wordes that wer spoken afore, or the like in effect.’ [1565 1WCHEST Sample 3 [added emphasis]

In another matrimonial, case the witness Margareta Waite reported Alexander Winstanley’s words to Ellen Sonkie:
"I will take thee for my wief from this daie forward"

When asked, 'whether theis were the wordes of contract, or whether ther were more spoken', Margareta replied that,
'theis and all the wordes vsid to be spoken bie the priest, were spoken, altho nowe she hath forgotten them: then she had them in memory.' [1564 1WCHEST Sample 11]

This does not invalidate these utterances as data in a qualitative study. It would be difficult to produce definitive results in a quantitative historical pragmatic study of conversation. It would be possible to detect the gradual loss of a feature regionally and socially, but the data can only ever reveal an approximation of contemporary usage. What Koch’s model demonstrates is that historical texts should be ‘assessed on the basis of the individual parameters of the distinction between the language of communicative immediacy and the language of communicative distance’ (Jucker 2000b:27). They should be seen not as ‘an imperfect reflection of some ideal spontaneous conversation’, therefore ‘even highly constrained forms of language are “real”’ (Jucker 2007). Attention must be paid to contexts: textual, regional, temporal, social, affective to discover, if not when thou was actually used, when it was likely to have been used or when contemporaries considered it likely to have been used and what this implies about the function of the thou/you variant.

What is possible from records of depositions and trials in which several speakers use the same form of words (as the Fighting in the Churchyard example discussed above) is an assessment of the context in which thou was actually used or, when witnesses recall an utterance from twenty years previously (as Margareta Waite’s report above [1564 1WCHEST]), of the context in which it would have seemed to them likely to have been used. One objective of this study is to discover this context.

30 Quarrelling and Fighting in the Church and Churchyard of Stannington [1573 1WDURHA Sample 14].
**Constructed Dialogue**

**Drama Comedy** is categorised in the *Guide* as ‘dialogue constructed by an author which is presented as direct speech’ with ‘limited intervention by the narrator’ (Kytö & Walker 2006:22), such as stage directions and minimal and frequently erroneous speaker identification. Drama texts are referred to as ‘constructed’ dialogue. Jucker (2007) categorises drama as simulated spoken interaction. These texts differ from the so-called ‘authentic’ dialogues in that they are constructed to be overheard by a third party.

**Figure 3.2 The Discourse Structure of Drama**
from Short (1996:169)

**Prototypical structure of drama**

![Diagram of the Discourse Structure of Drama](image)

Figure 3.2, Short’s diagrammatic illustration of the discourse structure of dramatic texts, shows that the playwright gives his message to the speaker, character A, who delivers it to the addressee, character B, in such a way that it is received by the audience/reader. The way in which character A addresses character B constructs their identities to the third party. In plays with a more complex discourse structure, a narrator relates the story of a play within a play to characters on the stage who are in turn observed by the audience. In this case, the narrator is constructing the characters he describes by the way in which he describes them. The audience’s perception of the inner characters may then be filtered through the narrator’s perception. Identity is constructed not only through the actions of the characters but also through the language used by the characters and through the language used about them. The language used in constructed texts is, therefore, likely to index their social identity and social relationships in addition to having the discourse function of developing the story. What can be deduced from the language of drama is the contemporary implication of the use of linguistic variables. Unlike the dialogues in the authentic texts, which were not intended to be overheard, the dialogues in the
constructed texts were written specifically to categorise the participants to a third party. The authentic dialogues have been preserved incidentally as legal documents. We cannot be sure to what extent any of the dialogues represents authentic Early Modern English usage but ‘even highly constrained forms of language are “real”’ (Jucker 2007).

**Didactic Works**
Like drama texts didactic works have little narratorial intervention. Their purpose is to instruct or inform. Jucker (2007) categorises them as ‘prospective’ dialogues to be understood as models for future use, perhaps to be learned by heart. The *Guide* notes that they comprise dialogue structured ‘as if between master and student’ (Kytö & Walker 2006:23), which suggests that they may be useful as an indication of potential social status in *thou*/you usage.

**Language Teaching Handbooks**
The dialogue in language teaching handbooks may be affected by ‘the target language or by the native language of the author’ (Kytö & Walker 2006:23). They may have ‘long vocabulary lists.’ Jucker (2007) categorises them as ‘prospective’, that is: they constitute models for future use and thus illustrate prescribed usage.

**Miscellaneous Texts**
Miscellaneous texts are categorised in the *Guide* (Kytö & Walker 2006:24) as mainly fictional dialogues resembling didactic works but seem ‘intended as entertainment or complaint rather than as informative/instructional.’ All have dialogue as direct speech with minimal narratorial intervention.

**Methodology**
As far as I am aware, previous studies of the *thou*/you variants in Early Modern English have analysed texts on the basis of some component of the vertical and horizontal axes of status and distance, or like Mulholland they have sought a grammatical feature to account for variation. Calvo’s 1996 study based on artistic merit and on the supposed superior literary talent of Shakespeare concludes from a comparison of two versions of *Hamlet*, the ‘non-authoritative’ 1603 Quarto and the
‘genuine’ 1623 First Folio that ‘we are now forced to grant that the pirates improved Shakespeare’s choice of pronoun,’ (1996:19) so that ‘the swift shifts of pronominal choice which we have been bent on deciphering and explaining as the expression of transient feeling could perhaps be, in some cases, the result of meaningless free variation’ (1996:21). The problem with these approaches is that they limit the analysis so that, if the particular feature investigated cannot be shown to motivate thou/you variation, one is left with the conclusion of Johnson’s 1966 study that the difference between the pronouns of address had become ‘meaningless’ by the seventeenth century.

**Pragmaphilological Model**

For the present study a pragmaphilological\(^{31}\) model has been used, based on an in-depth contextual analysis of the CED texts. This approach has been chosen rather than the more common method of analysing the text for specific features in order to avoid any preconceptions which might influence the results. The intention was to arrive at a fully data-driven model to explain the pronoun switches.

In identifying switching usage as potentially significant, I do not set out to justify any particular explanation. I do not assume that usage necessarily connotes power or solidarity, only that a change in use may be significant in some way since, Jucker (2007) claims:

Language without situational constraints does not exist.

Language is always produced in a complex matrix of conditions of participants, medium, formality of the situation and so on, some of it ephemeral, some of it preserved, some of it original, some of it a reproduction.

Therefore even highly constrained forms of language are “real”.

**Unmarked Usage**

My approach is not whether or not a specific feature appeared to motivate thou/you variation, rather to find all examples of thou usage in my corpus and then to identify any common features in their context. This relates to my first objective:

to discover the contexts in which the forms *thou* and *you* were used with singular reference

I identified the *thou* forms, but where a speaker habitually used *thou* to an addressee, noted this only once, since my objective was not to count tokens but to discover the context of use. As I undertook a close reading of these texts, there was no problem in sifting out plural *yous* and no need to estimate their number. In his analysis of *thou*/*you* usage in *Richard III*, Barber notes that of the 22,767 examples of *you* in Shakespeare’s work as a whole,

> quite a few of these 22,767 examples must be of plural *you* ... it seems likely that there is no enormous difference in frequency between *thou* and singular *you*. It can by no means be said, therefore, that in Shakespeare’s works as a whole the usual form is *you*, and *thou* merely an occasional variant used on special occasions (1987:177).

Barber bases this assumption on his findings in *Richard III*, which are contrary to Mulholland’s (1967) finding in *King Lear* and *Much Ado About Nothing*. It seems hazardous therefore to extrapolate from one text to the entire corpus.

The repetition of forms in the following examples from the CED texts illustrates why token counting alone is inadequate.

*Peniculus:* *You, you, you,* shall we fetch a kennell of Beagles that may cry nothing but *you, you, you, you*. For we are wearie of it.  

[1595 1CWARNE]

*Sir Paul Plyant:* *Thy, Thy,* come away *Thy,* touch him not, come hither Girl, go not near him, there's nothing but deceit about him;  

[1694 4CCONGR]

>his daughter Cynthia, presumably *Thy* here is a hypocorism [ðiː] not [ðai]

In the deposition and trial texts the relationship of the participants and the nature of the discourse was apparent from the identification of the roles they played. Dialogue in the drama comedies was more difficult to classify. After identifying *thou*-forms, my next step was to identify unmarked usage among the participants in the dialogues. My method differed significantly from that employed by Walker in her analysis of the drama comedy sub-corpus. Walker focuses on pronoun usage in the play samples given in the corpus and does not ‘attempt to relate this usage to the play as a whole’ (2007:173). I found it impossible to determine the relationships of the
characters, their relative social status and distance without the context of the whole play. Some samples began with the play opening but other samples were taken from the middle of the play. Often the character names were given only as abbreviations and a list of characters was rarely supplied. It was sometimes necessary also to know what had transpired previously between the characters in order to interpret apparent aberrant usage. Where possible, I therefore, studied the whole play text, frequently from EEBO,\textsuperscript{32} in order to set the CED extract in context. My objective was to study language in use. I was concerned that an isolated extract of text would be more appropriate for the study of language as a system.

Walker sets sociolinguistic parameters and investigates how they might motivate pragmatic interpretation. I adopted the reverse approach and identified each pragmatic change then investigated what extra-linguistic or linguistic factors may have motivated the usage. This meant that I had to look for pragmatic indicators within the text. She excludes from her quantitative summary disputed cases ‘in which different deponents give conflicting reports about which pronoun was used in an earlier speech event’ (2007:116). I have categorised these as ‘reporting discrepancies’ and include them since they connote that the speaker considered that the variant they report is appropriate to the context they are reporting. I also considered those extra-linguistic variables ‘degree of intimacy and emotion’ categorised by Walker as being ‘too subjective for precise quantification’ (2007:21fn), where they appeared to influence \textit{thou/you} variation.

\textbf{Markedness & Markedness Reversal}

For my second objective:

\textit{to determine the motivation for shifts from one form to the other within an exchange or within a single utterance}

Various studies have differed in their assessment of the marked form at a particular time. Since \textit{you} initially had only plural reference and \textit{thou} eventually came to be used in very restricted registers, there may have been a period marking a ‘tipping point’ when \textit{you} ceased to be marked and \textit{thou} became marked. Since this happened

\textsuperscript{32} Early English Books Online.
at different times in different registers, my objective is to establish the form that is marked in a particular exchange and to discover the implication of its use.

I identified *thou* as the diachronically socially marked form of the *thou*/you variable over the Early Modern English period, in accordance with Battistella’s criteria (see discussion on Markedness Chapter 1). I did not assume that this would be the case for individual exchanges. This differs from Stein (2002:252), who in analysing *thou*/you in *King Lear* and *As You Like It* identifies ‘the normal, or the unmarked pronoun for a given social relationship,’ then analyses ‘the individual occurrences of departures from these socially determined uses as marked uses.’ He claims that since ‘the speech conventions of the Elizabethan period were socially based and supra-personally valid, and the theater audience of the time relied on them and reacted accordingly,’ markedness ‘cannot be determined right from the start for every address relationship individually, excluding general language use’ (2002:276). If the audience were aware of linguistic convention, presumably they would be aware when it is flouted whether this occurs in the initial address or in subsequent markedness reversal.

For the drama extracts I undertook a close reading of the complete text, where available, to establish each character’s unmarked usage. I then attempted to account for each instance of a speaker’s usage switch to an addressee, either within one conversational exchange or within the same utterance. This analysis depends on the concept of markedness reversal. Where one form appears to be the established unmarked form for a particular pair of interlocutors in an exchange, my objective is to discover the motivation for a sudden change of use to the form that is *marked for them in that context*.

**Correlation of Address Terms and Epithets with *thou*/you**

One of Walker’s (2007) aims in her study of the CED is to examine the influence of extra-linguistic factors on the distribution of *thou*/you. For each genre she categorises usage according to sex, age and rank. She supplies the following table (3.2) to illustrate the system of rank classification used for her data analysis.

As far as I am aware, rank is the factor most widely cited as influencing *thou*/you
distribution in Early Modern English, that is Brown and Gilman’s *power semantic*. Walker uses these categories to test hypotheses concerning usage among those of equal rank and between those of unequal rank in drama comedy (2007:184). Whilst I found social status significant in determining usage, because my *thou*/*you* variation analysis did not depend on a quantitative assessment of social status, I found this classification system too detailed for my requirements.

**Classification of Rank**

Wrightson finds that Elizabethans assessed social status pragmatically:

> The Elizabethan hierarchy of degrees was a perception of the social order which was concerned less with universal ideals than with present realities, less with function than with place, less with vocational and occupational differentials than with the bald facts of relative wealth, status and power ... degrees conventionally distinguished lacked for the most part both fixity of definition and independent institutional reality. Relative status emerged from the interplay of a range of variables (of which wealth was the single most important) in a process of social assessment which was, and remained, largely informal (1991:43-44).

**Table 3.2 Detailed Classification System for the Rank Parameter**

(Walker 2007:25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Official Title</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-commoners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>royalty, nobility, and the high clergy</td>
<td>Queen, Duke, Archbishop, Baron, Bishop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>knights and baronets</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>gentry</td>
<td>Esquire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>those in the professions, wealthy traders, wholesale merchants</td>
<td>Doctor, Colonel</td>
<td>lawyer, doctor, army officer, clergyman, teacher, financier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commoners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>well-to-do farmers, and retailers, urban masters, and certain urban craftsmen</td>
<td>yeoman, shopkeeper innkeeper, cutler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>poorer farmers and (especially) rural craftsmen</td>
<td>husbandman, weaver, blacksmith, shoemaker, alehouse keeper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>poor wage-earners, or those bound to a master</td>
<td>labourer, servant, apprentice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>unemployed, criminals</td>
<td>pauper, vagrant, whore, thief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coward (1996:43-46), assessing social distinctions in the early seventeenth century, finds that there is no commonly accepted terminology:
It is easier to reject terminology for this purpose than it is to find acceptable categories ... ‘gentry’ itself is not a precise term: the most usual definition is those who had the right to bear coats of arms, but it is clear that contemporaries considered others also to be ‘gentlemen’ ... Similar confusion surrounds the terminology used to describe those lower down the social scale; of these ‘yeoman’ and ‘freeholder’ are perhaps the most ambiguous. It was not uncommon for men to style themselves as ‘gentlemen’ in their wills, only to be described as ‘yeomen’ by the neighbours who drew up their probate inventories ... Contemporaries were very careful in the use of terminology to describe the social stratification within the landowning classes: nobles, knights, esquires and gentlemen. These distinctions were overshadowed by the divisions between those who were landed gentlemen and those who were not. In the late sixteenth century Sir Thomas Smith described gentlemen as those who could ‘live without manual labour.’ The borderline between Smith’s gentlemen and non-gentlemen was the most important one in early seventeenth century society.

Walker’s categories A and B are acknowledged by contemporaries but below that status seems more fluid with the deciding factor being wealth. I suggest that Commoners, defined in her table as those below Code C, are actually those below her Code B. Laslett terms Walker’s Non-Commoners as Gentry and views this as the significant dividing line. In pre-industrial society ‘the term gentleman marked the boundary at which the traditional social system divided up the population into two extremely unequal sections’ (Laslett 2005:27). ‘The primary characteristic of the gentleman was that he never worked with his hands on necessary, as opposed to leisurely, activities’ (2005:27). For the purpose of the present study Laslett’s categories of Title with Mr and Mrs above the Gentry boundary line and Goodman and Goodwife below and of Form of Address with Name and Surname only below the line are useful indications of contemporary usage. A 1694 Act of Parliament takes a pragmatic approach to status, imposing a tax ‘upon burial of every Gentleman or reputed Gentleman, or owning or writing himself such’ (Laslett 2005:42). Such a one may have been Tom, the Oxford Bargeman, who in a discussion with fellow boatmen in 1681 classifies London as, ‘a Nest of unthankful Rogues that hate us Country Gentlemen’ [4HOSAM]. The Gentry did not, however, comprise a coherent social group. Laslett cites Kerby’s finding that distinctions defined by a Gentry boundary line exist more for historians than they did for contemporary society (Laslett 2005:301). In categorising social status I therefore rely where possible on considering ‘the way a man is treated by his fellows’ (Laslett 2005:300). A significant part of this treatment is how he is addressed.
In addition to the horizontal divide of wealth, there is also the vertical divide of town and country that seemed a preoccupation in CED texts. Speakers identified ‘the other’ in pejorative terms *bumpkin* and *cit*:

Sparkish [town fop]: Why, d’ye think I’ll seem to be jealous, like a *Country Bumpkin*?
Mr. Pinchwife [country gentleman]: No, rather be a Cuckold, like a credulous *Cit*.  

---

Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick (1625-1678), said of her father-in-law, the Earl of Warwick’s, second wife, Susan Halliday, who was the widow of a rich London alderman, ‘Because she was a citizen, she was not so much respected in the family as in my opinion she deserved to be’ (Fell Smith in Fraser A. 2002:104).

*Gentry* is a term that signifies status as a component of a social status paradigm. Walker’s classification system for rank, based mainly on the work of the historian, Laslett (Walker 2007:25), shows *gentry* in the upper part of the table. Earls, such as Warwick, would be classified as Nobility, Walker’s group A, whereas Susan Halliday, as the widow of a rich London alderman, would be classified as group C2, ‘essentially, but not exclusively, an urban group’ that ‘does not fit into the traditional social hierarchy based on land ownership’ (2007:26). Walker also includes ‘those referred to as “citizens” in comedy in this group.’

---

33 OED Short for citizen; usually applied, more or less contemptuously, to a townsman or ‘cockney’ as distinguished from a countryman, or to a tradesman or shopkeeper as distinguished from a gentleman. For both the countryman and the gentleman *cit* = ‘other’.

34 OED Extremely wicked or criminal: heinous, villainous.
According to Hopkins and Steggle, ‘unlike the gentry, citizens generally had their homes in London and derived their wealth (which could be very great) from trade of some sort rather than owning land’, and ‘“citizen comedies” of the London stage, record the aspirations, fears and values of this social group, the forerunners of today’s middle classes’ (2006:45). Conversely ‘buoyed by their sense of moral superiority, courtiers tended to deride citizens as unfashionable and vulgar. From the citizens’ point of view, the stereotype of the courtier was of an extravagant spendthrift, likely to be a bad payer of his debts’ (2006:46).

Since (2006:42) ‘[R]enaissance society ... existed in a constant state of competition, renegotiation and reorganization,’ a speaker’s construction of an addressee would be motivated to some extent on a subjective awareness of their relative social status and on a perception either of ‘otherness’ which may involve this ‘sense of moral superiority’, or of solidarity. The significant term here is gentleman, as these comments show:

Doon: "for although ye be a gent., and I a poore man, my honestye shalbe as good as yours."
Mr Ratcliffe [armigerum] "What saith thou?" said Mr. Ratcliff then, "liknes thou thy honestye to myn?"
[1560 1WDURHA]

Conicatcher: For he may best be termed a Gentleman,
That when all fayles, can liue vpon his wit.
[1594 1CKNAVE]

Captain Mullinex, a Sea Captain: What are you sir?
Gregory Dwindle, a Country Gentleman: Why, -- I am -- a Gentleman. --
Captain Mullinex, a Sea Captain: Will your Armes beare you out in the Title?
[1647 3CTB]

Captain Mullinex, a Sea Captain: you have a great many Bags, and a great many buildings to sir. -- But, dare you for all that, presume in the way of Matrimonie, to looke so high as a Lady?

Master Rash, a Mercer: He that can purchase a Lordship –
Captain Mullinex, a Sea Captain: Thinks, he may purchase a Ladiship:
[1647 3CTB]

‘We Merchants are a Species of Gentry, that have grown into the World this last Century and are as honourable and almost as useful as you landed Folks, that have always thought yourself so much above us.’ [1723 5CSTEEL] (Conscious Lovers not in CED extract)
Speakers in the CED identify Groups A and B as of high social status but below that reference is fluid. Town and country dwellers regard each other as ‘the other’, as do courtiers and citizens.

I therefore collocate address terms and epithets with *thou* usage in an attempt to address my third objective:\(^\text{35}\)

> to investigate how the use of the forms *thou* and *you* collocates with address terms and epithets and what this may imply about their changing significance in the Early Modern English period.

‘Terms of Address include titles, kinship terms, endearments and insults, first name, surname, title and last name’ (Wales 2001:7). I would add to these in Early Modern English ‘name of occupation’. In my classification, I separate the evaluative categories of endearments and insults and consider them as epithets. ‘Epithets can occur as an apostrophe (*Be quiet, wretch!*), appositive to a pronoun (*you wretch*) or as a predicate complement (*you are a wretch*)’ (Chapman 2008:3).

For five of the text types (trials, depositions, didactic, language teaching and miscellaneous), I constructed a table of all instances of epithets used either in collocation with *thou* or *you* within single utterances in either direct address or reported usage. This ignores some epithets, but my objective is to assess the affective value of *thou* and *you* rather than the affect of the epithets themselves. Epithets functioning as addressing epithets e.g. *you wretch* are included, whereas referring epithets (*the wretch*) are excluded since they reveal nothing about the second person pronoun.

I categorised modified address terms as epithets; thus *Madam* as a vocative, although evaluative of social status, functions as an address term, since it may be used by several speakers to the same addressee, whereas *dearest Madam* is an epithet, since it is an evaluation specific to that speaker and that utterance. Similarly, evaluative terms such as *rogue* are classed as epithets. Address terms express relationships and are used in a more consistent form than affective epithets which may vary according

\(^{35}\) Appendix 4.
to the speaker’s change of topic, change of stance on the topic and change of their perception of the persona of the addressee.

Constructed texts, particularly drama texts, comprise almost all direct speech with very little indirect speech. Since the dialogues in drama are constructed to be overheard by a third party, they feature a high rate of address terms to direct the listener’s attention to the intended addressee. Authentic texts with more indirect speech were not primarily intended to be heard by any other than the main interlocutors, so have fewer address terms. I have, therefore, included reported speech with address terms in the tables for authentic texts.

Table A3 (Appendix 4) depicts the use of thou and you with address terms and of thou and you with negative and positive epithets in drama texts. Drama is the text type Jucker (2007) defines as ‘simulated spoken interaction’. As a constructed text it offers a model of potential contemporary usage but probably does not represent an accurate model of contemporary natural conversation. The language used is adapted to fit the constraints of the genre, including the need to develop the plot. There are, therefore, likely to be more pragmatic switches than in authentic language use because of the need to complicate action and relationships in service to the plot. As an analysis of the application of epithets in drama texts is given in the markedness and markedness switching sections in Chapter 5, I have not shown this in the table for drama texts.

**Determination of Affect**

Affect has been determined pragmatically, since a term that may be construed as semantically positive when used ironically connotes negative affect, for example in the didactic text concerning the churching of women [1601 2HOCHUR], a woman addresses her kinsman, a Chancellor:

> my good kinsman this is a sinne amongst others that you must repent of

who replies with an equally positive-seeming term

> Well gentle kinswoman, seeing you are so snappish & over-busying your self in other folkes matters that apperteine not vnto you,
but these are utterances with negative illocutionary force. Here *you* collocates with, but does not contribute to, negative affect, since it functions as unmarked usage throughout this text.

My objective in the stylistic analysis is to enable my reader to respond to usage as the participants in these texts might have been expected to do. These epithets provide some substantive evidence on interpretation but my analysis inevitably suffers from a modern interpretive framework. Sometimes there is explicit evidence in the text of how a contemporary listener assessed an utterance:

Robert Bye comminge into the Court,
The Bishop of London *spake kindly to him*, saying,
"Come, thou lookest like a good fellow, that wilt take *thy* oath."
[1631 2THIGHC]

And then spoke the said William Hudspeith to the said Tompson, and said,
"What reprooffe gyves you my frends?"
and with that gave the said Tompson a shut backe
with his hand upon the breste, *being in greiffe*;
[1573 1WDURHA]

Other examples may need clarification. The connotation of the usage *buss* [1647 3CTB] defined as ‘to kiss (archaic and dialect)’ [OED] is apparent from a supporting quotation:

1648 HERRICK *Hesper.* (1823) I. 266 Kissing and bussing differ both in this, We busse our wantons, but our wives we kisse.

OED usage labels help in assessing affect:

*you paper kite* = a term of reproach or detestation
[1640 3HOTJ]

*a mother pugs art thou* comming to Church? = term of endearment for a person
[c1582 1WDARCY Essex]

Semantic change can usually be explained by reference to the OED corpus of quotations but the most questionable aspect of diachronic pragmatics is the imposition of a 21st century interpretive framework on an Early Modern English mindset. Is a diachronic transposition of viewpoint tenable or even achievable? In his analysis of the themes of *The Old Wives Tale* [1595 1CPEELE], Ardolino (2005) claims that modern perceptions of it as light entertainment are false. Ardolino suggests that, given that the theme of all Peele’s work is ‘the praise of Protestant England under Elizabeth’, this play is an allegorical retelling of the rise of Elizabeth
and Protestant England and that contemporary audiences ‘would have been aware of the cultural references, which would have influenced their interpretation.’ These cultural references are unlikely to be available to modern audiences. For lack of anything better, the terms used in my analysis assume universal responses as if the relevant concepts were operative in Early Modern English.
Chapter 4 Data Analysis of Authentic Texts

Depositions

Categories for use of single thou/you:

Usage as a reflection of social status

Having compiled my own mini corpora of all thou usage in the genres of depositions and trials, I first applied the Brown and Gilman power/distance semantic to see to what extent speakers appeared to distinguish social status in their use of the second-person pronoun by reciprocal and non-reciprocal usage. Where interlocutors consistently have the same usage to each other, I have given a single illustrative example. When the accused is addressed directly by a court official their relative status is usually apparent. Jone Waterhouse, accused of being a witch, is asked in court by the Queen’s Attorney,

Howe vvylt thou do before god.

To her reply, ‘O my lord, I trust god wyll haue mercy vpon mee,’

He responds ‘thou saiste vvell’.

[1566 1WCHENS]

This is not the formulaic, ‘How wilt thou be tried?’ of trial rhetoric but an indication of her lowly status. Agnes Waterhouse, her mother, is named as Mother Waterhouse. The term Mother is defined in the OED as: ‘a term of address for an elderly woman of the lower class. Also used (instead of Mrs.) as a prefix to the surname of such a person.’

The social status of interlocutors is not always apparent. Biographical data is useful here. In one of the earliest texts one of the participants, Anthony Ratcliffe, is classified as armigerum, that is ‘arms bearing’ or ‘gentleman’. Unfortunately, we are told nothing about his opponent other than his name, Roger Doon. There is a further clue to their perceived status, however, in the way they are referred to in the account of their dispute, either as a faithful record of the testimony given by

36 In the trial of Lord Audley [1631 2WMERVI] Sir Thomas Fanshaw asks him ‘How wilt thou be tried?’ and the Lord High Steward directs Lord Audley, ‘I advise you not to deny those things which are clearly proved.’
Christopher Egleston, or by the scribe’s modification of this testimony to what he considered more appropriate usage.

And then Mr. Ratcliff, being then in the church yard after servic, liftyd up his hand at Doon, which gave back; but to this examinant's knowledge the said Mr. Anthony dyd not then touch the said Doon, neither with his hand nor with any kinde of wepon, nor no wepon was then drawne, by virtue of his ooth.

[c1560 1WDURHA Defamation, Courts of Durham]

Anthony Ratcliffe, the gentleman, is given the title Mister, whereas Roger Doon becomes Doon. They seem to share this estimation of their comparative social status. In asking Doon to keep his promise to reveal who had stolen the sheep, Ratcliffe addresses Doon as thou and receives you. Doon is not intimidated though. He responds, ‘I neid not unless I woll ...’ nor, he claims, would Ratcliffe be able to prove him a thief, ‘for although ye be a gent., and I a poore man, my honestye shalbe as good as yours.’ Ratcliffe appears to find this suggestion outrageous: ‘What saith thou?’ said Mr. Ratcliff then, ‘liknes thou thy honestye to myn?’ They maintain their use of thou/you throughout, suggesting that it relates to the unchanging feature of their relative social status.

In the case of a disputed will in the Durham Ecclesiastical Courts, William Wilde, a bowyer, aged sixty, visits Elizabeth Blithman, a butcher’s widow, as she is dying. They would seem to be of similar social standing. We are not given Elizabeth’s age only that she was ‘of great aidg, and hath had 4 husbands’. William considers that the pair ‘talked familiarly to gither.’ They addressed each other as you, as did Elizabeth and William’s wife Janet. Husband and wife both wanted to know how Elizabeth proposed to dispose of her goods. Janet addressed Elizabeth as Commother (friend). This suggests that the use of you denoted equal social status. This is particularly so when compared with Elizabeth’s usage to Isabell Jackson, her poor neighbour and some-time servant, ‘Ysabell, I know thy tounge.’ This could be an affectionate thou but Elizabeth leaves her goods to her husband’s daughters, not to Isabell, and Isabell refers to Elizabeth as her Dame (Mistress), which suggests that these usages denote relative status. [c1562 1WDURHA Sample 2 Defamation, Courts of Durham]
A further example of the use of *thou* by a dame to her servant appears in the case of defamation brought by Katherine Reid against Isabel Hynde for saying that Katherine had had an illegitimate child [1569 1WDURHA]. Katherine’s sister-in-law, Helinor, calls on Isabel to discuss the matter and Isabel’s dame, Clibborn’s wife, says to her,

"*Thou* hast brought thyself in troble with this good wife's suster,"  
[pointing to this examinat then present, and said,]  
"*Thy* M=r= will not be in troble therwith."

Helinor, a merchant’s wife, addresses Isabel, a servant, as *you*,

"she will have *you* to answer the sklander that ye have maid upon hir,  
which was that she had borne a barne in Chirton."

This may express a desire on Helinor’s part to remain formally polite in order to avoid provoking Isabel into an argument.

There is, however, an example from the Chester Court [1562 1WCHEST Sample 12] of Margaret Wir rall addressing Jana Wolfall’s female servant as *thou*, ‘then I will go with the myself’. It may just be Helinor’s idiolect in the Durham case, since she also uses *you* in comforting her sister-in-law, when an affective *thou* would not have seemed inappropriate,

"Suster Kathren, be of good cheir, and cast not *your* self downe again  
for any such talk; And, for ease of *your* myend, I wyll myself goo and question hir of hir words."  
[c1569 1WDURHA Sample 5 Defamation, Courts of Durham]

Henry Smith is rebuked by John Walles, the sumner, for ‘looking down’ after participating in a handfasting ceremony into which he and Elizabeth Frisell had been hustled by the Commissary Court ‘to be corrected for their incontinent living.’

Walles, spiyng Henry Smith to loke down, said to him,  
"Whi lokest *thou* down? If *thou* meane not to do it in dede,  
but does to avoid the penance, it is not well."  
[c1567 1WDURHA Sample 6 Defamation, Courts of Durham]

To classify this *thou* as denoting relative social status is debatable but Smith is an apprentice and Walles, as a churchman, his social superior, which would license the use as socially appropriate. The speech act verb does not connote negative affect.
Walles does not seem furious, just mildly annoyed, so social status seems the most appropriate category for this usage.

Matthew Lithgo’s use of *thou* to Mawde Holme appears to be friendly advice over the case of defamation she has brought against Elizabeth Tilston for calling her ‘Robert Soundes Hoore.’

"Mawde, *thou* hast begonne a mad matter against Elizabeth Tilston, widowe, for *thou* hast reported as ill by her.”

Mawde’s response is to the proposition not to the address, which suggests that she finds this usage unmarked,

'Whie?' [quod she] 'one foule word askis an other.'
[1562 1WCHEST Sample 12]

Ursley Kempe reassures Grace Thurlowe that her sick child will recover with the words,
‘I warrant *thee* I, *thy* Childe, shall doe well enough’,

Grace had previously paid Ursley to assist with her lying-in. In the same records of witches’ confessions John Wade in the parish of Little Okeley in Essex, who was in a position to pay someone to care for his flock of over a hundred sheep, therefore not poor, directs Annis Heard to the Registrar in Colchester when she appeals for his help in preparing her defence against the charge of witchcraft:

it must be hee that therein may pleasure *thee* (help you).

Ursley Kempe and Grace Thurlowe seem to have been of similar social standing. They exchange *thou*. John Wade seems more prosperous than Annis Heard. There is no record of the form of her speech to him but subsequent testimony suggests that she was poor. Andrew West, a parishioner,

hee knowing her neede, saith, hee caused his wife to giue her a peece of a lofe.
[1582 1WDARCY (Essex) Sample 1]
Bennet Lane demands repayment of a loan of two pence she had made to Annis,

you must needes helpe me with it now,
for this day I must paye the Lordes rent,

who has to borrow this to repay Bennet

then shee saide shee must goe borrowe it,
and so went and fetched it, saying, there is your money.

These two women, who seem to be equally poor and of similar low social standing exchange you. Bennet Lane does not feature in any other exchanges, so we do not know if this is her customary usage. There is no record of Annis addressing anyone with thou. She uses you to the nephew of Andrew West’s wife, who is referred to as ‘the Boy who brought the wool for her to spin,’ saying, ‘your Aunt might as well give me one of her pigges.’ Though we do not know his age, Annis was presumably of an older generation, which might have licensed the use of thou. It seems that Annis is conscious of her lowly status and addresses everyone with you. In her request to the parson for plums,

I pray you giue me som plummes sir

her use of you indicates her acknowledgement of his superior social status and the address term sir contributes to the politeness of her request.

She is addressed as thou by both Andrew West and his wife, who are more prosperous than Annis:

Andrew West: Annis, thou art ill thought of for witchcraft

Wife of Andrew West: Thou saidest the other day thou hadst no skill in witcherie, I will say thou hast an vnhappie tongue.
[1582 1WDARCY (Essex) Sample 10]

The problematic usage is that of the parson Richard Harrison’s address to Annis whom he describes as, ‘a light woma–, and a common harlot.’ In his response to Annis’ request for plums, Harrison rails against her and accuses her of having bewitched his wife. His address pronoun changes during the course of his speech, as he becomes more emotional. This is later examined as an instance of markedness reversal but it is difficult to account for his initial use of you when he terms her ‘you
yield strumpet.’ Given her low social status and his use of a pejorative epithet, *thou* would seem more likely usage to a woman addressed this way by everyone except the lowly Bennet Lane.

*Thou* was apparently still being used by the lower orders to those of equal social status in north-eastern England in the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1660, Robert Philip of Newcastle, a labourer, reported that Margaret Cotherwood, whose status is not recorded but who was ‘accompanied by the wife of a labourer’ told him to

"Wype off that on *thy* forehead, for it burns me to death,"

and in 1662 William Moulthorpe, a labourer, addressed Nicholas Myas, a labourer of Pontefract,

*Thou* shalt see that before the moneth
end as many will arise in England and Scotland as will cutt
the throats of all those that were for the Kinge.

At a hearing on 13 July in 1685, William Robinson, a husbandman, attested that, as was going to work with John Howden, he asked him

"Did *you* drinke the King's health, for *you* weare an Oliver soouldier?"

Since they were going to work together, they were presumably of similar social status, yet Robinson’s *you* may be socially distancing, as Howden replies with *thou*. This can probably be explained by as consideration of the political context. Robinson’s question implies doubt that Howden would have drunk the health of the Catholic King James II, since he had fought for the Protestant Oliver Cromwell in the recent Civil War. Monmouth, the Protestant illegitimate son of the recently deceased Charles II, who was the brother of James II, landed with an invasion force on 11th June 1685 and proclaimed himself king. He was captured on 8th July after his defeat at the Battle of Sedgemoor and executed on 15th July. In his reply Howden addresses Robinson with the *thou* of their equal status but is charged with uttering seditious words for the sentiment he expressed,

"If *thy* father had left *the* an estate, and *thy* unckle should seek
to wrong the of it, *thou* would fight for it, wouldst *thou* not?"  
[1655-1664 3WYORK]
Robinson, giving evidence in a hearing against Howden for seditious words, may have felt it advisable not to appear sympathetic to him.

In addressing Grace Thomas, spinster, as you, Temperance Lloyd, widow, not only collocates this with the address term Mistress, but also falls on her knees in Bideford High Street weeping with joy to see her well again:

Mrs. Grace, I am glad to see you so strong again.
Upon which this Informant said,
Why dost thou weep for me?
Unto which the said Temperance replied,
I weep for joy to see you so well again,
[1682 4WDEVON]

That her use of you is an expression of her perceived lower social status is emphasised by Grace Thomas’s use of thou to her.

Unequal Exchange Older to Younger Generation

One category in which address terms frequently indicate status is that of parent or adult to offspring or child. Most of these usages seem to connote superior social status rather than affection, though this may be because they feature in deposition texts relating to conflict. Parent-to-child usage is recorded in Durham c1569 by Isabell Hynde to her young son,

"Thow shall not caule Katherine Reid mother, for she caul me hoor."
[c1569 1WDURHA Sample 5]

In Chester 1562 Rafe Golburne deposed that Widow Tilston had called Maude Holme ‘an arrant hoore, and Roberte Soundeses hore, and like vnto Mawde Scottabout, who was a most notorious hoore.’ Randle Roland deposed that as he was talking with Widow Tilston in the street, Maude Holme came up the street and Widow Tilston instructed a boy, her grandson, who was with her,

"call her thy fathers Scattabout,"
[1562[1WCHEST Sample 6]

Henry Sellys, aged nine, on telling his mother that he was afraid of a black sprite that had attacked him and his younger brother in the night receives the response,

Thou lyest, thou lyest whoresonne
[c1582 1WDARCY Sample 6 Essex]
Given the collocation with the pejorative epithet *whoresonne*, this usage may connote negative affect rather than social status. The testimony, which appears to have been recorded in March, relates to an incident occurring the previous Candlemas (2nd February). It is a matter of debate how reliable the recollection of the brothers aged six and nine can be, given that at least a month had passed since the incident, but they testify mutual *you* exchange between parents and between parents and children, except for Henry’s report of his mother’s outburst and that of his father to his mother, *why thou whore*.

Henry’s awareness of *thou* usage suggests that in this family *you* was used in unmarked address.

Addresses to children that do seem to imply affection are those of Ursley Kempe who took Davye Thurlowe by the hand saying,

*A good childe howe art thou laden?*  
[1582 1WDARCY Sample 1 Essex]

and of Joan Smith’s mother taking her grandchild by the hand and saying,

*a mother pugs art thou comming to Church?*  
[1582 1WDARCY Sample 6 Essex]

In an example in the Forest of Pendle in the County of Lancaster reported in 1612 father and son have *thou/you* usage that seems to relate to their comparative social statuses. The incident related happened nineteen years previously but, unlike the previous examples, the son in this case, Robert Nutter, does not seem to have been a small child at the time of the hearing, as at the time of the incident he was ready to leave to go to his master.

*Father, I am sure I am bewitched by the Chattox, Anne Chattox, and Anne Redferne her daughter, I pray you cause them to bee layed in Lancaster Castle:*  
*Whereunto this Examinates Father answered,*  
*Thou art a foolish Ladde, it is not so, it is thy miscarriage.*  
[1612 2WPENDL Sample 7 in the Forest of Pendle in the County of Lancaster]

Use of *thou* to a younger addressee other than the speaker’s own children is reported in Bennet Lane’s request to Annis Herd’s daughter for the return of a dish lent to Annis three weeks previously,
though I gave thy mother milk to make her a posset I gave her not my dish,
[c1582 1WDARCY Sample 10 LITTLE OKELEY Essex]

Though this has the force of a rebuke, it is probably motivated by their relative ages.

The remaining examples in this category of the use of thou to indicate the superior social status of age also illustrate the pragmatic feature of affect. Abraham Cosin is charged with murder of James Stancliffe, aged about 14, whom he has tied on horseback and driven from one constable to another whilst demanding a fee to carry him to the next parish. When James asks to be taken off the horse, Abraham tells him,

"Hold thy tongue, for thou shalt not be taken of, for thou has wanted for no thinge, and it is but a myle thou hast to goe."

Joshua Eastwood hears Cosin tell one constable,

"If yow and I can agree, yow shall not be troubled with the childe, I'le cary him to the constable of Huddersfeild myselff."
[1689 4WYORK Sample 5]

but he gave the boy 'hard words.'

The final example of the use of thou by a parent occurs at the very end of the period. Here Susannah Gunnell, a chambermaid, recounts the melodramatic scene she witnesses between Francis Blandy and his daughter Mary, who is charged with poisoning him;

Oh Sir! your Kindness to me strikes Daggers to my Soul; Sir, I must down on my Knees and pray that you will not curse me; [he reply'd,] I curse thee! no Child I bless thee, and hope God will bless thee, and I pray thou may'st live to repent and amend. --
[1752 5WBLAND Oxfordshire]

The address terms Sir and Child add to the pathos. It is doubtful that the chambermaid testifying in March 1752 could have remembered such detail from a conversation she witnessed the previous August. This was either a faithful account of thou/you usage or it illustrated what the chambermaid considered to be appropriate usage. In either case, it suggests that she was aware of a pragmatic implication.
Young Speaker to Older Addressee

As well as Mary Blandy’s exchange of thou/you with her father in 1752 and that of Robert Nutter with his father in the Pendle Witch Trials of 1613, in a discussion of indictments brought by Ralph Walker and his brothers against Thomas and John Allanson (aged 33), his nephews, Walker
did fall to sweareinge and takeinge God's name in vaine, uttering manie detestable oathes. Allanson said, "Fie, mann, doe yow not feare God?"

Walker had previously told Thomas Allanson,

_Thou art but a sillie felloe._
[c1630 2WDIOCE Durham Sample 7]

This exchange also connotes affect. The interlocutors are involved in a continuing dispute. John Allanson’s testimony that his brother rebuked Walker’s ‘cursinge and sweareinge’ but ‘spooke merilie unto him’ implies that Thomas Allanson was mitigating his criticism of his uncle. Though it is always difficult to assess the illocutionary force of an interjection at any point in its history, _fie_ seems relatively mild and _mann_ a Northumbrian dialect address term. Allanson’s use of _you_ to address his uncle and his receipt of _thou_ from his uncle seems to reflect their relative social status rather than affect, though _sillie felloe_ does express Walker’s disparagement of his nephew.

An exchange in which child and adult are not related occurs in the trial as witches of Agnes Waterhouse and her daughter Jone. Agnes Brown, a child of about twelve years, tells Agnes Waterhouse that Satan, in the form of a dog, when asked who was his dame (mistress),

_nodded & wagged his head_  
to _your_ house mother waterhouse.
[1566 1WCHENS]

To Agnes Brown’s assertion that Satan came at her with Agnes Waterhouse’s dagger, the latter retorts,

_there thou liest_

claiming that she did not possess a dagger. This, like the accusation made by his mother to Henry Sellys,
Thou lyest, thou lyest whoresonne
[c1582 1WDARCY Sample 6 Essex]

has the negative force of a face-threatening act. The fact that thou may also
collocate with terms of affection when used to younger addressees in these texts
suggests that the thou/you variant when use inter-generationally seems to denote
comparative social status rather than affect.

Discrepancy in Reporting

A potentially significant feature in deposition texts in identifying the process of
diachronic change is discrepancy in reporting. This is where informants apparently
differ in their reporting of thou/you usage in a particular exchange. As already noted
such discrepancy may derive from the insensitivity of subsequent editors to the
connotation of the thou/you variants but in cases where the informants themselves
obviously differ this suggests that they have different interpretations of the
implications of the exchange.

In 1562 in Chester in the case over a contracted marriage agreement brought by
Morgan Edmund, gentleman, against Elizabeth Bird, deponents gave different
accounts of the wording of the agreement. It was unclear in the sixteenth century
what constituted a valid contract of marriage. It was not necessary to involve the
Church. According to Picard (2003:226) ‘a valid marriage ... required only a
declaration *in the present tense* by each of the parties that he or she took the other in
wedlock ... if the declarations were in the future tense, it was not a valid marriage
until it was consummated’ [original emphasis].

A breach of contract case between Elizabeth and Edmund heard in Chester in 1562
concerned Elizabeth’s subsequent marriage to someone else because she claimed she
had heard that Edmund had died. Edmund brought the case for breach of contract in
order to claim Elizabeth’s property from her husband. Edward Griffiths and John
David, who were present at the betrothal testified that the participants exchanged
you. Reporting in the witnesses’ testimony varied, with Edward Griffiths testifying
that Elizabeth said to Morgan,

"I take you for my husband; and I will marry you when you comme back againes."
He deposed that

'he thinkes that handes trouthe, with such wordes as he hard spoken, shuld make them man & wief before god.

John David’s testimony implies intention to marry with vows exchanged in the future tense (and with mutual you) [added emphasis]

and then they kist ... and pointed a day to marry

Elizabeth’s sister, Margaret Fradsam, asked what words were used to make the contract, deposed,

'by the wordes of Wedlock -- as nere as they cold hit those wordes, -- that ar spoken at the church dore:
"I take the for my weddid husband," & "I take the for my weddid wief, for better & for worse, &c."

Technically these commitments differ. A promise to marry in the future, such as that reported by Griffiths, constitutes a handfasting or betrothal, that is a legal commitment, so that the parties could not contract another marriage (Pickard 2003:195). According to Margaret Fradsam’s testimony the couple’s exchange constituted marriage and they were taken and reputid as man & wief afore god, by this deponent, and of all other that were present by, & of the neighboures thereabout that knowe of it

Elizabeth also considered herself to be married to Edmund and that they did make a contract of mariage, speakinge the wordes of mariage (as nere as this Respondent cold remember the same), saynge:
"I take the, Morgan, to my husband, from this day forward; and therto I plight the my trouthe": and held hym by the hand, sayeng these wordes aforesaid, with other, in full mynd to have hym for her husband duringe her lief: and likewise Morgan toke this Respondent by the hand, and said:
"I take the, Elizabeth, for my wief from hensforth; and therto I plight the my trouthe".

Both Elizabeth and her sister claim that they could not remember the exact words spoken but both deposite that it was the words conventionally constituting the marriage ceremony, which they perceive as resulting in a valid marriage, that is: a declaration in the present tense using the address pronoun thee. This formulaic usage persists to the end of the period and in some versions of the Prayer Book to the present day. Griffiths interpreted their exchange to constitute an intention to marry
in the future but considered that they were married in the sight of God. David sees their exchange as a betrothal and an intention to marry. For Edmund the dispute concerned his claim of a pre-contract with Elizabeth, which would enable him to claim her property from the man she had subsequently married. He did not intend to marry Elizabeth, as he considered that in marrying someone else she had committed adultery. Elizabeth’s claim was that the vows she had exchanged with Edmund constituted marriage. This would allow her to claim the land that had been settled on her by Edmund as her marriage portion in consequence of their contract made, as her sister deposed,

'by the wordes of Wedlock -- as nere as they cold hit those wordes, -- that ar spoken at the church dore:
"I take the for my weddid husband," & "I take the for my weddid wief, for better & for worse, &c." [1562 1WCHEST Chester sample 9]

In a case heard in Durham in 1573 William Hudspeth testifies that he called Tomson, the vicar’s servant, *lymber* (limmer - rogue, scoundrel Sc. and north dial. OED) whilst Tompson called him *knave* in a dispute over Hudspeth’s claim that Tompson had insulted his friends. The testimony of two other informants both of whom are local labourers in their mid-twenties differs. Thomas Gofton deposes that Hudspeth addresses Tompson with *thou* and calls him *loowne* (rogue, *Sc. and north dial.* OED). Henry Tromble deposes that Hudspeth addresses Tompson with *you*,

"What reprooffe gyves you my frends?"

The pair did not come to blows but ‘chiding words’ were exchanged. William Hudspeth’s status is not recorded but from the fact that Tompson spent the afternoon in the stocks, it seems that Hudspeth may have been of higher social status than Tompson. Some witnesses observed the altercation but did not hear what was said. It is possible that the deponents do not report the same utterance. It is possible that Hudspeth addressed Tompson initially with the unmarked *thou* of superior social status and then switched to *you* as he pushed Tompson in anger as deposed by Tromble. Hudspeth is disparaging of Tompson, saying that he is *but a cryetour*. Such an analysis would accord with the model of *thou* as an address term of negative affect,

What, loowne, what saith thou
[1573 1WDURHA Durham Sample 15]
being followed by the you of social deixis as Hudspeth pushes Tompson away.

In the case of the Sellys children already noted, there is a discrepancy in the children’s reporting of their father’s utterance to their mother, with nine-year-old Henry reporting,

*why thou whore cannot you keepe your impes from my childre~?*

and his six-year-old brother John reporting,

*ye stinking whore what meane yee? can yee not keepe youe imps from my children?*  
[1582 IWDARCY Essex Sample 6]

This example is included here for the sake of consistency but I do not consider it significant. The reports do appear to relate to the same utterance but young children may not have been concerned over the precise wording.

John Richardson, who created a disturbance by collecting the names of communicants during a church service, is reported by Jane Bell to have addressed her as *you*, whereas Marie Trotter, who was sitting next to Jane, reported that he said,

"What! is thy name Jaine Barcroft?"

According to the different deponents Richardson’s usage varied. He addressed the vicar who was administering communion as *you*, as he did Elizabeth Dobson and Anne Softley, according to Elizabeth Dobson. Elizabeth Tindale and Margaret Bawde deposed that he addressed them as *thou*. Richardson joked with the young women, pretending to Jane Bell that he thought she was George Barcroft’s daughter rather than his servant. To Elizabeth Dobson he said,

"Yow are a taverene wench, I maie come to be acquainted with yow."

and to Anne Softely,

"Yow are indeede a good soft wench,"  
in jeastinge and smileinge manner.
Elizabeth Tindale deposed that he replied,

"Is thie name Tindale? Had we then a Ridsdell, yee would be well mett,"
in a laughing and jeastinge manner.

Richardson urged Margaret Bawde to speak up, saying,

"Thou canst speake at home, I'le warrant the,"
[c1633 2WDIOCE Durham Sample 6]

These young women were all servants ranging in age from 20 to 24 years except for Jane Bell, who was 17. There seems to be nothing in the text to account for his different usage to them. He is recorded as laughing and jesting whether using thou or you.

Variation in this last example does not seem to be significant. The only example in this category where variation in use does seem to be significant to the deponents is in the case between Morgan Edmund and Elizabeth Bird in which Elizabeth and her sister claim that the contract was made ‘by the wordes of Wedlock’, that is the parties addressed each other as thou in the formula ‘spoken at the church dore.’

Formulaic use of thou

From the beginning of the period, parties in matrimonial cases were questioned on the precise wording of the promises they had made, since a declaration made in the presence of witnesses and using the correct formula constituted a legal contract of marriage. This is why deponents were often concerned to deny the words it was claimed they had uttered. The couple were legally married if they had made the vows in the present tense. The thou/you distinction had no legal significance.

Thomas Snelson deposed that although there had been talk of marriage between him and Ellen Ricroft, there had never been any contract of intended marriage as had been claimed, nor did he ever say anything,

‘on this sort “I will take the for my wief,”’
[1563 1WCHEST Sample 1]

with the intention of marrying her.
As the Edmund v Bird case suggests (1562) the promise of intention to marry does not seem to have depended on formulaic usage. According to the testimony of Margaret Gravenour, in the case brought by her sister, Sybil Blakhurst, against Randle Ramshae, the pair had promised in the presence of witnesses to marry. Sybil had borne Randle a child but they had not married. Margaret Gravenour deposes that Randle said, 'or the like in effect.' [added emphasis]

"I will marry the, if euer I marry any."

to which Sybil responded,

"I will marry you, if euer I marry any."

[1565 1WCHEST Sample 3]

In a case heard in Chester relating to events that had happened twenty years previously, George Holland deposed that he was present when Alexander Winstanley challenged Ellen Sonkie’s right to marry another since she was betrothed to him. Ellen responded,

"I will neuer marrie non but you."

and Alexander replied,

"yf you be so determynid, let vs make the matter sure, before this man and theis ij=o= women".

then the said Alexander toke the said Eleine bie the hand, afore the said witnes, and said:

"I, Alexander, take the, Eleine, to my weddid wief, to have and to hold, for better & worse, for richer and poorer, in sicknes & in health, till death vs departe; and therto I plight you my trouth."

and so, vnlosing hand, the said Eleine toke the said Alexander bie the hand likewise, and spake the like wordes in effect to hym. [added emphasis]

[1564 1WCHEST Sample 11]

The deposition of Margaret Waite, one of the witnesses, reports the conversation of the couple before the exchange of vows in which they addressed each other as you throughout. She deposed the same wording for the vows with ‘take the’ and ‘I plight you my trouth’ but omitting ‘for richer and poorer, in sicknes and in health.’

According to her testimony, however, Ellen said ‘I plight the my trouth.’ Elizabeth Winstanley gave very similar testimony with the couple addressing each other as you in conversation and take thee in their vows, though both she and Margaret Waite
deposed that the couple also repeated all the other words the priest used to say. Margaret Waite added however, that ‘altho nowe she hath forgotten them: then she had them in memory.’

In the case of Elizabeth Frissell and Henry Smith compelled by the Commissary Court to marry, they repeat their vows after the vicar. It is not thought necessary to give these in full in the deposition, which merely states,

"Here I, Henry Smith, take you, Elizabeth Frisell, to my wedded wyfe, &c. and thereto I plight the my troth," [c1567 1WDURHA Sample 6]

Elizabeth repeats similar words.

The format is not uniform. There is uncertainty over the wording with combinations of ‘take thee’ and ‘plight you my troth’ but most exchanges seem to have thee somewhere in the vows. Since thee is the form used in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer as the direct translation of the singular Latin usage, this probably reflects a perception that it somehow gave gravitas or perhaps legitimacy to the proceedings. In fact ‘there needs no stipulation or curious form of contract in wedlock making’ according to The Lawe’s Resolution of Women’s Rights (anon 1632 in Picard 2003:226). Prior to 1754 the only requirement to make a marriage valid was for the parties to declare that they took each other as man and wife (Picard 2000:68).

Formulaic use of thou in trial proceedings is more standardised and seems to act as a discourse marker to indicate the opening and closing of the proceedings. The prisoner is asked, ‘how wilt thou be tried’ and is addressed as thou when the sentence is pronounced but may be addressed as you during the course of the trial.

Mervin, Lord Audley, is asked by Sir Thomas Fanshaw, ‘how wilt thou be tried?’ The Lord High Steward then addresses Audley as you when putting the evidence to him and in summing up, switching to thou in pronouncing sentence,

Mervin Lord Audley, you have beene indicted, and have pleaded not guilty, and put your selfe on God and your Peers, who have found you guilty of both ... 

... Forasmuch as thou Mervin Lord Audley hast been indicted of divers fellonies, for which thou desiredst to be tryed by
God and thy Peeres, which tryall thou hast had, and they
have found thee guilty of them, thy sentence therefore is, that
thou returne to the place from whence thou camest, and from
thence to the place of execution, there to bee hanged by the
necke till thou be dead.
And the Lord have mercy upon thee. [1631 2WMERVI Westminster]

Dialogue with Spirits

One of the most consistent usages throughout the deposition texts is the exchange of
thou with familiars or spirit beings. There seems to be a dual motivation for the use
of the familiar form: the familiar is a being with whom the speaker has a unique and
private relationship and which frequently has the form of a domestic animal.
Though sentient, the familiar presumably does not have a soul, since it is addressed
as what rather than who. Agnes Brown, aged about twelve years, exchanges thou
with Joan Waterhouse’s familiar, Satan in the form of a dog, though she addresses
Mother Waterhouse with you [1566 1WCHENS Essex sample X].

Elizabeth Bennet’s familiar was a spirit called Suckin that had the form of a black
dog.
In the name of God, what art thou:
thou wilt not hurt mee,

Sample 5
This Examine saith, that she never used
any of those speaches, which Ales Hunte hath
enformed against her, As yea art thou so sawsie?
art thou so bould? Thou were not best to bee so
bould, for if thou beist, thou shalt have Simonds sauce
[1582 1WDARCY Essex sample 4]

Joan Prentice converses with the Devil in the shape of a ferret. She also asks,
In the name of god what art thou. [1589 1WNOTOR Chelmsford, Essex]

Defendants in the Lancaster Witch Trials were accused of conversing with spirits
and testified that:
Sample 1 - Elizabeth Sowtherns exchanged thou with a spirit or devil in the shape of
a boy whose name was Tibb.
Sample 2 - Anne Whittle was addressed by a spirit or a devil in the shape of a man called Fancie:

_thou_ shalt want nothing; and be reuenged of whom _thou_ list.

Sample 5 – James Device was addressed by a thing like a black dog called Dandy that said to him:

_thou_ didst touch the said Duckworth ... _thou_ didst touch him, and therefore I haue power of him.

Sample 8 Alizon Device was addressed by a thing like a black dog, which spoke to her _in English saying_ [added emphasis]:

What wouldst _thou_ haue me to do vnto yonder man?
to whom this Examinate said: What canst _thou_ do at him?
[1612 2WPENDL Lancaster]

In other cases:

Anne Baker saw a hand appear and heard a voice in the air:

_Anne Baker save thyself_
[1618 2WFLOWE Bever Castle]

_Anne Barker – there came to her a little dun dog and syd to he:
if you will cleaue to me _thou_ shalt want nothinge_
[1645 3WSUFFO Suffolk]

Jane Milburne - something in the perfect similitude and shape of a catt told her it had come for her life, to which she replied - "I defye _the_, the devill and all his works."

On another occasion it leaped at her throat saying:

"Theafe, I'le not overcome ye as yett."
[1663-4 3WYORK York sample 4]

This usage by the cat may be motivated by the fact that it is not Jane Milburne’s familiar.

Nine months later on being re-examined, Jane deposed that a grey cat appeared and transformed itself into the shape of Dorothy Stranger with whom she had had a continuing feud, and which addressed her as _thou_. In several encounters, both opprobrious and conciliatory, Dorothy Stranger only ever addressed Jane Milburne as _thou_. In the form of a cat Dorothy addressed Jane as _you_. It is difficult to account for this, as it is marked in the context of address from non-human speakers.
Dorothy Stranger also used *thou* to address her adult niece, who after encountering her aunt ‘imeditly she fell sick and lanished above 1/2 a yeare and dyed.’ This niece referred to her aunt as *witch-theafe*. Only in the persona of the cat did Dorothy Stranger ever use *you* to address Jane Milburne. It would be useful, space permitting, to analyse usage when spirits take human form. Kytö & Walker (2003:235) note an instance of the form *ythe* (*thou*) transcribed variably as *you* and *thou* in the 1845 Edition of Depositions from which data was taken for the CED. It is possible that *ythe* in these 17th century depositions was similarly variably transcribed as *thee/ye* in the 1861 published version.

**Subversion of Social Order**

Although abusive words may be exchanged between speakers of different rank, there is rarely subversive use of pronouns with a speaker of lower rank addressing a social superior as *thou*. Mr Ratcliffe, a gentleman, is incensed when Roger Doon, whom he has summoned into his presence, suggests,

"for although ye be a gent., and I a poore man, my honestye shalbe as good as yours"

[c1560 1WDURHA]

but they maintain the upward *you* of deference and the downward condescension of *thou* in their exchanges. John Rosse, labourer, calls Raif Ogle, gentleman, *coustran*37 of all *coustrans* and Ogle addresses Rosse as *slave* but they also retain the *thou*/*you* of rank [c1560 1WDURHA].

Elizabeth Sowtherns, a blind beggar, accompanied her daughter to Richard Baldwyn’s house to ask him to pay her daughter for work done at Baldwyn’s mill. To Baldwyn’s response,

get out my ground Whores and Witches, I will burne the one of you, and hang the other, unusually, Elizabeth replied,

I care not for *thee*, hang thy selfe [1612 2WPENDL sample 1].

Elizabeth presumably felt that she had little to gain by deference and very little to lose by insolence.

---

37 OED term of reproach or contempt: knave, base fellow, low varlet.
In the case of a quarrel in a churchyard [1575 IWDURHA], although James Walton first addresses the curate, Sir Richard, with the you appropriate to his status, he questions the curate’s authority to intervene in a local quarrel,

"What have ye adoo with that?"
but switches to the thou of abuse at the curate’s claim that he would have to be concerned if he were asked by one of his parishioners:

"Wawd [would] thou, thou droucken horemonger preist?"

Surprisingly, Sir Richard does not take offence but acknowledges the validity of Walton’s abuse and tries to placate him,

“James, I have bein punished for my hordom, and the part I dyd; saing yee ar my neighbours, a good fellow and nowe an honest man, I pray yow to leave such talke.” And still the said James contynewed in his raidge, bragging and swerynge, and said that he wold "whapp his coott,"

Finally the curate also loses his temper and switches to addressing Walton with thou,

“Goo thy way, thou art an evill man.”

Frustratingly, the deponent claims to know no more of ‘any matter betwixt them’ but the curate’s apparent feeling of guilt over his hordom seems to cause him to accept not only Walton’s abuse over his behaviour but also the implied threat to his social status in being addressed as thou.

In two of the cases where church ministers are addressed as thou textual clues reveal the motivation. Christopher Bramley, charged with brawling in church, called out to the Minister [1655 WYORK],

"Thou art going into the throne of pride;"
and afterwards caused a disturbance in the church by haranguing the minister and refusing to remove his hat. Thomas Taylor [1657 3WYORK] called out to the minister as he preached,

"Come down, lyar, for thou speakes contrary to the doctrin of Christ, for Christ hath said, sweare not att all."
The refusal to show deference by the removal of one’s hat and the refusal to swear oaths mark these speakers as Quakers, who had ‘an intense aversion to any kind of formal ecclesiastical authority or institutional discipline ... considered Scripture to be no more than an historical document ... and attended church specifically to make an ungodly noise’ (Scha 2003:159).

**Terms of Negative Affect**

Speakers in authentic texts do not appear to be particularly inventive of terms of abuse, the most frequent being *whore* and *thief*, which may be applied merely as general terms of opprobrium. Various witnesses deposed that a dispute over money between Henry Fazakerley and Margaret Wirall led to their calling each other: *hard strong thief, gryninge thief, provid hore* [1561 & 1562 1WCHEST]. The only examples of direct address cited include: *thou hoore, thou thief, thou art a false thief* and, curiously these epithets in, *thou art as like a hoore as I a thief*, which, since Fazakerley had denied owing Margaret Wirall money, seems to imply that he was suggesting that she was not a whore.

In a dispute over property [c1569 1WDURHA] George Browell says to his opponent,

"Such maynswers\(^38\) harlotts as thou art kepes me from it."

Both the epithet and the modifier are opprobrious giving *thou* negative affect. OED has as possible definitions of *harlot*: *vagabond, beggar, rogue, rascal, villain, low fellow, knave* but summarises: ‘often a mere term of opprobrium or insult.’ *Maynsworn* is a dialect term and the more opprobrious, since it is actionable. It appears to be used with literal reference.

Agnes Wheitley deposed hearing Margaret Bulman call Janet Steilling *noughtie pak*\(^39\) [c1567 1DURHA]. Given the apparent highly offensive nature of this remark, Janet’s response seems mild:

\(^{38}\) OED 1650 HOBART Rep. 126 Slater brought an action of the case against Franks for saying, Thou art a main-sworne Lad, and a bankrupt Lad ... It stood upon the word Maine-sworne: against which it was said, that it was an unknowne word in these parts, and of an uncertaine sense, though in the North parts it was understood to be as much as perjured, as forsworne with his hand upon the book.

\(^{39}\) OED A promiscuous or licentious woman; a prostitute.
"What nowtynes⁴⁰ know you by me? I am neyther goosteler nor steg steiler, I would you knew ytt."

She addresses Margaret Bulman with a polite you. The implicature of her second remark is that Margaret interprets it as an accusation of theft. She addresses Janet as noughty hoore, probably as a term of abuse, rather than a literal accusation, and collocates this with thou.

"What, noughty hoore, caull thou me goose steiler?"

This seems the more impolite since Janet had addressed her as you. Janet remains calm and her next remark has a conciliatory thee but she reverts to you in admonishing Margaret to restrain her language while they discuss the matter:

"Nay, mayry, I know thee for no such"
"but I thank you for your good reporte, whills you and I talk further."

In a dispute between Thomas Robson and Ralph Wilson in which Robson has been accused of stealing two mares, Wilson overheard Robson’s daughter, Isabell, deny that he is any longer her suitor. Utterances are differently attributed but the consensus is that Ralph hears Isabell’s further remark to the effect that unlike Ralph’s wealth her family’s wealth is honestly gained. Ralph’s response is,

"Thou giglott,⁴¹ thou knowest best whither your goods be well woon or noo."
[c1567 1WDURHA sample 9]

The use of the epithet thief in the case of libel against Robert and John Waugh is intended literally. The Waughs physically attack Horsfall, who, they claim, has,

done our kinswoman Isabell Hinde a displeasure

To Horsfall’s claim to have no money, Robert Waugh replies,

"Yes, that hast thou, theffe, and let me se it."
[c1569 1WDURHA sample 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20]

They then compelled him to make a bill of £3 debt, which suggests that this was not just a case of libel but that they believed he had stolen from Isabell Hinde.

⁴⁰ Naughtiness i.e. wickedness.
⁴¹ OED a lewd, wanton woman.
The seriousness of the epithet *whore* is seen by the fact that it was actionable. Helen Johnson brought a case of defamation against George Allenson for having called her *whore*. There is no instance of *thou whore* in this deposition but it illustrates Helen’s concern at being so labelled that she sat down in the church porch after the service and asked him to justify his claim. [c1570 1WDURHA sample 13, 14, 15, 16, 20]

In the case of Quarrelling and Fighting in the Church and Churchyard of Stannington (1573) the protagonists employ the epithet *slave*, defined in the OED as ‘a term of contempt’, in collocation with *thou*. A similar case of quarreling in the same location in the same year has *thou* in collocation with *loon*, which the OED has as ‘chiefly Scottish or Northern dialect’ and ‘a worthless person, a rogue, a scamp.’ [1573 1WDURHA sample 16, 20]

James Walton, accused of laying violent hands on the curate of Lanchester in the churchyard, addresses him as,

"*Thou droucken [drunken] horemonger preist*" and "*Thou drouken villan.*"

The curate, Sir Richard, does not reject the accusation, saying he has been punished for his whoredom but, as Walton ‘contynewed in his raidge,’ Sir Richard loses patience and tells him,

"*Goo thy way, thou art an evill man.*"
[1573 1WDURHA sample 16, 20]

In the case of defamation brought in 1587 by Isabell Rothwell against George Smith the significant epithet is again *whore*. Isabell appears to have initiated the abuse, saying to Smith,

"*I may as tite [soon] be a ladye as thou a lord, as thou, pricklouse*\(^2\) that *thou arte.*"

but George’s riposte seems more opprobrious,

"*Thou art a tantarband and a tantarbawde*\(^3\) *whore.*"
[1587 1WDURHA sample 20]

\(^2\) OED a derisive name for a tailor.
\(^3\) OED *bawd* a procuress, *tant* ?a1534 haughty, Anglo-Norman 1292 *tant amanter* to amount to as much, *tant* Fr as much, so much *tantarbawde* ? I can find no convincing explanation but it is obviously pejorative.
Henry Sellys, aged nine, deposed [1582 1WDARCY Essex] that his father had addressed his mother,

why thou whore cannot you keepe your impes from my childre~?

When Henry told his mother that he was afraid of the imp, she told him,

Thou lyest, thou lyest whoreson.

These do not seem to be literal references, whoreson being ‘commonly used as a coarse term of reprobation’ (OED) and whore ‘in early use often as a coarse term of abuse’ (OED).

Joan Prentice, on being told by ‘the Devil in the shape of a ferret’ that he has bitten a child at her instruction and that the child would die, said to him

thou villaine⁴⁴ what hast thou doon, I bid thee to nip it but a little
and not to hurt it, and hast thou killed the childe?
[1589 1WNOTOR]

Robert Lunsden, charged with resisting arrest, said to the arresting officer,

"Hange the, rogue,⁴⁵ art thou comen with a fase warrant to arreast me againe? I will not stirr my foote for the."

That he also addressed him as thief demonstrates that these epithets are not literally applied but used as terms of abuse.

"In faith, theife, if ever thou come the waie thou hast comen,
I will cutte thy journey short once within a twelvemoneth."
[c1630 2WDIOCE sample 3, 7]

Walker involved in a legal dispute with his nephew, tells him,

"Thou art a sillie felloe; wee will destroie the."
[c1630 2WDIOCE sample 7, Durham]

This is problematic, since the proposition has the force of a threat but the address term does not appear to denote opprobrium. The OED defines fellow as ‘a familiar synonym for man, male person’. It connotes familiarity but whether or not that is opprobrious depends on its modifier. Silly [OED: ‘lacking in judgement or common sense, foolish, senseless, empty-headed’] also seems to depend on its collocate to

⁴⁴ OED used as a term of opprobrious address.
⁴⁵ OED a dishonest, unprincipled person; a rascal.
determine its semantic colouring. Taken in its entirety the utterance seems to have negative affect but it is the proposition that effects this.

In the trial of Janet and George Benton for witchcraft, during Susanna Maude’s deposition it is unclear if she or George Benton, Janet’s son, told how a ‘thing’ had come into Susanna’s house and struck the iron range with iron tongs. Janet’s response,

"Villaine, did it ever doe the any hurt?
It will doe soe at the noone time"
[1656 3WYORK sample 1, 4]

implies that she is speaking to George. Villain\textsuperscript{46} seems to be gender-specific to men and applied to women only in jocular use. From the evidence of these texts, the most likely term of opprobrious address to Susanna would have been whore.

Joane Jones deposed [1682 4WDEVON] at the trial for witchcraft of Mary Trembles and Susanna Edwards that she had heard Mary say to Susanna

O thou Rogue, I will now confess all: For 'tis thou that hast made me to be a Witch, and thou art one thy self, and my Conscience must swear it.

Susanna replied,

I did not think that thou wouldest have been such a Rogue to discover it.

Anthony Jones deposed that, observing Susanna fluttering her hands over her body, he said to her,

“Thou Devil, thou art now tormenting some person or other”

It is not clear if he was addressing Susanna or the spirit who possessed her but the usage certainly demonstrates negative affect.

\textsuperscript{46} OED originally, a low-born base-minded rustic; a man of ignoble ideas or instincts; in later use, an unprincipled or depraved scoundrel; a man naturally disposed to base or criminal actions, or deeply involved in the commission of disgraceful crimes. Used as a term of opprobrious address.
Terms of Positive Affect

There are fewer terms of positive than negative affect in the depositions as might be expected, since many of them concern cases of defamation, quarrelling and fighting.

As Robert Ripley lay dying [1586 1WDURHA], his wife Agnes showed more concern for his feelings than that demonstrated by William and Janet Wylde towards the dying Elizabeth Blithman [1582 1WDURHA above], telling him affectionately,

"Bullie,  
47 thow hast geven thy silver whistle and chaine unto Leonard Harle, but I trust thou shalt lyve to weare yt thy self."

Two examples from an Essex witchcraft hearing of 1582 that appear to have been heard about the same time [1582 1WDARCY] have almost identical speeches attributed to the accused. According to the deposition given 19 February, Ursley Kempe took Grace Thurlowe’s child by the hand and said,

A good childe howe art thou laden?  
48

On 24 February William Bonner deposed that his wife’s ‘familiar friend’, Elizabeth Bennet, said to his wife, who was ‘sickely and sore troubled,’

a good woman how thou art loden, 
then clasped her in her armes, and kissed her.

These utterances both express sympathy, but it is the accompanying actions together with the use of thou and the modifier good that establish positive affect in this context. Elsewhere in these texts woman and good woman connote the condescension of social status [1632 2THIGHC].

Joan Smith deposes [c1582 1WDARCY] that her mother addressed Joan’s child as, 
a mother pugs art thou comming to Church?

The OED defines mother pugs as ‘a term of endearment for a person (rarely an animal); also applied to a bauble or doll,’ which suggests that size and infantile appearance are significant in motivating positive affect.

47 OED a term of endearment and familiarity, orig. applied to either sex: sweetheart, darling.
48 OED burdened.
John Nutter’s testimony [1612 WPENDL] of an exchange that occurred between his father and brother ‘some eighteen or nineteen years ago’ concerning his brother Robert’s conviction that he had been bewitched relates his father’s response as,

*Thou* art a foolish Ladde, it is not so, it is *thy* miscarriage.

This seems to echo the measure of affect implied in the *sillie fellow* epithet given by an uncle to his nephew in Durham Depositions of 1630. Robert’s reaction to his father’s response is to weep, which implies frustration at his father’s apparent refusal to take his son’s fears seriously. The OED suggests that *lad* may be ‘applied familiarly or endearingly to a male person of any age.’ Robert’s father appears to be appealing to their close family relationship to reassure his son.

Francis Bland, whilst dying from poison administered by his daughter, demonstrates almost saintly forgiveness [1752 5WBLAND],

*I curse thee! no Child I bless thee,*  
and hope God will bless thee, and I pray *thou*  
may'st live to repent and amend.  
-- Leave me least *thou* shouldst say something to *thy*  
Prejudice;

As a whole the utterance displays positive affect but, such is its pathos, that it would be similarly affective were Bland to have addressed his daughter as *you*. It is, therefore, not feasible to find that the term *child* in collocation with *thou* denotes positive affect.

**The Connotation of Titles in Collocation with *thou*/*you***

The use of titles in the depositions generally collocates with *you*, suggesting that *you* is the more formal socially-distancing usage.

Katherine Reid, bringing a case of defamation against Isabell Hynde, is reassured by her sister-in-law, Helinor, who addresses her as *sister* [c15691WDURHA],

"Suster Kathren, be of good cheir, and cast not *your* self downe again for any such talk;"
It may seem socially-distancing for Helinor to address Katherine as *you* when trying to reassure her, but there is no record of Helinor using *thou*, so this may just be part of her idiolect and evidence of the change in progress.

Annis Herd, a poor widow, addresses the parson deferentially,

*I pray you giue me som plummes sir*

[1575 1WDARCY  Essex sample 10]

Temperance Lloyd, another widow apparently aware of her low social status, fell on her knees and wept in the street before Grace Thomas, spinster, saying,

*Mrs. [Mistress] Grace, I am glad to see you so strong again.*

[1682 4WDEVON]

It is difficult to accept as authentic dialogue the example from the trial of Mary Bland, since it is so melodramatic. The chambermaid deposed that Mary fell on her knees before her father saying,

*Oh! Sir, forgive me, send me where you will, and I'll never see or hear from, or write to Cranston more; so you do but forgive me I shall be happy.*

[1752 5WBLAND]

In Temperance Lloyd’s case the self-abasement could be attributed to religious fervour rather than deference to Grace Thomas, which is incidental though denoted by the address terms. Mary Bland is kneeling in supplication to her father. Her appeal is to his authority rather than to their mutual affection.

Lack of title in conjunction with a family name where one might be considered appropriate generally denotes negative affect. John Rawe in the company of Robert Waugh threatens with his staff a man he refers to simply as *Horsfall*,

"Nowe, we are glade, Horsfall, that we have got the hear: thou hast done our kinswoman Isabell Hinde a displeasure, and we will make thi skinne make her amendes; and, by God's woundes, rather then thou use her thus thou shall beare me thy backfull of strockes;"

[c1569 1WDURHA]
Brian Darcy, Justice of the Peace, describes the proceedings relating to Elizabeth Bennet,

it was said to her, if it be proued to your face, what will you say to al the other matters you haue bin charged with, are they true:
[c1582 1WDARCY]

the implication being that this is said in open court. Then the dynamic changes as Darcy addresses Elizabeth privately. His role changes from the formality of Court official to the informality of friendly advisor and the address changes accordingly,

the~ I calling her vnto mee, saide,
Elizabeth as thou wilt haue fauour confesse the truth.

A related change occurs in the case of assault against James Walton, in which he addresses the curate as Sir collocating with you,

"What maks you so hye, S=r= Richerd?"

but switches to thou when he drops the title,

"Thou droucken horemonger preist?"
[c1569 1WDURHA]

In the affair of doctrinal dispute between Alvey, the preacher, and John Blakeston, in which Blakeston claims that Alvey has made seven errors, Alvey calmly asks Blakeston,

"Mr. Blaikston, yow will justifie this."

When Blakestone subsequently interrupts his wife in a doctrinal discussion with Alvey, the latter exclaims ‘in verie angry manner,’

"What, man? is thou comen to out-faice me?"
[c1638 2WDIOCE Durham]

implying that unmarked formal usage is you, but that this can switch to thou under the influence of negative affect.

The trial of Mervin Lord Audley [1631 2WMERVI] illustrates the use of you as an indicator of social status. Audley is addressed by his title and you throughout his
trial but *you* gives way to *thou* when his sentence is delivered. He continues to be addressed by his full title, however, which implies that he retains his social status despite being ‘found guilty for committing rapine and sodomy.’

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

There is little *thou*/*you* switching in the deposition texts. The case of the arraignment and conviction of Mervin Lord Audley [1631 2WMERVI] discussed above illustrates the Court’s construction of his persona. As an Earl he is addressed as *you* and accorded his title. As a prisoner, he is addressed as *thou* in the formulaic opening and closing discourse of the trial. Formulaic marriage vows already discussed also include switches between *thou* and *you* but this seems to be a matter of the deponents’ ignorance of the usual formula rather than a case of markedness or markedness reversal.

In the case of a disputed marriage contract between Thomas Snelson and Ellen Ricroft, Ellen, who had borne his child, rejects Thomas’s offer to release him from their agreement. To which Thomas replies,

"*if thou* will not release me, I have gone so far with my frendes in talk with an other woman, that it is best for *you* to get out a Citacion, and call me before the Ordinary."

[1563 1WCHEST]

The switch from *thou* to *you* here suggests the switch from Thomas’s construction of Ellen’s identity as the mother of his child to the formal persona of a litigant.

In the dispute between Janet Steiling and Margaret Bulman in which Margaret has addressed Janet with the opprobrious terms *noughtie pak* and *noughty hoore*, Janet seems to have been the more distant and restrained of the pair. She has not called Margaret opprobrious names, though Margaret interprets Janet’s claim not to be a goose-stealer as an implication that she, Margaret, may be:

"What, noughty hoore, caull *thou* me goose steiler?"

Janet denies this with a reassuring *thee* of solidarity. Then the pragmatic marker *but* signals a topic turn and her switch to the address term *you* a change in social deixis.
as she distances herself from Margaret in admonishing her to modify her language while they discuss the matter:

"Nay, mayry, I know thee for no such"
"but I thank you for your good reporte, whills you and I talk further."

In the exchanges between Sir Richard, the curate, and James Walton both begin by addressing each other as you but it is apparent that James is not well-disposed towards the curate asking him (still addressed as you) why he is interfering in a quarrel between parishioners. Sir Richard replied that, if appealed to, he would have the authority to act as peacemaker. To which James reacts,

"Wawd thou, thou droucken horemonger preist?"

Sir Richard attempts to pacify James,

"James, I have bein punished for my hordom, and the part I dyd; saing yee ar my neighbours, a good fellow and nowe an honest man, I pray you to leave such talke."
And still the said James contynewed in his raidge, bragging and swerynge, and said that he wold "whapp his coott,"

Finally Sir Richard loses his temper,

"Goo thy way, thou art an evill man."

These two cases show you as the unmarked form. Thou is used with negative affect in collocation with abusive epithets when tempers are lost. Janet Steilling’s switch to a marked thou denotes the positive affect of a conciliatory gesture. In both cases marked usage is pragmatically significant in illustrating the speaker’s attitude to their interlocutor.

In the case of witchcraft against Cysley Sellys there is a discrepancy in the wording of the depositions. As the informants are young brothers aged nine and six, it could be argued that their evidence is not reliable but they vary no more than some adult deponents, so this case is included. According to Henry, aged nine, there is a switch in their father’s address to their mother, when the children are attacked in the night by a black sprite. Their father says,

why thou whore cannot you keepe your impes from my childre~?
His younger brother, John, aged six, does not report such a switch, deposing that their father said,

*ye* stinking whore what meane *yee*?
can *yee* not keepe *your* imps from *my* children?

A possible explanation for a switch in Henry’s report can be deduced from his report of his mother’s utterances to him,

*Thou* lyest, *thou* lyest whoresonne.

and subsequently,

take heed *ye* say nothing.
[c1582 1WDARCY]

Here again *thou* collocates with abusive epithets.

The deposition of Richard Harrison, a parson, in the case of witchcraft against Annis Herd, shows that in conversation with his wife his unmarked usage is *you*. His wife fears that she has been bewitched by Annis, so, when Annis asks him to give her some plums, Harrison calls down to her from his plum tree,

I am glad *you* are here *you* yield strumpet,
saying, I do think *you* haue bewitched my wife,
and as truly as God doth liue, *if* I can perceiue *she* be troubled any more as she hath been,
I will not leaue a whole bone about *thee*,
& besides I will seeke to haue *thee* hanged:
and saith, he saide vnto her that his wife would make her father priuie vnto it, and that *then* *I* warrant *thee* he will haue *you*
hanged, for he will make good friends, & is a stout man of himselfe.
[c1582 1WDARCY]

This example of switching involves topic reorientation. Initially Harrison collocates an abusive epithet with *you*. His reported exchanges with his wife show that for him *you* is the unmarked form. His switch to *thou* is introduced by the pragmatic marker *if*. The current state of affairs is denoted by the unmarked form. He perceives Annis as the wanton strumpet who has bewitched his wife. Should *thou*, Annis in a future hypothetical persona continue this behaviour, *then* (pragmatic marker) this will be the consequence; her father will have *you*, the actual Annis, hanged.
Francis Bland, whose daughter was charged with poisoning him, addresses his contrite daughter, to whom he has referred as ‘my poor love-sick Girl,’

I do forgive thee, but /thou shoul'st have remembred/
I am your Father, but for that Villain Cranston,
if thou had'st loved me, thou would'st curse him
and the Ground he walks upon.
[1752 5WBLAND]

This is the thou of positive affect denoting his identity as a loving father contrasted with the switch to the you of his status as the pater familias.

Trials

Three of the trial texts relate to plots to kill the Queen and feature the same two main participants, the Clerk of the Crown, Miles Sands Esquire and Vice-Chamberlain, Christopher Hatton. These are the treason trials of William Parry [1584 1TPARRY] and the two Babington Plot trials [1586 1TABING] and [1586 1TBABIN]. Usage is fairly consistent through all three texts. The clerk opens the proceedings by first instructing the accused to raise their hand and then putting the charge to them and asking them to plead. This is performed with a formulaic thou:

What sayest thou William Parry, art thou guilty of these treasons whereof thou standest here indicted, or not guiltie?
[1584 1TPARRY]

How sayst thou, Anthony Babington, art thou Guilty of the Treasons contained in the Indictment?
[1586 1TABING]

How sayest thou Edward Abington, art thou guilty of these Treasons whereof thou standest indicted, or not Guilty?
[1586 1TBABIN]

At the conclusion of the trial, the clerk’s function is to invite the accused to speak in mitigation, again in a formulaic speech:

John Ballard, thou hast been indicted of High-Treason, and thereupon arraigned, and hast pleaded Guilty; what hast thou to say for thy self, wherefore Judgment and Execution of Death should not be given against thee?
[1586 1TBABIN]
the formulaic nature of which is indicated by the fact that this is sometimes merely 
 referenced,

John Savage, *thou* hast been indicted of High-Treason, &c.  
[1586 1TBABIN]

During the course of the proceedings, the clerk’s function is to ensure that the correct 
 formula is followed. Where the accused does not conform, on occasion by making a 
 speech, Sands advises them,

*Parry, Thou* must answere directly to the indictment,  
 whether *thou* be guiltie or not.  
[1584 1TPARRY]

When this fails, Sands abandons the required script and directs the speaker,

*If you* confesse it, *you* must confesse it in maner and  
 fourme as it is comprised in the Indictment  
[1584 1TPARRY]

*You* must either answer Guilty, or not Guilty.  
[1586 1TBABIN]

Much of the variable usage can be explained if the proceedings are considered as 
 drama. Sands delivers his prescribed written lines to the character of the accused 
 and utters natural language when prompting the person playing that role. The Vice 
 Chamberlain has similar variation. In addressing Parry, the accused, in Court, he 
 switches usage in the same utterance,

But I will tell *thee*, what we saide. I spake these words,  
[sayd Master Uicechamberlayne,]  
*If you* will willingly vtte the truth of your self, it may do *you* good,  
 and I wish *you* to doe so: *If you* will not, wee must then 
 proceede in ordinary course to take *your* examination.  
 Whereunto *you* answered, that *you* would tell the truth 
 of *your* selfe. Was not this true?  
[1584 1TPARRY]

That is: in speaking to the accused before the trial Hatton addressed Parry as *you*. 
 Now, when Parry stands accused before the Court, Hatton addresses him in the 
 persona of the prisoner as *thou*. Hatton seems to reserve *you* for directives (except 
 those relating to the format of the prisoner’s responses) and permissives,

*If you* will say any thing for the better opening to the worlde  
 of those *your* foule & horrible facts, speake on:  
[1584 1TPARRY>Parry]
When you hear any thing you are desirous to answer, you shall speak an answer at full,
[1586 ITABING>Abington]

Then you may plead not Guilty.
[1586 ITBABIN>Tichborne]

Say what you will.
[1586 ITBABIN>Titchborne]

Nay, Ballard, you must say more, and shall say more, for you must not commit High-Treasons and then huddle them up;
[1586 ITBABIN>Ballard]

When referring to prisoners’ past deeds or confessions, Hatton addresses them as thou:

Parry then doe thy duetie according to conscience, and utter all that thou canst say concerning those thy most wicked facts.
[1584 ITPARRY]

Thou hast not onely confessed generally, that thou wert guilty according to the inditement, which summarily, and yet in express wordes doeth conteyne that thou haddest trayterously compassed & intended the death and destruction of her Maiestie
[1584 ITPARRY]

Savage confronted thee to thy face, and avouched these things to thy face ...
To perform thy Friendship, thou didst break thy Allegiance to thy Sovereign.
[1586 ITABING > Charnock]

Ballard, under thine own Hand are all things confessed;
[1586 ITBABIN]

Then it was thus, that they said the Queen should be killed, and thou saidst, God’s Will be done ... O Wretch, Wretch! thy Conscience and own Confession shew that thou art Guilty.
[1586 ITBABIN >Donne]

O Ballard, Ballard, what hast thou done? A sort of brave Youths otherwise endued with good Gifts, by thy inducement hast thou brought to their utter Destruction and Confusion.
[1586 ITBABIN 1586]
It is as though for Hatton also the accused has two personae: the confessed traitor addressed as *thou* and the man charged but not yet found guilty. For the Clerk of the Crown the form of address is determined by the role of the accused as performer and for Hatton, the Vice Chamberlain, by their likely guilt or innocence.

This concept of a dual persona continues through the trial texts. In 1649 John Lilburne’s trial is conducted in both a formal and an informal register with Lilburne, the prisoner, addressed with formulaic legal *thou*, which is first repeated without comment when he makes the wrong response. Then it is explained to Lilburne, the man, what is the required format:

Mr. Broughton: By whom wilt *thou* be tried?

L. Col. Lilb: By the known lawes of England, and a legall jury of my equals, constituted according to law.

Mr. Broughton: By whom wilt *thou* be tried?

L. Col. Lilb: By the known laws of England, I meane by the liberties and priviledges of the laws of England ...

One of the Clerks: You must say by God and your countrey, that's the forme of the law?

L. Col. Lilb: Why must I say so?

Another Judge: This is the form and law of the Land.

[1649 3TLILBU]

Where the formal wording is given in trials later than this, it is not consistent. The accused, as accused, is addressed with formulaic *thou* in the bigamy trial of Mary Moders [1663 3TMODER], but this usage is not recorded in these texts later than this.

**Address Forms & Epithets**

In the sixteenth century Sands/Hatton trials, address terms are motivated by the role of the speaker. Sands, the clerk, addresses the accused by their full name for the purpose of identification. Hatton, the vice chamberlain, in his role of authority addresses and refers to the accused simply by their surnames. He also collocates the expression of negative affect with *thou*, referring to Henry Donne, who confesses to agreeing to the killing of the Queen,
O Wretch, Wretch! thy Conscience and own Confession shew that thou art Guilty

and in his exasperation over the treachery of the accused,

O Ballard, Ballard, what hast thou done?

O Barnewell, Barnewell, didst not thou come to Richmond ... then wouldst thou have killed the Queen for Conscience. Fie on such a devilish Conscience. [1586 1TBABIN]

The trials of Lady Frances, Countess of Somerset, and her husband Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury took place on consecutive days in 1616. Both feature the formulaic opening and closing pronouncements with the accused addressed by the Clerk as thou collocating with their full title. The trial of Robert Carr includes preliminary details of the convening of the proceedings in which the clerk summons the Sergeant at Arms and the Lieutenant of the Tower:

O yes, Lieutenant of the Tower, return thy Precept. Throughout the rest of the trial Carr is addressed as you and either with his title or as My Lord. The Lord High Steward in pronouncing sentence switches mid-speech from the impersonal formulaic address of thou denoting the generic guilty party to the specific you, Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset,

Robert Earl of Somerset,
Whereas thou hast been indicted, arraign'd, and found guilty, as Accessary before the Fact, of the wilful Poisoning and Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury;

you are therefore to be carried from hence to the Tower, and from thence to the Place of Execution, where you are to be hang'd till you be dead: And the Lord have Mercy upon you.

Frances, Countess of Somerset, is similarly addressed by the Lord High Steward but the motivation for the switch in the Lord High Steward’s final address to her is made

---

49 OED = Oyez ‘Hear, hear ye’; a call by the public crier or by a court officer to command silence and attention when a proclamation etc., is about to be made.

50 OED warrant.
more explicit than that to her husband. In the introduction to the pronouncement of sentence she is addressed with formulaic *thou*.

Frances Countess of Somerset, whereas *thou* hast been indicted, arraigned, pleaded guilty, and that *thou* hast nothing to say for *thy* self, it is now my part to pronounce Judgment;

Then follows the pragmatic marker: (only thus much before,) *since* to indicate her specific circumstances in which she is addressed as *you*:

*only thus much before,*  
*Since* my Lords have heard with what Humility and Grief *you* have confessed the Fact,  
I do not doubt they will signify so much to the King, and mediate for his Grace towards *you*:

The switch back to the sentence that applies to all found guilty of murder is introduced by the pragmatic marker *but* (in the mean time)

*b**ut** in the mean time, according to the Law, the Sentence must be this, That *thou* shalt be carried from hence to the Tower of London, and from thence to the place of Execution,

where *you* are to be hang'd by the Neck till *you* be dead; and the Lord have Mercy upon *your* Soul.

In addressing Lady Frances, though not her husband, as *thou*, at this point, the Lord High Steward is departing from the formulaic script because he does not think that in her case the sentence will be applied, explaining that in general:

according to the Law, the Sentence must be this, That *thou* shalt be carried from hence to the Tower of London, and from thence to the place of Execution.  
[1616 2TCARR]

In formal court rubric the accused in the role of accused is addressed impersonally as *thou*. The Lord High Steward explains that in the normal course of events ‘thou the guilty party’ would be ‘carried from hence ...’ but, because of her expression of ‘Humility and Grief,’ he does not doubt that the Lords will ‘mediate for his Grace towards you’. Then, as in the case of her husband, the sentence concludes with the specific reference term *you*. 
Effect of semantic change on interpretation of affect

The effect of semantic change on the interpretation of affect in historical texts is illustrated in two reports of cases in the Star Chamber: ‘divers persons ... taken ... at a Conventicle’\(^{51}\) [1632 2THIGHC] and ‘the censure of ...’ three Puritans, Bastwicke, Burton and Prynne, for seditious writings [1637 2TBAST]. The common theme is sedition. The Lord Keeper, Thomas Coventry, although complaining that Prynne is ‘somewhat sawcy’\(^{52}\) (a term that has now become semantically bleached), addresses him and his fellow-accused as you throughout and accords them their titles Mr Prynne, Mr Doctor, Dr Bastwicke, Mr Burton. This is the same Thomas Coventry who presided at the trial of Lord Audley [1631 2WMERVI], who was convicted of the capital crime of sodomy and to whom he also accorded his full title and the respectful address term you.

The other Star Chamber cases concern people of lower social status than those accused of seditious writings. Barnett, a brewer’s clerk, said that he was at his parish church when the conventicle was discovered in his house but that his wife refused to attend that church. At which the Archbishop of York asks him,

"Will you suffer that in your wife?"

The implication is that a wife is (or should be) subordinate to her husband. How the social status of women is expressed in this text and how this correlates with address terms is considered by an analysis of the use of the term woman.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, requiring Sara Jones to take the oath in Court asks her,

"What say you, woman?"\(^{53}\) [1632 2HIGHC]

An OED usage note has this as ‘a mode of address, now used chiefly derogatorily.’ It is unsafe, however, to apply modern perceptions to historical text. When did woman become derogatory as a term of address? During the British General

---

\(^{51}\) OED a meeting of (Protestant) Nonconformists or Dissenters from the Church of England for religious worship, during the period when such meetings were prohibited by the law.

\(^{52}\) OED insolent towards superiors, presumptuous.

\(^{53}\) OED as a mode of address. Now used chiefly derogatorily or jocularly.
Election campaign in 2010 the Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, was involved in controversy when he was overheard referring to one voter with whom he had been involved in a discussion of immigration, “they should never have put me with that woman ... she was just a bigoted woman.” Commenting on the incident, the woman in question was reported to have said, “It wasn’t the bigot, it was that he said ‘that woman’. I thought, ‘What does he mean, that woman?’ It’s no way to talk of someone, that, is it? As if I’m to be brushed away. Why couldn’t he have said ‘that lady’?” *(Times Online 02/05/2010)*

The term *woman* may be perceived as a pejorative term of reference in the twenty-first century but was this the case in the seventeenth century? Quotations given in the OED for the address term *man* show that it may be used ‘emphatically to indicate contempt, impatience, exhortation’:

1530 J. PALSGRAVE *Leslarcissement* 661/2 Plucke up thy herte, man, for Goddes sake.
1616 SHAKESPEARE *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1623) II. iii. 41 Tut, man.
1714 R. A. HUNTER *Monoropolis* Ded. p. i, What's the matter Man? Have ye got the Gripes?

Contemporary quotations for *woman* as a vocative, however, do not make this apparent. It is not until the eighteenth century that usage illustrates derogation:

1607 SHAKES. *Cor. IV*. i. 12 *Virg.* Oh heauens! O heauens! *Corio.* Nay, I prythee woman.
1667 MILTON *P. L.* IX. 343 O Woman, best are all things as the will Of God ordaind them.
1726 R. WEST *Hecuba* IV. 24 Oh Woman! thy Calamities are great.
1842 S. LOVER *Handy Andy* ix, Arrah, woman, don't be talkin' your balderdash to me.
1860 SALA *Badd. Peer.* I. iii. 63 'Will you hold your tongue, woman?' her husband..cried out..'Woman! hold my tongue! This language to me!'

Is *woman* derogatory in the Star Chamber texts and what does this connote about the address pronoun with which it correlates? Much of the trial discourse concerns the requirement to ‘take the oath’. As Conventiclers the accused would be reluctant to take any oath. In one hearing Abigail Delamar asks if it is the Oath of Allegiance they are being pressured to take. This oath acknowledged the monarch as the rightful ruler and denied the right of the Roman Catholic Church to depose him or to incite his subjects to do so. Throughout the proceedings various members of the
clergy and court officials try to persuade the accused to take the oath. The King’s Advocate explains that it is a requirement to swear to tell the truth.

The Bishop of London, identifying Abigail as ‘a deepe Familist and Brownist, and one of the Conventiclers taken at Black Fryars’ and her husband as ‘a stiffe Romane Catholique’, refers to her as ‘this woman’. The Archbishop of Canterbury in a very offensive, though etymologically correct utterance, concerning Roman Catholicism addresses her as ‘woman’ in collocation with you:

"Your husband, they say, is a Roman Catholique, this is a most absurd thing to professe to be a Romane Catholique, the words imply a contradiction. Rome is a particular Church, Catholike is universall, then this is as much as to say of a particular universall Church; Nonsense! But, woman, where dwell you, in what parish?"

Abigail Delamar: Att Giles where Manwairing dwelleth.

Canterbury: How often have you heard him within this 12 moneth? Is that your manners? Why not Doctor Manwaring? is he not a doctor?

For the Archbishop of Canterbury Abigail Delamar is doubly suspect. She is of dubious religion and does not appear to acknowledge her low social status. This may motivate his switch to thou when he next addresses her,

Wilt thou goe heare him the next Sunday?

but he reverts to addressing her as you

I see you are an obstinate woman

The King’s Advocate in exasperation tells her,

"Woman, take your oath."

The Bishop of London tries flattery in trying to persuade the accused to take the oath, saying to William Granger,

Granger! You look like a man of fashion: will you take your oath to answere to the articles according to your knowledg, and as farre as you are bound by law?
and then, according to the scribe, when Robert Bye came into court, ‘spake kindly to him, saying’,

"Come, thou lookest like a good fellow, that wilt take thy oath."

The Bishop of London’s utterance is assessed as positive by the scribe.

Other users of woman in this text are the Earl of Dorset who collocates thou with woman in addressing Sara Jones, one of the conventiclers, in an utterance conveying disapproval,

"What, doest thou thinke woman of these grave Fathers of the church, that these heere be not lawfull Magistrates?"

and the King’s Advocate who asks a conventicler, Sara Barbon,

"What, will you take your oath, good woman?

though the modifier good\textsuperscript{54} mitigates any potential negative affect connoted by the low social status of the term woman.

Other trial texts featuring woman as an address term are the trial of John Giles for attempted murder [1681 4TGILES] and the trial of three men for writing and publishing scandalous letters in relation to the death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey [1682 4TTFP]. In the first of these, before she has spoken, the Court Recorder advises Ann Beron,

Speak as loud as thou would’st do if thou wer’t at home

This seems like an aside as he moves on to the main discourse,

Good Woman, did you go with him to Whetstones Park?

He abandons the positive modifier, however, when she does not give him the desired response,

Woman you must be mistaken.

In the Scandalous Letters trial [1682 4TTFP] some of the male witnesses including the accused are addressed as Mister by the Lord Chief Justice. One of the witnesses is addressed only by his surname Rawson. His apparent lowly social status may motivate this address to his wife by the Lord Chief Justice. John Farewell, one of the accused is apparently of higher social status, since he is accorded a title.

\textsuperscript{54} OED an epithet of courteous address or respectful reference.
Woman, Mr. Farewell desires to know if there were Fly-blows in the Eyes of Sir E. B. Godfrey.

These examples suggest that *you* was the unmarked address term in seventeenth century public discourse. The term *woman* collocates with either *you* or *thou* but does not seem to be pejorative, rather it is an indication of low social status; a general address term to females of lower orders.

Utterances addressed to Frances, Lady Somerset, in the sample of text relating to her trial for murder [1616 2TLADYF] relate to the rubric of the proceedings, so that she is addressed as *thou* (except for the text of the sentence, previously discussed). At one point, she murmurs a request for mercy, which she ‘spake humbly, fearfully, and so low, the Lord Steward could not hear it’. Her attorney obligingly repeats this to the Court, saying,

The Lady is so touch’d with Remorse and Sense of her Fault, that Grief surprizes her from expressing of her self.

He might more conventionally have referred to her as *Lady Frances*. His reference to her as *the Lady* emphasises her social status. She is not a *woman*. She is a *lady* and, therefore, presumably deserving of deference, despite the scandal occasioned by her divorce case in which she, or possibly a paid substitute, was physically examined, whilst masked and behind a screen, to prove her virginity (Schama 2003:43).

**Expression of Affect**

In the trial of Stephen College for High Treason in conspiring the death of the king [1681 4TCOLLE], Serjeant Jeffreys cross-examines the witness Mowbray over discrepancies in his testimony of when he and another witness, Bolron, had left York. He directs twenty five questions to him with the address term *you* until Mowbray finally concedes,

Mr. Mowbray: I am mistaken, I find.

Mr. Ser. Jeff: Ay, that *you* are, one of *you* most grosly.

Mr. Mowbray: See, Sir, here is my Almanack, whereby I find that it is my mistake; but pray see, Sir, here it is set down, the day we came out was the 24. the day we came to London was the 27.
Jeffrey’s response connotes exasperation:

Mr. S. Jeff. How didst thou set out the 3 of August from that place, and yet come to London the 27th. of July?
Mr. Mowbray: I will refer my self to Mr. Smith, as to the time we came up, & here is my Almanack.

Mr. S. Jeff. I will believe thy Almanack to speak truth, though it have never so many Errors about the Changes of the Weather, sooner than I will believe thee.

His final remark in this exchange has the force of an aside. The unmarked address term in public discourse being you, Jeffrey uses thou to connote negative affect with reference to Mowbray. Jeffrey then twice silences Stephens whose unsolicited comments on the evidence suggest that he is possibly a co-accused. Jeffrey’s first response suggests annoyance, then he switches to you in collocation with the pragmatic marker well, as a concluding comment,

Stephens: This was the Maid that hid her Masters papers when they were searched for.

Mr. Serj. Jefferies.: Be quiet; art thou got into Dialogues with the Maid now?

Stephens: Three parts of what she hath said is false.

Mr. Serj. Jefferies: Well, hold you your tongue.

The other occurrence of thou in this text is in the exchange reported by Colledge’s maid, Elizabeth Hunt, between herself and the prosecution witness, Stephen Dugdale, who had been steward to Lord Aston and as such of higher social status than Elizabeth. In this thou/you usage connotes their relative status with Elizabeth addressing him as Mr Dugdale and you and Dugdale addressing Elizabeth as thou and calling her Sweetheart and taking her by the hand.

In the trial of Colonel James Turner for housebreaking [1663 3TTURNE], his wife, Mary, denies being an accessory,

I did not, it's false, what did --

at which Turner admonishes her,

Prethee be patient dear Mal, come sit thee down.
The term of endearment and the diminutive form of her name collocate with the form *thee* in an address of positive affect.

Having admonished Katherine Lee, a witness in a murder trial [1678 3TGBH], to

Have a care what *you* say, and mind the Question I ask *you,*

Mr Justice Wild’s remark,

*Ile say that for thee, thou* hast spoke with more care then any of them all,

also reads as an aside, as he switches from the *you* of public discourse to a concessive personal opinion expressing positive affect to Katherine.

During the hearing over an election riot [1682 4TPILKI] the Common Serjeant recounts the case of a previous election riot during which he was asked by Sir Robert Clayton to calm the situation,

*Prethee, do thou* speak to them, they will hear *thee* if they will hear any body; for the Hall was in a great uproar, and they call’d to throw me off the Hustings, and then I made Answer to Sir Robert Clayton; *Sir,* It is not the duty of my Office, and when I do any thing that is not my Office, I shall expect particular Directions. Then, saith he, *You* must tell them, I must Adjourn them till Munday, because I go to the Old Baily to try the Assassinates of Arnold.

This is again the *thou* of private discourse and the *you* of public discourse. Sir Robert uses *thou* in appealing to the man, not the office. The mob knows the individual performing the function of common serjeant and will listen to him but he replies that what is requested of him is not the duty of his office. Then Robert Clayton addresses the official: *you.*

**Discussion of Results for Deposition & Trial Texts**

The text types defined by Jucker (2007) as ‘retrospective’ are depositions and trials. These are purportedly accounts of natural language in use. Much of the discourse of trial texts is formulaic. When the charge is stated, the accused may be addressed as *thou* whatever his social status. This accounts for *thou* usage in the trial texts from 1571, 1584, 1644, 1649, 1658, 1660 and 1663. Other use of *thou* in trial texts has negative affect either from a Court Official to a witness perceived as of lower status: [1632 2THIGHC], [1680 4TGILES], [1681 4TCOLLE], from a male witness to a female
witness (his wife) [1663 3TTURNE] or in indirect speech from a witness to a female servant [1681 4TCOLLE]. The *Trial of Mary Blandy* text [1752 5WBLAND] is notable for the use of affective *thou* long after it seems to have been discontinued in other non-drama texts. This may be a melodramatic touch by the maid describing the poisoned father’s speech of forgiveness to his guilty daughter.

Deposition texts constitute 18% of the total word count in the texts studied and 24% of the total word count in non-drama texts. In an attempt to identify any potential significant period in the change from *thou* to *you*, I have categorised the texts into 20-year periods. This proved a particular problem in dating extracts from deposition texts, as the CED texts are grouped in 40-year periods. This meant that data from [1680 4WYORK] had to be classified in the next sector, since the extract in question is dated 1681. Much of the data in depositions is indirect speech. There are only two samples of direct speech with pronoun and address in the period 1661-1680, so there is little available data.

It is mainly the lower orders who feature in deposition texts. Table 4:1, showing the use of unmarked address pronouns, shows *thou* used to others of equal status in Chester in 1562 and a hundred years later in York. *You* was used in this way in Durham in 1569 and reciprocally in this social group in Essex in 1582. There was also use of *you* to social equals among the lower orders in York in 1685.

There are fewer representatives of the middling sort in deposition texts. There is reciprocal use of *you* in this group in Durham in 1562 and both *thou* and *you* down the social scale in 1568. In Durham in 1573 there is discrepancy in informants’ reporting of usage to a servant by a deponent from the middling sort. These are both accounts of abusive usage. It is not possible to determine whether the reported utterance had collocated with *thou* or with *you* but the deposition of alternative usages seem to imply that either *thou* or *you* was perceived as appropriate in this context or that either the deponent or the clerk recording the proceedings was aware of prescriptive usage and accommodated his usage to the formal context. There is also use of *thou* down the social scale in Devon in 1682. After this date, speakers of all categories no longer allude to addressees’ social status by the use of the address term *thou*. 
Table 4:1 Unmarked Address of *thou* and *you* in Depositions
Indicating status of speaker and addressee

- ►◄ reciprocal use
- ► use to a social equal
- ▼ use down the social scale
- ▲ use up the social scale
- Does not indicate frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting Social Status</th>
<th>Lower Orders</th>
<th>Middling Sort</th>
<th>Higher Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560-1575 Durham</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562 Chester</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582 Essex</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612 Lancaster</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660-1689 York</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682 Devon</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting Comparative Age</th>
<th>Lower Orders</th>
<th>Middling Sort</th>
<th>Higher Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1562 Chester</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569 Durham</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582 Essex</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612 Pendle</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 Durham</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689 York</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752 Oxfordshire</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thou*/you use denotes comparative age among the lower orders from 1569 in Durham to 1689 in York, after which *thou* is not used in this way. The one aberration is the reported use of possibly affective *thou* in the Mary Blandy deposition in Oxfordshire in 1752.
Figure 4:1 Collocation of *thou* and *you* with Address Terms in Deposition Texts
Depositions: Mean 30.45% STDEV 21.05% Other: Mean 70.55% STDEV 21.36%

Figure 4:1 compares the percentage of speakers using *thou* and *you* in collocation with an address term in deposition texts. There is a statistically significant high use of *thou* with address terms in 1601-1620 when compared with the use of *you* with address terms (figure 4:1). This is attributable to the fact that most of the utterances were either opprobrious address to accused who were charged with witchcraft or comprised their reported speech with their familiars.

*Thou* in collocation with an address term begins to fall in deposition texts after 1620. Its continued relatively high use in depositions in 1621-1640 may be influenced by regional variation, as most of the samples are from the High Commission Court of Durham. There is a fall in use of *thou* with address terms in deposition texts from 40% to 26% in 1641-1660.

Figure 4:2 shows the percentage of speakers using *thou* and *you* with affective epithets. Affective *thou* is significantly high in depositions from Durham and Chester in 1560-1580 (figure 4:2). This may relate to the adversarial nature of the discourse as participants abuse each other. Where there is less reported speech and where a witness is questioned by an official, there are fewer epithets. There is a switch in 1601-1620 to give a high significance for affective *you*. Thereafter usage varies.
As may be expected, there is very little use of positive epithets in deposition texts. *Thou* is more frequently used to categorise an addressee than to denote their status relative to the speaker in deposition texts (figure 4:3) but this function switches to *you* after 1660 (figure 4:2).

In trial texts there is a formulaic use of *thou* in the trial rubric when the accused is instructed to plead and in the format of the sentence. Participants are otherwise addressed as *you* with a few exceptions when *thou* may indicate negative affect. Low social status is connoted by *thou* in a trial of Conventicler [1632 2THIGHC] and in an instruction to a female witness [1681 4TGILES]. Reported speech in the Trial texts reveals that as late as 1725 collusive *thou* is found with positive affect in private discourse [1725 5TMACCL]. Mr Elde testified that he applied to Lord Macclesfield for the vacancy of Master in Chancery telling him that he ‘would make him a Present of 4 or 5000 l.’ To which he reported,

Mr Elde: My Lord said, *thee* and I, or *You* and I,
my Lord was pleased to treat me as a Friend,
must not make Bargains.

That is: the *thou* form is considered to connote positive affect, though the use of *thee* as the subject of the verb suggests that this usage is marked. With this exception, *thou* does not feature in trial texts after 1681, though texts after this date do not include the trial rubric.

**Figure 4.2 Collocation of *thou* and *you* with Affective Epithets in Deposition Texts**

*thou*: Mean 40.25%  STDEV 33.05%  *you*: Mean 29.75%  STDEV 27.25%
The next text type to investigate is drama, which potentially shares with deposition and trial texts the feature of direct or indirect confrontation.
Chapter 5 Data Analysis of Drama Comedies

Unlike authentic texts drama texts were constructed to be heard. They were intended to be performed and to entertain. Features of dialect may be exaggerated to locate a particular character socially. Captain Whit in *Bartholomew Fair* [1614] is a stage Irishman with marked pronunciation *ty* and *tee*. Similarly, Tegue O Divelly, an Irish priest in *The Lancashire Witches* [1682], described as ‘an equal mixture of fool and knave’, uses variations of *thou* (*dou, dee, ty, dy*). Master Plush in *The Countrie Girle* [1647] is described as a ‘notable humorous Coxcomb’, which alerts the audience to the possibility of deviant linguistic usage. Dialogues in drama texts are therefore unlike the authentic exchanges reported in deposition texts and the more formulaic exchanges recorded in trial texts.

In his study of *thou/you* in *Richard III* Barber suggests (1987:177) ‘it would be perfectly possible for *thou* to play a relatively small role in real life, while in drama, because of its concentration of emotional tension and its tendency to present scenes of confrontation, *thou* appeared much more frequently.’ One potential indicator of confrontation is the shifting of *thou/you* address as the speaker’s construction of the addressee changes.

I have therefore undertaken a close reading in chronological order of those drama texts in which *thou* occurs in order to identify the speakers’ unmarked usage to other characters. I have identified *thou/you* shifts and, rather than assessing them as deviations from an anticipated social norm, attempted to identify the motivation for such usage from the context. I found that the shift frequently followed a pragmatic marker. Fraser (1996:168) proposes that pragmatic markers are ‘the linguistically encoded clues which signal the speaker’s potential communicative intentions.’ In his later study on topic orientation markers (2008:892) he incorporates parallel markers, which may denote the addressee, into the category of commentary markers ‘by which the speaker can convey an attitude towards either the action or state represented in the segment or [towards] an individual.’ He does not elaborate these but in his ‘Pragmatic Markers’ paper (1996:168) gave a sentence adverb as a commentary marker and a given name as a parallel marker.
When investigating *thou/you* switching, I found that not only was the switch frequently introduced by an explicit pragmatic marker but also that the pronoun switch functioned as a comment, as the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun denoted the addressee and the switch commented on the speaker’s changed attitude towards the addressee. Switching *per se* functioned to connote the speaker’s reorientation\textsuperscript{55} of viewpoint with regard to the proposition. This re-orientation may include: the speaker’s stance towards the persona of the addressee (e.g. public/private), their stance towards the topic of the exchange or a change of topic. I use *stance* here with Biber & Finegan’s definition (1989: 93): ‘the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgements or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message.’ Thus, a switch in the address pronoun functions as an implicit pragmatic marker. In the following analyses explicit pragmatic markers are emboldened.

\textbf{1584 [ICLYLY] A most excellent Comedie of Alexander [the Great], Campaspe [his captive, a gentlewoman, with whom he falls in love], and Diogenes [philosopher]}

**Unmarked Usage**

Of the three eponymous characters Alexander and Diogenes are the protagonists in the CED extract. In general Diogenes and his fellow philosophers exchange *thou*, as do the servants and ordinary soldiers. Since the philosophers are dependent on rich patrons, this may be seen as reciprocal *thou* among the lower orders. Characters of higher social status, such as Alexander, his General, Hephestion, Campaspe, a gentlewoman, and the artist, Apelles, exchange *you*. Manes addresses his master, Diogenes, as *you*, but the other servants and those characters who know him address him as *thou*, possibly because he is a figure of fun. Diogenes has a reputation for eccentricity. Plato, a fellow philosopher, says to him,

*Thou* takest as great pride to be peeuish, as others do glory to be vertuous.

Anaxarchus, another fellow philosopher, also says of Diogenes,

\textsuperscript{55} After Fraser (2008) *Topic Orientation Markers*, which ‘signal a meta-comment on the structure of the emerging discourse.’ Topic orientation markers include ‘return to a prior topic, continuation with the present topic, digression from the present topic and introduction of a new topic’ (2008:892). I discount topic continuation in my analyses, since *thou/you* switching connotes some aspect of change. Where the topic is unchanged, the switch connotes a change in some other aspect of the exchange. e.g. perception of the persona of the addressee.
Let vs goe: for in co~temning him, we shal
better please him, then in wondring at him.

And Diogenes lives in a tub. Alexander, who has resolved to turn his court into a
school of philosophy, calls on Diogenes and unusually addresses him as you, which
seems to demonstrate greater respect than that exhibited to Diogenes by most
speakers.

Markedness and Markedness Reversal

Alexander, whose customary unmarked usage is to address everyone as you, has
fallen in love with the beautiful Theban captive, Campaspe, and asks his General,

Alexander: Hephestion, how doe yee like the sweete face of Campaspe?

When Hephestion tries to turn the discussion to the noble Theban lady Timoclea,
their relationship changes. Alexander teases Hephestion with bantering thou, then
switches to you as he suspects that his loyal General Hephestion has becomes a
potential rival for Campaspe.

Alex.: Timoclea stil in thy mouth, art thou not in loue?

Hephe.: Not I.

Alex.: Not with Timoclea you meane, wherein you
resemble the Lapwing, who crieth most where her neast
is not. And so you lead me from espying your loue with
Campaspe, you cry Timoclea.

Then Alexander confides in Hephestion in an expression of positive affect,
connoting solidarity as he switches to thou with the pragmatic marker well
introducing an address to his friend rather than to his loyal General.

Alex.: Well, nowe shalt thou see what small difference
I make betweene Alexander and Hephestion.

But Hephestion does not offer support when Alexander reveals that he loves
Campaspe:

Alexander: Whye hangest thou downe thy head Hephestion?
blushing to hear that which I am not ashamed to tell.
and his address term shifts as his construction of Alexander’s persona shifts from that of conqueror and god to that of lover and mortal man,

Hephestion: Will you handle the spindle with Hercules, when you shuld shake the speare with Achilles?

... Remember Alexander thou haste a campe to gouerne, not a chamber, fall not from the armour of Mars to the armes of Venus ... You Alexander that would be a God, shewe your self in this worse then a man

This is not what Alexander wants to hear and he retreats to his former formality. What can Hephestion know of the emotions of a great prince?

Alex: Little do you know, and therefore sleightly doe you regard the dead embers in a priuate perso~, or liue coles in a great prince,

Since this is the case, ‘cease then’.

Alex: ... Cease then Hephestion with argumentes to seeke to refel that, which with their deitie the Gods cannot resist, and let this suffice to aunswere thee, that it is a king that loueth

The pragmatic marker then indicates a switch as Alexander tries to conclude the discussion. The collocation with thee is a sign of rapprochement. Hephestion tries to continue:

Hephest.: You say that in loue there is no reason, and therefore there can be no likelyhood.

but Alexander has the last word with a conciliatory thou:

Alex.: No more Hephestion: in this case I wil vse mine owne counsell, and in all other thine aduice, thou mayst be a good soldier, but neuer good louer.

A common context for switching between you and thou as address terms is wooing scenes where the participants, unsure of their interlocutors’ potential reaction, make tentative declarations. Apelles, the painter, has been instructed by Alexander to paint Campaspe’s portrait. He tells Campaspe that he has almost finished the painting and that his love for her will be eternal. They have so far exchanged you.

Camp.: What will you saye, if Alexander perceiue your loue?
Apel.: I will say, it is no treason to loue.
Apelles’ declaration licenses Campaspe to address him as *thou*. This usage also collocates with a pragmatic marker, denoting a switch of topic:

**Camp.**: **But** how if he will not suffer *thee* to see my person?
**Apel.**: **Then** will I gase continually on *thy* picture.

Her switches in the next utterance denote Apelles’ dual persona. Campaspe’s assertion, ‘I had rather be in thy shop,’ is addressed to Apelles, as the man she loves, whilst she addresses Apelles, the painter, as *you*:

**Camp.**: Wel, I must be gon: **but** this assure *your* self, that I had rather be in *thy* shop grinding colours, then in Alexanders court, following higher fortunes.

A sequence of exchanges involving Diogenes and Sylvius, a citizen, illustrates their changing relationship. Silvius brings his sons to Diogenes in the hope that he will agree to instruct them. He opens the proceedings by using the customary address of *thou* to Diogenes:

**Silvius**: I haue brought my sons Diogenes, to bee taught of *thee*.

Silvius then tells his sons to perform for Diogenes. He becomes a supplicant and switches to *you* connoting deference:

**Silvius**: Now shall *you* see the other: tumble sirha. How like *you* this? why do *you* laugh?

Perim, the dancer, is offended that Diogenes laughs and addresses him as *thou*:

**Perim**: I meruaile what dog *thou* art, if *thou* be a dog.

Their father is also displeased:

**Silvius**: Doest *thou* beleueue that there are any gods, that *thou* art so dogged?

but, still having hopes for his third son, switches back to deferential *you*:

**Silvius**: Now shall *you* heare the third, who signes like a Nightingall.

He cannot sustain this, however, and admits defeat as his sons and Diogenes fall into mutual abuse:

**Silvius**: **Well** Diogenes, I perceiue my sonnes brook not *thy* manners.
The switches in Alexander’s exchange with Hephestion denote topic change in Alexander’s questions introduced by the pragmatic marker but:

Alex.: if all the travailes of conquering the world will set either thy body or mine in tune, wee will undertake them. But what think you of Apelles?
Hephe.: I pittie the poore painter, if he be in loue.

Alex.: Pittie him not, I pray thee, that seuere grauity set aside, what do you think of loue?

He asks Apelles formally,

Alex: Doe you loue Campaspe?

then, conceding that, though he can conquer countries, he cannot control people’s emotions, switches to more informal usage in an apparent attempt to save face indicated by the pragmatic marker well:

Alex: Well, enjoy one an other, I giue her thee frankly Apelles. Thou shalt see that Alexander maketh but a toye of loue.

Apelles is then formally dismissed and Alexander switches to informal usage again with yet another face-saving pronouncement that he had tired of Campaspe:

Alex: Go Apelles, take with you your Campaspe, Alexander is cloied with looking on that, which thou wondredst at.

1594 [1CKNAVE] A Knack to Know a Knave

Unmarked Usage

The theme of this play is the uncovering of dishonesty. The device of assumed identities enables characters to speak in the role of their own identity or in that of their adopted persona. The king’s unmarked usage is thou, indicative of his high social status, but when he colludes with Honesty in a plot to entrap Coneycatcher into making a false statement, he addresses Coneycatcher as one of equal social status.

King [in disguise]: Now sir, I would haue you as witnesse, That at my house you saw me pay three hundred pound, And for your paines I will giue you a hundred pound:
Bishop Dunston in his lower social status as the farmer victim addresses Coneycatcher as thou:

Bishop Dunstan [as Farmer]: Thou man of worth, or citizen, what ere thou be,

which does not support the theory that you was used to avoid giving offence in cases where the status of the addressee was unknown. This appears to be the thou of supplication as the farmer (bishop) pleads his case,

Bishop Dunstan [as Farmer]: Weigh but my charge, and then thou wilt not swear
I haue fiue sonnes, al pretie tender babes,
That liue vpon the farme that he would haue,

having previously addressed Perin, the supposed judge, in formal terms connoting his higher status,

Bishop Dunstan [as Farmer]: If it please your Worship, this is the man,
That wrongfully would haue my farme from me.

Perin, a courtier, plays the role of judge in this scene and in this role has the highest social status of all the participants. As a sign of his status he addresses Coneycatcher as thou,

Judge: Wel, if thou be wel aduised, take thy oath,
But yet remember before whome thou swearest.

In a later scene a knight, a squire and a farmer all exchange you. Two old men being defrauded by Walter, the farmer, and the bailiff acting on his behalf all exchange you. Only the knight uses thou to the bailiff, indicating the difference in their rank,

Knight: But I wil: sirra Bailie, I will answere the poore mens debts, and come home to me for thy fee anon.

Perin, the courtier, maintains social distinctions when soliciting loans on behalf of the king. He addresses the knight and the squire as you but does not address the farmer directly, speaking of him in the third person, a usage that is even more distancing than thou,

---

56 This honorific substitutes for and connotes greater social distance than ‘you’. It is interesting that ‘your worship’ and ‘your honour’ are attested at a similar time. They seem to connote uncertainty of the precise social status of the addressee and a wish to imply deference. OED 1548 E. Gest Treat. againste Masse Ded. 5, 1 · doo offre y¢ same · · to your worshipful mastership, not that I adiudge it a present, worthy your worship, but that [etc.]. 1553 Gresham in Burgon Life (1839) I. 98, I received your honnor's letter of the 24th of this present.
Per.: Very wel, but what saith the Farmer?  
What can he spare the King?

In a scene involving a priest and a beggar address pronouns seem to be motivated by social status. The priest gives *thou* and receives *you*. The two deviations are motivated:

Beggar: Alas sir, *you* see I am old.  
Priest: But that's no reason *you* [probably: generic *you*=one] should beg.

The beggar’s switch to *thee* in the phrase ‘fie upon thee’ from his unmarked usage to the priest of *you*,

Beggar: Now fie vpon *thee*, is this the purenes of *your* religion?  
probably with the stress on *thee*, seems to be an echo of the Priest’s earlier usage to him,

Priest: Fy vpon *thee* lazy fellow, art *thou* not ashamed to beg?

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

The changing relationship between Perin, the courtier, and the farmer is illustrated by Perin’s changing usage towards the farmer as he solicits loans for the king. Initially he speaks of the farmer in the third person, what saith the Farmer?

This changes to *thou* when the farmer offers a loan of ‘a hundred or two of pounds’ and a bribe to Perin for promoting his cause with the king

Perin: **Why** thats well said, and I commend *thy* honest mind,  
Would all men wer of *thy* mind:

I warrant *thee*, *thou* art an honest man, & one that loues the king  
But tel me, what wouldst *thou* haue me doe?

This loan could be increased to a gift of five or six hundred pounds were Perin to secure for him a licence to export corn. Perin would also be rewarded. Hearing this Perin switches his address to the farmer to *you* and *Sir*, as the farmer’s persona changes from that of yokel deserving of condescension to that of potential business partner,
Perin: Sir, feare not, I wil do it for you, I warrant you,  
For I tel you I can do much with the King.

The farmer inviting Perin to dinner is anxious to know the status of his companion:

Farmer: Wel sir, wil it please you to come and dine with me.  
Perin: I thanke you sir hartily.  
Farmer: But whats he there in your company.  
Perin: A plaine fellow, and his name is Honesty.

Honesty’s name betrays his character. Both know that he will not be useful in their schemes and express this in their address to him. It is not necessary to accord him respect:

Perin: Trulie Honesty, if I were furnisht with money,  
I would not stick to giue thee thy dinner,  
But now thou seest I am but a guest my selfe.

Farmer: Truly honest fellow, if I were certaine of my cheere, I wold bid thee to dinner, but know not my prouisio~  
I promise thee

The knight and Perin, the courtier, however, exchange you indicative of their status,

Knight: Heare you sir, will it please you to take part of a peece of beefe with me, you shal be welcome.

Perin: I thank you sir, but I must dine with my honest friend here, els I would not refuse your gentle offer.

A subplot involves Earl Osrick, his daughter Alfrida and Earl Ethenwald sent to investigate the suitability of Alfrida as a wife for the king. In their initial exchanges, Alfrida addresses both as you. Osrick addresses his daughter in accordance with her private and public personae. As Osrick’s daughter she receives the address term thou but as the daughter of an earl she receives the address you,.

Osr.: Daughter, see that you entertaine the Earle,  
As best beseemes his state and thy degree

This is said as the earl enters and is presumably directed at him as well as Alfrida. It may be that the switch is from Alfrida’s public to her private persona. When Osrick includes the earl in his utterances to his daughter, he addresses her formally, as in a subsequent occurrence:

Osrick: Daughter, if you haue any skil at all,  
I pray you vse your cunning with the Earle,  
And see if you can ease him of his paine
Similarly Ethenwald constructs two identities for Alfrida: that of the lady he woos and that of the daughter of an earl,

Ethenwald: Briefly, I loue thee, seeme I neere so bold,
So rude and rashlie to prefer my sute,
And if your father giue but his consent,
Eased be that paine that troubles Ethenwald.

These clearly motivated cases of switching depend on the role played by Alfrida. In a later scene Ethenwald also gives Alfrida two personae: her formal status as his wife is accorded the term you, whereas the woman he suspects of planning to cuckold him is addressed as thou.

Zwouns, they are both agreed to cuckold me,
But heare you wyfe, while I am master of the Bark,
I meane to keepe the helmster in my hand:
My meaning is, you shall be rulde by me,
In being disguised till the King be gone,
And thus it shall be, for I will haue it so.
The King hath neuer seene thee I am sure,
Nor shall he see thee now, if I can chuse

The switches into and out of her formal status do not have the same connotation with each occurrence. Osrick’s usage connotes paternal affection. Ethenwald’s usage connotes desire/love, which then becomes jealousy and suspicion. Ethenwald’s deception has two consequences: Edgar, the king, vows revenge on him but does not make Ethenwald give up Alfrida, telling her to return to her husband. Alfrida’s reaction is two-fold. She expresses her overwhelming gratitude for his generosity to her by addressing his office of king with the thou of exalted register then with the pragmatic marker nor switches to the unmarked royal address term you as she switches to the topic of her appeal to the king as man to pardon Ethenwald.

Alfrida: Thanks, gratious King, myrrour of curtesie,
Whose vertuous thoughts bewray thy princely mind
And makes thee famous mongst thy enemies:
For what is he that heares of Edgars name,
And will not yeeld him praise as he deserues.
Nor hath your Grace euer bene praised more,
Or tearm’d more iust in any action,
Than you shall be in conquering your desires,
And yeelding pardon to Earle Ethenwald.
The priest accosted by the beggar (above) dismisses him,

Care not *thou* for that

then carefully distinguishes between the two personae of the neighbour who wants to rent his house. As a Christian the neighbour is accorded the intimacy of fellowship,

*if thou* wilt haue my house, friend, and brother in Christ

but the pragmatic marker *well* introduces the switch to their business relationship, defining the neighbour as a prospective tenant,

*well* neighbor ... it wil cost *you* fourtie shillings.

A final example of switching is illustrated by Honesty. Given the task of sentencing the miscreants, he addresses them as *you* and delivers their sentences with *thou*. This is possibly an attempt to replicate contemporary formulaic legal usage:

Now to *you* Cutbert Cutpurse the Conicatcher,  
*Thy* iudgment is to stand at the Market crosse,  
And haue *thy* cursed tongue pind to *thy* breast

1595 [1CPEELE] The Old Wives Tale

A problem with the comedy drama texts is lack of textual and social context making it difficult to account for particular usage. Many samples are extracts from longer texts and start mid-discourse. They may lack a list of characters, so it is difficult to appreciate the characters’ relationships with each other. Names of characters may be variously spelled and abbreviated or even changed during the text. In *The Old Wives Tale*, a character who exits as *Booby* appears to re-enter as *Corobus* (sometimes *Corebus*). A further complication is that this text has a play within a play, thus giving an extra layer of discourse.

Unmarked Usage

The opening scene involves three characters who use the familiar *thou* form to each other. The morphology of their names: *Anticke, Frolicke* and *Fantastick* implies that they form a group and Fantastick’s use of the term ‘our yong master’ that they are servants or followers of an overlord. A smith enters and is addressed as *thou* by Frolicke. This could be a sign of Frolicke’s perception of their relative social status
but his use of the term *what* implies that he thinks the approaching figure may not be
human, which would license the address *thou*:

**Frolicke:** be *thou* Oxe or Alfe\(^{57}\) that appearest,
tell us what *thou* art.

Anticke’s use of the familiar *thou* in reply to the smith’s demand to know what they
are doing in his woods in the middle of the night does imply a difference in their
social status, since the neutral address form *you* might be anticipated to an unknown
addressee:

**Anticke:** What doe we make dost *thou* aske?
why we make faces for feare: such as if *thy* mortall eyes could behold,
would make *thee* water the long seames of *thy* side slops, Smith.

**Frolicke** takes a more diplomatic approach, using the polite form *you* and the address
term *Sir* in contrast to Anticke’s use of *Smith*.

**Frolicke:** And in faith Sir vnlesse *your* hospitalitie doe releue vs,
wee are like to wander with a sorrowfull hey ho,
among the owlets, & Hobgoblins of the Forrest:

**Frolicke** then switches to the familiar form and the courteous epithet *good* in an
apparent conciliatory gesture, as he asks the smith for help:

**Frolicke:** good Vulcan, for Cupids sake that hath cousned vs all:
befriend vs as *thou* maiest.

The trio generally address the smith’s wife as *you*. There is one instance when
Frolicke addresses her as *thou*:

**Frolicke:** Gammer\(^{58}\) *thou* and *thy* good man sit louingly together,
we come to chat and not to eate.

Since *Gammer* is also used here in correlation with *you, thou* in this case may
connote friendliness rather than address from one of superior social status.

\(^{57}\) OED elf.

\(^{58}\) OED ‘A rustic title for an old woman, corresponding to *Gaffer* for a man. The spelling *gandardmer* in
1589 shows that the word was then regarded as a corruption of *grandmother.*’ No usage label is
given. *Gaffer* is defined as ‘A term applied originally by country people to an elderly man or one
whose position entitled him to respect’ and ‘Used simply as a title of address, often with no
intimation of respect.’ The general connotation of *Gaffer* is thus unclear and it is anyway unsafe to
assume that male and female versions of the same term have the same connotation.
Gammer’s story is acted out in the play within a play. She introduces the characters as:

a King ... that had a faire daughter ... a Conjurer [who]... turned himselfe into a great Dragon, and carried the Kinges Daughter away ... hir two Brothers [who] went to seeke hir. [The Conjurer] turned a proper yong man to a Beare in the night, and a man in the day, and keeps by a crosse that parts three seuerall waies, & he made this Lady run mad.

Their discourse forms her story. The two brothers, being princes, address each other as you. They initially address as you in deference to his age an old man they encounter at the crossroads but this changes to thou when they discover that he is foraging for food and they offer him alms. The old man encounters his neighbour, Lampriscus, and they exchange you. Huanebango, a knight, and Booby, the clown, are both pursuing the same fair lady. Huanebango warns Booby to forget her, since he does not possess the requisite knightly skills to win her. He uses the familiar thou form to Booby and the ambiguous address term my friend, which can only connote the OED’s usage ‘kindly condescension’, when considered in context:

Huanebango: Alas my friend what fortune calles thee foorth to seeke thy fortune among brasen gates, inchanted towers, fire and Brimstone, thunder and lightning.

The implication is clear: this friend is a silly fellowe. Booby addresses Huanebango as Sir and uses the formal you form to him. Their usage seems to reflect their comparative social status.

Encountering the old man Booby hails him as Gaffer. Both Booby and Huanebango address him with the formal you and after their initial approach both subsequently address him with the more prestigious term father. This seems to be another reflection of relative social status.

The old man appears to make an astute assessment of Huanebango, alluding to the fair maid in question as being:

Old man: Faire inough, and farre inough from thy fingering sonne.\(^{59}\)

\(^{59}\) OED term of familiar address without implication of affection.
The two brothers re-enter and glimpse Delya, their lost sister, exiting. Brother 2 calls after her, using the familiar *thou*:

Brother 2: Sister, where art thou? Delya come again
He calleth, that of thy absence doth complaine

Huanebango has been rendered deaf. On his entrance, he has addressed Zantippa, who has gone to the well in search of a husband, as *you*:

Let me faire Ladie if you be at leisure, reuell with your sweetnes
and takes her response as encouragement. On being called a *flouting knave*, he adopts the familiar *thou* form in an attempt to woo Zantippa.

The next scene involves Eumenides, the wandering knight and Jack, a ghost. Their usage is according to their ages and unmarked. Jack refers to Eumenides as *you* and *Master*. Eumenides calls Jack *thou* and *Lad*. Although he does say:

Eumenides: I thinke this boy be a spirit,
How knowst thou all this?

it is not apparent if this is intended to be understood literally.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

It is difficult to link the incidents in the play into a coherent whole. It transpires that Jack was Wiggen’s brother. An argument between a churchwarden and a sexton with Wiggen over their refusal to bury Jack until they are paid begins with an exchange of *you*. When Wiggen threatens violence, the churchwarden responds with a derogatory *thou*:

Churchwarden: Viggen I hope thou wilt do no more then thou darst aunswer

Eumenides, the wandering knight, who intervenes, addresses Wiggen with a conciliatory *thou* apparent from his use of the term *good fellow*:

Eumenides: Hould thy hands good fellow.

Corebus (Booby), the clown (that is: a rustic or peasant), who has previously addressed the others as *you* tells Sacrapant, the conjurer, who has struck him blind:
Corebus: Heer hast thou slain Hua— a slashing knight
And robbed poore Corebus of his sight.

The nature of the accusation and the modifier poore connote negative affect here.

When the two princely brothers switch from their unmarked mutual formal you address, this seems to imply a change in affect. Formal usage gives way to emotive usage as Brother 2 urges his brother forward in the search for their sister and Brother 1 reacts as his brother falls, apparently as a consequence of lightning and thunder created by Sacrapant:

Brother 2: Then brother draw thy sword & follow me.
(Enter the Coniurer; it lightens & thunders, the 2. Brother falles downe.)

Brother 1: What brother doost thou fall?

Zantippa and Celanta are sisters who have been sent to the well by their father to find husbands. As sisters they may be expected to exchange familial and intra-generational thou. Zantippa overhears Celanta speak of their father’s plan. There is no doubt of the negative affect here, first her exclamation, then her invective, finally her action in breaking her sister’s pitcher:

Zantippa: Marrie gup with a murren,60
I knowe wherefore thou speakest that,
but goe thy waies home as wife as thou camst,
or Ile set thee home with a wanion.61

Next a head rises from the well and speaks to Zantippa:

Zantippa: What is this,
she repeats his dialogue:

Zantippa: faire maiden white & red,
Combe me smooth, and stroke my head:
And thou shalt haue some cockell bread62

---

60 OED exclamation of derision, remonstrance, or surprise.
61 OED plague, vengeance.
62 OED a1687 AUBREY in Thoms Anecd. & Tradit:94 Young wenches have a wanton sport which They call moulding of cockle-bread, viz. they get upon a table-board, and then gather up their knees and their coates with their hands as high as they can, and then they wabble to and fro, as if they were kneading of dowgh, and say these words, viz. My dame is sick and gonne to bed, And I’le go mould my Cockle-bread.
She reacts angrily and strikes it with her pitcher:

Zantippa: Cockell callest thou it boy, faith ile giue you cockell bread. (Shee breaks hir Pitcher vpon his heade,)

There is a change of address from thou to you, which is puzzling, since Zantippa seems to be indignant at what she perceives as the speaker’s presumption as shown by her ironic comment: ‘ile giue you cockell bread.’ It may be that this is a change of emphasis from her repetition of and comments on the head’s utterances to her own intended reaction.

She repeats some of his recitation with negative affect of her address term and an apparent expression of contempt:

Zantippa: By gogs bones thou art a flouting knaue, Hir Corall lippes, hir crimson chinne: ka Wilshaw.64

Sacrapant, the conjurer, who has kidnapped Delya, refers in to her in a soliloquy as ‘Faire Delya, the Mistres of my heart’. On her entrance, he addresses her with the formal you:

Sacrapant: How now faire Delya where haue you bin?

He changes to a seductive tone:

Sacrapant: Ah Delya , fairer art thou than the running water, ... I Delya, sit & aske me what thou wilt, thou shalt haue it brought into thy lappe

while she maintains the formal you form to him.

On the entrance of a Friar bearing provisions for Delya, Sacrapant addresses Delya’s public persona yee:

Sacrapant: Heere Delya, will yee fall to.

The changing use within his remark before the friar’s entrance introduces a change of topic with the pragmatic marker well and a directive:

---

63 idiomatic approximately How dare you say...?
64 pshaw? OED int. An exclamation expressing contempt, impatience, or disgust.
Sacrapant: Delya I am glad to see you so pleasant, well sit thee downe.

Sacrapant controls Delya ‘with a potion’. He functions almost as her familiar and addresses her private persona as thou Delia. In her post-kidnap state Delya is known as Berecynthia whose public persona is addressed as you:

Sacrapant: She hath forgotten to be Delya, 
But not forgot the same she should forget: 
But I will change hir name 
Faire Berecynthia so this Country calls you.

1595 [ICWARN] Menaecmi

This concerns the search for a missing twin, Menechmus, who was lost in Epidanum as a child. When this happened, the remaining twin was given the name of the missing twin. The lost twin is referred to as Menechmus the Citizen, and the twin who has travelled from his home in Syracuse to search for him in Epidanum is Menechmus the Traveller. The CED text does not always distinguish between them, citing both characters as Men, so the twins have to be identified from context.

Unmarked Usage

Unmarked usage for Menechmus the Traveller, is to address his servant, Messenio, as thou, who addresses him as you. Menechmus the Citizen, addresses Peniculus, his parasite, as thou. This possibly reflects the status of a parasite, defined in the OED as: ‘one who eats at the table of another, one who lives at another’s expense and repays him with flattery’. Such is the social distance between the parasite and his patron that Peniculus addresses him as you, even in an abusive outburst delivered to Menechmus the Traveller, in a case of mistaken identity.

Peniculus: O well met fickle-braine, false and treacherous dealer, 
craftie and vniust promise breaker. How haue I deserued, you 
should so giue me the slip, come before and dispatch the dinner, 
deale so badly with him that hath reuerenst ye like a sonne.

In another case of mistaken identity, social status distinction is observed. Cylindrus, a cook, mistaking Menechmus the Traveller, whom he does not know, for Menechmus the Citizen, addresses him as you. Menechmus the Traveller, does not know Cylindrus but recognises his status,
Menechmus, the Traveller: God a mercy my good friend, doest thou know mee?
... Whom meanest thou good fellow?

Menechmus the Citizen, initially addresses his wife as you, speaking abusively over his shoulder to her, as he leaves the house,

Menechmus, the Citizen: If ye were not such a brabling foole and mad-braine scold as yee are, yee would neuer thus crosse your husbande in all actions.

His courtesan, Erotium, also receives you, as he gives her instructions to arrange their dinner but this changes to thou in collocation with terms of endearment: sweete mouse and sweete hearte. Erotium addressing Menechmus the Traveller (in error) as sweetheart collocates this with you, however, and he tells her,

Menechmus, the Traveller: Gentlewoman ye are a straunger to me, and I maruell at your speeches.

Erotium instructs the cook using you, which is indicative of their comparable social status and contrasts with the use of thou to the cook by Menechmus the Traveller.

Mulier, the wife to Menechmus the Citizen, has you as unmarked usage to him and to his twin in mistake for him. This switches to thou during her argument with Menechmus, the Traveller in Act V. There is an isolated example of thou to her husband in Act IV,

Mulier: Aske yee mee whats the matter? Fye vppon thee.

This usage indicates that fie upon thee may be a fixed expression. I have not found it identified as such but this phrase occurs elsewhere in this corpus in collocation with you as an address term: fie vpon thee, is this the purenes of your religion? [1594 1CKNAVE]

When Messenio tries to persuade his master of the futility of their search for the missing twin, Menechmus’s response is to rebuke him as sirrah with (what is for them) distancing you:

Menechmus, the traveller: Sirra,65 no more of these sawcie speeches,
I perceiue I much teach ye how to serue me, not to rule me.

65 OED A term of address used to men or boys, expressing contempt, reprimand, or assumption of authority on the part of the speaker.
Menechmus’s other expressions of negative affect to Messenio collocate with thou and relate to Messenio’s lesser misdemeanour of his mistaken identity of the Menechmus twins.

Menechmus, the traveller: Impudent knaue, wilt thou say that I euer saw thee since I sent thee away to day, and bad thee come for mee after dinner?

Menechmus, the traveller: Why doating patch, didst thou not come with me this morning from the ship?

Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Menechmus switches from his unmarked use of address to his servant Messenio in an outburst of anger when the latter expresses the opinion that their continued search for the missing twin is folly,

Menechmus, the traveller: Sirra, no more of these sawcie speeches, I perceiue I much teach ye how to serue me, not to rule me.

This subsides somewhat in his response to Messenio’s warnings of the dangers to his purse in Epidanum but only to express his lack of faith in Messenio, after which he reverts to addressing Messanio as thou,

Menechmus, the traveller: Because I feare you wil be busie among the Curtizans, & so be cosened of it: then should I take great paines in belabouring your shoulders,

with both positive affect:

Menechmus, the traveller: I mislike not thy counsaile Messenio.

and negative affect:

Menechmus, the traveller: Peace foolish knaue, seest thou not what a sot she is, I shall coozen her I warrant thee.

As may be expected, most switches occur in encounters involving mistaken identity. Mulier, the wife to Menechmus the Citizen, whose unmarked usage to her husband is you, seems incensed not because he gave her cloak to his courtesan but that he is prepared to deny this. She addresses the Traveller, mistaking him for her husband:

---

66 OED crazy fool.
Mulier: Impudent beast, stand ye to question about it? For shame hold thy peace, who asks in bemusement,

Menechmus, the traveller: What offence haue I done woman, that I should not speake to you?

and, still addressing her as you, compares Mulier to Hocuba, whom the Greeks termed a bitch because she railed at strangers just as Mulier was doing. Finally, as the argument continues, he switches to thou:

Mulier: These foule abuses and contumelies, I can neuer endure, nay rather will I liue a widowes life to my dying day.

Menechmus, the traveller: What care I whether thou liuest as a widow or as a wife. ... Prethee for my part, liue a widow till the worldes end, if thou wilt.

He then reverts to you as he switches from the topic of Mulier’s reaction to his abuse to that of her accusation

Menechmus, the traveller: Woman, you are greatly to blame to charge mee with stealing of this cloake, which this day an other gaue me to carry to be trimde.

Mulier also switches topic and introduces this with the pragmatic marker well:

Mul: Well, I will first complaine to my father. ... Ile tell him first of your prankes, I hope he will not see me thus handled.

As Mulier’s father, Senex, approaches and she asks if Menechmus knows him, Menechmus reverts to thou,

Menechmus, the traveller: As much as I knew Calcas of Troy. Euen him and thee I know both alike.

This usage reflects his perception of the two propositions. The first is Mulier’s claim that they are acquainted, though Menechmus knows that they are not and is unconcerned as his jocular response demonstrates,

Mulier: Doest know neither of vs both, me nor my father? Menechmus, the traveller: Faith nor thy grandfather neither.

He takes the accusation of theft more seriously and reacts by addressing Mulier as you. It is this accusation he first denies rather than acquaintance with Mulier when Senex asks in what way his wife has offended him.
When Mulier complains about Menechmus to her father, they exchange you and Senex sides with her (presumed) husband against his daughter. Initially Menechmus and Senex exchange you, then Senex switches to thou with the implication that Menechmus must be mad to deny that he has ever entered ‘this woman’s’ house,

Senex: Why fond man, art thou mad to deny that thou euer setst foote within thine owne house where thou dwellest?

His perception of Menechmus as a rational being and his social equal changes to a perception of him as a madman and social outcast. Since he finds this so difficult to believe, Senex then interprets the whole incident as a joke that has been taken too far and switches back to you to chide his foolish but sane (presumed) son-in-law,

Senex: Menechmus, I pray leaue this fondnesse, ye iest too peruersly with your friends.

Taken for mad Menechmus decides that the only way to rid himself of Senex and his daughter is to seem to be mad. Alarmed, Senex abandons his previous formal address to his daughter and instructs her,

Senex: Get thee into thy house daughter, away quickly.

Subsequently encountering Menechmus the Citizen (his actual son-in-law), Senex relates the details of his madness to the Doctor, addressing the (perceived) mad Menechmus as thou,

Senex: Thou didst, mad fellow ... This thou didst, I know what I say

When the long-lost brothers finally meet, Menechmus the Traveller greets his brother emotionally but they subsequently exchange you despite expressing joy and addressing each other as brother,

Menechmus, the Traveller: It is he, what need farther proofe?
O Brother, Brother, let me embrace thee.

Menechmus, the Traveller: I ioy, and ten thousand ioyes the more, hauing taken so long trauaile and huge paines to seeke you.
Menechmus, the Citizen: Brother I will intreate you to performe your promise to Messenio

Menechmus, the Traveller: Brother, will ye now go with me to Syracusis?
This text illustrates some of the problems of undertaking a pragmatic analysis of part
of a complete work, where the data is assessed as utterances in a discourse rather
than as sentences in a text, which would be the case for a morphological or syntactic
assessment. The extract appears as a continuous discourse with no indication of
scenes and the CED text opens about half way through the complete play. There is
no character list and speakers’ names are abbreviated. One character, La Besha may
be indicated as: Labe or Be. Care must be taken to distinguish this character from
Count Labervele, whose name may be abbreviated to Lab. A speaker labelled Be
may be either La Besha or Berger. The characters Lord Moren and Martia may be
written Mor and Mar and their speeches are sometimes wrongly attributed. It is not
clear if Jaquena is the same character as Sateena, nor does it become apparent until
the end of the play that this character is the maid. An automatic text search will
therefore not reveal valid data on personal relationships. A close reading is essential.

Parrott claims ‘the text...is so corrupt, and the stage directions are so infrequent and
confusing, that it is extremely difficult to follow the story.’ The play was probably
‘altered and published without the author's supervision’ (1907:xx). As it is
hypothesised in this study that thou/you variation reflects characters’ relationships, a
close reading of the entire text of the play (EEBO) was undertaken in order to
determine these. The character Lemot for example is referred to in the first part of
the play before the beginning of the CED extract as ‘the witty minion of our king,’
which guides the potential interpretation of his utterances as banter.

Unmarked Usage

Unmarked usage in this text follows the pattern of exchange of you among social
equals. This applies in the upper social rank of the titled characters and among the
lower orders where the host of the ordinary (inn), his man and the maid usually
exchange you even when being abusive to each other. Generational distinction tends
to be maintained with older characters addressing younger characters over whom
they have social control as thou, for example Count Labervele to Lord Dowseecer, his
son, and the host to the boy, his son. The superior social status of the husband is
indicated by Lord Moren’s address to his wife, the countess, as *thou* and her address to him as *you*.

An exception to this is the king’s unmarked address to everyone as *you*. He deviates from this usage once, expressing positive affect, when commiserating with La Besha, who was on the point of hanging himself thinking Martia, the woman he loved, was dead:

King: Well sweete Besha let her marry Dowsecer, Ile get thee a wife worth fifteene of her

As Lemot is identified as ‘the witty minion of our king’, the audience is predisposed to interpret his utterances as comedy. His address to Catalian, a gentleman, as *Sirrah* and *thou* is an invitation to collude in mischief:

Lemot: Sirrah, Catalian, while they are playing at cardes, *thou* and I will haue some excellent sport: sirrah, dost *thou* know that same Gentleman there?

Lemot claims to be able to predict the response of a group card players to his remarks. The exchange continues with Lemot addressing Catalian as *thou* but being addressed by Catalian in return as *you*. Catalian remains sceptical and does not reciprocate Lemot’s light-hearted approach:

Catalian: I do not thinke so.
... This is excellent, forward sir I pray.
... Come let vs see *you*.
... Why but hearke *you* Lemot, I hope *you* cannot make this lord answer so roundly.

Florilla is a Puritan, a category often mocked in Early Modern English drama. Her use of *thou*, however, seems to convey negative affect rather than perceived Puritan usage, as it is not consistent. She uses *you* to the king:

King: What Madam are *you* so pure now?
Florilla: Yea, would not *you* be pure?
King: No puritane.
Florilla: *You* must be then a diuell, I can tell *you*.

and to her husband, who addresses her as *thou*:

Labervele: O wife where hast *thou* beene?
Florilla: where did I tell *you* I would be I pray.
Labervele: In *thy* close walke *thou* saidst.
In part of the play preceding the CED extract Lemot in order ‘to have some sport’ proposes a test to Florilla to prove her constancy to her elderly husband. He woos her and she falls in love with him only to realise she has been tricked:

Florilla: O monstrous man, what, wouldst thou haue him take vs? 
... Out on thee wretch, he hath bit me to the bone, 
... O barbarous Canibal, now I perceiue thou wilt make me a mocking stocke to all the world. 
... Vilain, thou didst it in contempt of me.

Lemot acknowledges her emotion:

Lemot: Come, come, leaue your passions, they cannot mooue mee.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

Lemot’s advice to Florilla on how she may become reconciled with her husband constructs two personae for Florilla: in the first, Lemot addresses her with the formal you and the second is his projected conversation between Florilla and her husband in which they exchange the intimate address term thou:

Florilla: Vilain, thou didst it in contempt of me.

Lemot: Well, and you take it so, so be it: harke you Madam, your wisest course is, euen to become puritane againe, put off this vaine attire, and say,

I haue despised all: thanks my God, good husband, I do loue thee in the Lord, and he (good man) will thinke all this you haue done,

was but to shew thou coudest gouerne the world, and hide thee as a rainebow doth a storme:

my dainty wench, go go, what shall the flattering words of a vaine man make you forget your dutie to your husband? away, repent, amend your life, you haue discredited your religion for euer.

A similar construction involving reported speech occurs between Count Labervele and his wife, Florilla,

Count Labervele: O wife where hast thou beene?
Florilla: where did I tell you I would be I pray.
Count Labervele: In thy close walke thou saidst.
Florilla: And was I not?
Count Labervele: Truly I know not, I neither looked nor knocked, for Labesha told me that you, and faire Martia were at Verones ordinarie.

Labervele switches to addressing his wife as you when reflecting Labesha’s presumed formal reference to Florilla. In her persona as his wife, he addresses her as thou and in the persona of the woman Labesha speaks of she becomes you.

The switch from Lemot’s unmarked usage to Labesha marks a topic change indicated by the pragmatic markers but as his utterance switches between his assessment of the situation and his reaction to it:

Lemot: Come Labesha thy money. Labesha: You must lend me some, for my boy is runne away with my purse. Lemot: thy boy? I neuer knew any that thou hadst. Labesha: Had not I a boy three or foure yeares ago, and he ran away. Lemot: And neuer since he went thou hadst not a peny, but stand by, Ile excuse you.

A switch to thou from previous unmarked use of you in the host’s address to Catalian with reference to Labesha implies an invitation to collusion:

Host: O he is ashamed yfayth: but I will tell thee Howe thou shalt make him mad indeed, say his mistres for loue of him hath drowned her selfe

as does Catalian’s instruction to Berger, another gentleman,

Catalian: We haue yfaith, stop thou him there, and I wil meet him here.

1602 [2CHEYWO] How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad

The CED extract opens approximately half way through the play. The relationships of the characters are confusing. The editor of the 1824 edition (digitised by Google) suggests that the author confused the status of one of the characters naming him Young Lusam, which suggests that he is the son of Old Lusam, Mistress Arthur’s father, which would make Young Lusam Mistress Arthur’s brother. He then has Mistress Arthur address him as a stranger,

You are a stranger sir, but by your words You do appeare an honest Gentleman: If you professe to be my husbands friend, Persist in these perswasions:
Thus, caution is needed in interpreting the significance of address terms.

**Unmarked Usage**

Speakers’ unmarked usage does seem to reflect social and generational status with the father figures Old Master Arthur and Old Master Lusam using reciprocal *you* and addressing their sons as *thou* whilst receiving *you*. The young friends Master Anselm and Master Fuller generally exchange *thou* and *thou* is generally addressed to servants, from whom *you* is received. Unmarked usage for the servants Hugh and Pipkin is to exchange *you*.

The relationship between Mistress Mary, a Courtesan, and Mistress Splay is unclear with Mary addressing Mistress Splay as *good mother*[^67] Splay. This may be a term of address or it may denote their family relationship, since Mistress Splay addresses Mary as *daughter*[^68]. Initially they exchange *you*. Mary addresses her servant, Brabo, as *thou* and he addresses her as *you*. All of these exchanges, whether denoting difference of generation or rank, connote relative social status.

The imprecise application of family relationship terms is illustrated by the address of Mistress Arthur as *daughter* by both Old Arthur, her father in law and Old Lusam, her father. The distinction is apparent in their respective use of the formal and intimate address pronoun:

Old Arthur: Daughter me thinkes you are exceeding sad:
Old Lusam: Faith daughter so thou art exceeding sad:

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

In a prior conversation Mistress Mary and Mistress Splay have exchanged *you*.

Mary: But Mistris Splay, now to your lecture that you promist me.

Now Mistress Splay reorientates the topic within her speech. She opens with an affectionate address term; *daughter*, a reference to herself; ‘what I myself have tried’

[^67]: OED a term of address for an elderly woman of the lower class. Also used (instead of Mrs.) as a Prefix to the surname of such a person.
[^68]: OED used as a term of affectionate address to a woman or girl by an older person or one in a superior relation. A girl, maiden, young woman (with no express reference to relationship).
and an invitation to collusion; ‘Be rul’d by me.’ These features connote a rapprochement in their relationship.

Splay: Daughter attend, for I will tell thee now
What in my yong daies I my selfe haue tried:
Be rul’d by me and I will make thee rich.

Then she switches to a general reference to Mary,

You God be praisde are faire, and as they say
Full of good parts, you haue bene often tried
To be a woman of good carriage,
VVhich in my mind is very commendable.
Mary: Forward good mother Splay.

... And as I told you, being faire, I wish
Sweet daughter you were as fortunate.

She concludes with advice for a specific situation indicated by the pragmatic marker when:

VVhen any sutor comes to aske thy loue,
Looke not into his words, but into his sleeue,
If thou canst learne what language his purse speakes,
Be rul’d by that, thats golden eloquence.

Mary now changes her address to thou possibly connoting their collusion in their approach to suitors, possibly under the influence of the rhyming couplet with its suggestion of poetic register

Mary: Soft who comes here? begone good Mistris Splay,
Of thy rules practise this is my first day.

In the first exchange between Young Master Arthur and Mistress Mary you is retained throughout, although they both invite familiar address suggesting to each other the use of their names without a title of address. Arthur is under the impression that he has poisoned his wife and that she is dying. He woos Mary who is aware that he has a wife:

Mary: Are you not Maister Arthur?

Young Arthur: Not M. Arthur, but Arthur,
and your seruant sweete Mistris Mary

Mary: Not Mistris Mary, but Mary and your handmaid, sweet Maister Arthur.
Yong Arthur: That I loue you, let my face tell you:
that I loue you more then ordinarily, let this kisse testifie:
and that I loue you feruently and entierly, aske this gift, and
see what it will answere you. My selfe, my purse, and all
being wholy at your seruice.

Mary: That I take your loue in good part, my thankes
shall speak for me: that I am please with your kisse, this
interest of an other shall certifie you: and that I accept
your gift, my prostrate seruice and selfe shall witnes with
me. My loue, my lips, and sweet selfe, are at your seruice:
wilt please you to come neare sir?
... How doth your wife?

It seems that neither is willing to commit themself. Generally a male declaration of
love would use thou and a woman wishing to give a positive response may
reciprocate after a further few utterances.

Mary is later described by Anselme, who is in love with the virtuous and wronged
Mistress Arthur, as ‘a leaud lasciuous Curtezan’. She rejects a proposal of marriage
from her servant, Brabo, who switches from his unmarked usage to her of you:

Brabo: I prithee Mistris, for all my long seruice,
For all the loue that I haue borne thee long,
Do me this fauour now to marry me.

Her surprise at his presumption gives rise to the marked address term you, then the
pragmatic marker what indicates the return to her customary unmarked usage to
him:

Mary: Marry come vp you blockhead, you great asse,
What wouldst thou haue me marie with a diuel,

The further pragmatic marker but moves the topic on, telling him that it is Young
Arthur they have conspired to entrap,

Mary: But peace, no more, here comes the silly foole
That we so long haue set our lime-twigs for.

In their subsequent exchange Young Arthur addresses Mary as thou throughout,
whereas she switches between you and thou, beginning with a formal address, good
maister Arthur. His more intimate address to her connotes positive affect:

---

69 OED marry come up used to express indignant or amused surprise or contempt.
Mary: O good maister Arthur, where haue you bene ...
How should I thinke you loue me,
That can indure to stay so long from me?

Yong Arthur: In faith sweet heart I saw thee yesternight.

Mary: I true, you did, but since you saw me not,
at twelue a clocke you parted from my house,

Then she switches from the past to the present as indicated by the pragmatic marker and switches to thou in a rhyming couplet:

And now tis morning, and new strucken seuen.
Seuen houres thou staidst fro~ me, why didst thou so?
They are my seuen yeares Prentiship of woe.

Yong Arthur: I prithee be patient, I had some occasion
That did inforce me from thee yesternight.

With her switch back to you Mary distances herself again from Arthur with self-deprecation implying his lack of respect for her introduced by the pragmatic marker I (aye):

Mary: I you are soone inforc'd, foole that I am,
To dote on one that nought respecteth me:
Tis but my fortune, I am borne to beare it,
And euerie one shall haue their destinie.

Yong Arthur: Nay weepe not wench, thou woundst mee with thy teares.

Mary: I am a foole, and so you make me too,
These teares were better kept, then spent in waste,
On one that neither tenders them nor me:

Then a pragmatic marker indicates her switch from apparent self-deprecation to apparent negative affect, as she addresses him as thou:

Mary: What remedie, but if I chance to die,
Or to miscarrie with that I go withall,
Ile take my death that thou art cause thereof.

But she draws back to formal usage in reminding him of his promise:

Mary: You told me, that when your wife was dead,
You would forsake all others, and take me.

Yong Arthur: I told thee so, & I will keep my word,
And for that end I came thus early to thee:
Her objective achieved, marriage to a rich man, she resumes in a rhyming couplet the use of *thou*, the term of positive affect:

**Mary:** Nay then I see *thou* louest me, & I finde  
By this last motio~, *thou* art growne more kinde.

Her insincerity is illustrated by her final remark, presumably an aside, in response to Arthur’s declared intent. Both of these are expressed in rhyming couplets:

**Yong Arthur:** My loue and kindnesse like my age shal grow,  
And with the time increase, and *thou* shalt see,  
The older I grow, the kinder I will bee.

**Mary:** I so I hope it will, but as for mine,  
That with my age shall day by day decline.

Initially Mistress Arthur asking her husband’s servant, Pipkin, when he last saw his master, addresses him as *you*. His responses indicate that this is intended as a comic exchange:

**Mistress Arthur:** Sirra when saw *you* your Maister?  
**Pipkin:** Faith Mistris when I last lookt vpon him.  
**Mistress Arthur:** And when was that?  
**Pipkin:** When I beheld him.  
**Mistress Arthur:** And when was that?  
**Pipkin:** Mary when he was in my sight,

This banter influences Mistress Arthur’s response as she switches to the less formal address, *thou*:

**Mistress Arthur:** Didst *thou* not intreat him to come home?  
**Pipkin:** How should I mistris, he came not there to day.  
**Mistress Arthur:** Didst not *thou* say he was there?

Pipkin, however, retains the formal address appropriate to his station:

**Pipkin:** True mistris he was there, but I did not tel ye whe~,  
He hath bin there diuers times, but not of late

and Mistress Arthur switches back to the formal style, as she concludes the exchange and dismisses Pipkin:

**Mistress Arthur:** About *your* busines,  
... get *you* to schoole againe.
The motivation for Young Arthur’s switch in his instructions to his servant, Pipkin, is not immediately apparent. Young Arthur addressing Pipkin as you, gives him a list of six formal instructions: ‘take, bid, goe, invite, goe, take’. This is followed by a less formal abbreviated form (be/go) ‘about it’ taking the less formal address term thou. The modern variant of this might be ‘off you go!’ Possibly the switch connotes a similar informal ending.

Young Arthur: Here take my purse, and bid my wife prouide ...
Sirra goe you to lustice Reasons house, Invuite him first with all solemnitie. Goe to my Fathers, and my Father in lawes, Here take this note. The rest that come I will invite my selfe, About it with what quick dispatch thou canst.

When Pipkin speaks disparagingly of Mary, whom Arthur plans to marry:

Pipkin: Common to all men: she that is beholding to no Trade, but liues of her selfe, Arthur’s mood changes and he switches back to the formal imperative and the formal you, connoting a distancing of affect from Pipkin:

Young Arthur: Sirra be gone, or I will send you hence.

Pipkin, crying that he is mad, rushes in with the news of his mistress’s death and switches from his previous formal address to his social equal, Justice Reason’s servant, Hugh,

Pipkin: O Mistris, o` Hugh, o` Hugh, o` Mistris, Hugh I must needs beate thee, I am mad, I am lunatike, I must fall vpon thee, my Mistris is dead. At first Hugh does not understand and retains the formal terms you and Master Pipkin (a title not employed to Pipkin by those of higher rank),

Hugh: O M. Pipkin, what do you meane, what do you meane M. Pipkin? Pipkin: O Hue, o` Mistris, o` Mistris, o` Hue. Then, as Hugh understands what has happened, he shares Pipkin’s emotion and adopts a less formal tone addressing Pipkin by name with no title:
Hugh: O Pipkin, o` God, o` God, o` Pipkin.

1607 [2CWILKI] Miseries of Inforst Mariage

Unmarked Usage

Master Scarborrow, the central character of this text, and his friends, Sir Francis Ilford, Bartley and Wentloe exchange *thou* of social intimacy. His uncle, Sir William Scarborrow, and his guardian Lord Faulconbridge, who is a good friend of Sir William exchange *you*, which may indicate a greater formality in their relationship. Lord Faulconbridge initially addresses Master Scarborrow as *you* but switches to *thou*, as does Sir William, in reaction to Master Scarborrow’s impoliteness. Scarborrow addresses the torch bearer as *thou*.

Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Master Scarborrow has contracted to marry the daughter of Sir John Harcop, the neighbour of his Yorkshire estate. Because of his wealth, his guardian, Lord Faulconbridge, insists that he marry Katherine, Faulconbridge’s niece. This is the basis of the plot. Despite being categorised as a comedy, the denouement of this play involves Master Scarborrow rejecting Katherine and their children, since he considers himself legally bound to Harcop’s daughter. This explains his antipathy towards Lord Faulconbridge.

Lord Faulconbridge: Whose this, young Scarborrow?
Scarborrow: The man that the Mare\(^70\) rid on.
Lord Faulconbridge: Is this the reuerence that *you* owe to me?

Faulconbridge interprets this remark as offensive and Scarborrow agrees:

Scarborrow: *You* should haue brought me vp better.
Lord Faulconbridge: That vice should thus transforme man to a beast.

That is: bad manners reduce man to the level of animals, but Scarborrow implies that, though Faulconbridge may be styled a Lord, he does not have the attributes of a Lord:

Scarborrow: Go to, *your* names Lorde, Ile talke with *you* when
*your* out a debt and ha better cloaths.

---

\(^{70}\) OED a kind of goblin supposed to produce nightmare by sitting on the chest of the sleeper; the nightmare itself i.e. Lord Faulconbridge is a nightmare.
Only at this point do the address terms switch, as Faulconbridge’s usage suggests positive affect, though this could equally connote irony:

Lord Faulconbridge: I pitty thee euen with my very soule.

whereas Scarborow’s immediate response appears to be an offensive fixed expression followed by a return to formal you

Scarborow: Pitty ith thy throat,\(^71\) I can drinke Muscadine and Eggys, and Muld-sack, do you heare: you put a peece of turnd stuffe vpon me, but I wil –

Lord Faulconbridge interrupts him with a more socially distant formal address, then Scarborow resumes his pragmatically marked switch collating thou with further abuse:

Lord Faulconbridge: What will you do Sir?
Scarborow: Pisse in thy way, and thats no slander.

Faulconbridge concludes that such deviant usage implies that Scarborow is drunk:

Lord Faulconbridge: Your sober blood wil teach you otherwise

Butler, servant to the Scarborows, is discovered hiding in a tree by Sir John Harcop, who has been robbed. Sir John is convinced the thieves fled into the wood:

Sir John Harcop: Vp to this wood they tooke, search neare my friendes ...
... as sure as I was rob’d the theeues went this way.

He asks Butler:

Sir John Harcop: But tell me sir, why lurkt you in that tree?
Butler: that there I might see which way the knaues tooke, then to tell you of it, and you right worshipfullie to send hue to cry after em.

Sir John’s switch to thee at this point seems intended to pre-empt Butler’s advice, which he considers unnecessary, as the pragmatic marker nay then implies. Sir John’s switch may indicate that Butler’s address to him, ‘you right worshipfully,’

\(^71\) Repudiation, don’t bother?
\(\text{cf 1594 Shakespeare } Titus Andronicus ii. i. 55 }\) Till I haue..Thrust those reprochfull speeches downe his throat, That he hath breathd in my dishonour here.
places Butler socially or this may be a corrective thou\textsuperscript{72} to remind Butler of his social status.

Sir John Harcop: \textbf{Nay then} I tell thee they tooke into this wood.

To contradict Sir John, Butler reproduces Sir John’s usage, presumably with the stress on thee, but with the immediate caveat that he is aware that this address is inappropriate. Then he resumes his unmarked usage of you.

Butler: And I tell thee (setting thy worsh. knighthood aside) he lyes in his throat that saies so: Had not one of them a white Frocke? Did they not bind your worships knighthoode by the thumbs? then fagoted you and the fool your man, back to back.

Sir Francis Ilford is tricked into believing that the Scarborrows’ sister possessses a fortune. He is, therefore, eager to marry her.

Sir Francis Ilford: Kind Mistres, as I protested, so againe I vow. Ifaith I loue you.

This changes after their wedding (as the singular verb form indicates), though she maintains her address term of you to him:

Sir Francis Ilford: Ho Sirrha, who would ha thought it, I perceiue now a woman may be a maid, be married, and loose her maiden-head, and all in halfe and an hower, and how doest like me now wench.

Sister: As doth befit your seruant and your wife, That owe you loue and duty al my life.

Sir Francis is effusive in his use of terms of endearment and familiar address as he tries to cajole his wife to reveal all her wealth but is uncertain how to react when she tells him:

Sister: The land I can endow you with, is my Loue, The riches I possesse for you is loue.

\textsuperscript{72}There is a similar rebuke in a French text from 1605 [2HFERON The French Garden], when a Lady switches from you to thou and then back to you in addressing a shop assistant whom she perceives as being presumptuous.
He addresses her with you, marked usage in this context implying distance but so incredible to him is the suggestion that she has no wealth that he reverts immediately to the familiar thou:

Sir Francis Ilford: ... why my little frappet you,73 I heard thy Vnckles talk of thy riches, that thou hadst hundreds a yeare.

Thereafter his usage switches back and forth as he becomes progressively more abusive gradually realising that he has been duped into marrying a woman with no fortune.

Master Scarborrow’s younger brother, Thomas, attacks him for having spent their inheritance, addressing him as thou:

Thomas: Turne, draw, and dye, I come to kill thee.

This may connote fraternal relationship but Scarborrow’s response indicates that this interpretation is unlikely:

Scarborro: Whats he that speakes? Like sicknesse: Oh ist you, Sleepe still, you cannot moue me, fare you well.

As they fight, Scarborrow switches to negative affect thou:

Scarborrow: Would thou were not my Brother?

At this point Ilford, Wentloe and Bartley enter and begin to attack Scarborrow:

Here the Brothers ioyne, driue the rest out, and returne.

The brothers switch to an exchange of you but Scarborrow’s reaction to having his life saved is not effusive: it seems to connote ‘not impoliteness’ rather than strong emotion:

Scarborrow: Brother I thanke you, for you now haue bin A patron of my life ... If penitence your losses might repayre, You should be rich in wealth, and I in care

73 A curious structure: I have been unable to trace frappet but the various components of the phrase in a blend of jocular endearment and reproach nicely reflect Ilford’s uncertainty over his wife’s financial state: OED: my used vocatively, prefixed affectionately to terms of relationship or endearment; little: used to convey an implication of endearment or deprecation, or of tender feelings on the part of the speaker. you: as vocative, chiefly in apposition with a noun following; in reproach or contempt often repeated after the noun; though in this case my ... you.
and Thomas maintains his distance from his brother, addressing him as Sir in collocation with you:

Thomas: I do beleue you Sir, but I must tell you,
Euils the which are gainst an other done,
Repentance makes no satisfaction
To him that feeles the smart.

Scarborough’s attempt at conciliation:

Scarborough: I prethee let vs be at peace together

is met with rejection and a switch back to a distancing thou of negative affect:

Thomas: At peace for what? For spending my inheritance,
By yonder sun that euery soule has life by,
As sure as thou hast life Ile fight with thee.

Scarborough’s exchange with Katherine, his ‘inforced’ wife illustrates his perception of their relationship. Though she has borne him two children, he does not recognise their marriage, since he was previously betrothed to another. He greets her as a stranger with an address term implying high social status:

Scarborough: You are very welcome, peace: wele ha complement.
Who are you Gentlewoman.

but switches to thou in collocation with derogatory terms in denying their relationship:

Scarborough: Thou lyest? strumpet thou lyest?
... tell me woman,74
Did ere my Loue with sighs intreat thee mine,

1611 [2CBARRE] Ram-Alley or Merrie Tricks

Unmarked Usage

Much of the plot in this text depends on disguise and subterfuge. William Smalshakes, an impoverished gentleman disowned by his father, conspires with his friend Thomas Boutcher and Frances, a whore, who purports to be heiress to the recently deceased Sir John Somerfield, to cheat Throte, who purports to be a lawyer. Constantia, the actual heiress to Sir John Somerfield disguises herself as a pageboy in order to enter the employ of Thomas Boutcher with whom she is in love.

74 Not as pejorative term in itself at this time but marked usage here, as Katherine has been downgraded from ‘gentlewoman’. See discussion in trials, chapter 4.
For most characters the unmarked usage is to exchange you. Boutcher first greets the pageboy (Constantia) as thou but does not sustain this usage, frequently addressing him simply as boy. This may connote the pageboy’s youth rather than his status. The only other unmarked uses of thou are: from the widow, Tafata, to her Maid connoting their relative social status and from Sir Oliver Smaleshankes to his son, Thomas. Sir Oliver addresses his son younger William as you when they meet and switches to thou connoting negative affect:

Sir Oliver: Thou varlet knaue, 
... Ile giue her some-what, though I loue not thee.

This implies that Sir Oliver’s address to his older son, Thomas, indicates positive affect rather than any distinction due to age:

Sir Oliver:  I tell thee boy, I am right harty glad,  
to heare thy brother Hath got so great an heire.

Captain Puffe, whose name denotes his comic status, addresses both Sir Oliver and Justice Tutchin as thou. His bravado provokes laughter from Sir Oliver:

Captain Puffe: Sir Oliuer Smaleshankes,  
Know my name is Puffe, knight, thee haue I sought,  
To fright thee from thy wits.

and derision from Justice Tutchin:

Justice Tutchin: Nay good Sir Puffe,  
Wee haue too many mad men already

Captain Puffe: How? I tell thee Iustice Tutchine, not all  
Thy Baylifes, Sergants, busie Constables,  
Defesants, warrants, or thy Mittimusses,  
Shall saue his throte from cutting, if he presume,  
To woe the widdow eclipped Taffata,

Their reactions after his exit, however, reveal that they perceived his usage as abusive:

Justice Tutchin: I wonder how my spirit did forbeare,  
To strike him on the face: had this beene spoke,  
Within my Liberties, had dyed for it

Sir Oliver: I was about to draw.
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

William Smalshankes laments the loss of social esteem that accompanied his loss of wealth and claims that only his whore would remain faithful.

William Smalshankes: noble Letchery
Sticks by a man, when all his friends forsake him.

Boutcher’s switch from unmarked you to thou could be interpreted as a disparaging response,

Boutcher: The Poxe it will, art thou so senselesse growne,
So much indeared to thy bestial lust,

but Boutcher’s reference to William’s worth and spirit free and noble implies that the switch to thou here connotes positive affect:

That thy originall worth should lye extinct
And buried in thy shame? farre be such thoughts
From spirits free and noble.

His subsequent agreement to lend Smalshankes forty shillings elicits an emotive expression of thanks in the present tense in which Smalshankes addresses him as thee and then switches back to you in reference to Boutcher’s future persona.

William Smalshankes: VVill you lend me forty shillings.
Boutcher: I will.
William Smalshankes: VVhy God-amercy, there’s some goodnesse in thee,
Youle not repent. With that money I will ...

This same effect is achieved in William’s exchange with Frances. His unmarked usage to her is you:

William Smaleshanke: now you pernicious Coccatrice,
You see how I must skelder for your good,

In the following utterance he addresses her as thee then switches back to you. Thee refers to her current persona. The pragmatic marker and introducing a series of imperatives refers to her future persona. The switch back to thou in the final two lines collocates with the pragmatic marker but and the conditional mood of the verb: do but thou. William’s changing usage collocates with his changing stance in relation to his interlocutor and topic. The phrase that does not fit this pattern is filch
for thee and me in which an imperative collocates with thee. A possible explanation is that phonetics overrules pragmatics here: the rhyme thee and me precedes the concluding rhyming couplet that signals the characters’ imminent exit.

William Smalshankes: Tut, I know thee a good rascal, lets in, And on with all your neate and finest ragges.
On with your cloake and saue-guard, you arrant drab, You must cheate without all conscience, filch for thee & me.
Do but thou act what I shall well contriue, Weele teach my Lawyer a new way to thriue.

Subsequently William commends Frances for their success in getting a gold chain from Sir Oliver. The pejorative epithets seem somewhat mitigated in collocation with you: thou whore being possibly more opprobrious than you whore, so that thou would function as an affect intensive.

William Smaleshanke: Why this came cleanly off, Giue me the chaine, you little Cockatrice,75 Why this was luck, foote foure hundred crownes, Got at a clap, hold still your owne you whore, And we shall thriue,

William Smaleshanke: Did I not bring you off, you arrant drab, Without a counterbuffe?

In her public persona as his betrothed William addresses Frances as thou.

William Smaleshanke: Come now to Ram-alley. There shalt thou lye, Till I prouide a Priest,

... Art not weary. ... Th’art not merry loue,

This contrasts with his unmarked usage to her in the persona of his whore.

In the exchange between Constantia (as the pageboy) and Adriana, Mistress Tafata’s maid, their address terms switch according to their perception of their interlocutor. Adriana initially uses the thou form of the verb to the pageboy. Since the pageboy is in fact a woman in disguise, she/he will not have the appearance of a mature male.

75 OED a term of reproach for a woman: prostitute, whore.
76 OED after 1575 widely used as an opprorious intensive through the whole vocabulary of abuse.
77 OED a harlot, prostitute, strumpet.
Adriana is apparently addressing a young boy, so her address connotes age difference:

Constantia: Now will I fall a boord the waiting maide,  
Adriana: Fall a boord of me doost take me for a ship?

Her switch to you collocating with an exclamation of contempt is sarcastic, implying that the pageboy is not mature enough to pose any sexual threat to her:

Constantia: I, and will shoote you betwixt wind and water.

Adriana: Blurt 78 maister gunner, your linstocks too short.
Constantia is disconcerted but switches to thou and the discourse of wooing:

Constantia: Foote how did she know that, dost here sweet heart,  
Should not the page be doing with the maid,  
Whilst the maister is busie with the mistris,  
Please you79 prick forwards, thou art a wench  
Likely to goe the way of all flesh shortly

Adriana acknowledges the banter with a switch to the familiar thou:

Adriana: Whose witty knaue art thou.  
Constantia: At your service. 80  
Adriana: At mine faith, I should breetch thee.  
Constantia: How breetch me.  
Adriana: I breech thee, I haue breech’d a taler man,  
Then you in my time, come in and welcome.

Adriana’s reversion to you seems to be an aside. The discourse of banter licenses thou but Adriana signals an end to the banter as she takes control of their exchange.

The exchange between Boutcher and Mistress Tafata is also based on a misunderstanding. They exchange you. As they enter, Boutcher has apparently told Mistress Tafata that he will not marry a widow. Mistress Tafata assumes that this is because he thinks to do so would be beneath him. Boutcher responds that she misinterprets his motive and expresses his admiration for her by switching to thou to reorientate the topic in a phrase introduced by the pragmatic marker but:

---

78 OED an exclamation of contempt: ‘pooh!’ ‘a fig for’.
79 OED ‘if it please you, if you like, if it is your will or pleasure: a courteous qualification to a request.’ This seems to be a fixed expression. The collocation please thee is not attested.
80 OED used ellipt. as a phrase of politeness.
81 OED flog.
Boutcher: You mistake my thoughts:
But know thou wonder of this continent,
By one more skild in vnowne fate, then was,
The blind Achaian Prophet,
It was foretold,
A widdow should indanger both my life,
My soule, my lands, and reputation.

Mistress Tafata dismisses the faith in fortune-tellers of a man of his social status whom she addresses as you, then concludes with a switch to thou in response to his tentative wooing:

Mistress Tafata: A triuiall Idle ieast,
Tis for a man, of your repute and note,
To credit fortune-tellers,
... Then giue thy loue free scope, imbrace and kisse,
And to the distafe sisters leaue th'euent

Boutcher remains formal in his leave-taking and Mistress Tafata switches back in a curt dismissal, as he has not responded to her invitation to move their discourse to a less formal level:

Boutcher: I must intreate you licence my depart
For some few houres.

Mistress Tafata: Choose what you will of time,
There lyes your way

For Throte, the lawyer, his clerk, Dash, has two personae: that of his legal assistant whom he addresses as you:

Throte: Is that reioynder done.
... Haue you drawn't at length, haue you dasht it out,
According to your name.

and that of his servant whom he addresses as thou:

Throte: Then trusse my points,
And how thinkst thou of law?

Dash: It is the kingdomes eye, by which shee sees
The acts and thoughts of men.

This develops into a connotation of disparagement when Throte disagrees with Dash’s assessment:
Throte: The kingdomes eye,
I tell thee foole, it is the kingdomes nose,

As William Smalshanke colludes with Frances to defraud both his father and Throte, he switches his address to thou:

William Smalshanke: Come wench of gold,
For thou shalt get me gold, besides odde ends
Of siluer: weele purchase house and land,
By thy bare gettings, wench, by thy bare gettings
Lieutenant Beard: Exceeding well she carries it by Ioue,
And if she can forbear her Rampant trick,82
And but hold close a while twill take by Mars.

Beard’s status is uncertain. In the plot against his father, Sir Oliver, Smaleshanke introduces him as my man. In their plot against Throte he plays the part of servant to Frances. He probably has a similar social status to Frances. She exclaims indignantly at his abuse:

Frances: How now you slau? my rampant tricks you rogue,

then switches to address him as thou with a switch of topic correlating with the pragmatic marker nay, which introduces a tirade of abuse against him:

Nay feare not me my onely feare is still,
Thy filthy face betrayes vs, for all men know,
Thy nose stands compasse like a bow,
Which is three quarters drawne, thy head
Which is with greasy haire ore-spred,
And being vncurld and black as cole,
Doth show some scullion in a hole
Begot thee on a Gipsie, or
Thy mother was some Colliers whore:

pausing for breath, she repeats her initial complaint:

My rampant tricks you rogue,

then switches back to her assessment of him. Delivered with stress on My and thou’t these lines connote the contrast in her implication that it is not her behaviour that

---

82 I take this to be a reference to prostitution. Beard agrees with Smaleshanke that Frances looks the part of a young maid and suggests that their ruse in passing her off as a wealthy heiress and Smaleshanke’s betrothed will work if she can refrain from prostitution for a while.
would expose their plot but his appearance. It is as if there were a pragmatic marker understood: on the contrary:

thou't be descrie
Before our plot be ended.

Sir Oliver’s address to his son William as you contrasts with the familiar thou form to his son Thomas:

Sir Oliver: You are well met, know yee me good sir,
... Y'haue stole sir Somerfields heire,

William Smaleshanke: who told you so did lye,

His switch to thou when William denies his accusation that he has stolen Somerfield’s heir connotes anger, as indicated by the address:

Sir Oliver: Thou varlet knaue,
T'hast stolne away Sir Iohn Somerfields heire,
But neuer looke for countenance from me,
Carry her whether thou wilt.

Sir Oliver switches back to the distancing you as he calms down, then in a further expression of negative affect tells William ‘I love not thee’ and resumes you to quiet William’s suggestion that Sir Oliver should give Frances his gold chain. Though he addresses William as knave, in collocation with Sir Oliver’s unmarked usage to William this does not connote the emotive force of the previous usage.

Sir Oliver: Well, where's your wife.
William Smaleshanke: Shees comming here behind,
Sir Oliver: Ile giue her some-what, though I loue not thee

Sir Oliver: Peace knaue, whats she your wife?

An example of a switch to thou connoting proposed collusion occurs in William Smaleshanke’s request to Throte that he should mislead Sir Somerfield’s heir (Frances) into believing that he is rich:

William Smaleshanke: now Maister Throte
It rests within your power to pleasure me,
Know that this same is sir Iohn Somerfields Heire,
**Now** if she chance to question what I am,
Say sonne vnto a Lord, I pray thee tell her
I haue a world of land, and stand in hope
To bee created Barron
... Wilt thou do this?

A similar request for collusion is made by Boutcher to Tafata’s maid Adriana, whom he has previously addressed as you

Boucher: Stand thou propitious, indeere me to my loue

Having announced that he is unable to marry Tafata, Boutcher changes his mind and switches from his previous formal you to woo Tafata and address her as thou:

Boucher: My fate compeld me but now farewell fond feare,
My soule, my life, my lands, and reputation,
Ile hazard all and prize them all beneath thee.

Tafata’s response is an immediate switch to thou from her former usage to Boutcher but this is not accommodation to his wooing. It is an invitation to collusion.

Tafata: which I shall put to triall, lend me thy eare,

Having put her proposition to him, Tafata steps back metaphorically and linguistically to ask:

Tafata: Wil you performe so much.

Then switching to thee of positive affect she tells him:

Tafata: Make him subscribe it, and then I vow,
By sacred Vestaes euer hallowed fire,
To take thee to my bed

She subsequently explains to her Maid that Boutcher has agreed to rid her of Captain Face who persists in publicly proclaiming that Tafata is his lawful wife.

1614 [2CJONSO] Bartholemew Fayre

Unmarked Usage

There is a notable reduction in the social diversity of the use of thou in this text. The story concerns the encounters of characters from various levels of society in one day at Bartholemew Fair. Gentlemen, ladies, servants, traders and pickpockets generally
exchange unmarked you. Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, a Puritan, addresses everyone as you and even the tapster, the character to whom the general usage thou survives longer than that for any other in the CED texts is addressed in this text as you.

Knockhum, a horse dealer, consistently addresses Ursula, a pig-woman, as thou. This seems to connote familiarity, as he also addresses her as Urs and, when she is injured, as Ursa Major, offering to look after her booth while:

Knockhum: thou shalt sit i' thy chaire, and giue directions, and shine Vrsa maior.

Ursula addresses him and all of the other characters as you, even when this collocates with abuse to Moon-Calf, her tapster:

Ursula: Why, you thinne leane Polcat you, ... what did you know Vermine ... you Weasell?

and to Quarlous, the companion of Win-Wife, a gentleman:

Ursula: you Rascall, out you Rogue, you hedge bird, you Pimpe, you pannier-mans bastard, you ... Doe you sneere, you dogs-head, you Trendle tayle! 83

There is some use of thou with negative affect. Captain Whit, a bawd, importuning Win-Wife:

Captain Whit: gi' me ty twelpence from thee, is told:

Win-Wife: Why, there's twelpence, pray thee wilt thou be gone?

though Quarlous tells him:

Quarlous: Get you gone, Rascall.

Cokes' use of thou to Grace Welborn, his betrothed, seems to connote affection. Discovering his purse has been stolen, he tells her:

Cokes: I ha' gold left to gi' thee a fayring, yet, as hard as the world goes

83 OED a dog with a curly tail; a low-bred dog, a cur. Applied contemptuously to a person.
When Coke has a second purse stolen by Edgworth, the cutpurse, working in collusion with Nightingale, the singer, who distracts their victim, they contrive to deflect suspicion with Edgworth’s apparent disparagement of Nightingale’s plea:

Nightingale: I hope you suspect not me, Sir.

Edgworth: Thee? that were a jest indeede! Dost thou thinke the Gentleman is foolish? where hadst thou hands, I pray thee? Away Asse, away.

This is a fine example of dramatic irony.84 Other characters who have thou as unmarked usage are Captain Whit, a bawd and Stage Irishman, and Justice Overdo who assumes the disguise of a preacher in order to uncover any wrong-doing at the fair. Since these are both comic characters, this suggests that thou was perceived as marked usage by this time.

Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Quarlous encourages his friend, Win-Wife, in pursuit of the widow, Dame Purecraft:

Quarlous: Now were a fine time for thee, Win-wife, to lay aboard thy widow, thou'lt neuer be Master of a better season, or place;

Win-Wife expresses reluctance to act hastily. Quarlous replies that he would not hesitate and the pragmatic marker but introduces a distancing as he contrasts their approaches:

Quarlous: ... But you are a modest vndertaker, by circumstances, and degrees;

then the second pragmatic marker come introduces a rapprochement, as he offers advice,

come, 'tis Disease in thee, not Judgement, I should offer at all together.

Quarlous changes the address term according to his stance as he expresses advice, opinion then advice.

84 Whereby the audience perceives the irony of the situation before the characters do. (Wales 2001:225)
Cokes generally addresses Humphrey Waspe, his servant, with the diminutive Numpes, collocating with *thou*. He placates Numpes who makes a sarcastic remark over Cokes’ concern that Numpes will lose some of the goods he has been set to guard:

*Cokes*: Good honest Numpes, keepe afore, I am so afraid *thou*’lt lose somewhat: my heart was at my mouth, when I mist *thee*.

*Waspe*: You were best buy a whip i’ your hand to driue me.

*Cokes*: Nay, doe not mistake, Numps, *thou* art so apt to mistake: I would but watch the goods. Looke *you* now, the treble fiddle, was e’en[^85] almost like to be lost.

His switch to *you* connotes a switch from a stative (*art*) to an imperative dynamic verb[^86] (*looke*) and thus a change of stance.

Negotiating with Trash, the gingerbread woman and Leatherhead, the hobby horse seller, for provisions for his wedding, Cokes tells Trash:

*Cokes*: I’le buy vp his shop, and thy basket.

He is impressed to hear that Leatherhead ‘makes all the Puppets i’ the Fayre,’ addressing him with an appreciative *thou* and taking his hand. He switches his previous usage to Trash, possibly indicating a reorientation away from Leatherhead:

*Cokes*: Do’st thou (in troth) old veluet lerkin? giue mee thy hand.

... *Thy* shop shall furnish out the Masque, and hers the Banquet

... what’s the price, at a word, o’ *thy* whole shop?

>Leatherhead

... **And** what comes *yours* too?

>Trash

Quarlous has previously addressed Waspe as *you*. His switch to *thou* when assuring Waspe that he is believed is an expression of affinity.

*Waspe*: Is there a vexation like this, Gentlemen?

will *you* beleeue mee now, hereafter?

shall I haue credit with *you*?

[^85]: OED 'just now'.

[^86]: I investigated the possibility of a relationship between stative and dynamic verbs and *thou*/*you* but did not find enough evidence to support this.
Quarlous: Yes faith, shalt thou, Numps, and thou art worthy on't, for thou sweatest for't.

Cokes’ unmarked usage to Humphrey Waspe, his man, is thou. A switch to you seems to connote the distancing of reproach in response to Waspe’s warning that a public performance of ballad singing will lead to the audience’s pockets being picked:

Waspe: Yet these will serue to picke the pictures out o' your pockets, you shall see
Cokes: Good i' faith, how say you, Numps? Is there any harme i' this?

Then Cokes becomes conciliatory:

Cokes: yet, o' thy conscience, Numps, speake, is there any harme i' this?

Waspe is concerned that Cokes’ constant revealing and concealing of his purse is a provocation to potential pickpockets.

Cokes: Looke you Sister, heere, heere, where is't now? which pocket is't in? for a wager?

Stop gambling with fate warns Waspe and let Nightingale finish singing his ballad:

Waspe: I beseech you leaue your wagers, and let him end his matter, an't may be.

Cokes’ switch back to you appears to be a sarcastic and distancing comment on Waspe’s warning:

Cokes: O, are you aedified Numps?

On discovering his purse has gone Cokes’ panic is calmed by the suspicion that Waspe may be safeguarding it:

Waspe: Come, doe not make a stirre, and cry your selfe an Asse, thorow the Fayre afore your time.

Cokes: Why, hast thou it, Numpes?

A switch from unmarked thou to you connotes esteem in Coke’s expression of relief:

good Numpes, how come you by it? I mar'le!
There are two social ranks in this text: the middling sort comprising gentlemen, gentlemen’s wives and adult children, a country justice, a physician and a parson; and the lower orders of servants and the host of the inn. Unmarked usage for the higher social group is exchange of *you*. Most of the lower orders also use reciprocal *you*. An exception is Pistol, Bardolph and Nym, Falstaff’s followers, who habitually address each other as *thou*. Most of the upper rank address the servants as *you*, the exception being Fenton, a young gentleman, who addresses Mistress Quickly, servant to Doctor Caius, as *thou*. This seems to be status-related, since it collocates with *good woman* in contrast to the term *gentlewoman* applied to Anne Page.

Fenton: How now good woman how dost *thou*?

Falstaff’s page introduces Mistress Page to him in these terms:

Robin: Sir, here’s a woman would speake with *you*.

and he greets her in a term appropriate to her status:

Falstaff: Good-morrow, good-wife
... ile vouchsafe *thee* the hearing.

Of the married pairs Mistress Page addresses her husband as *you*, whereas Mistress Ford’s exchange with her husband seems first to connote positive affect and then negative as she responds to his rebuke:

Mistress Ford: How now sweet Frank why art *thou* melancholy?
Mistress Ford: Faith, *thou* hast some crochets⁸⁷ in *thy* head,

The one speaker who defies social convention is the host of the inn who radiates bonhomie and addresses everyone as *thou* frequently in collocation with *bully*⁸⁸ or *bully-rooke*,⁸⁹ greeting Page thus:

---

⁸⁷ OED a whimsical fancy; a perverse conceit.
⁸⁸ OED a term of endearment ans familiarity, implying friendly admiration: a good friend, fine fellow, ‘gallant’.
⁸⁹ OED jolly comrade, boon companion.
Host: How now Bully-Rooke: *thou'rt* a Gentleman.

Sir John Falstaff addresses his followers as *thou*, not as an expression of superior social status, rather as a sign of camaraderie as they are partners in crime with Sir John sharing the proceeds of their thefts and protecting them when they are accused.

Falstaff: Goe, beare *thou* this Letter to Mistris Page; and *thou* this to Mistris Ford: we will thriue Lads we will thriue

Sir John’s followers reciprocate this usage, which in their case seems to connote negative affect, as they complain to him:

Pistol: Didst not *thou* share? hadst *thou* not fifteene pence?

and about him:

Pistol: Let Vultures gripe *thy* guts:
... Base Phrygian Turke

Mistress Quickly, servant to Dr Caius, uses *pray thee* to John Rugby, her fellow servant, then in the same utterance addresses him as *you*.

Mistress Quickly: What, Iohn Rugby, I pray thee goe to the Casement, and see if *you* can see my Master,
Master Docter Caius comming:

This raises the interesting question, which is beyond the scope of this investigation, of the correlation of *pray thee, pri’thee*, and *pray you* with *thou* and *you*. It may be that Mistress Quickly’s unmarked usage is *you* both up and down the social scale, since she addresses an unknown servant as *you*:

Mistress Quickly: Peter Simple, *you* say *your* name is?
... And Master Slender’s *your* Master?

and subsequently uses *pray you* to this servant:

Mistress Quickly: Peace, I pray *you*.

It may be that Peter Simple, unlike John Rugby, is unknown to her or that she does not distinguish between *pray thee* and *pray you*. 
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Mistress Page and Mistress Ford exchange you. When Mistress Ford encounters an angry Mistress Page just after she has read a love-letter sent to her by Falstaff, she tells Mistress Page:

Mistress Ford: If I would but goe to hell, for an eternall moment, or so: I could be knighted.

To which Mistress Page replies:

Mistress Page: What thou liest? Sir Alice Ford? 
these Knights will hacke, ⁹⁰ and so thou shouldst not alter the article of thy Gentry.

The OED does not offer a satisfactory explanation for the expression ‘these knights will hack’ but it certainly seems to be a pun: the article of Alice Ford’s gentry being Mistress, which should not be hacked off and replaced with Sir. Mistress Page is making a joke, which licenses the less formal thou. As a question, ‘thou liest’, is not an accusation but an expression of incredulity. Mistress Ford is still concerned and dismisses this levity:

Mistress Ford: Wee burne day-light: heere, read, read:
proferring the letter to Mistress Page in explanation:

Mistress Ford: Did you euer heare the like?

but Mistress Page consoles her using thou to express sympathy:

Mistress Page: to thy great comfort in this mystery of ill opinions, heere’s the twyn-brother of thy Letter.

When Pistol, having refused to deliver Falstaff’s letter, attempts to borrow money from him, Falstaff distances himself and switches from his unmarked use of thou, addressing his former honest lad with formal you and Sir:

Falstaff: I will not lends thee a penny.
... Not a penny: I haue beene content Sir, you should lay my countenance to pawne: I haue grated

⁹⁰ OED The sense of hack in SHAKES. Merry W. II. i. 52, ‘These knights will hack’ is doubtful. The senses, To be common or vulgar; to turn prostitute; to have to do with prostitutes; and ‘to become vile and vulgar (Johnson and Nares), have been suggested; but the history and chronology of this verb, and of the n. whence it is derived, appear to make these impossible.
vpon my good friends for three Repreeuues for you,
and your Coach-fellow Nim;

He switches back to thou marking a turn in the discourse to recount a specific instance:

... And when Mistresse Briget lost the handle of her Fan,
I took't vpon mine honour thou hadst it not.

To Pistol’s protest that Falstaff also benefitted, he instructs him to think:

Falstaff: Reason, you roague, reason:

specifically:

thinkst thou Ile endanger my soule, gratis?

Then Falstaff reorientates the topic.

With reference to our relationship:

at a word, hang no more about mee,
I am no gibbet for you: goe, a short knife,
and a throng, to your Mannor of Pickt-hatch:
goe, you’ll not beare a Letter for mee you roague?
you stand vpon your honor:

this is how I must behave:

why, thou vnconfinable basenesse it is as much
as I can doe to keepe the termes of my hononor precise:

despite which, you will not deliver my letter:
and yet, you Rogue, will en-sconce your raggs; your
Cat-a-Mountaine-lookes, your red-lattice phrases, and your
bold-beating-oathes, vnder the shelter of your honor? you
will not doe it? you?

Thus his address terms switch according to the focus of his utterance.

When Falstaff hears the subject of Mistress Quickly’s message, his address to her switches from the use of thou that he had considered appropriate to her status when she was introduced as a woman to the you appropriate to her status as a messenger from Mistress Ford:

Mistress Quickly: There is one Mistresse Ford,
Sir I pray come a little neerer this waies:

Falstaff: Well, on; Mistresse Ford, you say.
but he reverts to *thou* as he gains the impression that Mistress Quickly is prepared to collude with him in arranging secret meeting for him with Mistress Ford and Mistress Page:

Falstaff: Farethee-well, commend mee to them both: there’s my purse, I am yet *thy* debter

There is a similar motivation for Falstaff’s usage switch to the disguised Master Ford, whom he had addressed as *you* whilst Ford (purporting to be Master Broome) revealed his plan for Falstaff to seduce Mistress Ford and warned him to avoid Master Ford. Here is collusion again and Falstaff adopts a tone of solidarity:

Falstaff: Master Broome, *thou* shalt know, I will predominate ouer the pezant, and *thou* shalt lye with his wife. Come to me soone at night:

The extract from *The Merry Wives of Windsor* text in the Corpus is from Folio 1 published in 1623. Since there is also a Quarto 1 version, which dates from 1602, I compared *thou*-usage in the two versions. I was concerned with contemporary language use not with authorship. The 1602 version is about half the length of the text in the CED, so there were additional tokens of *thou* in the 1623 Folio text but usage was remarkably consistent in the duplicated utterances. I discovered one variation that could be attributed to number reference. The host, who throughout both texts addresses everyone as *thou*, tells Doctor Caius (CED 1623 Folio) with reference to Sir Hugh Evans:

Host: Let him die: sheath *thy* impatience: throw cold water on *thy* Choller: goe about the fields with mee through Frogmore, I will bring *thee* where Mistris Anne Page is, at a Farm-house a Feasting: and *thou* shalt wooe her:

In the Quarto 1602 text this is:

*Host:* Let him die, but first sheth your impatience, Throw cold water on your collor, com go with me Through the fields to Frogmore, and Ile bring thee Where mistris An Page is a feasting at a farm house, And *thou* shalt wear hir cried game:

with ‘thy impatience’ and ‘thy choller’ as ‘your impatience’ and ‘your collor’. It seems very likely that this refers to both Doctor Caius and Sir Hugh, since this is marked usage for the host.
The other slight difference is in Mistress Page’s address to her husband. In the 1602 Q1 text this is:
Mistress Page: How now sweet hart, how dost thou?

and in the 1623 F1 text:

Mistress Ford addresses her husband as thou in both texts:
Mistress Ford: How now husband, how chaunce thou art so melancholy? (1602 Q1)
Mistress Ford: How now sweet Frank why art thou melancholy? (1623 F1)

In neither text does Master Ford greet his wife. In the 1602 Q1 text Master Page does not respond to his wife’s greeting but he greets Master Ford and Mistress Ford. In the 1623 F1 text Master Page first greets his wife:

Master Page: How now Meg?

and she responds:

There seems to be no change in the pragmatics of thou between the two texts.

1647 [3CTB] The Countrie Girle

Unmarked Usage

The five suitors of Lady Moseley, the young widow in this text, all address each other and her brother-in-law, Sir Robert Mallory, as you but are aware of their unequal social status. Master Rash, a mercer, tells one of his rivals, Sir Oliver:

Master Rash: Ile hope as much as I can, though you be a Knight; and I but an honest Citizen. A Mercer, is a Merchant, and will looke for good Ware, for his Money.

The sea captain, Captain Mullinex, tells Rash that his wealth does not buy him the necessary status to aspire to the hand of a lady. Despite this derogatory opinion, he addresses Rash as you:

Captain Mullinex: you have a great many Bags, and a great many buildings to sir. -- But, dare you for all that, presume in the way of Matrimonie, to looke so high as a Lady?
This form continues as he becomes more disparaging and dismisses the suggestion that Rash could possibly be his rival for Lady Moseley’s hand:

Rash: He that can purchase a Lordship --
Captain Mullinex: Thinks, he may purchase a Ladiship: -- you my Rivall? Can you fight sir?

The exception to this formal usage is Master Plush, a ‘fine gentleman of fashion’ and one of the suitors, described as being ‘a notable humorous Coxcomb’, i.e. a comic character and as such conventionally licensed to subvert unmarked usage. He addresses one of his rivals, Gregory Dwindle, who proclaims himself a gentleman but seems to be in somewhat straitened circumstances, his constant refrain being:

Gregory: an my Father wou’d but dye once!

The use of thou correlates with Plush’s impoliteness and reinforces the status of both as comic characters:

Plush: My name is Plush; Master my Title, and Sir, a Title, that may be.

Gregory: And my name is Gregory --

Plush: Fop: thy sound is out o’ season.

Plush is alone among the higher status characters in addressing Master William, Lady Moseley’s servant, as thou, which may imply inappropriate (and therefore comic) usage. Master William’s title indicates that he is not on the same social level as Barbara, the chambermaid, whom all the characters address as thou. There is an acute awareness of social status in this text. Captain Mullinex in response to Gregory’s claim to be a gentleman asks for proof of his status:

Captain Mullinex: Will your Armes beare you out in the Title?

Master William is dismissive of the chambermaid’s suspected pregnancy:

Master William: Come, thou mak’st such a Matter, of Nothing.
... Come, come, thou art, A Chamber-maid still;
-- And I prethee, whats this, but a work that belongs to the Chamber?

---

91 OED a fool, simpleton (obs); now, a foolish, conceited, showy person, vain of his accomplishments, appearance, or dress; a fop; ‘a superficial pretender to knowledge or accomplishments’. Plush fits this second definition.

92 OED a fool.
The implication being that, given her status, she should expect nothing else.

Lady Moseley’s brother-in-law, Sir Robert, favours Sir Oliver Bellingham to marry her, addressing him as:

Sir Robert: my Noble Sir. My Sir, of a thousand per annum.

and saying of the others:

Sir Robert: their Worships are hardly worth it.

Sir Oliver: Yet in a just proportion, to their merit.

Sir Robert: Yes, that’s just nothing: -- Hang e’m Gloworms,\(^93\) hang e’m.

The opinion of Master William, Lady Moseley’s servant, is that Rash, Plush and Gregory

Master William: together, They make up, a delicate motion.\(^94\)

Lady Mallory also sees them as objects of derision and potential entertainment, telling Lady Moseley, her grieving sister:

Lady Mallory: Why, their mirth -- will be a means to cure you.

Lady Moseley’s suitor, Sir Oliver Bellingham, addresses Plush with mock deference when Plush explains that having to wait at home for a new suit has made him late:

Sir Oliver: We heard of your Worships\(^95\) new Suit, and would not goe in before it.

Plush is unaware of the irony. The high social status characters make fun of the middling sort in formal expressions of politeness.

Sir Robert Mallory addresses his tenant’s son, Abraham, as thou indicative of the latter’s lowly social status, though this switches to you when inviting Abraham’s collusion in delivering a ring to Margaret, Sir Robert’s pretty tenant and Abraham’s sister:

\(^{93}\) OED in 17\(^{th}\) c. often applied contemptuously to persons.
\(^{94}\) OED a puppet-show.
\(^{95}\) OED with your or his: a title of honour, used in addressing or speaking of a person of note [but here applied ironically].
Sir Robert: Remember me to her by this.
Abraham: I am in hast Sir Robert.
Sir Robert: Take your own time good Abram.

Since *thou* to one of lowly social status is distancing, a switch to *you* is marked in indicating a deictic change not in comparative social status but in Sir Robert’s estimation of Abraham’s usefulness.

A further unmarked use of *thou* is that of Lady Moseley to the old gentlewoman, who addresses Lady Moseley as *you* and appears to be free to advise her. Sir Robert instructs the old gentlewoman:

Sir Robert: Peace, an *you* love your old Carkasse, -- peace.

Such impoliteness suggests that she does not have the status of a lady but the address term *you* implies a higher social status than that of the chambermaid. The old gentlewoman uses *pray* and *you* to her Mistress:

Old Gentlewoman: Come, come, pray. -- You are so melancholly.

Master William is described by Sir Robert as Lady Moseley’s *gentleman*, which implies that he may be of similar social status to the old gentlewoman. She uses *prethee* to him:

Goe, prethee bid e’m come,

as does the socially-superior Lady Mallory:

Prethee stay.

Master Plush, one of Lady Moseley’s suitors, is identified as a *fine gentleman of fashion*. The old gentlewoman addresses him as *you* in correlation with *pray*:

But I must speake to *you* sir; for *you* see she has other imployment, Pray, stand aside a little.

---

96 OED a female attendant (orig. a gentlewoman by birth) upon a lady of rank.
The phrase *old gentlewoman* in humorous or derisive sense is attested in 1699 in the OED but does not seem to apply with that sense here.
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Sir Oliver with his title and wealth is Sir Robert’s favoured suitor for his widowed sister-in-law. Sir Robert’s switch from you to thou denotes an invitation to collusion:

Sir Robert: You see Sir Oliver ...
as her Gentleman discreetly said,
A little time may change her: We must still
In such a kind humour a womans will.
But, she’s thine own, be bold on’t.

That is: this may be the current state of affairs but together we can change her mind.

The ladies persuade Barbara, the chambermaid, to disguise herself as Lady Moseley in order to fool the latter’s suitors. Sir Robert is angry that Plush, Rash and Dwindle have apparently been allowed access to Lady Moseley, while Sir Oliver has not:

Sir Robert: -- An ye were as heavy as Lead, ’twas but a light trick of you to deny Accesse to such a brave man as this is, and allow’t to such Mimicks as these are.

He switches his address term to the supposed Lady Moseley though in an apparent demonstration of sympathy with her continued mourning:

Sir Robert: Prethee look up a little; -- I can shew thee
A Glasse, shall shew thee better things;

eventually losing patience when ‘Lady Moseley’ appears unpersuaded and proposes to the titled, wealthy suitor that they collude in seeking a more willing conquest:

Sir Robert: come, I'le bring thee, though shee be mine owne
Madona's Sister, My Knight, of a thousand per annum,
to her betters: -- one that is younger, fairer, richer

On the discovery that Barbara, the chambermaid, has been masquerading as Lady Moseley, Sir Robert switches back to you in addressing Sir Oliver to discover his reaction. He is uncertain now of their relationship and withdraws slightly until he can discover whether Sir Oliver still intends to pursue Lady Moseley:

Sir Robert: My Lady Bab. -- How like you this Sir Oliver?

Throughout their long private conversation in which Sir Oliver Bellingham tries to persuade Lady Moseley to agree to marriage and declares the sincerity of his love,
they address each other as you. This contrasts with the comedy scene in which Barbara impersonates Lady Moseley. Barbara is apparently veiled. As she enters Rash exclaims:

Rash: Beautious Lady!

and Plush, not to be outdone:

Plush: Most beautious Lady!

Gregory is more pedantic:

Gregory: Most beautifull Lady, that may be:
for yet, I see no such matter.

Plush reacts to Gregory with thou and disdain and to ‘Lady Moseley’ with deference. Implied in the dialogue is his step forward with a hand outstretched to ‘Lady Moseley’s’ veil and a rapid retreat, presumably in response to the ‘Lady’s’ reaction.

Plush: Thine eyes are veyl’d with ignorance, or else,
Through this thin veile, thou might’st, as we, -- behold
Matter of admiration!
-- You'll vouchsafe; --
Not yet.

Babara: Alas: -- upon their Captive heart,
My sorrowes yet have set too strong a Guard
For such delights to enter.

Plush is not to be subdued for long, however, and switches to the conventional thou of wooing:

Plush: I could wish. That Conquerour of thy heart,
and all his Guard Were visible,
that I might challenge them.

A scene opens with Margaret, Old Thrashard’s pretty daughter, telling her father, who is Sir Robert Mallory’s tenant, of her fears concerning the attempts of an unidentified man to seduce her. Thrashard’s address terms to his daughter change as the identity of this would-be seducer is revealed:

Thrashard: And doest thou feare, -- thou shalt hold out no longer?
... Do I know him?
... How Sir Robert!
... He ayme against thy chastity? Alas.
Thrashard switches from listing Sir Robert’s bounty to his daughter:

Has he bestowed upon thine Infancie,
That care, and cost, that he has done? -- Maintain’d thee
Among his owne? -- Fed thee among his owne?

to contrast this with his daughter’s ingratitude:

-- And for this,
Is this the best you can returne him?
-- Nay, perchance
The merriment, that you interpret lust,
Was his meere love to vertue.

Thrashard tries to persuade Margaret, his daughter, that she has misinterpreted Sir Robert’s good intentions:

Thrashard: Tis my conceit, that all his talk, -- his
Letters, and all the gifts he sent thee, were impoyed,
Ith’ way of triall: -- Not to make thee naught;
But so to sound thy goodnesse.

When her brother Abraham enters with news of Sir Robert’s arrival and Margaret asks to leave, Thrashard loses his temper and distances himself from his daughter addressing her as you:

Thrashard: Come, y’are a Baggage; y’ar a foolish Baggage,
To injure with such frivolous suspicions,
A Gentleman of his repute, and goodnesse!
Come, let me heare no more on’t.

There is no evidence of Margaret’s utterance to her father that provoked the following reply but the structure of his reply introduced by the pragmatic marker why suggests that it constitutes a response and the switch of address term that it connotes positive affect in contrast with his previous usage.

Thrashard: Why, well said Girle, keepe but that resolution,
And let his purposes, be what they can,
They cannot hurt thee.

Thrashard concludes the topic with a return to an affectionate address to his daughter in which he expresses his concern that they must placate Sir Robert:
Thrashard: *Th'art a pertish* \(^97\) thing:
And -- I'm afraid, have beene distastfull to him:
I'm halfe afraid on't Girle: -- we must be wise;
By's frown we fall Wench; by his favours rise.

In the scene where Sir Robert attempts to seduce Margaret, she addresses him as *you* throughout and his address to her switches between *you* and *thou* as he attempts to persuade her. He begins by greeting Thrashard and Margaret:

Sir Robert: Good morrow Tennant; -- good morrow beautiful Tennant.

Thrashard and Abraham respond but Margaret does not.

Sir Robert acknowledges Abraham and prompts Margaret to respond, addressing her as *you*:

Sir Robert: My Tennant Abra'm! -- God-a-mercy good Tennant Abra'm.  
I want *your* welcome faire one.

Margaret: Sir, *you* are welcome.

This does not satisfy Sir Robert and he switches to the intimate *thou* in collocation with the hypocorism *Peggy*:

Sir Robert: Had this bin spoke, with smiles upon thy cheek,  
I durst have sworne the Syllables had beene  
The Language of *thy* heart; *thy* heart, sweet Peggy.  
What, still so adverse to my pleasure?

He dismisses Thrashard and Abraham and continues trying to cajole Margaret. His switch to a distancing *you* in the same utterance has the effect of a stage direction. *Thou* is the address term of persuasion here and, on receiving no response, it is as if Sir Robert turns away abruptly with a frown:

Sir Robert: Still, still this cloud upon *thy* brow sweet Peg?  
*You* know my minde.

Margaret: And *you* know mine Sir Robert.

It seems as though Sir Robert cannot believe that he has been rejected and he switches back to a wooing register as he seeks to explain himself:

---

\(^97\) OED of a person, esp. a young one, or one regarded as socially inferior: inpertinent or saucy in speech or manners.
Sir Robert: I meane, I love thee, my sweet Peggy.
Margaret: Doe you? -- Not halfe so well as I love you.

but the feelings Margaret goes on to describe are those of respect rather than love which angers Sir Robert, who reminds her of their relative social status:

Sir Robert: This is not that I look for: heark you Margaret; Your Father is my Tennant.

Since his previous use of thou and hypocorisims to address her has connoted emotional proximity and endearment, his subsequent switch to you has the negative affect of emotional distance. Sir Robert’s prior use of thou to Margaret’s brother, Abraham, and his subsequent switch to address him as you connoted a positive affect. Thou expressed the social distance between a landlord and his tenant’s son and the switch to you in collocation with positive epithets a narrowing of the distance caused by Abraham’s collusion in Sir Robert’s wooing of Margaret:

Abraham: You know who I meane, Sir Robert.
(reference to Gillian, his scolding sister)

Sir Robert: Thy scolding sister.
... And how does Margaret, my pretty Tennant?
... Remember me to her by this. -- (A Ring.)

Abraham: I am in hast Sir Robert.
Sir Robert: Take your own time good Abram.

Sir Robert adopts a progressively more hostile tone to Margaret. Not only does he continue to address her as you he now collocates this with abusive epithets:

Sir Robert: Nay, since you vrge it, let me tell you Minion,98 He’s not my Tennant, neither; but my Beadsman.99

The constant switches in his use of address terms seem to reflect the switches between his passion for her and his indignation at her rejection of him:

Sir Robert: Is’t not forgetfulnesse
When all the love, -- the tender cares, and cost,
That from thy Infancie, to this Ripe groweth,
I have bestowed upon you, cannot gaine me
Such a request as this is!

---
98 OED As a derogatory term (esp. as a form of address): slave, underling.
99 OED the term by which men used to designate or subscribe themselves in addressing their patrons and superiors, answering to our modern ‘humble servant’.
-- Come, prethee kis me. (Kis her.)
Why, God a mercy Peg; -- a'gen, a'gen;
... Lock me, once more, in thy embrace, and busse\textsuperscript{100} me,
And then. --

Herrick’s quotation cited in the OED definition of *busse* illustrates Sir Robert’s concept of Margaret: ‘we busse our wantons, but our wives we kisse.’

Their private dialogue concludes as Abraham enters. Sir Robert again collocates affectionate *thou* with the hypocorisms *Peg* and *Peggy* but his switch to *you* indicates that she is rejecting a gift. The pragmatic marker *Nay* connotes her physical withdrawal and his pursuit and his use of *you* a re-opening of the emotional distance between them:

Sir Robert: For this time Peg I'll leave thee. --
What, leave thee, and leave nothing with thee Wench?
Nay, that were foule play Peggy: there, -- Nay, take it.
Indeed *you* shall

Subsequently he addresses her as *thou* and in terms of affection:

Sir Robert: Musick? -- Rot on their fiddle, and their fiddle strings,
*Thou* art my Musick.
-- Do but remember me, as I shall *thee*;

\textbf{1653 [3BROME] A Mad Couple Well Match’d}

\textbf{Unmarked Usage}

The social mix of characters in this text is similar to that in the previous text but the use of address terms is more uniform with most characters exchanging *you* and only Saleware, a citizen, that is: a character of the middle rank, commonly addressing his wife as *thou*.

An adapted version of this play by Aphra Behn, *The Debauchee or The Credulous Cuckold* was published in 1677. The characters and the plot are the same. In this later version Saleware’s unmarked usage to his wife is *you*. An incident only

\textsuperscript{100} OED to kiss: \textbf{1648 HERRICK Hesper.} (1823) I. 266 Kissing and bussing differ both in this, We busse our wantons, but our wives we kisse.
referred to in the 1653 text is depicted in more detail in the 1677 text. In this Carlesse, Sir Thrivewell’s heir, enters ‘drunk, all loose, and without his perriwig’ and rouses Old Sim, his uncle’s butler. Carelesse uses unmarked thou to Sim and to Bess, the kitchen maid.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

Mistress Alicia Saleware is serving Bellamy, Lord Lovely’s steward, when her husband enters. He greets her with the singular form of the verb, then switches to the more formal you. This remark, although addressed to his wife, is also directed implicitly to Bellamy. Mistress Saleware is not given any new information and the use of you indicates that this remark is for public hearing.

Saleware: Ally how dost?  
Mr. Bellamy how ist?  
you must use Mr. Bellamy kindly my sweet Ally:  
hee is our noblest Lords most speciall favorite,  
and must finde all faire dealing here, as  
well when I am abroad as at home sweet heart.

Bellamy: You heare not mee complaine sir, fare you well  
(Exit)

After Bellamy’s exit Saleware resumes what appears to be his unmarked address to his wife:

Saleware: What an Affinego’s this! He might ha’ thank’d mee for my good words, though I meant him no good will, I hope thou hast overreach’d101 him indeed.

This is followed by a long exchange in which Mistress Saleware complains of having to work in her husband’s shop and to dress as a citizen’s wife. She addresses her husband as you. He placates her, addressing her as thou. He agrees that she may dress ‘as Courtly, or as Lady-like as thou pleasest,’ to which his wife replies that she is friends with him again and they agree that friend will be their ‘common compellation’. She tells him of her business success and he accepts her rebuke, addressing her as you as a concession to their equal status:

---

101 OED to gain an advantage over, get the better of, outdo.
Alicia: Then friend, let your shop be your own care for the rest of this day, I have some busines abroad.

Saleware: Whither sweet friend?

Alicia: Is that a friendly question?

Saleware: I am corrected friend, but will you not take a Man to wait upon you?

His closing comment on their exchange acknowledges the need to treat his wife as an equal:

Saleware: Sapientia mea mihi. A wity wife, with an imperious will, Being crost, findes meanes to crosse her Husband still; And Tradesmen that so match, must not with Gall Temper their wives, but sweetly by wit-all.

The 1677 text retains Salesware’s initial public and private address usage to his wife but omits the exchanges in which they negotiate the reciprocal use of the term friend. In the 1677 version this usage is a given:

Tom Saleware: Nay, now I am sure she’s pleas’d, she calls me Friend, she ever did so when she was in good humor

whereas the 1653 CED text implies a different motivation:

Saleware: friend it will sound daintily, especially when thou shalt appeare too gallant to be my Wife.

Carelesse, Sir Thrivewell’s nephew and heir, addresses Closet, Lady Thrivewell’s former nurse, as you, even when collating this with a derogatory term. ¹⁰²

Carelesse: I had rather see your Gibship¹⁰³ hang’d up with Polcatts in a Warren, and your sweet Lady with you, though I confesse that were some pitty.

His subsequent switch to thou, is possibly conciliatory, as he attempts to persuade the nurse that his exclamation, ‘Excellent,’ referred to the broth she had brought him and not to the doubt she expressed that his aunt would ever bear his uncle a child.

¹⁰² Lowe (Richard Brome Online) has this utterance as an aside in the edited Modern text. I consider that the explanation offered here for the pronoun switch applies, whether or not the nurse was intended to hear the comment.

¹⁰³ OED gib = a term of reproach, esp. for an old woman.
The nurse asks:

Nurse: Is that your love to your Aunt?

Carelesse tries to cover his mistake and addresses her as thou as he tries to extricate himself from the difficulty he has created:

Carelesse: Cannot all thy art, and her cost finde helpe for my Unkle, think'st thou, to get a child?
... Still thou mistak'st me Nurse
... And tell her if thou wilt, that I love her so well

This usage is reproduced in the 1677 version:

Carelesse: I had rather see you at the Devil, and your Charming Lady too;
—But, dost think there are no ways, Closett, to get my Aunt with Child?
... Canst not thou perswade her to her good?
... Nor do I care if thou tell'st my Aunt, how dearly I love her.

Carelesse’s anger with his servant Wat for delivering his wrongly-addressed letter, so that Phoebe, his whore, and Mistress Crostill, the rich vintner’s widow, receive each other’s letters containing a marriage proposal and an insulting rejection respectively results in a beating for Wat. The switch in address terms here seems to reflect the negative affect of Carelesse’s construction of Wat as a malicious rogue and the positive affect of his former perception of Wat when he behaved as ‘so good a Master’ towards him.

Carelesse: Thus sir – i'le give you demonstration,
you malicious Rogue,
you that conspirst with her to betray me,
so good a Master I have bee to thee,
and so good a friend to her, i'le recomence you both.

Carelesse seems to use you with negative affect in addressing Wat, asking him:

Carelesse: But what you Traitor you?

This continues as he continues to castigate and beat Wat:

Carelesse: I owe you somewhat for your last-nights absence,
too pernicious Villaine that kepst thy selfe out o' the way o' purpose that I should bee drunke, and abuse my self, and the house here all lay o' your absence, There's somewhat more for that. (Beats him.)
This episode is much briefer in the 1677 text and has Carelesse addressing Wat as you.

A comparison of the scene relating to the reading of the letter intended for Phoebe, the whore, but delivered in error to Mistress Crostill, the rich widow shows that Tom Saleware addresses his cousin Phoebe as thou in the 1653 CED text which becomes you in the 1677 version.

Tom Saleware (1653): weepe not, but hold up thy head Cuz, wee will not be dasht, nor basht relative in a good cause;

Tom Saleware (1677): hold up your head, Phebe, we'll not be dasht in a good Cause.

The style of the letters is much more opprobrious in the 1677 version in which thou collocates with terms of abuse. Tom Saveall, Sir Valentine’s steward, reads aloud the letter:

1653
In the first place you shall give mee leave to wonder at your impudence (though it be but in your dreames) to have a thought that I ever intended, or can be drawne by perswasion, force, or the power of witchcraft to marry you –
Secondly, I am to tell you, that I am warme in mine Unkles favour.

1677
Thou damnable impudent Woman, —hah, — how darest thou, tho but in thy Dreams, imagin I am, or can be so great a Coxcomb as to marry thee; a sin which thou art Damn'd for but believing.—
Dost thou not hear I am again establish’t in my Uncles favour

The earlier (CED) text is written in legalese, whereas the later text has a conversational style (for example the exclamation hah):

1653 you shall give mee leave to wonder at your impudence
1677 Thou damnable impudent Woman, - hah,

1653 to have a thought that I ever intended
1677 how darest thou ... imagin I am

1653 or can be drawne by perswasion, force, or the power of witchcraft
1677 or can be so great a Coxcomb as to
1653 I am to tell you
1677 Dost thou not hear

The earlier text is consistent in the use of you. The later text, which is structured more as a dialogue, answers the proposition that the writer is ‘or can be so great a Coxcomb as to marry thee’ with the pragmatic marker No that reorientates the topic and turns from abuse to advise the recipient how to proceed.

1653
Thirdly, and lastly, let mee advise you, since you are so hot upon Marriage, though I assure my selfe you love none but mee, (and I thanke you for’t) that you fraine or dissemble an affection to some one of the City, who is but comparative to your selfe in blood and fortune, and so you may make by-use of me as your friend, and have children like me, George Carelesse.

1677
No, therefore let me advise you, since you are so mad for a Husband, (tho I believe you love me, and only me,) marry a Blockhead, either in the City, or Country, that thinks there’s Joys in Marriage, and I may chance to be so kind to be your Friend, by the by; and so you may have Children, like Yours, (that way,) G. Careless

Lady Thrivewell is flustered at her nephew’s suggestion that she should bear him a child to provide his uncle with an heir, asking,

Lady Thrivewell: Is the man sound troe?
... Sound i’ your senses sir, I meane.
But is all this in earnest?

She finds his proposal difficult to believe and addresses him with distancing thou more in incredulity than opprobrium having previously addressed him as you when chastising him for his drunken assault on a chambermaid. Her fluctuating usage indicates her emotional turmoil:

Lady Thrivewell: Fie, fie, you doe but say so?
... Nay praythee George set me down a little.
... But praythee tell mee, dost thou not all this onely to trie me, or am I a Rogue thinke you, or wouldst thou seriously that thine own naturall Unkle, thy bountifull Patron, nay thy father on the matter, should suffer such a wrong, and done by us?
... Was ever such a Reprobate?
She reverts to you with a calm denial of Careless’ claim that her husband Cuckqueanes her.

... You speake not on your knowledge.

1669 [3CDRYDE] The Wild Gallant

Unmarked Usage

This is yet another text with titled characters, their followers or hangers-on, tradesmen and domestic servants. Master Loveby, the wild gallant, employs thou in addressing both Mistress Bibber, his landlady, and her husband to whom he owes rent. This may be an indicator of their social inferiority but Loveby’s own social status is indeterminate. He is loved by Lady Constance, daughter to Lord Nonsuch, who secretly supplies him with gold to finance his wooing of her. He has lost the fortune he once had but ‘keeps company with his betters; and commonly has Gold in’s pockets.’ His address to Bibber and his wife may reflect his attempt to ingratiate himself with them in an assumption of intimacy. He addresses Bibber as Will and Mistress Bibber as sweet Landlady but reveals his true opinion in an aside:

Loveby: (aside) -- Well Monsieur Bibber, from henceforward I'll keep my wit for more refin’d spirits; you shall be payd with dirt.

The unmarked usages of thou that do seem to connote comparative social status are those of Lady Constance, Lord Nonsuch’s daughter, to her cousin, Madam Isabella, who addresses Lady Constance as you. Lady Constance also addresses Setstone, the jeweller, as thou. She addresses the impoverished Loveby as you in collocation with the term servant. This apparently rather curt usage refers to his status as her suitor, so you is unmarked in this context.

Markedness & Markedness Reversal

The opening dialogue is between Failer and Burr who are identified as hangers-on of Sir Timirous, a bashful knight. They are joined by Bibber, the tailor. Their use of

104 OED 1749 H. Fielding Tom Jones III. VIII. ii. 157 [An unmarried young lady is referred to by servants and inferiors as ‘Madam Sophia’.]
105 OED A professed lover; one who is devoted to the service of a lady.
address terms switches throughout their exchanges. Initially Failer is disparaging about Burr’s appearance:

Failer: *thy* Doublet and Breeches are Guelphs and Ghibellins to one another; and the stiches of *thy* Doublet are so far asunder, that it seems to hang together by the Teeth.

Burr appears to accept this as banter:

Burr: *You* are very merry with *my* Wardrobe.

When a boy announces the arrival of the tailor, Failer continues in this bantering register but an aside addressed only to Burr adopts a more serious tone in which he switches to *you*. The switch in topic is indicated by the pragmatic marker **well, but**

Failer: – **Well, but** what think *you* of being put into a Suit of Cloaths, without Money? (aside)

Failer: Do *you* not know Will. Bibbers humor?

Burr: Prethee, *What* have I to do with his humor?

In his explanation Failer switches back to the more intimate address as he reveals the secret to Burr. The pragmatic marker **but** functions as the modern use *just, simply*:

Failer: Break **but** a Jest,\(^{106}\) and he'll beg to trust thee for a Suit;

In his reaction to this suggestion Burr’s switch from his previous address term to Failer indicates a change of stance, as his perception of Failer changes from *dear Heart* to *unreasonable Rogue*:

Failer: *Art thou* not ashamed to lie a Bed so long?

Burr: I may be more ashamed to rise; and so *you’l* say, *dear Heart*, if *you* look upon *my* Cloaths;

Burr interprets Failer’s suggestion as a joke. The emphatic predeterminer **what** functions as a pragmatic marker of this change:

Burr: Wit from a Low-Countrey-Soldier? One that has convers’d with none but dull Dutchmen these ten yeares! **What** an unreasonable Rogue art *thou? why, I tell thee,* 'tis as difficult to me, as to pay him ready Money.

\(^{106}\) Simply make a joke.
Failer’s response is a change from humour and intimacy to a didactic tone as he repeats his instruction to Burr to make a jest and encourages him:

Failer: *Come*, you shall be rul’d for your own good, Lie down; I'll throw the Cloaths over you to help Meditation; and, upon the first opportunity, start you up, and surprise him with a Jeast.

Later when Failer and Burr fight over the Lady Constance, Burr’s use of the epithet *Judas* in collocation with *you* and a kick is more deprecatory than his former bantering usage *unreasonable Rogue*, which collocated with *thou*:

Burr: go you Judas ! I'll teach you what 'tis to play fast and loose with a Man of War (Kickes him)

Bibber, the tailor, addresses Failer formally but there is an element of banter in his message, which Failer reciprocates in less formal terms, using Bibber’s first name:

Bibber: Morrow Mr. Failer: What, I warrant you think I come a Dunning now?

Failer: No, I vow to Gad, Will, I have a better opinion of thy Wit, than to think, thou would'st come to so little purpose.

He continues in a similar tone when Bibber declines his offer of ale:

Bibber: I had too much of that last night; I was a little disguis'd,107 as they say.

Failer pretends to misinterpret this and their comparative status seems to licence his derogatory reply, moving from the friendly *thou Will* to the less friendly *thou Bibber*. Bibber does not react, nor does he reciprocate. This implies Bibber’s acknowledgement of his lower social status:

Failer: Why disguis'd? Hadst thou put on a clean Band, or but change of address wash’d thy Face lately? those are thy Disguises, Bibber.

After the banter, Failer begins to discuss business explaining that Burr wants the tailor to make him a suit of clothes on credit. This change of topic involves a switch of usage and a switch of persona to *you*, the tailor, from *thou*, the butt of the banter:

---

107 OED intoxicated; drunk, tipsy.
Failer: This Porter brings sad Newes to you Will, 
you must trust him for a suit of Cloathes, as bad as 'tis:

Failer reverts to banter as the conversation closes, resuming the informal address and implying that Bibber is anxious for his morning tipple:

Failer: *come* Bibber; I see *thou* longest to be at *thy* mornings watering.

This usage is repeated when Bibber appears with a bottle in his hand, indicating that business is conducted in a formal register, whereas Failer collocates informal, proximal usage with banter:

Bibber: By this hand, I have a light upon the best wine in your Cousins Cellar, drink but one glass to me, to shew I am welcome, and I am gone.

Failer: Here then, honest Will. 'tis a cup of forbearance to thee. 
... Why, I drank that to *thee* Will. that *thou* shouldst forbear *thy* money.

The relationship that Master Loveby, the wild gallant, has with Bibber, the tailor, is similar to Failer’s. Both address him with apparently good-humoured banter but his lowly social status does not permit him to return this. Indeed, Bibber seems to be a complaisant cuckold, or wittol, since in response to his wife’s complaint that Loveby had used her, he remarks:

Bibber: Has he us'd *you* Frances; put so much more into his Bill for Lodging.

Loveby’s reaction is to patronise Bibber with the hypocoristic *little*:

Loveby: Honest Will, and so he dy'd; I thank *thee* little Bibber, being sober, and when I am drunk, I will kiss *thee* for’t.

Their argument over the rent Loveby owes to Bibber becomes heated and Loveby switches to the distancing form *you* and to the further distancing formal title and occupation with no reference to Bibber’s name:

Loveby: Mr. Taylour, I shall turn the better Bill-man, and knock that little Coxcomb of *yours*, if *you* do not answer me what I owe *you*.

When first encountering Lady Constance and Madame Isabelle, Justice Trice addresses each of them as *you*:
Justice Trice: O you Rogue are you there? you are welcome huswife,\textsuperscript{108} and so are you Constance, (\textsuperscript{^fa tol de re tol de re la^}) .
(Claps their backs)

He continues to use you but, although he addresses Lady Constance, it is not apparent if he refers to her alone or if he includes Madame Isaballe in his invitation. I have, therefore, ignored switches that could be explained linguistically as reference to number,\textsuperscript{109} such as:

Justice Trice: Huswife Constance, I'll have you into my Larder, and shew you my provision:

As the interlocutors are being ushered in to dinner, it is conceivable that Trice takes Constance by the arm and speaks to her alone.

... I have a delicate dish of Ruffs\textsuperscript{110} to dinner Sirrah.
... To dinner! why by supper they had been past their prime, I'll tell thee a story of u'm: I have a friend. --

Then, having been interrupted, he resumes the narration of his story to the general company.

... Well, well; I have a friend as I told you

In a later dialogue Trice and Constance exchange bantering abuse whilst addressing each other as you:

Justice Trice: Come you little Harlotry,\textsuperscript{111} What satisfaction can you give me for running away before the Ruffs came in?

Lady Constance: Why I left you to u'm, that ever invite your own belly to the greatest part of all your feasts.

Justice Trice: I have brought you a Knight here Huswife, with a plentiful Fortune to furnish out a Table; and, What would you more? Would you be an angel in Heaven?

Then he switches topic and address, as if to say ‘enough of this abuse/banter’, what is your answer to my serious question, ‘will you marry Sir Timirous’:

\textsuperscript{108}OED a light, worthless, or pert woman or girl.
\textsuperscript{109}Similarly usage where you = one.
\textsuperscript{110}OED the male of a bird of the sandpiper family.
\textsuperscript{111}OED a harlot; a term of opprobrium for a woman.
... but, What say'st thou to Sir Timorous, little Constance?

That the exchange is banter and not abuse is indicated by his switch of epithets from Harlotry and Huswife to the affectionate little Constance. That Constance has regarded this as banter is indicated by her laughter:

Lady Constance: Would you have me married to that King Midas Face? ... Come on Sir; What's your will with me? (Laughs)

1675 [3CWYCHE] The Country Wife

Unmarked Usage

The characters in this text are all of a similar social status. There is a group of friends, Master Harcourt and Master Dorilant, London gallants, and their friend Master Horner who has just returned from Paris and has devised a scheme to enable him to cuckold the husbands of respectable married ladies. He spreads a rumour that he is impotent in the hope that husbands will permit him to socialise freely with their wives. Unmarked address within this group is you. The exception is Master Sparkish, an outsider, who frequently addresses the members of the group as thou and sees himself as a wit and as part of the group:

Sparkish: ... a wit to me is the greatest title in the World

Sparkish is a figure of fun whose use of thou to the three friends seems inappropriate and over-familiar, as their disparaging assessment of him indicates:

Harcourt: What, my dear Friend! a Rogue that is fond of me, only I think for abusing him

Dorilant: No, he can no more think the Men laugh at him, than that Women jilt him, his opinion of himself is so good.

Horner: 'tis a very hard thing to be rid of him, for he's one of those nauseous offerers at wit, who like the worst Fidlers run themselves into all Companies.

The newly-married Mistress Pinchwife greets her husband as thou as does Sir Jasper Fidget his wife but in general thou is marked usage in this text.
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

In Act I prior to the CED extract the newly-married Master Pinchwife tries to hide the fact of his marriage from the friends, convinced that they will try to seduce his wife. Horner greets him with good-humoured banter:

Horner: Well, Jack, by thy long absence from the Town, the grumness of thy countenance, and the slovenliness of thy habit; I shou’d give thee joy, shoud’ I not, of Marriage? ... the next thing that is to be heard, is thou’rt a Cuckold.

Pinchwife dissembles and tries to leave:

Horner: Nay, prethee stay.
Pinchwife: I cannot, I will not.

At which Horner switches from banter with the directive come functioning as a pragmatic marker.
Horner: Come you shall dine with us.

When Pinchwife offers an excuse, Horner switches back in a gesture of rapprochement. It is as though he acknowledges that they have gone too far with their raillery.

Pinchwife: I have din’d already.

Horner: Come, I know thou hast not; I’ll treat thee dear Rogue, thou sha’t spend none of thy Hampshire Money today.

Then there is a further switch functioning almost as a stage direction indicating Horner’s movement towards Pinchwife and a restraining hand as he tries to prevent his leaving.

Horner: ... Nay, you shall not go.

The young Mistress Pinchwife, newly-married to a jealous husband, greets him affectionately but thereafter switches to you when it appears that he is angry with her:

Mistrss Pinchwife: Oh my dear, dear Bud, welcome home; why dost thou look so fropish, who has nanger’d thee?

---

112 OED gloominess
113 OED a term of endearment.
114 OED froward, fretful, peevious.
Pinchwife’s unmarked address to his young wife is you. He guards her jealously from the attentions of the ‘men of scandalous reputations’, telling her, when she has expressed a desire to ‘go a walking’:

Mr. Pinchwife: Your a Fool. (Mrs. Pinch goes aside, & cryes)

and berating his sister for supporting her:

Mr. Pinchwife: What you wou'd have her as impudent as your self, as errant a Jilfirt, a gadder, a Magpy, and to say all a meer notorious Town-Woman?

This invective in collocation with you implies that thou is no longer a necessary feature to connote disparagement.

Pinchwife fluctuates between chastising and cajoling his seemingly naive wife as she admits to liking the ‘player men’.

Master Pinchwife: Nay, if she be so innocent as to own to me her liking them, there is no hurt in't -- (Aside) Come my poor Rogue, but thou lik'st none better then me?

She is a poor Rogue because of her apparent innocence and Pinchwife’s use of thou seems condescending whilst offering rapprochement but Mistress Pinchwife seems oblivious to possible danger:

Mistress Pinchwife: Yes indeed, but I do, the Player Men are finer Folks.

Her husband reorientates the topic and switches to a more serious question with more formal address:

Master Pinchwife: But you love none better then me?

The guileless Mistress Pinchwife evades the question:

Mistress: You are mine own Dear Bud, and I know you, I hate a Stranger.

He directs her:

115 OED a young woman or girl of a wanton or giddy character.
116 OED one who gads [to rove idly].
117 OED an idle or impertinent chatterer.
118 OED a prostitute.
Mr. Pinchwife: Ay, my Dear, you must love me only, and not be like the naughty Town Women, who only hate their Husbands,

then ultimately switches to cajoling her with the pragmatic marker come inviting her to change her stance as his stance changes with his proximal address thou ...

Dearest:

Mr. Pinchwife: Come, be not melancholly, for thou sha't go into the Country after to morrow, Dearest.

A further switch to thou similarly connotes affection and compassion over Mistress Pinchwife’s naive dismissal of his fear of jealousy.

Mr Pinchwife: ... that which is worse than the Plague, Jealousy.

Mrs. Pinchwife: Pish, you jear, I'm sure there's no such disease in our Receipt-book at home.

Mr. Pinchwife: No, thou never met'st with it, poor Innocent -- well, if thou Cuckold me, 'twill be my own fault -- for Cuckolds and Bastards, are generally makers of their own fortune. (Aside)

Mistress Pinchwife is more concerned with entertainment:

Mrs. Pinchwife: Well, but pray Bud, let's go to a Play to night.

Pinchwife notes his wife’s change of topic and he changes his stance from regarding his wife as an innocent ingenue whom he has unjustly maligned to seeing her as a devious plotter planning to cuckold him. He switches to you again and introduces a topic change with the pragmatic marker but:

Mr. Pinchwife: 'Tis just done, she comes from it; but why are you so eager to see a Play?

and their exchange concludes with his switch back to thou introduced by the directive come functioning as a pragmatic marker as he addresses her like a child with the promise of a reward for good behaviour:

Mr. Pinchwife: Come have a little patience, and thou shalt go into the Country on Friday

In their ensuing exchanges Mistress Pinchwife remains curious about plays and “player men” and Master Pinchwife becomes progressively more angry, addressing her as Mrs Minx, telling her ‘hold your peace’, and ‘you lye.’ Finally, on the
entrance of Sparkish and Harcourt, he hurries to hide her from them and addresses her with the opprobrious term *baggage*:

Master Pinchwife: In baggage,\textsuperscript{119} in. (Thrusts her in: shuts the door)

At no point do they resume the use of *thou*, which for them had seemed to connote affection.

Horner responds with banter to Dorilant’s claim:

Dorilant: But I wou’d no more Sup with Women, unless I cou’d lye with’em, than Sup with a rich Coxcomb, unless I cou’d cheat him

then switches and reorientates to comment on the circumstances of Dorilant’s drinking with a fool:

Horner: Yes, I have known thee Sup with a Fool, for his drinking, if he cou’d set out your hand that way only, you were satisfy’d; and if he were a Wine-swallowing mouth ’twas enough

Horner has a similar switch in topic reorientation in a comment to Sparkish:

Horner: but hast thou a Mistriss, Sparkish? ’tis as hard for me to believe it, as that thou ever hadst a buble, as you brag’d just now.

Sparkish: O your Servant, Sir; are you at your raillery, Sir?

This uncertainty on the part of Sparkish reflects the greater social distance that exists between him and the rest of the group. He seems insensitive to the nuances of their banter. Just as Sparkish enters, Harcourt confesses to the others that he is in love with Sparkish’s mistress, Alithea. He is concerned that Spar

\textsuperscript{119} OED a worthless good-for nothing woman; a woman of disreputable or immoral life, a strumpet.
Harcourt: I make love to her?

Sparkish: Nay, I forgive thee; for I think I know thee, and I know her, but I am sure I know my self.

Harcourt attempts to ingratiate himself with Sparkish in the hope that the latter can further his wooing of Sparkish’s mistress. Having previously addressed Sparkish as thou in annoyance that Sparkish is more anxious to attend the king’s supper than to reconcile him with Alithea:

Harcourt: thou art one of those Fools, that think their attendance at the King’s Meals, as necessary as his Physicians,

Harcourt switches to more formal address:

Harcourt: Come, Sparkish, your Mistriss saw you, and will be angry you go not to her; besides I wou’d fain be reconcil’d to her, which none but you can do, dear Friend.

Sparkish reciprocates this usage switching to thou in the elaboration of the first sequence of his utterance introduced by the pragmatic marker for

Sparkish: Well that’s a better reason, dear Friend; I wou’d not go near her now, for her’s, or my own sake, but I can deny you nothing; for though I have known thee a great while, never go, if I do not love thee, as well as a new Acquaintance.

Harcourt responds formally and politely. Their repetition of dear Friend gives a tone of effusive formality and politeness. Harcourt employs the more intimate form of address to Sparkish in explaining that his desire to be reconciled with Alithea is a means to retain his friendship with Sparkish, and then switches back to you as he reorientates the topic back to Alithea:

Harcourt: I am oblig’d to you indeed, dear Friend,
I wou’d be well with her only, to be well with thee still;
for these tyes to Wives usually dissolve all tyes to Friends:
I wou’d be contented, she shou’d enjoy you a nights, but wou’d have you to me self a dayes, as I have had, dear Friend.

Sparkish resorts to hyperbole and use of thou to express his deep friendship:

Sparkish: And thou shalt enjoy me a dayes, dear, dear Friend, never stir; and I’ll be divorced from her, sooner than from thee; come along --

Sparkish introduces Harcourt to Alithea, his betrothed:
Sparkish: Here Harcourt, do you approve my choice?

Harcourt salutes Alithea but does not immediately reply to Sparkish, who repeats his question addressing Harcourt as thou as a sign of affinity thus imposing a greater obligation on Harcourt to respond:

Sparkish: Harcourt how dost thou like her, Faith?
Sparkish: Tell me, I say, Harcourt, how dost thou like her?
thou hast star'd upon her enough, to resolve me

When Alithea attributes Harcourt’s eventual expression of admiration to raillery, Sparkish assures her that ‘he does not railly now’ and switches to address him as you after attributing to him the status of the honestest, worthyest, true hearted Gentleman:

Sparkish: Nay, I gad, I am sure you do admire her extremely,
I see’t in your eyes.

When Harcourt reveals to Alithea that he would prevent her marriage to Sparkish if he could, Sparkish interprets this as Harcourt’s regret at the loss of a friend and in seeking to console him switches to expressions of solidarity in address, dear Franck, thou dear Rogue, and in categorisation, we Men of wit:

Sparkish: Come dear Franck, for all my Wife there that shall be, thou shalt enjoy me sometimes dear Rogue:
by my honour, we Men of wit condole for our deceased Brother in Marriage, as much as for one dead in earnest:

A further expression of solidarity is his concluding appeal for approbation:

Sparkish: I think that was prettily said of me, ha Harcourt?

In struggling to prevent Pinchwife interrupting Harcourt’s private conversation with Alithea, Sparkish’s switch of address term seems to function deictically to indicate an affective distancing accompanying a physical approach to Pinchwife to struggle with him:

Sparkish: Nay, you shall not disturb’em; I'll vex thee, by the World.
(Struggles with) Pinch. (to keep him from) Harc. (and) Alith.
Another exchange involves the titled characters Sir Jasper and Lady Fidget. Sir Jasper greets his wife as *thou* and *dear* when addressing her in the persona of his wife and speaking to her privately but switches publicly to the formal *your Ladyship* and *Madam* when chastising her for her use of abusive language to Horner. In stating her social status, he implies that such usage is inappropriate in a lady.

Sir Jasper: Ay, my dear, dear of honour, *thou* hast still so much honour in thy mouth --

Sir Jasper: Nay, prethee Dear, hear me. [Whispers to Lady Fid.]

Sir Jasper: Hold, an't please your Ladyship;  
... Hark *you*, Madam, take my advice in *your* anger;  
*you* know *you* often want one to make up *your* droling pack of hombre Players;

Sir Jasper’s switch in address to Horner is possibly part of his declared strategy ‘to mollify, to wheedle him’. When Horner seems surprised at Sir Jasper’s offered hospitality, Sir Jasper changes his offer into a request, thus reducing and even reversing the social distance between them, so that *you* becomes *thou*.

Sir Jasper: since *you* are unprovided of a Lady to flatter, and a good house to eat at, pray frequent mine, and call my Wife Mistriss, and she shall call *you* Gallant, according to the custom.

Horne: Who I? –

Sir Jasper: **Faith**, *thou* sha’t for my sake, come for my sake only.

Harcourt contrives to declare his love to Alithea in the presence of her betrothed, Sparkish, with ambiguous opprobrious references to some unspecified person she should not marry. Alithea is aware that the references are to Sparkish and protests, but Sparkish himself protests at Alithea’s apparent misinterpretation. This leads to switches in the address terms Sparkish employs to his ‘friend’ Harcourt. The stage direction in the following exchange by which Harcourt demonstrates his reference to ‘so unworthy and inconsiderable a thing’ by clapping his hand to his own breast whilst pointing to Sparkish is just one example of the confusing ambiguities of reference in this scene. Sparkish is startled by Harcourt’s outright declaration of love to Alithea but is persuaded by Harcourt’s explanation, interpreting it according to his preconceived construction of Harcourt as his friend.
Harcourt: I love *you*, Madam, so --
Sparkish: How's that! Nay -- now *you* begin to go too far indeed.
Harcourt: So much I confess, I say I love *you*, that I wou'd
not have *you* miserable, and cast *your* self away upon so
unworthy, and inconsiderable a thing, as what *you* see here,
(Clapping his hand on his breast, points at Sparkish.)

Sparkish: **No faith**, I believe *thou* wou'dst not, now his meaning is plain:
but I knew before *thou* wou'dst not wrong me nor her.

In a further attempt to persuade Alithea of her perceived mistake Sparkish puts a
direct question to Harcourt switching between the familiar address term to indicate
the formal nature of the question:

Sparkish: answer to *thy* Catechisme:
Friend, do *you* love my Mistriss here?

Harcourt: Yes, I wish she wou'd not doubt it.
Sparkish: But how do *you* love her?

Sparkish: **But** speak for *thy* self Harcourt,
*you* said *you* wou'd not wrong me, nor her.

There are two levels of discourse according to Harcourt’s dual persona: Sparkish
addresses his friend with the familiar address term and frames his questions as a
formal interrogation.

**1676 [3CETHER] The Man of Mode**

**Unmarked Usage**

There is little use of *thou* in this text, though gentlemen friends greet each other with
*thou*. These examples are from Act I and precede the CED extract:

Medley: Dorimant my Life, my Joy, my darling-Sin;¹²⁰
how Dost *thou*.
Dorimant: [Enter Bellair]
Dear Bellair, by Heavens
I thought we had lost *thee*;

An orange seller comments disapprovingly on the effusive nature of their greeting:

Orange Woman: Lord what a filthy trick these men have got of
Kissing one another!

---

¹²⁰ cf French *péché mignon* – darling sin = dearly loved, favourite, pet.
In the CED text Sir Fopling Flutter, a gentleman and the eponymous hero *the Man of Mode*, greets Dorimant as *thou*:

Sir Fopling Flutter: Dorimant, let me embrace *Thee*.

As his name implies, Sir Fopling is a comic character. This possibly accounts for his continued use of familiar address to Dorimant, who addresses Sir Fopling as *you*. Sir Fopling greets the others more formally:

Sir Fopling: (To Lady Townley) Madam, I *Kiss your Hands*,
(To Emilia, a gentlewoman) *Lady your servant*;

The other comic character is Old Bellair, brother to Lady Townley. His customary usage is *you* except to Emilia whom he addresses as *thou*:

Old Bellair: Neighbour, a Dod I am glad to see *thee here*,
(To Emilia) Make much of her Sister, she's one
Of the best of your acquaintance; I like her
Countenance and her behaviour well, she has
A Modesty that is not Common i'this Age, a Dod,
She has.

There is some usage to servants indicative of unequal social status:

in Act I
Dorimant: Leave your unnecessary fidling; a Wasp
That's buzzing about a Mans Nose at
Dinner, is not more troublesome than *thou* art.
(To Handy, his valet, who is fidling about him)

in the CED extract
Harriet, daughter to Lady Woodvil, to Busy, her waiting woman:

Harriet: How do I daily suffer under thy Officious Fingers?

Since other more opprobrious usage collocates with *you*, is is likely that *thou* in these examples is motivated by downward social usage.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

The comedy in Old Bellair’s character is in his relationship with Emilia, a young gentlewoman, of which the recurrent theme according to Emilia is:
Emilia: He calls me Rogue, tells me he can't abide me;  
And does so bepat me.

That Old Bellair sees himself as something of a rogue where young women are concerned is illustrated by his remark to his sister concerning Emilia’s attractions:

Old Bellair: I am but Five and Fifty Sister you know, an 
Age not altogether unsensible!

(To Emilia) 
cheer up sweet Heart;  
I have a secret to tell thee may 
Chance to make thee merry, we three will make 
Collation together anon, i’the mean time 
Mum,¹²¹ I can't abide you, go I can't 
Abide you –

(To Emilia) 
Remember Night, go y’are a Rogue, y’are a 
Rogue; fare you well, fare you well; 
come, come,

This switching of address terms to Emilia seems to constitute banter. His use of thou connotes the difference in their ages and his switch to you in collocation with apparent negative affect, ‘I can’t abide you ... y’are a Rogue’ is ironic. Partridge comments of elderly gentlemen that they are ‘moodily whimsical in their uses of the modes of address to children and servants’ (1969:25). This seems to apply also in their modes of address to young ladies.

Old Bellair’s favourite phrase is a Dod.¹²² He expresses appreciation and affinity when another young lady, Harriet, makes fun of this:

Old Bellair: Come! there is Love i'th' case, a dod there is, 
Or will be; what say you young Lady?

Harriet: All in good time Sir, you expect we should fall to, 
And Love as game-Cocks fight, as soon as we are set 
Together, a Dod y’are unreasonable!

Old Bellair: A Dod sirrah,¹²³ I like thy wit well.

¹²¹ OED ‘not a word!’
¹²² OED dial. or vulgar in asseverations, originally a deformation of God.
¹²³ OED a term of address used to men or boys, expressing contempt, reprimand or assumption of authority on the part of the speaker, sometimes employed less seriously in addressing children. Applied to women (seriously or in jest) – in this context appears to have positive connotation.
Old Bellair is apparently one of those waggish old gentlemen who consider that their age licenses bantering usage to young females.

One further example of switching is that of Harriet’s usage to Busy, her waiting woman, to whom her unmarked usage is *thou*. Since Harriet does not take particular care to respect Busy’s positive face, as this remark indicates:

Harriet: Hast *thou* so little wit to think I spoke what I meant

the motivation for the switch to *you* is not immediately apparent. The negative connotation of *prating* suggests that Harriet’s unmarked usage of *thou* to her maid, though seemingly disparaging, reflects only social status and that *you* in collocation with *prating* represents an intensification of this disparaging stance to Busy:

Harriet: Leave *your* prating, and sing some foolish Song or other.

1682 [4CSHADW] The Lancashire Witches

Unmarked Usage

Unmarked usage among the titled characters in this text is *you*. The exception is Sir Edward Hartford who greets Theodosia, Sir Jeffrey Shacklehead’s daughter, and Isabella, his own daughter as *thou*. He subsequently addresses Isabella as *you*, though this may reflect his disapproval at Isabella’s alleged mistreatment of Sir Jeffreys’ son, Sir Timothy, her intended husband:

Sir Edward: My sweet Cousin good Morrow to *thee*,
I hope to call *thee* shortly by another Name,  
[to Theodosia, his prospective daughter in law]  
my dear Child, Heaven's bless *thee*. [to Isabella, his daughter]  
(Isabella Kneels.)

Sir Edward: *You* would not use him, *you* intend to marry, ill. [to Isabella, his daughter]

Sir Timothy Shacklehead is described as: ‘a very pert, confident, simple Fellow, bred at Oxford, and the Inns of Court.’ His parents, Sir Jeffrey and Lady Shacklehead have arranged with Sir Edward Hartford that Sir Timothy should marry Sir Edward’s daughter, Isabella and that their daughter, Theodosia should marry Sir Edward’s son, Young Hartford. The daughters both oppose this arrangement, as their affections are engaged elsewhere.
The Priest is described in the *Drammatis Personae*\textsuperscript{124} as Tegue O Divelly, the Irish Priest, ‘an equal mixture of Fool and Knave.’ He is given some Irish dialect terms to identify him as Irish but the inconsistency of his phonetic rather than of his semantic usage suggest that his dialogue cannot be a faithful representation of an Irish dialect. He is a stage Irishman: *thou* may be rendered as *dou; thee* as *dee* and *thy* as *ty* or *dy*.

\textbf{Markedness & Markedness Reversal}

Isabella’s unmarked usage to Sir Timothy, her proposed husband, is *you* but the majority of her addresses to him collocate abusive epithets with *thou*:

Isabella: Sir Timothy, *you* are a Bloody-minded man.

Isabella: Why how now Dogs face, hast *thou* the Impudence to make love again, with that hideous Countenance? that very insipid silly Physnomy of thine?

... every motion of *thy* Body proclaims *thee* an Ass.

... Be gone *thou* Basilisk,

... Be gone, *thou* infinite Coxcomb, I'le set *thee* farther.

(She throws Stones at him.)

When her father chastises her and tells her that the marriage is arranged, Sir Timothy addresses Isabella formally:

Sir Timothy: *Do you* here that Gentlewoman –

but switches to a placatory *thou* once they are alone:

Sir Timothy: Dear Cousin, prethee be kinder to me,

I protest and vow, as I am a Christian, I love *the* better then both my Eyes, for all this.

He switches to a distancing *you* in response to her abuse, then apparently almost switches back at the emotive connotation of ‘to Morrow-night’ (their intended wedding night) but checks himself: ‘well I say no more.’

Sir Timothy: I shall be more Familiar with *you* to Morrow-night,

\textbf{oh} my dear rogue -- \textbf{well} I say no more, faith I shall,

\textbf{well}, no more to be said.

He gives way to this emotion in a later speech, switching from the formality of ‘I am mightily beholden to you’ when Isabella dissembles before him and her father that

\textsuperscript{124} Early English Books Online.
her abuse was a jest to reorientation of topic with expressions of lust introduced by the pragmatic marker *oh* collocating with *thou* and punctuated by the more conventional declaration with a switch to *you*, ‘I love you’:

Sir Timothy: Dear Cosin be in good humour, I could wish my self well beaten for mistaking one that loves me so, I would I might ne’re stir, if I did not think *you* had been in earnest: well, but I vow and swear I am mightily beholden to *you*, that *you* think me so fine a person, and love me so dearly;

**Oh** how happy am I that I shall have *thee* to morrow in these Arms! by these ten bones, I love *you* more than all the Ladies in London put them together. Prethee Speak to me, O that Smile Kills me, **oh**

I will so Hug *thee* and Kiss *thee*, and Love *thee* to morrow night.

Both of these characters use *thou* to connote affect: for Isabella this is negative. Sir Timothy initially addresses Isabella as *thou* in opening a courtship scene and he reverts to *thou* in expressing lust.

Isabella’s further use of *thou* is to Doubty, a gentleman, expressing affinity as she opens her heart:

Isabella: Well, my Dear, I must open my heart to *thee*;
I am so much in Love with this Bellfort,
that I shall dye if I lose him.

Thomas o Georges’s, a country fellow, report of his dialogue with Mal Spencer, an alleged witch, shows that he addressed her as *you* and she replied with *thou*. This may be motivated by the *me/tee* rhyme, since the rest of her address is *you*.

Thomas o Georges: Quo ay what don *yeo* doo with that fow Cat?
**why**, says Whoo,¹²⁵ who soukes me. Soukes [sucks] *tee*!
Marry that’s whaint quo ay, by’r Lady what can Cat do besides?
Why, says whoo, whoost carry me to Rachdale believe.
Whaw, quo ay, that’s protty [pretty=clever]!
**Why**, says whoo, yeost ha one an *yeow* win to carry *yeow*;

Mal also addresses Clod, a country fellow, as *you*. Both are of low social status. Mal’s usage illustrates the deictic function of *thou*/*you* switching. She begins their exchange with formal address to which Clod responds negatively with *thou*.

¹²⁵ Whoo = dialect for *heo* = she.
Mal Spencer: Why so unkind Clod? You frown and wonnot kiss me.
Clod: No marry, I'le be none of thy Imp, I wott.

Mal replies with thou of positive affect, as she attempts to cajole him.


When this does not succeed, she proclaims her innocence of the charge of witchcraft:

Clod: Stand off by'r Lady an I lift kibbo once, Ist raddle thy bones: thou art a fow Queen, I tell o that, thou art a fow Witch.

Mal Spencer: I a Witch! a poor Innocent young Lass, that's whaint, I am not awd enough for that Mon.

Clod: And I believe my Eyne, by the Mass I saw you in Sir Yedards Cellar last neeght with your Haggs, thou art a rank Witch, uds flesh I'le not come nere thee.

Then Mal reverts to you when she no longer seeks his love but offers him the inducement of betterment from their relationship.

Mal Spencer: Did you see me? Why, if I be a Witch, I am the better Fortune for you, you may fare of the best and be rich.

Clod: Fare, marry I'le fare none with thee, I'le not be hang'd, nor go to the Deel for thee, not I by th' mass, but I will hang thee on I con by'r Lady.

When this is rejected, she retains you but with negative affect.

Mal Spencer: Say you so Rogue, I'le plague you for that. She goes out.

1694 [4CCONGR] The Double Dealer

Unmarked Usage

Social status is not significant to address variables in this text as the participants are either titled or appear to be socially accepted in titled circles. Careless, Mellefont and Brisk are not identified as gentlemen but the fact that Mellefont is promised to Cynthia, the daughter of a knight, and that Careless is his friend suggests that they are regarded as such.
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Speakers’ exchanges switch between unmarked you, sometimes in collocation with a hypocorism, implying familiarity, and thou of banter or raillery, functioning deictically to imply yet closer familiarity:

Mellefont: Ned, Ned, whither so fast? What, turn'd flincher! Why, you wo' not leave us?
... Then thy Reason staggers, and thou'rt almost drunk.

Brisk, a pert coxcomb, interprets Careless’s negative remark as raillery:

Brisk: Careless, this is your trick; you're always spoiling Company by leaving it. Careless: And thou art always spoiling Company by coming into 't.

Brisk: Pooh, ha, ha, ha, I know you envy me. Spite, proud spite, by the Gods! and burning envy. -- I'le be judged by Mellefont here, who gives and takes Raillery better, you or I. Pox, Man, when I say you spoil Company by leaving it, I mean you leave no body for the Company to Laugh at.

Then Careless repeats his negative affect to Brisk:

Careless: Prithee get thee gone; thou seest we are serious.

The switches in address terms of Brisk, the pert coxcomb, to Mellefont connote topic and speaker reorientations. His use of you is motivated by his use of reported speech which distances him from the utterance, as he replicates the formality of Lord Touchwood’s and Sir Paul Pliant’s usage:

Brisk: you shall Command me from the Zenith to the Nadir. -- But the Deuce take me if I say a good thing till you come. -- But prithee dear Rogue, make haste, prithee make haste, I shall burst else. -- And yonder your Uncle my Lord Touchwood swears, he'll Disinherit you, and Sir Paul Pliant threatens to disclaim you for a Son-in-Law.

Mellefont also switches to thou in attempting to cajole his friend, Careless, into plotting with him. Here prithee functions as a pragmatic marker in reorientating Mellefont’s utterance from a statement to a request:

Mellefont: I'll tell you, I would have mirth continued this day at any rate; There are times when Sense may be unseasonable, as well as Truth. Prithee do thou wear none to day; but allow Brisk to have Wit, that thou may'st seem a Fool.
On hearing Mellefont’s explanation that his aunt, Lady Touchwood, is plotting against him, Careless objects:

Careless: I thought your fear of her had been over -- is not to Morrow appointed for your Marriage with Cynthia.

Subsequently, on hearing that Lady Touchwood has attempted to seduce Mellefont, Careless first exclaims admiringly, then objects with the pragmatic marker but as he reorientates his stance to focus on Mellefont’s particular viewpoint and then elaborates in a comment on the wider more general viewpoint introduced by the pragmatic marker for:

Careless: Exquisite Woman! But what the Devil does she think, thou hast no more Sense, than to get an Heir upon her Body to Disinherit thy self: for as I take it this Settlement upon you, is, with a Proviso, that your Uncle have no Children.

Lady Touchwood, who is in love with her nephew, Mellefont, conspires with Maskwell, ‘a villain, pretended friend to Mellefont, gallant to Lady Touchwood and in love with Cynthia’, to prevent the marriage of Mellefont and Cynthia. They argue and Lady Touchwood switches her prior usage:

Lady Touchwood: How, what said you Maskwell -- another Caprice, to unwind my temper.

to exclaim:

Lady Touchwood: O Maskwell, in Vain I do disguise me from thee, thou know’st me, know’st the very inmost Windings and Recesses of my Soul. -- Oh Mellefont! I burn; Married to Morrow! Despair strikes me. Yet my Soul knows I hate him too: Let him but once be mine, and next immediate Ruin seize him.

Her exclamation ‘O’ functions as a pragmatic marker to introduce a passionate outburst and Maskwell’s response is an indication of his awareness of the emotion her usage connotes:

Maskwell: Compose your self, You shall Enjoy and Ruin him too, -- Will that please you?

She continues to address him as thou as she invites the intimacy of collusion:
Lady Touchwood: How, how? *Thou* Dear, *thou* precious Villain, how?

then switches with a further pragmatic marker to reorientate her stance from hope to disillusion:

Lady Touchwood: **But** I don't see what *you* can propose from such a trifling design.

Lady Froth, ‘a pretender to poetry, wit and learning’, switches only once from her unmarked usage of *you* to address Cynthia, daughter to Sir Paul, as *thou* at the climax of an exchange in which she elaborates on her love for her husband. She had earlier chastised Cynthia’s cynicism:

Lady Froth: **O** my Dear Cynthia, *you* must not rally *your* Friend,

but on hearing that Cynthia does not write about her love becomes more and more passionate as she realises the possible implication for her own relationship:

Lady Froth: **O** Inconsistent! In Love, and not Write! 
if my Lord and I had been both of *your* Temper, 
we had never come together, 
-- **O** bless me! What a sad thing would that have been, 
if my Lord and I should never have met!

Cynthia: Then neither my Lord and *you* would ever have 
met with *your* Match, on my Conscience.

It may be this passion that motivates her more intimate address to Cynthia. Lady Froth considers herself a poet. She launches into a description of her husband:

Lady Froth: **O** my Conscience no more we should; 
*thou* say'st right -- for sure my Lord Froth is as fine a Gentleman, 
and as much a Man of Quality! Ah! Nothing at all of the Common Air, 
-- I think I may say he wants nothing, but a Blue Ribbon and a Star, 
to make him Shine, the very Phosphorus of our Hemisphere.

The effect of this hyperbole is rather undermined by the anticlimax when Lady Froth switches back to mundanity and unmarked address.

Lady Froth: *Do you* understand those Two hard Words? 
*If you* don't, I'll explain 'em to *you*. 
Having been misled by his sister, Lady Touchwood, into believing that Mellefont plans to marry Cynthia only to gain access to her stepmother and his wife, Lady Plyant, Sir Paul Plyant abuses Mellefont:

Sir Paul Plyant: Thou Serpent and first Tempter of Womankind. –

but, despite his emotion in making his accusation, he switches to you in addressing Mellefont:

Sir Paul Plyant: Do you think my Daughter, this pretty Creature; gads bud she's a Wife for a Cherubin! Do you think her fit for nothing but to be a Stalking-Horse, to stand before you, while you take aim at my Wife? Gads bud I was never angry before in my Life, and I'll never be appeased again.

Possibly this is motivated by a reorientation of the topic from Mellefont to Cynthia. Confusingly Sir Paul addresses his daughter, Cynthia, by the hypocorism Thy (presumably [θi:] rather than the pronoun [ða:i]).

Sir Paul Plyant: Thy, Thy, come away Thy, touch him not, come hither Girl, go not near him, there's nothing but deceit about him; ... he will eat thee up alive ... -- gadsbud he does not care a Farthing for any thing of thee, but thy Portion, why he's in Love with my Wife; he would have tantalized thee, and made a Cuckold of thy poor Father, -- -- therefore come away; but providence has prevented all, therefore come away, when I bid you.

Sir Paul’s dramatic warnings to his daughter (here combined) of Mellefont’s dastardly intentions conclude, like Lady Froth’s speech to Cynthia, in an anticlimax and, like Lady Froth, Sir Paul switches to you. The pragmatic marker but introduces the change of key from high drama and emotion to mundanity.

Mellefont and Maskwell, ‘a villain’ and his ‘pretended friend’, exchange unequal address terms, with Maskwell habitually addressing Mellefont as you and Mellefont’s use of thou appearing to reflect heightened emotion. After learning of his aunt’s plot against him, Mellefont encounters Maskwell and welcomes him:

Mellefont: Maskwell, welcome, thy presence is a view of Land, appearing to my Shipwrack'd hopes:

since:
Mellefont: There's comfort in a hand stretch'd out, to one that's sinking; tho' ne'er so far off.

When Maskwell convinces him that he has deceived Mellefont's aunt and is plotting on his, Mellefont's, behalf, Mellefont continues his shipwreck metaphor in collocation with poetic *thou*:

Mellefont: Ha! O I see, I see my Rising Sun! Light breaks thro’ Clouds upon me, and I shall live in Day – O my Maskwell! how shall I thank or praise *thee*; *Thou* hast outwitted Woman. -- But tell me, how could'st *thou* thus get into her Confidence?

He concludes the exchange with topic reorientation introduced by the pragmatic marker *if* and a switch to *you* in reference to a potential different outcome and a switch from a poetic register:

-- *if you* had not come as *you* did; I don't know what she might have attempted.

His switch back to *thou* connotes his affection and gratitude to Maskwell and is introduced by the pragmatic marker *well*, as Mellefont reorientates from his aunt, Lady Plyant, to Maskwell:

Mellefont: She is most gracious in her Favour, -- *well*, and dear Jack, how hast *thou* Contrived? ... till then, success attend *thee*.

**1696 [4CMANLE] The Lost Lover**

**Unmarked Usage**

Unmarked usage in this text is for titled parents and their children to address each other as *you*. This also applies between Smyrna, the Turkish Merchant, and his wife and to servants. The exception is Sir Rustick Good-Heart, an Old Country Gentleman, who has arranged with Lady Young-Love, an Old Vain Conceited Lady, to marry her daughter Marina. Sir Rustick addresses Marina as *thou* in collocation with a variety of endearing epithets: *sweet heart, my Dear, Girl, Child, Sweet Mistress.*
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

A notable feature of this text is the switching of pronouns of address. Lady Young-Love seeks her companion’s opinion and reduces the social distance between them in an apparent attempt to encourage an honest answer, though actually seeking confirmation of her own opinion.

Lady Young-Love: Belira, How do you like these figur’d Velvets; ... Belira, thou won't flatter me; I have not red enough have I?

When Marina, daughter to Lady Young-Love, tells Sir Rustick, the old country gentleman, that she had not given a thought to having a husband, he addresses her with thou as an old man to a young girl, then switches to you when comparing her with the women of the town. His switch back is introduced by the exclamation Ods bobs functioning as a pragmatic marker to introduce a comment on his previous assertion.

Sir Rustick Good-Heart: All in good time, Child; I like thee ne'er the worse for that. You don't look like the forward things of the Town, that Marries a Man only to Cuckold him, Ods bobs126 thou wilt not do that, I hope, Child.

As their exchange continues, Marina protests that Sir Rustick must be mistaken to think that he is in love with her ‘at your Age’. Sir Rustick does not appear to take offence but treats her observation as meriting discussion and Marina as a more equal partner, introducing the topic reorientation with the pragmatic marker why:

Marina: Love of me, sure you mistake your self, one wou'd have imagin'd it, any other under the Sun at your Age.

Sir Rustick Good-Heart: Why there, be dad you'r out, there's none Lovers but us old Fellows, the Young ones don't think it worth their time;

This stance does not last, however, and he follows a conventional leave-taking with a switch to thee appropriate to a young girl:

Sir Rustick Good-Heart: Sweet Mistriss your Servant, till I see thee again.

126 OED a euphemistic substitute for God in asseverative or exclamatory formulae. Perhaps alteration of God’s body.
Smyrna, the eponymous jealous husband in this text, is terrified of being cuckolded. The switch in Wildman’s address to him introduced by the pragmatic marker *if* denotes the hypothetical case of a different and more distant reality in which Olivia is not Smyrna’s wife.

Smyrna: ... 'tis a dangerous place, for an old Fellow, that has an Handsom Wife; Have you not that Opinion of her, Mr. Wildman?

Wildman: All the World must allow her that Character, but Faith, my Friendship to you, hinders me to think of her, as I would, *if* she were not *thy* Wife.

Smyrna takes offence and leaves:

Smyrna: let me tell you, Mr. Wildman, I Love my Wife, and don't like People that slight her Charms, and prefer my Friendship to her Beauty

Wildman’s use of *thou* in response connotes negative affect:

Wildman: Go *thy* ways, for an old Jealous, I wish be-gad, I could say, Cuckold, but my honest Endeavours shall not be wanting to make *thee*, that *thou* believest *thy* self.

It is difficult to account for the difference in usage in exchanges between Sir Rustick’s son, Wilmore, and his friend Wildman. Wilmore’s unmarked usage to his friend is *you* but Wildman’s usage to Wilmore varies considerably. Their exchange concerning Wilmore’s apparent intention to marry old Lady Young-Love opens with Wildman addressing Wilmore as *thou*:

Wildman: If *thou* art weary already, what wilt *thou* be when the Noose is fixt, and no kind relieving Hand can do *thee* the curtesy of unslipping it.

Wilmore: I confess, I have given the Town reason to believe, I cou'd allow May and December the two ends of time, to meet in our expected Wedlock.

Wildman: The Opinion of *thy* Sense was not forfeited by that, we always believed, *thou* hadst enough to distinguish between the glittering Metal and the Allay; **But** are *you* not resolved to Marry my Lady Young-Love.

Wildman’s switch here introduced by the pragmatic marker *but* seems motivated by a temporal reorientation from a discussion of the existing situation to asking what
Wilmore proposes to do in the future. Wilmore denies any intention to marry Lady Young-Love. In response Wildman reverts to *thou* with reference to the existing situation.

Wilmore: So far from it, that I wou’d run my self into any other Noose in Christendom, to avoid hers;

Wildman: Begad if our Town Ladies come to know how well *thou* art principled, *thou* may’st e’en make *thy* own Markets amongst them,

Wilmore explains that in his plot to marry Marina he has pretended to be in love with Belira and agreed to marry Lady Young-Love. Again, Wildman re-orientates the exchange. The pragmatic marker *and* introduces his question about Wilmore’s proposed future action.

Wildman: *And* how do *you* think to evade either.

To which Wilmore replies that he wishes Wildman to engage Belira in his affairs, so that he can entertain Marina. Wildman appears displeased and his usage switch seems to distance him from Wilmore:

Wildman: *You* have ordered *your* own without considering my applications to Belira may ruine me with Orinda.

but agrees to help:

Wildman: *You* shall command me.

Sir Amorous Courtall, a fop, addresses only Wildman as *thou* and on occasion by his name, Charles. It seems that Sir Amorous does consider Wildman to be his friend.

Sir Amorous Courtall: Let me expire, if *thou* dost not talk scandalously, I hope ’tis not Matrimony *thou* hint’st at.

and tells him the extent of his losses on military campaign:

*thou* art my Friend, to whom I may own such a Misfortune,

though Wildman is already aware of his misfortune but does not reciprocate Sir Amorous’s usage:

Wildman: Besides, my Widow will set all uneasiness aside, and repair the breach *you* have made in *your* Estate.
On the one occasion Wildman does address Sir Amorous as *thou*, he expresses annoyance:

Wildman: The Devil take *thy* Foppery; was it for this, *thou* madest us stay for *thee*?

Similarly Marina’s one use of *thou* to Belira reflects her irritation when Belira asks if she wishes to meet Wilmore in the park. She changes the topic with *but* and reverts to *you*:

Marina: Why *thy* question? He is my Mothers, and never can be mine; *but* we trifle: will *you* favour me with *your* Company, whilst I am Dressing?

The switches in Smyrna’s addresses to his wife may indicate his uncertainty over her virtue. She denies having cuckolded him and he addresses her abusively. His replies to her protests seem to construct her private and public personae. With reference to her thoughts and beliefs she is addressed as *thou*. The public perception of her is addressed as *you*.

Smyrna: *You* are the Mother of Lyars,

Olivia: Because *you* heard he courted me before I was Married, *you* think I must needs be naught with him.

Smyrna: ... *why thou* art not a Citizen's Wife for nothing; *thou* hast more grace I trust in the Lord, than not to think Cuckolding *thy* Husband a good honest practicable Thing;

Smyrna consults an astrologer to discover if his wife is cuckoldling him:

Olivia: But sure, *you* don't believe, that an ignorant block-head of a Fortune-teller, should speak any thing like Truth.

Smyrna: I'll tell *you* what I believe *though*, Mistriss, ... the Sin will lye at *your* door, *Wife*, *you'd* as good confess, and save charges into the Bargain

Olivia: Lord, Husband, what do *you* take me for? Why, if it were so, do *you* think I'd be such a Fool to confess.

Smyrna: *No*; *Thou'rt* wiser o' my Conscience, *but* be sure *you* are as trusty to other Folks;

Smyrna asks the astrologer:
Smyrna: How say you Master Knowlittle, do you like my Wife too?
does the Stars denote me for further Cuckoldom,

Knowlittle: Is that one question all you wou'd have resolved.

but switches usage from formally addressing you Master Knowlittle in his capacity
as fortune-teller to informal Friend and thou as he seems to recognise and
acknowledge Knowlittle, the man’s, lack of clairvoyant skill:

Smyrna: Ay Friend, and I see 'tis more than thou canst do,

Smyrna dreads having his suspicion proved right but is desperate to discover the

Switching to address Knowlittle as the fortune-teller, Smyrna’s address changes once

more:

... Wou'd you frighten me into an Opinion of your Art,

Wilmore addresses Belira as you. Her

address to him fluctuates approximately with switches connoting her construction of

the dual persona of his current identity in society as you, the gentleman about to

make an advantageous marriage, and his former identity as thou, her secret lover.

... You reproach me with what I wou'd be;
do not, do not rouze the Woman in me,
I wou'd be Calm to Night and see you Married

Belira: Perhaps so -- Cou'd the remembrance of my Wrongs
but127 sleep with thee, I wou'd not Envy thee a quiet Grave.

Wilmore: Then do you Love me?

Belira: Yes, to see you happy -- But the Mask is off, and
thou canst Cheat no more, and I no more believe.

... You reproach me with what I wou'd be;
do not, do not rouze the Woman in me,
I wou'd be Calm to Night and see you Married

WVilmore: Rather see me Buried.

Here cou’d ... but may be rendered in Modern English as if only ... could. This structure,
therefore, functions as a pragmatic marker despite not having the conventional structure of such.
The speaker reorientates the topic towards the persona of her interlocutor as her lover.
Having addressed Wilmore, her lover, Belira switches to address Wilmore, the
gentleman on the verge of marriage:

Belira: **At least**, Sir, if you will not Marry your self,
but unkindly leave your Bride thus in the longing Moment;
do your Father the honour to grace his Marriage

Wilmore: What have I done, that you shou'd wish to make me Wretch'd?

He becomes her lover again:

Belira: What hast **thou** left undone to make me such?

but seems to misinterpret the cause of her despair, assuring her that their secret and
her reputation is safe:

Wilmore: Your Reputation yet stands fair, and unless your own
Indiscretion betrays you the Secret shall be such, with me for ever.

Belira, however, is not concerned with reputation, as she reorientates the topic of his
discourse (but not of her own) with the pragmatic marker **but**:

Belira: **But** thy heart, Traytor, thy perjur'd Heart;
tell me, how shall I get it back?

Wilmore: Never this way, I assure you.

She dismisses him with a directive indicating spatial deixis ‘Go’ and a directive of
negative affect collocating with **you**:

Belira: 'Tis given for gone\textsuperscript{128} then -- Go -- Live as Wretch'd as I can
make you, I'll think no more upon you.

Still Wilmore does not understand her:

Wilmore: Then 'tis Spite disturbs you: In what have I deserved it?

and Belira returns to the topic of their relationship and **thou**:

Belira: Look in thy false perfidious Heart, and take my Answer thence.

As Belira turns to leave, Wilmore calls her back with a switch in address that seems
to connote negative affect when the motives he attributes to her are considered:
‘womanish revenge, malice, despight’:

\textsuperscript{128} OED hopeless.
Wilmore: Come back Belira, 'tis my last Call: I wou'd satisfie thy Womanish Revenge, and let thee see me Curst by any other way than Fatal Marriage. -- Take my Sword -- Thy Malice can supply thy want of use, despight can furnish strength, and too often thou hast found the way to my unhappy Heart to miss it now.

To this Belira replies formally with the further distancing device of reference to herself in the third person:

Belira: Ha, ha, ha, in Love to dying! By all that's good, turn'd Hero: Your Mistress, Sir, is much obliged -- Keep your Sword, it may be a Fortune better worth than all your Fathers Lands;

Then Wilmore refers to Belira’s two personae beginning and ending his utterance addressing her as you the Proud, Fantastick Woman she now presents and digressing to address opprobriously as thou the secret mistress she once was:

Wilmore: Am I indeed your Scorn, Proud, Fantastick Woman; [...] ... I've served it seems, as long as you cou'd like, and now you chuse another.

[thy liking was foul Lust; not Love: That gentle Name brings Happiness, but thou -- Let me not think upon thee, for fear it force my Tongue to something worse, than shou’d be said of Ladies;]

This duality continues with reference to their reciprocal relationship being expressed as thou and to that with third parties as you:

Wilmore: Belira, thou hast power to read my Soul; thy Magick Spells are irresistible. How hast thou found this Failing in my Vertue, which I not knowing of, my Wants cou'd never miss till now?

Belira: ... I've seen your shuffling poor designing Arts, to wave this Marriage and promote another.
1707 [4CFARQU] The Beaux Stratagem

Unmarked Usage

There is very little use of thou in this text. Of note is the exchange between Archer, masquerading as a servant to Aimwell, an apparently rich gentleman, and Cherry, the daughter of the landlord at the inn. Archer has been teaching her the Catechism.

The stage direction, ‘Chucks her under the Chin’, illustrates his patronising attitude to her, yet he addresses her as you. This contrasts with similar exchanges in a previous text [3CETHER 1676 The Man of Mode]: Old Bellair’s bantering switches of address to the young ladies, Emilia and Harriet:

Archer: Come, my Dear, have you con’d over the Catechise I taught you last Night?
... What is Love?
Cherry: Love is I know not what, it comes I know not how, and goes I know not when.

Archer: Very well, an apt Scholar.
(Chucks her under the Chin)

Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Unmarked usage for Mistress Sullen, wife to Squire Sullen, in addressing Dorinda, her unmarried sister-in-law is you. Dorinda’s response to Mistress Sullen’s complaint against her husband:

Dorinda: He allows you a Maintenance suitable to your Quality.

provokes a formal reaction:

Mrs Sullen: A Maintenance! do you take me, Madam, for an hospital Child, that I must sit down, and bless my Benefactors for Meat, Drink and Clothes?

but this switches to informality as she appears to decry Dorinda’s naivete with the formal address Madam giving way to Child:

Dorinda: You share in all the Pleasures that the Country affords.

Mrs Sullen: ... dost think, Child, that my Limbs were made for leaping of Ditches, and clambring over Stiles;

When Dorinda reveals that she is smitten by Aimwell, the handsome stranger, Mrs Sullen expresses affinity, since she is flirting with the handsome French officer,
Count Bellair, in order to make her husband jealous. Then she switches from *my dear Sister* and *thou* employing the pragmatic marker *for* to reorientate the topic from the current intimacy of the moment to the future unmarked state of affairs and *you*.

Mrs Sullen: ... Ha, ha, ha, my dear Sister, let me embrace thee, now we are Friends indeed! *for* I shall have a Secret of *yours*, as a Pledge for mine -- now you'll be good for something, I shall have *you* conversable in the Subjects of the Sex.

The only other use of the singular form is in Aimwell’s exchange with his friend, Archer. Unlike Dorinda, Archer has not revealed an intimate personal secret but he hints at a possible scandalous secret concerning Cherry, the landlord’s daughter.

Aimwell: And was she the Daughter of the House?  
Archer: The Landlord is so blind as to think so; but I dare swear she has better Blood in her Veins.

This provokes Aimwell to a more intimate form of response in anticipation of further revelations: an invitation to collusion.

Aimwell: Why *dost* think so?  
Archer: Because the Baggage has a pert (*Je ne scai quoi*), she reads Plays, keeps a Monkey, and is troubled with Vapours.  
Archer’s reply is not as dramatic as Aimwell anticipated and he switches back to unmarked *you*:

Aimwell: By which Discoveries I guess that *you* know more of her.

**1719 [4CKILLI] Chit Chat**

**Unmarked Usage**

The characters in this text appear to be of similar social status. The only one to whom a title is assigned being Mrs Commode, an Indian Woman, in whose presence Alamode, a Fop, is discovered ‘with a Heap of Fans, Snuff-boxes, and other Toys before him.’ That is: Mrs Commode is in trade. The male characters are identified by their family names and the other female characters by their given names. Unmarked address is *you*. 
One usage it is difficult to account for is that of Worthy, a male character, to Townly, an acquaintance, whom he addresses as *thee*. This is odd morphologically and pragmatically. Worthy’s unmarked usage to friends is *you*. This is the first reference to Townly in this scene. The connotation of the address is not apparent, unless it is to contrast with a distancing *you* from Worthy to his sister, Florinda, as he instructs her to entertain Bellamar. Worthy has previously given Bellamar his consent to marry Florinda. It may be that he disapproves of the antipathy Florinda has exhibited to Bellamar:

Worthy: Townly, *thee*\(^{129}\) and I will make a Visit
-- Sister, *you’ll* entertain Bellamar.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

Marlove is Bellamar’s secret Mistress. She suspects him of being in love with Florinda. Bellamar, she suggests, hides his true feelings, since:

Marlove: with an affected Negligence *you* Courted her, as Life;
told her her Faults only to be thought sincere,
when e’er *you* spoke *your* Love, and prais’d *her* Virtues;
*thou* poor Dissembler!
... *thou* Faithless, Base, Perfidious Man.

Bellamar has two personae: the face he presents to the world to which Marlove refers as *you* and the inner man known to Marlove and addressed as *thou*.

After her exit Bellamar, who has previously addressed Marlove as *you*, ruefully echoes the prosody of her parting triad, addressing her formulaically in abstentia as *thou*:

Bellamar: *Thou* very very -- true Woman!

---

\(^{129}\) *Thee* occurs twice in a compound subject in this extract. *Thou* features as a single subject. Use of *thee* as a subject is reported in a trial text [STMACCL 1725] and in a later drama text [SCMILLE 1734]. This differs from the use of *thee* as the second person singular subject form with a bare-stem form of the verb found on the seventeenth century Sword Inscriptions of William Peachey (c1643) and identified as the dialect of the Hampshire/Sussex border: ‘I John Cooke be, thee dye bye me’ – sword of John Cooke; ‘When I be wraught on , Thee might’st have naught on!’ – sword of Richard Norton (Coates 1999).
Worthy, Bellamar’s friend, considers that Bellamar was able to persuade Marlove to influence Moderna to marry him. He, therefore, attributes his happiness to Bellamar, asking him:

Worthy: how can my Gratitude repay the Joy you gave me with Moderna

to which Bellamar replies:

Bellamar: Why, just the Way you do, by being happy with her.
Believe me, Friend, I am as glad to see thee pleas’d,
as Knaves wou’d be to have thee griev’d.
-- I need not ask how your Wife does, since your
Joys seem without Allay.

The switch here denotes a topic reorientation from Bellamar’s comment on the persona Worthy presents to the outside world to a comment in the form of a rhyming couplet on his own perception of his friend. The poetic register may have influenced this usage.

This duality seems to apply to the next part of their exchange. Where the topic is the here and now or a reference to the addressee’s presumed emotion, the address is you.
Where the topic is an expression of the speaker’s own emotion, the address is thou.

Worthy: They are indeed, Bellamar. And --

Bellamar: Hold, I guess what you would say; Rapturous Love, Elizium Fields, and all the Joys that Poets ever dream’d of, are much surpass’d by yours.

Worthy: Bellamar thou art in the Right; I am happier if possible than thou hast spoken; and what’s impossible to her?
Bellamar: That’s hard to say. In the mean Time, Is it possible for you to tell me where you was a-going.

Worthy: No farther, now I’ve met you;

Similarly Alamode, the Fop, exclaims in pleasure on greeting Townly:

Alamode: O dear Townly, I joy to see thee!

then switches to you on being chastised for having previously ignored him:

Townly: You do! -- Gad, I met you just now, and you did not know me.

Alamode: I ask Ten Thousand Pardons. I was thinking, and did not see you.
Townly is identified as a Common Acquaintance (presumably in the sense of ‘known to all’ rather than ‘of low degree’, since there is no indication of the latter). Alamode subsequently addresses him as thou whilst addressing Bellamar as you in reported speech:

Alamode: Good, Bellamar; very good.
-- Townly, when shall I hear thee say such a Thing? Thy Wit is like a certain Friends of ours, who to be very sharp, bids you kiss his A---, and laughs.
You know him, Bellamar?

and Lurcher, a Fool, as thou:

Alamode: O Lurcher, I'm sure thou art no Cheat!

Worthy’s address to his wife, Moderna, reflects that of Salesware to his wife which is also directed to a third party [3BROME 1653]. Worthy consoles his wife in intimate terms. Then Marlove’s entrance seems to promote an affective and possibly spatial distancing as he addresses his wife in the presence of a third party:

Worthy: Come, prithee cheer up, and glad my Heart that knows no Joy while thou art sad.
Here's Marlove, she'll join to chase away your Cares.

A notable usage is Marlove’s response. Marlove is described as Moderna’s Confident. She addresses Moderna as Child collocating with you. There is no indication that the two women are not of a similar age, so this is presumably a term of affection, yet it does not collocate with thou.

Marlove: What makes you out of Humour, Child?

Some of the switching seems to be motivated by irony rather than banter. Bellamar appears to have inadvertently offended Lurcher by usurping his place at table. He asks how long he and Lurcher have been ‘foes.’ Townly offers:

Townly: I'll tell you, if you won't think me a Fool for repeating his Words.
Lurcher: Ay, tell him, tho' he was the only Man I desir’d you not to tell.
Bellamar: Then I am the only Man he ought to tell, for I hope thou never spok'st well of me.

130 ‘Bids you’ here marks an example of reported speech. Alamode is one level removed from the friends’ utterance and speaks from their viewpoint, hence the pronoun is appropriate to them rather than to Alamode.
Bellamar is as yet unaware of his fault but aware of ill-feeling between himself and Lurcher, so addresses Lurcher with negative affect to convey apparent indifference to Lurcher’s opinion.

On hearing the explanation, he attempts to save face by mitigating the offence: ‘is that all’, and making a satirical apology with an apparently friendly address:

Bellamar: Is that all, I'm sorry for it, dear Lurcher:
To make thee amends, thou shalt go to
Heaven before me, if thou canst.

Friendly banter appears to motivate Marlove’s affectionate rebuke to Townly when he enters ‘a little fuddled’:

Marlove: You want warm Water to wash those Hands of thine, and that dear dirty Face. Why, Man, thou'rt as dirty as a Chymist.

1723 [5CSTEEL] The Conscious Lovers

Unmarked Usage

The characters are from all ranks of society. Two of them are knights. One is a wealthy heiress. One is a poor orphan who has been brought up by her aunt. One is a coxcomb with a rich uncle. They and their servants all exchange you.

Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Act I precedes the CED extract

The First Act opens with Sir John and his old servant, Humphrey, whom he addresses as you though he twice says to him; ‘I’ll tell thee ...’ This is a proximal device, an invitation for Humphrey to draw near and listen. Tom, Bevil Junior’s servant, enters singing and Humphrey greets him good-humouredly:

Humphrey: O, here's the prince of poor coxcombs, the representative of all the better fed than taught! —
Ho, ho, Tom! whither so gay and so airy this morning?

Tom reciprocates,

Tom: Sir, we servants of single gentlemen are another kind of people than you domestic ordinary drudges that
do business; we are raised above you:
the pleasures of board wages, tavern dinners, and
many a clear gain, vails, alas! you never heard or dreamt of.

and Humphrey acknowledges Tom’s banter. Then he switches from this register as
he recalls Tom’s former state:

Humphrey: Thou hast follies and vices enough for a man
of ten thousand a year, though it is but as t’other day
that I sent for you to town to put you into Mr Sealand’s family,
that you might learn a little before I put you to my young master
... such a rude thing as you were

Phillis, Lucinda’s maid, has similar social aspirations, telling Tom,

Phil. — Lard l one is almost ashamed to pass along the
streets. The town is quite empty, and nobody of
fashion left in it; and the ordinary people do so stare
to see any thing dressed like a woman of condition, pass by.

... O Tom, Tom! is it not a pity that you should be
so great a coxcomb, and I so great a coquette,
and yet be such poor devils as we are?

She expresses her opinion of Tom addressing him as thou. Then she reverts to you
to direct him.

O Tom, Tom! thou art as false and as base as
the best gentleman of them all:
but, you wretch! talk to me no more on the
odious subject; don’t, I say.

Tom constructs two personae for Phillis: first as madam and Mistress Phillis who
constucts herself as ‘a woman of condition’ and ‘so great a coquette’, and whom he
addresses as you in order to ‘put her into the right temper to be wrought upon’.

Tom: I know not how to resist your commands, madam.
[In a submissive Tone retiring.]

— Why, truly, to be plain with you, Mrs. Phillis,
I can take little comfort of late in frequenting your house.

Then as the maid with whom her Mistress’s would-be lovers flirt. He explains that
he is jealous and addresses her as thou in an apparent expression of affection. He
acknowledges this usage as banter by reverting to you ‘... to be serious’
Tom: I say it is, that thou art a part which gives me pain for the disposition of the whole. You must know, madam, to be serious, I am a man at the bottom of prodigious nice honour.

He begins to propose a scheme to enrich them both. They exchange you but Phillis forgets her assumed superior persona and loses patience with Tom:

Phillis: Explain thyself, and don't be so fond of thy own prating.

Bevil Junior’s addresses to his father’s servant Humphrey switch between you and thou with thou connoting expressions of trust and secrecy:

Bevil jun. Humphrey, I know thou art a friend to both, and in that confidence I dare tell thee — Thou hast made it now my interest to trust thee. Be patient, then, and hear the story of my heart.

The extract in the CED begins at Act II. Unmarked usage is the exchange of you. On the entrance of Charles Myrtle, his friend, Bevil Junior addresses him as thou:

Bevil junior: Well Charles, why so much Care in thy Countenance? Is there any thing in this World deserves it? You, who used to be so Gay, so Open, so Vacant!

but immediately switches to you and maintains this in the rest of the text in collocation with Dear Sir, Sir, Dear Myrtle.

When Isabella addresses her niece, Indiana, as thou, it seems to connote pity at what she perceives as Indiana’s naivete over Bevil Junior’s apparent affection for her:

Isabella: Yes -- I say 'tis Artifice, dear Child; I say to thee again and again, 'tis all Skill and Management.

Well, go thy ways, thou willful Innocent!

This collocates with infantilising epithets, dear Child and willful Innocent in contrast with her use of poor Soul, Madam and dear Neice that collocate with you.

An exchange between Lucinda and Phillis, her maid, suggests that Lucinda’s switch from unmarked you to thou connotes affinity in appreciation of Phillis’ wit as a pert merry Hussy. Lucinda reverts to you as she resumes her former more distant stance and rebukes Phillis’ perceived over-familiarity: ‘you grow impertinent.'
Lucinda: But, I thought, I heard him kiss you. Why do you suffer that?

Phillis: **Why,** Madam, we Vulgar take it to be a Sign of Love; we Servants, we poor People, that have nothing but our Persons to bestow, or treat for, are forc’d to deal, and bargain by way of Sample; and therefore, as we have no Parchments, or Wax necessary in our Agreements, we squeeze with our Hands, and seal with our Lips, to ratifie Vows and Promises.

Lucinda does not recognise Phillis’ sarcasm:

Lucinda: But can’t you trust one another, without such Earnest down?

Phillis: We don’t think it safe, any more than you Gentry, to come together without Deeds executed.

Lucinda: **Thou** art a pert merry Hussy.

Phillis: I wish, Madam, your Lover and you were as happy, as Tom and your Servant are.

Lucinda: You grow impertinent.

**1734 [5CMILLE] The Mother in Law**

**Unmarked Usage**

The only unmarked use of *thou* in this text is that addressed by both Lady Hippish and her step-daughter, Belina, to Primrose, Belina’s maid. Lady Hippish is a stereotypical wicked stepmother who schemes to turn her husband Sir Credulous Hippish against his children and rejoices when she believes he has died. Primrose has persuaded Sir Credulous to fake his own death in order to discover his wife’s reaction. The reaction of Lady Hippish when she encounters Primrose at this scene contrasts with that of Belina:

Lady Hippish: What is it? What dost thee mean by this Blubbering, pr’ythee?

Belina: What ails thee, Primrose? Why those Tears? How does my Father do?

Both Lady Hippish and Belina address Primrose as *thou*, but the use by Lady Hippish of the term *blubbering* (OED: ‘generally used contemptuously and in ridicule for *weep*’) connotes negative affect in comparison with Belina’s usage.
Lady Hippish continues to address Primrose as *thou*, probably as a reflection of social status, since subsequent utterances do not have negative connotation:

Lady Hippish: This is the only time, Primrose, I ever beheld him with Pleasure.
-- But, come, *thou* must assist me in executing my Design; and, depend on't, that in serving me, *thou* wilt most effectually serve *thy* self.

Sir Credulous addresses Agnes, his younger daughter, as *you*. It is apparent from the nature of their exchange that she is a child:

Sir Credulous: Take care *you* tell me the Truth then; for here's my little Finger that knows all, will tell me if *you* lye.
-- Hold, ay, ay, so, so; *ay*, my little Finger tells me that *you've* seen something *you've* not yet told me of.
(Putting his Finger to his Ear.)

His emotional address to his older daughter, Belina, on hearing her grief over his supposed death, therefore, seems to connote sentimentality:

Sir Credulous: (Looking for some time scornfully on his Wife, and then running to Belina) Ah! my dear Girl, come to my Arms, let me embrace *thee*, my Child. *Thou* art my own Daughter, my own Flesh and Blood, and I'm overjoy'd to discover so much Good-nature in *thee*.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

Unmarked usage for Sir Credulous Hippish and his second wife, Lady Hippish, is to address each other as *you*. Sir Credulous calls his wife *my love* and she calls him *Child, my life* and *my dear*. As Lady Hippish takes her leave, they switch to the more intimate *thou*. This usage is probably formulaic rather than a sign of endearment, since Lady Hippish addresses her husband as *you* in the same utterance and their epithets thus far have been affectionate.

Lady Hippish: Good by t'ye, my Love, for a little while; I'll see *thee* again as soon as possible.

Sir Credulous: Goodby to *thee*, my Life.

Sir Credulous intends his daughter, Belina, to marry Looby, the nephew of his physician, Dr Mummy. Belina is in love with Beaumont, a young gentleman.
Beaumont conspires with Primrose, Belina’s maid, to frighten Looby away. His momentary switch to thou in addressing Primrose collocates with a switch from the unmarked address, Primrose, to the appreciative epithet dear, charming, courageous Wench connoting his gratitude. Then his leave-taking switches back to the conventional format.

Beaumont: Well, but what have you for me to do now?
-- But now, Primrose, what have we to go upon next?
Primrose: Why, we have nothing now to do, but to sow the Seeds of Discord betwixt Husband and Wife, and the Day’s our own.
Beaumont: Thou art a dear, charming, courageous Wench, and shalt be rewarded accordingly.
... Success attend you.

Sir Credulous reacts with fury to Primrose’s perceived meddling, addressing her as you in collocation with abusive epithets:

Sir Credulous: Why, you meddling Baggage, ... Will you hold your Tongue, Serpent?
I’ll make you be silent, or I’ll --
... Why, you tormenting Beast!
(Goes to strike her.)

This switches to thou when he reorientates the topic (with the pragmatic marker but) from abuse of Primrose to consideration of her proposed strategy to validate Sir Credulous’s faith in his wife’s affection.

Sir Credulous: -- No, no, I can never bear to hear the Shrieks and Lamentations she’ll make over me; -- But, Primrose, ar’t thee not afraid that her very thinking me dead, will break her Heart?

The excessive sentimentality Sir Credulous feels for his wife seems to influence his address to Primrose. His belief that Primrose shares his perception of his wife’s feeling for him creates his perception of an affinity between them that motivates the more intimate address term.

131 Though thee is used as a subject cf [4CKILLI 1719] above.
Sir Credulous reveals that he is alive and has heard his wife’s abuse of him during his feigned death. He claims to have learned his lesson. Lady Hippish responds with negative affect.

Lady Hippish: ’Tis such a Lesson, Fool, as I shall make thee repent having ever got from me. Thou shalt pay so dear for thy Wisdom, as shall make thee wish thy self in easy Delusion again.

He threatens to turn her out. Lady Hippish responds to this threat over several exchanges with emotional thou in collocation with the negative epithets Wretch and Worm, yet her questions also express sarcasm:

Lady Hippish: Wilt thou so, Man?
... Say'st thou so, my Soul?

... And now, thou shalt be altogether as great a Wretch; for I'll so chastise thee for this Curiosity! I'll so trample on thee, Worm!

Sir Credulous: Out o’ my House, I say

Her switch to unmarked you implies that she has regained control of the situation, reverting ironically to the previous patronising epithets my Dear and Child:

Lady Hippish: Ha, ha, ha! You talk wildly, my Dear; you are light-headed, and don't know it.
-- To bed, to bed, Child, and send for a Doctor and Nurse, in an Instant.

1744 [5CFIELD] Historical Register for the Year 1736

Unmarked Usage

The topic of this text is a play rehearsal attended by Sowrit, a drama critic, accompanied by Lord Dapper. Unmarked usage is you with very little use of thou. Two examples of thou are to colleagues and connote solidarity. Player 2 addresses Player 1:

Player 2: Ay, prithee, what Subject wou’dst thou write on?

and Medley, the Playwright, instructs one of the players:

Medley: Get thee gone for the prettiest Hero that ever was shown on any Stage.
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

The only other example of *thou* in this extract is the ironic comment made after Lord Dapper’s exit by the Prompt:

Lord Dapper: ... one does not go to see the Play but the Company ... and therefore I am always ready to countenance good Plays.

Prompt: *Thou* art a sweet Judge of Plays, indeed, and yet it is in the Power of such Sparks\(^{132}\) as these to damn an honest Fellow, both in his Profit and Reputation.

The motivation for the use of *thou* in this example is not wholly the absence of the addressee. The Prompt’s utterance morphs into a pejorative aside, so that *thou* also connotes pejoration.

1747 [SCHOADL] The Suspicious Husband

Unmarked Usage

The characters in this text are of the middling sort, not titled but they include several gentlemen, a lawyer and rich heiresses together with their servants. Unmarked address is *you*. Of note is the usage of Ranger, the lawyer, to the Milliner’s young assistant delivering linen to him:

Ranger: Well, Child -- and who are *you*?
... I swear, my Dear, *you* have the prettiest pair of Eyes
-- the loveliest pouting Lips -- I never saw *you* before.
-- The Devil fetch me, Child, *you* look’d so prettily,
that I could not mind one Word *you* said.
... Dear little smiling Angel -- (Catches, and kisses her.)

The use of the terms: *Child, my Dear, Dear little smiling Angel* imply that she is a young woman. These collocate with *you*, whereas previously [4CMANLE 1696] such terms of endearment collocated with *thou*: an indication that the use of *thou* with this connotation to young women appears to be weakening.

\(^{132}\) OED a young man of elegant or foppish character; one who affects smartness or display in dress and manners. Chiefly in more or less depreciatory use.
Markedness & Markedness Reversal

Jack Meggot greets his old friend, Charles Frankly, as *thou* in obvious banter as the terms ‘Antique’ and ‘these five hundred Years’ connote:

Jack Meggot: Whom have we here? my old Friend Frankly?
*Thou* art grown a meer Antique since I saw thee?
How hast *thou* done these five hundred Years?

but though they subsequently indulge in banter together, their unmarked usage is to exchange *you*:

Jack Meggot: Pho! prithee! Pox! Charles -- Don't be silly
-- Well! Charles, what? Dumb?
Come, come; *you* may talk tho' you have nothing to say, as I do -- Let us hear, where have *you* been?

Frankly’s comment on the only occasion he addresses Jack as *thou* indicates that they perceive such usage as banter: ‘but to leave fooling’. The pragmatic marker *but* here introducing the change of topic:

Jack Meggot: ... I'll be as secret as a debauch'd Prude --

Charles Frankly: Whose Sanctity every one suspects.
Jack, Jack, 'tis not in *thy* Nature. Keeping a Secret is worse to *thee* than keeping *thy* Accounts.
**But** to leave fooling, listen to me, both,

There is a similar motivation for the marked exchange of *thou* between the friends, Clarinda and Jacintha.

Clarinda: Hey Day!\(^{133}\) O' my Conscience *thou* art a brave Girl. *Thou* art the very first Prude, that ever had Honesty enough to avow her Passion for a Man.

Jacintha: And *thou* art the first finish’d Coquet who ever had any Honesty at all.

This is banter not to be taken seriously. The OED notes of Clarinda’s exclamation, ‘Hey Day’, that it denotes ‘frolicsomeness.’

---

\(^{133}\) OED an exclamation denoting frolicsomeness, gaiety, surprise, wonder, etc.
Frankly, having fallen in love with Clarinda, extols to his friend Bellamy the superior joys of love to those of friendship.

Bellamy: I shew my Heart is capable of Love, by the Friendship it bears to you.
Frankly: The Light of Friendship looks but dim before the brighter Flame of Love.
   -- You dull, and cold as Earth and Water;
   I light and warm as Air and Fire.

reorientating his topic to a protest with the pragmatic marker **why** collocating with **thou**:

Frankly: ... **Why**, Bellamy, for Shame! get thee a Mistress, and be sociable.

then switching back to **you** in further comment on Bellamy’s demeanour:

Frankly: My Flood of Joy shall not be stopt by your melancholy Fists, I assure you. (Going.)

At the suggestion that Bellamy may really be in love he switches back with an expression of surprise in a reorientation of topic from Bellamy’s demeanour to his character:

Bellamy: Stay, Frankly, I beg you stay.
What would you say now, if I really were in Love?

Frankly: **Why**, faith, thou hast such romantick Notions of Sense and Honour, that I know not what to say.

He makes a further switch to reorientate his topic to satirize Bellamy’s use of the term ‘confess’, introducing this with the pragmatic marker **and**:

Bellamy: To confess the Truth then, I am in Love.
Frankly: **And** do you confess it as if it were a Sin?

Their exchange concludes with Bellamy’s climactic declaration:

Bellamy: I swear, I am as true an Enamorato as ever tagg’d a Rhyme.

and Frankly’s further switch to express his affinity with **thou dear Companion of my Joys**:

Frankly: **And** art thou then thoroughly in Love?
Come to my Arms, thou dear Companion of my Joys --
(They embrace.)
Frankly’s ironic response to Bellamy in their final exchange on this topic later in the text implies that Frankly’s dialogue with Bellamy may have been intended as banter.

Bellamy: Oh! Frankly, Ranger, I never felt such Ease before. The Secret’s out, and you don’t laugh at me.

Frankly: Laugh at thee? -- for loving a Woman of thirty thousand Pound? Thou art a most unaccountable Fellow.

Mr. Strictland, the eponymous Suspicious Husband, discovers a man’s hat in his wife’s dressing room. His switches from unmarked you to thou in addressing her correlate with negative epithets: wretch, worst of women. Even when in a passion as in the stage direction ‘Both walk about in a Passion’, he uses you. It seems that thou has negative rather than just emotional connotation in this exchange.

Mr. Strictland: ... Mrs. Strictland! Mrs. Strictland!
How came this Hat into your Chamber!

Mr. Strictland: Speak, Wretch, speak. --
Why dost thou not speak?

Mrs. Strictland: Sir --

Mr. Strictland: Guilt -- 'tis Guilt that ties your Tongue!

Mr. Strictland: My Fears are just, and I am miserable --
Thou worst of Women!

Mrs. Strictland: I know my Innocence, and can bear this no longer.

Mr. Strictland: I know you are false, -- and 'tis I who will bear my Injuries no longer. (Both walk about in a Passion.)

1757 [5CGARRI] The Male Coquette

Unmarked Usage

There are characters in this text from several ranks in society: a lord, knights, gentlemen, ladies and servants. Unmarked usage for all of these characters is to address each other as you. The social deixis function of the second person pronoun is now assumed by the address term. The hero, Daffodil, is a gentleman. He has a manservant, whom he addresses by his family name, Ruffle. There is also a servant who addresses Daffodil as your Honour and Ruffle as Mr Ruffle. Daffodil addresses
this servant as *Harry*, which suggests that the latter is of lower social status than Ruffle. Both Sir William and Lord Racket address Daffodil as *George*. Daffodil addresses Sir William as *Sir William*. Lord Racket addresses the waiters by their first names. The waiters are on first name terms with each other and address Lord Racket as *my Lord*. To each other the cousins, Arabella and Sophia are: *my Dear ... Bell* and *dear Sophy*. Arabella interprets her cousin’s formal leave taking as unfriendly:

Sophia: *Since you* are as little to be convinc'd, as I am to be persuaded -- *your Servant* -- (Going)

Arabella: Nay, Sophy -- This is unfriendly.

**Markedness & Markedness Reversal**

Daffodil uses *thou* collocating with a negative affective epithet to express his opinion of his manservant, Ruffle, but switches to *you* when speaking of him in relation to others connoting their potential more distant relationship with him.

Daffodil: *Thou* art a most incomprehensible Blockhead --

Ruffle: No great Scholar, or Wit, indeed
-- I had the whole Pack after me --

Daffodil: And did not they catch *you*?

The only other use of *thou* occurs in Mrs Dotterel’s exchange with Daffodil. Daffodil amuses himself by trifling with womens’ affections, flirting with them until they imagine themselves in love with him and discarding them when they become serious. Mrs Dotterel is one of his victims. She tells Daffodil that she has named her pet dog *Daffodil* but it is apparent that she is aware of Daffodil’s duplicity and she switches from her unmarked use of *you* to *thou* in collocation with a string of abuse:

Mrs Dotterel: Could I love and esteem any Thing, and not call it Daffodil? -- What a Wretch! (Aside.)

Daffodil: My Passions are now tearing me to Pieces, and if *you* will stay, by Heav'n I will not answer for the Consequences.

Mrs Dotterel: Consequences! What Consequences! *Thou* wretched, base, false, worthless Animal!
Daffodil keeps up the pretence:

Daffodil: You do me Honour. (Bowing)

but Mrs Dotterel is not convinced and continues her abuse:

Mrs Dotterel: Canst thou think that I am so blinded by my Passion, not to see thy treacherous, mean, unmanly Evasions?

Conscious of her reputation when they are interrupted, Mrs Dotterel switches to addressing Daffodil as you in an attempt to disguise the emotion of the encounter, yet her utterance still conveys negative affect:

Mrs Dotterel: You are a Villain -- I despise you, and detest you -- and will never see you more.
(Exit Mrs Dotterel)

**Discussion of results for Drama texts**

In the earliest text from 1584 the high status characters exchange you and the low status characters exchange thou. In 1599 you is exchanged among social equals in all levels of society but social control is indexed by thou to offspring and servants. There is little later use of reciprocal unmarked thou within the lower orders with the last examples being in 1623 (included in numbered figures as 1602 where the usage is the same: see figure 5:2). There is also unconventional use of thou to social superiors by the host of the inn in this text [1623 2CSHAKE]. This subversion of unmarked usage identifies the host as a comic character. Contexts in which the use of thou seems inappropriate implies that such usage is marked. In 1607 an acknowledgement of inappropriate usage to a social superior is expressed by the servant, Butler, in addressing a knight: ‘I tell thee (setting thy worsh. Knighthood aside) ... Did they not bind your worships knighthood’ [1607 2CWILKI].

Most of the main characters in the drama texts are of the middling sort or drawn from the higher orders. The middling sort use thou as an address term within their social group until 1744, though this usage also connotes solidarity, not only of social status but also of semantic field: e.g.a player and a playwright [1744 5CFIELD]. The last use of thou down the social scale by the middling sort [1647 3CTB] is in a text that exhibits acute awareness of social difference.
Table 5:1 Unmarked Address of *thou* and *you* in Drama Comedies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting Comparative Social Status</th>
<th>Lower Orders</th>
<th>Middling Sort</th>
<th>Higher Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>►◄ reciprocal use</td>
<td>►◄ ►◄ ►◄</td>
<td>►◄ ►◄ ►◄</td>
<td>►◄ ►◄ ►◄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► use to a social equal</td>
<td>►◄ ►◄ ►◄</td>
<td>►◄ ►◄ ►◄</td>
<td>►◄ ►◄ ►◄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ use down the social scale</td>
<td>▼ ▼ ▼ ▼ ▼</td>
<td>▼ ▼ ▼ ▼ ▼</td>
<td>▼ ▼ ▼ ▼ ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲ use up the social scale</td>
<td>▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not indicate frequency</td>
<td>▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲</td>
<td>▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher orders in this text distinguish between the higher status servants, addressing them as *you*, whilst servants of lower status receive *thou*. Master Plush, who aspires to be a gentleman, is alone in addressing Master William, one of the higher ranking servants, as *thou*. Plush is described as ‘a notable humorous Coxcomb’, with presumably insufficient social skills to identify conventional usage. When *you* is unmarked as an address term in a text, the use of *thou* by stereotypical comic characters such as Captain Whit, a stage Irishman, and Justice Overdo in the guise of a preacher also implies that *thou* is marked [1614 2CJONSO]. In a 1675 text [3CWYCHE], *you* is unmarked address within a group of London gallants. Master Sparkish, an outsider, aspires unsuccessfully to be part of the group. He addresses each of them as *thou*. This usage marks him as being outside the group. Sir Fopling Flutter, [1676 3CETHER] whose name denotes his comic status, continues to address Dorimant, a gentleman, as *thou* even when this is not reciprocated. Tegue O Divelly, an Irish priest [1682 4CSHADW], described as ‘an equal mixture of fool and knave’, uses variations of *thou* (*dou, dee, ty, dy*). These characters demonstrate social and...
linguistic insecurity. They aspire to be part of society but their usage does not conform to the norm. It is marked.

*Thou* as an unmarked address term seems most common among the higher orders. In 1607 younger higher status male friends exchange *thou*, whilst older higher status male friends exchange *you*. Older higher status characters also address younger higher status characters as *you*. There is use of ‘corrective *thou*’ in 1607. In 1611 the characters, who are mainly gentry, exchange *you*. Unmarked address within a group of gentlemen friends is *you* in the 1675 text. A newly-married wife greets her husband as *thou* and *thou* is used from a husband to his wife. In 1676 *thou* is used to young women and servants, otherwise characters exchange *you*. Again in 1682 a titled character addresses a young woman as *thou*, otherwise unmarked usage among the titled characters is *you*.

Characters in the 1694 text who are gentry or of similar status exchange *you*. The titled parents and their children in the 1696 text exchange *you* as do a merchant and his wife and the servants. The exception is a young woman who is addressed as *thou* by an old country gentleman. As late as 1723 *thou* is used within this social group by an aunt to her niece, though this may connote the difference in their ages rather than social solidarity [5CSTEEL]. It is used by the higher orders down the social scale to servants as late as 1734 [5CMILLE], though a gentleman in this text addresses his young child as *you*.

In the final text from 1757 the *thou*/*you* dichotomy appears to have been replaced by naming formats. Characters from a variety of social ranks including servants exchange *you* but there is a wide range of titles, which serve to locate the characters socially. There is still use of affective *thou*.

Writing of dialect literature, Ferguson (1998) coined the term *fictolinguistics* to describe the phenomenon when ‘aspects of the dialect that may seem absolutely inconsistent from the sociolinguistic perspective often have a clear logic when

---

134 1607 [2CWILKI] page 163 a switch to *thou* to remind one of the lower orders of his social status. A switch to *you* may also have this function. A Lady switches to address her maid as *thou* in appreciation of her wit but reverts to *you* to indicate that her maid is being presumptuous: *you grow impertinent* [1723 5CSTEEL].
viewed from the perspective of the narrative.’ In a similar way, the language of the constructed drama texts is inconsistent with the language of the authentic texts. The development of the narrative takes precedence over authentic usage. It is three times more likely for thou to collocate with an address term in the drama texts than in the authentic texts over the 200-year period and 10 times more likely for thou to collocate with an affective term in the drama texts. Audience awareness of the significance of a particular usage may cause it to survive long after it has ceased to feature in contemporary exchanges. An example of this is the use of thou by Old Bellair, a gentleman, to Emilia and to Harriet, who are young gentlewomen [1676 3CETHER]. Old Bellair addresses all the other characters as you but his bantering use to Emilia and Harriet in collocation with sweet Heart and sirrah constitutes what Partridge defines as ‘elderly gentlemen’ being ‘moodily whimsical’ (1969:25). Similarly Sir Rustick Good-Heart, an old country gentleman, addresses the young gentlewoman, Marina, as thou and child as he declares his love for her [1696 4CMANLE]. Marina finds his declaration inappropriate, suggesting that he is mistaken ‘at your age’. After 1620 the use of unmarked thou diminishes in drama texts (table 5, figures 5:1 and 5:2). There is more use of thou as a marked address term in drama texts than in other texts. This does not imply that playwrights were unaware of contemporary usage, rather that marked use has an evaluative connotation. It is ‘a species of interpretant’ (Shapiro 1983:15-17). Its use connotes some aspect of the speaker or the addressee to the audience.

With a total of 238,590 words drama comprises approximately 25% of the total text studied. A comparison of the collocation of thou and you with address terms in drama texts with that in the total of texts studied shows, as expected, a higher occurrence in drama (37% of the CED total), as utterances are directed for the benefit of the audience. There is also a higher occurrence of thou in collocation with address terms in drama texts: 23% of address terms compared with 18% in non-drama texts (figure 5:1). It is notable that thou is still used as an address term in drama texts in 1747 [SCHOADL].
Figure 5:1 Collocation of *thou* with Address Terms in Drama & Other Texts
There are no drama texts for the periods 1560-1580 & 1621-1640
Drama: Mean 17.40% STDEV 12.10% Other: Mean 21.60% STDEV 15.99%

There is a statistically significant high use of *thou* with address terms in both drama and non-drama texts in the period 1581-1600 (figure 5:2), though in non-drama texts the rate of use is fairly consistent at around 30-35% before a sudden fall in 1661-1680 (figure 5:1).

Figure 5:2 Collocation of *thou* and *you* with Address Terms in Drama Texts
There are no drama texts for the periods 1560-1580 & 1621-1640
*thou*: Mean 17.40% STDEV 12.10% *you*: Mean 82.60% STDEV 36.13%

A consideration of the collocation of *thou* with affective epithets shows that this is more common in drama than in non-drama texts (figure 5:3). When this collocation of *thou* with affective epithets is compared with collocations with address terms (figure 5:1), it is striking that drama is the genre of ‘emotional tension’ (Barber 1981:177). There is a far greater use of *thou* with affective epithets than there is of *thou* in collocation with address terms.
Figure 5:3 Collocation of *thou* with Affective Epithets in Drama & Other Texts

There are no drama texts for the periods 1560-1580 & 1621-1640.

Drama: Mean 37.50% STDEV 18.68%    Other: Mean 29.20% STDEV 18.10%

Figure 5:4 Collocation of *thou* & *you* with Affective Epithets in Drama Texts

There are no drama texts for the periods 1560-1580 & 1621-1640.

*thou*: Mean 37.59% STDEV 18.67%  *you*: Mean 62.50% STDEV 28.16%

There is a statistically significant high use of *thou* with affective epithets in drama texts in 1581-1600 (figure 5:4). From 1600 affective usage becomes more common with *you* than *thou* in drama texts (figure 5:4). In non-drama texts this change occurs from 1581 (figure 5:5).

Over the whole period affective epithets collocate with *thou* and *you* in drama texts in a ratio of 38:62 (figures 5:6 and 5:7). *Thou* collocates with negative affect to a statistically significant degree in drama texts in 1581-1600 but after that date *you* collocates with negative affect to a greater extent (figure 5:6).
In non-drama texts positive epithets collocate predominantly with you throughout the whole period (figure 5:8). Positive affect in drama collocates equally with thou and you until 1641 when there is a noticeable change to you-collocation (figure 5:7), though the use of thou in collocation with address terms also begins to diminish at this point in drama texts (figure 5:2). In non-drama texts thou in collocation with an address term falls significantly after 1660 (figure 5:1). It is more frequent in drama texts but is never as high as it is with affective epithets (figures 5:2 & 5:4). Thou continues to be used with positive affect in drama texts until the end of the period [1757 5GARRI]. The final example found in non-drama texts is in didactic texts [1703 4HOMEMEB].
Figure 5:7 Collocation of *thou* and *you* with Positive Epithets in Drama Texts

*thou*: Mean 38.125%  STDEV 20.46%  *you*: Mean 61.875%  STDEV 28.99%

Towards the end of the period [1747 5CHOADL], *thou* appears to function as a mitigating factor for the exchange of negative epithets between two friends in one drama text, as Clarinda switches to a marked *thou*:

Clarinda: Hey Day! O’ my Conscience *thou* art a brave Girl. *Thou* art the very first Prude, that ever had Honesty enough to avow her Passion for a Man.

Jacintha: And *thou* art the first finish’d Coquet who ever had any Honesty at all.

This is potentially banter but a third character does not interpret it as such:

Mrs. Strictland: Come, come! You are both too good for either of those Characters.
Other use of *thou* in this text in a pragmatically negative utterance does appear to be interpreted as banter:

Jack Meggot: Whom have we here? my old Friend Frankly?  
*Thou* art grown a meer Antique since I saw *thee*?  
How hast *thou* done these five hundred Years?

Frankly: Even as you see me; well, and at your Service, ever.

Other semantically negative *thou* in this period [1757 5CGARRI] can only be interpreted as negative:

Mrs. Dotterel: Consequences! What Consequences!  
*Thou* wretched, base, false, worthless Animal!

This is much later than the use of negative affect *thou* in non-drama texts (figure 5:9) where the final occurrence found was in the satirical didactic text [1703 4 HOLUCI].

Drama depicts a fictitious world that has to be sufficiently realistic for the audience to interpret. The text may not represent authentic usage but it has to resemble contemporary usage sufficiently for the audience to be able to perceive marked and unmarked usage and to be able to perceive the implications. It is likely that the numbers of switching in dramatic texts are higher than those in authentic texts but it is also likely that such switching was significant to the audience.
Chapter 6 Data Analysis of Didactic Works, Language Teaching & Miscellaneous Texts

Unlike drama texts didactic and language teaching texts are primarily intended to be read. They may have the same features of characterisation as the drama texts but tend to have less plot development with less change of topic and change of stance. They are texts invented by the author with little narratorial intervention. Their purpose is to instruct or inform. Argument or information is presented as a dialogue as if between master and student (Kytö & Walker 2006:23).

A) Didactic Works

1568 [1HOTILN] Flower of Friendshippe

Master Pedro discusses duty in marriage with a group of ladies and gentlemen. They exchange mutual you. There are rare uses of thou. Master Gaulter, a merie gentleman, cites the utterance of a wise man to a friend who has asked his advice:

Nowe choose, which of these foure [wives]
thou canst best content thy self

As an address to a friend, this can be seen as intimate, informal address. The address by Master Pedro, the instructor, to Master Gaulter begins with generic you (= one) and shifts to the specific reference that seems to connote affinity in the fellowship of men against shrewish women:

Tushe,\textsuperscript{135} they [women] bee shrewes all,
and if you giue the simplest of them
leau to daye to treade vpon your foote,
to morrowe she will tread vpon thy head

1579 [1HOBEZA] Little Catechisme

This text is translated from the French. It is religious instruction in the form of question and answer. The addressee is addressed as you. Many of the responses are not in the form of finite sentences. The questioner is not directly addressed.

\textsuperscript{135} OED an exclamation of impatient contempt or disparagement.
1579 [1HONICH] Lady Called Listra, and a Pilgrim

This is a dialogue between the Lady Listra and a poor pilgrim, who ‘was a man well growne in yeeres’, who encounter each other on the road. They address each other as father Pilgrime and Good Madam and exchange you.

1580 [1HODW] Certaine Godly Instructions

This text is set out in question and answer format and describes the rubric to be adopted by the minister of religion in assessing the preparedness of young people to receive Holy Communion. Initially he addresses the group as you and then the individual as thou. The format of the text indicates that this is formulaic usage.

Question: Whiche bee the outwarde signes in this Sacrament?
Answer: Bread and Wine.
Question: How doest thou receiue the outward signes?

1593 [1HOGIFF] Dialogve Concerning Witches

This is a dialogue constructed by a minister of religion concerning the Devil’s strategy in leading witches and others astray. M.B. and Dan, the participants, address each other as you.

Formulaic thou is used in addressing the Devil, as Dan reports to M.B.:

Dan: [a]s to say we command thee in the name of God, that thou tel vs who sent thee.
Who sent thee? who sent thee?

and in the speech of non-human beings. Another speaker, Sam, reports that a spirit appeared to a confessed witch and addressed her:

Spirit: thou hast confessed and bewrayed\textsuperscript{136} all,
I coulde teeme it to rend thee in peece

Goodwife R. tells M.B. the formula for driving a witch out of the cream:

Goodwife R. :Some thinke she is there,
& therefore, when they thrust in the spitte
they say, If thou beest here haue at thine eie.

\textsuperscript{136} OED malign, defame.
Use of thou among human speakers in this text seems to reflect social status. Sam recounts how a woman suspected of being a witch is admonished by a gentleman:

Gentleman: Looke yonder same is thy spirit.
[a Weasill or Lobsterre looking euen vpon them]

to which she replies:

Woman: Ah maister (said she) that is a vermine, there be many of them euery where.

The significant terms here are the indicators of social status, gentleman and woman. She is not a lady. The gentleman addresses her as thou and she calls him master. Another witch then confronts her, addressing her as thou in collocation with the negative epithet beast.

Another witch: Ah thou beast, what hast thou done? thou hast bewrayed vs all.

This seems to connote opprobrium rather than social intimacy.

Sam’s use of thou as a term of address to his wife does seem to indicate social intimacy:

Sam: Wife why diddest thou say that he sayd the good wife R. is a witch?

1594 [1HOOB] Questions of Profitable & Pleasant Concernings ... to Cure if it were possible, the Principle Diseases wherewith this Present Time is Especially Vexed

This is a dialogue between ‘two old seniors’ one of whom is ‘an ancient retired gentleman’ and ‘the other a midling or new upstart frankeling’. They dispute the concept of the possibility of creating a gentleman: one of the principal diseases of the title being the social aspirations of the lower orders.

Huddle is apparently the gentleman. He addresses Dunstable as: neighbour
Dunstable . Dunstable, the new upstart frankeling, addresses Huddle as: Sir, your maistership, your worship. They address each other throughout as you.

137 OED a freeholder, in 14th-15th c. the designation of a class of landowners, of free but not noble birth, and ranking next below the gentry.
1601 [2HOMAXE] New Instruction of Plowing and Setting

A discussion between a ploughman and a scholar of the latter’s newly-published book, *God speede the Plough*. The ploughman disputes the scholar’s recommendations but the discussion is amicable. They exchange *you* and address each other as *Sir*.

1601 [2HOCHUR] Concerning Churching of Women

The *woman* in this dialogue protests to her cousin, the Chancellor, that she has been served with a citation by his apparitor\(^{138}\) for not having presented herself for churching after childbirth. His stance switches during their exchange from annoyance at her presumption in dealing with matters beyond her concern to conciliatory address terms but they exchange *you* throughout.

1607 [2HONORD] Surveyors Dialogue

The objective of this text is to explain the function of the surveyor. It opens with a dialogue between the surveyor and the tenant farmer. They are hostile to each other but maintain exchange of *you* and *Sir* throughout.

Sample 2 of the text concerns the exchange between the surveyor and the lord of the manor. The lord’s address of *Friend* to the surveyor connotes ingratiating. He considers that he could benefit from the surveyor’s services but preserves social distance with the use of *you*:

Lord: *Friend*, of late I met with a Tenant of mine, who told me *you* are a *Surueyor of Land*.  
... I haue at this time some occasion to vse the ayd of one of *your* faculty

It may be the realisation that the surveyor is merely another domestic servant that motivates the lord to address him as such with *thou*. When the lord asserts that he knows the extent of his holdings but does not have the necessary skill to interpret the legal implication of this, however, he switches to *you* in acknowledgement of the surveyor’s superior knowledge:

\(^{138}\) *OED* an officer of an ecclesiastical court.
Lord: Thou sayst true in thy comparison: but for my part, although indeed I haue Land, and I know how many Mannors I haue, ... I needed not your seruice, as of quantities ... relate vnto me what you can say of the definition of a Mannor,

At the conclusion of the long technical exchange in which the surveyor explains the legal niceties of tenancy law, the lord switches to thou following the pragmatic marker well as he switches from the topic of the discussion to comment on the surveyor’s presentation of his argument. The social deixis changes as the persona of the surveyor changes from that of expert to that of potential employee:

Lord: Wel, I haue heard all thy discourse with patience:

In the final segment the farmer takes the surveyor to the first manor to be surveyed and misinterprets an apparently critical comment made by the surveyor, who hurries to correct him, then, in a remark introduced by the pragmatic marker but, the surveyor switches to thou in a move from the specific to the general. It is as if he maintains formal usage in exchanges that may be recorded but feels able to use a more familiar term in ‘idle communication’:

Surveyor: The house is beautifull and faire: I deride it not, you doe your selfe wrong in attaching mee, ... But to tell thee by the way, (for this is but idle communication) that I haue obserued in nothing more sudden and serious repentance, then for building.

1610 [2HOSNAW] Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes

The descriptions of the four women in this text indicate how they are to be assessed and the names Abigail and Xantip would presumably serve as character clues to contemporary readers:

Abigail,\textsuperscript{139} the fathers ioy
Eulalie, wel-spoken
Xantip,\textsuperscript{140} a scold
Margerie, a proud malapert

\textsuperscript{139} OED A lady’s maid; a female servant or attendant.
\textsuperscript{140} OED allusively An ill-tempered woman or wife, a shrew, a scold.
The writer approves of the first two but not of Xantip and Margerie. Xantip is the only speaker who does not use *thou*. Abigail is, to employ an anachronism, a prig, but, as ‘the father’s joy’, is intended as an admirable character. The motivation for some of her address term switches is problematic. Some of her apparent switches may indicate a change of addressee. Xantip states that she would have modified her language had she been aware of Abigail’s presence:

Xantip: Where were *you* that we saw *you* not before not?
Abigail: Little had *you* thought that I had bene so neare *you*, till *you* saw me.

Xantip: No, for if I had, I would not haue sworne so, as I did.

Abigail: Alas I heard *thee* with griefe, and thought to haue told *thee* of it at time conuenient: **but** were *you* not afraid lest God should see *you*, and heare *you* sweare so horribly.

Xantip refers only to herself as swearing. The first part of Abigail’s reply in the singular may be to Xantip alone and the second plural part may be addressed to them all. This would mean that they were all swearing. If this is not the case, Abigail changes the reference mid-utterance with the pragmatic marker **but** introducing a reorientation from her own viewpoint to that of Xantip’s viewpoint.

Abigail chastises the others for expressing an interest in their appearance rather than in God. Margerie suggests that this makes her sound like a Puritan, to which Abigail objects and addresses the ‘proud malapert’ Margerie as *you*:

Margerie: What shall wee haue of *you*? a Puritane?

Abigail: I pray *you* Margerie, vse no more such scoffing speeches.

She also addresses the ‘well-spoken’ Eulalie as *you* and this can have only singular reference, since she speaks privately to Eulalie:

Abigail: I will make my case knowne vnto *you* in *your* eare.

---

141 OED one who cultivates or affects a propriety of culture, learning, or morals, which offends or bores others; a conceited or self-important and didactic person.
This *you* is problematic, as Abigail has previously addressed Eulalie as *thou*:

Abigail: A lacke Eulaly, *thou* art an honest ciuill woman, I must needs say, but yet *thou* speakest very carnally

As Abigail’s main function is to instruct the other women in their ‘behaviours toward God and their husbands’, much of her discourse concerns religion. In general when relating their behaviour, she addresses them as *you* and when commenting on how she regards such behaviour, her usage becomes *thou*:

Abigail: *You* haue uttered too much of *your* own euil disposition;
... I dare assure *thee*, it doth grieue me at the heart;

but this is not consistent:

Abigail: O neighbour Eulalie, if *you* would but practise that which *you* know, I should loue *you* better then euer I did: for then I hope *you* would be a Christian indeed.

Unmarked usage for the ‘well-spoken’ Eulalie, the other character of whom the writer approves, is *you*. She switches to *thou* in criticising Xantip’s preoccupation with their new gowns and in finding fault with her husband:

Eulalie: Well Xantip, well, I pray *thee* be contented;
and if *thou* louest me, nay if *thou* louest God or *thy* selfe, marke well what our good neighbour Abigail hath said out of the Apostle Paul, that the woman ought to be in subiection to her husband.
... O terrible mannish woman!
I did not thinke that *thou* hadst bene of such a peremptory spirit. *Thou* doest not remember that he hath power ouer *thee*, and that *thou* shouldest let *thy* desire be subiect to *thy* husbands.

It seems that for Eulalie *thou* connotes negative affect. Later she tells Xantip:

Eulalie: Truly Xantip it is as I say, and therefore cry Christ mercy for *thy* cursed blasphemy, and study to agree with *thy* husband henceforward by appluing *thy* selfe vnto his qualities.

having first formally sought Xantip’s permission for some plain speaking:

Eulalie: I pray *you* good neighbour hold *your* tounge, and giue me leaue to speake my mind a little to *you*.

to which Xantip agrees, since they have been best friends since childhood:
Xantip: You say true. For truly we haue bene play-fellowes from our cradles; and of all that euer I had, there was none that I euer loued better then you.

The other participant, Margerie, the ‘proud malapert’, sympathises with Xantip whose husband spends all her marriage portion:

Margerie: If I were as thou art, I would haue better things, or else the house should be too hot for him

and who threatens her with violence:

Xantip: Hee got vp a great cudgell, and shaked it at me, threatening me with thundering speeches.

Margerie: Wast thou not afraid then Xantip?

Her sympathy turns to admiration, however, on hearing how Xantip reacted. Her switch to you here connotes Xantip’s masculine persona (‘your manly courage’) in resisting her husband’s aggression. This contrasts with Eulalie’s negative reaction to the same perception: ‘O terrible mannish woman!’ For Eulalie (above) this collocates with thou.

Xantip: Afraid? no: on the other side, I tooke vp the treuit; and if he had but touched me with a finger, he should wel haue seene and felt, that I would haue laid about me lustily with both my hands.

Margerie: I promise you, I commend you for your manly courage; ... did he, when you stood so stoutly to him, leaue off to threaten you blowes?

Unmarked usage for Margerie is to address Abigail and Eulalie as you but she greets Xantip with thou and resumes this usage after this switch, expressing positive affect and affinity with the other apparent non-conformist:

Margerie: It was well done Xantip; hold him out still at staues end, yeeld him not an inch, lest he take an ell: let him not crow ouer thee.

... What does hee, I pray thee, whilst thou art scolding?

... I am sure, this behauiour of his angers thee to the heart.

There is no reference to social status in this text. The participants address each other by name or as: woman, gossip, neighbour. For both Xantip and Eulalie thou may connote affect, the nature of which is determined by their perception of the topic.
**1615 [2HOHOBY] Cvry-Combe for a Coxe-Combe**

This is a response by Sir Edward Hoby, written under the pseudonym Nick Groom, to a libel against him by Jabal Rachil. Unmarked usage among the characters in this text: Nick, groom to Sir Edward, the mayor and to a minister of religion is *you*. The mayor and the minister of religion, who are of higher social status than Nick, switch to address him as *thou* when he utters one word of Latin. This seems to impress his interlocutors, who comment favourably on his social status: ‘thou art true bred’ and demeanour: ‘thou art a merrie grigge.’

Nick: I will ferret his sides till he crie Flebo

Minister: I perceiue *thou* art true bred; such a Whelp is fittest for this game: But how camest *thou* by *thy* Latin?

Maior: On my soule *thou* art a merrie grigge. I would not for the price of a good Breake-fast haue wanted *thy* companie in the revieu of this discourse.

They both immediately revert to *you*, then the Mayor switches to *thou* again in approbation of Nick’s further use of Latin:

Maior: Gra-mercy Nick, I perceiue *thou* hast not left all *thy* Latine shreads at home.

Nick may not be of equivalent social status to the others but his knowledge of Latin accords him prestige, which motivates these expressions of approbation.

**1640 [3HOTJ] Vpright the Shoomaker**

This is a dialogue between two craftsmen who initially address each other as *Sir* and *Master* collocating with family name. They do not seem to be close acquaintances but their exchange descends into mutual sniping initially expressed by *you*:

Pattent, the Smith: how many of the Kings Subjects have *you* put in the stockes\(^{143}\) without authority not vagrants and Beggars, but Gentlemen, Marchants, Citizens, with their wives and daughters.

---

\(^{142}\) OED an extravagant lively person, one who is full of frolic and jest.  
\(^{143}\) OED *the shoemaker’s stocks* (jocularly): tight boots.
Vpright, the Shoemaker: I understand your wit:
you mean that I have made their shooes too little for them.
... They had better be in the Shoomakers stacks,
then be so gauled\textsuperscript{144} by Pattent\textsuperscript{145} as they have beene.
Pattent; I doe not thinke but you have dranke your
Mornings draught in Wormewood Beere Mr. Vpright.
... You fall so bitter upon me:

Vpright: I shall be bitterer ere we part Master Pattent.

Pattent, the smith, switches to thou with negative affect stripping his interlocutor of
title and name, addressing him only by his occupation:

Pattent: Doe thy worst Shoomaker.

But Upright has worse opprobrium to heap on Pattent than criticism of his
workmanship. He recalls a past event that Pattent remembers with amusement,
motivating his switch to you to Upright in anticipation of the positive affect of
shared amusement:

Vpright: doe you remember when you were Constable Master Pattent,
when you tooke me in your watch on Crispine
and Crispianus Night, and carried me to the Counter.

Pattent: Ha ha ha, yes I doe, I doe.
Vpright: Doe you laugh at it.

Pattent: Yes faith, I remember you went beyond your Last then.

Upright, however, did not consider this an amusing anecdote and switches to thou in
collocation with a string of negative epithets and phrases:

Vpright: I remember thou wer't the troublesom' st
tyrannicall Constable that ever knock'd down
iniquity with a painted staffe:
... And what had your Loggerhead to doe with Mr.
Logwood the Dyer; thou wilt vndertake to teach
people to dye well, and thy selfe could'st never live well.

\textsuperscript{144} OED chafed.
\textsuperscript{145} OED a kind of overshoe or sandal worn to raise the ordinary shoes out of mud or wet.
The switch to *you* in this utterance introduced by the pragmatic marker **and** functions as an aside then Upright resumes his criticism of Pattent with a switch back to *thou*. Pattent’s reply is an appreciation of Upright’s puns:

Pattent: Very good.

but Upright switches the topic back to a discussion of the consequences of the behaviour of *you*, Pattent, in the role of *thou*, constable:

Vpright: **Not** very bad sir, 'tis *you* I am talking off, 
*doe you* heare Pattent, the Spanish Marchant 
Don tobacco vowes a revenge upon *thee*, and I much feare he will take *thy* life:

The ensuing exchanges switch between *you* and *thou* as the pair abuse each other. 
Terms of opprobrium may collocate with either address term:

Pattent: *you* Dunstable\(^{146}\)  
... *ye* Pantoffle\(^{147}\)  
... *you* vagrants

Vpright: Yes *you* paper Kite\(^{148}\)  
... *thou* lack in a boxe\(^{149}\)  
... *you* puppie\(^{150}\)

Of the two, Upright switches address terms more frequently. The Latin motto in the title of the text may explain this: ‘Ne Sutor Ultra Crepidam’ ~ *Let the Cobbler Stick to his Last*. It is when Upright complains of Pattent’s other persona as constable that he switches to *thou* of opprobrium:

Vpright: *thou* wer't the troublesom'st tyrannicall Constable  
...*when you* traded in sheepskins and Lambskins  
**oh thou** wer't a precious Woolfe in Lambskinne

The one reference to address terms is made by Upright who objects when Pattent addresses him as *goodman Shoomaker*. The term *goodman* is defined in the OED as: ‘prefix to designations of occupation, prefixed to names of persons under the rank of gentlemen, a man of substance, not of gentle birth; a yeoman.’ Upright interprets

---

\(^{146}\) OED plain-speaker.  
\(^{147}\) OED slipper, loose shoe, sandal.  
\(^{148}\) OED term of reproach or detestation.  
\(^{149}\) OED name for a sharper or cheat.  
\(^{150}\) OED applied to a person as a term of contempt.
this as a slur on his social status and retaliates with distinct social deixis: ‘I am a Gentleman ... thou art an Upstart’

Pattent: But heark ye goodman Shoomaker.

Vpright: Goodman Shoomaker, I deny and defie the title. I am a Gentleman, my gentility is of Antiquity, thou art an Upstart; Shooes were made when thy villanous Pattents were not thought on.

**1641 [3HOTRAV] Dialogue betwixt Three Travellers**

Factious Wrest-Writ, the puritan in this dialogue, appears to address Crucy Cringe, the papist, stereotypically as *thou*. Both Crucy Cringe and Accepted Weigh All, a member of the Church of England, use only *you* in addressing the other participants. Their names refer to their personae. Only Accepted Weigh All is moderate. The others are extremists whose ‘errors’ are discussed in the text.

The use of *thou* by Factious is not, however, indicative of his Puritanism but collocates with his abuse to Crucy:

Factious: Out of my sight, *thou* Idolator;

... Down Dagon, 151 down, I hate *thee* Cringe; I hate *thee* and *thy* late disputed doctrine of the reall presence in the Sacrament,

**1641 [3HOPOET] Dovvnefall of Temporizing Poets**

This text is described as ‘a very pleasant dialogue, printed merrily’, suggesting it is intended as a comedy. The protagonists are: Light-foot, the Mercury, who sells pamphlets and newsbooks in the street, Suck-bottle, the Hawker, who sells books and the Moderator between them, Red-Nose, the Poet. Encountering his rival, Light-foot greets him with *you* then switches to *thou* in reorientating the topic to answer his own enquiry. This gives his utterance the structure: question, statement, directive and moves it from his viewpoint to that of Suck-bottle:

151 OED an idol, or object of idolatrous devotion
Light-foot: How now Suck-bottle, how goes the world with you?
me-thinkes you are growne very wist of late,
... Tell me the cause of thy dejected countenance.

This apparent expression of sympathy switches to negative affect with you in collocation with the negative term Sirrah, in response to Suck-bottle’s curse:

Suck-bottle: A pox on you Lightfoot, if it had not beene for you I might have beene now merry and frolicke

Light-foot: Sirrah Suck-bottle, doe not you lay the cause of your downfull upon me,

Suck-bottle's subsequent switch to thy is problematic. When he tells Light-foot,

Suck-bottle: Light foot, cease thy rayling,

it is not immediately apparent if this indicates abuse or banter, since ‘rayling’ may imply either [OED]: ‘uttering abusive language or jesting or bantering’. Red-Nose, the poet, entering at this point has overheard them. He has interpreted their exchange as negative affect:

Red-Nose: me thinkes yee should rather deplore one anothers late misfortunes, than to deride at each others misery.
... You Master Light-foot call Master Suck-bottle Knave, and Master Suck-bottle calls you Knave, and as for my part, I thinke yee are both Knaves.

Lightfoot turns on the poet:

Light-foot: Master Poet, your tongue runnes before your wit, you tell us of our faults, but never looke upon your own.

Suck-bottle becomes conciliatory:

Suck-bottle: Master Poet, let me desire you to cease, I have heard you thus long with patience, let us all three bee Friends.

The poet agrees to be placated on condition that their reconciliation is confirmed in the Tavern:

Poet: Well spoken Sim Suck-bottle, I were not worthy the name of a Poet if I would not condescend to be friends, so the band of amity were made in an Ale-house or a Taverne.

Light-foot raises a problem:

Light-foot: Have you any money Poet?
Throughout these exchanges with the poet in which the stance has switched from opprobrium to conciliation, the address term you has been used consistently. In addressing Light-foot, the poet switches to thou. The pragmatic marker come reorients the topic with an implied stress on thou to indicate that poets are unlikely to have money, whereas ‘I know thou hast’ and it does no harm to imply affinity in addressing a possible source of funds.

Poet: Money? I wonder when you ever see Poets have money two dayes together, ... come, I know thou hast money Light foot.

The final addresses to the poet form a poetic couplet whose structure licences the formulaic poetic use of thou:

Light-foot: Thy fall O Poet, makes poor Light foot mad.
Suck-bottle: Thy fall O Poet, makes Suck bottle sad.

1641 [3HOCARE] Coyntry-Mans Care

This is an encounter between two strangers, a countryman and a city dweller, who discuss the prospects of advancement for the countryman’s son. They address each other as Sir and exchange you. The countryman is not a peasant, since his son is educated and understands Latin but he defers to the citizen:

Countryman: Alas sir! I wonder you should so earnestly enquire newes of mee, that live in the Countrey, whenas we receive all our newes from you.

The text is a satire on the chaotic nature of the times. The citizen advises the countryman against the conventional careers for a young educated man:

Citizen: if you intend to make a Divine of him, he must have a great care least the Arch-Bishop doe not cut of his eares 
... Did you not heare that most of the Iudges are to be judged under other Iudges, yea and they'le hardly escape hanging too.

The text concludes with the citizen offering to take on the young man as an apprentice, telling the concerned father:

Citizen: I am a Vintner by my Trade.

---

152 ‘verbal humour which draw[s] on a particluar kind of irony for the design of stylistic incongruity... satire has an aggressive element ... satirical discourse ... requires a kind of ironic twist or distortion in its textual make-up.’ (Simpson 2004:46-47)
Of interest is the exchange of address terms. Both speakers are of the middling sort. As strangers they are unable initially to place each other socially and rely on the use of neutral you as unlikely to give offence.

1641 [3HOSTAR] Star-Chamber Epitomized

In this text Inquisition, a newes smeller, is interviewing Christopher Cob-Web, a keeper of the records for the Star-Chamber. The structure of the exchange as question and answer means that Inquisition makes more use of the second person pronoun than Cob-Web. He greets Cob-Web familiarly:

Inquisition: My old friend Christopher Cob-Webbe how goe all things at your Office.

The you in this utterance is probably generic, since he continues with an address of thee to Cob-Web and an obvious generic reference to ‘your High Court’.

Inquisition: Why I pray thee tell what is the matter, J hope the Parliament doth not meddle with so great a Court as your high Court of Starre-chamber.

Cob-Web addresses Inquisition as Sir and uses only you to him. Inquisition switches sometimes to ask a formal direct question:

Inquisition: Why are not Lawyers so honest as other men? Doe you know any thing to the contrary?

and switches back with a collusive thou to ingratiate himself when it seems as if Cob-Web is about to reveal some scandal and to encourage him to continue until all the details have been revealed:

Inquisition: Thou now tells me of a thing more then ever J heard of; is it possible ... Surely ... How J pray did they squeeze their Claints? That is unpossible sure ... This was intollerable exaction, but I pray thee proceed. ... But J pray thee to what use was the money taken, and how was it imployed? ... I pray thee proceed? ... But I pray thee explaine who were these two Clarkes.
1641 [3HOSPIR] Spirituall Courts Epitomized

This is an exchange between two proctors lamenting their loss of business in the Spiritual Courts under the contemporary Parliament. It is mainly in the first person as they reminisce singly and together. Despite having the solidarity of employment in the law and addressing each other as brother, they exchange you.

1653 [3HOCOLE] Ingrossers of Coles

This dialogue is between two merchants whose objective is to hoard coal in order to sell it at inflated prices. They greet each other amicably as brother and cozen whilst exchanging you:

Chandler: How is it with you Brother Stop-coale?
Woodmonger: Why so, deare Cozen Hoord-coale?

then Chandler reacts with disparagement to Woodmonger’s concern that commissioners may be appointed to investigate their dealings, switching to thou at his colleague’s negativity and then back to you to elaborate his suggestion that they can collude to bribe any investigators.

Chandler: Tush, what’s the, matter? doest thou not know the old Proverb? (Knaves have better luck then honest men) cannot we joyne and make a purse? and you know, silver bags will worke, especially with good store of Wine, and a rich Feast;

Here you seems to connote affinity and positive affect.

The pair discuss how they cheat their customers with Chandler advising the less-successful Woodmonger, who switches to thou in approbation:

Woodmonger: Oh rare policy! surely thou hast mightily incouraged mee to kepp up mu [my] mystery;

Chandler invites Woodmonger to share his strategies and both exchange you:

Chandler: I would hear now what devices you use to squeeze your Customers.

Woodmonger: Why I would not have you thinke that we doe not equalize, but rather exceed these stratagems;
Woodman’s next switch to *thou* connotes negative affect. He embeds in his dismissal of Chandler’s claim to outdo him: ‘Pish ... I tell thee plainly’ a nest of explanatory subordinate clauses addressed to *you* and introduced by the pragmatic marker *for*:

**Woodmonger:** Pish\(^{353}\) man, if that Art should faile, we use another;

*for you* must know we deale with a Fleet of Colliers as Hunters do with their Hounds etc.

... I tell *thee* plainly, that by this onely trick we have gotten twenty bushels of coales cleare to our selves out of three chaldron; and is not this a thriving Trade?

Woodmonger’s final switches seem to connote solidarity in adversity as he labels them both foxes. The reversion to *you* introduces a new money-making scheme as Woodmonger switches from reflection to proposed action.

**Woodmonger:** Truly I know *you* to bee good furtheres of our gaines ... *but* to disclose some deeper craft in our dealing yet, I tell *thee*, Brother Hoord-Coale, wee know that wee are hated and cursed of every man, but then we Foxes fare best; ... *except* the wisedome and Justice of a Parliament, or a Counsell of State interpose and hinder us by stinting our number ... I tell *you* Brother, there is such a generall exclamation of people of all sorts against us ... I confesse, that I doubt our best dayes are past

*1679 [3HOYARR] Coffee-House Dialogue*

This is a coffee-house discussion of the Exclusion Bill of 1679 which sought to exclude the Duke of York, the illegitimate son of Charles II, from the succession. The discussion ends opprobriously but the participants have exchanged *you* throughout. The closing comment directed at the captain is the first ad hominem attack in the exchange.

P, a Young Barrister: in truth *you* do not know so much as *you* have spoke ... I begin now to be weary with *your* Impertinence ... Well, I see *you* are an obstinate, prejudic’d Man, therefore I'le take my Leave. (Farewell).

\(^{353}\) OED an exclamation expressing contempt, impatience, or disgust.
1680 [4HOEP] Piper and Captain

This text is a discussion by Tom the Piper and Captain Crackbrain of a pamphlet that took the form of a dialogue between Cit and Bumpkin. The text opens with Crackbrain addressing Tom as an acquaintance with a familiar thou.

Captain Crackbrain: On my Soul, that's Tom the Piper that sits so gravely there: He is a notable Knave, I'll acost him, pretend acquaintance, and get something out of him; How dost thou Tom? I think there is no body left in the House but us two, if thou wilt I'll sit down by ye.

Crackbrain’s familiar address is explained by his pretended acquaintance. Not knowing Crackbrain, Tom addresses him with formal you:

Tom Piper: Sir, may I beg the favour of your Name?

After this initial approach, Crackbrain switches to you and the pair exchange you in discussing the pamphlet.

Captain Crackbrain: But lets Talk now of other matters, and because I hear you to Be Book learned, I'll ask you what you think of the Dialogue 'twixt Cit and Bumpkin.

Where Crackbrain uses you, he is asking Tom’s opinion of events.

Captain Crackbrain: But what say you to all the Phanaticks so cordially joyning in it ... But what think you of the discovery of a new Plot, in case the Petition had gone on;

When he poses a question to thou Tom, he is asking Tom’s opinion about the writer’s style. Perhaps this motivates the usage. In switching to the proximal pronoun he is seeking to persuade Tom to the writer’s viewpoint.

Captain Crackbrain: But what thinkst thou Tom, to page 26. is it not an excellent facetious discourse, displaying Villalany in its proper colours?

The third participant, Make a Noise Tom, the Pudding-Pie Man, enters towards the end of the discussion. His relationship to Crackbrain, whom he addresses with a disparaging epithet, Captain Crackfart, in collocation with unmarked you, contrasts
with his relationship to Tom to whom he adopts an intimate address telling him how Crackbrain was cashiered from the Army and assumed the title of Captain.

Make a noise Tom: What you Captain Crackfart turn’d Advocate;
... I tell thee Tom Piper, how this fellow came by the doughty name of Captain,

He then switches usage in the same utterance in a change of topic introduced by the pragmatic marker, but as to, to address Crackbrain as thou.

Make a noise Tom: But as to the discourse,
I tell thee Old Souldier; that he or thou, or any body that wears a head, God bless the king, should have call’d, or shall call me by the contemptible name of Cit (though I be but free of the Porters Company) I would and will, if ever it be any mans ill luck so to do, all to be pudding pie his Calves head: What Cit.

The construction, ’ I tell thee’, seems to be emphatic (rather like the Modern English usage ‘Let me tell you’). It has a similar connotation in Ingrossers of Coles [3HOCole 1653]. The implication in this text is that Make a Noise Tom objects strongly to being referred to by the ‘contemptible name of Cit’. His claim concerning the unacknowledged role played by the schismatics in the restoration of Charles II is similarly emphatic:

Make a noise Tom: I tell thee Crackbrain, had the King had no better friends than the Papists, he had never seen the English shore again.

Exchanges revert to you after this with just one more thou in Make a Noise Tom’s comment on Tom’s recital of a passage from a play:

Make a noise Tom: but thou hast a plaguy memory to remember all this stuffe, I wonder how thou dost it, I can hardly remember the Lords Prayer.

Tom’s self-deprecatory reaction implies that he interprets this as amicable usage:

Tom: Nature always supplies Fools and blind men with a special gift that way.
1681 [4HOTREA] Treason Made Manifest

In this text the participants introduced simply as Richard and William discuss recent treason trials. They address each other as neighbour and exchange you. There is no indication of their social status.

1681 [4HOSAM] Sam, the Ferriman

Unmarked usage of the three boatmen, Tom, Will and Sam, in this text is to exchange thou. On the rare occasions when you is used this connotes banter. Tom refers to Will as poor Rogue and Whelp and relates how he has eaten ‘half a Stone of Beef today’. Will denies this and adds that ‘not one mouthful of Mutton was to be seen’. To this Tom retorts:

Tom: Sirrah, one word more of Mutton and off you go; you cannot forbear your Roguery.

Will’s retort to Tom’s claim to have been ‘press’d once into the Service when the Duke [of Monmouth] was our Amral’,

Will: Pox on you Rogue, you staid but one Bout and run away;

produces further discussion of the Duke but no perception of any slight on Tom’s part.

On those occasions when the participants do speak disparagingly to each other, they use the term thou. This occurs when correcting a misperception rather than when commenting on behaviour.

Sam: Why, I thought no man living durst have medled with any of the Blood Royal.

Will: Thou art a Fool, did not they behead the last King, and kept this banished a long time?

and later:

Tom: Pray thee, who were these Noblemen that Petitioned?

Will: I cannot tell thee who they were by their Names; but he that was the Rump’s first General delivered it.
Sam: He! thou art a Fool Will. he is dead at least thirty years since:

An example of *thou* connoting downward social status occurs in reported speech from a Member of Parliament to a boatman, though this may have also some connotation of affinity since this text is contemporaneous with the Exclusion Crisis when there was a move to exclude the king’s brother and heir from the succession because he was a Roman Catholic. The Member of Parliament, presumably a supporter of the move, had been lecturing his boatman during their trip down the river. The boatman being deaf had nodded in apparent agreement from time to time, at which the Member of Parliament concludes that the boatman may keep the change from his fare:

Member: I see *thou* art a right English man, a good Protestant, and, I dare say, hates the Popish Successor with all *thy* heart, and therefore I will give *thee* the whole Six pence.

Another example of reported speech features a Member of Parliament angry at what he considers ‘an unusual fare’ telling a waterman that he will introduce legislation to restrict their numbers and compelling them to display licences. The waterman responds ‘civilly’ that he hopes, as a freeman of Waterman’s Hall, he could not be compelled to take a licence. The Member of Parliament takes umbrage at this as the appellations *Sirra* and *sawcy Rogues* connote:

Member: *Sirra*, for *your* sake, and such *sawcy* Rogues as *you* are, we will have that Watermans-Hall pulled down,

so that *you* here collocates with terms of negative affect.

The other example of reported speech that may be status-related concerns two foot-boys fighting in the Palace Yard. The defeated boy, who was the servant of a Member of Parliament, threatens to send for the other’s master to have him arrested for employing such a rogue as would dare to commit such a breach of privilege in beating him. The victor, however, reveals himself as a servant of the King of France and tells him:

French footboy: Go bid *thy* Master, and the House of Commons send a Serjeant at Arms to fetch him over.
This use of *thou* seems derogatory. Money the boys had wagered on the outcome was held by a waterman who was threatened by the defeated boy,

English footboy: Sirrah, give it him if you dare, if his Master be the King of France, I'll make you answer it before the House of Commons.

Sirrah and *you* collocate with negative affect.

**1685 [4HOKATE] Honest John and Loving Kate**

This is a discussion between John and Kate of their approaching marriage. Unmarked usage for Kate is to address John as *you*. She addresses him as *thou* on two occasions: in commenting on John’s proposal that they should run an ale house together:

John: how dost *thou* like such an imployment?
Kate: Very well truly if it will not make *thee* an ill Husband
and in expressing her reluctance to dance with the guests at the wedding:

Kate: Ide rather dance with *thee* John, than with them all.
Kate: You’d best wet your whistle first, for I see thy Pipes are stopt

John’s use of *thou* in collocation with a multiplicity of terms of endearment connotes positive affect: *my dear Katy, Dear heart, Pretty heart, Sweet soul, Pretty soul, honey, my dear, Poor heart, my Birds-ny,*154 *my sweet love, pretty Pig-ny,*155 yet he uses similar terms with *you*.

John: God be with *you* sweet one, my Duck my
dear, my Pig’s-ny, when we do meet to morrow,
we will conclude all more firmly; *here*, take my
heart and a hundred kisses besides with it, and keep
them till I see *thee*.

‘Here’ appears to be deictic as he draws her to him or gestures towards her motivating a switch to *thou*. Similarly, it seems that *thou* relates to their personal relationship and *you* is used when discussing an outside agent, for example:

John: Who told *you* these stories,
truly I never kiss any one but in mirth,
for I will never marry any but *thee* my love.

---
154 OED an obsolete vulgar term of endearment.
155 OED sweetheart.
but later the same question has *thou*:

John: I shall shun both Maids and widdows, unless in *thy* sight to make *thee* sport: but who tells *thee* these stories? prethee Kate tell me,

It may be that *thou* connotes persuasive force as in the switch in these consecutive utterances:

John: Be not in such a passion, 'ile tell you how it was.
Kate: I shall not hear you.
John: Dear heart, hear me, by this kiss ile tell thee truth.

and later:

John: I wish you would believe me, and not be thus jealous, pray be not so cruel to torment me thus, no whore of them all shall entice me from *thee*,

Some of John’s uses of *you* seem to connote his authority as Kate’s prospective husband in contrast to his persuasion as a lover. When Kate objects to John’s proposed inn sign of ‘three fair maids’, he responds curtly,

Kate: Why man they’d think surely we kept a bawdy house.
John: What then shall we have, do *you* tell me?

He reassures Kate when she expresses embarrassment at the thought of being the centre of attention at their wedding but seems to lose patience when she seeks further reassurance:

Kate: but good lack how shall I do to behave my self at that time amongst so many; I shall be so ashamed I shant know what to do.

John: No matter for their looking, 'ile warrant thee who ever sees thee will wish her self in the same condition, who are not married already.

Kate: Will they think *you*.
John: I faith i'l warrant *you*.

Since John’s unmarked usage to Kate is *thou*, the address term *you* and John’s complacent response to Kate’s concern serve to remind her of his impending social superiority as her husband and Master.

John: ... my Master he is angry too, but faith I fit him for it, for when he begins to chide, I get me out of doors, and come no more in that night.
Kate: *Youl* serve me so I fear.
John: Ay if *you* chide.
When Kate is concerned that her mistress will be angry that she is late, neither of them views as ironic John’s response that he will soon assume the role of her social superior,

Kate: my Mistriss will be very angry with me.
John: So shall [i]f you go yet, you must learn to humour me now.

though this is ameliorated somewhat by his change of topic and usage introduced by the pragmatic marker come:

Kate: You do not think how impatient I am with staying
Oh my Mistriss, my Mistriss.
John: You shall have a Master shortly worth ten of her,
come stay a little, i’le sing thee a fine Song of my own making.

1695 [4HOROGU] State Rogue

Unmarked usage here may indicate relative social status. The Member of Parliament, Mr State Rogue, addresses Mr John Undertaker as thou and Jack and receives you and my dear State Rogue from him.

Jack’s switch is provoked by the reorientation of the State Rogue’s reaction from polite interest to ridicule of Jack’s proposed scheme to wage single-handed war against France. The pragmatic marker Now introduces Jack’s switch from an explanatory discourse to his confusion at State Rogue’s response:

Jack Undertaker: Now can’t I, for the Soul of me, understand where lies this merry Conceit; nor what in the Name of Fate it is that thou laughest at. I ask thee where’s the Difficulty in my Undertaking, and thou fallest a Laughing

The derogatory nature of the explanation introducing John’s next utterance could imply that his switch to you is deprecatory but it is more likely to be a move back to unmarked usage following his puzzlement at State Rogue’s laughter:

John Undertaker: Shaw, shaw, you talk like an Apothecary.

156 OED one of those who in the reigns of Jas. I, Chas. I, and Chas. II undertook to influence the action of Parliament, esp. with regard to the voting of supplies. This seems to be the likely interpretation in this context despite the late date.
157 OED an exclamation expressing contempt, impatience, or disgust.
John’s next switch echoes the syntax of the State Rogue’s utterance, which seems to emphasize his own argument, especially if the stress of Jack’s question falls on thee:

State Rogue: What, in the Name of Pharaoh, should make thee imagine that the Parliament should give thee such vast Sums of Money for no Service;

Jack Undertaker: And what, in the Name of Jupiter, should make thee approve of their actually giving it a Dutch Man, for the very same Non-service?

the pragmatic marker and here indicating a change of orientation from Jack’s viewpoint to that of State Rogue.

The State Rogue switches twice to you in addressing Jack in the phrase look you. This phrase seems to have become a fixed expression in the seventeenth century. It is attested eleven times in the OED from the end of the sixteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century. The form ‘looke thee’ is attested only from the Shepherd’s address to his son, the Clown, in The Winter’s Tale (1611). The use of ‘look you’ does not, therefore, seem to constitute markedness switch.

The State Rogue’s unmarked use of thou to Jack may connote a difference in their social status, though there is no evidence of this. Jack is described as ‘his old acquaintance’. The epithets State Rogue uses suggest that he regards Jack as something of a character. He describes Jack as: ‘a rare Fellow, old Boy, my true honest English Man’ and laughs at his proposal to defeat France single-handedly:

State Rogue: Ha, ha, ha, by my troth thou makest me laugh; a most incomparable Project! O rare Mr. Undertaker! But thou’rt not in earnest sure Jack? ... Why the Devil’s in thee sure to talk at this rate. ... prethee leave off this Boffonery, and be serious.

He is finally persuaded that the project may succeed and agrees to persuade his fellow-rogues to finance it with the objective of personal profit. Ultimately, Jack is revealed as a patriot and the State Rogue as interested only in financial gain. Possibly his use of thou to Jack is an over familiar approach motivated by his previous experience of the success of Jack’s schemes but this suggestion is speculative.
Jack’s one use of *thou* is formulaic in his apostrophe to England:

Jack Undertaker: O England! unhappy England! betray’d by *thy* own Children!

**1696 [4HOTWO] A Dialogue between Two Young Ladies lately Married, concerning Management of Husbands**

This text replicates one of the themes of the Snawsel text (1610) *A Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes* [2HOSNAW]. As the titles imply, this later text concerns the management of husbands, whereas the earlier text concerns not only this but also behaviour towards God. The participants are reduced to two in this text, so that we are presented with a dialogue without the third-party commentary of the 1610 version. Eulalie, the *wel-spoken* character from 1610 becomes Amy, who advises and castigates the former Xantip, ‘the scold’, who is now Lucy. Their dialogue also incorporates some of that spoken in the earlier text by Marjorie, who tends to sympathise with Xantip. Some of the religious discourse attributed to Abigail, ‘the father’s joy’ (and Puritan), in the first text remains. There is no *thou* usage in this later text, though unlike the earlier text where Eulalie greets Xantip as neighbour, the protagonists greet each other as friends:

Amy: Welcome, my dear Lucy! I have long’d to see you.

Lucy: Sweet Amy! I have had no less impatience for your dear Company.

A comparison of the two texts to investigate how the connotation of *thou* in the earlier text is expressed in the 1696 version suggests that the later text is less emotive. The comment on the mistreatment of Xantip/Lucy by her husband seems quite unfeeling:

1610 Margerie: I am sure, this behauiour of his angers *thee* to the heart.

1696 Amy: This enraged you.

Similarly the reaction to the claim by Xantip/Lucy that she would have retaliated had her husband assaulted her provokes horror in the earlier text and sorrow in the later text:
1610 Eulalie: O terrible mannish woman!
I did not thinke that thou hadst bene of such a peremptory spirit

1696 Amy: Alas, alas, my Lucy, this is not the way.

When Xantip/Lucy asks for advice on how to reform her husband, the first reply criticises her for not applying what she has learned. The repetition of her name emphasises the speaker’s exasperation. The reply in the second text suggests that she lacks the confidence to apply her knowledge:

1610 Eulalie: Xantip, Xantip, thou art like vnto those women which the Apostle speakes of, that are alwaies learning, and are neuer taught:
... thou remainest still ignorant

1696 Amy: You need no Teacher, the Art is yours already, you only want a Will to use it.

1697 [4HORIDP] Jack and UUill

This is a discussion of the Lord Mayor’s attendance at a Conventicle preceded by his ceremonial sword; the implication of which is that he attended in his official capacity, thus giving it official approval. Jack disapproves of this but Will seems deliberately obtuse in appearing not to understand Jack’s concern.

Jack: I’m sure I have a piece of ill News to tell you.
Did not you hear that my Lord Mayor went to Salters-Hall on Sunday last, with the Sword carried before him?
Will: To Salters-Hall, what to do? to a Play,or a Ball there?

Jack appears to be annoyed but acknowledges that Will is deliberately misinterpreting his news and Will does not take offence at Jack’s apparent opprobrium:

Jack: Pox on ye for a nump-skull’d Fellow, to a Play or a Ball on Sundays!
... Come, come, Will; you love to play the Rogue;
... Plague on ye, leave off your Banter,

---

158 Conventicles were not illegal after 1689 but the term came to be considered as especially fitted to express disapprobation.
Jack finally switches to an affective *thou* in response to Will’s banter, then reorientates the topic back to discuss his original news with the pragmatic marker *and* together with the address *you*:

Jack: Prethee leave off *thy* fooling, and let’s discourse the Point in good earnest; *thou* always pretendedst to be a true Church-of-England-man *and* don’t *ye* think that the Lord Mayor’s going to a Conventicle with the Sword is an Injury to the Church of England?

Initially Jack acknowledges and colludes with Will’s banter but eventually reorientates the topic to serious discussion.

The disparaging comments they do make relate to the style of argument and neither of them takes offence:

Jack: *Thou* talkst like a mad Man;
Will: Prethee don’t rage so:
Jack: Prethee let *your* Stories alone, and come to the matter.
Will: *Thou* art in a grand Mistake, Jack.
Jack: How strangely do *you* talk?
Will: Nay Jack, *you* talk strangely, and not I.

Having initially addressed Jack as *you*, Will then echoes Jack’s *thou* in his response to the topic of his religious affiliation:

Will: Pish, what is that *your* ill News?
... *Why* truly Jack, whether *thou* believest it or not, I am as much for the Church of England as any Man alive.

The banter resumes as Will asks:

Will: Why prethee Man, if the Sword be all, no matter if it had been burnt a dozen Years ago:
... *why* *dost* make all this pother about a wooden Sword?

Jack resumes *thou* in response to Will’s continued banter:

Jack: *Thou* talkst like a mad Man;
it’s not the very individual Sword that I mean, but it’s the Badg and Ensign of Authority that is carried away from the Church to a nasty lowzy Conventicle:

Will seeks to calm Jack and then with the pragmatic marker *but* introduces a change of topic and address to ask Jack’s motive in discussing the Church:
Will: Prethee don't rage so: thou hast been so out of Humour ...
But after all the doe and stir you make about the Church,
I believe I may say to you as the little Boy said to his Mother,
(Mother, what need you talk so much of the Church?
you don't go so often to it).

Topic reorientation continues throughout the discussion:

Jack: That's nothing to you Will: do you make out your
Assertion, and then I'll say something to thee.

Will: Have but Patience, and I will. [=just have patience]
Thou knowest that the Dissenters are allowed
their Meetings by Act of Parliament,

Jack: Prethee let your Stories alone, and come to the matter.

Will: Thou knowest also that that Liberty is allow'd them

Jack: Nay but you mistake the Matter. The Meetings have only
a Liberty ... they don't observe all those Modes and Forms which
by our selves are accounted indifferent.

Jack: How do you mean indifferent?

Will: Thou art in a grand Mistake, Jack.
... the Church of England hath altered her Mind since.

Jack: How! the Church of England alter'd her Mind?
What? d'ye make her akin to Mahomet?

Will: Nay Jack, if you be so forgetful, I'll tell you:
Jack: Thou hast said a great deal to convince me;

Jack: How strangely do you talk?

Will: Nay Jack, you talk strangely, and not I.

1703 [4HOLUCI] English Lucian

As the three dialogues in this text are categorised as Lucian,\textsuperscript{159} it is to be expected that they are satirical.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN RALPH MIXINGTON, A CITY VINTNER, AND JENNY HIS WIFE

Ralph, the city vintner and his wife entertain themselves with banter. They begin by addressing each other very formally as Mr Mixington and Madam but this appears to

\textsuperscript{159}OED the name of a celebrated writer of Greek dialogues (c160 A.D.); allusively, a witty scoffer.
be sarcasm, as they bicker over money. Jenny, Ralph’s wife, complains that he has no ready cash, to which he replies:

Ralph: I can tell your wealthy Ladyship, that all Lombard-street can’t fill a Money Bag without a Bottom

and Jenny comments sarcastically on her husband’s attempted humour:

Jenny: Oh my Heart (Cries) Soh! To the Misery of approaching Poverty we must have, aiming at Wit, come in for an additional Plague.

They switch to thou to address each other opprobriously:

Jenny: And yet without this Help-mate thou had’st been as wretched a Stair-Ambler as ever carried a Role after an Oyster-woman.

Ralph: And without this, Stair-Trotter, thou hadst been still in an Eighteen-penny Lodging in the noble White-Fryers.

Throughout the text, they switch address terms. There is no consistent pattern of usage with both thou and you collocating with terms of abuse.

Jenny: Ungrateful Wretch as thou art!
... Foul Mouth, you measure others by your Heathenish self, and Paganly Companions.
... Brute -- you had been low enough but for some of them;

Ralph: I think too, thou Ape, that thou hast Wit,

Their next exchange demonstrates that they perceive this switching and abuse as a game and appreciate each other’s skill.

Ralph: thou hast Wit, tho’ thou wert plaguy silent before I had thee

Jenny: You took me for my Beauty ... and if you find some Wit and Sense besides, it’s more than expected, and above the bargain.
Jenny appreciates Ralph’s rueful response

Ralph: Ay Jenny, ’tis more, as the Witch covenants with the Devil for Wealth, and has Damnation into the bargain.

Jenny: Well express’d,

then reorientates their discourse:

... but come Rafee (stroaks him) no more Satyr.
They reveal to each other how business is improving using a conciliatory *thou*:

Ralph: Well Jenny, no more Swaggering nor Uneasiness, and to satisfie thee, things are better than *thou* think'st;

Jenny: Now Rafe, to satisfie thee, things are better than *thou* think'st.

Jenny concludes by addressing Ralph with jocular and affectionate *thou*:

Jenny: *Thou* fool of a Wit; employ *thy* Sense in *thy* Profession to get Wealth and Pleasure at other Peoples Expence, and joyn with me in carrying on our Happiness, and in order to it, I will ever be Loving to *thee* and Easy.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN MR. NEHEMIAH TRAP, A REFORMER OF MANNERS, AND CAPT. FLOURISH, AN OFFICER IN THE GUARDS

This is the second dialogue under the heading English Lucian. The opening exchange demonstrates its sarcastic style. Nehemiah Trap, a reformer of manners, appears oblivious, however, to the captain’s witticism:

Nehemiah Trap: Well Captain, I am glad of the Honour of *your* Company to this Choice Glass of Wine. I wish I had as good Company to Entertain *you* with, as *you* had when *you* Treated me at the Tower.

Captain Flourish: Thank *you* Landlord; then send for *your* Wife.

The social distance between them is indicated by their address terms rather than by variation in the second person pronoun. Trap addresses Flourish as: Captain, sometimes as dear or good Captain and sometimes as Sir or dear Sir but always as you. Captain Flourish addresses Trap variously as: Landlord, Landlord of mine, Mr Trap, Fool, Gossip, Mr Jew (with reference to the Protestant Reformers’ strict keeping of the Sabbath), Trap and Mr Occasional (with reference to Trap’s intermittent Church of England attendance and frequenting of Schismatical Meetings). None of these collocates with thou, though they seem to range from positive to negative affect. None of them raises any objection from Trap, who calls Captain Flourish a notable Satyrical Wit.

When Captain Flourish does switch to address Trap as *thou*, this involves some element of contrast, a reorientation of persona, topic or reference. The pragmatic marker *when* here contrasts the occasional drunkenness of the soldiers with Trap’s habitual drunkenness:
Captain Flourish: But if a poor Officer that can't say his Life's his own for 3 Months, gets a Glass Extraordinary ... then it's, O the Debauchery of these Soldiers! ... when Landlord, thou art sensible, I know thou comest home well loaden five days in the Week from the Tavern.

He reorientates his discourse to elaborate the implication of well loaden:

... That is just on this side of Reeling, with 3 Bottles in your Guts, a grave Look, and a Hickup, and perhaps a Knavish Bargain in your Pocket-book.

Similarly there is the persona Trap presents to the majority of his acquaintances which contrasts with the flawed persona that Captain Flourish sees:

Captain Flourish: You may seem another Man to your Brethren, who won't know you; or your Bubbles, who don’t know you; or your Subjects who dare not know you. But my dear Landlord, Here's to thy own Reformation and Health. I do know thee.

Trap complains of his wife’s criticism of him:

Trap: This is Uncharitable.

to which Flourish comments on Trap’s reformist beliefs:

Captain Flourish: Nay Trap, I'll commend thy Zeal, rather than Charity, that will sooner give five Shillings to have a poor Devil Whip'd or Stock'd, than six pence to Relieve a poor Starving Family.

He adds a further comment to Mrs Trap’s conclusion, again addressing Trap in the persona of reformer as thou.

Mrs Trap: By my Life, Mr. Trap, you're worsted. Come, take our Advice, Live like an Englishman, a good Natur’d Man, and a Gentleman, reform your self.

Captain Flourish: And if a Preacher in Red that desires to be thy Friend, may be believ’d, thou wilt find an easy Temper, a clear Conscience, a sound got Estate, much more comfortable than the Applauses of Villains, indirect Dealings, and the Cries and Curses of the Oppress'd.

Trap’s unmarked usage to his wife is informal thou. He greets her with the hypcorism Nelly, later switching to you to address her in the persona of the judge of their argument:

Trap: Nelly, thou art to be Judge between the Captain and I about Reformation of Manners ... What say you to our Argument?

---

160 OED Bubble = dupe, gull. One swindled, cheated.
161 Church of England as opposed to a Reformer?
He rebukes her as *thou*:

Trap: *Thou art to Censorious*

then later as *you*:

Trap: *You are a Fool, forsooth; What care People for Satyr when they have Money?*

She addresses him as *you* and accords him the negative epithet *Mr Inquisitive*. She refers opprobriously to his:

Mrs Trap: *Noble Campaign to Trappanning, Jayls, Whippings, and Robbing at the Head of your Mirmidon Informers, and Catch-Poles*

and tells him when he speaks disparagingly of women:

Mrs Trap: *Foul Mouth, hold your scurvy Tongue.*

She does not think highly of her husband’s debating skill, telling him:

Mrs Trap: *Hold, Sir, none of your Fustian till after Supper, it may chance to vex me.*

but she reserves her invective for his persona as reformer and this collocates with the term *thou*:

Mrs Trap: *The Name [Reformer] makes me sick and choaks me with the Spleen. ... Leave off that odious Practice, or by my Life, I'll peach thee my self tho' I starve. ... What was thy Chief End in making thy self a Publick Nuisance, that is such a kind of Reformer?*

In delivering her judgement on his argument with Captain Flourish, Mrs Trap switches to *you* in proposing that her husband reconstruct himself as an Englishman and a Gentleman:

Mrs Trap: *By my Life, Mr. Trap, you're worsted. Come, take our Advice, Live like an Englishman, a good Natur'd Man, and a Gentleman, reform your self.*

---

**A DIALOGUE BETWEEN CHARLES CLASSICK, A MASTER OF ARTS OF ONE OF THE UNIVERSITIES, AND MRS. MARY TOPPING, A LADY'S WOMAN.**

The final text of the trilogy is a dialogue between two strangers who encounter each other on a journey. They are of similar social status. As might be expected, they

---

162 OED inappropriately lofty language; high-sounding words and phrases; bombast, rant.
exchange you. The satire is directed not against the participants but against the concept that an expensive classical education can lead to gainful employment.

1703 [4HOMEMB] Member of Parliament

This dialogue involves six participants who all exchange you as unmarked usage. The farmer and the freeholder, who are tenants of the Member of Parliament, greet him as Your Worship and both address him as Master. Along with the shopkeeper, the lawyer and the divine (priest) they also exchange Sir as a term of address. They discuss contemporary political events with particular reference to Parliament. The epithet honest, applied to the freeholder by both the Member of Parliament and the lawyer connotes condescension towards an addressee of lower social status who supports the speaker’s argument. As such, it collocates with thou:

Freeholder: God be praised, we have now as good a Government, as our hearts can wish, and I hope you’ll neither Lead, nor be Mislead to change it for any other,

Member of Parliament: Thou art an honest Fellow, and a true English-man, no honest Jack, I am entirely of thy opinion, for preserving the Establisht Government, and the Established Succession, in the Protestant Line,

Freeholder: I am resolved to follow my own poor Judgment at last, and not to be led by the Nose blindfold.

Lawyer: Thou art an Honest heart I'll warrant, ... I wish all our Senators of both Houses were of thy mind; but what will you say, if men resolve to stand by one another right or wrong, and in a manner Subscribe their names to it?

The pragmatic marker but introduces the switch in the lawyer’s utterance from his assessment of the freeholder’s present persona to the uncertainty of the freeholder’s unknown future persona. The freeholder’s response:

Freeholder: I think they that do so, ought to have but one Vote amongst them all

---

163 OED as a vague epithet of appreciation or praise, esp. as used in a patronizing way to an inferior.
meets with the lawyer’s approval and he switches to condescend once more to the freeholder’s complaisant persona:

Lawyer: Thou hast certainly pass'd a very good Sentence, if it were possible to be put in Execution.

The freeholder meets with similar condescension from the Member of Parliament, who also switches when referring to the freeholder’s current and potential future personae:

Freeholder: pray Sir, who are our great Officers in all the high stations?

Member of Parliament: Thou hast a mind to be a States-man, I am afraid you will be as great a Politician as your Ploughman,

When the farmer attempts to support the freeholder:

Farmer: pray give him a little Instructions, for he is a leading Member in our Parish ... and will baffle a Whigg Justice very handsomely.

the Member of Parliament does not welcome advice from the lower orders and puts the farmer in his place addressing him as thou:

Member of Paliament: Prithee leave of thy Old distinctions of Whigg and Tory, I know no distinction but one, and that is between an Honest Man and a Knave.

1736 [5HOJS] Gentleman and a Broker

This dialogue between a gentleman and his broker concerning investment advice has a formal style involving exchange of you.

1737 [5HOBAPT] Baptist and a Churchman

The Baptist in this religious discussion addresses the Churchman as Friend and he replies with Neighbour. They exchange you. The exchanges sometimes become unharmonious but they remain formal and polite.

1748 [5HOGILP] Dialogue upon the Gardens

In this dialogue a gentleman shows his friend around his country estate. They discuss the layout of the grounds and the style of the statuary. They exchange you.
### 1750 [5HOWILL] Christian Education of Children

This is a series of dialogues in which parental care is used as a model for religious education. Terms of affection are used from parent to child: *my Dear, my Child, Child, my dear Child*, and from child to parent: *my dear Father, My dear Papa*, and on one occasion: *Sir*. Unmarked *you* is exchanged throughout.

### Discussion of results for Didactic Texts

**Table 6:1 Unmarked Address of *thou* and *you* in Didactic Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting Comparative Social Status</th>
<th>Lower Orders</th>
<th>Middling Sort</th>
<th>Higher Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▲ ►◄</td>
<td>►◄ ▲ ▼ ►◄</td>
<td>▼ ►◄ ▲ ▼ ►◄</td>
<td>▼ ►◄ ▲ ▼ ►◄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-1580</td>
<td>t y t y</td>
<td>t y t y</td>
<td>t y t y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1600</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1620</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1640</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1660</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1700</td>
<td>t t t t</td>
<td>t t t t</td>
<td>t t t t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1720</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
<td>y y y y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final non-drama usages of *thou* in the CED are in didactic texts, which are constructed texts intended to be read rather than heard. These are the satirical *English Lucian* [1703 4HOLUCI] concerning a domestic argument and [1703 4HOMEMB] a political discussion in which a freeholder is addressed with kindly condescension by a Member of Parliament and a lawyer. *Thou* is used both as an address term in
collocation with a name and as an affective term in collocation with epithets until 1703.

As ‘prospective dialogues’ (Jucker 2007), didactic texts are proposed as exemplars of usage. They are intended to ‘instruct or inform’ and ‘present the argument or information in a dialogue as if between “master” and “student” (Kytö & Walker 2006:23). It is notable that there is little use of thou in collocation with address terms. In the first text [1568 1HOTILN] ladies and gentlemen exchange the address term you. Thou is used formulaically with reference to the supernatural. In most of the texts most of the participants are of the middling sort. In a 1593 text, a gentleman addresses a woman as thou, that is as a sign of social status. In a 1680 text a speaker uses thou in collocation with a name to connote familiarity to an addressee of similar social status. When this is rebuffed, the exchange continues with you, though thou is still used affectively.

Members of Parliament address London boatmen as thou in 1681 and the three boatmen exchange thou. The only other contemporary unmarked use of thou as direct address among colleagues from a similar social group occurs in depositions in 1662. A Lancashire country fellow, though, opens a dialogue with a witch by addressing her as yeo in a 1682 drama. His use of dialect functions to locate him socially. This may be the case with the usage attributed to the boatmen.

After 1680 thou with an address term seems to connote kindly condescension in texts [1685 4HOKATE], [1695 4HOROGU], [1697 4HORIDP] and [1703 4HOLUCI]. It is not apparent why this does not occur in the earlier texts. It may indicate that thou was now regarded as a marked term. Thou collocates with 12 different positive epithets in a conversation in which the speakers discuss their wedding plans [1685 4HOKATE]. Loving Kate, to whom Honest John addresses these, tells him, ‘you flatter me’. Perhaps such effusive usage is intended to connote insincerity. Loving Kate addresses Honest John as you.

Usage in a 1695 text does seem to relate to social status with the Member of Parliament addressing his old acquaintance, Jack, who appears to be of the middling sort, as thou and receiving you. A discussion of contemporary events in a 1703 text
involves participants of mixed social status from a land-owning Member of Parliament to a freeholder. All exchange *you* except the freeholder, who is addressed as *thou*. In the remaining didactic texts all participants exchange *you*.

![Figure 6:1 Collocation of thou and you with Negative Epithets in Non-Drama Texts](image)

**thou**: Mean 39.90%  STDEV 32.30%  **you**: Mean 40.01%  STDEV 32.37%

High usage of *thou* with negative epithets in non-drama texts in 1641-1660 (figure 6:1) is attributable in part to a didactic text concerning a contention for pre-eminence between Wit and Wealth [1647 3MWIT], that is, like deposition texts, the discourse is confrontational. The lower orders may have exchanged *thou* in 1681 [4HOSAM]. There is insufficient evidence in the CED to determine, though their use of *you* in collocation with negative epithets demonstrates that switching was perceived as deictic.

B) Language Teaching Texts

These texts appear in the Corpus as translations. I have consulted the original French texts (EEBO) to discover if there are any instances where the second person pronoun usage does not coincide with that of the original.

1573 [1HFDESA] The French Schoolemaister

This bilingual text is directed at English speakers who wish to learn French. In his preface Holyband warns the reader not to expect the elegant use of English nor to pay particular attention to the use of English:
musing not at ... the English of my booke, take the French with such good will as I doo give it thee.

The reader is addressed in the singular form in both texts with the English translation of the dialogues corresponding to the French usage. The didactic part of the texts concentrates on the pronunciation of French. Although Holyband offers some rules of grammar for thy greater ease and solace, there is no reference to the usage of the second person pronoun, which suggests that this is perceived as the same in both languages.

**FAMILIAR TALKES FOR TO SPEAKE IN ALL PLACES**

The dialogues are presented as continuous discourse in a variety of contexts and between various interlocutors who are not distinguished from each other. For clarity I have attributed utterances to the most likely participants.

Margerite and Peter appear to be servants to Fraunces, a young schoolboy. Reciprocal unmarked usage is *you*. The switch to *thou* by Fraunces when addressing the servants with negative affect seems licensed by his superior social status.

Margerite: Your mother will chide mee if you go to schoole without your cleane shirt.
Fraunces: I had rather *thou* shouldst be shent, then I should be either chid, or beaten:

Peter retains *you* even when his utterance seems very critical:

Peter: Can *you* not wash in the baason? shall you haue alwayes a seruaunt at *your* tayle? *you* are to wanton.

Fraunces: Wilt *thou* that I wash my mouthe and my face, where I haue washed my handes, as they doo in many houses in England?

There is formulaic usage in the father’s blessing to his son, who is otherwise addressed as *you* even with negative affect:

Father: Are *you* vp? is it time to rise at eight of the clocke? *you* shalbe whipt: go, and kneele downe, and say *your* prayers: God blesse *thee*.

A master and servant exchange has unmarked *you* with a switch in the master’s usage apparently motivated by his scepticism at his servant’s excuse. The pragmatic

---

164 OED scolded.
marker *yea verely* indicates the master’s topic reorientation. The term *lackey* does not appear to have a negative connotation of servility in this usage.

Master: Lackey, come hither ... Where haue you been so longe?
Servant: My maistris hath sent mee on two or three arands.
Master: You haue played by the way, and then you bryng to mee these feare scuses.
Servant: No forsoothe, Sir, if it doth please you to aske of N. you shall know the truth, for he was with mee.
Master: *Yea verely*, I shall aske of thy fellow, which is as great a liar as thou art: is thy maistresse at home.

An exchange apparently between a steward and a kitchen servant of lower rank has fairly consistent *thou* to the servant collocating with terms of abuse: *great lubber, vile gallowes*, and with threats of beating and *you* to the steward in response even with the socially-inappropriate retort: ‘go your selfe’.

Steward(?): What, is not the childrens table couered yet? what doest thou there great lubber? why goest thou not and serue the children?

The one inconsistency is the steward’s reaction when the servant denies having sampled the dishes. This is a direct translation of the French form, which does not include the equivalent of ‘go your wayes’. It is, therefore, difficult to assess the precise implication of the use of *you* in this context. This utterance is followed by the steward’s distancing reference to the servant in the third person before he resumes unmarked *thou*. It may be that usage in this dialogue, in which the original French usage is reproduced in the English translation, is just an indicator of social status.

Steward: who hath drawen the lard out of these rabbets?
Servant: It is not I.
Steward: *You* lie: go your wayes, you are lickerish. O Lorde, he hath supped vp all the brothe of this mince pie, I would not be in thy skinne for twentie crownes of golde.

The switch from unmarked *you* to *thou* in an exchange between two singers is an expression of affinity implying a concomitant obligation for the addressee to respond.

---

165 OED a big, clumsy, stupid fellow; esp. one who lives in idleness.
166 OED greedy.
Singer 2 offers singer 1 a generous exchange for his recipe for quenching thirst:
‘thou shalt haue two quartes’. This becomes derision when singer 2 hears the recipe:
‘one must drinke often, and longe draughtes’ but he interprets the exchange as good-
humoured banter concluding: ‘Truelie he is a merie fellowe’.

Singer 1: and among vs singers, wee haue a good recepте for to be neuer drie.
Singer 2: What is it I praye you? I wold faine learne it.
Singer 1: I will teach it vnto you for a quarte of wine, is not that good cheape?
Singer 2: Truly thou shalt haue two quartes, and geeue it mee in writyng.
Singer 1: You neede no writing in that: you will remembre it well enough by harte.
Singer 2: Say then I pray thee.
Singer 1: For to quenche well the thirst, one must drinke often, and longe draughtes.
Singer 2: Is that thy receite? go, go with a morion.¹⁶⁷ I know that aboue ten yeeres a go.
Singer 1: I could not geeue you a better phisicke then the same which I take for my selfe.
Singer 2: Truelie he is a merie fellowe.

FOR TO ASKE THE WAY, BUJE & SEL: WITH OTHER FAMILIAR COMMUNICATIONS.

Thou in this extract is addressed by travellers to servants at inns but the host is
generally addressed as you. This suggests that thou-usage is an indicator of relative
social status.

Servant: dooth it please you now to come to supper?
Traveller: Thou sayest well: thou art a good fellow: go too, let vs go: I am readie.

Traveller: Boy, bryng some light: make some fier, that wee may rise.
Go, go: kindell the fier, thou wilt make vs as slougish, and as good
husbandes as thou art:

Traveller: Hold, ther is some to drink, as I haue promised thee,
to the end that thou maiest remember me an other time.

¹⁶⁷ OED punishment inflicted on soldiers.
singular form of the imperative, which differs from the plural form. The form employed indicates their relationship. This is not the case in English, where the addition of the personal pronoun would be required to indicate relationship. A close translation of the French may not necessarily reveal the social relationship in the English version.

*va dire à mon voisin* [singular thou form of the imperative]
→ *go tell my neighbour* [no indication of number]
*i’en va prier* → *go thou desire*

In this example the nature of the master/servant relationship has been indicated by changing the use of the servant’s given name *Richard* to the nickname *Dicke:*

The Maister: Dicke. [Richard in the French version]
Richard, the Man Servant: Anone forsoth. What is *your* pleasure.
The Maister: Goe tell my neighbour roper, that I pray him to come to morow to dine with me:
And fro~ thence. Go *thou* desire my sonnes schoolemaister, to beare vs co~paignie.

**AT PLAYING**

Unmarked usage among the schoolboys is *you.*

**UPON THE WAY**

In the French translation the gentleman addresses the serving man as *Edward* and uses the singular imperative. The English original text with an imperative unmarked for number has *Nedd* as the address term. This suggests that in the French translation use of the singular form connotes relative social status, whereas the English text has to employ a hypocorism to convey this:

The Gentleman: Neadd bring hether my horse

Later he addresses the serving man:

The Gentleman: Nedd, take *thou* the candell

which renders the French: ‘Edouard pren la chandelle’, in which the relationship of the participants is again indicated only by the form of the verb.

Exchanges between all other participants have unmarked *you.* *Thou* is addressed only by the gentleman to his own serving man. In both the French and English
versions the gentleman addresses a ploughman encountered on the way as *you*. Since the ploughman is presumably of similar or lower social status than the serving man, the gentleman’s usage to the latter presumably connotes familiarity in addition to social status.

**1605 [2HFERON] The French Garden**

This is a translated French text intended for the English speaker who wishes to learn French. In his address to the reader the author states that his ‘chiefe ayme hath beene to furnish English Ladyes and Gentle-women with such conference and familiar talk as is incident unto them specially’. Under *The Rules of Grammer* he gives a usage note for the second person pronoun:

> Note that when we speak to our superiors, equals or courteously (though we speak but to one) yet we say vous, and not tu: as vous etes le bien venu, you are welcome.

This seems to imply that the author considered this not to be the case in contemporary English.

Unmarked usage in dialogues between adults in this text is exchange of *you* even when the page is being addressed disparagingly by the lady. The one use of *thou* from Joly, the waiting gentlewoman is addressed to Prudence, the chambermaid, who is of lower social status. It is an appeal for help, however, in collocation with a term of endearment, after which Joly reverts to *you*:

> Joly: I pray thee sweet heart, help me a little to put on my gowne

A lady bestowing a blessing on her school-aged children addresses them each as *you*. Only the baby in a different dialogue receives *thou* and a term of endearment in blessing from his lady mother:

> Lady: ô my little hart! God blesse thee, ... *y=e= art prety & fat my little darling, [i.e. *thou art*, thorn in original]*

This switches to *you* in collocation with comments on the baby’s behaviour:

> Lady: ah little knaue, *you* will shoue that *you* haue a yarde
... do ye kicke sirha?

and reverts to thou and further endearment as the mother concludes her blessing:

Lady: God send thee good rest my little boykin.

In another dialogue featuring a lady and her school-aged children the children’s boy (servant) Richard is chastised by their mother with usage in a direct translation of the French:

Lady: Richard Neuf-a-bien*, haue you made cleane their shooes to day.

‘signifieth never to do good’

Richard Neuf-a-bien: Yea Madame.
Lady: Truely so it seemes, come hether you brasen-facte lyer, art thou not ashamed to affirme so apparant a lye before me?
The myre and durt sticke on them yet.
Seest thou not that they are all durtie?
[Of lying] Truely I will teach you how to lye, or rather how you should not lye.
I will not leaue such a vice vnpunished.

It is difficult to account for the specific instances of switching. The overall intent is obviously pejorative.

FOR TO CHEAPEN (i.e. Bargain)

In this dialogue the lady addresses the shop assistant, Atire-gain:

Lady: Now my friend, haue you any faire Holland? Atire-gain: Yes forsooth Madame, and the fairest lawne that euer you handled:

Lady: thou speakest a proud word, what knowest thou, what lawne I haue ha~dled? it may be that I haue had better then any that is in all thy shop

This is a rebuke addressed to one of lower social status but, when the shop assistant stands her ground, the lady withdraws, albeit rather condescendingly, and they continue their dialogue by exchanging you.

Atire-gain: I doe not say to the contrary Madame, but so it is notwithstanding, that I haue as good & as faire as euer was made.
Lady: Well, well, you doe but your duetie.

---

168 OED a linen fabric.
In these last two dialogues in which a lady addresses one of the lower orders, *thou* seems to be applied almost as a corrective. The social inferior is reminded of their place, then *you* is resumed.

1625 [2HFWODR] The Marrow of the French Tongye

This text appears to be a teach-yourself book for both English and French, claiming:

**THE MEANEST CAPACITY EITHER FRENCH OR ENGLISHMAN, THAT CAN BUT READE, MAY IN A SHORT TIME BY HIS OWNE INDUSTRY WITHOUT THE HELPE OF ANY TEACHERS ATTAINDE TO THE PERFECTION OF BOTH LANGUAGES**

Use of *thou* in this text can be readily explained as a misreading of the originals: ‘nettoyez bien mon grain/ make very clean my grain’, has been reproduced as ‘make very clean thy grain’, which does not fit the context.

A DISCOURSE BETWEENE THE BURGUER AND THE YEOMAN

The burger (townsman) addresses both the yeoman (countryman) and his wife with the polite *you* of equal social status.

**THE GREAT ORCHARD OF RECREATION: COMPOSED & GATHERED OUT OF SUNDRY DUTCH AUTHORS, AND AFTERWARD TRANSLATED, AND DIVIDED INTO TWELVE CHAPTERS, BOTH IN FRENCH, AND ENGLISH**

The other instances of *thou* feature in a sample of text translated into French and English from Dutch. It is unclear how closely they follow the original.

**THE RISING IN THE MORNING, THE CLOATHING, AND GOODS OF THE CHAMBER, AND SOME OTHER BUSINESSE PARTAINING TO THE SAME. BETWEENE NALANO, TORQUATO: AND RUPSA SERVANT.**

THE FIRST CHAPTER

In this Rupsa, the servant is consistently addressed as *thou* by his master, who terms him *Boy*. The French usage *Valet* specifies his status more precisely.

**A DISCOURSE OF FAMILIAR SPEECH (VPON THE WAY IN THE MORNING) WITH ANOTHER PRETY DISCOURSE OF THE TENIS, BETWEEN THREE FRIENDS: TO WIT, HENRY, IOHN, AND PECENIE THEIR SERUANT - THE SECOND CHAPTER**

Pecenie, the servant in this extract, is also addressed as *thou* and *Boy*. He may be younger than the servant in the previous extract, as he is also addressed as *Child*. 
James consistently addresses his servant, Lippa, as **thou** and **Child**.

### 1653 [3HFMAUG] The True Advancement of the French

**THE FIFTH DIALOGUE, BETWEEN TWO FRIENDS THAT ARE PURPOSED TO TRAVELL INTO FRANCE**

Speakers are not identified in this text. It is necessary to decide who they may be from the context. The only use of **thou** in this text appears to be addressed to a pot-boy by a traveller arriving at an inn:

Traveller: Prithee honest friend, draw us a pint of the best Claret *thy* Master as in his Cellar.

This agrees with the finding in other CED texts that **thou** seems to have been used routinely to waiting staff for far longer than to other addressees.

### 1667 [3HFEST] A New and Easie French Grammar

This text is designed to teach English speakers French. There is no reference to the pragmatics of **thou** or **tu**. The implication seems to be that the English speaker would be aware of this.

### A DIALOGUE BETWEEN SEVERAL GENTLEMEN THAT GO TO BE MERRY ABROAD

In a dialogue concerning a gentlemen’s day out again it is only the drawer or pot-boy who is addressed as **thou**. The landlord, although presumably of lower social status than the gentlemen, is addressed as **you**. This seems to connote affinity, since, according to one gentleman, the landlord:

Gentleman B: ... is a man of good company too.

He is invited to socialise with the gentlemen:

Gentleman B: Sit **you** down there,
Landlord, and eat a bit with us.

In the French version the drawer is addressed by one of the gentleman with the **thou**-form of the verb, which is not apparent in the English:
Gentleman A: Drawer, go and draw us of the same white wine.
Drawer: I will, Sir.
Gentleman A: Make haste.

and the landlord addresses him as *thou*.

Gentleman B: This Drawer is long a coming.
Landlord: He would be fit to fetch death.
Why dost *thou* make us stay so long?

**A DIALOGUE BETWEEN TWO GENTLEWOMEN**

The gentlewomen exchange *you* and address each other as: *My Dear, Lady Mary, Madam*. Possibly these two more formal address terms license the use of *you*. This contrasts with the following dialogue:

**A DIALOGUE BETWEEN TWO GENTLEWOMEN, WHE-IT IS NECESSARY FOR WOMEN TO BE LEARNED**

In this two gentlewomen address each other as *My Dear* and exchange *thou* throughout, which may connote a greater intimacy than in the previous extract.

**1685 [4HEMIEG] Nouvelle methode**

This text is written for speakers of French to learn English. There is a usage note on the change in progress of the third person singular present tense ending (p81). The interchangeability of *shall* and *will* is also noted (p84). There is no comment on *thou/you* usage. This implies that the usage is the same in both languages and that the reader is expected to know what this is.

**A DIALOGUE, TO LIE IN AN INN**

This concerns a traveller arriving at an inn. He first instructs a boy on the care of his horse by means of a series of directives. The pronoun of address is not used. The French verb forms are in the second person singular *thou* form but, as there is no distinction in the English singular and plural imperative verbs, there is no connotation of unequal social status in the English version. In the ensuing dialogue the traveller addresses the other characters as *you*.
A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TRAVELLOUR AND THE COACHMAN

The traveller’s switch from you to thou in addressing the coachman, when the coachman suggest driving to Hell ‘with a full gallop’, collocates with the epithet wretched Charon, an allusion to the mythological ferryman to the Underworld.

The French version continues with thou-address and singular forms of the imperative. The English version switches again:

Traveller: Go strait to the Garden.
There I'll shew you what Place we must go to.
[Là je t’indiquerai où il faut que nous allions]
Coachman: 'Tis well enough.
Sir, we are at the Garden.
Which way must I go now?

Traveller: Go into the Street which is just over against us.
And, when I bid you stop, be sure to stop.
[Et, quand je (O) dirai Arrête, ne passe pas plus avant]

Hold, hold, this is the Place.
How much must thou have?

This is problematic. The text is translated from English to French. If the translator intended the switches to be significant, there would presumably be an explanation for this discrepancy. It may be that the distinctive form of the singular imperative in French has prolonged the use of tu after thou had been replaced by you in many contexts in English.

If it is the case that the switch in the English version is motivated, it may be that you connotes the traveller’s less emotive utterances in which he gives directions after his wretched Charon outburst. The concluding question about the fare switches their relationship back to that of hirer and hired, which may account for thou as an indicator of comparative status.

The remaining dialogues in this text involve a traveller and various people he meets on his journey. All of the speakers exchange you.
The Compleat French-Master

This is a French Grammar for the use of English speakers ‘to learn with ease and delight the French tongue, as it is now spoken in the court of France’, that is: formal usage. The English dialogues are translations of the original French. Utterances are not attributed, so I have again given what seems to be the most likely attribution. Address to servants uses the same form in both the French and English versions.

TO MAKE A VISIT IN THE MORNING

To another’s servant on arrival:

Where is thy Master?

THE GENTLEMAN AND HIS VALET DE CHAMBRE. TO DRESS ONES SELF

To one’s own valet:

You have done well.

AT DINNER

To server at table in a private house:

Boy, give the Gentleman some drink

There is no address pronoun but the plural imperative in the French.

TO MAKE AN EXCHANGE

In this exchange one speaker accuses the other of trying to cheat him in progressively more opprobrious language: ‘you jeer me, you tell me fine stories, I am not so easie to be imposed upon, I am not such a Fool, Look for your Cullies somewhere else’. In both the French version and the English the term of address is you.

BETWEEN TWO COUZENS OF VISITS

From the French version of this text it is apparent that the cousins are female (cousines). This may account for the first speaker’s use of tu. The English version, though, has you here and subsequently both versions have only you.

How now, Cozen, is no body come to visit you to day?

169 OED one who is cheated or imposed upon (e.g. by a sharper, strumpet etc.).
On being told that she has a further visitor, the lady of the house complains but, despite her anger evidenced by the negative epithets directed at the maid servant, *that block-head, little Booby*, \(^{170}\) *beast*, she addresses the maid as *you* in both language versions:

Lady: Oh Lord! what a Visit!
... Quickly, go and tell that I am not at home.

Maid Servant: They have told her already, that *you* were.

Lady: Who is that block-head as told so?
Maid Servant: 'Tis I, Madam.
Lady: Deuce take the little Booby,
I'll teach *you* to make Answers of your own self.
Maid Servant: Madam, I'll go and tell her
that *you* have a mind to be gone out. –

Lady: Stay, beast, and let her come up,
since the Folly is done already.

**DIALOGUE OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN A FATHER AND HIS DAUGHTER**

A father tells his daughter that he has arranged for her to marry a rich old man. She objects. They exchange *you* throughout until, in the original French version, the father makes an appeal to his daughter, when he switches to *tu*. This remains as *you* in the English version. The *tu/vous* distinction remains to the present day in French. The translator of this text appears to acknowledge that by 1694 the distinction had been lost in prescribed English usage.

Daughter: I'd rather throw my self into a Nunnery,
than to marry (S. N.) since a Marriage cannot
be happy where there is no inclination.

Father: Will *you* yield to your Brothers Judgment?

**1731 [SHGBEIL] A New German Grammar**

There is no use of *thou* in the text. The dialogues are similar to those in previous texts mainly involving a gentleman and various tradespeople. A hackney-coachman is addressed as *you*. There is a conversation with a landlord at an inn but no serving

\(^{170}\) OED clown.
staff are addressed, so it is not possible to determine if *thou* was still in use for pot-boys.

**Discussion of Results for Language Teaching Texts**

Language teaching texts are ‘prospective dialogues’ (Jucker 2007). In these the language ‘may be particularly contrived for didactic purposes’ (Kytö & Walker 2006:23). These texts are intended for non-native speakers. They are formal translations following the lexical and grammatical norms of the source texts and designed to teach formal usage ‘as it is now spoken in the court of France’ [1694]. The texts tend not to be discursive nor even coherent. They are bilingual texts of which some are translated from English and some from French. Their principal objective is to enable the reader to learn vocabulary.

**Table 6.2 Unmarked Address of *thou* and *you* in Language Teaching Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting Comparative Social Status</th>
<th>Lower Orders</th>
<th>Middling Sort</th>
<th>Higher Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal use</td>
<td>►◄</td>
<td>▼ ▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use to a social equal</td>
<td>►</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use down the social scale</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use up the social scale</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not indicate frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Middling</th>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1HFDES</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1HEBELL</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>2HFeron</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>2HFWODR</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>3HFMAUG</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>3HFEST</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>4HEMIEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>4HFBOYE</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>5HGBEIL</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speakers generally exchange you. Thou is used only twice to address a named addressee. In 1586 a gentleman addresses his servant Nedd as thou [1586 1HEBELL]. This is an original English text. There is no address pronoun in the French translation but the singular form of the imperative is used and elsewhere in the French text the servant is addressed with the singular pronoun. In [1625 2HFWODR], which is translated from Dutch, a servant, Rupsa, is addressed as thou.

The choice of pronoun to servants seems inconsistent:

Wilt thou go lay the table clothe vile galloces?
Lackey, from whence come you? [1573 1HFDESA]

but this is a feature of the French original.

There are few affective epithets, presumably as these are difficult to judge pragmatically in a foreign language. Some reflect social status:

ò my little hart! God blesse thee, blesse thee,
y=e= art prety & fat my little darling,
[i.e. thou art, modified thorn]
God send thee good rest my little boykin.
[1573 1HFDESA] Mother>infant

I pray thee sweet heart, help me
[1605 2HFERON] waiting gentlewoman>chambermaid

My Dear [reciprocal thou]
[1667 3HFEST] Dialogue between 2 gentlewomen

Most are to servants:

thou art a good fellow
[1573 1HFDESA] >Inn servant

honest friend, draw us a pint of the best Claret thy Master as in his Cellar.
[1653 3HFMAUG] >drawer

V [presumably ‘traveller’]: God forbid, thou wretched Charon.
Carry me to Covent-Garden.
[1685 4HEMIEG] >coachman

Most speakers in this genre are from the middling sort. This is presumably that sector of society that feels a need for self-help books. The texts are designed to teach correct usage in a foreign environment. It is notable that the only mutual use of thou is between two gentlewomen in 1667. The prospective dialogues offered in
these texts are to be addressed to strangers, so the lessons feature the use of *thou* only to social inferiors and even then *you* is also used in this context from the first text in 1573.

**C) Miscellaneous Texts**

These are mainly fictional dialogues which resemble didactic works, but seem to be intended as entertainment or complaint rather than being informative/instructional (Kytö & Walker 2006:24).

**1593? [IMBARRO] Examinations of Henry Barrowe (etc.) (authentic account written after the event)**

Henry Barrowe was a follower of John Greenwood, the Puritan Separatist leader. This is his recollection of his various examinations *‘AS NEERE AS MY MEMORIE COULD CARY’*. On being brought before the Archbishop, Barrowe refuses to swear the oath. The Archbishop first addresses him as *you* but switches to *thou* with negative affect when agreeing with Dr Cussins that Barrowe is ‘clamorous’ and a ‘schismatic’:

**Archbishop:** Why know *yow* what *yow* say?  
know *yow* what book it is?  
it is the Bible.

Barrowe: I wil sweare by no Bible.

**Dr Cussins:** Scismaticks\(^{171}\) are clamorous alwayes.  
it is a perpetual note to know them by.

**Archbishop:** Mr. Dr. Cussins saith true  
such were the Donatistes\(^{172}\) alwayes in the counsels  
and such art *thow* and al other scismatiks such as *thow* art.

He switches back to *you* to repeat his request for Barrowe to take the oath.

**Barrowe:** Say *yowr* pleasure God forgiue *yow*:  
I am neither scismatike nor clamourous:  
I answer but *yowr* demandes if *yow* wil I wil be silent.

**Archbishop:** Wel wil *yow* lay *your* hand on the  
Bible and take an oath.  
Barrowe refuses to swear the oath.

\(^{171}\) OED One who promotes or countenances schism or breach of external unity in the Church; one who is guilty of the sin of schism.  
\(^{172}\) OED a Christian sect.
The Archbishop’s reaction was to hurl abuse at Barrowe though in collocation with *you*:

Archbishop: Yow are a scismatick / a recusant\(^{173}\) / a seditious person / [etc. with many such like.]

**SAMPLE 2 EXAMINATION OF BARROWE CONTINUES AT A LATER DATE**

The Lord Treasurer begins by addressing Barrowe as *you*

Lord Treasurer: Why wil yow not goe to church?

Barrowe: My whole desire is to come to the church of God.

There follows an examination by the Lord Treasurer in which he addresses Barrowe as *thou*, whilst remaining calm and un abusive. He uses *you* only as the plural to refer to Barrowe and his co- accused.

It is difficult to assess the mood of the exchanges in this text, since they are reported by Barrowe. He gives the impression that he was the most abusive speaker. Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on the Archbishop’s peremptory denial:

[Then requested I conference againe / and that in writing: which was againe by Cant. very peremtorilie denyed. He said that he had matter to cal me before him for an hereticke.]

His description of the Archbishop of Canterbury as a Beast spoken of in the Book of Revelation seems to have been received very mildly with the Lord Treasurer politely asking Barrowe to show the Court chapter and verse.

Lord Chancellor: What is that man? (pointing to Cant.)
Barrowe: [The Lord gaue me the spirit of boldnes / so that I answered:]
He is a monster / a miserable compound / I know not what to make him: he is neither Ecclesiastical nor ciuil / euen that second Beast spoken of in the Reuelation.

Lord Treasurer: Wher is that place / shew it.

**1595 [1MDANDO] Maroccus Extaticus**

This text involves a dialogue with Marocco, a performing horse. Bankes greets the horse as *you* and the horse addresses Bankes as *you* throughout. Subsequently, Bankes’s addresses to the horse switch between *you* and *thou*.

\(^{173}\) OED a person, esp. a Roman Catholic, who refuses to attend the services of the Church of England
Marocco suggests that any horse can whinny and wag his tail as he has been instructed but Bankes demands that Marocco should have the nobility of spirit [ingenuitie] to acknowledge the kindness, care, and attention he has had lavished on him. His switch to thou here seems to imply rebuke as Bankes reminds Marocco of his status and his obligation to Bankes.

Bankes: ... so must thou if thou haue so much ingenuitie,\(^{174}\) confesse my kindnes, thou art not onely but also bound to honest Bankes, for teaching thee so many odde prankes. I haue brought thee vp right tenderly, as a Bakers daughter would bring vp a Cosset\(^{175}\) by hand.

Following their discussion of tradesmen who have cheated them Bankes is of the opinion that they should not create a fuss. Marocco disagrees, saying that he will substantiate his master’s claims and that he has no sympathy for young gentlemen who will not defend their rights:

Horse: Why maister of whome should you bee afraide, I am able to iustifiye as much as you say. Indeed those be the young men that neuer sawe the Lyons.\(^{176}\) ... He that will thrust his necke into the yoke, is worthy to be vsed like a iade.

This shocks Bankes who switches to you to comment on Marocco’s opinion:

Bankes: Why how now Marocco. O ye are too sowre. Dare you tell mee of my splene agaynst the Sadler, and bee so bitter against the young gallantes of our age.

In the middle of this outburst, when he realises that he is addressing Marocco as if he were a man, he corrects himself to address the persona of a horse, then switches to introduce a negative epithet: not a horse but an asse.

Bankes: What man, nay horse rather, nay asse as thou art, to become odious to the flower of Englande with thy foule manners.

\(^{174}\) OED nobility, generosity.
\(^{175}\) OED A lamb (colt, etc.) brought up by hand; a pet-lamb.
\(^{176}\) OED In early use, to have seen the lions often meant to have had experience of life.
Bankes make a further switch in commenting on Marocco’s opinion, possibly to imply yet another persona: Marocco does not have the judgement of a mature horse but that of an immature colt.

Bankes: *Why* colte then, *youle* take vppon *you* I see? Doo *you* not heare what they saie that scarse vouchsafe *you* an answere?

As their discussion continues, Bankes’ switches in usage correlate with his switches in stance. He agrees whole-heartedly with the next point Marocco makes.

Bankes: ... and I were as plaine as I will bee, I should crie out-right, *for* in this I agree with *thee*, and with *thee* the world agrees

Marocco intersperses his utterances with samples of verse and Latin quotations. Bankes comments on one of these, switching his reference from Marocco’s argument to his style:

Bankes: *Ho, ho, good* Marocco, *I see* now a dozen of bread dooes as much with *you*, as three pipes of Tobacco taken in an odde alehouse, to a weake braine.

Again a change of topic by Bankes to comment on the content of Marocco’s argument motivates a switch in usage.

Bankes: *Thou* speakest of mallice against some or other Marocco, and perhappes *thou* meanest that drabbe that the last daie when shee sawe *thee* heere doo *thy* trickes, sayd *thou* wert a deuill & I a coniurer.

Even with a willing suspension of disbelief that one of the participants in this text is a horse, there are so many snippets of verse, Latin quotations and examples of word play that it cannot be evaluated as authentic conversation. It does, though, illustrate the correlation between pragmatic markers and pronoun switching, where the switch of the pronoun of address connoted thematic discontinuity. A further example of this occurs in the same utterance, as Bankes warns Marocco, speaking of:

Bankes: ... this beastly beast that I thinke *thou* meanest. **But** speake not so loude, for and if her landlord heard *you*, hee would aunswere for her.
After several more uses of *thou* in a further discussion, Bankes concludes with the peremptory dismissal to ‘referre the rest till another time’. The use of *you* to Marocco contributes to the distancing force of this utterance.

Banks: Tis almost supper time Marocco, I heare mine host call, *you* haue done pretily well for two pointes, referre the rest till another time.

**1615 [2MWORKE] Worke for Cvtlers**

In this text three metal weapons who provide ‘worke for Cutlers’ quarrel about which of them is the most effective. Unmarked usage in their discussion is *you*. The use of *thou* occurs when the dialogue implies physical movement in the form of a dare or challenge.

Sword: Nay Rapier, come foorth, come forth I say, Ile giue *thee* a crowne, though it be but a crackt one: what wilt not? art so hard to be drawne forth Rapier?

Rapier: S'foot *thou* shalt know that Rapier dares enter: nay Backe-Sword.

When they discuss logistics, they switch to *you*:

Rapier: shall I get *you* out Sword alone, that I may haue *you* Single-sword.

Sword: Yes if *youle* be single Rapier too.

Dagger attempts to intervene but Sword is not to be pacified:

Sword: Hang him, I defie him base Spaniard

which provokes abusive *thou* from Rapier:

Rapier: Defie me? sirrha Sword, Rapier spits i' thy face: dar'st meete mee i'the fields, crauenly Capon?

Dagger attempts to conciliate Sword with *thou* of positive affect:

Dagger: Why any man may see that *thou* art well caru'd Sword;

Sword responds calmly to Rapier’s challenge, switching to *thou* in collocation with a conditional clause:
Sword: **Well** Rapier,  
*if thou goest into the fields with me,/*  
Ile make a Capon of you before I haue done with you,  
you shall nere come home vnctu ile warrant you.

It may be that this connotes Sword’s construction of Rapier as the cowardly opponent who was previously ‘so hard to be drawne forth’ and is therefore unlikely to go ‘into the fields’.

Subsequently the participants exchange you except for one utterance addressed to Sword by Dagger who, in his persona of Justice of Peace, attempts to pacify them with the threat of legal action. Sword’s scornful rejection of this suggestion seems to frustrate Dagger’s attempts at diplomacy. He rebukes Sword with a face-threatening reference to his past status, so that thou in this utterance connotes negative affect.

Sword: What talke you of Law? Sword scornes to haue any other Law then Martiall law  
Dagger: Away Sworde, the Time was indeed when thou wast a notable Swash-buckler,  
but now thou art growne olde Sword.

Dagger resumes his role as mediator attempting to flatter them both as *Gentlemen* and defusing the situation with a switch back to you.

Dagger: You are a craftie Foxe Sword: It were well if you knewe howe to keepe your friendship too, for Gentlemen and Friendes should not fall out.

**1641 [3MSTAGE] The Stage-Players Complaint**

Two actors perform in a play as Quick and Light in order to express their grievances. Their unmarked usage is you.

Quicke: You have without doubt some great cause of alacrity, that you produce such eloquent speeches now. Prithee what is’t?

Light replies with indignation addressing the other character as thou:

Light: How? Cause of alacrity? S’foot I had never more cause of sorrow in my life: **And** dost thou tell me of that? Fie, fie!

Quick: Prithee why?

He reorientates his stance:

Light: **Nea** you know this well enough
Quick: For i’me perswaded that there’s never a ‘What lack you Sir’ in all the City, but is sensible of our calamity too

His emphatic agreement connotes affinity. Then a further reorientation as he reassures Quick:

Light: I beleev thee: therefore I thinke, they may well commiserate our cause with their own ... wherefore let not that thing trouble you so much.

When Quick reflects on:

Quick: the brave times which wee have had heretofore ... But (alas) we must looke for no more of these times I feare

Light tries yet again to reassure him with a friendly thou followed by a switch to you in an expansive reorientation:

Light: Dost thou thinke because a cloud sometimes may cover and obnubilate the Sun, that it will therefore shine no more? Yes I’le warrant you, and that more bright too: so never feare Boy, but we shall get the day agen for all this.

Quick: But i’le assure you ‘tis to be feared

Light begins to lose patience:

Light: Pish, I can show thee many infallible reasons to the contrary:

... Pish, a thousand more Arguments I could add, but that I should weary your patience too much:

Light: But Prithee how comes it to passe that you act Tragedies every day.

Quick then switches to emphatic usage and addresses Light as thou in pouring forth his grievances.

Quick: How? J’le tell thee: my purse each day perisheth most Tragedically: and now J may be taken for a Scholler, since J’ve no money, but because I cannot speake true Latine, I’m afraid, I shall be taken for a Lawyer.

Light: What do’s Lawyers then speake false Latin?

He resumes his unmarked usage to finish the dialogue:

Quick: As if you know not that!

**1641 [3MCOUNT] The Counters Discovrse**

The three participants in this dialogue form a team of fraudsters who seek out wealthy debtors with the intention of parting them from their wealth whilst pretending to hide them from their creditors. It is Spyall’s job to locate the debtor.
Unmarked usage among the three conspirators is you. Tenterhooke, referred to by Catchall as ‘our Grand-Seignior Master Tenterhooke’, is the sergeant and Catchall is his assistant.

Spyall’s greeting to Catchall connotes solidarity

Spyall: How now mad shaver\textsuperscript{177} and Catchall replies in a similar style, addressing Spyall as thou in collocation with a description of Spyall as:

Catchall: one that standest in no need of perspective glasses, for thy eyes are as piercing as a Hawkes, and as dangerous as a Basiliskes, thou puttest a prodigall spend-thrift to as many turnings as a Woodcock hath windings ...

Spyall interprets Catchall’s greeting as raillery, saying, ‘Poxe of your jesting for me’ and they subsequently exchange you.

When Catchall asks,

Catchall: Is not this Man-catching a brave trade?

Spyall shifts to thou in addressing Catchall, which connotes solidarity in collocation with the expressed intent to deal plainly:

Spyall: Ile deale plainly sirrh with thee, we in our offices must be like theeves upon the high-way side,

In a rare expression of solidarity Tenterhooke the sergeant, who has previously addressed his helpers singly as you and jointly as my two Harpies, my nimble villaines, you Varlets, old Rogues, shifts to thou to equate himself with Spyall. Within their own group, Tenterhooke has superior status but he acknowledges that in the face of higher authority they would be equally disparaged.

Tenterhooke: I am afraid of the worst, if such a Leather-fac’d fellow, as I or thou art, should but be brought into question, our very downe-looks would halfe hang us,

\textsuperscript{177} OED mad shaver: a roysterer, a noisy and boisterous reveller.
Catchall’s shift of address denotes a change of stance in a move to flatter Spyall as he explains why he asks Spyall’s help.

Catch-all: but sirrah Spy-all, what shall you and I doe?

\textit{thou} mayest have as good an head to advise well
as \textit{thou} hast eyes to spie well.

The response does not please him and he shifts back to \textit{you} and a derogatory epithet:

Catch-all: And what will \textit{you} doe \textit{you} mad slave?

\textbf{1647 [3MWIT] VWit and VWealth}

Wat Witty-Pole and Davy Rich discuss the relative importance of wit and wealth. They exchange \textit{thou} throughout what appears to be an affable dispute. Walt addresses Davy as \textit{fool} and \textit{a meere Dody-Pole} (fool) but neither speaker appears to be angry. There is only one switch to \textit{you}:

Walt: what can be more cleare?

\textit{a ha} Davy? have I taken \textit{you} tardy\textsuperscript{178} ath’ last?
come yeild, yeild.

This may connote Walt’s feeling of superiority when he feels that he has won the dispute.

\textbf{1648 [3MWOMEN] Women Will Have Their Will}

In this text Mistress Newcombe, a victualler’s wife, visits Mistress Custome, who is decorating her house for Christmas. Mistress Newcombe addresses Mistress Custome as \textit{you} throughout. One feature that may be of significance in this text is Mistress Custome’s age. She is ‘fourescore and one years old’. Mistress Newcome’s age is not mentioned but, since her husband is a soldier, she is presumably much younger.

Mistress Custome greets her visitor as \textit{you} then switches to \textit{thou} when reminiscing about past Christmases. Her change of stance is introduced by the pragmatic marker \textit{nay} when she refers back to her youth:

\textsuperscript{178} OED caught you out.
Mistress Custome: *nay*, if *thou* hadst ever seen the Mirth and Jolitie that we have had at those Times when I was young, *thou* wouldst blesse *thy* selfe to see it.

This switches to *you* as she reverts to the present day:

Mistress Custome: Didst *thou* never heare of my Grand-father?
... 'tis very strange *you* never heard of him.

There seems to be formulaic use in the set phrase:

Mistress Custome: Ile tell *thee*;

then, under the apparent influence of Mistress Newcome’s obvious disapproval,

Mistress Newcome: it would make the stander by ashamed to see what the feeder devoures, and what gods they make of their bellies

Mistress Custome is chastened and addresses Mistress Newcome as *you* for several exchanges,

Mistress Custome: Indeed all this as *you* speake is true;

when Mistress Newcome’s recital of an old saying appears to motivate Mistress Custome’s switch to *thou*,

Mistress Newcome: It is an old saying, and true,
That which is bred in the bone, will seldome or never out of the flesh.
Mistress Custome: *Thou* sayest true.

The dialogue concludes with a switch by Mistress Custome to a *thou* of negative affect. Realising that the authority of Parliament will not persuade Mistress Custome to abandon ‘this Romish Beast Christmas’, Mistress Newcome threatens her that ‘some other sharper and more rigorous power must’. Mistress Custome takes offence at the term ‘must’ but in her response, although abusive, she retains the address *you*:

Mistress Custome: Must, doe *you* say? How now, *you* said *you* did not come to Scold, but I see *you* will Scold before *you* goe: I see now by the Masse, there is no making hony of a Dogs-turd ... must make me?

It is Mistress Newcome’s claim of support by ‘the honest godly partie of the Armie of which societie my Husband is a member’ that provokes Mistress Custome into an expression of contempt and motivates *thou*. Reference to anonymous powers such as Parliament and the Army provokes uncertain resistance from Mistress Custome
but with a reference to Master Newcome, she is on firmer ground. She knows that he merits opprobrium.

Mistress Custome: As for the Armie, no doubt but there may be some honest men amongst them, but all the world knowes what thy Husband was, a poore man which ran out of his Countrey for debt ... Devill, doe thy worst.

1661 [3MWHORE] The Wandring Whore

In this text Magdalena, a bawd, Julietta, a whore, and Gusman, a pimp, collude to persuade Francion, a rich gallant, to marry Julietta. Unmarked usage for the three conspirators is exchange of collusive *thou*.

Magdalena: wee'l make him marry thee Julieta, or make thee a good joynture all thy life time:

Gusman’s usage is problematic, since it is not always possible to determine if he is addressing one or both women when he uses the term *you*. Julietta lists the articles she intends to persuade Francion to sign ‘for an Assurance of his future Affections’.

Gusman: They are singular ways to provide horns for his head, but I would not wish you to stand upon such Punctilios, if he will but marry thee Ju,

A similar subsequent example, however, can address only Julietta.

Gusman: well if you think to have Francion I hear, and see coming Ju, *you* must behave *your* self with more discretion,

A close reading of Gusman’s addresses to Julietta reveals that *thou* collocates with his advice on how she should comport herself after she has succeeded in marrying Francion. When Gusman addresses Julietta as *you*, it is in reference to their plot to entrap Francion. Gusman seems to distinguish the personae of Julietta his co-conspirator and that of Julietta the whore.

Julietta’s affable *thou* in dismissal of Gusman’s advice to act with more discretion is instantly followed by her obsequious address to Francion collocating with *you*:

Julietta: Prithee Gusman keep thy breath to cool thy pottage,\(^\text{179}\) but stick close to us in our new found Plots;

\(^{179}\) OED hold your counsel, keep quiet.
Mounsieur Francion, truly devoted of your servants salutes you, and rejoices at your appearance,

The conspirators all address Francion as you,

Magdalena: I would advise you Sir to marry her,
Gusman: she's resolved to turn if you'll marry her.

Francion greets Julietta affectionately,

Francion: Thy company's no less to me my sweetheart, my deer, and my beloved one,

but switches to a distancing you at the mention of marriage.

Francion: I thought I had remov'd all scruples in that point, is the motion of your mentioning Julietta?

1682 [4MLAST] Last Words and Confessions (authentic)

The scribe of this text cautions that it contains the last words and confessions of three convicted witches ‘as fully as could be taken in a case liable to so much noise and confusion, as is usual on such occassions’. He is more likely to have been concerned with substance than form, so recording of the second-person pronoun variable may be less reliable than in other texts. What is probably significant, though, is the scribe’s apparent expectation of usage. Mr H asks similar questions of Mary Trembles and of Temperance Lloyd concerning their relationship with the Devil. In most of these, he addresses them as thou, which suggests that this is formulaic usage (numbers added):

Mr H To Mary Trembles
1) In what shape did the Devil come to you?
2) Did he give thee any Gift, or didst thou make him any Promise?
3) Had he any of thy bloud?
4) Did he come to make use of thy Body in a carnal manner?

Mr H To Temperance Lloyd
2) Temperance Lloyd, Have you made any Contract with the Devil?
3) Did he ever take any of thy bloud?
1) How did he appear to thee first
4) Had he ever any carnal knowledge of thee?
5) What did he do when he came to thee?
Similarly, Mr H’s usage switch within one utterance to Mary Trembles appears to be motivated by a switch to the higher register of Biblical reference:

Mr H: Mary Trembles, Was not the Devil there with Susan when I was once in the Prison with you, and under her Coats? the other told me that he was there, but is now fled;

(I take this reference to the other to indicate that you here has singular reference)

... Thou speakest now as a dying Woman, and as the Psalmist says, I will confess my iniquities and acknowledge all my sin. We find that Mary Magdalen had seven Devils, and she came to Christ and obtained Mercy: And if thou break thy League with the Devil, and make a Covenant with God, thou mayst also obtain Mercy. If thou hast any thing to speak, speak thy mind.

Discussion of Results for Miscellaneous Texts

Table 6.3 Unmarked Address of thou and you in Miscellaneous Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting Comparative Social Status</th>
<th>Lower Orders</th>
<th>Middling Sort</th>
<th>Higher Orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>►◄ reciprocal use</td>
<td>►◄</td>
<td>►◄</td>
<td>►◄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► use to a social equal</td>
<td>►</td>
<td>►</td>
<td>►</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ use down the social scale</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲ use up the social scale</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not indicate frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1593 1MBARRO
1595 1MDANDO y y
1615 2MWORKE y
1641 3MSTAGE y
1641 3MCOUNT y
1647 3MWIT t
1648 3MWOMEN y
1661 3MWHORE t y y
1682 4MLAST y
The miscellaneous texts form a group because the compilers of the corpus considered that they do not readily fit any of the other text types (Kytö & Walker 2006:24). They form 2.7% of the total texts studied and do not cover the whole period of the corpus, so cannot be taken as representative. It is notable, though, that the opening and closing texts both seem to show you as unmarked. They are both accounts of legal examinations. The first, published c1593, is a recollected account by the accused of a speech event which occurred in 1586 [1593 IMBARRO]. The last text was recorded under the ‘noise and confusion’ of a witches’ trial [1682 4MLAST]. Allowance must be made for the fact the particular use of address terms may have been forgotten in the first account and not clearly heard in the last but it seems likely that the respective scribes will have written what they would have expected to hear. Actual or expected unmarked usage in both texts is you.
Chapter 7 Analysis of the collocation of the forms *thou* and *you* with address terms and epithets

Tables in Appendix 4 give a pragmatic analysis of reference terms, address terms and epithets in collocation with *thou* and *you* for each of the text types studied. The categories used were assessed as follows:

**Address Terms**

**Social Status** terms connote the speaker’s perception of his specific social relationship with the addressee. They function as a kind of metaphor. To address an unrelated man as *brother* is to map onto the speaker’s relationship with a colleague or associate the familiarity of a kinship relationship. Similarly, *cousin* may connote a distant family relationship. *Father* may connote age or veneration in address to an old person or to a priest:

*Now father God be your speed* [1595 1CPEELE]

*Mother* may connote age but not always respect. It is the title given to the eponymous Lancashire Witches [1682 4CSHADW]

*Child* rarely denotes offspring but usually refers to a young woman of high social status i.e. not a *girl* or a *wench*, though it is used as a term of endearment by a woman to her husband:

*I can't guess, Child: Not you, to be sure, my Dear -- one should think not* [1734 5CMILLE]

Other terms in this category seem to imply the speaker’s perception of his addressee as being of similar social status to himself. *Neighbour* and *Gossip* imply that the addressee is known to the speaker, if only slightly, whereas *Friend* suggests that the addressee may be unknown to the speaker but is addressed as though of similar social status. The OED notes such usage as ‘kindly condescension’. It is used in this way to witnesses by Court Officials:

*L. Ch. Just.: Look you here Friend, you are not to be sworn;* [1681 4TCOLLE] >William Shewin, witness
It may connote cajolery:

Edgworth, a Cutpurse: Friend, let mee ha' the first, let mee ha' the first, I pray you.

The connotation of social distance in the term *Friend* is implied by Saleware’s suggestion to his wife, whom he addresses as *thou*, that they should address each other as *Friend* in order to seem more sophisticated:

Saleware, a Citizen: Troth, and I'le call thee friend, and I prethee, let that be our familiar and common compellation: friend it will sound daintily, especially when *thou* shalt appeare too gallant to be my Wife.

The term *Man* may be categorised as Social Relationship when it connotes impatience. Menechmus urges Peniculus, his parasite, to stop talking of food and to flatter him as he asks:

Menechmus: Tush, say as I bid thee man.

Peniculus in turn loses patience with Menechmus, his benefactor, though addressing him with the appropriate formal *you*:

Peniculus: I warrant ye man.

Menechmus’ wife, Mulier, loses patience with him when he prevaricates, addressing him as *Man*:

Mulier: My cloake man, why do ye blush?

and he parallels this by addressing her as *Woman* in response:

Menechmus: Why what aile ye woman?

This is not his usual address to her. It seems to have been provoked in response to her use of the term *Man*, suggesting that this usage is marked. He reverts to unmarked *Wife* in conciliation:

Menechmus: Tell me wife, hath any of your servants abused you?

... Good wife come hither. [1595 1CWARN]

*Man* may function as a term of social status:

Archbishop: Lay your hand vpon it man. [1593[1MBARRO] >accused directed to swear oath
but in the CED it functions more frequently in transient usage to denote the social relationship of speakers in a specific situation.

A woman may be addressed as: Dame, Gentlewoman, Girl, Huswife, Lady, Madam, Mistress, Wench, Woman. Speakers categorise their addressee in relation to their own perceived social status. This is demonstrated in a language teaching text in which the waiting gentlewoman, Jolye, addresses her employer, the lady, as Madame [1605 2HFERON]. The lady addresses this servant by her given name, Jolye. The chambermaid, being of lower social status than the waiting gentlewoman, addresses her as Mistress Iolye. All of these women exchange you.

There are fewer male social status terms. The most enduring of these is Sir, which may contrast with Sirra as an indicator of superior social status:

Lord Moren: Sirra in this thou maiest highly pleasure me, let me haue thy place to beare a torch, that I may look on my wife, and she not see me,

Iaques (Inn Keeper’s Servant): O sir you shall, or any thing that I can do, Ile send for your wife to. [1599 1CCHAPM]

Terms denoting social status may be applied pejoratively. Mr Upright and Mr Pattent accord each other their title and address each other as Sir [1640 3HOTJ]. Then their discussion becomes heated and they exchange Sirra:

Upright: I shall vexe thy soule first Sirrah, vnlesse thou canst come off with good Language, thou wilt suffer many deaths in one,

Pattent: Well sirrah, you are a railing fellow, I'le talke no more to you.

There is an indication of a distinction in the following usage in a 1607 drama text where the addressee is not visible to the speaker and his social status is unknown. The speaker hedges his bets by using both sirrah and sir, which collocate with the inclusive term you:

Speaker 2: Sirrah, sir, what make you in that tree. [1607 2CWILKI]
The final examples are from the 1680s. These, addressed by a witch to a country fellow and by Captain Clark attempting to subdue an Election Day riot, possibly connote social status and certainly connote negative affect:

Mal. Spencer [a witch]: Come Sirrah, I have switcht you well
I'le tye you up now to the Rack.
[1682 C4SHADW] >Clod, a Country Fellow

Captain Clark: ‘No King's-man, no Sword's-man’, cryed they;
‘Sirrah, you are a Rascal and a Traytor in your heart’,
said I, and laid fast hold on him;
[1682 4TPILKI] Election Day Riot

This next example suggests banter. It is from a dialogue among colleagues who frequently exchange thou:

Tom: Sirrah, one word more of Mutton and off you go;
you cannot forbear your Roguery. [1681 4HOSAM]

I did not find Sir in collocation with thou.

Composite address terms with the prefix your (as Grace, Honour, Ladyship, Lordship, Worship) replace you in addressing the concept of a person of higher social status. The high-status office is being addressed rather than the person holding the office. This distances the addressee further from the speaker than the use of the prefix my and appropriate title (as my Lady, my Lord) which addresses the actual person. Most address terms connoting relatively high social status collocate with you. There are a few exceptions:

Queen: O pardon me my lord, that I mistake thy royall meaning so.
[1599 1CCHAPM] >absent King

Brabo, servant: I prithee Mistris, for all my long seruice,
For all the loue that I haue borne thee long,
Do me this fauour now to marry me.
[1602 2CHEYWO] >his mistris proposing marriage

Banckes: Marocco I dare saie it and sweare it to thee
... I am vndone, nowe young gentleman
[1595 1MDANDO] >Marocco, his Horse, where young gentleman is facetious
**Occupation/Description**

This category differs from Social Status which connotes the speaker’s perception of their comparative status to that of their addressee. It is the description of the addressee which is either given in the introduction to the text or which may be deduced from the content of the text. Names of occupation as address terms generally collocate with *you*. This connotes social distance. The address is to the office rather than to the holder of the office who may be unknown to the speaker. Collocation with *thou* may connote negative affect:

Sacrapant: Yea a Frier indefinit, & a knaue infinit
... Holde thee there Friar, [1595 1CPEELE]

Master Pattent, the smith, switches from addressing Mr Upright by title and name in collocation with *you*, as their conversation becomes abusive:

Pattent: Whether insuch hast Mr.Upright; *you* looke as if you did not know me.
... Doe thy worst Shoomaker [1640 3HOTJ]

Pattent knows his addressee’s name but distances himself socially by denying Upright’s individuality and categorising him as a type, addressed as *thou*. This has a deictic function by reinforcing the negative affect of his utterance. A similar kind of switch in a didactic text connotes banter. The title of the text suggests how it is to be interpreted: *a very pleasant dialogue ... printed merrily*:

Light—foot: Master Poet, your tongue runnes before your wit
... Thy fall O Poet, makes poor Light foot mad.
Suck.bottle: Thy fall O Poet, makes Suck bottle sad. [1641 3HOPOET]

The collocation of *thou* and *what* in a drama text [1595 1CPEELE] connotes Anticke’s uncertainty whether the apparition before him is human:

Anticke: In the name of my own father, be *thou* Oxe or Alfe¹⁸⁰ that appearest, tell vs what *thou* art.

When he is reassured by the smith:

¹⁸⁰ OED elf.
Smith: What am I? Why I am Clunch the Smith, what are you, what make you in my territories at this time of the night?

Anticke responds with self righteous indignation and addresses Clunch as thou and Smith:

Anticke: What doe we make dost thou aske? why we make faces for feare: such as if thy mortall eyes could behold, would make thee water the long seames of thy side slops, Smith.

unlike his colleague, Frolicke,, who adopts a conciliatory tone with a respectful term of address collocating with you:

Frolicke: And in faith Sir vnlesse your hospitalitie doe releeue vs.

Careless greets Closet, Lady Thrivewell’s old nurse, formally but switches to thou Nurse as he attempts to cajole her into colluding with him to seduce Lady Thrivewell:

Carelesse: And you have brought me, what sweet Mistris Closet? ... Cannot all thy art, and her cost finde helpe for my Unkle, think'st thou, to get a child? ... Still thou mistak'st me Nurse.  [1653 3CBROME]

This following example is from didactic texts labelled English Lucian [1703 4HOLUCI], which implies that they are satirical. In most of their exchanges Captain Flourish addresses Nehemiah Trap as you Landlord. The Captain’s superior social status seems to license the satire he directs to the landlord:

Landlord: Well Captain, I am glad of the Honour of your Company to this Choice Glass of Wine. I wish I had as good Company to Entertain you with, as you had when you Treated me at the Tower.

Captain Flourish: Thank you Landlord; then send for your Wife.

which the landlord appear not to recognise as satire:

Landlord: O dear Captain, Would she were here, I’m sure she’d go all over the Town to wait on you;

On two occasions the Captain switches to thou Landlord. The motivation for this is explained in one of these utterances:
Captain Flourish: You may seem another Man to your Brethren, who won’t know you; or your Bubbles, who don’t know you; or your Subjects who dare not know you. But my dear Landlord, Here’s to thy own Reformation and Health. I do know thee. [1703 4HOLUCI]

The landlord has two personae. The Captain’s use of you Landlord connotes ‘another man’, known to the world in general, whereas thou Landlord addresses the real man known to Captain Flourish. The contrast expresses spatial deixis with you as the distal and thou as the proximal form.

**Name**
This includes given names and given names plus family name collocating with thou and you

**Title+Name**
This category includes titles such as Master, Mistress, Sir followed by a name.
Unmarked usage is collocation with you.

**Title+Occupation**
I found only one example collocating with thou in this proposed classification, so it is not shown in the tables:

Knight: sirra Bailie, I will answere the poore mens debts, and come home to me for thy fee anon [1594 1CKNAVE]

The knight’s unmarked usage to social inferiors is you. The usage here of sirra and thou may connote his distaste for the attempt to defraud the poor man. The use of a title to the bailiff seems ironic.

**Collocations with thou**
Although functioning as titles, the terms Fellow, Sirra and Mother preceding a name connote familiarity, so it is not remarkable that they collocate with thou:

Anticke: How nowe fellowe Franticke, what all amort?
Doth this sadnes become thy madness?

Fantasticke: Syrrha Frolicke, I am sure thou art not without some round or other, no doubt but Clunch can beare his part. [1595 1CPEELE]
Lemot: Sirrah, Catalian, while they are playing at cardes, thou and I will haue some excellent sport
[1599 1CCHAPM]

Demdike: And make thee Mother Madge a Witch
[1682 4CSHADW]

All of the characters in the drama Bartholomew Fayre address Grace Welborn as Mistress Grace. Her betrothed Cokes’s unmarked usage to her is thou. His usage to the other characters varies. His address to her seems to acknowledge the high social status evidenced by his use of her title and his affection for her as his betrothed evidenced by thou:

Cokes: Come, Mistresse Grace, pre'thee be not melancholy for my mis-chance; sorrow wi’ not keepe it, Sweet heart.
... I ha’ gold left to gi’ thee a fayring, yet,
1614 [2CJONSO] >his betrothed

I found two examples of an addressee of high social status being addressed with thou of negative affect. One of these in the deposition texts is reported speech. Sir Richard, a priest, is addressed as you and subsequently abusively as thou:

JAMES WALTON "What maks you so hye, S=\(=\) Richerd?"
"thou drouchken horemonger preist?"
[1573 1WDURHA] >Sir Richerd, priest

In the drama, Ram Alley, Captain Puffe, whose name connotes his bombastic character, addresses both a knight and a justice as thou:

Captain Puffe: Sir Oliuer Smal-shankes,
Know my name is Puffe, knight, thee haue I sought,
To fright thee from thy wits.
... I tell thee justice Tutchine, not all
Thy Baylifes, Sergants, busie Constables,
Defesants, warrants, or thy Mittimusses,\(^1\) Shall saue his throte from cutting
[1611 2CBARRE] >Justice Tutchine,>Sir Oliver Smalshankes

Justice Tutchine thinks him mad:

Justice Tutchine: Nay good Sir Puffe,
Wee haue too many mad men already.
[1611 2CBARRE] >Captin Puffe

\(^1\) OED writs.
Non-Predictability of Collocation

With abusive epithets

It is not the case in the CED that certain epithets always collocate with *thou* or *you*. An investigation of the collocation of vocatives in the CED does not coincide with Barber’s findings in *Richard III*. Barber assesses usage from the First Folio of 1623. Assuming the first performance date of this play to have been 1592-3 (Maslen 1994:743), I have compared Barber’s findings with drama texts in the CED in the period 1580-1640. He finds that certain abusive vocatives ‘always collocate with *thou*, never with *you*’ (1981:174). I have investigated those abusive vocatives noted by Barber that also feature with negative affect in the CED drama texts. These are: *fool, knave, slave, villain* (Appendix 2). Barber considers them only as address terms (vocatives) and concedes (1981:175) ‘in most cases the figures are too small to be considered reliable ... we need statistical information on such collocations from a larger body of Shakespeare’s plays.’ I am not concerned that there may be insufficient statistical data to draw quantitative conclusions, since my study is essentially qualitative. My objective is to discover why speakers in the CED used *thou* as they did.

Barber notes that the vocative *Brother* collocates only with *you* in *Richard III* (Barber 1981:175). This is not the case in the CED drama texts where collocation varies according to context (Appendix 2). In neither of my categories, address terms or negative epithets, do the abusive vocatives cited by Barber consistently collocate with one form of the pronoun to the exclusion of the other, thus demonstrating the need for a pragmaphilological analysis to determine the collocates of *thou*.

In case the collocation of abusive epithets with *thou* is a feature of Shakespeare’s idiolect rather than common usage in the Early Modern English period, I investigated the collocation of other abusive epithets in the CED that feature in the analysis tables in Appendix 4. Ignoring those epithets that collocate only with *thou* in one text and with *you* in another, I concentrated on those terms that collocated with both in the same text. This suggested that the choice of pronoun was not determined by the affect of the epithet. There were two epithets, *slave* and *whore*, that collocated with both *thou* and *you* in the same text but these were attributable to reporting discrepancies in deposition texts [1573 1WDURHA] and [1582 1WDARCY]. In
the drama texts, however, *varlet* [1595 1CWARN], *minx* [1607 2CWILKI] and *ass* [1614 2CJONSO] and [1669 3CDRYDE] collocated with both *thou* and *you*. The term *rogue*, which is semantically negative, features as a pragmatically positive term in collocation with both *thou* and *you* in texts from 1669 [3CDRYDE] and 1675 [3CWYCHE], where it functions as a ‘playful term of reproach or as a term of endearment’ (OED). This demonstrates the significance of context rather than collocation alone in determining affect.

**With Apostrophe**182 & **Personification**183

Hope (2003:77-79) considers the use of *th*-forms to be ‘almost mandatory’ in Shakespeare plays in the contexts of: absence, apostrophe, and address to animals and spirits. This ‘apparently fixed convention can’, however, ‘be varied according to the affective semantic’. In his study of second-person pronouns in the Shakespeare corpus Ulrich Busse (2002:34) finds apostrophe to be ‘governed by the use of invariant *thou*.’ Although this applies to most of the instances of apostrophe in the CED, there are a few exceptions (Appendix 3). In all of these examples (except for the case of the speaker’s uncertainty of the status of his addressee [1595 1CPEELE]) a strong emotion overrides the unmarked usage. This is at variance with what has been claimed about Russian usage where Mühlhäusler & Harré find (1990:141) that the Russian *ty* is ‘the pronoun of surprise, upset, derangement and strong emotion of every kind, both hate and love, anger and tenderness.’ In Early Modern English such strong emotion may be expressed by pronoun switching in the use of apostrophe.

---

182 vocative address to an absent, or dead person, or to an inanimate object or quality as if personified (Wales 2001:27).

183 a figure of speech or trope in which an inanimate object, animate non-human, or abstract quality is given human attributes (Wales 2001:294).
Chapter 8 Conclusions

My investigation into the pragmatics of *thou* in Early Modern English dialogues had three interrelated objectives:

- to discover the contexts in which the forms *thou* and *you* were used with singular reference
- to determine the motivation for shifts from one form to the other within an exchange or within a single utterance
- to investigate how the use of the forms *thou* and *you* collocates with address terms and epithets and what this implies about their changing significance in the Early Modern English period

First Objective

to discover the contexts in which the forms *thou* and *you* were used with singular reference:

As far as I am aware, previous analyses of the *thou*/*you* variants in Early Modern English have been based on some component of the vertical and horizontal axes of status and distance, or like that of Mulholland they have sought a grammatical feature to account for variation. The problem with these approaches is that it limits the analysis so that, if the particular feature investigated cannot be shown to motivate *thou*/*you* variation, one may be left with the conclusion of Johnson’s 1966 study on the basis of rank as a determining factor that the difference between the pronouns of address had become ‘meaningless’ by the seventeenth century. Johnson found insufficient information to enable her to categorise many of her speakers into her selected ‘three social divisions’ (1966:263). I assumed that the address term may be significant but unlike Stein (2002:252) did not assume a socially unmarked pronoun for any given pair of speakers. Instead I undertook a close reading of the complete text to establish each speaker’s unmarked exchange-based usage to their interlocutor. I thus established a text-internal classification of interlocutors’ relative status rather than a text-external one. In the CED texts *you* began to be unmarked in the third quarter of the sixteenth century. *Thou* became inclusive or exclusive. The *thou*/*you* contrast is one of social deixis.
I considered three text types:

- Deposition and trial texts, which depict authentic use of *thou* and *you*, give some suggestion of authentic usage.

- Didactic and language texts, which depict prescribed appropriate usage.

- Drama texts, which may depict the stylistic effect of subverting these expectations.

In all text types I found that, except for formulaic *thou* in trial texts, the percentage of *thou*-collocation both with address terms and affective epithets measured against that of *you* begins to diminish after 1600. The implication of this is that, as *thou* gradually becomes marked, its use as a form of address or in collocation with an epithet acquires pragmatic significance. The address pronouns *thou* and *you* exemplify Traugott’s pattern of semantic change in English in undergoing semantic bleaching and pragmatic strengthening. *You* develops from denoting number to connoting first deference then politeness. *Thou* becomes gradually marginalised as a pronoun expressing singularity, so that eventually its usage is marked.

Jucker notes the first attestation of *you* with singular reference in the second half of the thirteenth century (2006:57). Brown & Gilman also give this date for the ‘first uses of “ye” as a reverential singular’ and say that it seems to have been copied from the French nobility (1960:265). It seems that 1600, the point by which Partridge claims ‘the distinctions [between *thou* and *you*] have become too subtle for the average person to observe’ (1969:25), is a significant point in the decline in the use of *thou* in the CED texts. Contributory factors in this decline appear to have been the changing structure of society and growing urbanization. Statistics from the sixteenth century (Turchin & Nefedov 2009:85) show an increase in the numbers of the middling sort, who feature prominently in the constructed texts, and of the higher orders, who feature mainly in the drama texts. This increase followed the dissolution of the monasteries, much of whose land was sold to the gentry during the 1540s and early 1550s, creating the economic basis for the expansion of this sector of society (Stone 1972:154). Rising rents after 1580 benefited this sector, whose numbers increased in the hundred years to 1640.

Turchin & Nefedov (2009:85) give the following figures. In that part of society categorised as ‘higher orders’ in the CED analyses: the number of aristocratic
families grew from 6,300 to 18,500 between 1540 and 1640. Among the county gentry there were 500 knights in 1524 but 1,400 baronets and knights by 1640. Among the ‘middling sort’, the number of esquires rose from 800 to 3,000 between 1524 and 1640. The most significant groups, because of their involvement in local affairs, are the parish gentry or armigerous (arms bearing) gentry who grew from 5,000 to 15,000 between 1540 and 1640. This compares with a general population increase of 80% in this period from 2.8 to 5.1 million. In the same period, there was a growth in the number of lawyers and doctors, who are also categorised as ‘middling sort’ in the CED analyses.

From the mid-sixteenth century there was a trend to reorganise estates away from communally-managed open fields into individually-managed enclosed farms. Between 1550 and 1600 cereal yields rose by about 38% (Wrightson lecture 12, chapter 2). This was accompanied by a fall in real wages, an increase in the number of landless peasants and a growing degree of inequality together with famine during the years 1594 to 1597 (Turchin & Nefedov 2009:100). Regional specialization in agriculture and expanding urban economies attracted both the unemployed and those with produce to sell, creating a ‘redistribution of population’ (Wrightson lecture 12, chapter 5). This led to a period of rapid urban growth or urbanization of cities such as Worcester and Norwich. The greatest population increase was in London where the population grew from around 70,000 in 1550 to 200,000 by 1600, that is 5% of the national population (Wrightson lecture 12, chapter 3). In a period of rapid social change with a growing population of the middling sort, it may be difficult to locate one’s interlocutor socially and safer to hedge one’s bets like the speaker in the 1607 drama, Miseries of Inforst Mariage, addressing an invisible addressee with both informal and formal address terms:

Speaker 2: Sirrah, sir, what make you in that tree.
[1607 2CWILKI]

The equivalent for the second person pronoun of address in case of doubt is to use you to avoid giving offence. The increasing uncertainties about relationships in the changing social order may explain the thou/you shift.
The contemporary perception of *thou* as marked as an address term to strangers in the mid-seventeenth century is illustrated by Fox’s account in his *Journal* of 1651 (see chapter 2 above). Similarly in 1660, Thomas Ellwood, a fellow Quaker, provoked fury when he addressed his father as *thou*, who told him: ‘Sirrah, if ever I hear you say Thou or Thee to me again, I'll strike your teeth down your throat’ (Bear [1714] 2008). Figure 8:1 illustrates the decline of *thou* as an address term after 1600. After 1721 it is very little used in this way. Figure 8:2 shows that *thou* continued to be used with affective epithets to the end of the period, though after 1600 this use declined in comparison with *you*. Figure 8:3, an amalgam of the two previous figures, depicts the overall progression of declining *thou*-usage after 1600.

![Figure 8:1 Collocation of thou and you with Address Terms in All Texts](image1)

There are no drama texts for the periods 1560-1580 & 1621-1640

*thou*: Mean 20.07% STDEV 13.37%  *you*: Mean 76.9% STDEV 18.1%

![Figure 8:2 Collocation of thou and you with Affective Epithets in All Texts](image2)

There are no drama texts for the periods 1560-1580 & 1621-1640

*thou*: Mean 38.6% STDEV 9.2%  *you*: Mean 61.4% STDEV 9.2%
In collocation with affective epithets *thou* as a percentage of second-person pronoun usage is higher both synchronically and diachronically in drama texts than in other text types. *Thou* survives as an address term and as an affective term until the end of the period in drama texts [1757 5CGARRI]. Except for the isolated instances of the Mary Blandy deposition [1752 5WBLAND] and the reported use in a trial text by Mr Elde [1725 5TMACCL], thou does not feature either as an address term or in collocation with an affective epithet after 1682 in authentic texts.

![Figure 8:3 Collocation of *thou* and *you* with Address Terms & Affective Epithets in All Texts](image)

*thou*: Mean 26.6%  STDEV 12.16%  *you* Mean 73.4%  STDEV 12.16%

The use of *thou* survived and was sustained in English by a combination of religious laws in the sixteenth century. The 1549 Act of Uniformity established the *Book of Common Prayer* as the only legal form of worship and the 1559 Act of Uniformity imposed compulsory church attendance. *The Book of Common Prayer* specified that psalms should be read every day for morning and evening prayer and ‘the Psalter followeth the translation of the great English Bible, set forth and used in the time of King Henry the Eighth, and Edward the Sixth.’ Crystal finds that though the King James Bible influenced the English language with innovative idiomatic expressions’ (2010:261), for stylistic influence Coverdale’s 1535 translation of the Psalms in the *The Book of Common Prayer* ‘is more likely to be remembered, not King James’ (2010:88).

‘By the early seventeenth century the Church as it had been established in 1559 [along with its *Book of Common Prayer*] had sunk deep roots into English popular
During the Protectorate *The Book of Common Prayer* was replaced by the *Directory for Public Worship* which commended ‘the more frequent reading of such scriptures as he that readeth shall think best for edification of his hearers, as the book of Psalms, and such like.’ In 1650 all laws compelling attendance at the national Church were repealed. After the Restoration, however, the Prayer Book was revised and the Conventicle Act of 1664 prohibited all assemblies not held in accordance with *The Book of Common Prayer* (Coward 1996:294).

Coward finds that there was ‘a determined campaign to suppress those sects that would not conform to the restored Church of England’ (1996:296). Protestant dissent continued and in 1689 the Toleration Act allowed licensed worship outside the Church of England. It is difficult to quantify Church attendance in the Early Modern period but what is apparent is that anyone attending any denomination of Church service at any time during this period would have encountered the Psalms. Church congregations were thus regularly exposed to the use of *thou* in a formal register throughout the whole of the period under consideration. As *you* took over in natural conversation, *thou* would have progressively come to be perceived as connoting a marked register.

It was perceived as such by de Saussure, a French Protestant, writing in 1729. He says of Quakers that they

> form a particular nation of people, quite different from ordinary English citizens, by their language, manner of dressing, and religion. Amongst their other customs, one of which is their use of the pronoun ‘thou’, is that of never giving any man his titles, whatever his position or worth may be. Quakers make use of a sort of Bible talk, which strikes you more particularly, as it appears to date two hundred years back, no Bible having been printed in England in the fine modern language, the earliest edition of the Holy Book being still in use. (cited in Gibson 1998:223)

Indications are that the use of *thou* as a subject was becoming rarer by the beginning of the eighteenth century. A drama text from 1719, which also features *thou* as a single subject:

Worthy: Townly, *thee* and I will make a Visit [4CKILLI]

implies linguistic uncertainty similar to the confusion in Modern English over the use of case in personal pronouns e.g. *Me and you will make a visit*. Reported speech
in a trial from 1725 seems to express similar uncertainty with *thee* in a compound subject:

Mr Elde: My Lord said, *thee* and I, or *You* and I [5MACCL].

A drama text from 1734 has *thee* as a singular subject form:

Lady Hippish: What dost *thee* mean by this Blubbering, pr'ythee? [5CMILLE].

The address term *thou* to strangers in the CED texts seems to have survived the longest when connoting the twenty-first century relationship with those who perform a service but are not directly employed by the user such as waiting staff, taxi drivers and other people’s servants. Perhaps *thou* in these relationships has been replaced in modern times by the custom of tipping with the same potential for friendly condescension.

In late-seventeenth-century texts *you was* as a variant of *you were* occurs as singular address together with the more frequent *was you* replacing *were you*. This may have exemplified a grammatical trend to specialize *was* as singular and *were* as plural. I have not undertaken a detailed analysis but it is interesting that the one language text in which this usage occurs [1694 4HFBOYE] has the singular form of the verb in an address to a lady by her friend, while the maid retains the established plural form. It may be that linguistic insecurity is motivating the new singular form among the middling sort. I found no such use in deposition texts where there is a preponderance of speakers from the lower orders. Most occurrences are in the trial texts beginning with the Attorney General in 1658 [3TSLING]. Usage is not consistent. Until the end of the seventeenth century some trial texts featured only the plural form. From 1702 [4TSWEND] both forms occur in the same text with speakers (mainly Officials) often using them inconsistently. This may be hypercorrection. The last trial text [1759 5TSTEVE] has only *you were* with singular reference. *You was* features in all the drama texts from 1719.

**Second Objective**

**to determine the motivation for shifts from one form to the other within an exchange or within a single utterance**

My approach to my second objective was to identify the phenomenon of switching and then to assess the cause. In this way, I intended to avoid the Fish criticism of
stylistic analysis (1979): that it ‘was always arbitrary, less a matter of something demonstrated than of something assumed before the fact or imposed after it.’ In her study of the CED Walker undertook a micro analysis of samples of texts. As I considered that the relationships of the speakers, their relative social status and distance could only be determined in context, I undertook a close reading of the entire text. In identifying switching usage as potentially significant I did not set out to justify any particular significance. I did not assume that usage necessarily connotes power or solidarity, only that a change in use may be significant in some way. Nor did I follow Calvo in assuming literary merit for any particular version of a text leading to the conclusion that thou and you must be in ‘meaningless free variation.’ As the markedness and markedness reversal analyses show, shifts in the pronoun of address connote a shift in the speaker’s stance towards the persona of the addressee, a reorientation of the topic, or a change of topic. Shifts are deictic.

Some motivations for shifts to thou as expressions of temporary solidarity of purpose or affinity are shown in Appendix 1. These include:

- Perception of potential or actual shared experience;
- Attempt to reassure or console the addressee;
- Attempt to promote intimacy with the intention of obliging a reluctant addressee to respond;
- Persuasion to collude;
- Expression of appreciation of wit.

Brown & Gilman do not account for pronoun switching in Middle English citing Kennedy’s finding of ‘inexplicable fluctuation between T and V in Middle English’ (1960:255). Jucker (2006:69), however, suggests that:

> Chaucer’s system of pronouns of address is characterised by retractable choices. In Canterbury Tales, the choice of the appropriate pronoun is not fixed for each dyad of interlocutors’ with switches in pronouns ‘depending on the interactional status reached at any given point.’

My investigation of the Early Modern English Corpus of English Dialogues replicated this finding. In the CED texts, the thou/you variant functions interpersonally as a social deictic to position the speaker in relation to the addressee. This may be determined by: their ages, their sex, their kinship status, their comparative social status, the extent of their acquaintance, their mutual affect. These

---

184 See chapter 2 footnote 13 page 26
factors would determine unmarked usage for the interlocutors. When their default usage changes and there is a switch to the other variant, this indicates a change in some aspect of the context of their exchange. This may relate to the emotion the speaker feels to the addressee, to the perceived persona of the addressee, or to textual features such as the topic of the exchange or the location of the exchange. Thus markedness reversal functions as a pragmatic marker in connoting the speaker’s attitude to his addressee and in locating the proposition in the context of the discourse. Eventually, as you replaced thou in most conversational registers, it ceased to have these connotations and became depragmaticalised.

The amount of pronoun switching varies according to the type of text. The statistics are shown on the next page. It is much more frequent in drama texts than in other texts. As the intended audience has to construct the characters from their dialogue, this may sound artificial because of the unnatural burden of information it contains. There may be time jumps in drama, so changes in stance and topic contribute to plot development. A drama text is unlikely to have a sequence of twenty five questions such as that directed at a witness in a treason trial over discrepancies in his testimony [1681 4TCOLLE]. The most common category of switching is in the speaker’s perception of the persona of the addressee, which comprises about 75% of all switches. This contributes to the construction of the characters and may also serve to develop the plot. Speaker change of stance on the topic constitutes about 20% of the total and change of topic around 5%. In 1747 a switch to marked thou in a drama text [1747 5CHOADL] appears to function to mitigate negative affect.

Deposition texts have very little switching since they comprise mainly interviews with some reported speech between speakers whose social roles in relation to each other are generally stable. The texts generally comprise accounts by one or more deponents of the same single utterance or short exchange. Many of the utterances in language teaching texts are directives to servants or comments on their behaviour.

What little switching there is denotes mainly the chastisement of servants or the expression of endearment to infants.
Pragmatic Factors motivating *thou*/you* switching in different text types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Change of perception of persona of addressee</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Change of stance on topic</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Change of topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Drama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%S</th>
<th>%T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560-1580</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1600</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1620</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1640</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1660</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1720</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depositions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%S</th>
<th>%T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560-1580</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Didactic</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%S</th>
<th>%T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560-1580</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1620</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1640</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1660</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1700</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1720</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Teaching</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%S</th>
<th>%T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560-1580</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1620</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1720</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%P</th>
<th>%S</th>
<th>%T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560-1580</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1600</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-1620</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1640</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-1660</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-1680</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1720</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1740</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741-1760</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td>No texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5

? unreliable data in [1682] 4MLA

*Last Words and Confessions*
Discounting the opening and closing legal interviews in the miscellaneous texts, the remainder, which date from 1595 to 1661, have the structure of drama. In the 1648 text Mistress Custome, who is 81 years old, switches to *thou* when referring to events in her youth [1648 3MWOMEN]. Presumably Mistress Custome would have used *thou* as a term of address to a neighbour in 1590, when she was young. The persona of the speaker seems to influence this switch. Use of *thou* is collusive in the 1661 text [3MWHORE]. Switches to *you* in this text are difficult to categorise. They may connote two personae of one addressee. Other usage in this 1661 text, with *thou* and *you* expressing comparative social status and affect, show that there was still an awareness of the difference in their connotations, even if *thou* was becoming progressively rarer in authentic conversation.

Pronoun switches not signalled by a pragmatic particle but connoting affect comprised 66% of switches to 1660 in the drama texts. This fell to 58% in the second hundred year period. In didactic texts the numbers were 72% and 44%.\(^ {185} \) Occurrences in the other text types were too small to be significant. The highest numbers of both types of switching in the drama texts occurred between 1581 and 1620, which reflects the overall declining use of *thou* shown in figure 8:3. As a consequence of the changing structure of society and growing urbanisation described above this forty-year period is evidently the most significant in the pragmaticalisation of *thou* and *you* in the CED texts.

**Usage not explained by Pronoun Switching as Pragmatic Marker Theory**

As can be seen, very few of the pronoun switches could not be explained by the switching as pragmatic marker theory developed in this study. There are a few problematic cases.

1610 [2HOSNAW] *Looking Glasse for Maried Folkes*

In this didactic text Abigail chastises her friend Eulalie:

> A lacke Eulaly, *thou* art an honest ciuill woman, I must needs say, but yet *thou* speakest very carnally.

\(^ {185} \) There were no didactic texts for the periods 1560-1600 and 1721-1760 in the CED.
It may be that *thou* here connotes negative affect but Abigail also chastises her friend Margerie, addressing her as *you*:

Abigail: I pray *you* Margerie, vse no more such scoffing speeches.

Then Abigail switches to address Eulalie as *you* in speaking privately to her:

Abigail: I will make my case knowne vnto *you* in *your* eare.

Abigail’s use of switching is not consistent.

1605 [2HFERON] *The French Garden*

This is a language teaching text translated from French. This extract is a lady chastising a servant. It is a direct translation of the pronoun forms:

Lady: Truely so it seemes, come hether *you* brasen-facte lyer, art *thou* not ashamed to affirme so apparant a lye before me? The myre and durt sticke on them yet. Seest *thou* not that they are all durtie? [Of lying] Truely I will teach *you* how to lye, or rather how *you* should not lye. I will not leaue such a vice vnpunished.

It is difficult to account for the specific instances of switching. The overall intent is obviously pejorative.

1685 [4HEMIEG] *Nouvelle method A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TRAVELLOUR AND THE COACHMAN*

This is a language teaching text that was translated from English into French. The pronoun forms differ with *you* in English rendered in French either as *tu* or as the singular form of the imperative. There are pronoun switches in the English texts but not in the French. The traveller’s switch to address the coachman as *thou wretched Charon* to reject the suggestion that they drive to Hell ‘with a full gallop’ can be interpreted as a change in the traveller’s perception of the coachman’s persona. More problematic is the switch in the traveller’s instruction:

When I bid *you* stop, be sure to stop. How much must *thou* have?

since the traveller had opened their dialogue by addressing the coachman as *you*. 
In this miscellaneous text the usage of Gusman, a pimp, is problematic, since it is not always possible to determine if he is addressing one or both women in the dialogue when he uses the term you. In addressing only Julietta, a whore, he switches to thou with the hypochorism Ju:

Gusman: They are singular ways to provide horns for his head, but I would not wish you to stand upon such Punctilios, if he will but marry thee Ju.

It is not apparent why he subsequently addresses her as you with the hypochorism Ju:

Gusman: well if you think to have Francion I hear, and see coming Ju, You must behave yourself with more discretion.

Third Objective

To investigate how the use of the forms thou and you collocates with address terms and epithets and what this implies about their changing significance in the Early Modern English period

To the best of my knowledge previous analyses of thou/you collocation with nominal address terms have examined Shakespearean plays. Ulrich Busse compiles a list of 36 nominal forms of address for which he finds examples in the Shakespeare corpus. He establishes a definition for the nominal term and investigates how it collocates with the pronoun variant. As my method focuses on the pronominal form, I do not preselect possible address terms but analyse only those nominal address terms and epithets that do collocate with a pronoun of address. The collocation of affective epithets with the form of the pronoun of address is not predictable. A comparison of the collocation of those abusive epithets in Richard III that Barber finds always collocate with thou (1987:174) does not find the same result in the CED (see Appendix 2). Epithets and pronoun may colour each other but abusive epithets do not always collocate with thou. I found that apostrophe and personification do not invariably collocate with thou (see Appendix 3). The nature of the addressee is less relevant in determining usage than the context of the address. Strong emotion may provoke the use of you. The context of the utterance is the most relevant factor in determining the connotation of the pronoun.

Findings

My findings in deposition texts differed from Hope’s finding (1994:143) that ‘in those cases where there are multiple accounts of the same conversation, the accounts almost
always preserve identical pronoun forms.’ I found examples of discrepancy in reporting use of the pronoun form in deposition texts (1562, 1582, 1633). These particular cases implied that reporters seemed to attach no significance to the address pronoun. Cusack (1998:97) cites a case from Virginia in 1644 with reporter discrepancy that does connote affect for the deponents who are reporting previous utterances. We need more data in order to be able to account for reporting discrepancies.

Similarly Barber notes the need for more data when he claims that his analysis of *Richard III* (1987:174) found that abusive vocatives always collocate with *thou*. This is contrary to my analysis of the CED.

We also need to bear in mind Ferguson’s warning about fictolinguistics (1998). The requirements of the narrative may override the need for linguistic authenticity. Thus we cannot rely on constructed Early Modern English texts as a representation of authentic Early Modern English usage. More authentic data is needed. The publication of the CED gives the possibility to examine such additional data and this opportunity has motivated the work presented here.

Because of the limitations of the data it is not claimed that they depict a definitive assessment of diachronic change in the use of *thou* in Early Modern English. It is possible though, to say that *thou* connotes affect throughout the period studied. My findings differ from other studies most significantly in my investigation of *thou*/you switching. Contrary to findings in other studies that *thou*/you switching was ‘meaningless’ (Johnson 1966), or ‘entirely a matter of personal preference’ that ‘did not connote much’ (Calvo 1996), I found that it has a deictic function. Switches reposition the speaker in relation to some aspect of the utterance. My investigation for the motivation for *thou*/you switching within the text rather than through the frame of externally imposed norms such as rank established that *thou*/you switching is motivated but not predictable. In social semiotic terms *thou*/you switching is interpersonally, ideationally and textually deictic. *Thou*/you switching functions as an implicit pragmatic marker.
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Appendix 1

Affinity: Temporary Solidarity of Purpose in which switches to thou are motivated by:

A perception of potential or actual shared experience

Master Pedro: Tushe, they [women] bee shrewes all, and if you giue the simplest of them leaue to daye to treade vpon your foote, to morrowe she will tread vpon thy head
[1568 1HOTILN]

Isabella: Well, my Dear, I must open my heart to thee; I am so much in Love with this Bellfort, that I shall dye if I lose him.
[1682 4CSHADW]

Mrs Sullen: Ha, ha, ha, my dear Sister, let me embrace thee, now we are Friends indeed!
[1707 4CFARQU]

Sir Credulous: -- No, no, I can never bear to hear the Shrieks and Lamentations she'll make over me; -- But, Primrose, ar't thee not afraid that her very thinking me dead, will break her Heart?
[1734 5CMILLE]

Frankly: And art thou then thoroughly in Love? Come to my Arms, thou dear Companion of my Joys -- (They embrace.)
[1747 5CHOADL]

Attempt to reassure addressee who fears he may not be believed:

Quarulous: Yes faith, shalt thou, Numps, and thou art worthy on't, for thou sweatest for't
[1614 2CJONSO]

or to console addressee:

Sparkish: Come dear Franck, for all my Wife there that shall be, thou shalt enjoy me sometimes dear Rogue:
[1675 3CWYCHE]
Attempt to promote intimacy with the intention of obliging the reluctant addressee to respond:

Inquisition: *Thou* now tells me of a thing more then ever J heard of; is it possible ... Surely ... How? but I pray *thee* proceed.

Sparkish: Here Harcourt, do *you* approve my choice? ... Harcourt how dost *thou* like her, Faith?

Persuasion to collude

Catalian: ... stop *thou* him there, and I wil meet him here.

Lemot: Sirrah, Catalian, while they are playing at cardes, *thou* and I will haue some excellent sport: sirrah, dost *thou* know that same Gentleman there?

Splay: Be rul'd by me and I will make *thee* rich.

William Smaleshanke: Now if she chance to question what I am, Say sonne vnto a Lord, I pray *thee* tell her I haue a world of land, and stand in hope To bee created Barron ... Wilt *thou* do this?

Boucher: Stand *thou* propitious, indeere me to my loue Tafata: ... lend me *thy* eare,

William Smalshanke: Come wench of gold, For *thou* shalt get me gold ... By *thy* bare gettings, wench, by *thy* bare gettings

This utterance from 1653 illustrates the use of marked *thou* to introduce the suggestion of collusion and a reversion to unmarked *you* that functions to mitigate the proposition.

Chandler: Tush, what's the, matter? *doest thou* not know the old Proverb? (Knaves have better luck then honest men) cannot we joyne and make a purse? and *you* know, silver bags will worke, especially with good store of Wine, and a rich Feast;

[1653 3HOCOLE]
Appreciation of wit:

Old Bellair: A Dod sirrah, I like thy wit well.
[1676 3CETHER]

Lucinda: Thou art a pert merry Hussy.
[1723 5CSTEEL]

Non Predictability of Collocation

A more permanent solidarity of social identity or of membership of a social group such as: age, sex, dialect, kinship, occupation does not motivate the inevitable use of a specific address pronoun. Two proctors employed in the law address each other with a proximal address term, brother, and exchange the distal address pronoun, you [1641 3HOSPIR], as do two merchants [1653 3HOCOLE]. One of the merchants switches to the proximal thou in an expression of affinity and in a metaphorical closing of ranks against external opprobrium:

Woodmonger: I tell thee, Brother Hoord-Coale, wee know that wee are hated and cursed of every man, but then we Foxes fare best;

A similar uniting against ‘the Other’ is connoted in a switch by a debt collector to address his assistant as thou in acknowledging how they would be universally regarded:

Tenterhooke: I am afraid of the worst,
if such a Leather-fac'd fellow, as I or thou art,
should but be brought into question,
our very downe-looks would halfe hang us.
[1641 3MCOUNT]
Appendix 2

Comparison of collocation of *thou/y*ou with selected epithets in the CED186

**fool**

**Address terms:**
[1584 1CLYLY] Psyllus: Why foole, that is all one, for if *thou* cry, *thou* must needes make a noise
[1595 1CWARN] Menechmus: Out drunken foole, without doubt *thou* art out of *thy* wits.
[1602 2CHEYWO] Fuller: Come my loues foole giue me *thy* hand to lead
[1611 2CBARRE] Throte: I tell *thee* foole

**Negative Epithets:**
[1595 1CWARN] Menechmus: If *ye* were not such a brabling foole
[1614 2CJONSO] Knockhum: Away, *thou* art a foole, Vrs
[1614 2CJONSO] Waspe: A resolute foole, *you* are

**knave**

**Address terms:**
[1595 1CWARNE] Menechmus: Peace foolish knaue, seest *thou* not what a sot she is
[1599 1CCHAPM] Host: Hold still *thou* knaue
[1611 2CBARRE] Sir Oliuer Smale-shankes: *Thou* varlet knaue
[1611 2CBARRE] Sir Oliuer Smale-shankes: Peace knaue, whats she *your* wife?

**Negative Epithets:**
[1594 1CKNAVE] Maid: Go your waies, *you* are a coggine knaue I warrant you.
[1595 1CPEELE] Zantyppe: By gogs bones *thou* art a flouting knaue
[1599 1CCHAPM] Maid: Baggage? *you* are a knaue to call me baggage
[1607 2CWILKI] Scarborrow: *You* knaue Slaue-trencher-grome
[1611 2CBARRE] Adriana: Whose witty knaue art *thou*?

**slave**

**Address Terms:**
[1607 2CWILKI] Scarborrow: I *your* coat slaue?
[1607 2CWILKI] Scarborrow: Yes goodman slaue, *you* shal be master

**Negative Epithets:**
[1594 1CKNAVE] Conicatcher: *you* are a slaue indeede

**villain**

**Address Terms:**
[1584 1CLYLY] Lays: Downe villaine, or I wil haue *thy* head broken?
[1594 1CKNAVE] Honesty: Good villaine, theres no help for *you*.
[1594 1CKNAVE] King: Now fie vpon *thee* base villaine, lay hands on him
[1623 2CSHAKE] Caius: Villanie187, take *your* Rapier

186 Epithets found by Barber (1987:174) in *Richard III* that ‘always collocate with *thou* never with *you*.’
\textit{brother}

collocates only with \textit{you} in \textit{Richard III} (Barber 1981:175). In CED Drama texts collocation varies according to context:

[1595 1CWARN] Menechmus Traveller: O Brother, Brother, let me embrace \textit{thee}
[1595 1CWARN] Menechmus Citizen: Brother I will intreate \textit{you} to performe \textit{your} promise to Messenio

[1595 1CPEEL] 2 Brother: Brother remember \textit{you} the white Beare of Englands wood
[1595 1CPEEL] 2 Brother: Then brother draw \textit{thy} sword & follow me.

\footnote{This may be \textit{villain} but I think it is more likely to be \textit{villainy}.}
Appendix 3

Comparison of Collocation of *thou/you* with Apostrophe\(^{188}\) & Personification

**Apostrophe + you**

[1595 1CPEELE]
speaker-Jack
adresssee-dead Sacrapant
Iack: Oh Sir are *you* gon: now I hope we shall haue some other coile

Sacrapant has just died as the direction ‘he dyeth’ attests. The motivation here seems to be Jack’s uncertainty over whether Sacrapant is alive or dead.

[1595 1CPEELE]
speaker-Zantyppa---
adresssee-Celanta, her absent sister--
-Once againe for a husband, & in faith
-Celanta I haue got the start of *you*;

Strong negative emotion seems to motivate the use of *you* here, as Zantyppa’s previous usage in addressing her sister indicate:

Zantyppa: heere comes Celanta my sweete sister, ... goe thy waies\(^{189}\) home as wife as thou camst, or Ile set thee home with a wanion\(^{190}\)

[1599 1CCHAPM]
speaker-Countess Moren-
adresssee-absent Lemot
- Nothing els quoth *you*, can there be more?

This seems to be the heightened emotion of the Countess’ expression of outrage at the news Lemot has recounted.

Lemot: indeed it is a shame for your husband, that contrary to his oath made to you before dinner, he shoud be now at the ordinary with that light huswife Martia , which I could not chuse but come and tell you; for indeede it is a shame that your motherly care should be so slightly regarded ... Well, there they are: nothing els now, to her husband go I.

\(^{188}\) With reference to Hope’s claim that *th*-forms are ‘almost mandatory’ in Shakespeare plays in the context of apostrophe (2003:77-79) and the finding by Ulrich Busse that apostrophe in the Shakespeare corpus is ‘governed by the use of invariant *thou*’ (2002:34).

\(^{189}\) OED exclamation of derision, remonstrance, or surprise.

\(^{190}\) OED *wanion* – plague, vengeance.
A Mad Couple Well Match’d

speaker-Carelesse
addressee- tongue Personification

And for my Unkle were I his heire apparent, I rather wish he might live till all this World were weary of him, and the next affraid to take him. Then I survive him (Tongue, a pox punish you for lying)

This is the negative affect of self-reproach, as Carelesse appears to consider that he is indiscreet in his conversation with Nurse Closet. He subsequently remarks:

The Devills in this overrunning Tongue of mine, I could finde in my heart to worme him out with my teeth.

The Man of Mode

speaker- Mrs Loveit
addressee- absent Dorimant

Again excessively negative affect attested by Mrs Loveit’s cumulative negative epithets motivates a marked you to an absent addressee:

Wou'd I had made a Contract to be a Witch When first I entertain'd this greater Devil, Monster, Barbarian; I could tear my self in pieces. Revenge, nothing but Revenge can ease me; Plague, War, Famine, Fire, all that can bring universal ruin And misery on mankind, with Joy I'd perish to Have you in my power but this moment!

The Suspicious Husband

speaker-Ranger
addressee-His Wig, inanimate object Personification

The Servant’s reaction to Ranger’s comparison of his ‘batter’d’ wig with the ‘spruce, sober Gentleman’ who is the personification of his other wig implies that this is ludic usage. This ludicity may licence the address of you. Perhaps it is their genteel status connoted by the epithets Ranger uses that motivates his use of you. As this text is near the end of the period, it may simply be that thou is not longer used to inanimate objects.

(Enter Servant, with a Wig dress'd)
Ranger: Where have you been, Rascal? If I had not had the Key in my Pocket, I must have waited at the Door in this dainty Dress.

Servant: I was only below combing out your Honour's Wig.

Ranger: (Pulling off his Wig) §] Well, give me my Cap -- Why, how like a raking Dog do you look, compar’d to that spruce, sober Gentleman -- Go, you batter’d Devil, and be made fit to be seen.

Servant: Cod, my Master’s very merry this Morning
[1747 5CHOADL] The Suspicious Husband
speaker – Frankly
addressee- Cupid Personification
-- Now, you young Rogue, Cupid, guide me directly to her, as you would the surest Arrow in your Quiver.

Here Cupid is not afforded the exalted status of a god, unlike Arcite’s address to Mars and Juno in Canterbury Tales::

Alas thou fell Mars, alas thou luno,
Thus hath your ire our linage all fordo
The Knights Tale

Frankly’s address to Cupid connotes the collusion of two hunters in the chase. Frankly’s pursuit of the attractive unknown lady is a speculative venture. If, on further acquaintance, she should prove unworthy, he will ‘endeavour to forget her’.

Frankly: as yet, I own, I am but upon a cold Scent... and when once she is found, the Pleasure of the Chace will overpay the Pains of rousing her.

Bellamy: But if at last she should prove unworthy --

Frankly: I would endeavour to forget her.

When he does meet her again, however, he falls in love with her and addresses Love with reverence:

speaker-Frankly
addressee- concept Personification
Oh, Love! thou art a Gift worthy of a God indeed!

In all of these examples (except for the case of the speaker’s uncertainty of the status of his addressee [1CPEELE 1595]) a strong emotion overrides the unmarked usage.

Apostrophe + thou

[1584 1CLYLY]
speaker-Permenio, one of Alexander’s soldiers
addressee-Philip, Alexander’s dead father---
O Phillip, wert thou alius to see this alteration, thy men turned to women, thy soldiers to louers, gloues worne in veluet caps in steede of plumes in grauen helmets, thou wouldest either dye among them for sorow, or confound them for anger

speaker-Apelles, painter
addressee-self----
Now Apelles, gather thy wittes together: Campaspe is no lesse wise then faire, thy selfe must be no lesse cunning then faithfull. It is no small matter to be riuall with Alexander ---
[1594 1CKNAVE]
speaker-Earl Ethenwald---
addressee-self---
Now Ethenwald, if Fortune fauour thee,
Thou maist prooue happie loue to Alfrida

speaker-Ethenwald---
addressee-self----
Ethenwald, be aduised, the King hath sent to thee,
Nay, more, he means to come and visite thee

speaker-Dunston---
addressee-The Devil--- Personification – non human
-I charge thee by the eternall liuing God,

[1595 1CPEELE]
speaker-Frolicke-----
addressee-A Smith--- Personification – non human
-In the name of my own father, be thou Oxe or Alfe [Elf ]that appearest,
-tell vs what thou art.

speaker-Old Man---
addressee-self----
Old man: Now sit thee here & tel a heauy tale.
Sad in thy moode, and sober in thy cheere,
Here sit thee now and to thy selfe relate,
The hard mishap of thy most wretched state.

speaker-Huanebango---
addressee-absent Faire Lady----
Faire Lady, if thou wert once shrined in this bosome,
I would buckler thee harantantara.

speaker-Brother 2----
addressee-Delya, his absent sister -
-Sister, where art thou? Delya come again-
-He calles, that of thy absence doth complaine

speaker-Brother 1----
addressee-Echo –
Neere, O where, hast thou any tidings?

speaker-Sacrapant--
addressee-self----
Then cheere thy selfe, this is thy destinie,
Neuer to die, but by a dead mans hand.

speaker -Zantypa
addressee-self----
Laugh, laugh Zantypa, thou hast thy fortune,
a foole and a husbande vnder one.
So Corebus things haue well hir,
Thou hast gotten wealth to mend thy wit.

Then Sacrapant thou art betraide.

-What hand invades the head of Sacrapt?—
-What hatefull fury doth enuy my happy state?—
-Then Sacrapant these are thy latest dayes,—
(He dyeth.)

[1595 1CWARN]
Doest thou bid me Phoebus, to tear this dog in peeces with my nayles?
-if I laie hold on him, I will do thy commandment—

[1599 1CCHAPM]
-O diuine aspect, the excellent disposer---
-thy pure societie, but euen as angels do, to angels flie. -

-Out on thee strumpet and accurst, and miserable dame

- doe something wretched woman, staies thou here?

O cruell fortune, and dost thou spit thy spite at my poore life

O sowre creame what thinkest thou that I loue thee  still?

ake on rude arme, I care not for thy paine,
speaker-Queen  
**addressee-absent King**  
O pardon me my lord, that I mistake thy royall meaning so.

speaker-Colenet  
**addressee-Deity Personification**  
O Lord I beseech thee no

speaker-Florilla  
**addressee-Self**  
Well wench, for this foule shame thou puttest on me,  
the curse of all affection light on thee

speaker- Lemot  
**addressee concept Personification**  
Good fortune, be thou my good fortune bringer,  
And make me amends for my poore bitten finger.

[1602 2CHEYWO]  
speaker-Mother Splay  
**addressee-Future Projection Mary to her dead self**  
This if thou practise, thou when I am dead

Wilt say old mother Splay soft laid thy head

speaker-Mother Splay  
**addressee- Deity**  
God for thy passion what a beast am I,  
To scar the bird that to the net would flie.

speaker- Aminadab, a Schoolmaster  
**addressee-weapon and armour Personification**  
Stand to me bill, and head-peece sit thou close,

speaker- Aminadab, a Schoolmaster  
**addressee absent Mary**  
As in presenti, thou loath' st the gift I sent thee,

speaker-Aminadab, a Schoolmaster  
**addressee death Personification**  
O death come with thy dart, come death whe' I bid thee,

speaker-Aminadab, a Schoolmaster  
**addressee absent Mary**  
And my sweet Mary, not these drugges,  
Do send me to the Infernall bugges,  
But thy vnkindnesse, so adieu,

speaker-Young Arthur  
**addressee poison Inanimate Object**  
I haue I got thee, thou shalt goe with me:
speaker-Anselme

**addressee-absent Mistress Arthur**

So doth my loue on thee, but long no more,

**addressee-Self**

To her rich loue, thy servuce is too poore.

speaker-Anselme

**addressee-his own heart Personification**

Come to thy selfe faint heart, she sits vpright,

**addresse-Self**

Anselme be bold she liues, and Destinie
Hath traind thee hither to redeeme her life.

[1607 2CWILKI]

speaker-Scarborrow

**addressee-absent brother**

O tis too true, theres not a thought I thinke,
But must pertake thy griefes, and drinke
A rellish of thy sorrow and misfortune.

speaker-Scarborrow

**addresse-concept Personification**

O Conscience, how thou are stung to thinke vpont,
My Brothers vnto shame must yeeld their blood,

[1602/1623 2CSHAKE]

speaker-Falstaff

**addresse Self**

Saist thou so old lacke go thy waies:

[1614 2CJONSO]

speaker-Justice Overdo

**addresse-concept Personification**

I thank thee fortitude

[1647 3CTB] The Countrie Girle

speaker-Abraham

**addresse-absent Scolding Sister**

Thou't never be two, I think; -- For on my conscience, there is no man that knowes her,
has valour enough, to come neere her

speaker-Abraham

**addresse [unclear but probably] absent Scolding Sister**

An scolding were fighting, what a Leader wouldst thou be Gillian? -- Thoudst bring 'em on, with a pouder
[1677 version]
speaker-Simon
addressee Self
—Well, Simon, well, thou art bound to give God thanks,
thou wert not born a Gentleman,—some comfort that.

[1669 3CDRYDE] The Wild Gallant
speaker-Loveby
addressee unknown voice
- I hear a voice, but nothing do I see; speak what thou art.

speaker-Loveby
addressee-Satan? Personification
Honest Sathan! well encounter’d! I am sorry with all my
heart it is so dark: 'Faith I should be very glad to see thee
at my Lodging

speaker-Loveby
addressee-Satan? Personification
The Devil a cross that I have; or know where to get;
but I must promise well to save my credit:
now Devil, if thou dost forsake me!

[1675 3CWYCHE ] The Country Wife
speaker- Pinchwife
addressee absent Sparkish
Well, go thy wayes, for the flower of the true Town Fops,
such as spend their Estates, before they come to em,
and are Cuckolds before they'r married

[1682 4CSHADW] The Lancashire Witches
speaker -Smerk
addressee Love, concept Personification
I feel a flame within me, oh Love, Love, wether
wilt thou carry me?

[1694 4CCONGR] The Double Dealer
speaker- Maskwell
addressee-absent Cynthia
Cynthia, let thy Beauty gild my Crimes;

[1696 4CMANLE] The Lost Lover
speaker –Wildman
addressee absent Smyrna
Go thy ways, for an old Jealous, I wish be-gad, I
could say, Cuckold, but my honest Endeavours
shall not be wanting to make thee, that thou
believest thy self.
[1719 4CKILLI] Chit Chat
speaker-Bellamar
addressee-absent Marlove
Thou very very -- true Woman!

[1734 5CMILLE] The Mother in Law
speaker-Lady Hippish---
addressee-widowhood, concept-Personification
-Sweet, charming, wanton Widowhood, thou only
-Recompence for Marriage Slavery! thou only End
-and Aim of prudent Wives! once more, thou’rt
-welcome----

speaker-Primrose
addressee-absent Looby
By t’ye, Bubble, and Fortune bless thee,
for thou art one of her own Dotard Brood.

speaker-Lady Hippish
addressee-apparently dead husband
Thou poor, pitiful, credulous Fool, farewell. --

speaker-Lady Hippish
addressee-apparently dead husband
Alas! poor Dear, thou hast lost, then, the small matter of Breath thou wer’t Master of.

[1747 5CHOADL] The Suspicious Husband
speaker-Ranger
addressee-Self
Honest Ranger, take my Word for it,
thou art a mighty silly Fellow.

speaker-Frankly
addressee concept Personification
Oh, Love! thou art a Gift worthy of a God indeed!

[1593 1HOGIFF] Dialogue Concerning Witches
reporter-Dan-----
speaker-Dan-----
addressee-M.B.-----reporting Devil Personification
-And what warrant haue we to learne any truth
-from his mouth? as to say we command thee in the
-name of God, that thou tel vs who sent thee.
-Who sent thee? who sent thee?—

[1695 4HOROGU] State Rogue
speaker Jack Undertaker
addressee concept Personification
O England! unhappy England!
betray’d by thy own Children!
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Table A1 DEPOSITIONS: Analysis of Reference Terms, Address Terms & Epithets relating to witnesses and accused in collocation with *thou* & *you*

Terms collocating with *thou* are **emboldened and italicised**
Positive epithets are shown in capitals
* matrimonial  ** legal formulaic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560 1WDURHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Doon</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor man</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENT.</td>
<td>[Roger] Doon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Antony Ratcliff</td>
<td></td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ratcliff]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabell Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ratcliff]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Blithman</td>
<td></td>
<td>butcher’s widow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMMOTHER</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Blithman]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Waules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maynsworn harlotts</td>
<td>[John] Waules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Reid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabell Hynde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td>[Hynde]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Frisell you*/thou*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Pentland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Steilling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steilling’s wife</td>
<td>noughtie pak noughty hoore</td>
<td>Steilling/Stelling’s wyffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Bullman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullman’s wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulman’s wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabell Robson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>giglott</td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffe Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raffe [Wilson]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsfall</td>
<td></td>
<td>theffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horsfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Brandling</td>
<td></td>
<td>knight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife of Henry Branding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Keye</td>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Melmerbye</td>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Allenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>[Allenson]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>hore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen [Johnson]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

374 Depositions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Thomas Topping</td>
<td>father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Topping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Rosse</td>
<td>John Rosse</td>
<td>labourer</td>
<td>slave/slave</td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] Rosse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raif Ogle</td>
<td>generos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raif [Ogle]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Tompson</td>
<td>vicar's servant</td>
<td>loowne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Tompson</td>
<td>Sir Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Richard</td>
<td>curate</td>
<td>drouken horemonger drouken villan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Walton</td>
<td>James Walton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586-1588</td>
<td>Katherine Whittingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret [Key]</td>
<td>Mrs. Whittingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Ryple</td>
<td>BULLIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert [Ryple]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Harle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard [Harle]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td>labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Pereson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet [Pereson]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Smith</td>
<td>shopkeeper</td>
<td>pricklouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George [Smith]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabell Rothwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>tantaraaband and a tantaraawde whore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Peter Tayler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Tayler</td>
<td>Sir Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Whitmore his wif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Whitmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Whitmore his wif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Whitmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Ripley</td>
<td>yeoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561 1WCHEST</td>
<td>Ellen Ricoft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Snelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Snelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugo Holme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hugo Holme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Garnet</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Bybbye*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleanor Manwaring *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randle Ramshae*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Randle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sybil Blakhurst*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sybil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Wirral</td>
<td></td>
<td>stronge hore provid hoore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Fazakerley</td>
<td></td>
<td>thief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Henry] Fazakerley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Fazakerley</td>
<td>false thief</td>
<td>Henry Fazakerley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Wolfall’s servant</td>
<td>Jane Wolfall’s servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Maisterson</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>cousin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosin Maisterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafe Bostok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rafe Bostok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son of Robert Soundes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda Holme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Tilston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicilia Streete</td>
<td>wife of Rafe Williamson</td>
<td>Cicilia Streete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galfrid Bretton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Galfrid Bretton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Edmund*</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>Morgan Edmund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bird*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Brid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Edmund*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bird*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistris Bird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Sonkie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Winstanley*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Winstanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Sonkie*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Winstanley*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td>William [Ball]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Frost</td>
<td>Frostres wife</td>
<td>Constance Frost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Orton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Orton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black dog [Satan]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Waterhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Browne [age 12]</td>
<td></td>
<td>child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>mother waterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauye Thurlowe [child]</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>GOOD CHILDE</td>
<td>Dauye Thurlowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Thurlowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Thurlowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrsley Kempe</td>
<td>witch</td>
<td>naughtie name</td>
<td>Vrsley Kempe (alias Grey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alice [Newman]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bonner’s Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD WOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauye Thurlowe [child]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alice [Newman]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alice Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Sammon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cysley Sellys</td>
<td>Cysley Sellys</td>
<td>witch</td>
<td>Cysley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Smith’s Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Smith’s Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife of Thomas Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wife of Thomas Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felice Okey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annis Herd’s daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annis Herd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bennet Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>wife of William Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs West’s nephew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs West’s nephew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife to Richard Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife to Richard Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk, Parson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacker of Queen’s man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attacker of Queen’s man</td>
<td></td>
<td>villan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the Queen’s men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the Queen’s men</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wyndson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Wyndson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Browne [Sir William Paston’s servant]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Browne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589 1WNOTOR</td>
<td>Joan Prentice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Prentice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Ferrit [Satan]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Ferrit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 2WSOUTH</td>
<td>Robert Earl of Essex**</td>
<td>The Earl of Essex</td>
<td>my Lord your Lordship this man</td>
<td>Earl, Accused</td>
<td>my Lord of Essex</td>
<td>The Earl of Essex the Earl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lord Admiral</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Walter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentleman of Privy Chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Knivett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603 2WRALEI</td>
<td>Sir Walter Raleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td>odious man abominable Traytor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>Sir Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612 2WPENDL</td>
<td>Richard Baldwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>alias old Demdike</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Richard] Baldwyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Sowtherns</td>
<td></td>
<td>alias Chattox</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Sowtherns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spirit called Tibb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Whittle</td>
<td></td>
<td>alias Chattox</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Whittle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Device</td>
<td></td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dandy [a Spirit]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Nutter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Nutter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Nutter</td>
<td></td>
<td>foolish ladde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alizon Device</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spinsters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alizon Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Black Dog</td>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabel Robey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618 2WFLOWE</td>
<td>Anne Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spinster, Witch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Milles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Milles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff of Durham</td>
<td>Mr. Rauffe Hutton</td>
<td>Official to Dean &amp; Chapter</td>
<td>Mr. [Rauffe] Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bullocke</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notary Public</td>
<td>Mr [Thomas] Bullocke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mitford</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rogue</td>
<td>Robert Mitford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Raine,</td>
<td>Messenger of this Court</td>
<td>base, beggerlie fellow</td>
<td>Nicholas Raine,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Readshawe</td>
<td>wife of John Readshawe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Readshawe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margerie Stobbes</td>
<td>Mrs. [Rauffe] Hutton</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Stobbes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fenwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Fenwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Reede</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabell Carrock</td>
<td>wife of Richard Carrock</td>
<td></td>
<td>wife of Richard Carrock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabell Oxley</td>
<td></td>
<td>wife of William Oxley</td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaie Bell</td>
<td>Jaine Bell</td>
<td>Spinster &amp; Servant</td>
<td>Jaine [Barcroft] [Bell]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dobsonn</td>
<td>Spinster &amp; Servant</td>
<td>taverne wench</td>
<td>Elizabeth Dobsonn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Tindale</td>
<td>Spinster &amp; Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Bawd</td>
<td>Spinster &amp; Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Bawd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Brigges</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Allanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Allanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Walker</td>
<td>mann</td>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Edward Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Easterby</td>
<td>Clerke</td>
<td>GOOD SIR</td>
<td>John Easterby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Alvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Alvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Blakeston</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] Blakeston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistris Blakeston</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blaikston his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Macklewyyan</td>
<td>Sirra</td>
<td>Clerk, vicar</td>
<td>Thiefe, carle,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Macklewyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallowae knave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1630 2DIOCE

1634

1635

1637

379
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Refno</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Ref to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>2WMERVI</td>
<td>Mervyn Lord Audley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mervyn Lord Audley</td>
<td>My Lord Audley, The Lord Audley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>3WESSEX</td>
<td>Elizabeth Besse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suspected Witch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good-wife Greenleife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>Master Swinnerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Swinnerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>Anne Swinnerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistris Swinnerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>the Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>George Benton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>Col. Finch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Francis] Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>William Wade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scrivener</td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3WMOSEL</td>
<td>Col. Finch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Col.] [Charles] Finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>3WCROMW</td>
<td>Francis Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>3WCROMW</td>
<td>John Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scrivener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>3WCROMW</td>
<td>John Minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Josiah Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Jennett Benton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Susanna Maude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer of [George] Benton, Villaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>William Wade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Mrs Elizabeth Mallory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Francis Higginson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Robert Allyson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1655</td>
<td>3WYORK</td>
<td>Daniel Lister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Robert Phillip</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Robert Phillip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Sowthebie</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Henry Sowthebie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Sudeby</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>Mr. Sudeby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maid to Jane Milburne</td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>Jane Milburne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Milburne</td>
<td>wife of Wm. Milburne</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliz. Stranger</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Eliz. Stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Allan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Allan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Myas</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Nicholas Myas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Parkin</td>
<td>Knife-Maker</td>
<td>[George] Parkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>William Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosamond Bower</td>
<td>wife of Jeremy Bower habberdasher</td>
<td>Rosamond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Maddox</td>
<td>Maddox</td>
<td>[Mr. [Thomas]] Maddox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Orfeur</td>
<td></td>
<td>[William] Orfeur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Edmond Appleby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. [Edmond] Appleby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Mary Darley</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Mary Darley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>John Howden</td>
<td>Husbandman</td>
<td>[John] Howden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. Robinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Lockwood</td>
<td>Clothier</td>
<td>Joseph Lockwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>James Stancilffe, a boye of about 14</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>James [Stancilffe]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Constable</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. Brearcilffe</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Wm. Brearcilffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>4WBUTS</td>
<td>Joan Buts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Buts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4WDEVON</td>
<td>Grace Thomas</td>
<td>Spinster</td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>Temperance [Lloyd]</td>
<td>Mrs. Grace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temperance Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susanna Edwards</td>
<td>Widow &amp; Witch</td>
<td>Rogue, Devil</td>
<td>Susanna [Edwards]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Trembles</td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>Such a Rogue</td>
<td>Mary Trembles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4WDUTCH</td>
<td>Margaret Ellwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>whore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Ellwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Varelst</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Varelst</td>
<td>Mrs Sawbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edith Sawbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Wadsworth</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Wadsworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4WOXFOR</td>
<td>John Hurst</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Hurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major of the Regiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of Mr. Hurst</td>
<td>Wife of Mr. Hurst</td>
<td>Bitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Gyles</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>OldBitch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Gyles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Hawkins</td>
<td>Adjudant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Cosens</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Cosens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Wise</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Wise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5WLYDDE</td>
<td>Mr Lyddel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord's Steward</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Lyddel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Osman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Osman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Lyddel's Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Lyddel's Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5WBLAND</td>
<td>Mary Blandy</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Blandy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Blandy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>CHILD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Binfield</td>
<td>Cook-Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth/Betty Binfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td>on Inquest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Fisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2 TRIALS: Analysis of Reference Terms, Address Terms & Epithets relating to witnesses and accused in collocation with *thou* & *you*

Terms collocating with *thou* are **emboldened and italicised**
Positive epithets are shown in capitals
*legal formulaic +other participants are similarly addressed/described with/without title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Duke of Norfolk*</td>
<td>Thomas Duke of Norfolk</td>
<td>My Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AN HONEST MAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cavendish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571 1TNORFO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571 1THICKF</td>
<td>Hickford</td>
<td>Mr Robert Hickford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hickford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584 1TPARRY</td>
<td>William Parrie*</td>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td>[William] Parrie</td>
<td>Parry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586 1TABIN</td>
<td>Edward Abington*</td>
<td>Edward Abington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Abington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Tilney*</td>
<td>Tilney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Tilney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charnock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charnock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632 2THIGHC</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Brewer's clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Dod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Dod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Latrop</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Latrop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Jones</td>
<td>Sara Jones</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sara Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sara Barbone</td>
<td>good woman</td>
<td>conventicer</td>
<td>GOOD WOMAN</td>
<td>Sara Barbone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marke Lucas+</td>
<td>conventicer+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marke Lucas+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Delamar</td>
<td>Abigail Delamar</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>conventicer</td>
<td>an obstinate woman</td>
<td>Abigail Delamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bye</td>
<td>Ralph Grafton</td>
<td>Upholsterer</td>
<td>A GOOD FELLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Bye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Etsall</td>
<td>this man</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Etsall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1644 3TMACGU                  | C. Conner Maguire*          | Connor Maguire Esquire | My Lord | | C. Conner Maguire alias Cornelius Maguire | | |
|                               | Sir Charles Cootes          |                          |         | | Sir Charles Cootes | | |

| 1648 3TCHARL                  | Charls Stuart King of England |                        | Elected King high Delinquent | Charls Stuart King of England | | |

<p>|                               | Brother                    |                     | Lilurne's brother    | | | |
|                               | Master Sprat               |                     | SWEET SIR             | | | |
|                               |                            |                     | Master Sprat          | | | |
|                               |                            |                     | Lord Keeble           | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. Date</th>
<th>Ref. Code</th>
<th>Ref. to/Addressed (as thou)</th>
<th>Ref. to/Addressed (as you)</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1658 3TSLING</td>
<td>Sir Henry Slingsby*</td>
<td>Sir Henry Slingsby</td>
<td>Ralph Waterhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Henry Slingsby*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capt John Overton</td>
<td>Mr Overton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capt John Overton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant George Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant George Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hewet D. D.*</td>
<td>Dr. Hewet</td>
<td>Mr Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Hewet D. D.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Mordant Esquire</td>
<td>John Mordant Esquire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Mordant Esquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Stapley</td>
<td>this gent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Stapley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. Date</th>
<th>Ref. Code</th>
<th>Ref. to/Addressed (as thou)</th>
<th>Ref. to/Addressed (as you)</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1660 3THARRI</td>
<td>Hardresse Waller*</td>
<td>Hardresse Waller</td>
<td>Thomas Harison*+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardresse Waller*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Harison*+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. Date</th>
<th>Ref. Code</th>
<th>Ref. to/Addressed (as thou)</th>
<th>Ref. to/Addressed (as you)</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1663 3TURNE</td>
<td>Col. James Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Turner/Col. Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Alleyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alderman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Alleyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Tyran’s Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[William] Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Fry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Wench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Hanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole [brothers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cole [brothers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mal [dim]</td>
<td>Mrs Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEAR MAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Turner’s son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mosely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Mosely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir T Chamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir T Chamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Dawes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Dawes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Rowse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Rowse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Turners Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maiden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Turner [son]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. Date</td>
<td>Ref. #</td>
<td>Ref. to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Ref. to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663 3TMO</td>
<td>3TMO</td>
<td>Mary Moders, alias Stedman* Mary Moders* otherwise Mary Stedman</td>
<td>Mary Moders, alias Stedman</td>
<td>Spinster, Prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Moders, alias Stedman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Knot</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>Wedding Witness</td>
<td></td>
<td>[James] Knot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carleton [the elder]</td>
<td>Young Carleton's Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carleton [the elder]</td>
<td>Mr. Charlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Smith</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Finch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Jane] Finch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678 3TCO</td>
<td>3TCO</td>
<td>Edward Coleman</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Coleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Oates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Oates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Langhorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Langhorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Dolman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas [Dolman]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Robert Southwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Robert Southwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bedlow +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Bedlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Berry</td>
<td>Accused, Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Berry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Brown</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Skillard</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Skillard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Cambridge</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Curtis</td>
<td>this person</td>
<td>Soul Status</td>
<td>Godfrey's Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Stringer</td>
<td>young man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Lancelot Stringer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Green</td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Carey</td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Richard] Cary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Evans</td>
<td>Boy of the House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Robert Southwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Robert [Southwell]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Farr</td>
<td>Berry's Neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Stephen] Farr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Tilden</td>
<td>Maid, Mistris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Godwin's Niece</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Stephen] Farr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Broadstreet</td>
<td>you woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] Broadstreet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katharine Lee [witness]</td>
<td>Katharine Lee</td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Katharine] Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JP &amp; MP</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Arnold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Phillips +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Giles + others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Giles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Moor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Philpot</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [John] Philpot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Herbert Jones</td>
<td>Mayor of Monmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Herbert] Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones [age 15]</td>
<td>Cutler's Apprentice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Beron</td>
<td>Good woman, Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD WOMAN, Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann [Beron]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Crook</td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Elizabeth] Crook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gadbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Astrologer</td>
<td>MAN OF LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Gadbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Dangerfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirrah</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Dangerfield</td>
<td>Mr Dangerfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Cellier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] Cellier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Briscoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph Briscoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Williamson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Jenkens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Jenkens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Susan] Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet Dowdal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Bennet] Dowdal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Colledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>[Mr Colledge]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shewin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [William] Shewin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hickman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>Henry Hickman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Elizabeth Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs [Elizabeth] Oliver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Hall’s Maid</td>
<td>[Mary] Richards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Mary Wingfield +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs [Mary] Wingfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mowbray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a rash man</td>
<td>Mr Mowbray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetheart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this Woman</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mowbray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Dugdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colledge’s Maid</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr Stephens]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Atterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Atterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Prance+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr Prance]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>Sir John [Nicholas]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hazard+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] Hazard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawson’s wife</td>
<td></td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>Rawson’s wife</td>
<td>Rawson’s wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lightfoot</td>
<td>Mr Lightfoot</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Serjeant</td>
<td>Common Serjeant</td>
<td>Election Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Common Serjeant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Papillon+</td>
<td>Mr Papillon+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter King</td>
<td>Mr. Peter King</td>
<td>Election Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Peter] King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wells</td>
<td>Mr Wells</td>
<td>Common Cryer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Hooker</td>
<td>Sir William Hooker</td>
<td>Former Sheriff &amp; Lord Mayor of London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir William [Hooker]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sword Bearer [Mr Man]</td>
<td>Mr Sword Bearer [Mr Man]</td>
<td>Sword Bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Serjeant Jeffries</td>
<td>Mr Serjeant Jeffries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Reeves</td>
<td>Mr Reeves</td>
<td>Friend Reeves</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRIEND REEVES</td>
<td>Mr [George] Reeves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Fletcher+</td>
<td>Richard Fletcher+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Gray</td>
<td>Lord Gray</td>
<td>my Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Clark</td>
<td>Captain Clark</td>
<td>Sirrah&gt;rioter</td>
<td>Rascal Traytor &gt; rioter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Kelsey</td>
<td>Major Kelsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Trice Hammon</td>
<td>Mr. Trice Hammon</td>
<td></td>
<td>witness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. [Trice] Hammon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vavasor</td>
<td>Mr. Vavasor</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Vavasor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Denham</td>
<td>Mr Denham</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Denham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683 4TSIDNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr West+</td>
<td>Mr West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel/Mister Sidney+</td>
<td>[Colonel] [Mister] Sidney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Howard+</td>
<td>Lord Howard+</td>
<td>my Lord Howard, your Lordship</td>
<td></td>
<td>[The] Lord Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Andrew Foster+</td>
<td>Sir Andrew Foster+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Andrew Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Clare</td>
<td>Lord Clare</td>
<td>my Lord of Clare, your Lordship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Clare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Philip Howard+</td>
<td>Mr Philip Howard+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Philip Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Burnet</td>
<td>Dr Burnet</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Burnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ducas</td>
<td>Joseph Ducas</td>
<td>Frenchman</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Joseph] Ducas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Penwick +</td>
<td>Elizabeth Penwick +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Elizabeth] Penwick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683 4THAMBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Howard</td>
<td>my Lord [Howard]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mr] Sheriffe</td>
<td>this man, Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inn-keeper</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Sheriffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Atterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Atterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Andrew Foster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Andrew Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Howard</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord/Earl of Clare</td>
<td>my Lord of Clare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord/Earl of Clare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Paget</td>
<td>good my Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD MY LORD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Paget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Burnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr [Burnet]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Newport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Newport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Paget</td>
<td>My Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Paget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692 4TMOHUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Hudson+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [John] Hudson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mohun</td>
<td>your Lordship</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD MY LORD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Mohun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Knight+</td>
<td>my Lord Mohun</td>
<td></td>
<td>YOUR HONOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Elizabeth Sandys</td>
<td>this woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs [Elizabeth]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Dixon</td>
<td>this man</td>
<td></td>
<td>coachman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [William] Dixon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ann Bracegirdle</td>
<td>this gentlewoman</td>
<td></td>
<td>THIS GENTLEWOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs [Ann] Bracegirdle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gawen Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Gawen] Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>villain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Mary Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs [Mary] Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Browne</td>
<td>Mistress, Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Browne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Row</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Row</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr William Merry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beadle of the Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [William] Merry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fennel</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Fennel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bassit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>[James] Bassit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696 4TRROOKW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose Rookwood+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Rookwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Capt. Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chamberlain+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Chamberlain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr/Capt.] Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Will</td>
<td></td>
<td>a Moor</td>
<td>Sweetheart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Black] Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 4TSWEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W. Busby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr W. Busby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Nightingale+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] Nightingale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Swendsen+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Swendsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Baynton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Baynton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Busby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] Busby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartwel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Bayntons Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] Bayntons Maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Berkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] Berkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr VVakeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] VVakeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Pleasant Rawlins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young Gentlewoman</td>
<td>Mistress, Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] [Pleasant] Rawlins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Scoreman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picture Drawer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Scoreman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parson</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dan. Cotchett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Dan. Cotchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cook at Vine Tavern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sarah] Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Joseph Smith</td>
<td>King's Messenger</td>
<td>[Mr] Joseph Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Horatio Walpole</td>
<td>Mr. [Horatio] Walpole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Buckley</td>
<td>Mr. Buckley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Townshend</td>
<td>your Lordship my Lord Townshend</td>
<td>Lord Townshend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis+</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Boyer</td>
<td>French translator</td>
<td>Mr Boyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ozell</td>
<td>French translator</td>
<td>Mr Ozell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Flint</td>
<td>prisoner’s translator</td>
<td>Mr Flint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Secretary Stanhope</td>
<td>Mr. Secretary Stanhope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Francia</td>
<td>prisoner’s brother</td>
<td>Simon Francia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaques Gonsales</td>
<td>prisoner’s uncle</td>
<td>Jaques Gonsales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emes Lamira +</td>
<td>Emes Lamira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revel+</td>
<td>Revel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mr.] Everall</td>
<td>[Mr.] Everall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Everall</td>
<td>Mrs Everall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cade</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>Dr. Cade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Francia</td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td>[Francis] Francia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Richardson</td>
<td>[Thomas] Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Edward Crispe</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>Mr [Edward] Crispe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Coke</td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td>[Mr] Coke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sturgeon</td>
<td>surgeon</td>
<td>Mr. Sturgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Willett</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>[Charles] Willett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wetherel</td>
<td>Gaoler</td>
<td>William Wetherel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carter</td>
<td>Blacksmith Boy</td>
<td>[John] Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Woodburne</td>
<td>Daughter of Accused</td>
<td>Ann Woodburne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Woodburne</td>
<td>Daughter of Accused</td>
<td>Sarah Woodburne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburne</td>
<td>Accused, Labourer</td>
<td>[John] [Woodburne]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722 STLAYER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Layer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>Prisoner at the Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [Christopher] Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Plunkett</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irishman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Matthew] Plunkett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Elizabeth Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs [Elizabeth] Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Speare</td>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Speare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725 STMACCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Thomas Bennet</td>
<td>Mr. Peter Cottingham</td>
<td>Master in Chancery</td>
<td>this gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Thomas] Bennet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Cottingham</td>
<td>Mr. Kynaston</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>this gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Peter] Cottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kynaston</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Baily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Charles] Baily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Baily</td>
<td>Mr Elde</td>
<td>Master in Chancery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Elde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Elde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738 STCIBBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Cibber</td>
<td>Mr Fleetwood</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>Master of Drury-lane Play-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Cibber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Fleetwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Fleetwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Hayes+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Drury-lane Play-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Hayes+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Hayes +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hopson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Cibber’d Maid</td>
<td>Mrs Hopson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne [Hopson]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740 STGREEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Wheatley+</td>
<td>Dr/Mr Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Wheatley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr/Mr Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr/Mr Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Thomas Baker</td>
<td>Mr Wheatley’s tennant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Thomas] Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Baker+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] John Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicely Mow</td>
<td>old Mr Greenwood’s Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cicely] Mow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chatler</td>
<td>old Mr Greenwood’s neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] Chatler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bartholomew Greenwood</td>
<td>prisoner’s uncle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Bartholomew Greenwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Egglestone</td>
<td>Carpenter/Drawer</td>
<td>the Boy</td>
<td>rogue</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John Egglestone</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Egglestone</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Egglestone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr James Annesley</td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>rogue</td>
<td>[Mr]</td>
<td>[James] Annesley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bettesworth+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[John]</td>
<td>Bettesworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Redding</td>
<td>Gamekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Joseph] Redding</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Staples</td>
<td>Deputy Steward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas Staples</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Burlingson+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
<td>Thomas Redding</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Redding, the Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Joseph]</td>
<td>Redding, the Elder</td>
<td>[Joseph] Redd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dalton</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[John]</td>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>[John]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reverend Mr. Eusebius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Eusebius] Williams</td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr James Bethune</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>James Bethune</td>
<td>Mr. James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Perkins</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
<td>John Perkins</td>
<td>[Mr.] John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Keating</td>
<td>Irishman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Paul] Keating</td>
<td>[Paul]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Charles Gastineau</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Charles Gastineau</td>
<td>Mr. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr]</td>
<td>Richard Holland</td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Deputy Slater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
<td>Deputy Slater</td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Holbrook</td>
<td>warehouse keeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
<td>Holbrook</td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Toby Chauncey</td>
<td>Apprentice to Mr Hayter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
<td>Toby Chauncey</td>
<td>[Mr.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sedgwick</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Robert]</td>
<td>Sedgwick</td>
<td>[Robert]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sedgwick</td>
<td>Assistant to Joint Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[John]</td>
<td>Sedgwick</td>
<td>[John]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referral to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752 STSWAN</td>
<td>Miss Elizabeth Jeffreys</td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>Madam, Miss Prisoner Miss Jeffreys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss [Elizabeth] Jeffreys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Buckle+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Edward] Buckle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Matthews</td>
<td></td>
<td>villain</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Thomas] Matthews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Arnold</td>
<td>Servant to Mr Jeffreys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sarah] Arnold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Gallant</td>
<td>Friend to Mr Jeffreys</td>
<td>dear</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Anthony] Gallant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Ann Wright</td>
<td>Inn Keeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mrs] [Ann] Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Swan</td>
<td>Prisoner, Gardener to Mr Jeffreys</td>
<td></td>
<td>[John] [Swan]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759 STAYLF</td>
<td>Mr Henry Thomas</td>
<td>Clerk to Mr Jones, Stationer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Henry] Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Fannen</td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [John] Fannen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Ellis Dawe+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [Ellis] Dawe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Walter Hargrave</td>
<td>Witness to Aycliffe's signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [Walter] Hargrave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Jones</td>
<td>Stationer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr George Donisthorpe</td>
<td>Steward to Mr Fox</td>
<td>'come up here from the country'</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [George] Donisthorpe [Esq]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Cruse</td>
<td>Witness for the Prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Cruse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Brown+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Thomas Bonnell</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [Thomas] Bonnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759 STSTEVE</td>
<td>John James</td>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Stevenson</td>
<td>Accused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mr] [John] Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Francis Elcock</td>
<td>Victim, Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr [Francis] Elcock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Atkin+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Atkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Cooper</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Cooper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Robert Baxter</td>
<td>Sheriff's Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Robert Baxter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Cross+</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3 DRAMA COMEDIES: Reference Terms, Address Terms & Epithets in collocation with thou & you

Terms collocating with thou are **emboldened and italicised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference/Address Terms with thou</th>
<th>Reference/Address Terms with you</th>
<th>Negative Epithets with thou</th>
<th>Positive Epithets with thou</th>
<th>Negative Epithets with you</th>
<th>Positive Epithets with you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1584 1CLLY</td>
<td>Boy name x 12</td>
<td>asse dogged</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goldwomanne</td>
<td>Foule lubber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>knawe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>villaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mistresse</td>
<td>Vnciuill wretch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your maiestie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name x 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594 1CKNAVE</td>
<td>friend man</td>
<td>base strumpet</td>
<td>beauteous brother* in Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>base villaine</td>
<td>citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>cosoner</td>
<td>gentle Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bailie</td>
<td>dissembler</td>
<td>gratious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name x 7</td>
<td>gracelesse man</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>impious wretch</td>
<td>honest fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cobler</td>
<td>ingrateful wretch</td>
<td>man of worth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>lazy fellow</td>
<td>myynour of curtesie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earl + name x 2</td>
<td>monster of a man</td>
<td>sweet love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>monster of nature</td>
<td>sweete mouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maister courtier</td>
<td>poore wretch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maister Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maister Squire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your Honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your Majesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your Worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name x 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drama Comedies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference/Address Terms with thou</th>
<th>Reference/Address Terms with you</th>
<th>Negative Epithets with thou</th>
<th>Positive Epithets with thou</th>
<th>Negative Epithets with you</th>
<th>Positive Epithets with you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1595 1CWARN</strong></td>
<td>brother daughter fellow man name x 3</td>
<td>brother daughter father Friend Gentlewoman maister maister Doctor man mistresse old man* Sir wife woman name x 3</td>
<td>doating patch drunken foole filthie mad drivel fond man foolish knaue lack Napes impudent knave knave mad fellow prating dolt raskall verlet villaine</td>
<td>good fellow my good friend my good friend and helper sweete heart sweete mouse</td>
<td>braibling fool crafty and unjust promise breaker false and treacherous dealer fickle-brain good woman [irony] impudent beast mad-braine scold rogue sirra varlet villaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1595 1CPEELE</strong></td>
<td>brother Father* fellowe Frantick Frier Friar Friend Lad Sister Smith Syrtha Frolick name x 4</td>
<td>brother Father* Hostes Master neighbour Sir sir Frier wench your worship name x 3</td>
<td>flattering knave sonne*</td>
<td>faire faire Ladie fairer fairest flower Father* Gammer gentle knight good fellow good Vulcan my ducke my owne sweete sweete heart valiant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boy brother Father* fellowe Frantick Frier Friar Friend Lad Sister Smith Syrtha Frolick name x 4</td>
<td>brother Father* Hostes Master neighbour Sir sir Frier wench your worship name x 3</td>
<td>faire faire Ladie fairer fairest flower Father* Gammer gentle knight good fellow good Vulcan my ducke my owne sweete sweete heart valiant</td>
<td>Capons face whoreson sodden headed sheepes-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boysen sonne*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faire faire Ladie good Father* Gaffer Gammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with thou</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with you</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with you</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boy my lord [absent] wench wife sirra name x 5</td>
<td>father huswife lady Madam Maister mine host my liege My lord Sir your Grace your highnesse your ladiship your lordship your Maistie Your worship Monsieur + name x 5 name x 4</td>
<td>accurst and miserable dame barbarous Canibal fon man knaue monstrous man prowdest harlotrie strumpet Vilain vile wretch</td>
<td>bird deare sonne gentle bird Good sonne Sirrah sweet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599 1CCHAPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter man Mall [dim. Mary] Mistris [proposal] wench Wife name x 3</td>
<td>Daughter [in law] Gentlewoman Lady Maister Mistris sir Sirra M. Justice Reason Wife M. + name x 3 Mistris + name x 2 Sir + name x 1 name x 1</td>
<td>diuel loues foole</td>
<td>good sweet sweet heart</td>
<td>bitter Genius blockhead great asse old Bawd Sirra</td>
<td>deare good love old mother Poore gentlewoman sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602 2 CHEYWO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with thou</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with you</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with you</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607 2CWILKI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adulteresse</td>
<td>Chucke</td>
<td>goodman slae</td>
<td>Good hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crooked-nose</td>
<td>Good gentle hart</td>
<td>slae-tencher-grome</td>
<td>good worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuill</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Minxe</td>
<td>hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iade</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>old mad-cap</td>
<td>honest Mistris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ifffect</td>
<td>Honest-biest-natural-friend</td>
<td>Puppet</td>
<td>honoured Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minx</td>
<td>Kind hart</td>
<td>rogue</td>
<td>Kind Mistres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sawcie lacke</td>
<td>Lambe</td>
<td>runnagate</td>
<td>little frappet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stinking-breath</td>
<td>Pigny</td>
<td>slae</td>
<td>Noble Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strumpet</td>
<td>Play-fellow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Right worshipfull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whore</td>
<td>Pretty pretty any thing</td>
<td></td>
<td>worships knighthoode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>Sweet Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worse then the Deuill</td>
<td>Prety hart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thy wors. knighthood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611 2CBARRE</td>
<td>boy and girl</td>
<td>Good rascal [oxymoron?]</td>
<td>Goodhart</td>
<td>slae</td>
<td>Good hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But.[ler] i.e. hypocorism</td>
<td>Sir Oliver Smalshankes</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Loue</td>
<td>arrant drab</td>
<td>good worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wench</td>
<td>Justice Tutchine</td>
<td>My second selfe</td>
<td>my second selfe</td>
<td>knauw</td>
<td>hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman [cf ref gentlew]</td>
<td>Wench</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>little Cockatrice</td>
<td>honest Mistris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name x 3</td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>Sweet heart</td>
<td>Pernicious Coccatrice</td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>honoured Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>Wench of gold</td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>Slae</td>
<td>Kind Mistres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father</td>
<td>Witty knauw</td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>Whore</td>
<td>little frappet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maister</td>
<td>Wonder of this continent</td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noble Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mistress</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Right worshipfull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sister [in law]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td>worships knighthoode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your worship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with <em>thou</em></td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with <em>you</em></td>
<td>Negative Epithets with <em>thou</em></td>
<td>Positive Epithets with <em>thou</em></td>
<td>Negative Epithets with <em>you</em></td>
<td>Positive Epithets with <em>you</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow friend</td>
<td>Brother friend</td>
<td>Asse</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Baboun</td>
<td>Bud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistresse + name x 1</td>
<td>Captaine Whit</td>
<td>childe of wrath</td>
<td>Good honest</td>
<td>cutpurse</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numps [hypocorism]</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>heyre of anger</td>
<td>old velvet lerkin</td>
<td>cutpurse</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinsh Quarlous</td>
<td>goody lone</td>
<td>foole</td>
<td>asse</td>
<td>dogs-head</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrs [hypocorism]</td>
<td>Master + name x 3</td>
<td>vort</td>
<td>very sufficient</td>
<td>modest undertaker</td>
<td>pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young man</td>
<td>Mistris + name x 3</td>
<td>hy man</td>
<td>Coxcombe</td>
<td>panniers-man bastard</td>
<td>Mistris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name x 1</td>
<td>sir</td>
<td>veteran</td>
<td>Weasell</td>
<td>Patrico</td>
<td>sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonne [in law]</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>very serious asse</td>
<td>Pimpe</td>
<td>Rascal</td>
<td>sweetheart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your worship name x 8</td>
<td>your worship</td>
<td>very sufficient</td>
<td>Rascal</td>
<td>roasting Rascal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drama Comedies

1614 2CIONSO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference/Address Terms with thou</th>
<th>Reference/Address Terms with you</th>
<th>Negative Epithets with thou</th>
<th>Positive Epithets with thou</th>
<th>Negative Epithets with you</th>
<th>Positive Epithets with you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1602 [1623] 2CSHAKE</td>
<td>my boy name x 1</td>
<td>base hungarian wight</td>
<td>Bully bully Hector</td>
<td>Banbery Cheese</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base Phrygian Turke froth, and scum</td>
<td>bully-Doctor Bully-Rooke Castalian-king-Vrinall Hector of Greece Emperor Cesar, Keiser and Pheazer faire woman Gentleman good woman guest-Cavalaire Mars of Malecontents mountaine Forreyner sweet</td>
<td>lack’Nape roague Sirha Villanie wanton</td>
<td>Good good woman sweet sweet Coz your good Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647 3CTB</td>
<td>Bab [hypocorism] Girlie Peggy [hypocorism] wench</td>
<td>Chamber-maid Fop pertish thing</td>
<td>My Knight, of a thousand per annum my Musick sweet Peg</td>
<td>Asse beautiful Blowse foolish Baggage good master outside of a Gentleman Madam Fumble Minion Mistris Jinnie-Pinnie</td>
<td>faire one Fair’st Good Kind Kinde young Master Noble Sir My Sir, of a thousand per annum sweet Lady Worthy your good Worship your sweetest selfe Sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 3CBROME</td>
<td>1669 3CDRYDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference/Address Terms with thou</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference/Address Terms with you</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally [hypocorism] f Cosen Cuz Nurse</td>
<td>Boy Childe Daughter Husband huswife Madam Monsieur + name x 1 Mr. + name x 5 my Lady + name x 1 my Lord Servant Sir Sir + name x 1 your Ladiship your Lordship name x 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozen friend Lady Madam man Mistris + name x 1 Mr. + name x 3 Sir your Ladiship name x 5</td>
<td>Cozen friend Lady Madam man Mistris + name x 1 Mr. + name x 3 Sir your Ladiship name x 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Epithets with thou</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive Epithets with thou</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pernicious Villaine</td>
<td>friend sweet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Epithets with you</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive Epithets with you</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malicious Rogue Traitor your Gibship wag</td>
<td>Good Kinde Noble Sweet Sweetheart Witty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Epithets with you</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative Epithets with you</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Good Kinde Noble Sweet Sweetheart Witty</td>
<td>pernicious Villaine friend sweet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good honest little Boy sweet sirrah unreasonable Rogue</td>
<td>Ass jealous Coxcomb Judas little Harlotry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear dear Heart good worship Little Gentlewoman Rogue sweet Servant worship worship's honor</td>
<td>Ass jealous Coxcomb Judas little Harlotry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with thou</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with you</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with you</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1675 3CWYCHE</strong></td>
<td>name x 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear, dear Bud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistriss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear Madam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistriss + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear, noble Sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. + name x 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear, little Rogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dearest Madam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your Ladyship name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mine own Dear Bud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor Gentleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pretty Rogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear, dear Bud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear Madam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear, noble Sir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dear, little Rogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dearest Madam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mine own Dear Bud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Dear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pretty Rogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1676 3CETHER</strong></td>
<td>Neighbour name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>man of Wit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sirrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sweet Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Pert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my Lady + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perjur’d Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The worse Woman you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a living Libel a breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lampoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name x 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Devil that have rais’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This storm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>young Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with <em>thou</em></td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with <em>you</em></td>
<td>Negative Epithets with <em>thou</em></td>
<td>Positive Epithets with <em>thou</em></td>
<td>Negative Epithets with <em>you</em></td>
<td>Positive Epithets with <em>you</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682 4CSHADW</td>
<td>Cousin Mother Madge</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Dear Cousin</td>
<td>Blockhead</td>
<td>dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dame</td>
<td>my Dear</td>
<td>Clown</td>
<td>dear rogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>my dear Child</td>
<td>Coxcomb</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>my Love</td>
<td>Fool</td>
<td>as fine a Gentlewoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentlewoman</td>
<td>sweet Cousin</td>
<td>Popish-Priest</td>
<td>as ever I saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puppy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistress + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirrah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir + name x 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>your Worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirrah</td>
<td></td>
<td>name x 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your Worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basilisk</td>
<td>Dogs face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>filthy Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fow Queen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694 4CONGR</td>
<td>Girl name x 2</td>
<td>Cousin Mellefont</td>
<td>Serpent and first Tempter of Womankind</td>
<td>Audacious Villain</td>
<td>dear Rogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calm Villain</td>
<td>dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>disobedient, headstrong Brute.</td>
<td>my Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. + name x 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insolent Devil</td>
<td>Good my Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td>mollifying Devil</td>
<td>my Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lady + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Son [in law]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your Ladyship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your Lordship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>name x 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with thou</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with you</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with you</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1696 4CMANLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Child [sister in law]</strong></td>
<td>Daughter, Gentlewoman, Husband, Madam, Master + name x 1, Master Fortune-Teller, Mistress, Mr. + name x 4, Mrs. + name x 1, name x 4, Sir, Sir + name x 2, Wife, your Ladiship</td>
<td><em>an old Jealous ... Cuckold poor Wife Proud, Fantastick Woman Traytor</em></td>
<td>Poor Caviller, poor Lady, Mother of Lyars, too much a Man of Mode</td>
<td>dear Husband, Judge of Decorum and Decency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1707 4CFARQU</strong></td>
<td><strong>Child [sister in law]</strong></td>
<td>Brother, Brother Martin*[disguise], Brother Scrub*, Captain, Child [sister in law], Daughter, Doctor, Father, Friend, Landlord, Madam, Monsieur le Count, Mr. + name x 3, Sir, Sister Sullen [in law], your Ladyship, your Worship, name x 3</td>
<td>dear Sister [in law]</td>
<td>Jade, Slave</td>
<td>dear Joy, dear Sister [in law], dear Sister, my Dear, my dear Brother, sweet, Sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with thou</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with you</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with thou</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with you</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>dirty as a Chymist</td>
<td>dear</td>
<td>Brute</td>
<td>Dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. + name x 1</td>
<td>Mrs. + name x 3</td>
<td>Faithless, Base,</td>
<td>very very -- true Woman</td>
<td>Insulting Monster</td>
<td>Generous Creature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Perfidious Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your Ladyship name x 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor Dissembler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridiculous Creature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Name x 3                         |                                  |                             |                             |                             |                             |

| 1723 SCSTEEL | name x 1 |                           | dear Child                  |                             |                             |
|--------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|                             |                             |
| Child        | Cousin Cimberton Master + name x 1 | pert merry Hussy.       |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Madam    | willful Innocent          |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Master + name x 1 | dear Child               |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Master + name x 1 |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | my Lady  |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Sir      |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | your Ladyship name x 3 |                             |                             |                             |                             |

| 1734 SCMILLE | child Man name x 1 |                           |                             | audacious wicked Woman      |                             |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------| Bubble                      |                             |
|              | Brother            | Fool                      |                             | cunning Gipsy               |                             |
|              | Child              | poor, pitiful, credulous  |                             | impertinent Hussy           |                             |
|              | Child              | Fool Simpleton            |                             | little Counterfeit          |                             |
|              | Doctor             | Worm                      |                             | meddling Baggage            |                             |
|              | Madam              |                             |                             | Serpent                     |                             |
|              | Mistress           |                             |                             | tormenting Beast            |                             |
|              | Mr. + name x 1     |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Mrs. + name x 2    |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Mrs. Wife          |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Papa               |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Sir                |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | Squire             |                             |                             |                             |                             |
|              | name x 1           |                             |                             |                             |                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name x 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Dear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wise Sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name x 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with Thou</td>
<td>Reference/Address Terms with You</td>
<td>Negative Epithets with Thou</td>
<td>Positive Epithets with Thou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>Scfield</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>most incomprehensible Blockhead</td>
<td>brave Girl the first finish'd Coquet who ever had any Honesty at all the very first Prude, that ever had Honesty enough to avow her Passion for a Man most unaccountable Fellow worst of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Schoadl</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>brave Girl the first finish'd Coquet who ever had any Honesty at all the very first Prude, that ever had Honesty enough to avow her Passion for a Man most unaccountable Fellow worst of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>dear Companion of my Joys old Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name x 1</td>
<td>Master + name x 2</td>
<td>Master + name x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. + name x 3</td>
<td>Mr. + name x 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. + name x 1</td>
<td>Mrs. + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your Honour</td>
<td>your Honour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>name x 9</td>
<td>name x 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Scgari</td>
<td>Baronet</td>
<td>Baronet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss</td>
<td>Miss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lord</td>
<td>my Lord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>my Lord Marquis</td>
<td>my Lord Marquis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your Honour</td>
<td>your Honour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your Ladyship</td>
<td>your Ladyship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your Lordship</td>
<td>your Lordship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss + name x 2</td>
<td>Miss + name x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs + name x 1</td>
<td>Mrs + name x 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr + name x 3</td>
<td>Mr + name x 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir + name x 3</td>
<td>Sir + name x 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>name x 8</td>
<td>name x 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A4 DIDACTIC: Analysis of Reference Terms, Address Terms & Epithets in collocation with \textit{thou} & \textit{you}

Terms collocating with \textit{thou} are \textit{emboldened and italicised}
Positive epithets are shown in capitals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Referral to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referral to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Lady Aloisa</td>
<td>Maister Pedro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Lady] Aloisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maister Gualter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Maister] Gualter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady Isabel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady Isabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Father*</td>
<td>Father*</td>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td>FATHER PILGRIM</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>Lady Listra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR PILGRIM</td>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>PILGRIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lady Listra</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>MADAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>PILGRIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PILGRIM</td>
<td>GOOD PILGRIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>young scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the wife</td>
<td>GOOD WOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>MAISTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suspected witch</td>
<td>thou beast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>Wife of Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>Wife of Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Referrer</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1HOOB</td>
<td>Dunstable</td>
<td>Midling or New Upstart Frankeling</td>
<td>NEIGHBOUR</td>
<td>Dunstable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huddle</td>
<td>Ancient Retired Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huddle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>2HOMAXE</td>
<td>Ploughman</td>
<td>Ploughman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>2HOCHUR</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>good Maister Chauncelor my good kinsman</td>
<td>Cousen GOSSIPE GENTLE COUSEN GOOD GOSSIPE GOOD HUSWIFE Cousen Puritane gentle kinswoman Mistres Cousen my good kinswoman one of the perversest creatures that ever anie man dealt with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>2HONORD</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>MY FRIEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>FRIEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baylie</td>
<td>Baylie</td>
<td>Baylie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1610 2HOSNAW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xantip</td>
<td>Xantip</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xantip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulaly</td>
<td>Eulaly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eulaly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margerie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margerie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1615 2HOHOBY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Mayor</td>
<td>your Worship</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Vicar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Vicar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1640 3HOTJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Shoomaker</em></td>
<td>Mr. Upright</td>
<td>Shoomaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOODMAN SHOOMAKER Pantoffle Dunstable railing fellow Shoomaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Upright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **1641 3HOTRAV**             |                               |               |                        |         |                       |              |
| *Cringe*                     | Crucy Cringe                  | Papist        | Idolator Dagon         | Cringe  | Master Cringe Master Crucy |              |
|                             | Accepted Weigh All            | C of E        |                        |         | Master Weighall        |              |
|                             | Factious Wrest Writ           | Brownist      |                        |         | Master Wrest-Writ      |              |

<p>| <strong>1641 3HOPOET</strong>             |                               |               |                        |         |                       |              |
| <em>Light foot</em>                 | Master Light-foot             | Mercury       | Sawcy                  | Light foot | [Master] Lightfoot |              |
| <em>Poet</em>                      | Master Poet Red Nose          | Poet          |                        | Light foot | Red Nose | Master Poet        |
| <em>Suck-bottle</em>               | Suck-bottle Sim Suck-bottle Master Suck-bottle | Hawker | | Light foot | [Sirrah] Suck-bottle Sim Suck-bottle | Master Suck bottle |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Referred to</th>
<th>Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>3HOCARE</td>
<td>Countryman</td>
<td>Countryman</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Citizen, Vintner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>3HOSTAR</td>
<td>Christopher Cob-Webbe</td>
<td>Christopher Cob-Webbe</td>
<td>Keeper of Records Star Chamber</td>
<td>MY OLD FRIEND</td>
<td>Christopher Cob-Webbe</td>
<td>Inquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>3HOSPIR</td>
<td>Busie Bodie</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Broth VER*</td>
<td>Busie Bodie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scrape-All</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Broth VER*</td>
<td>Scrape-All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>3HOCOLE</td>
<td>Brother Stop-coale</td>
<td>Wood-Monger</td>
<td>Broth VER STOP-COALE Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cozen Hoord-coale</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>DEARE COZEN HOORD-COALE Broth VER*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679</td>
<td>3HOYARR</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>young lawyer</td>
<td>such an Enemy to Prerogative an obstinate, prejudic'd Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>a young man, and run too fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1680 HOEP | Tom [Piper] Tom Piper Tom Piper  
Captain Crackbrain Captain Crackbrain  
Make a noise Tom Make a noise Tom |               | Cheshire Piper         | MAN OF OBSERVATION  
strange man Minstrel NOTABLE FELLOW        | Tom [Piper]  
[Captain] [Crackbrain]  
Make a noise Tom |               |             |
| 1681 HOTREA | William Neighbour William Neighbour  
Richard Richard |               |                        | NEIGHBOUR GOOD NEIGHBOUR | William  
Richard |               |             |
| 1681 HOSAM | Will Will Will  
Sam Sam Sam  
Tom Tom Tom  
Hugh Hugh Hugh |               | London Waterman        | HONEST WILL  
Sirrah Rogue Whelp          | Will  
Sam  
Tom  
Hugh |               |             |
|        | Sam Ferryman  
Tom Oxford Bargeman  
Hugh Sculler |               |                        | fool Rogue A RIGHT ENGLISH MAN A GOOD PROTESTANT | Sam  
Hugh |               |             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrer to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referrer to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1685 4HOKATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HONEST</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dumpish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate/Katy</td>
<td>Kate/Katy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOVING</td>
<td>Kate/Katy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY LOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEAR HEART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HONEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY BIRDS-NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY DEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY DEAR KATY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY SWEET LOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POOR THING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRETTY HEART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRETTY PIG-NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRETTY SOUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWEET SOUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWEET ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY DUCK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY DEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY PIG’S-NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695 4HOROGU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Undertaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RARE FELLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOST EXCELLENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNDERTAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RARE MR. UNDERTAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOBLE UNDERTAKER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RARE FELLOW AT PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY TRUE HONEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mr] State Rogue</td>
<td>Parliament Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEAR STATE ROGUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mr] State Rogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Young Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td>A VERY ANGEL SWEET MY DEAR</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Young Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEAR MY DEAR FRIEND</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRIEND WILL nump-skull’d Fellow</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafe, Rafee</td>
<td>Mr Mixington</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Vintner</td>
<td>Ungrateful Wretch wretch Foul Mouth Fool of a Wit</td>
<td>Ralph Mixington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Madam, Child</td>
<td>Rafe's Wife</td>
<td>your wealthy Ladyship Child thou Ape</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703 4HOLUCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>Landlord of mine greatest corrupter of Youth most dangerous Person Mr. Jew MY DEAR LANDLORD Mr Inquisitive Foul Mouth Mammon a notable Judge Mr. Occasional NEIGHBOUR TRAP</td>
<td>Trap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Trap Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Officer in the Guards</td>
<td>DEAR CAPTAIN NOTABLE SATYRICAL WIT GOOD CAPTAIN</td>
<td>Captain Flourish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelly</td>
<td>Mrs Trap</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>a Fool</td>
<td>Nelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refferred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Refferred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>your worship</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>YOUR WORSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeholder</td>
<td>Freeholder</td>
<td>Freeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEIGHBOUR HONEST FELLOW AND A TRUE ENGLISH-MAN HONEST JACK AN HONEST HEART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A5 LANGUAGE TEACHING: Analysis of Reference Terms, Address Terms & Epithets in collocation with *thou* and *you*

Terms collocating with thou are *emboldened and italicised*
Positive epithets are shown in capitals
These texts contain many independent unattributed utterances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1573 1HFDESA</td>
<td>[trans fr French]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILIAR TALKES FOR TO SPEAKE IN ALL PLACES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraunces</td>
<td>Schoolboy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fraunces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margerite</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Margerite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gossip</td>
<td>gossip</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOSSIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lackey</td>
<td>Lackey</td>
<td>lickerish</td>
<td></td>
<td>maister lackey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>wa~ten</td>
<td></td>
<td>ames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maister lackey</td>
<td>maister lackey</td>
<td>vile gallowes</td>
<td></td>
<td>maister lackey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cosin</td>
<td>cosin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>MY LOUER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>MY FREEND</td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maistresse</td>
<td>Maistresse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shee gossyp</td>
<td>shee gossyp</td>
<td>MY SHEE GOSSYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katherin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katherin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gentiliwoman</td>
<td>Gentiliwoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR TO ASKE THE WAY, BUIE &amp; SEL</td>
<td>Maister Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maister Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shee freend</td>
<td></td>
<td>shee sheapheird</td>
<td>MY SHEE FREEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my freende</td>
<td></td>
<td>my freende</td>
<td>MY FREENDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mine hoste</td>
<td></td>
<td>mine hoste</td>
<td>GOOD FELLOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td>MY SHEE FREENDE</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAYRE MAYDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>my shee freende</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>MY SHEE FREENDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAYRE MAYDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586 1HEBELL</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>GOOD WENCHE</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Schoolboy</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Schoolboy</td>
<td>A WAGGE</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>MY SONNE</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE RISING IN THE MORNING</td>
<td>Ayles</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAYRE MAYDE</td>
<td>Ayles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cousin Ralf</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOSSEPPE RALF</td>
<td>cousin Ralf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cousin Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>cousin Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawer</td>
<td>Drawer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO THE MARKET</td>
<td>Symon</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD BROTHER GOSSIPPE BROTHER SIMON</td>
<td>Symon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
<td>Title + Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT THE TABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my friend</td>
<td>Dicke</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>MY FRIEND</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maister roper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>MY FRIEND DICKE</td>
<td>maister roper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY FRIEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>schoolboy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>schoolboy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT PLAYING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serving Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nedd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plowman</td>
<td>MY FRIEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myne host</td>
<td></td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPON THE WAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serving Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nedd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plowman</td>
<td>MY FRIEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myne host</td>
<td></td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605 2HFERON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[trans fr French]</td>
<td>sweet heart</td>
<td>Madame</td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Lady Ri-melaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mme</td>
<td>Madame</td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady Ri-melaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td>Chambermaid</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>head-braine fellowe</td>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>serra</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>head-braine fellowe</td>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mistresse) Iolye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mistresse) Iolye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistresse Clemence</td>
<td>Girls' Teacher</td>
<td>Mistresse Clemence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistresse Charlot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistresse Charlot</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Mistresse Charlot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlote</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Charlote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleurimond</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Fleurimond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master E.</td>
<td>French Master</td>
<td>Mistres Fleurimond</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Master E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Mistresse</td>
<td>Mistres Fleurimond</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Mistres Fleurimond</td>
<td>Fleurimond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Sister Charlette</td>
<td>Sister Charlette</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>Sister Charlette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Cousin</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLET</td>
<td>mistres Charlette</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Mistres Fleurimond</td>
<td>Fleurimond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue 4</td>
<td>Master E.</td>
<td>French Master</td>
<td>GOOD MASTER E.</td>
<td>Master E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Mistresse</td>
<td>Pupil</td>
<td>Mistres Fleurimond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as thou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Fleurimond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister Charlote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE COUSIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mistres Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue 4</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue 5</th>
<th>Madame</th>
<th>Madame</th>
<th>Lady</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to/Addressed</td>
<td>little knaue</td>
<td>sirha</td>
<td>Infant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as thou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY LITTLE DARLING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LITTLE KNAUE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY LITTLE BOYKN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY LITTLE HART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>GOOD NURCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Dialogue 6               | Master Champ-porte-aduis   | Tutor         | MASTER            | Master Champ-     |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|porte-aduis        |
|                          | Mother                     | Madame        | Mother            | LADY AND MOTHER   |
|                          | Guy                        | Son           | Son               |                     |
|                          | Rene                       | Son           | Rene              |                     |
|                          | brasen-facte lyer          | Children's Boy| brasen-facte lyer|                     |
| Dialogue 7               | Madame de Beau-seiour      | Lady          |                   | Madame de Beau-   |
|                          |                            |               |                   | seiour             |
| Dialogue 8               | my friend                  | Shopkeeper's Maid | MY FRIEND |                     |
|                          | my she friend              | Shopkeeper    | MY SHE FRIEND     |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1625 2HFWODR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[trans fr French]</td>
<td>A DISCOURSE BETWEEN</td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>GOOD MAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BURGUER AND THE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeamanesse</td>
<td>Yeamanesse</td>
<td>GOOD WIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE WORDS BETWEENE</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>School Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SCHOOLE-MASTER,</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND ONE OF HIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLLERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE GREAT ORCHARD OF</td>
<td>Master Torquato</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRIEND OF THE MUSES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Torquato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION</td>
<td>Master Nalano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Nalano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the original Dutch</td>
<td>Rupsa</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Loggerhead euill boy Senselesse Carelesse body AN HONEST MAN</td>
<td>Ruspa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPON THE WAY</td>
<td>Mr. John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THE MORNING</td>
<td>Mr. Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Henry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE 2</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Marker</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Lippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Title &amp; Name</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>3HFMAUG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>English Gentlewoman</td>
<td>Honest Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[trans fr French]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETWEEN TWO FRIENDS THAT ARE PURPOSED TO TRAVELL INTO FRANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>3HFFEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Wife, Gentlewoman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[trans fr French]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWIXT A GENTLEMAN AND A GENTLEWOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Husband, Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>English Gentlewoman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>French Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A FRENCH GENTLEMAN AND AN ENGLISH GENTLEWOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drawer</td>
<td>Drawer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN SEVERAL GENTLEMEN THAT GO TO BE MERRY ABROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN TWO GENTLEWOMEN (1)</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN TWO GENTLEWOMEN (2)</td>
<td>my dear</td>
<td>Gentlewoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY DEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685 4HEMIEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honest Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWIXT A FRENCH TRAVELLOUR, AND A COUNTRYMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE, TO LIE IN AN INN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hostler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE ABOUT TAKING A LODGING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TRAVELLOUR AND THE COACHMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>thou wretched Charon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TRAVELLOUR AND HIS LANDLADY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Landlady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TRAVELLOUR AND THE MAID OF THE HOUSE</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweet-Heart</td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>SWEET-HEART</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE ABOUT GIVING OF LINNEN TO BE WASHED</td>
<td>Good Woman</td>
<td>Washerwoman</td>
<td>GOOD WOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE TO GET A SUITE MADE TO BUY A HAT, PERWIG, GLOVES STOCKINGS, AND SHOOS</td>
<td>Honest Man</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my Friend</td>
<td>my Friend</td>
<td>Periwig-Maker</td>
<td>MY FRIEND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DIALOGUE TO ASK FOR ONE AT HIS HOUSE OR LODGING</td>
<td>Sweetheart</td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td>SWEETHEART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1694 4HFBOYE [trans fr French] BETWEEN A LADY AND HER WAITING-WOMAN

| Madam | Madam | Lady | Waiting Woman |

BETWEEN A TUTOR AND TWO YOUNG GENTLEMEN

| Master P. | pupil, child | | Master P. |
| Master B. | pupil, child | | Master B. |

A LADY AND HER DAUGHTER ABOUT THE EXERCISES

<p>| Daughter | Daughter | | |
| Madam | Mother | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as thou</th>
<th>Referred to/Addressed as you</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN THE STEWARD AND THE COOK</td>
<td>Master Cook</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>master Steward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO PAY THE RECKONING</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN A GENTLEWOMAN AND HER WOMAN</td>
<td>your Ladyship, Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>YOUR LADYSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mistress Sue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN A LOVER AND HIS MISTRESS</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Madam</td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td>MY DEAR ANGEL</td>
<td>Celia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY CHARMING CAELIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisidor</td>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>Lisidor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN TWO COUZENS OF VISITS</td>
<td>Cozen</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN A FATHER AND HIS DAUGHTER</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731 SHGBEIL</td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td>Washerwoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALOGUE WITH A WASHER-WOMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALOGUE WITH A HACKNEY-COACHMAN</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN A GENTLEMAN AND A MASTER OF A SHIP</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master of a Ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN AN INN, UPON THE ROAD</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT TAKING LODGINGS</td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td>Mistress</td>
<td>Landlady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A6 MISCELLANEOUS: Analysis of Reference Terms, Address Terms & Epithets in collocation with *thou* & *you*

Terms collocating with *thou* are *emboldened and italicised*
Positive epithets are shown in capitals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ref <em>thou</em></th>
<th>Ref <em>you</em></th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Occupation/Description</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Name [may be omitted]</th>
<th>Title + Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Barrowe</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Scismatick</em> <em>scismatick</em> <em>recusant</em> <em>seditious person</em> <em>fantastical fellow</em></td>
<td>Barrowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Marocco</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>a Horse</td>
<td>too sovre</td>
<td><em>asse</em> <em>colte</em></td>
<td>Marocco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marocco</td>
<td>boye</td>
<td>man horse</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>YOUNG GENTLEMAN</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bankes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Rapier</td>
<td>Rapier</td>
<td>Syr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>sirra</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>crauenly Capon</em></td>
<td>sirra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dagger</td>
<td>Syr</td>
<td></td>
<td>backe-Friend</td>
<td>Dagger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Quick</td>
<td>Quick</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Player</td>
<td>Quick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td>Player</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as thou</td>
<td>Referred to/Addressed as you</td>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td>Occupation/Description</td>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Name [may be omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>MCPATC0110107</td>
<td>Catchall</td>
<td>Catchall</td>
<td>sirrah</td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td>mad shaver</td>
<td>Catchall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spy-all</td>
<td></td>
<td>sirrah</td>
<td>Setter</td>
<td>NO KINNE TO THE SNAILE</td>
<td>Spy-all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mad slave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Tenterhooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serjeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREAT COMMANDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Tenterhooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRAVE DAVY Dody-pole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wat [hypocorism]</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>Sirrah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wity-pole</td>
<td>Wat Witty-Pole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HONEST WAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>MWTW0110109</td>
<td>Mistris Custome</td>
<td>Gillian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victualler's Wife</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>Mistris Custome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huswife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gossip</td>
<td>M. New-come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>MWH0110107</td>
<td>Julieta</td>
<td>Whore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ju [hypocorism]</td>
<td>Julieta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY SWEETHEART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY DEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MY BELOVED ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gusman</td>
<td>Pimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIME TUTOR</td>
<td>Gusman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mounsieur Francion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>MLSTW0110107</td>
<td>Mary Trembles</td>
<td>Mary Trembles</td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>Mary Trembles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Trembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temperance Lloyd</td>
<td>Temperance Lloyd</td>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>Temperance Lloyd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susanna Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>