Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg
Anglistisches Seminar
Supervisor: PD Dr. Sandra Mollin

MA thesis

Get thee to a nunnery

The use of 2nd person singular pronouns in William Shakespeare's *As You Like It* and *Hamlet*

Maria Irena Szawerna
turtilla@interia.pl
Nordanvindsvägen 2/26, 45160, Uddevalla, Sweden
3631682
19.09.2022

Stichworte: *Pronomen, Frühneuenglisch, Höflichkeitstheorie, Korpusanalyse, Shakespeare*

Abstract:

Die Werke von William Shakespeare waren und sind Gegenstand der Forschung nicht nur in der Literaturwissenschaft, sondern auch in der Linguistik. Obwohl sie gegenwärtig nicht als gute Quelle für die Modellierung des im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert gebrauchten Englischen gelten, ist die Sprache des Dramatikers selbst der Aufmerksamkeit wert. Einer der größten Unterschiede zwischen dem modernen Englisch und dem von Shakespeare und seinen Zeitgenossen verwendeten ist das Vorhandensein von zwei verschiedenen Pronomen für die zweite Person Singular. Zwar gibt es Theorien zur Erklärung ihrer Verteilung, aber sie sind nicht immer in der Lage, alle Abweichungen von den Regeln zu erklären; außerdem variieren die Forschungsergebnisse je nach den berücksichtigten Werken sowie den Methoden.

Das Thema dieser Magisterarbeit ist die Verwendung der Pronomen *thou* und *you* in der zweiten Person Singular in zwei Werken Shakespeares, „Wie es euch gefällt“ und „Hamlet“. Es wird versucht, Tendenzen in der Verwendung von Pronomen, sowie Motivationen und Gründe für Abweichungen von diesen Tendenzen und Regeln zu ermitteln. Durch den Vergleich von Komödie und Tragödie wird auch versucht, die Frage zu beantworten, ob die literarische Gattung einen signifikanten Einfluss auf die Verwendung bestimmter Pronomen hat. Um die angestrebten Ziele zu erreichen, wurden sowohl quantitative als auch qualitative Methoden eingesetzt. Die Texte der Theaterstücke wurden redigiert und mit Anmerkungen versehen; Dialoge zwischen ausgewählten Figuren wurden ebenfalls ausgewählt und separat analysiert. Die Anzahl der einzelnen Wörter wurde mithilfe des Korpusanalyseprogramms AntConc ermittelt und dann als Prozentsatz des Textinhalts dargestellt, sodass Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschiede zwischen den Stücken ermittelt werden konnten. Im qualitativen Teil dieser Arbeit wurden Beispiele für die Abweichungen von der Norm in ausgewählten Dialogen diskutiert.

Die in dieser Arbeit vorgestellten Ergebnisse deuten darauf hin, dass das *you* in beiden Stücken das dominierende Pronomen für die zweite Person Singular ist und dass die literarische Gattung weniger eine Rolle zu spielen scheint als die Struktur der Szenen selbst, wie die Unterschiede in der Verteilung von Singular und Plural des *you* zeigen. Es wurde auch beobachtet, dass die Anwesenheit von Dritten die Verwendung von Pronomen beeinflussen kann, indem sie Druck ausübt, der zur Einhaltung der Regeln führt.

Aus den Ergebnissen und ihrem Vergleich mit früheren Studien werden zahlreiche Schlussfolgerungen gezogen. Die Vielfalt der Ergebnisse auf der Grundlage von nur wenigen Werken lässt vermuten, dass eine Studie mit einem so engen Umfang einige allgemeinere Fragen eindeutig beantworten kann. Es besteht auch der Bedarf, besser kommentierte Materialien zu entwickeln, auf denen weitere Forschung der Sprache von Shakespeare aufbauen kann. Der qualitative Teil dieser Arbeit deutet darauf hin, dass es immer noch möglich ist, Faktoren zu finden, die die Verwendung von Pronomen beeinflussen, die nicht gut beschrieben wurden, und dass die Analyse des Gebrauchs von Pronomen aus der Perspektive der Gesamtbeziehung zwischen zwei Figuren in einem Werk ein guter Ansatz sein kann.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

William Shakespeare is undoubtedly a household name and has been so for several centuries. Copious amounts of research have been conducted on the literary qualities of his plays and poetry, but while most people may better know him for the content of his works, Shakespeare's linguistic tools have not been left unexplored (Busse, 2002, p. 2). A considerable amount of research has been conducted both on Shakespeare's language in particular and on the language of his times, known as Early Modern English. Since all the linguistic material that remains from that period, usually placed between 1500 and 1700, is in writing, some elements thereof are much harder to investigate (Nevalainen, 2006, p. 1). For obvious reasons, the study of the sounds of Early Modern English is quite difficult, but the sparsity of the material affects other branches of linguistics too, and the conclusions drawn from the available sources may not always be entirely true (Busse & Busse, 2017, pp. 314-316). Some ideas circulating in both the laypeople's and professionals' perceptions, such as the idea that Shakespeare had a much broader vocabulary than his peers, have even been proven to simply not be true (Craig, 2011, pp. 60-64). Clearly, even for this closed chapter in the history of English, there remain contentious issues.

The factors influencing the selection of the second person singular pronoun in this period could be considered one such issue. In Early Modern English there were two pronouns that could be used to address a singular interlocutor: *you* and *thou*. While a more in-depth description of the relevant parts of the Early Modern English pronominal paradigm will be presented in one of the subsequent sections, the general consensus in many grammars of Early Modern English is that *you* – originally only the second person plural pronoun – was used by members of the upper classes to address each other, and by members of the lower classes to address their superiors, while *thou* – the initial Old English second person singular pronoun – was used reciprocally among lower classes, and by their superiors to address them. Essentially, upper classes would always receive *you*, and lower – *thou*. There would, however, be reasons to infringe upon these rules – *you* would also be seen as a pronoun of unfamiliarity, used towards people who were not close to the speaker, and *thou* as a pronoun of familiarity or intimacy. The intentional choice of an inadequate pronoun could reflect a change in the speaker's emotional state – anything from an attempt to appease someone, through anger, to contempt (Hope, 2003, pp. 72-73, Johnson, 2013, pp. 133-135).

Many attempts have been made to find support for or rebuke these claims – the most relevant of which will be described in more detail in the section on prior research. Some researchers favored analyzing source material in a qualitative fashion, looking at instances of pronoun use in context, case by case. Others opted for a quantitative approach, implementing corpus linguistics methods to estimate how prevalent which pronoun was, sometimes taking into account other factors that could have influenced the pronoun choice; finally, some decided to combine elements of both approaches. Another variation between the inquiries is the source material. It is widespread to base investigations into Early Modern English on literary sources, like Shakespeare's plays. Nevertheless, as noted by some researchers, such approaches are insufficient when it comes to describing language as it was in everyday use, as dialogues in plays are not records of real-life speech acts (Walker, 2007, p. 9). Instead, a variety of other written sources is used by some in the field, including letters, depositions, and transcripts of trial proceedings.

The focus of this thesis will be to first present a more detailed overview of the pronominal system in Early Modern English, as presented by grammars of the language, and then report the findings from previous quantitative and qualitative research, along with the possible shortcomings thereof. Subsequently, a combination of the two aforementioned methods will be used to analyze the pronoun use in two of Shakespeare's plays, "As You Like It" and "Hamlet." The results will then be juxtaposed with the prior research to assess whether or not they support the most common claims of you being the unmarked pronoun and the choice of pronouns being influenced by factors such as power and solidarity, as well as other possible factors.

2. Prior research

Before engaging in any independent analysis, it is essential to review what has already been written on the topic. Comprehending the existing literature not only provides a solid background in terms of what has been concluded from prior research, but it can also yield a unique perspective on how to conduct one's research. In order to write anything about Shakespeare's language, it is good to have some understanding of the times in which he wrote and the linguistic norms he followed; it is also relevant to know what the consensus is on a given issue in the existing grammars of Early Modern English. Going a step further, as mentioned before, reviewing what other researchers have to say on the topic is vital for

understanding what methods and materials are best for conducting a new analysis that will not simply overlap with one of the prior ones.

In this section, a review of the background literature will be presented. In the first subsection, materials pertaining to the history and structure of Early Modern English, such as publications on the history of English, history of Early Modern English, grammar of Early Modern English, or grammar of Shakespeare's language, will be summarized. This will be followed by materials related to the Politeness Theory and the Power and Solidarity approach, which serve as some of the more important approaches for explaining the pronominal system in Early Modern English. Subsequently, studies of the pronoun use in Early Modern English and, in particular, in Shakespeare's plays will be presented. Since many of them take a combined, quantitative-qualitative approach (with a varying extent to which one is preferred over the other), such a division here is impossible. Instead, the works shall be divided into those of a wider scope, which take into account more data and are predominantly corpus-based inquiries with a preference for the quantitative approach, and those of a narrower scope, which focus on a small number of plays and approach the analysis somewhat more qualitatively.

2.1. History of English

The works to be discussed in this section are focused on the history of English and the historical grammar of that language in a textbook or grammar format. This means that they present what is considered to be the consensus on a given issue and do not report any research of their own (although they may be based on it, that is not the purpose of the publication). The purpose of including these works is to understand what is considered the most common interpretation of the existing research, as well as to present some overview of what exactly Early Modern English was and when it was spoken.

Nurmi's (2017) chapter in "The History of English, Volume 4: Early Modern English" presents an overview of the language of the period. The author approximates the period when it was spoken to span from 1500 to 1700, as mentioned in the introduction to this thesis. It should be remembered, though, that these are relatively arbitrary boundaries and that the language was not uniform throughout that period but rather evolved. In terms of the language itself, Nurmi identifies two significant developments: standardization and the growth of the lexicon, but the increase in literacy indirectly contributed to the amount and kind of remaining sources as well. In terms of grammar, nominal case endings were lost,

auxiliary *do* appeared, word order was becoming increasingly fixed, and the Great Vowel Shift occurred. The author asserts that in the study of Early Modern English, initially predominantly literary sources were used, with more and more written or printed ones, such as letters, journals, or court proceedings being added, culminating in the rise in popularity of corpus-based research (pp. 8-10, 16-17, 22-24). As for the second person singular pronoun, Nurmi claims that the *you* form merged with *ye* and eventually pushed out *thou,* which had become marked (p. 23).

In the same volume, Busse (2017) has a chapter exclusively on pronouns. He begins by listing the changes to the pronominal paradigm, out of which the ones relevant to this thesis are the loss of the second-person singular *thou* and its replacement by the second-person plural *you,* as well as the disappearance of *ye* (the accusative form of *you*) (pp. 210-211). The author writes that historically the difference between *thy* and *thine* was phonotactically determined, same as the modern indefinite article, with the first form preceding consonants and the latter – vowels. According to him, though, by Shakespeare's times, the choice was stylistic, with *my* and *thy* being the more common forms (pp. 213-215). During the Early Modern English period, there seemed to be much confusion about the use of the nominative and objective forms of the second person singular and plural pronouns, possibly due to their unstressed forms sounding very similar or the same, and, as mentioned before, the distinction between *you* and *ye* was eventually lost (pp. 215-218). The use of the second person plural for singular as a polite form is older than this period in the history of English, as old as the 13th century. However, in Early Modern English, the choice of the pronoun was dependent on social, personal, and situational factors, and while many instances can be interpreted in terms of power and solidarity semantics, sometimes there is more at play. Busse asserts that the choice of pronoun most likely did not depend on linguistic factors but was motivated by social or pragmatic reasons (pp. 218-221).

The same researcher co-authored another chapter in the same publication (Busse & Busse, 2017). This one is about the language of Shakespeare. According to the authors, there is a long history of linguistic inquiry into Shakespeare's language, with the modern approaches being predominantly descriptive but covering an extensive scope of topics within linguistics (pp. 310-314). While Shakespeare's language seems similar to modern English, there are some key differences that can only be understood by comprehending the sociohistorical and linguistic context of Early Modern English – but the authors point out that Shakespeare's writings cannot be considered an authentic representation of Early Modern English the way it was used in everyday life (pp. 313-314). Busse & Busse also note

that idiolects and social dialects are used to characterize different people in the plays. They note that while Shakespeare is credited with coining many new words, it is likely simply just a case of him being the first one to record them (pp. 316-319). Shakespeare's grammar did not stand out from his contemporaries but differed from the present-day one in word order and sentence structure, the use of *do*-support, auxiliaries, and a more considerable variation of third-person singular present tense verb endings (pp. 320-323). In the studies of Shakespearean pragmatics, second-person singular pronouns are commonly studied, as they are said to not only express power and solidarity but also reflect and build relationships, identities, and attitudes, and also help structure discourse (pp. 323-326). The authors conclude with the note that the most recent studies seem to focus on corpus studies, and some researchers have ventured into multimodal inquiries (pp. 326-327).

Another succinct account of the use of Early Modern English pronouns comes from Smith's (2005) book on the history of English. He also establishes the period to span from roughly 1500 to 1700, and to be characterized by the standardization of the language, though the spelling conventions were not entirely modern or unified then and can vary from writer to writer (pp. 124-125). He presents the second-person pronominal paradigm, setting a distinction between singular and plural, not including *you* forms as singular ones, but acknowledging that they were used for that (pp. 132, 142). According to Smith, by the 1600s, *thou* was a marked form that denoted familiarity and could be used both in positive and negative expressions. By the end of that century, they had become nonstandard and only appeared in fixed phrases (p. 132). The forms of the second-person plural pronoun *ye* and *you* alternated in different positions (p. 143).

Hope's (2003) book on the grammar of Shakespeare includes a rather informative section on pronouns, which begins with specifying that they are "a set of […] function words, used to replace fully lexical nouns," meaning that there is a set, limited number of them (p. 67). They carry information about the number, gender, and person of what they represent, and they were often marked for case in Early Modern English (pp. 67-68). While the number of pronouns is usually fixed, it was different in Shakespeare's times than in contemporary English. The greatest complexity is shown by the second-person singular pronouns, where there are four possible forms: *thou,* the strictly singular nominative *thee,* the singular accusative *ye,* deriving from the plural nominative but used in both cases for the singular, and *you,* deriving from the plural accusative but used the same way as *ye* (pp. 72-73). This reflects a system that was present in other European languages, the origin of which in English can be traced back to French or Latin, where the plural forms were used as a polite way of

addressing someone. In Early Modern English, th-forms are used when talking to someone of lower social status, and y-forms when addressing someone of equal or higher status; there are, however, instances that defy those rules, and certain pronouns could be used to insult someone or distance oneself from someone (pp. 73, 75-77). Hope summarizes that this meant that the use of second-person singular pronouns was governed by a social semantic and emotional semantic, and the two affected each other and need to be taken into account when analyzing Shakespeare's pronouns. He also points out that it is likely that Shakespeare's language was not a faithful representation of what was actually spoken during his times and that he overrepresented *thou* for literary purposes, a conclusion drawn from comparing his writings to genuine accounts of spoken Early Modern English (p. 77). Aside from the contexts motivated by the aforementioned semantics, there are four situations in which *thou* is mandatory in Shakespeare: apostrophes, addressing deities, addressing animals, addressing ghosts and spirits; these forms are also clearly more archaic and used in contexts that would call for that (pp. 77-81). Grammar-wise, Hope points out two peculiarities: the "generic your" construction, which was an informal way to "express a general truth about something," and the possibility to omit *thou* if the verbal inflection clearly indicates second person singular. He also asserts that the distinction between *ye* and *you* in terms of case was all but lost in Early Modern English (pp. 82-83).

A similar description can be found in Nevalainen's (2006) "An Introduction to Early Modern English." He also begins by explaining that pronouns are closed-class words and that they can perform the role of nouns. Personal pronouns are used to indicate the speaker, the addressee, and others involved in the discourse, and they are marked for number, case, and, occasionally, gender. They also appear in the subjective, objective, and possessive cases (p. 77). In the 16th century, the distinction between the possessive forms *my* and *mine* as well as *thy* and *thine* was lost; *my* and *thy* became the dominant forms, while their counterparts remained only in fixed phrases (p. 78). The second-person singular and plural pronoun also lost some diversity, with the original subjective form *ye* being lost and replaced by the objective *you* (p. 80). As far as the changes to the second-person singular pronouns are concerned, Nevalainen traces them back to Middle English, where the first instances of the polite *you* occurred. Initially, it was used to address people of higher status, but gradually it started being used by peers, while the older *thou* became more emotionally loaded, and its use implied either disrespect or close familiarity with the interlocutor. It disappeared entirely in the mainstream dialects of English around the early 18th century, though it persists in some regional variants of speech to this day (pp. 78-80).

There are a few sections in Blake's (2002) "A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language" that are relevant to this thesis. In his chapter on the noun group, he discusses the structure of the noun phrase in Early Modern English. The head of that phrase could be a noun or a pronoun, which is what makes this section of interest. Possessive pronouns could also appear in the determiner position in the phrase (pp. 34-35). As for the pronouns themselves, Blake reports that in Early Modern English, they still retained some of the differences in case (nominative, genitive or possessive, and oblique, the latter also known as the objective or the accusative), number (singular and plural), and gender (feminine, masculine, neuter). What sets this system apart from modern English is the presence of a second-person singular nominative form *thou* and oblique form *thee*, as well as a second-person plural *ye* form for the oblique case, though for all the case forms of the second person singular and plural *you* could be used, and the trend was for that pronoun to take over (pp. 35-43). Among the possessive pronouns, *my* and *mine, as well as thy and thine,* could be found. Those were the possessive pronouns for the first and second person singular, and the difference between the two forms is claimed to have been motivated by the initial sound of the phrase that they preceded, with *my* and *thy* co-occurring with consonants, and *mine* and *thine* with vowels; this seems to no longer hold in Shakespeare's times, and the only regularity that exists is the latter forms being used emphatically and together with phrase-initial *h* (pp. 45-46). Blake continues to reiterate that *you* was becoming the dominant form in Shakespeare's times and that there does not seem to be any regular system for second-person singular pronouns in Shakespeare's works. He also highlights that different editions of Shakespeare's works sometimes use different pronouns in the same sections, indicating that the difference may have been irrelevant. Finally, he lists hypothesized reasons for pronoun choice, such as attitude, social hierarchy, power relations, markedness, or social identity (pp. 55-58). In the chapter on discourse and register, Blake asserts that different forms of address were used to provide information about the characters and their social standing. Pronouns play a part in this, and choosing the correct one may have reflected social stratification. Blake notes that *you* often occurred both with insults and praise and that phrases such as *pray you* or *prithee* played the role of discourse markers (pp. 271-273, 276-277, 294). Finally, in his chapter on pragmatics, the author mentions Politeness Theory and how it can perhaps explain the forms of address in Shakespeare's writing (pp. 320-325).

Another look at Shakespeare's language comes from Johnson's (2013) linguistic guide to his works. He begins by claiming that by Shakespeare's times, the case distinction between *thou* and *you* has become very blurry (pp. 132-133). According to him, there were

many reasons to use one of those two pronouns in specific contexts: if the referent was plural, only *you* could be used, if a person of high status addressed someone of low status, or sometimes if both speakers were of low status, or yet if the speakers were really close or intimate with each other or wanted to offend one another, *thou* was used. Otherwise, *you* was employed. Gender was also a factor in determining the relative social positions of the speakers. For addressing non-human agents, only *thou* was used (pp. 133-135). In terms of raw numbers, *you* forms dominate over the other ones, and momentary shifts from *you* to *thou* are more common than the other way around (p. 138).

Out of all these publications emerges a relatively uniform view of Early Modern English and its pronominal system. The period in discussion spans approximately from 1500 to 1700, which places Shakespeare, whose works are from the late 1500s and early 1600s, right in the middle of it. Throughout that period, the pronominal system evolved and changed in many ways, but what is relevant to this thesis is how it is described for Shakespeare's times in particular. The literature seems to agree on there being two second-person singular pronouns, *thou* and *you,* which were governed by a strict social hierarchy semantic and a more flexible affective semantic, meaning that the ways of addressing others were determined by their relative social status and the emotional states of the speakers. Because of that, deviations from the norms imposed by the social hierarchy can be noted, and they can be motivated by strong positive feelings like love or affection or strong negative feelings like hate or resentment. Most sources agree that *you* was the more generic reciprocal pronoun for peers, and *thou* was rather marked, even if it was sometimes used among lower classes as the basic pronoun of address. As for the forms of the pronouns, *thou* was the nominative form and *thee* the objective form, but that distinction was lost for the other pronoun, and *you* and *ye* alternated more freely (with the latter being the original subjective form). The authors also agree that Shakespeare's writings are not the most representative when it comes to looking at Early Modern English as a whole, and the way that the playwright uses language may be archaic or motivated by stylistic reasons at times rather than entirely faithful to the spoken language of his peers.

2.2. Power and Solidarity

One of the core concepts that are used to explain the use of second person singular pronouns in Early Modern English is Politeness Theory and its notions of power and solidarity. As mentioned in one of the sources summarized in the first section, these concepts

can be used to try to explain the different factors that are at play in the Early Modern English second-person pronoun paradigm, i.e., characterize the elements that influence the pronoun choice (Blake, 2002, pp. 320-325). Within this section, the most relevant publications on this topic pertaining to the use of second-person pronouns in general and in Early Modern English in particular will be presented, as they are quite often referred to in further research. Both of them are authored by the same people, and the first one presents a general look at some explanation for how these pronouns are used in various European languages, trying to find a model that would explain it sufficiently. The second paper goes into more detail on how this pertains to Shakespeare's writings and Early Modern English.

Brown and Gilman (1960) open their first paper with a look at the history of using the second person plural pronoun as a polite form of the singular one. According to them, it is still used in many European languages nowadays, like French, German, Spanish, or Italian, and it used to be used in English; however, the original second-person singular pronoun appears in modern English only in highly specialized areas such as poetry or prayers (p. 252). Throughout the paper, the authors decide to use the symbols T and V to signify the regular second-person singular pronoun and the polite second-person singular or second-person plural pronoun, respectively. These symbols come from their Latin counterparts, *tu* and *vos,* as it is this language that is credited with the first occurrence of this phenomenon (p. 254). Brown and Gilman then move on to explain what the power semantic is – a relationship between two people that does not go both ways, i.e., is nonreciprocal. This means that when one person is in a position of power, the other one is not. Power itself is hard to define, and there are many elements that contribute to it, such as physical strength, age, wealth, gender, birth, profession, etc. It seems that in many European languages in the Middle Ages, this semantic governed the use of second-person singular pronouns, with the people in power using T towards their inferiors and receiving V from them (p. 255). There are also other ways of expressing the power semantic than the use of pronouns – for example, calling someone by surname or given name (pp. 269-270). Among power equals – people of the same status – pronouns can be used reciprocally, and the tendency is for upper classes to use the more polite V and for lower classes to use T, which seems to stem from the V use originating at the top of the social ladder (pp. 256-257). There is another dimension that the authors describe, that of solidarity. Unlike power, solidarity is reciprocal or symmetrical. It is a dynamic that connects people who share some trait – such as being family members, friends, working together, or having attended the same school. Power and solidarity are not mutually exclusive – for example, a parent is both superior in power and close in solidarity

(pp. 257-259). The authors create a chart to depict how these factors interact with each other, centering on the idea that in a balanced system with two second-person singular pronouns, superiors will receive V, inferiors will receive T, solidary equals will use reciprocal T, and not solidary equals – V. If the system is under tension, the interactions between superiors and inferiors become more complicated, with solidarity playing a more important role there – solidarity then increases the chance of addressing even a superior with a T, and the lack of solidarity makes it possible to address an inferior with a V (p. 259). The authors claim that nowadays, the tendency is to step away from the power dynamic and choose pronouns solely on familiarity, but that the step towards using the reciprocal T has to be taken by the person in a position of power. They also note that the use of T seems to become more common with time (pp. 260-262). In a small study of how these pronouns are used in contemporary European languages, the authors discovered that their assumptions are generally correct, though there are some differences that can be explained in terms of solidarity and its perception by the speakers of given languages (pp. 264-265).

Brown and Gilman then move on to the discussion of some extralinguistic factors that influence these pronoun systems. They claim that the power semantic is tied to hierarchical societies and that societies that reject this static organization also often reject the use of reciprocal V (pp. 265-266). For example, out of the languages that they analyzed, the ones that retain the most of the power semantic are Afrikaans and languages of India – places where the society remains more hierarchical than in European countries (pp. 268-269). As an extension of that, ideologies pertaining to the social system may also influence pronoun choice (pp. 275-276). However, personal style rarely has a significant influence on it (p. 273). Deviations from the norms for pronoun use can be explained by some emotional state of the speaker towards the addressee – for instance, T can be used to show contempt or anger, and V to show admiration or respect (p. 277). Sympathy or estrangement can also be expressed through a violation of the solidarity semantic (p. 280). Brown and Gilman claim that in Early Modern English, the second-person singular pronouns were much more often used to express mood and tone than in other European languages (p. 278).

In their second paper, Brown and Gilman (1989) discuss how Politeness Theory relates to the data gathered from four of Shakespeare's tragedies: "Hamlet," "King Lear," "Macbeth," and "Othello" (p. 159). They begin by explaining some more concepts relevant to the paper, such as the positive and negative face, as well as face-threatening acts. The first two are motivations for people to behave a certain way: the positive face is, in simple words, wanting others to share our goals, while the negative face is wanting to be free from

domination or imposition (p. 161). Face-threatening acts are linguistic behaviors that go against one of those faces, e.g., a request threatens the negative face, as it is infringing on the other person's independence. In order to mitigate the potential damage to the relationship, positive and negative politeness strategies are employed (p. 162). The authors then return to pronouns, explaining that they have a relational meaning, so they depend on who the interlocutors are. The choice is determined by power and distance – or power and solidarity (pp. 162-163). Taking all of this into account, Brown and Gilman propose that the riskiness of any face-threatening act can be represented as a function with the following variables: the social distance between the speaker and the addressee, the power of the addressee over the speaker, and the culturally ranked intrinsic threat of the act. The lower the risk posed by the act is, the bolder the conversational strategy can be – but all of this is not a conscious decision in most cases (pp. 163-164). Exemplary positive and negative politeness strategies are in-group identity markers or deference, respectively – appealing to solidarity or highlighting the power difference (pp. 167-168).

The authors acknowledge that Shakespeare's works are not necessarily a faithful representation of Early Modern English, but they are intended to mirror spoken language in a way that many other written sources do not. They also point out that the plays originating in a time of major social changes can be an interesting source for studying politeness (pp. 170-171). In order to find support for their proposed FTA-riskiness function, Brown and Gilman try to find dialogues between the same characters (and, consequently, with the same power and distance variables) but with different riskiness (p. 173). They then offer a quick explanation of what the second-person pronouns in Early Modern English were and how they were used. They name the nominative *thou*, accusative *thee*, genitive *thy*, and the free variant *ye* aside from the *you* and *your/yours* known from Present-Day English. They also note that many grammars say that *you* was the polite form, and *thou* was the casual form, which is not far from what the previous section recounted (pp. 176-177). Upper-class people tended to use reciprocal you, and in the tragedies, it is also spouses, adult siblings, parents and their adult children, and upper-class friends that use it the same way. Lower-class people used reciprocal thou – in the plays they are represented by characters such as anonymous soldiers or guards, messengers, murderers, and gravediggers. They would address upper-class characters with *you* and receive *thou* (p. 177). However, these status differences do not account for all the pronoun uses, and it seems that *you* may simply be the unmarked form, while *thou* is used in emotion-heavy situations. This kind of temporary, expressive shift to *thou* appears to be unusual for other languages, where if such a shift happens, it is because

the solidarity level between the two speakers changes, and the shift is permanent (pp. 177-178). Special cases of the use of second-person pronouns are *pray you* and *prithee,* which are forms of polite indirect request, similarly to imperatives that are followed by a second-person pronoun. Deferential strategies include using forms of address that include pronouns (pp. 181-183). According to the authors, however, pronouns on their own are not considered very important for face-threatening act ratings, as they are unavoidable in conversations and do not serve any special role, as well as because there are some shifts in their use that cannot be clearly explained; nevertheless, they can be parts of some politeness strategies, as mentioned before (p. 179).

Looking at the results of their analysis, Brown and Gilman report that there are two kinds of speeches that do not include any politeness strategies or the lack of concern for the feelings of others – speeches made in rage or madness (pp. 184-187). Wherever there is a contrast in the dimension of power, the examples support their theory, with a few exceptions (p. 188). However, the same cannot be said for situations where there is a contrast of distance, as the closer the relationship is, the more polite the speech is, which is not what Politeness Theory would predict. This, however, may be due to the fact that in the studied plays, there are very few examples of this kind of contrast, and they are not representative (pp. 192-193). The riskiness of the intrinsic threat – how risky the action is deemed culturally – supports the claims with one weak contradiction (p. 197). While the findings seem to confirm the theory, the authors note that the dataset that they performed their analysis on is incomplete and cannot be treated as entirely objective. For example, they suggest that violations of rules of politeness could have been used to characterize characters in the play, which means their lines do not always reflect the rules that governed politeness in Early Modern English (pp. 200-208).

Politeness Theory seems like quite a reasonable approach to discussing the use of second-person pronouns in Early Modern English. Brown and Gilman's 1960 paper presents a sensible explanation of how systems with casual and polite or formal pronouns have worked and still work and what factors may influence the choice of pronoun in a particular interaction. The authors also show that while the general ideas remain constant, there is a difference in pronoun use between systems that are static or under stress, as well as culturally conditioned differences concerning the perception of certain relationships or the importance of factors like power or age. This means that the rules governing the use of second-person pronouns in, say, modern German cannot be directly applied to Early Modern English, but that there definitely are some common themes. The authors' 1989 paper looks in more detail

at the motivations behind different politeness strategies in Shakespeare's plays and what factors influence that. Once more, they show that power and solidarity (or distance, as they call it now) can play a role in it, as well as the intrinsic riskiness of a given action. While they say that usually pronouns are not counted as relevant to politeness strategies, they are included in several of them, such as indirect requests. Since both the use of pronouns and certain politeness strategies rely on similar factors, they may not be entirely independent.

2.3. Wide-scope research

Within this section, articles and books which take a wide-scope approach to the topic of second-person pronouns in Early Modern English will be discussed. What is meant by a wide-scope approach is research that utilizes large amounts of source data to draw conclusions about the pronominal system, such as various corpora or collections of Early Modern English texts. In many cases, these publications could be considered to be quantitative research, but a number of them also include sections with a more qualitative analysis of some of the data, which is why this label was not selected in this thesis. As mentioned by Busse & Busse, corpus approaches are currently dominating this field of study, so it is vital to be aware of their methods and findings when discussing the topic (pp. 326-327).

In his voluminous publication entitled "Linguistic Variation in the Shakespeare Corpus: Morpho-syntactic variability of second-person pronouns," Busse (2002) presents an in-depth exploration of the topic on the basis of a corpus consisting of Shakespeare's plays in an attempt to give a comprehensive overview of how the pronouns are used, taking into account approaches such as sociolinguistics or Politeness Theory (pp. 2-3). He quickly reminds the reader that in Shakespeare's times, there were *you* and *thou* forms, the latter of which was later lost, and that their use was influenced by a variety of intra- and extra-linguistic factors, such as, for example, syntactic, phonological, or pragmatic constraints, as well as the social dynamic between the speakers (pp. 3-6). It is also important to remember that there was not only variation between *you* and *thou* but also between the *ye* and *you* forms, as well as *thy* and *thine* (pp. 4, 7). As for the reliability of the sources, the author notes that this variation "could quite purposefully be used as means for social, stylistic, rhetorical, etc. variation" and "Shakespeare was keenly aware of the effects of this variability" (p. 10). In his review of previous research, Busse notes that much of old research on Shakespeare is not very credible due to the methods that were used, but that there is also plenty of new

sources (pp. 15-17). He mentions in detail the writings of Brown and Gilman, summarized in this thesis in the previous section (pp. 17-22). He also mentions Calvo's 1992 paper, which will be included in the following section on narrow-scope research (pp. 31-33). From this review, it is clear to the author that the resources for Early Modern English are not plentiful but that the plays are not truthful representations of spoken language (pp. 26-27). For example, the use of *thou* in trials and depositions is quite dramatically different than in plays (pp. 30-31). From a practical standpoint, Busse stresses the importance of distinguishing between *you* used towards singular and plural referents (p. 30).

In his quantitative analysis, Busse takes the genre into account and aims to compare Shakespeare's use of pronouns to that of other playwrights to determine if it is within some norm. It is worth noting that not all papers apply the same division of plays into genres, so a direct comparison of results may not always be possible (pp. 37-38). Most corpora do not have a built-in distinction between singular and plural *you.* From the one that does, it has been estimated that 20% of the instances of that pronoun refer to multiple people, a percentage which was used to estimate the number of singular tokens of this pronoun in the entire Shakespeare corpus that the author uses (pp. 40-42). It appears that the later the play is, the more *you* forms are used in it, and any deviations from that pattern can be attributed to the genre, uncertain time of writing, or an unusual subject matter (pp. 46-48). Busse compares his results to those of others and concludes that they predominantly agree with him, but that plays, in comparison with other sources, overrepresent *thou* forms and that the preference for it may stem from the author's personal attitude or birthplace (pp. 49-52, 57).

The author then moves on to more specific analyses, many of which still rely on quantitative data. He tests whether there is a difference in pronoun distribution in verse and prose parts of the plays. The verse vs. prose distinction is a discourse marker, with powerful characters using verse and non-powerful – prose; the change between the two modes can highlight certain elements of the plots or features of characters. Because of the association of the modes with the status of the character, the assumption is that it could also correlate with pronoun usage (pp. 64-65). Busse finds that most *thou* forms can be found in verse, and most *you* – in prose. However, he remarks that prose and verse use and distribution are genre-dependent, with tragedies and histories having the most verse and comedies the least. Even with that factored in, some plays show the correlation, though some comedies stand out (pp. 66-70). In order to investigate that, a qualitative analysis was conducted, which showed that most of the unusual instances could be explained by plot-specific reasons (pp. 70-75). Overall, it seems that for given characters, an appropriate dramatic medium and address

forms are chosen by the author – and that perhaps prose shows more *you* forms because both those forms and prose are unmarked, or that both the mode and the pronoun choice serve as discourse markers (pp. 75-77).

Another issue that Busse discusses in his publication is that of nominal forms of address–nouns that are used when addressing someone, which can co-occur with pronouns. Since both forms of address and pronouns express the relationship between the interlocutors, it can be assumed that there may be a correlation in their use (p. 99). The author finds that when it comes to titles of courtesy, *you* is the most commonly co-occurring pronoun. The more high-ranking the title seems to be, the more of that pronoun it attracts, and only one title addressed to females has a very high ratio of *you* to *thou* (pp. 124-126). Not many terms of address indicating occupation can be found, and while they predominantly can be associated with *you* as well, it is important to note that the only one of them that at that time was a female-dominated profession – nurse – occurs mainly with *thou* (pp.131-132). Terms of family relationship generally occur with *you,* with the ones for siblings or cousins doing so more often than those for spouses – although there is still a slight prevalence of the more polite pronoun (pp. 146-147). As for the generic terms of address, such as *boy*, the pronouns which best reflect the relation are indicated by the word itself – e.g., *boy* would occur with *thou,* as it implies someone in an inferior position, while *gentleman* would occur with *you,* as it implies someone of an equal or superior position, although there are nonstandard – ironic or emotional – uses as well (pp. 161-162). Terms of endearment show a clear affinity towards *thou;* however, they are not very numerous in the source material and also vary with regard to who they can be used towards (pp. 169-170). Terms of abuse are more numerous, and most of them co-occur with *thou* as well, though there are some that appear more commonly with *you* – and some of them can also occasionally be interpreted as terms of endearment (pp. 182-183). Busse organizes the classes of terms of address into a spectrum ranging from those most commonly occurring with *you* to those most commonly occurring with *thou,* this order being: courtesy, occupation, family, generic, abuse, endearment. He also points out that these are not rigid categories and that the source material is not necessarily very representative of spoken Early Modern English (pp. 183-186).

The next chapter in Busse's work is concerned with the expressions *prithee* and *pray you.* According to the author, they have not been researched much and are most often considered to be a form of polite or earnest request or addressing the heavens (pp. 188-189). While a statistical analysis can reveal that their distribution is genre-dependent and that past 1600s their numbers start to dwindle, there are too few occurrences of these expressions for

a quantitative analysis to be of much more use (pp. 189-193). It seems that the decisive factors when it comes to using these forms are the same as choosing an appropriate pronoun – the social distance between the interlocutors. Both forms seem to be equally polite, and *prithee* occurs more often with terms of friendship, affection, or endearment but can sometimes also be used in a condescending tone (pp. 193-198). A certain degree of grammaticalization can also be noted when it comes to *prithee*, as it sometimes co-occurs with *you* as the pronoun of address (pp. 203-204). It is unclear why the form *pray you* fell out of use, but it seems like it was supplanted by *please* (pp. 206-211).

Busse also investigates the potential role that grammatical constraints may play in the choice between the two second-person singular pronouns. He recaps that previous research has shown *thou* to occur with closed-class verbs, and there may be more factors still, aside from the already mentioned pragmatic and sociolinguistic ones (pp. 213-215). However, the author finds no statistically significant correlation between the choice of pronouns and the type of verb (pp. 215-216). *Thou* and its forms seem to be often deleted from questions, which may be for phonological reasons. There is hardly any data for imperatives, but from the little that there is, it can be concluded that *you* was the unmarked form for it, and *thou* would be used for empathetic tone or metrical purposes when it comes to plays. Overall, the extralinguistic phenomena seem to be much more important for the choice of pronoun (pp. 217-221).

In the penultimate chapter of the volume, the role of the form *ye* of the pronoun *you* is discussed. It is also a rarely researched topic, but, as the author notes, it seems like the distinction between the two forms was not functional in Shakespeare's times (pp. 249-250). The reasons for this may include phonological and syntactic factors, such as the confusing pronunciations of the weak forms of both, and while contemporaneous grammars report the use of both forms, the literary sources do not show any consistent pattern of usage (pp. 250-256). The Shakespeare corpus shows that the instances of *you* heavily outnumber *ye*. It seems that the form was somewhat more often used in plural contexts (pp. 256-259). Other corpora show that *ye* was restricted to fixed phrases – for instance, many of the *ye* tokens appear in exclamations – or that the rate at which it was used depended on the writer, where social stratification may have played a more prominent role. Overall, drama seems to be more conservative in this regard (pp. 259-265, 270-271). There also appears to be evidence for the usage of the form in the plays being dependent on the character, with upper-class ones being more likely to use a *ye* form, and it is generally more common in older plays, histories, and tragedies (pp. 271-276).

In his conclusions, Busse recaps and summarizes the findings of the previous chapters. He takes the lower relative frequency of *thou* – 7 to 10 – to mean that it is the marked form, with *you* being unmarked (p. 283). He reports that *thou* forms are most common in histories and the least common in comedies (with the exception of romances, which are more akin to tragedies when it comes to pronoun use). Another division of the plays can be made on a chronological basis, with the tipping point being at 1598, where the plays after that year show more uses of *you* than *thou* (pp. 283-284). While a part of this seems to be dependent on the playwright's style, the characteristics of the genre also influence the choice. For example, plays featuring more upper-class characters may be more conservative with grammar rules, ad it was the middle and the lower class that powered the change (p. 284). When it comes to the blank verse versus prose distinction, *thou* forms are dominant in the former, and *you* in the latter (pp. 284-286). Nouns of address and pronouns are correlated, with respectful nouns being tightly connected to *you* – titles of honor, courtesy, occupation, and family relations fall into this category, while *thou* is preferred with generic terms of address, terms of abuse, and terms of endearment (pp. 286-287). There is no evidence for intralinguistic factors in the choice of pronouns (pp. 287-288). Though infrequent, *pray you* and *prithee* phrases do appear in the plays (pp. 289-290). *Thy* is a much more common form than *thine* and does not seem to be phonotactically conditioned anymore; this chapter, similarly to the one on pronouns in Shakespeare's sonnets, is not recounted, as it seems to be of marginal interest to this thesis (pp. 290-291). The rarest pronoun form in the corpus is *ye,* which is primarily used in exclamations and imperatives, but which had been almost entirely removed from the language by Shakespeare's times (pp. 291-292).

Overall, Busse presents an extremely comprehensive discussion of many aspects of the Early Modern English second-person pronoun usage. He asserts that there is no evidence for any grammatical conditioning in the choice of pronouns. He discusses the differences between genres and styles when it comes to quantitative discussions and also investigates the possible reasons for those differences. He discovers that nouns of address are tightly bound to pronoun choices and can reveal a lot about what interpersonal factors determine the correct pronoun. Busse also investigates some infrequent forms and expressions connected to pronouns, as they are also technically instances of the occurrence of those pronouns. While the amount of work that went into each chapter is staggering, and the evidence is overwhelming, there are, naturally, some aspects that the author did not take into account, such as, for example, gender-related differences. Busse is, however, also aware of

the shortcomings of a purely corpus-based study and skillfully merges that approach with case studies.

In a chapter in a volume on address term systems, Busse (2003) once more looks at the nominal forms of address. This chapter reports on the same data as can be found in Busse's previous volume but in a slightly more comprehensible way. His assumption is that address pronouns used with vocative nouns reflect the position that those nouns indicate: for example, titles of respect should attract *you*, and terms of abuse – *thou* (pp. 193-195). In his analysis, the author divided the nouns into the categories of titles of courtesy, terms of occupation, family relationship, generic terms of address, terms of endearment, and terms of abuse, not unlike the ones in his volume discussed previously in this section (p. 196). As for the titles of courtesy, most co-occur with *you,* and the ones that do not do it as clearly can be explained away by having slightly different implications of social status or being likely to occur with emotional address (pp. 197-198, 204-206). When it comes to terms of family relationships, there is no clear-cut dominant pronoun, which may be because these terms can be used regardless of the social status of the speakers, both by nobility and the commoners, but there is a tendency to use them with *you* unless the situation involves strong emotions (pp. 199, 208-209). Terms of abuse mostly occur with *thou*, though there are exceptions that may be linked to more light-hearted usage of some of the nouns (pp. 202-203, 212-214). Vocatives referring to occupation collocate with *you*, with the exception of "nurse," but they are not very numerous in the corpus (pp. 206-207). Terms of endearment, which are also not very well represented in the data, mostly co-occur with *thou* (pp. 211-212). Generic terms of address are quite a broad category, where the terms that reflect some sort of social distance or status collocate with *you,* while those used towards children or servants – with *thou* (pp. 209-211). Overall, there seems to be a strong correlation between the choice of pronoun and noun of address. This, in general, agrees with the tenets of Politeness Theory, but there are some uses that it cannot explain as it is too rigid. Additionally, genre seems to influence pronoun distribution, with comedies showing many more *you* forms (pp. 214-215). While this chapter presents the findings in a neat and tidy way, one could have hoped that it would have presented some new data or a different angle of analysis from Busse's previous work. Nevertheless, it is a solid piece of research outlining the collocation patterns between specific nouns and pronouns of address.

Some other evidence for the use of Early Modern English pronouns comes from Hope's (1993) paper, in which he investigates sources other than drama. He acknowledges that plays are not a faithful representation of speech and instead turns to court depositions.

The author recounts the premises of the power and solidarity model of pronoun use but points to the fact that it was established on the basis of these less faithful sources (pp. 84-85). Nevertheless, even the depositions are not entirely true to the Early Modern English reality, as there is proof of some of them having been tampered with or of the account of some event varying from witness to witness (pp. 90-91). Many instances of nonreciprocal pronoun usage can be found in depositions, as well as instances of emotionally motivated pronoun shifts, though those are less common than in drama (pp. 86-90). It appears that *you* is the neutral pronoun in the depositions, even in anger. *Thou* requires some special motivation and is common, for example, on deathbed. There are also situations where *thou* would be predicted, but is not used, hinting at a trend that would culminate with the loss of that pronoun (pp. 91-92). The author concludes that only some parts of the power and solidarity model are attested for, such as emotionally motivated pronoun use, while others – like gender-based asymmetry or lower-class reciprocal *thou* – are not. In comparison, plays appear to be more conservative in their pronoun use since there it is not always clear that *thou* is a marked form (pp. 94-97). Hope's article clashes with the findings based solely on plays, providing proof for the claim that drama is not a reliable source of spoken language – something that many of the researchers are painfully aware of. The core ideas seem to hold up, though: *you* is less marked than *thou,* there are both symmetric and asymmetric relations when it comes to the pronoun use, and it can fluctuate depending on the emotional state of the speakers.

Walker, in his 2007 book, presents a mixed-approach analysis that combines the sources – utilizing both drama and depositions, as well as transcripts of court proceedings, all taken from the "Corpus of English Dialogues"; this choice was made because a lot of the work on Early Modern English pronouns was done on plays, and Walker intends to focus on other sources, but still compare them to drama to get a clear picture of the differences between the two. The author aims to determine the importance of various intra- and extralinguistic factors (pp. 1-2). He does acknowledge that even though depositions and trial transcripts are closer to spoken language, they cannot be treated as fully representative of speech (pp. 14-18). The author recounts the current consensus in the field to be that high status was associated with *you* and low – with *thou,* and that the greater the social distance or the level of formality was, the more likely it was that the first of the two pronouns would be used (p. 2). The trend to use the plural pronoun as a polite form of the singular one began in English in the 13th century; in the 15th century, singular *you* became fully established, and by the 16th century, it was the standard with a few minor exceptions, such as the lower class (pp. 39-40).

The analyzed data was classified according to a set of parameters that were fitting to the period that the sources were from. For instance, biological sex was chosen as a classifier, although characters disguised as the opposite sex would be addressed differently, which is more related to gender roles (pp. 21-22). Age-wise, the speakers were divided into categories such as child, youth, adult, and old adult (pp. 22-23). Rank was a problematic factor, as throughout the 200-year period in question it was undergoing some change. Overall, two groups were formed, non-commoners and commoners, with subdivisions that attempted to reflect the hierarchy within these groups: non-commoners included categories such as nobility, royalty, and high clergy or wealthy traders and professionals, while commoners could be subdivided into poorer farmers and rural artisans or unemployed and criminals, among other categories (pp. 23-28). Since women in the Early Modern English period had little agency, their status was determined by that of their husband or father unless they were working (pp. 28-30). Unlike age, rank was much easier to assign to characters in drama, as there is much more information available on them in that regard (p. 36).

The author delves a bit deeper into the previous research, presenting the advantages and disadvantages of the power and solidarity model, which does not account for some pronoun uses but is credible in most situations. Pure Politeness Theory approach does not explain everything either, as it assumes that all acts promote social harmony, which is not the case (pp. 40-46). Dividing the pronouns into marked and unmarked also does not account for all the peculiarities (pp. 46-48). The author leans toward the idea that these ideas explain the motivations behind the initial choice of the pronoun but that any later fluctuations are micro-pragmatic (p. 48). The existing research into trials and depositions shows that *thou* was the marked or affective pronoun, while the research into letters shows that pronouns could change depending on the topic in the letter and that *thou* was used to mark intimacy or positive feelings (pp. 54-59). Grammarians of the time rarely seem to have recorded these uses, instead maintaining that *thou* is the singular, and *you* is the plural second-person pronoun, though there are instances where they do remark on their use in the singular or to show specific emotions (pp. 59-61).

What is of particular interest in Walker's book in the context of this thesis is the chapter about drama and comedy. In this case, a variety of authors were featured, with three plays representing every period of roughly forty years, so as to get a good idea of the trends in pronoun usage in the period between 1560 and 1760. All of the samples were roughly of the same length (p. 173). Overall, there is a decline in the use of *thou,* and while males tend to use it more than females, the difference is not statistically significant. What does play a

role is age, as the youth sometimes use *thou* as an in-group marker, while their elders tend to use it to address them (pp. 175-180). The lower the rank of a person, the more *thou* forms they receive, though this is also a declining trend, although there are exceptions from that around the 1600-1640 period (pp. 183-187). There are also a few special cases that complicate the picture a bit: asides, soliloquies, apostrophes, and characters in disguise. The first three share the characteristic of not being intended to be heard by the addressee or to be replied to, and they often involve emotions or a supernatural recipient, so *thou* is a very common pronoun there (pp. 191-192). Characters in disguise are problematic as sometimes it is hard to decide if the pronoun choice is motivated by their real or fake identity (which may differ in rank and familiarity) (p. 197). Overall, the trend seems for the selection of *thou* to become more and more motivated by emotion as time progresses (pp. 194-196). There also seems to be no proof of *thou* being an unmarked pronoun in lower classes (pp. 208, 234-235). All of these statements hold for the pre- and post-1600 periods, which are relevant for this thesis. A pragmatic microanalysis revealed that in interactions, sex and rank are important factors, which seems to align with the results of the macro-analysis. However, the micro-analysis also showed that family relationships, social distance, and emotions influence pronoun selection, and in some cases, specific pronoun usage is tightly connected with a particular character (p. 232).

Similarly to Busse (2002), Walker (2007) investigates the potential intralinguistic factors determining pronoun choice. The author's analysis found no proof for *thou* occurring significantly more often with closed class verbs or private verbs (pp. 240-248, 256-257). The syntactic function does not appear to play a role in this choice either (p. 260). It seems that when it comes to choosing between *you* and *thou*, extralinguistic factors play a much more significant role (p. 256). The two most obsolete pronoun forms are *ye* and the determiner *thine* (p. 262). Both appear to only be used in certain collocations or fixed expressions (pp. 262-267). The fixed forms *pray you* and *prithee* appear to follow the same pattern of usage as independent pronouns, and this should be treated as variants of them in the data, i.e., their appearing in these collocations does not influence the pattern of their usage (pp. 270-271, 278-279). Imperatives tend to be sometimes followed by a *ye* or *thee*, polite phrases – unsurprisingly – tend to collocate with *you,* and there are also formulaic trial expressions using *thou* (pp. 279, 281, 283).

Walker summarizes his findings by stating that the patterns for the decline of *thou* vary depending on the genre, with plays showing significant declines after 1640 and 1720 (pp. 288-289). The frequency of *thou* in drama was higher than in trial transcripts but lower

than in depositions (p. 291). This could have been due to the differing formality levels (p. 292). Reciprocal *you* among upper ranks of the society is attested for, but there is not enough evidence to draw conclusions about the pronouns used among the lower classes. As for the non-reciprocal usage, upper classes were addressed with *you* and lower ones with *thou*, but the latter usage decreased with time. Overall, women used fewer *thou* pronouns. Shifting pronoun usage could have been motivated by emotions, and that could also override any other factors in pronoun choice (pp. 291-293). There is very little evidence that any intralinguistic factors other than fixed expressions influenced the selection of pronouns, and overall power relations seemed to have been the most influential (pp. 293-294).

While not all sections of Walker's book have been discussed here in detail, his findings are very interesting. While in most aspects, such as reciprocal *you*, power relations, the decline in the use of *thou*, emotion-driven pronoun shifts, etc., his findings align with those of others, he finds little to no evidence for the reciprocal *thou* of lower classes. From a statistical perspective, sex does not seem to play a role, but it appears to be important in the micro-analysis of his data. Walker's analysis is very comprehensive and covers a broad spectrum of genres and quite a long time period, as per the intention behind the research. Because of the way that the sources were selected, Walker's book does not directly answer questions about Shakespeare's use of pronouns, but its findings can be compared to those stemming from an analysis of Shakespeare's works in order to determine if his usage was in line with the standards of his times.

Like Busse, Walker also contributed a chapter to the volume entitled "Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems," and similarly, the data provided here is not so different from his monograph. The difference here, though, is that Walker's book was published after this one, so instead of reiterating some of his findings, he presents research that preceded it. In the chapter, he investigates plays and dialogues from the "Corpus of English Dialogues" from two periods: 1560-1600 and 1680-1720 to compare the use of pronouns in the two genres and analyze their development; additionally, he aims to investigate the role of gender in pronoun selection as more contemporarily women have been shown to be more polite as a result of their social position (p. 309). Walker finds that in the late 16th century, *thou* was a marked form and was used by lower ranks, while *you* was used by upper classes, and in situations of status difference, pronoun use did not have to be reciprocal. In the second period, *thou* was used very rarely to address people of lower rank, but it persisted as a mark of male camaraderie among upper classes (p. 311). A pilot study also showed that in depositions women tended to use more polite language (p. 312). In the

analysis itself, instances of the use of *you* as plural or impersonal, as well as instances of quoting it from other literary sources, such as poetry or the Bible, were excluded (p. 313). Different tendencies and ratios in pronoun use occur in the two genres in discussion; in fact, Walker suggests that a threefold division may be warranted, as depositions on their own follow the same pattern as drama, and it is only trials that continue to show high ratios of *thou* usage (p. 315). These differences may stem from the different subject matters and situations described in these sources and from the fact that many occurrences of *thou* in trial transcripts are formulaic expressions (pp. 316-319). Within depositions, which show a decline in *thou* forms, the use of that pronoun is related to the low social status of the speaker or the conversation pertaining to some supernatural beings. There are also instances of contemptuous or intimate uses of *thou* (p. 319-321). Comedies also show a decline, and *thou* in the first period is used to address those of lower status and sometimes reciprocally in the lower classes, but also to show contempt. In the second period, *thou* is marginal and only occurs when extreme emotions are involved (pp. 321-322). Walker also analyzed handbooks, where *thou* occurs more in the second period, but that may simply be due to the subject matter of the dialogues presented in them (pp. 322-324). Overall, the genres where expressive use of *thou* is common display a higher ratio of that pronoun, while other genres only feature it as a tool to show superiority or contempt (p. 324). As for the gender differences, *you* was preferred by both genders, but while men continued to use *thou* into the 17th century, women did not, and there is a clear imbalance in terms of what pronouns they used to address each other; this is especially statistically significant in constructed dialogues (pp. 326-328). Some of the findings presented in this chapter by Walker seem to go somewhat against his later research, as here he finds gender to be statistically significant, while later, he steps away from that idea. This does not necessarily mean that either of his publications is wrong, but it may be due to a different selection of source materials, which only proves how difficult it is to assert anything about pronoun use in Early Modern English with a high degree of certainty.

While the wide-scope research does prove that there are some elements that can be taken as constants, such as the decrease of the use of *thou*, reciprocal *you* of upper classes, nonreciprocal use of pronouns in case of a status difference, emotion-driven uses of *thou*, or the lack of any significant influence of intralinguistic phenomena on pronoun choice, there is no uniform verdict on how big of a role gender played in the selection of pronouns, as there is both evidence for it being statistically important or not (though it seems that in qualitative analysis it usually plays some role), or on what the standard reciprocal pronoun

of lower classes was. The results differ based on what sources are used, but the researchers are aware of that and select their source material in a fashion befitting their hypothesis: there are those who aim to draw conclusions about Early Modern English in general and those who simply want to investigate Shakespeare's use of pronouns. In general, these findings are in line with the generally accepted truths about Early Modern English recounted in one of the previous sections, but they go into much more detail and sometimes present evidence that goes against them, as is the case with the reciprocal pronoun of lower classes.

2.4. Narrow-scope research

While the majority of the research summarized in the previous section utilized both quantitative, corpus-based and qualitative approaches, not all analyses of Early Modern English, particularly Shakespeare's variation of it, take into account such a broad scope of data. In particular, researchers who prioritize investigating the use of second-person singular pronouns in context prefer to limit their investigation to only a few plays. Within this literature review those have been classified as narrow-scope research, as they need not be purely qualitative, but they simply analyze smaller samples.

A prime example of such narrow-scope research is Calvo's (1992) paper on the pronoun use in "As You Like It." Her opinion is that none of the models that have attempted to explain the Early Modern English pronominal paradigm are fully successful, as they fail to account for rapid or seemingly spontaneous pronoun changes within one dialogue or, even if providing some rationale for that, they cannot explain all of the shifts occurring within the play (pp. 5, 7-8, 12-16). Calvo's claim, backed up by examples from the play, is that aside from the meanings of power and emotional expression, the pronouns serve as "social markers signaling a negotiation of social identities," meaning that they are used to define and negotiate the subjective relationship that the speakers perceive to have with one another – pronouns used in such a way make the social status and relationships more mutable than what other models account for (pp. 15-16). A notion related to that is the use of the pronouns as in-group markers. The selection of a particular pronoun may be motivated by the desire to indicate that one considers the interlocutor a member of their group or to highlight that it is not the case. While Calvo admits that this is somewhat related to positive and negative politeness strategies, she sets it apart from being purely that, as it is also a way of modeling or negotiating some sort of a social identity (pp. 16-22). Finally, the author notices that there is one more factor that may explain some of the unexpected pronoun shifts, namely the

pronouns being used as discourse markers. According to her, whenever a new, relevant subject is brought up in the text, there very likely co-occurs a shift to the *you* pronoun, which may be characteristic of the genre, not necessarily the pronominal system in general (pp. 22-26). Calvo's paper is a detailed investigation into the factors determining the pronoun usage in Shakespeare's "As You Like It," and her explanations for the previously mysterious pronoun shifts highlight the importance of understanding the dialogues in a social context, which is not necessarily fixed, but which can evolve and be renegotiated as the plot of the play progresses.

Another such piece of research was written by Joan Mulholland (1987). She claims that the reasons for choosing a singular *you* or *thou* are not entirely clear and that they can perhaps be seen as a system of marked and unmarked pronouns with a variety of factors influencing the choice of the marked one, which she intends to investigate by analyzing two plays, a comedy and a tragedy, namely "Much Ado About Nothing" and "King Lear" (pp. 153-154). In this case, though, the author is not only trying to investigate the pragmatic basis for pronoun selection but also conducts a small-scale investigation of the grammatical surroundings of the pronouns, hoping to discover if there are any intralinguistic phenomena that influence it; because of this division genitive forms of pronouns were not taken into account (pp. 154-155). In "Much Ado About Nothing," there seem to not be any *ye* forms, and the ratio of *thee/thou* and *you* is that of 2:5, a proportion which holds across most grammatical contexts, with the exception of preceding lexical verbs, but according to the author it is difficult to find a grammatical reason for it, and the difference may not be significant. As for phrases such as *pray you, pray thee, thanke you,* and *thanke thee,* the pronoun distribution is similar, indicating that they are not special in that way (pp. 155-156). In "King Lear," the ratio of the pronouns is 1:1, a staggering difference from the comedy. However, Mulholland is hesitant to draw any conclusions from it, as she is unsure if the differences would persist if a whole corpus was analyzed (pp. 157-158). There are differences in how many times different contexts appeared in the two plays, but she attributes that to the nature of the genres (p. 156). The author notes that it seems that the differences are more register-based than motivated by the grammatical context (p. 158). For example, in both plays, upper-class men use reciprocal *you;* they also use it to women of the same status and to superiors. Addressing social inferiors sometimes elicits *thou,* though it is by no means a rule with no exceptions. Men addressing socially inferior women used both pronouns as well, but this category is more complicated, as they are usually relatives. Women addressing women inferior to them mostly used *thou.* While there are exceptions to

it, it would appear that *you* was the standard, unmarked pronoun (pp. 159-161). Mulholland herself treats these findings as inconclusive, as a much larger study would be needed to make more general claims about the pronominal system (p. 161). This chapter, contrary to the paper discussed previously, reveals the shortcomings of a narrow-scope approach, as it is oftentimes impossible to generalize the findings from it. Nevertheless, if the aim of a study is not to discover the rules governing an entire pronominal system but to describe the pronoun use in a specific source, it is more than warranted. It can also offer some hints as to what may be expected from a larger study or serve as proof that not all texts belonging to a certain genre are homogenous.

From the same volume comes one more chapter which discusses the use of second-person pronouns in Shakespeare's works, this time in "Richard III." Barber (1987) performs a more detailed analysis of particular scenes, trying to find proof of *thou* and its related forms – subjective, objective, possessive, reflexive, etc. – being the reciprocal pronoun of lower classes (p. 163). The first scene he analyzes is that of Clarence's murder, which is committed by two representatives of the lower class. The interactions of characters in the scene leading up to the deed seem to follow the dynamic of power, and the two Murderers address each other with *thou.* They address Clarence, their superior in rank, with *you* unless he angers them (pp. 164-167). The one odd pronoun choice out is present only in some editions of the play, so it may be a printing error (pp. 167-168). In Richard's interactions with Anne and Elizabeth, some unexpected pronoun use occurs, but it can be explained through emotional use, such as *thou* of contempt or intimacy (pp. 169-170). One more situation in which a king is addressed with *thou* is when it is the spirit of a king (p. 168). Barber also finds in the play instances of using *thou* in anger (similarly to the one used by the Murderers to Clarence) and a mock-polite *you*, which showcases the variety of meanings that could be conveyed through the pronoun choice in a particular context; however, pronoun-switching towards a lower-rank addressee does not seem to cause much offense (pp. 171-172). The author also investigates the distribution of pronouns together with vocatives, finding that *lord*, *madam*, *sir*, and *brother* often occur with *you*, while *cousin* and *lady* have a more mixed distribution, and *fellow* occurs predominantly with *thou* (p. 175). Barber also asserts that any correlations between the distribution of pronouns and the grammatical context are not statistically significant and that even if they were, perhaps the grammatical construction would also be motivated by social factors, like the pronoun (p. 176). The author concludes that in "Richard III," there is a standard second-person singular pronoun, as the two occur at a roughly 1:1 ratio, and it appears that depending on the character in the play, a different pronoun may be

the standard (with the lower class characters having *thou* as the standard, and upper class – *you*). This ratio, however, may be skewed because of the highly emotional contents of the play, and this conclusion should not be generalized to Early Modern English in its entirety (pp. 176-177). Barber's analysis reveals precisely the same shortcomings of a narrow-scope approach as the previous chapter did when it comes to drawing general conclusions. However, since the findings – or at least conclusions – of these two chapters can be somewhat compared, it is interesting to see how the genre and the subject matter may influence the choice of pronouns in the play.

Another chapter that discusses pronouns in some of Shakespeare's tragedies comes from "Diachronic Perspectives of Address Term Systems" and is concerned with "King Lear," "Othello," and "Hamlet." The author, Gabriella Mazzon (2003), begins by summarizing the commonly agreed upon rules of pronoun use in Early Modern English, identifying social distance and affective elements as the two most commonly identified variables. She claims that *thou* is used for the extremes of each spectrum (i.e., to talk to inferiors or God, or to speak with love or hatred), while *you* takes up the space between those. Because of that, *you* is considered to be the unmarked, or neutral, form, though the evidence for that is not overwhelmingly convincing (p. 225). Variation in pronoun use can is often attributed to social or affective variables, poetic reasons (such as fitting the meter or rhyme), or intralinguistic factors (fixed phrases, co-occurrence with specific verbs or nouns of address), but research on this is either overly specific or vague (pp. 225-226). As far as Politeness Theory is concerned, many studies exclude pronouns as they are difficult to account for. Others claim that they are essential to politeness as they are unavoidable elements that indicate the attitudes of the speakers (pp. 226-227). Mazzon brings up the notions of discernment, meaning following the known rules, and volition, meaning consciously choosing certain forms as factors in pronoun choice (p. 228). She also asserts that on the basis of the existing body of research, a conclusion can be drawn that in Shakespeare's times, the pronoun system was complex, and pronoun choice was far from neutral to the interlocutor (p. 228). The author then identifies numerous types of relationships in the plays that she investigates and patterns of pronoun use in them. Within married couples, *you* is used as a sign of respect, and *thou* as a sign of affection, disillusion, or contempt (pp. 228-229). Between parents and children, predominantly nonreciprocal pronouns are used, with parents being addressed with *you*, and children with *thou*, with some exceptions (p. 230). Siblings usually utilize *you* with some affectionate pronoun switches; this may have to do with the status of the characters in the plays that were investigated (p.

230). Since other family relationships are even more distanced, *you* is the preferred pronoun; an exception to this is the relationship between Claudius and Hamlet, as it is very often highly emotional, but, nevertheless, the polite pronoun seems to be the default there (pp. 230-231). For interactions between superordinates and their subordinates, *you* seems to be the regular pronoun of address, with *thou* being determined by affective factors. However, the bigger the social gap is, the higher the chance for a non-reciprocal pair of pronouns, i.e., for the subordinate to be addressed with *thou.* The latter applies well to master and servant relationships, though there are not many examples of those (pp. 232-235). Peer relationships are also not well represented in the plays, and many factors play a role in the pronoun choice there, such as potential family relationships, status, age, etc. Upper-class peers usually employ *you*, with the exception of emotional interactions, middle classes show variation, but it may be plot-related, while lower classes use many *thou* forms, which indicates that it may be a social marker (pp. 235-237). In courting, *you* forms are predominantly used, with *thou* appearing in very intimate or emotional situations (pp. 237-238). *Thou* is used when addressing people who are dead or otherwise not present and in self-address (pp. 238-240). Mazzon claims that this data proves that pronoun switching is connected to politeness, not only to heightened emotional states. According to her, it is a "social device," always relevant to the context, reflecting the degree of familiarity and power that is sometimes used consciously. She also thinks that there are certain trends in pronoun use that can be identified (pp. 240-241). Mazzon rightfully notices that the middle ground between narrow- and wide-scope research exists and also understands the limitations of her investigation, but her point is instead to prove that pronouns are relevant in the discussion of politeness, and she remarks that pronoun choice need not be a subconscious decision, but that it can be intentionally utilized in interactions. In addition, her data generally supports the agreed-upon rules of pronoun use.

Within the same volume, Stein (2003) discusses the use of pronouns in "King Lear" and "As You Like It," a tragedy and a comedy. This selection was made since the cast and themes of the two plays are comparable, and they only differ in the genre. They were also written only roughly five years apart (p. 259). According to the author, pronouns are "subtle linguistic indicators of social relations and the management of emotional states at a time," and his aim is to analyze their use as such in the two plays (pp. 251-252). He defines the difference between the marked and unmarked pronouns as the "active contrast" that occurs when the marked form is selected; he agrees that *you* is commonly treated as the unmarked form, although the evidence for that can be contested (p. 252). In the author's view, the

standard pronoun choice is governed by power and solidarity semantics, while the spontaneous shifts are understood in terms of markedness (pp. 252-253). The approach in the study is statistical or corpus-based, but since it involves defining every dyad, or pronoun exchange, in terms of the status of the speakers, the data cannot be too voluminous; some case studies were also included (p. 254). Overall, *you* seems to be the dominant form, though *thou* is still used to express a certain social dynamic; when addressing social inferiors, the latter pronoun is the unmarked form, and vice versa (p. 255). Among the upper class, *you* seems to be the reciprocal pronoun, and among lower classes – *thou*. People in power seem to have more of a right to use a marked *thou* in emotional interactions within their social class (p. 257). Not enough examples of members of the middle class could be found in the sources; other than that, the division employed in the research was into sovereigns, aristocracy, servants of the court, lower classes, fools, and the insane; gender was not taken into account in this investigation (pp. 259-261). Stein finds that unmarked pronouns also carry connotations, such as the respect and polite distance of *you*; the marked versions can overlap in meaning and depend on the context, with *thou* being associated with "scorn, disapproval, complicity, affection, intimacy, respect" and *you* with "scorn, disapproval, formality, elevation, glorification" (p. 265). The author then moves on to a detailed discussion of what pronouns are used in what interactions, taking into account familial relations; these are not always reciprocal. The relations for which *you* is the unmarked pronoun include the following: sovereigns to sovereigns (regardless of family relations), children to their father, anyone addressing sovereigns, aristocrats to aristocrats (regardless of family relations), upper-class lovers, addressing children, servants addressing their superiors. *Thou* is the unmarked pronoun for servants to servants, superiors to servants, sovereigns to their inferiors, anyone to the insane, anyone to supernatural beings, or in apostrophes and self-address; all of these are discussed in detail for every class, e.g., what lovers from different social classes prefer, but generalizations can be made. It is unclear what the reciprocal pronoun for the lower classes is, as it differs in the two plays (with the tragedy using *you* and the comedy using *thou* in these contexts) (pp. 265-295). All the deviations from these rules can be explained, which implies that the marked forms were a salient way of expressing emotion (p. 296). It appears that around 30% of all the instances of pronoun use were marked pronouns of both kinds (p. 296). Stein also argues that the inconsistent pronoun use by lower classes may hint at the system rapidly changing at the time of writing of the plays (pp. 302-303). Stein's view of each of the pronouns being unmarked in some specific contexts sheds new light on the understanding of the pronominal system, marrying

the power/solidarity semantics with the markedness approach, as having two pronouns be marked or unmarked depending on the context fits in well with there being different pronouns of standard address for different social strata. The author's analysis of the address in different relationships is very thorough, even if also somewhat chaotically presented, but the sheer amount of data makes the presentation difficult. Once more, though, the status of the reciprocal pronoun of the lower class is not resolved.

What the narrow-scope research reveals is that both qualitative and quantitative methods can be applied to smaller samples. Instinctually this holds true for analyzing the pronouns in context, but it also works for statistical approaches that take into account more variables that have to be deduced from a closer reading of the text, such as age or social standing. Clearly, the choice of the source materials matters, as analyzing different plays yields slightly different results, for example, concerning issues such as the reciprocal pronoun among members of the lower class. Aside from that, most of the findings agree with the generally accepted paradigm. Many of the authors also present suggestions on how to fine-tune the existing theories to account for some non-standard pronoun use, such as it being an in-group marker or a consciously selected politeness element, which sheds new light on the interpretation of some interactions, where perhaps it was not just the heightened emotional state but also a conscious appeal to it that motivated a certain pronoun selection.

3. Pronoun use in As You Like It and Hamlet

3.1. Methods

In order to resolve some of the theoretical and methodological issues present in the prior studies done on the subject, a two-part inquiry was made on the basis of two plays by William Shakespeare, “As You Like It” and “Hamlet.” These texts were chosen in particular for a number of reasons: first of all, they were both composed in a similar time period (“As You Like It” is dated to 1599, and “Hamlet” between 1600 and 1601), which means that given the dynamic developments in the pronominal system in Shakespeare’s times, they would likely not represent two different stages in the development thereof, provided that the author adhered to the contemporaneous standards while writing them; the same holds true assuming that pronoun use in plays depended on the artist’s personal style, meaning that any differences must stem mainly from other sources (Busse, 2002, p. 43). Secondly, they

represent two different genres, which would allow for drawing some preliminary conclusions about the role that genre may play in the use of pronouns. Finally, both plays feature characters belonging to the upper class, and analogies can be drawn between some of them for the sake of a more qualitative comparison. The texts were sources from the Folger Shakespeare, where they are free to use for non-commercial purposes and where they can be obtained in a variety of formats, which is extremely useful when performing quantitative, computational inquiries ("Download Shakespeare's Plays, Sonnets, and Poems," n.d.). What is worth noting is that these texts have been edited with, for example, updated spelling. This should not have affected the pronoun distribution, but the edition is worth mentioning for the sake of comparing the results to other studies – as Blake (2002) mentions, different old editions could have different forms of pronouns in the same place in the text, so noting the edition is quite relevant (pp. 56-57).

The first, preparatory stage of this inquiry consisted of annotating the texts of the plays since, as mentioned before, both in Shakespeare's times and nowadays, the pronoun *you* can occur in singular and plural, and, in most cases, that can only be resolved in context. Only the *you* pronouns needed to be annotated, as *thou* does not have this ambiguity, and as no other elements were to undergo analysis. Despite there being prior research where the pronouns were annotated for more than just number (including, but not limited to, the gender, age, and social class of the speaker and addressee or addressees), it was decided that in this case, factors like these are better left off for the qualitative analysis, as they are numerous and not independent from each other. In addition, determining the social class of some characters or the level of familiarity between others seems to be highly subjective, given that it is done mainly on the basis of the text of the play itself, which does not always present in-depth descriptions of characters, so while it is possible to determine that for the heroes and heroines, it is much more challenging to do for characters who have less stage time. The following word forms were taken into account: *ye, you, your, yours, yourself,* and *yourselves.* These were annotated using one of the three possible tags: *_SG* for singular, *_PL* for plural, and *_UNK* where the interpretation is unclear. Given the fact that these judgments had to be passed based on the context and that it was not always clear whether the addressee was just one of the characters present in the scene or more of them, it needs to be kept in mind that any such annotation is influenced by the annotator's subjective perspective.

The quantitative analysis was performed utilizing the corpus analysis software AntConc. The version used was 3.40, as although there are newer releases of the program, they lack some of the tools (such as customized tag analysis) that were necessary for this

inquiry (Anthony, 2014). For the analysis of the annotated texts to be successful, the definition of a token was changed in the global settings of the program to allow for underscores to be counted as a part of a word so that *you_SG* and other such combinations would be parsed as singular words, not two separate words. In the tool preferences for the word list tool, a customized lemma list was loaded, which allowed for all the versions of a given pronoun to be counted together. Perhaps questionably, *prithee* was counted as a form of *thou* since it includes the pronoun *thee*, which would otherwise be excluded. The analogous construction for *you* is *pray you*, so there the pronoun is already separate. What remains is instances where only *pray* is used, with no pronoun, but since originally there is no pronoun there and this inquiry pertains to pronoun use, these were ignored. The annotated plays were loaded into the program separately in order to obtain counts for each play and together for total counts. AntConc's calculation of the total number of all tokens was also obtained for both plays for later use. Since the content of each play consists of more than just dialogues – names of the characters uttering the lines, didaskalia, and other miscellaneous elements, trimmed versions of the files were created, where everything that was not characters' utterances was removed.

Table 1. Lemmas and corresponding word forms used in AntConc.

LEMMA	WORD FORMS
you	ye, [you], your, yours, yourself, yourselves
you_SG	ye_SG, [you_SG], your_SG, yours_SG, yourself_SG, yourselves_SG
you_PL	ye_PL, [you_PL], your_PL, yours_PL, yourself_PL, yourselves_PL
you_UNK	ye_UNK, [you_UNK], your_UNK, yours_UNK, yourself_UNK, yourselves_UNK
thou	[thou], thee, thy, thine, thyself, prithee

The raw counts of pronouns and their forms were later normalized by the length of the text, since "Hamlet" is nearly 1.5 times longer than "As You Like It," so the absolute numbers would be misleading, and relative frequencies were necessary for good analysis. These frequencies were calculated as percentage frequencies, mostly in relation to the length of the entire play, but also respective to the count of all second person singular pronouns or all *you* forms, which will be described in more detail in the results section of this thesis. This was performed both for the full and trimmed versions of the texts. For certain selected

categories, chi-square tests (with the results being treated as statistically significant at $p < .05$). have been performed to evaluate their statistical significance. The results of that are reported in the discussion section and not in the results section, as the process has not been performed for all the results, only the ones that have been deemed worthy of further discussion.

For the more qualitative part, a selection within the source texts needed to be made. A more in-depth analysis of the social dynamics between every two speakers in the plays would have been beyond the scope of this thesis and would likely result in a lower quality discussion than focusing more on certain excerpts from the two plays. In order for the selected fragments to be comparable, it was decided that they should feature similar characters with similar dynamics. This would allow, once more, for a comparison between the genres and for a description of how this type of relationship is depicted by Shakespeare in terms of pronoun use. Thus, instead of selecting, for example, one act from each play (where the characters and their dynamics could differ widely), dialogues between the main, romantically involved characters were selected. For "As You Like It," this meant Rosalind and Orlando, and for "Hamlet" – the eponymous Hamlet and Ophelia. As pointed out in a later section, their dynamics are not identical, nor do the resolutions of their stories mirror each other, but they are both pairs of young, upper-class people who are romantically involved or courting each other throughout their interactions in the plays, meaning that they are analogous at least with regard to that.

The dialogues between these couples were manually selected from the annotated plays. They consist of the following sections: for "Hamlet", act 3, scene 1, lines 64-162, act 3, scene 2, lines 119-169, 173-175, 204, 247, 268-279, 287-290; for "As You Like It", act 1, scene 2, lines 161-165, 173-188, 190-191, 204, 244-247, 257, act 3, scene 2, lines 1-10, 301-443, act 4, scene 1, lines 33, 42-69, 72-131, 138-213, act 5, scene 2, lines 20-78, 110-113, 120-121, 124, act 5, scene 4, lines 9-10, 21, 121, 123, 127 (Shakespeare, 1600/2020, 1599/2015).

Any interaction between the two that occurred in the text was copied over, including the ones where there were more characters in the scene; however, those other characters' utterances were excluded for the quantitative analysis of the dialogues. Same as before, both a full version, including non-utterance elements, and a trimmed version was prepared for each play. These selected utterances were analyzed the same way that the whole plays were, using AntConc and the lemma list. Finally, comparisons were conducted between the obtained data, as well as a quantitative analysis of the interactions between Rosalind and

Orlando as well as Hamlet and Ophelia, where first they were characterized in terms of their social standing and the relationship with each other, and then the dialogues between them were reviewed, in context, with special attention being paid to what the predominant pronoun of address is, and under what circumstances they deviate from it. This analysis will be presented in the results section.

3.2. Results

The results obtained in the quantitative section of the thesis can be presented in tables, with raw as well as normalized counts. Overall, the full text of "Hamlet" consists of 32126 tokens, "As You Like It" – 23437, which sums up to 55563. Their trimmed versions are, respectively, 29760, 21446, and 51206 tokens long. The selected dialogues between Hamlet and Ophelia are 1345 tokens, between Orlando and Rosalind – 3295, and in total – 4640. After trimming, these are lowered to 1152, 3129, and 4281. These are the token counts that were used to normalize frequencies.

Table 2. Total word counts in all the files that were used in the study.

Document lengths			
	Hamlet	As You Like It	Total
Full text	32126	23437	55563
Trimmed text	29760	21446	51206
Dialogues	1328	3295	4623
Trimmed dialogues	1135	3129	4264

Frequencies expressed as percentages were rounded up to three places after the comma. Variants that did not occur at all were not listed, so any missing form should be assumed to either be not taken into account or to have appeared 0 times in all the texts – and that is the case with *ye*, which, despite being searched for, does not appear in these two plays. Due to their size, the full tables with all the counts can be found in the appendix. In those tables, counts for specific lemmas have been marked with a grey background. Smaller tables containing only that information, without specific word-form counts, have been included within this section. Separate tables depict other calculations, such as the ratios between different pronouns, which aim to put the counts into perspective; while the tables of counts

have been created for every version of the file (full text, trimmed text, full dialogues, trimmed dialogues), the ratios for both versions of dialogues files are displayed in one table, as they do not differ at all, and the only difference between the full-text versions in that regard stems from the fact that there is a *you* token in the title of the play – "As You Like It."

Table 3. Selected raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the full versions of the plays.

Full-text versions						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	643	2.001%	642	2.739%	1287	2.313%
all you_PL variants	144	0.448%	68	0.290%	212	0.382%
all you_UNK variants	34	0.106%	29	0.124%	63	0.113%
all you variants	821	2.556%	739	3.153%	1560	2.808%
all thou variants	272	0.865%	313	1408%	608	1.094%
all singular pronouns	921	2.867%	972	4.147%	1893	3.407%

Table 4. Composition of certain pronoun categories in full versions of the plays, percentage-wise.

Full-text versions			
	Hamlet	As You Like It	Total
% thou variants in all singular pronouns	30.185%	33.950%	32.118%
% you_PL variants in all you pronouns	17.540%	9.202%	13.560%
% you_PL and you_UNK variants in all you pronouns	21.681%	13.126%	17.628%
% you_PL variants in all you pronouns except UNK	18.297%	9.577%	14.162%

Table 5. Selected raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the trimmed plays.

Trimmed text versions						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	643	2.161%	642	2.994%	1285	2.509%
all you_PL variants	144	0.484%	68	0.317%	212	0.414%
all you_UNK variants	34	0.114%	28	0.131%	62	0.121%
all you variants	821	2.759%	739	3.441%	1559	3.045%
all thou variants	278	0.934%	330	1.539%	608	1.187%
all singular pronouns	921	3.095%	972	4.532%	1893	3.697%

Table 6. Composition of certain pronoun categories in trimmed plays, percentage-wise.

Trimmed text versions			
	Hamlet	As You Like It	Total
% thou variants in all singular pronouns	30.185%	33.950%	32.118%
% you_PL variants in all you pronouns	17.540%	9.214%	13.598%
% you_PL and you_UNK variants in all you pronouns	21.681%	13.008%	17.575%
% you_PL variants in all you pronouns except UNK	18.297%	9.577%	14.162%

Table 7. Selected raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the untrimmed dialogues.

Full dialogues						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	38	2.861%	141	4.279%	179	3.872%
all you_PL variants	10	0.753%	3	0.091%	13	0.281%
all you_UNK variants	2	0.151%	0	0.000%	2	0.043%
all you variants	50	3.765%	144	4.370%	194	4.196%

all thou variants	11	0.828%	23	0.759%	34	0.779%
all singular pronouns	49	3.690%	166	5.038%	215	4.651%

Table 8. Selected raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the trimmed dialogues.

Trimmed dialogues						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	38	3.348%	141	4.506%	179	4.198%
all you_PL variants	10	0.881%	3	0.096%	13	0.308%
all you_UNK variants	2	0.176%	0	0.000%	2	0.047%
all you variants	50	4.405%	144	4.602%	194	4.550%
all thou variants	11	0.969%	23	0.799%	34	0.844%
all singular pronouns	49	4.317%	166	5.241%	215	5.000%

Table 9. Composition of certain pronoun categories in trimmed and untrimmed dialogues, percentage-wise.

Full and trimmed dialogues			
	Hamlet	As You Like It	Total
% thou variants in all singular pronouns	22.450%	15.060%	16.744%
% you_PL variants in all you pronouns	20.000%	2.083%	6.701%
% you_PL and you_UNK variants in all you pronouns	24.000%	2.083%	7.732%
% you_PL variants in all you pronouns except UNK	20.833%	2.083%	6.771%

What can be noticed is that while in full text and trimmed versions of the plays the raw counts of the pronouns do not differ by much, their frequencies expressed in percentages do, and that is due to the difference in length between the plays, with “Hamlet” being almost 1.5 longer than “As You Like It.” Thus, for example, despite having more tokens of the variants of singular you, “Hamlet” has a lower frequency of those than the other play. Neither

of the plays contained the variant *ye* in any of the numbers, nor was *yours_PL* or *yours_UNK* featured. Quite understandably, *yourself_UNK* and *yourselves_UNK* were not featured either, since in the case of these forms the structure of the pronoun itself indicates the number it appears in. The rarest forms of pronouns include *yours_SG, yourself_SG, yourselves_PL, your_UNK, thine,* and *thyself*. The latter two do not occur at all in the selected dialogues. In the full plays, *thou* variants constitute around 30% of all the singular pronouns. In the selected dialogues, those numbers differ quite a lot from the total, with 23.5% in "Hamlet," 14% in "As You Like It," and 16.28% across both texts. Since *you* forms do not showcase variation, it is impossible to determine which use is more common just on the basis of this annotation. For *thou* forms, the nominative one is more common. Possessive and reflexive forms are significantly less frequent.

It is one of the last differences mentioned that is quite telling of what the focus of the qualitative discussion of the dialogues should be, as clearly both couples use fewer *thou* forms than the average in the text. This would suggest that *you* is the standard pronoun for their interactions. In the following sections, short characterization of the relationship between the characters in the dialogues will be given, along with the discussion of non-standard pronoun uses.

3.2.1. "Hamlet"

Throughout the play, the relationship between Hamlet and Ophelia does not undergo many significant developments. Both of the characters could be classified as upper class, with Hamlet being a prince and Ophelia the daughter of a high-ranking member of the court, Polonius. In act 1, scene 3, we learn that Hamlet has been courting Ophelia, but her brother and her father advise her to be cautious; clearly, the two have interacted in the past, with Hamlet being interested in Ophelia in the romantic sense. It is unclear to what extent these feelings are reciprocated. In act 2, scene 1, Ophelia reports to her father that her denying Hamlet any contact has made him act in quite a peculiar fashion, indicating his strong feelings for her. In the following scene, it is Hamlet's affection for Ophelia that is suspected to be causing his peculiar behavior. In act 3, scene 1, she is tasked with talking to Hamlet in an attempt to restore his wits, which is where the first interaction between the two of them in the play occurs. Their second interaction happens a scene later, during a play that is performed in the castle. This marks the last interaction between the two, and so the following events are inconsequential to the way they address each other. The dialogues between the

two within the play are thus marked by Hamlet's emotional upheaval caused by him learning of his father's murder, but also perhaps by Ophelia distancing herself. They are not happily in love with each other, but at least one of them harbors strong feelings for the other (Shakespeare, 1600/2020).

As aforementioned, in comparison with the entirety of the play, the selected dialogues in "Hamlet" show a lower frequency of use of the variants of *thou*. Surprisingly, the frequency of the use of the plural *you* is around the same; this, however, can be explained by the fact that there are not that many dialogues between Hamlet and Ophelia altogether and that during their second interaction Hamlet lapses into a speech where he addresses women in general, hence the plural *you* – as hinted on by the use of the pronoun *yourselves* among other, potentially more ambiguous, variants (Shakespeare, 1600/2020, 3.1.156). It is such speeches, alongside Hamlet's famous "to be or not to be" monologue, that contribute to the word count of the dialogues; however, since they do, in some part, address Ophelia or refer to the conversation that Hamlet has with her, they were kept in their entirety, unlike dialogue elements where there clearly was another addressee. Due to the singular variants of that pronoun outnumbering *thou*, an assumption can be made that *you* is the standard pronoun in the interactions between Hamlet and Ophelia, and, consequently, instances of the use of *thou* forms or pronoun-switching between the two are of particular interest for this analysis.

The first instance of the use of a variant of *thou* occurs in act 3, scene 1, line 97. In a line before that, a singular *you* is used, but that one, arguably, may be referring to Hamlet himself. As indicated by the line that follows, uttered by Ophelia, the two have not yet started a conversation. It is not clear whether "Nymph, in thy orisons Be all my sins remembered" is intended by Hamlet to be heard by Ophelia, even if it is addressed towards her (Shakespeare, 1600/2020, 3.1.96-100). In that case, it may be Hamlet's strong feelings for Ophelia that trigger the use of the more intimate pronoun while he is not in a direct conversation with her just yet, and thus does not risk infringing on any social norms. In addition, it could be argued that the monologue that precedes these pronouns puts the speaker in a heightened emotional state, making him more prone to use these nonstandard forms to express his attitude.

The conversation between the two quickly changes in mood, with Hamlet coming across as somewhat abrasive, refusing to tell Ophelia if he truly loved her once (Shakespeare, 1600/2020, 3.1.125-129). In the subsequent lines, Hamlet delivers another little speech targeted at his interlocutor, telling her to "get thee to a nunnery," as he bursts out against the

idea of marriage and parenthood, considering it more moral to abstain from such things. Throughout this section, Hamlet keeps using "thou" forms to refer to Ophelia, only switching to "you" variants when addressing womankind in plural and when asking his interlocutor where her father is (3.1.131-162). Again, it is clear that Hamlet is in a state of emotional upheaval in this case and only uses *thou* forms (and plural *you*, of course) when talking about marriage and women's influence on men; when swapping to a different subject, he returns to the standard pronoun when talking to Ophelia.

There are no more cases of the use of a *thou* form between the two in the second interaction that they have. In that situation, they are a part of the audience during a play (Shakespeare, 1600/2020, 3.2). It may be the presence of many other high-ranking people that imposes more strict social constraints and forces Hamlet to use the less risky pronoun. It also does not seem like any of the topics that the two discuss evoke strong emotions in them towards each other. All in all, it seems like it is that heightened emotional state that triggers the swap to *thou* forms between Hamlet and Ophelia; it could also be that they are more prone to using those forms when not directly addressing the other person or assuming that the other person cannot hear them. It may be that the presence of others also strengthens the need to adhere to social boundaries.

3.2.2. "As You Like It"

Unlike the previously discussed couple, Rosalind and Orlando share more stage time, and their relationship develops much more significantly. In addition, it is during the play that they meet each other for the first time, so they proceed from being strangers to lovers throughout the comedy. Both are members of the upper class, with Rosalind slightly outranking Orlando. The former is the daughter of a banished duke, and the latter is the son of one of his trusted men. While the fact that their fathers had fallen into disfavor may influence their interactions with other characters, it is a feature that they share rather than one that sets them apart. The two meet in the second scene of act 1, where Orlando partakes in a wrestling match at the court of Rosalind's uncle. Thereafter, Orlando is informed that his parentage puts him in danger, so he must leave the court. In the next scene, Rosalind is banished by her uncle on the same basis. The two end up in the Forest of Arden, with Rosalind and her cousin in disguise. In act 3, scene 2, Orlando begins showing off his affection for Rosalind by leaving poems about her around the forest, unaware that she is in the vicinity. Later in the same scene, Rosalind engages in a conversation with him in

disguise, questioning and testing his love for her; she promises to cure him of his love for Rosalind if he pretends that it is her and courts her daily. The two have a number of conversations in this fashion, with Orlando courting the fake Rosalind, unaware that it is, in fact, the woman he is in love with. Eventually, the romance between Orlando's brother and Rosalind's cousin, among other things, convinces Rosalind to reveal her identity, which she does, having promised Orlando that he will marry Rosalind on the same day as the other two are joined in wedlock, in scene 2 of act 5, and the two are married in scene 4, which marks the end of the play. Both of the characters are clearly in love with each other, but for a significant portion of the play, Rosalind hides under the name of Ganymede, pretending to be a man and testing Orlando's affection. However, a part of that, in turn, consists of Orlando pretending that Ganymede is Rosalind, which lends some credence to his utterances being the same as he would utter to Rosalind. In addition, while Ganymede is not an upper-class character, Orlando does remark that his language is suitable for court, meaning that Rosalind in disguise does not alter her speech patterns, but they actually are a give-away of her true status (Shakespeare, 1599/2015). In the selected dialogues from "As You Like It," *thou* forms are very infrequent both in comparison with the full text and with the numbers from "Hamlet." Once again, this points to the standard pronoun between the two being *you*, and it is the use of the other one that will be of special interest in this discussion.

The first instance of a non-standard pronoun comes from the very first interaction between Rosalind and Orlando. Right before the latter partakes in his wrestling match, Rosalind exclaims, "Now Hercules be thy speed, young man!". Out of their concern for his life, Rosalind and her cousin have tried to dissuade Orlando from the match, and it could be that Rosalind's budding affection, together with the dangerous circumstances, pushes her to use the more intimate pronoun (Shakespeare, 1599/2015, 1.2.145-204). Another explanation could be that it is some sort of a more fixed phrase, with the speaker wishing upon the addressee some mythical hero's or deity's favor, or that Orlando is not really meant to hear Rosalind in this case.

In act 3, scene 2, Orlando performs a little monologue while hanging his poem in the forest, in which he addresses Rosalind and uses *thy* as the possessive pronoun for her. Before that, he also uses the same pronoun three times, but this time likely referring to the moon and some related deity. Nevertheless, the last instance unquestionably refers to Rosalind (Shakespeare, 1599/2015, 3.2.1-10). Neither of the addressees is present, and for the first three instances Orlando is referring to a deity, which explains the use of that pronoun. As for him addressing the absent Rosalind, the assumption may be that he is using the more

intimate, loving pronoun because of the way he feels about her, and since he does not feel the pressure to use the more polite, socially acceptable form as neither Rosalind nor anyone else can hear him.

During their first interaction in the Forest of Arden, with Rosalind in disguise as Ganymede, Orlando addresses her first with singular *you*, but then uses the fixed expression *prithee*. This shift is difficult to account for, as the two have, to the best of the speaker's knowledge, just met. It could be since Orlando perceives the persona of Ganymede to be of the lower class, or perhaps the expression itself is fixed enough to not follow the same rules as the free-standing *thou* forms. However, at the start of their interaction, Rosalind uses the counterpart of that expression, *pray you*, indicating that both are in use and both are an option; it is worth pointing out that some researchers have considered these two to be equally polite. In the subsequent lines, Orlando remarks how Ganymede's speech sounds too refined for being a countryside person, which highlights that the way that Rosalind in disguise addresses him may not be typical for a person of her perceived social status. A bit further into their conversation, Orlando once more uses *prithee* towards Rosalind; it could be caused by the same reasons as mentioned above, but in addition, the topic of love is brought up, which could account for more emotional behaviors in Orlando's behalf. This is supported by the fact that later when Rosalind questions whether he really is in love, he addresses her with *thou* while asserting that he is indeed in love; when the topic shifts slightly, he returns to *you* though (Shakespeare, 1599/2015, 3.2.300-443). In this particular conversation, there are the two uses of *prithee* which are difficult to account for. However, given that this is a somewhat fixed expression and the two have seemingly just met, perhaps it is an element of negotiating a common ground for what is acceptable to use in their conversations, or the two *pray*-phrases are of equal politeness. Aside from that, the other instance of a *thou* pronoun seems to be spurred by the emotional topic of the conversation.

Having agreed on that during their previous meeting, Orlando pretends that Ganymede is Rosalind and courts him. Throughout the start of their second conversation, both use the standard pronoun. However, eventually, Orlando switches to *thou* when asking "[…] wilt thou have me?" and "[w]hat sayest thou?" when he does not get a satisfactory answer to his first question. Given that he is here pretending that his interlocutor is his love interest, it can be assumed that he would be using the same forms had he known it actually was Rosalind. The switch to *thou* forms could here be triggered by his heightened emotional state since the two are talking about love, and he is asking her to love him in return, and whether she would accept him as a suitor or husband; it is worth pointing out that since that

moment, Orlando only uses *thou* forms, but for a big part of the conversation he also does not use any pronouns at all. Later in the conversation, the two pretend to get married (with Rosalind's cousin not daring to carry the fake ceremony out), and they both use *thou* forms in the fixed expressions used in that circumstance, such as *I take thee*. This is not a switch triggered by emotions or status but an instance of the use of fixed expressions. When trying to explain to Orlando the fickle nature of women, Rosalind addresses him with *thou* variants – perhaps since her explanation is triggered by him saying he would love her forever, and she doubts he would do that given how emotional she can be, so in her anger, she uses the non-standard pronoun to address him. This may even serve to highlight how her mood changes easily. Finally, when Orlando is about to leave, and the two say their goodbyes, Orlando continues using *thou* forms, and while Rosalind responds with one such form, she then swaps back to *you*. This occurs when Orlando says that he will have to leave her for two hours, to which she responds, "Alas, dear love, I cannot lack thee two hours," which could either be slightly mocking him by almost repeating what he said, or it could be Rosalind's true feelings breaking through the façade of a country boy pretending to be a fickle girl (Shakespeare, 1599/2015, 4.1.33-213). Throughout the conversation, Orlando prefers to address Rosalind with *thou* forms, likely because he is supposed to be courting her, and it is a way of expressing the sincerity and strength of his feelings towards her. Rosalind, in turn, rarely uses those forms; however, she is pretending not to give in to his courtship, and to try to dissuade him, which could be why she chooses the standard forms, appearing more emotionally distant, with exceptions that could be caused by mockery, anger, or her true feelings for Orlando.

The next interaction between the two occurs after Orlando has been wounded. Straight from the start, Rosalind in disguise addresses him with *thou* forms, e.g., "[o] my dear Orlando, how it grieves me to see thee wear thy heart in a scarf." This is likely caused by the emotional upheaval that she is experiencing, having learned that Orlando has been injured. She quickly regains her composure, though, returning to the standard pronouns later in the conversation. Having discussed that Orlando's brother and Rosalind's cousin fell in love and intend to get married, Rosalind offers Orlando to have him marry Rosalind on the same day, which she explains by knowing some magic. Her interlocutor responds with a *thou* pronoun, questioning if she is serious, which could easily be attributed to the topic of the conversation, making him very emotional (Shakespeare, 1599/2015, 5.2.20-78). Later in the same scene, the two are joined by Phoebe and Silvius and discuss topics of love, but the two maintain using a singular *you* to each other, even when Orlando addresses Rosalind,

who he thinks is not present in the conversation; this clashes with how he addressed her with nobody around, but it could be precisely the presence of others that imposes on him the use of the more standard, polite pronoun (5.2.79-130). Once again, it seems that being in an emotional state brings out the non-standard pronouns, and the presence of others in a conversation tightens the social constraints on using appropriate language.

Finally, in scene four, Rosalind reveals her identity, having first made sure that both her father and Orlando agree to her marrying the latter. In their interactions in this passage, both use solely singular *you* pronouns, which, similar to the previous example, could be because of the many people present with them in the scene, and especially Rosalind's father, who would be superior to both of them in terms of status (Shakespeare, 1599/2015, 5.4.1-26, 112-129). Thus, social constraints are seemingly, once again, imposed or strengthened by the presence of others in the scene.

3.3. Discussion

3.3.1. Discussion of the results

While in the previous section, to some extent, the results were already compared between the two plays, a more thorough discussion of them is necessary, and so is juxtaposing them against the findings from previous research. One of the most important findings in the quantitative analysis is the complete lack of the *ye* form of the *you* pronoun in both of the texts. The gradual disappearance of that pronoun has been listed as one of the major changes that occurred in the pronominal system of English in the Early Modern English period, and the complete lack thereof in the plays could suggest that this change had already been mostly concluded by the time of the writing of the plays, at least in the dialect or dialects that Shakespeare drew from when writing (Busse, 2017, pp. 215-218).

Since the two plays in question come from a similar time period, no diachronic analysis of trends in pronoun use can be performed on the basis of this study's results. However, they do lend themselves to a cross-genre one. Overall, the ratio of *thou* forms to singular *you* forms in both full text plays is around 1:2. However, in the comedy, it is more than 3.5 percentage points higher than in the tragedy, which is a noticeable but not statistically significant difference. It may be indicative of some trend, but no conclusion about a given genre having a higher ratio of *thou* forms can be drawn from this data. Both for this difference, and the overwhelming majority of the other ones, the genre is not the

only thing that sets the plays apart. Naturally, they tell different stories and feature different characters; this, however, may be related to the genre to some extent, so while it is not possible to draw certain conclusions about the affinity of a given genre towards some distribution of second person singular pronouns, it can be a clue that such a relationship may exist. It is important to keep in mind that it is related to what characters these genres may be more likely to feature and what relationships between them they may model, but, on the other hand, one could define the genre also by including those factors. Therefore, any potential link between the genre and the use of specific second-person singular pronouns depends on the definition of the genre and the subsequent classification of the plays and should only be concluded on the basis of a larger sample than two plays of different genres.

An even bigger difference is visible between the plays when it comes to the number of plural and unknown *you* forms used, both in terms of percentages and absolute numbers, where the difference is once more statistically significant. "Hamlet" has almost double the percentage points compared to "As You Like It" when it comes only to plural forms and an ~8.5 percentage point difference when the unknown forms are factored in. Unlike the difference between singular *you* and *thou*, this is purely determined by the number of addressees present in a conversation and thus directly linked to how the scenes are structured. While this does not have to be genre-dependent and may only be a difference between these two plays in particular, it is important to keep in mind that the ratios obtained from one of the plays should not be generalized for other ones without more research to confirm this trend, since such big differences can be present.

What is interesting is that while in both plays *thine* is a less common form than *thy*, the distribution once more seems to be correlated to the genre, with *thine* occurring more frequently in the tragedy than in the comedy, both in terms of raw numbers and percentage frequencies. This correlation is also statistically significant. It has been suggested that these two forms once occurred dependent on the nature of the first sound of the following word, with *thy* eventually overtaking in all or most positions; while this analysis does not account for such factors, it is undoubtedly interesting to note this correlation (Blake, 2002, pp. 45-46). Unlike the previous examples, it cannot be explained by the types or number of characters occurring in the scene, and as the plays were written in a similar period, it must be either a stylistic choice or, if the aforementioned rules of distribution apply in both plays, "As You Like It" features surprisingly few words with an initial vowel that are preceded by a *thou*-based possessive pronoun. All of the aforementioned differences are visible both in the trimmed and untrimmed versions, as those only influence the percentage-based

frequency of specific forms in the text; ratios within specific categories or calculations performed on raw counts (such as the chi-squared test) are not influenced by that.

Overall, trimming the full texts did not make an astounding difference in terms of percentage frequencies, but in case those results were to be compared with other studies (past or future), it is key to compare the correct values and be aware that the way that the text is processed does indeed make a difference, even if it is a fraction of a percentage point – but the frequencies of individual word forms are never staggeringly high, so even that difference may be important. As for the in-category distribution, the nominative forms are dominant for all pronouns, although it is essential to note that the nominative and the objective for *you* look the same and have not been annotated for that feature. Reflexive pronouns, rarer forms of the possessive (*yours, thine*), and fixed forms like *prithee* all constitute only a small part of the overall count of a given pronoun's forms, which is not unexpected. Regular forms of the possessive pronouns are rather numerous, too, though definitely outnumbered by the total nominative and objective forms. However, in the case of *thou*, where those two can be differentiated, *thou* is more frequent than *thee* in "Hamlet," and when both texts are counted together, the opposite holds true only for "As You Like It." The rare forms are more specialized and have more constraints on where they would be used, while the nominative, objective (wherever applicable), and possessive forms of the pronouns are more universal or common, which is not surprising taking into account the fact that, for example, in the position of an object reflexive pronouns express only one idea, while possessive pronouns can describe a multitude of concepts.

In comparison with the full-text versions, the selected dialogues display a higher frequency of second person singular *you*, though not for all forms. All the other pronouns are less frequent, but overall second-person singular ones (both *you* and *thou*) appear more frequently. Once again, the nominative, objective, and regular possessive dominate the in-category counts. What is worth pointing out is that thou occurs relatively less frequently in these dialogues than it does in the plays as a whole. Although this difference is not statistically significant between the plays, nor between the full version of "Hamlet" and its selected dialogues, it is significant between the full text of "As You Like It" and its selected dialogues, meaning that they are not representative of the pronoun use in the play as a whole. Once again, "Hamlet" contains proportionally more plural *you* pronouns than "As You Like It" and by a more considerable margin. The difference between the two plays is significant, and so is the difference between the dialogues and the full version of the comedy, but not the tragedy, indicating once more that the selected dialogues from "As You Like It" deviate

from the rest of the play. In this particular case, it should not be treated as an indicator that this is typical of romances in comedies, as there can be many more dialogue-specific factors than can be accounted for just by the genre.

As for the qualitative discussion, for both of the plays, the singular *you* was taken to be the standard pronoun for the lovers, as it constituted upwards of 80% of the instances of pronoun use. While the status and the development of the relationship between the lovers are not exceedingly similar between the two texts, the participants' social status is comparable, suggesting that it was the standard upper-class pronoun. Deviations from that standard were discussed in more detail in the results section, together with possible justification given the context in which they appear. These justifications point to several possible trends explaining pronoun shifts. First of all, addressing one's romantic interest while they are not present or not intended to hear the speaker triggers the use of a *thou* form, as can be seen at the end of Hamlet's monologue and in Orlando hanging up his poem (Shakespeare, 1600/2020, 3.1.97, 1599/2015, 3.2.8). This category combines the addressee (and other kinds of audiences) being absent with strong feelings for the person to whom the words are directed. These strong emotions resurface in many instances of conversations between Rosalind and Orlando, including their very first one, where Rosalind is worried about the fate of a man she has started to fancy (1.2.19). In their subsequent conversations, Orlando tends to start using *thou* forms as they veer towards the topic of love and continues using almost solely that pronoun when mock-courting Rosalind in disguise, from act 3 onwards. Although some of the instances of the use of those pronouns here are caused by one character's worry for another's health or safety, the intensity of that emotion stems from their love or infatuation, which is why they are counted together. Aside from strong positive feelings, negative ones can also trigger a shift to *thou* forms. The majority of instances of that pronoun between Hamlet and Ophelia stem from his small "nunnery speech," where he seems to be venting his negative feelings about women and humanity (1600/2020, 3.1.131-140, 146-152). Such a case can also be noted in "As You Like It" when Rosalind may be annoyed by Orlando's over-the-top love declarations and explains to him how imperfect women can be (1599/2015, 4.1.153-164). Finally, and quite interestingly, there are no instances of the use of a *thou* pronoun in scenes with many other characters, especially ones superior in rank in some way to the characters, such as the play scene in "Hamlet" and the wedding scene in "As You Like It" (1600/2020, 3.2, 1599/2015, 5.4). In both of those scenes, a parent of at least one of the lovers, as well as other characters, is present. This, combined with the preference for *thou* forms when the speaker is alone or is not supposed

to be heard by others, suggests that the adherence to social norms is stricter the more people there are to witness the potential use of an inappropriate pronoun and that the proper public way of addressing each other for those characters would be using the singular *you*. There are also examples of difficult-to-explain pronoun choices, but they all stem from Orlando's first interaction with Rosalind in disguise, so, to him, a new person, and only in the form of the fixed phrase *prithee* (3.2.317). Even though that expression has its *you* counterpart, it could also be caused by the two subconsciously negotiating what pronouns are appropriate to use, given that Rosalind's persona is arguably of a lower class than Orlando; a possible explanation suggested in prior research is that the two forms are fixed and equally polite. What is worth pointing out is that once courting Rosalind, Orlando hardly ever uses *you* forms, while the opposite can be said about Rosalind. Finally, while it is not a pronoun used between two lovers, and it only appears once in Orlando's monologue, there is an instance of addressing a deity or some supernatural power, where *thou* forms are used.

3.3.2. Comparison with prior research

From the analysis of the second person singular pronominal system in the selected plays by William Shakespeare, it can be concluded that in this writer's works, the form *ye* had been all but ousted, and *you* and its variants were more standard for the social groups presented in the plays. This aligns with the description of the changes to the pronouns that occurred in Early Modern English according to Nurmi (2017, p. 23). The analysis also corroborates Busse's (2017) description, which makes similar claims, along with the difference between *thy* and *thine* being stylistic by Shakespeare's times, and the former being a more common variant; while the study presented in this thesis did not investigate the phonotactic environment in which these variants appeared, *thy* was indeed more common. The qualitative analysis also seems to support Busse's claim that the choice of pronoun likely did not depend on linguistic factors since reasons of pragmatic or social nature for using a non-standard pronoun can be identified in most cases in the plays (pp. 210-211, 213-215, 218-221). While it is not wrong of Smith (2005) to present *thou* forms as "familiar form[s] which could be used both positively and negatively," his rendering of the second person singular pronouns in Early Modern English which leaves out *you* forms is somewhat lacking given the prevalence of that pronoun among some social strata, at least in Shakespeare's writings, in the middle of what the author considers to be the Early Modern English period; he also claims *ye* to be a "conservative" form in Shakespeare's times, though it does not

appear at all in the analyzed plays (pp. 132, 142-143). While this could be due to the relatively small sample size, it is indeed clear that this form is in decline, if not entirely gone. Hope's (2003) somewhat more extensive discussion of Shakespeare's grammar does not conflict with the results of the analysis, although once more *ye* is mentioned here, a form which is not attested in "Hamlet" nor in "As You Like It," but it is likely mentioned as it appears in Shakespeare's other works (pp. 72-73). Hope mentions some contexts in which *thou* forms were mandatory, out of which two can be found in the analyzed dialogues: apostrophe and addressing deities (pp. 77-81). It is interesting to note that while clearly *thou* was not the dominant pronoun, the book's author claims that Shakespeare's writings still overrepresented it, meaning that in the actual speech of the playwright's contemporaries, it may be an even rarer alternative (p. 77). Nevalainen's (2006) description does not stand out from the aforementioned ones and does not conflict with the results of this analysis either (pp. 77-80). While Blake (2002) seems to not be convinced that there was much regularity to how *thou* pronouns were used and considers *you* to be dominant in Shakespeare's times, it seems that there is support for the possible reasons that he lists later, such as attitude or social hierarchy (pp. 55-58). The results of the analysis clearly show that *you* was indeed the dominant pronoun, but that there also were regularities as to when the non-standard forms were chosen. Johnson's (2013) description of the rules governing second person singular pronoun usage in Shakespeare, even if somewhat short, does, in general, agree with the findings of this thesis: *you* forms are dominant, and *thou* can be used to mark intimacy or to offend someone (pp. 133-135, 138). However, from the analyzed dialogues, it seems that intimacy need not be reciprocated, and perhaps both the positive and negative use of *thou* could be grouped under the umbrella term of the heightened emotional state of the speaker. Overall, the more general sources on the history of English do not conflict much with the findings of this analysis, except for the few aforementioned details. Sadly, the analysis, especially the qualitative one, mostly discusses interactions between upper-class speakers, meaning that it is nearly impossible to draw conclusions about other strata from this data.

Brown and Gilman's (1960) first paper describes the dynamics of systems where there are two second-person singular pronouns. According to them, it is dependent on factors called power and solidarity, meaning how distant on the social ladder the interlocutors are and how familiar they are with each other; these two elements influence each other, and the final outcome is not the same in every language, but certain trends can be noticed (pp. 256-262). In addition, deviations from the system are used to show exceedingly negative or positive feelings; according to the authors in Early Modern English, it was much more

common to break these rules than it is in contemporary European languages, meaning that pronoun shifts were used somewhat stylistically (pp. 277-278, 280). While the analysis presented in this thesis does not perform any comparison between Shakespeare's English and other languages, shifts to unexpected pronouns are not uncommon, and they are indeed often motivated by strong emotions. The authors later discuss this idea in relation to four of Shakespeare's tragedies, where they introduce the notion of politeness strategies and how pronouns could be used to mediate in those situations. While their analysis only partly supports what was predicted by Politeness Theory, their results cannot be well compared to those reported in this thesis, as the analysis was performed differently and investigated other aspects of the dialogues (Brown & Gilman, 1989). Overall, while not directly comparable, these papers' findings do not conflict with those presented in this thesis, as Brown and Gilman base the pronoun use on power, solidarity, the riskiness of the given action, and socio-pragmatic factors. There is no evidence to the contrary in the reported analysis, with the characters in question belonging to the upper class and using the more polite pronoun towards each other with the exception of situations of emotional upheaval or, to some extent, as their solidarity rises.

What is especially worth noting in the comparison of the results of this analysis with the wide-scope research is the disparity between the estimated proportion of second-person plural pronouns in all instances of the use of *you.* Busse (2002) places this estimate at 20% and proceeds to utilize this further, as most corpora are not annotated for what grammatical number that pronoun has. However, the results presented in this thesis conflict with this. First of all, there is a massive disparity between the two plays in terms of proportionally how many second-person plural pronouns are used relative to all the instances of *you*. Also, unlike what is presented by Busse, multiple different calculations were performed to approximate that ratio, as there are not only singular and plural but also unknown instances of the pronoun, and the numbers change depending on whether or not those unknown ones are included and in which category (if they are counted as singular, as plural, or discarded). In addition, while the raw counts of *thou* forms for "As You Like It," one of the plays for which the counts were performed, align with the results in this thesis, they do not for the *you* forms. The ratio of plural *you* in "Hamlet" (when only considering plural and singular *you* forms) is 18.297%, which is not very far from 20%, but for "As You Like It," it is 9.577%, and overall for the two texts – 14.162%. While the two plays were written in the same time period, the structure of their scenes is different, with the tragedy having more group scenes and, consequently, more plural *you* instances. While Busse's estimate is established on the basis of a "control

corpus with nine plays from different genres and different dates of composition," and while the author acknowledges the differences between the plays on their own, he asserts that, on average, those are likely slightly below 20% (pp. 41-42). The evidence from the two plays analyzed in this thesis highlights how important it is to not simply adopt a given estimate when analyzing anything less than all of Shakespeare's works at once, as they can differ greatly in terms of the proportion of plural and singular *you* forms. It also makes any generalizations based on just nine of the plays seem potentially misleading, as they were selected based on the genre and time of composition, but not on how numerous the multi-character scenes were in them. While the first two factors may be very relevant when establishing the ratio of *thou* to *you*, the latter one seems to be significant for the distinction between singular and plural *you.* It is not out of the question that it ties together with the genre, but no such assertions were made by Busse. Thus, I believe that estimating over only nine plays is insufficient, and for most uses, such estimates cannot be used on singular plays, nor should they necessarily be extended to all of Shakespeare's works, given how big the differences can be.

While many other aspects of pronoun use investigated by Busse (2002) were beyond the scope of this thesis, his other findings, overall, seem to align with those presented here. The author notes that *prithee* was grammaticalized to some extent, sometimes appearing where otherwise *you* forms were used, which may well explain the use thereof in "As You Like It" between Rosalind and Orlando (pp. 203-204). He also notes that *ye* was a form that was not relevant by Shakespeare's times anymore and was vastly outnumbered by *you* (pp. 256-259). This does not conflict with the fact that neither "Hamlet" nor "As You Like It" have any instances of that form, though neither of them featuring does not support any claims about the influence of genre on the distribution of that form. However, while Busse reports that *thou* usually constitutes only around 30% of all singular pronouns, which agrees with the results presented in this thesis, he claims that this pronoun was the least common in comedies – but the results from "Hamlet" and "As You Like It" do not support this; naturally, it does not mean that there was no larger trend within those genres, but it points to there being differences between specific plays nonetheless (pp. 283-284).

Walker's (2007) book presents the author's view on the approaches used to explain pronoun use, concluding that markedness, along with the power and solidarity model or Politeness Theory, can account for the choice of the base pronoun, but that the shifts to the other variant are micro-pragmatic, which seems to align with the findings of this thesis' analysis, where, in general, the couples discussed in the qualitative analysis used the

expected, polite pronoun, but swapped to *thou* in select situations, which could be explained away by certain situation-specific factors (p. 48). Walker also notes that males seem to use more *thou* than females do. While the quantitative analysis did not factor in gender, the qualitative one would point to the same conclusion (pp. 175-180).

In terms of the extensiveness of discussed data, this thesis, in particular, is more akin to what was earlier classified as narrow-scope research. Since they usually analyze only one or a few plays, their results and conclusions are more comparable with those presented here. For example, Calvo (1992) discusses "As You Like It," investigating the seemingly unexplainable shifts in pronouns that none of the models up to that date accounted for. She argues that unusual pronoun choices are used for modeling or negotiating a social identity or can be used as discourse markers. While neither of these is directly disproved by the qualitative analysis in this thesis, they are also not strongly supported. There seem to be other factors at play in the discussed examples. It is, however, worth pointing out that Calvo also investigated other dialogues from the play, so while this conclusion does not fully hold for interactions between lovers, it may be different for other kinds of relationships (pp. 16-26). It would also seem that since the publication of the paper, some attempts at reconciling different models and explaining shifts have been made that appear to be satisfactory in the context of the analysis presented here.

Mulholland's (1987) approach is similar to the one found in this thesis, with her research being concerned with a comedy and a tragedy, albeit different ones than were chosen here. She notices a major difference between the ratios of *thou* to *you* between the genres (2:5 for "Much Ado About Nothing," 1:1 for "King Lear"). These do not at all align with the results for "As You Like It" and "Hamlet," indicating that neither can be generalized over the whole genre, and there are likely more factors at play (pp. 155-158). The author does, however, conclude that *you* was likely the base, unmarked pronoun, which seems to align with the findings of this thesis (pp. 159-161). In the same volume, Barber (1987) analyzes "Richard III," determining that *you* seems to be the reciprocal pronoun of upper classes, with exceptions motivated by emotions, which is in agreement with the analysis presented here (pp. 169-170, 176-177).

Mazzon (2003) analyzes the preference for certain pronouns in different types of relationships between characters in three tragedies, including "Hamlet." She also introduces the notion of discernment and volition, with the latter meaning that pronoun shifts may have been intentional choices, and not everything was purely governed by rules (p. 228). According to her, during courtship, *you* forms are dominant, with *thou* being indicative of

highly emotional situations (pp. 237-238). In general, this does agree with this thesis's findings which point to the dialogues between lovers tending to feature fewer *thou* forms than the average. However, it is interesting to note Orlando's persistent use of *thou* towards Rosalind. While it is not impossible that he is depicted as being highly emotional during most of their dialogues, it is interesting to point out this trend, together with Rosalind not reciprocating this pronoun use.

"As You Like It" is discussed once more by Stein (2003) in comparison with "King Lear," as the two were written roughly five years apart, and the author claims that they are thematically comparable. He identifies *you* as the unmarked pronoun, at least for the upper class, which is the same as the conclusion drawn from the analysis here (pp. 252, 255). According to him, the standard pronoun of address for upper-class lovers was *you,* which aligns with the results presented here. He also claims that all the deviations from the rules of the use of the pronouns can be explained, meaning that they were an understandable way of expressing emotion. In the analysis here, nearly all instances of a non-standard pronoun were possible to explain either by emotion, social pressure, or additional rules (apostrophes, addressing deities), which does support this conclusion (p. 296).

4. Conclusions

Although the existing literature on the use of second-person singular pronouns in Early Modern English is quite sizeable, a review thereof revealed that not all researchers draw the same conclusions and that there is still work to be done, both in terms of the tools and resources available, as well as potentially refining the existing models and theories, or proposing new ones. This thesis presented the results of a relatively small-scale study of the use of pronouns in two of Shakespeare's plays. The obtained data suggests that *you* was the standard second-person singular pronoun, with a similar distribution of *you* vs. *thou* regardless of the genre. The drama showed significantly more instances of the plural *you,* but that pointed rather to the role of the structure of the scenes in the singular-to-plural ratio. While the general conclusions agreed with the prior research, specific numbers and ratios clearly differ across different plays. Certain pronoun forms were very rare or completely absent from the plays. Qualitative analysis identified non-standard pronoun uses in conversations between selected characters in plays and attempted to justify them in the context of the conversation. Most of the reasons for non-standard pronoun use had already

been identified in previous research, but some novel observations, such as the influence of bystanders, were made. What is important to remember is that this study is not only representative of Early Modern English but not even of all of Shakespeare's works; however, that was never the intention of it, and, instead, it is supposed to be a case study of the two plays and selected dialogues from them, and the conclusions drawn from it can only hint at some possibilities rather than prove them beyond any doubt, especially when it comes to quantitative findings.

While its findings do not drastically uproot the current understanding of the use of second-person singular pronouns in Early Modern English, they offer some insights, especially when compared with prior research. One of those insights is how different the ratios of these pronouns can be across genres and across plays within the same genre, pointing to the fact that it is more likely the structure of the scenes in the play, the characters participating in those, and the events that transpire that have an influence on the choice of pronouns. It is then perhaps not as insightful to compare plays in terms of their genre but some other qualities or to revisit the genre definitions. Another conclusion that can be drawn from this observation is that the findings based on small-scope studies should be generalized very cautiously, if at all. Naturally, there is some average ratio that is true for all of Shakespeare's plays, but the smaller the units one selects are, the more possible it is that they will deviate from that average by quite a large margin. This is even further highlighted by the selected dialogues from "As You Like It" not being representative of the ratios in the play as a whole. On the other hand, since some rather well-planned generalizations have previously been made due to the lack of proper annotation in Shakespeare corpora, this points to the need for a resource that would include the annotation of *you* forms for number. In this thesis, such annotation has been conducted manually; in many situations identifying the number is simple (e.g., when there are only two characters in a scene, when a form like *yourself* or *yourselves* is used, etc.), but there are instances where it is either up to the annotator's judgement to decide on the appropriate tag or the "unknown" tag has to be used. Perhaps involving more people in the process of annotating the plays would help resolve some of these problematic examples. In addition, this could help resolve the problems that may arise from comparing results based on different editions of the plays. Both for this thesis and some older papers, the subjectivity of manual annotation as well as the cumbersomeness of it play a part in the scope and objectivity of the quantitative study. Different interpretations of some dialogues could lead to slightly different results, and the time required to perform

manual annotation severely limits the size of the text collections that researchers can work on.

Another disparity between this thesis and the prior research occurs within the qualitative discussion of the dialogues. There appear to be hints to the fact that the presence of others in a scene is an important factor for the pronoun choice, indicating that situations like that enforced social norms or exerted social pressure that would make the speakers be more mindful of using specific forms. This tendency has not been widely mentioned before, with the exception of *thou* being more than acceptable in asides, which are not intended for the addressee to be heard; however, not much mention was made of what effect the opposite of such a situation may have, at least not explicitly (Walker, 2007, pp. 191-192). While the realization that there is more to pronoun choice than just the status and familiarity difference between the interlocutors is nothing new, it is interesting to note that the mere presence of others in a scene, not necessarily as active participants in a conversation, but just as onlookers, may have a restraining effect on the use of emotionally-motivated nonstandard pronouns.

Though the vast majority of the observations that were made agrees with the prior research, there definitely are areas that hint at a possibility of more future work on the topic. As mentioned before, annotation of linguistic data is one such field. While, understandably, annotating Shakespeare's works would streamline the investigations into his writings, there still remains the issue of the same problem occurring in other texts from that time period. One possible solution for this would be developing annotation software. Naturally, that would still have to be reviewed by humans for maximum accuracy, but perhaps it would speed the process up. From the less technical point of view, clearly, there is still work to be done on what elements influence pronoun choice and pronoun switching. While the current models account quite well for the choice of the base pronoun and for many deviations from it, there still are situations where they do not offer an obvious answer or where one has to look at the interactions between characters on a larger scale in order to notice deviations from a certain trend. It would certainly be interesting to see if the observations made in this thesis hold up for other romantically involved couples in Shakespeare's writings. Obviously, similar inquiries can also be made into other kinds of relationships, such as friendship, familial relationships, etc. Finally, since research comparing different genres does not tend to offer clear answers on whether the distribution of pronouns is correlated with it, and since it is clear that it is mostly socio-pragmatic factors that influence it, perhaps it is not the right question to ask in future research – unless in order to finally establish whether such

distinctions are relevant when evaluating linguistic elements so tightly connected to the scenes and characters. Since those can be typical of a given genre, perhaps by this definition, it is a fair question to ask after all.

Though the most recent trends in researching pronoun use in Early Modern English understandably seem to focus on sources other than Shakespeare, such as trials, depositions, and private correspondence, there is still merit in investigating the language of plays. While it may not be an entirely truthful reflection of the language of the time, it was, nevertheless, the language used by some people, even if those were only playwrights, which makes it worth investigating. From a practical standpoint, beyond simply describing the rules governing the language of Shakespeare, gaining a better understanding of the use of pronouns may be beneficial for interpretations within the field of literary studies or even on stage. While this thesis does not claim to present an ultimate answer to all the questions on this topic, it offers a summary of the current consensus within the field and presents a small study, the results of which strengthen much of the previous research but also put in question a part of it, and it also shows that there are still ways in which studying Shakespeare's pronouns can be continued and improved upon.

5. Bibliography

Monographs:

Blake, Norman. 2002. *A Grammar of Shakespeare's Language*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Busse, Ulrich. 2002. *Linguistic Variation in the Shakespeare Corpus: Morpho-syntactic variability of second person pronouns*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hope, Jonathan. 2003. *Shakespeare's Grammar*. London: The Arden Shakespeare.

Johnson, Keith. 2013. *Shakespeare's English: A Practical Linguistic Guide.* Harlow: Pearson.

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2006. *An Introduction to Early Modern English.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Smith, Jeremy. 2005. *Essentials of Early English: Old, Middle and Early Modern English, Second Edition.* London: Routledge.

Walker, Terry. 2007. *Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Journal Articles:

Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. 1989. "Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies." In: *Language in Society*, 18(2), 159-212.

Calvo, Clara. 1992. "Pronouns of Address and Social Negotiation in as You Like It." In: *Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics*, 1(1), 5-27.

Craig, Hugh. 2011. "Shakespeare's Vocabulary: Myth and Reality." In: *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 62(1), 53-74.

Hope, Jonathan. 1993. "Second Person Singular Pronouns in Records of Early Modern 'Spoken' English." In: *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 94(1), 83-100.

Articles in Editions:

Barber, Charles. 1987. "'Thou' and 'You' in Shakespeare's Richard III." In: Vivian Salmon & Edwina Burness (Eds.). *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 163-179.

Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. 1960. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." In: Thomas Sebeok (Ed.). *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 253-276.

Busse, Ulrich. 2003. “The Co-occurence of Nominal and Pronominal Address Forms in the Shakespeare Corpus.” In: Irma Taavitsainen & Andreas Jucker (Eds.). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 193-221.

Busse, Ulrich. 2017. “Chapter 12: Pronouns.” In: Alexander Bergs & Laurel Brinton (Eds.). *The History of English, Volume 4: Early Modern English*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 209-223.

Busse, Ulrich & Beatrix Busse. 2017. “Chapter 17: The language of Shakespeare.” In: Alexander Bergs & Laurel Brinton (Eds.). *The History of English, Volume 4: Early Modern English*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 309-332.

Mazzon, Gabriella. 2003. “Pronouns of Nominal Address in Shakespearean English.” In: Irma Taavitsainen & Andreas Jucker (Eds.). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 223-249.

Mulholland, Joan. 1987. “‘Thou’ and ‘You’ in Shakespeare: A Study in the Second Person Pronoun.” In: Vivian Salmon & Edwina Burness (Eds.). *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 153-161.

Nurmi, Arja. 2017. “Chapter 2: Early Modern English: Overview.” In: Alexander Bergs & Laurel Brinton (Eds.). *The History of English, Volume 4: Early Modern English*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 8-26.

Stein, Dietrich. 2003. “Pronominal Use in Shakespeare: Between Sociolinguistics and Conversational Analysis.” In: Irma Taavitsainen & Andreas Jucker (Eds.). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 251-307.

Walker, Terry. 2003. “You and Thou in Early Modern English Dialogues.” In: Irma Taavitsainen & Andreas Jucker (Eds.). *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 309-342.

Other Sources:

Anthony, Laurence. 2014. *AntConc (Version 3.40)* [Computer Software]. Tokyo: Waseda University. Available from: https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.

Shakespeare, William. 2015. *As You Like It.* Barbara Mowat & Paul Werstine (Eds.). Available from: https://shakespeare.folger.edu/shakespeares-works/as-you-like-it/download/ (Original work published 1599).

Shakespeare, William. 2020. *Hamlet, prince of Denmark*. Barbara Mowat & Paul Werstine (Eds.). Available from: https://shakespeare.folger.edu/shakespeares-works/hamlet/download/ (Original work published 1600).

The Folger Shakespeare. N.d. *Download Shakespeare's Plays, Sonnets, and Poems*. Available from: https://shakespeare.folger.edu/download/

6. Appendix

Table 10. Full raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the full versions of the plays.

Full text versions						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	643	2.001%	642	2.739%	1287	2.313%
you_SG	428	1.332%	453	1.932%	882	1.586%
your_SG	196	0.610%	173	0.738%	369	0.664%
yours_SG	4	0.012%	7	0.030%	11	0.020%
yourself_SG	15	0.047%	9	0.038%	24	0.043%
all you_PL variants	144	0.448%	68	0.290%	212	0.382%
you_PL	103	0.321%	53	0.226%	156	0.281%
your_PL	39	0.121%	14	0.060%	53	0.095%
yourselves_PL	2	0.006%	1	0.004%	3	0.005%
all you_UNK variants	34	0.106%	29	0.124%	63	0.113%
you_UNK	27	0.084%	23	0.098%	50	0.090%
your_UNK	7	0.022%	6	0.026%	13	0.023%
all you variants	821	2.556%	739	3.153%	1560	2.808%
all thou variants	272	0.865%	313	1408%	608	1.094%
thee	59	0.184%	90	0.384%	149	0.268%
thine	13	0.040%	2	0.009%	15	0.027%
thou	108	0.336%	143	0.610%	251	0.452%
thy	87	0.271%	75	0.320%	162	0.292%
thyself	5	0.016%	3	0.013%	8	0.014%
prithee	6	0.019%	17	0.073%	23	0.041%
all singular pronouns	921	2.867%	972	4.147%	1893	3.407%

Table 11. Full raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the trimmed plays.

Trimmed text versions						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	643	2.161%	642	2.994%	1285	2.509%
you_SG	428	1.438%	453	2.112%	881	1.721%
your_SG	196	0.659%	173	0.807%	369	0.721%
yours_SG	4	0.013%	7	0.033%	11	0.021%
yourself_SG	15	0.050%	9	0.042%	24	0.047%
all you_PL variants	144	0.484%	68	0.317%	212	0.414%
you_PL	103	0.346%	53	0.247%	156	0.305%
your_PL	39	0.131%	14	0.065%	53	0.104%
yourselves_PL	2	0.007%	1	0.005%	3	0.006%
all you_UNK variants	34	0.114%	28	0.131%	62	0.121%
you_UNK	27	0.091%	22	0.103%	49	0.096%
your_UNK	7	0.024%	6	0.028%	13	0.025%
all you variants	821	2.759%	739	3.441%	1559	3.045%
all thou variants	278	0.934%	330	1.539%	608	1.187%
thee	59	0.198%	90	0.420%	149	0.291%
thine	13	0.044%	2	0.009%	15	0.029%
thou	108	0.363%	143	0.667%	251	0.490%
thy	87	0.292%	75	0.350%	162	0.316%
thyself	5	0.017%	3	0.014%	8	0.016%
prithee	6	0.020%	17	0.079%	23	0.045%
all singular pronouns	921	3.095%	972	4.532%	1893	3.697%

Table 12. Full raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the untrimmed dialogues.

Full dialogues						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	38	2.861%	141	4.279%	179	3.872%
you_SG	27	2.033%	98	2.974%	125	2.704%
your_SG	10	0.753%	38	1.153%	48	1.038%
yours_SG	1	0.075%	3	0.091%	4	0.087%
yourself_SG	0	0.000%	2	0.061%	2	0.043%
all you_PL variants	10	0.753%	3	0.091%	13	0.281%
you_PL	6	0.452%	1	0.030%	7	0.151%
your_PL	3	0.226%	2	0.061%	5	0.108%
yourselves_PL	1	0.075%	0	0.000%	1	0.022%
all you_UNK variants	2	0.151%	0	0.000%	2	0.043%
you_UNK	2	0.151%	0	0.000%	2	0.043%
your_UNK	0	0.000%	0	0.000%	0	0.000%
all you variants	50	3.765%	144	4.370%	194	4.196%
all thou variants	11	0.828%	23	0.759%	34	0.779%
thee	3	0.226%	10	0.303%	13	0.281%
thine	0	0.000%	0	0.000%	0	0.000%
thou	5	0.377%	6	0.182%	11	0.238%
thy	3	0.226%	7	0.212%	10	0.216%
thyself	0	0.000%	0	0.000%	0	0.000%
prithee	0	0.000%	2	0.061%	2	0.043%
all singular pronouns	49	3.690%	166	5.038%	215	4.651%

Table 13. Full raw and normalized counts of pronoun forms in the trimmed dialogues.

Trimmed dialogues						
	Hamlet		As You Like It		Total	
Frequency type	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.	Raw	Norm.
all you_SG variants	38	3.348%	141	4.506%	179	4.198%
you_SG	27	2.379%	98	3.132%	125	2.932%
your_SG	10	0.881%	38	1.214%	48	1.126%
yours_SG	1	0.088%	3	0.096%	4	0.094%
yourself_SG	0	0.000%	2	0.064%	2	0.047%
all you_PL variants	10	0.881%	3	0.096%	13	0.308%
you_PL	6	0.529%	1	0.032%	7	0.164%
your_PL	3	0.264%	2	0.064%	5	0.117%
yourselves_PL	1	0.088%	0	0.000%	1	0.023%
all you_UNK variants	2	0.176%	0	0.000%	2	0.047%
you_UNK	2	0.176%	0	0.000%	2	0.047%
your_UNK	0	0.000%	0	0.000%	0	0.000%
all you variants	50	4.405%	144	4.602%	194	4.550%
all thou variants	11	0.969%	23	0.799%	34	0.844%
thee	3	0.264%	10	0.320%	13	0.304%
thine	0	0.000%	0	0.000%	0	0.000%
thou	5	0.440%	6	0.192%	11	0.258%
thy	3	0.264%	7	0.224%	10	0.235%
thyself	0	0.000%	0	0.000%	0	0.000%
prithee	0	0.000%	2	0.064%	2	0.047%
all singular pronouns	49	4.317%	166	5.241%	215	5.000%