

# Leeds Studies in English

## Article:

Vivian Salmon, 'Elizabethan Colloquial English in the Falstaff Plays', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 1 (1967), 37-70

## Permanent URL:

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=134448&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=134448&silos_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

# ELIZABETHAN COLLOQUIAL ENGLISH IN THE FALSTAFF PLAYS

By VIVIAN SALMON

The everyday trivialities of Elizabethan speech do not appear, at first sight, of special interest or importance to critics of Shakespeare's style; but it seems that, in the absence of objective criteria for describing colloquial English of the period, assessments of his style as realistic or artificial must depend on critical intuitions which may differ widely.<sup>1</sup> One critic feels that we know "by instinct" that in Shakespearean drama we are listening to "the real language of men,"<sup>2</sup> and she is supported by another who regrets that "To the subtle realistic language of the Falstaff scenes justice has seldom been done."<sup>3</sup> But a third notes that Shakespeare's characters speak like human beings, in real situations, only in his verse and not in prose.<sup>4</sup> In these circumstances an attempt to define the characteristics of realistic speech, and to consider their manifestation in Shakespearean drama, may be a helpful contribution to the argument by a linguist who is accustomed to looking for the special features of the spoken language in contemporary English. The results of this enquiry may seem trivial, partly because so many of these features have persisted from 1600 to the present day, and we tend to take them for granted as commonplaces of language (which they are certainly not); but at least it should be demonstrated that colloquial language is not differentiated from the written form merely by the use of "vulgarisms," as has sometimes been suggested; nor, on the other hand, need dramatic language necessarily be no more than "spoken prose," as has also been argued.<sup>5</sup> The respects in which dramatic language must undoubtedly differ from natural speech are features of utterance such as intonation patterns, hesitations and errors of articulation, which the writer cannot record with any sort of precision; given that the author provides the appropriate form of syntax and lexis, it is for the actor to realize them in naturalistic sound.

A detailed analysis of the language of even one Shakespearean play would require a lengthy monograph, and this article can therefore provide no more than a survey with illustrations; it is intended as a guide to what to look for in assessing the genuineness of stage speech and as a study in method for another, though related, purpose — the description of the history of English through a series of contrasted structures based on what we can discover of the spoken language of the past. What may seem trivial in this study will, it is hoped, gain point when it is seen as one stage in an evolutionary process; and even if it offers only a little clearer insight into the language of the early seventeenth century for students of that period who share in its life vicariously, some advantage may be gained in the sharpening of their responses to the language of domestic trivia. As H. C.

Wyld has remarked, "if we could . . . be suddenly transported back into the seventeenth century, most of us would find it extremely difficult to carry on . . . Even if the pronunciation . . . offered no difficulty, almost every other element which goes to make up the medium of communication with our fellows would do so. We should not know how to greet or take leave of those we met, how to express our thanks in an acceptable manner, how to ask a favour, pay a compliment, or send a polite message to a gentleman's wife . . . We should hesitate every minute how to address the person we were talking to."<sup>6</sup>

The plays chosen for analysis are those in which Shakespeare depicts English bourgeois and lower-class life in prose (which does not need to deviate from the norm to meet the requirements of metre). These are the plays in which Falstaff appears or is mentioned: *1 Henry IV*, *2 Henry IV*, *Henry V* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. They show Elizabethans carousing in taverns in London and Windsor, entertaining in a Gloucestershire garden, gossiping in their houses, being recruited for militia service by the local J.P., discussing the business of match-making or the pleasures of fencing or hunting, and going off to war in France. In all of these scenes, Elizabethan society comes to life as it never does in the contemporary grammars and phrase-books, the most valuable of which are *Florio's Firste Fruites* (1578), *Florio's Second Fruites* (1591), J. Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593), C. Holyband's *French Schoole-Maister* (1606) and his *French Littleton* of 1609. It might be thought that any study of Elizabethan colloquial English should begin with these since they were written to teach contemporaries to speak current French, Italian or English (most of the dialogues functioned reciprocally). Certainly they offer much valuable supporting evidence, but they must be used with caution. One at least disclaims accuracy: "doe not seeke the elegancie concerning the English of this Booke: for I doe not pretend to teach thee any other thing, then the French tongue . . . Therefore let not the Reader muse at the English of my booke."<sup>7</sup> Another admits to being, in part, merely a translation and contains some obvious mistakes.<sup>8</sup> Most of them are liable to lapse into lists for extending vocabulary: "I wil buy a Hat, a Cappe, a Girdle, a Doblet of Tafeta, Veluet . . . white, redde, greene, yalowe."<sup>9</sup> Finally, none of them is set in a really adequate context, where the participants speak in a language related to their personalities and social class. But these works may be of great linguistic value when compared with contemporary dramatic literature, and editors would often be at a loss without them.

In so far as the dialogues describe the speakers as "servants" and "masters" they contribute something toward the solution of the first problem of linguistic analysis at any stage of the language — the classification of the individual speaker in respect of factors which influence his language fundamentally. These are the innate factors of intelligence and personality, and the external factors of social class and place of origin. In the Falstaff plays there are obvious regional distinctions: deviations from the norm (if we accept Prince Henry's speech as such) occur in phonology, syntax and lexis in the speech of Welsh, Irish and Scottish characters. Further consideration of these varieties of English must be excluded here, for reasons of space. Deviations from the norm also occur in foreign speech (e.g.

Caius, Katherine) and these too will be excluded. The remaining characters speak a form of English which is syntactically homogeneous; regionally, it is the speech of London and the shires around, which Puttenham regarded as the standard; socially, it is probably middle-class with lower-class lexical deviations derived from the language of the criminal classes — “cant” terms relating to theft, the law and prostitution such as *coney-catch*, *cog*, *cuttle*, *St. Nicholas's clerks*, *ride the mare*, *nut-hook*, *bona-roba*, all of which are glossed by Schmidt and various editors.<sup>10</sup> There are also a few words and phrases which seem to mark their users as lower middle-class, e.g. *forsooth*, *indeed*, *by yea and nay*, *an't please your worship*.<sup>11</sup> Socially, then, the speech of the London region might be divided into upper-class (Henry), middle-class (the Pages and the Fords, with Justice Shallow of Windsor possibly of humbler origins: “Now has he land and beeves” says Falstaff — but he had not when he was younger), and lower-middle or lower-class (Quickly, Rugby, Simple and the carriers). The speech of the Host is ambiguous, and that of Falstaff, apparently upper-class, is affected by the use of cant terms. These distinctions need to be remembered, but probably affect lexis to a limited extent; again, the few indications that Quickly's pronunciation was lower-class are too trivial to consider. After region and class, intelligence and personality may affect language and be recorded by the dramatist: lack of intelligence is suggested by the confused syntax and the malapropisms of Quickly, and by the prolixity of Shallow; personality is suggested by the eccentric and affected language of “my ranting Host of the Garter” and of the “drawling, affecting rogue” Nym, as well as by the aggressive and violent vituperation of Pistol, “the foul-mouthedest rogue in England,” and of Doll Tearsheet who, like the whore of Hamlet's imaginings, “unpacks her heart with words.”<sup>12</sup> Less obvious aspects of personality are indicated by the semantic fields from which individual speakers draw their metaphors. Ford, the sportsman, uses hunting terminology in daily life, as when, begging his friends to follow him in the search for a concealed Falstaff, he adds “If I cry out thus upon no trail, never trust me when I open again” (*MW* 4.2.212).

While region and social class, intelligence and personality are factors affecting the language of an individual as a whole, they are not unique to the spoken language and will not, therefore, be further discussed here; although they are all, and especially social class, of great interest and importance. It is hoped that a complete investigation of these topics in relation to Shakespeare's language will be made elsewhere; only occasional comments will appear here on any point of special interest. Assuming then, that each speaker — especially for the purposes of drama — uses his own form of language, we may turn to the consideration of spoken as opposed to written language as it is manifested in all varieties of speech. Spoken language is distinguished in three major respects:

- I. Spoken language evolves within a given situation, e.g. a domestic conversation over the dinner table or a formal interview over an office desk.
- II. Nearly all spoken language (apart from the monologues of lecture or sermon) involves at least two participants within a situation who will

use language which is appropriate to their attitudes to one another, to the situation, and to any messages which are conveyed within the situation.

- III.** Because the linguistic symbols in use are spoken, they are both ephemeral and to some extent dependent on the physical ability of the speaker to produce them, in a way in which graphic symbols are not (e.g. in the juxtaposition of certain consonants). They are also open to influence by stress, rhythm and intonation.

These three characteristics of speech determine linguistic form in a number of ways:

- I.** Since speech arises in and from a situation,
- (1) for certain situations, which recur frequently, certain "ritual" forms of language will occur, e.g. situations of meeting, parting, eating, drinking. These "ritual" utterances will automatically occur and will function not referentially but phatically; i.e. their "message" serves only to establish, prolong or discontinue communication.
  - (2) Secondly, speech within a situation needs to be less explicit than written language. Certain syntactic elements may depend either on gesture or, without repetition, on an earlier utterance by another speaker, and may thus be omitted from the structure.
  - (3) Since speech represents some kind of interchange between two speakers within a situation, various linguistic devices will reflect that interchange or, as it has also been described, that "orientation toward the addressee" — the "conative" function of language.<sup>19</sup> This orientation is expressed by
    - (a) the use of questions and commands, which both require a reaction from the other participant, and of exclamations which, although not demanding any definite response, normally need the presence of another person for utterance.
    - (b) It is also denoted by terms of address which stand outside the syntactic structure of the sentence, and which in some languages are marked by a special "vocative" form.
    - (c) Interchange is also indicated by the form called traditionally the "ethic dative."
    - (d) Finally, "orientation towards the addressee" will of necessity include constant expression of mutual attitudes through lexical selection.
- II.** The preceding section describes the inherent features of dialogue; since two human beings are engaged in dialogue, they will choose the exponents of those features which express their attitudes towards all aspects of the situation and to one another. Sometimes the exponents chosen will indicate attitudes appropriate to permanent relationships, such as parent to child or servant to master; sometimes they will express temporary attitudes such as politeness, formality, anger or dislike, which often overlap both with one another and with

the permanent attitudes. Reactions towards the communication, on the speaker's part, can also include the desire for emphasis; and, on the listener's part, they may be favourable or unfavourable. Pleasure, displeasure and astonishment are the commonest reactions to the situation which can find linguistic expression.

- III. Inherent in speech as a medium of discourse are the two features of impermanence and the special requirements of physical utterance. Associated with impermanence is a lack of premeditation. The latter may cause the speaker to enter on a structure which is too complex for the limitations on memory imposed by the lack of written record; but there is no unsaying what has been said, and the speaker can only begin again, attempt to finish the construction by means which are at variance with any written form he would select, or stop with the construction unfinished. Whatever the precise result, there will be a divergence between the speaker's "competence" and his "performance," although such a divergence is far more likely in monologue than in the short structures which are more characteristic of conversational exchange. Other results of lack of premeditation are repetition of structures or of the message in a different form and, naturally, hesitations and pauses which are sometimes replaced by words and phrases with no real referential meaning—"pause-fillers." One special kind of repetition has the function of avoiding ambiguity and assisting the memory in coping with the impermanence of speech — this is cross-reference, i.e. the placing of (generally) subject or object at the beginning of an utterance, and repeating it later as a pronoun. The initial reference acts as a "title."

The other salient feature of the spoken mode of discourse, in contrast with the written, is the physical fact of utterance which may lead to the choice of certain syntactic or morphological forms on grounds of ease of pronunciation. It may also lead to divergences between spoken and written realizations of linguistic symbols where the former are subject to loss of stress in speech.<sup>14</sup>

The remainder of this paper is an attempt to illustrate these characteristics of speech in the prose portions of the Falstaff plays. It does not attempt to offer an analysis of the speech of every person in the drama as a reflection of social class or regional dialect—which would provide material for a book; nor does it give statistics of occurrences, which would not be especially meaningful. It matters little exactly how often Mistress Quickly exclaims "I warrant you" or "Indeed"; what is of interest is that these are her exponents for "pause-filler" and "exclamation" and that they occur frequently. Normally only one example of each form is quoted, unless it is in strong or unexpected contrast to Mod. Eng. usage, and occasional reference will be made to the phrase-books.

## I. LANGUAGE AND SITUATION

### 1. The use of ritual utterances

The prevalence of elaborate ritual formulae in common situations of daily life was a feature of Elizabethan culture which is illustrated in the

Falstaff plays and in the phrase-books. Certain formulae—greetings and farewells, for example, are quite clearly essential, but others, such as those for disclaiming precedence, are unnecessary to the carrying out of daily life, and seem to have met with some resistance even at the time. One of these may be mentioned before the essential formulae are described; it is used by the affected Slender who has just refused to enter the Pages' house at Windsor before his host's daughter, Anne. After much discussion, he finally complies, saying:

DI.1.328<sup>15</sup> I'll rather be unmannerly than troublesome.

Similar formulae are found in the phrase books, and they are of special interest because they are sometimes associated with disclaimers, e.g. Florio: "I pray you let vs leaue these cerimonies a parte, as more beseeming our counterfaite courtiers at this daye, than our pure and vnsported friendship." To which the second speaker replies: "I am an enemie vnto cerimonies . . . They ought not to be vsed among friends"<sup>16</sup>

#### (a) Greeting formulae

These are naturally of frequent occurrence on the stage. They include general formulae of friendship valid at any time of day, blessings, and references to the time of day.

##### (i) General formulae of friendship:

*How now*, which may be returned, answered by another formula, or not returned at all, e.g.:

D2.1.199 P<sup>17</sup> How now, mine host! Ho How now, bully rook!

B5.3.85 F How now, Pistol! Pi Sir John, God save you, sir!

D2.1.151 P How now, Meg! MP Whither go you, George?

*Well met*, answered by another formula or not at all:

C2.1.1 B Well met, Corporal Nym. N Good morrow,  
Lieutenant . . .

D3.2.53 P Well met, Master Ford. Fo Trust me, a good knot.

*Welcome*, answered by another formula or not at all.

B3.2.93 S Welcome, good Sir John. F I am glad to see you well.

##### (ii) Blessings:

*God save you*. In spite of its apparent formality, it was a common greeting mentioned by Morose (Jonson, *Silent Woman*, V, i) as "come to be a habit in our lives." It is answered by repetition or by another formula, and is often abbreviated:

B2.2.80 B God save your Grace! H And yours, most noble Bardolph.

B2.4.117 Pi God save you, Sir John! F Welcome, Ancient Pistol!

D2.3.19 S Save you, Master Doctor Caius! (no reply).

*Bless you (thee)*, answered by repetition or not at all:

D2.2.162 Fo Bless you, sir! F And you, sir.

D2.3.18 Ho Bless thee, bully doctor! (no reply).

##### (iii) References to the time of day:

For purposes of greeting, the day was divided into times before and after noon, i.e. *morrow* and *even*.

*Good day* occurs only in verse and in regional speech. (It is used by Jamy, the Scots captain in *Henry V.*)

*Good time of day.*

B1.2.107 F God give your lordship good time of day (no reply). *Good morrow* is the normal morning greeting (*good morning* very rarely occurs in Shakespeare). Only an abbreviated form occurs in the Falstaff plays, but the full form is recorded in Florio: "God giue you good morrowe" (Florio 2, p.15). It is usually reciprocated, or not answered:

D2.2.36 Q Give your worship good morrow. F Good morrow, good wife.

*Good even* is also recorded here only in abbreviated form; the full form is in Florio: "God geue you good euen" (Florio 1, p.25).

D2.1.202 S Good even and twenty, good Master Page!

The numeral indicates warmth of feeling, cf. Eliot "God night and a thousand to euerybody" (op. cit., p.20). A common abbreviation elsewhere, though here only with Fluellen, is *God-den* (C3.2.93).

### (b) Formulae following greeting

These formulae have been largely preserved, referring as they do to the welfare of the other speaker and his family, or to pleasure at meeting.

#### (i) *How doth:*

Most speakers, in accordance with what seems to be received Mod. Eng. practice, do not reply:

B3.2.3 S And how doth my good cousin Silence?

Si Good morrow, good cousin Shallow.

S And how doth my cousin, your bedfellow?

It may be socially significant that Q replies elaborately:

D1.4.139 Fe How now, good woman! how dost thou?

Q The better, that it pleases your good worship to ask.

and that, later, Fe does not; Q uses the 3rd person to him:

D3.4.34 Q And how does good Master Fenton?

Alternatively, a comment is made on apparent health:

B3.2.92 S By my troth, you look well.

#### (ii) *An enquiry for news:*

B2.4.388 Po Peto, how now! what news?

B2.4.405 F How now! what's the matter?

#### (iii) *I am glad to see:*

D1.1.83 S Master Page, I am glad to see you.

B5.1.62 B I am glad to see your worship.

#### (iv) *An early stirrer:*

This was a very common remark made on meeting in the morning (cf. C4.1.6)

B3.2.2 S An early stirrer, by the rood!

#### (v) *A comment on the weather:*

Such comments are surprisingly rare, although *Littleton* gives a list for use by guests after arrival:<sup>18</sup>

B3.2.102 F Fie! this is hot weather, gentlemen.

### (c) Parting formulae

Like greetings these are very varied, and include invitations to leave in company with the speaker, blessings and dismissals.

#### (i) *Invitations to leave:*

- D2.1.159 MF Will you go, Mistress Page? MP Have with you.  
 D3.2.95 Fo Will you go, gentles? All Have with you to see  
 this . . .  
 D2.1.237 Ho Here, boys, here, here! shall we wag? P Have  
 with you. (*Wag* = stir, move.)  
 C2.3.48 N Shall we shog? Pi Come, let's away. (*Shog* — also  
*shog off* C2.1.47 — was very rare: it was derived from  
 ME *shogge* "shake." Probably slang usage here.)  
 B4.3.143 F Come away (= *come along*).

(ii) *Forms of blessing and good wishes:*

*Farewell* and *adieu* seem to have been interchangeable, and could be used together. *God be with you* is surprisingly rare, not being recorded as a parting formula until the late 16th century (*OED*). It is used, somewhat ironically, by H to Pi after the latter had insulted him, and by Fluellen in the form "God be wi' you" (C5.1.70). Florio gives it as an alternative greeting to "God saue you" (Florio 1, p.27), but Mason quotes it as a parting formula with the spelling *God boui*.<sup>19</sup> *Bless you* is used by S:

B3.2.315 Sir John, the Lord bless you!

*Peace be with you* by Q:

D3.5.57 Peace be with you, sir.

(iii) *References to the time:*

Both *Good night* and *Good morrow* occur, as is shown by a conversation in the early hours:

A2.4.580 Sheriff Good night, my noble lord.

H I think it is good morrow, is it not?

Sheriff Indeed, my lord, I think it be two o'clock.

and on leaving shortly afterwards, H and Peto exchange *Good morrow*.

(iv) *Dismissals:*

There are varying degrees of politeness in dismissing a servant or intimates:

D3.3.19 MF Be gone.

D3.5.56 F (to Q) Well, be gone.

A2.2.48 F Out, you rogue!

B1.2.102 F Hence! avaunt!

The last instance is frequently used in dismissing dogs.

(d) *Formulae used after parting words*

D2.2.138 F Fare thee well: commend me to them both.

D1.4.164 Fe If thou seest her before me, commend me.

The phrase books show *commend* used in beginning a conversation in the form *I commend me to you*.

B2.4.412 F Farewell, good wenches . . . D Have a care of  
 thyself.

(e) *Formulae associated with drinking*

A popular setting in the Elizabethan drama is the tavern, and some of the most realistic dialogue is associated with it—especially with the Boar's Head in Eastcheap and the Garter Tavern at Windsor, which appear in the Falstaff plays. These also contain a drinking scene set in Justice Shallow's

garden in Gloucestershire. Shakespeare devises part of a scene to demonstrate the limited language of tapsters, the joke being at the expense of Francis:

A2.4.25 one that never spake other English in his life than—"Eight shillings and sixpence," and—"You are welcome," with this shrill addition,—“Anon, anon, sir!”

and in this scene the tapster's language consists in large part of the latter phrase, in answer to repeated calls from Poin. (*You are welcome* is the innkeeper's regular greeting in the phrase-books.) Toasts were drunk to the accompaniment of a formula, which is given by Florio: "We will pledge you euerie one most hartelie" (Florio 2, p.55). This is recorded from 1546 and may have been somewhat old-fashioned by c.1600 since it occurs only in verse, in a very formal context, in the Falstaff plays (B4.2.73). The other formula given in the phrase-books is "I drink to all the companie" which is also rare here, and possibly, in view of the age of S, old-fashioned:

B5.3.59 S I'll drink to Master Bardolph.

The formulae used by Falstaff are:

B2.4.118 Here, Pistol, I charge you with a cup of sack.

to which Pi does not reply directly, but later turns to D and says:

B2.4.128 Then to you, Mistress Dorothy; I will charge you.

B5.3.24 F I'll give you a health for that anon.

B5.3.52 F Health and long life to you, Master Silence.

When a sufficient amount of liquor had been consumed by the other speaker, the formula in use was:

B5.3.74 F Why, now you have done me right.

If there was any break in the drinking it was customary to call out to the drinkers *Hem!* Eliot also gives this in the form *ha-hem*, (op. cit. p.41) and the practice is mentioned by the Prince in his comment on the tapsters' speech:

A2.4.17 When you breathe in your watering, they cry "hem!" and bid you play it off.

Shallow, referring to the days of his riotous youth, recalls:

B3.2.234 Our watch-word was, "Hem, boys!"

and when Doll, having drunk too much wine, answers an enquiry about her health, she replies:

B2.4.33 Better than I was: hem!

The exclamation was probably intended to represent the clearing of the throat preparatory to taking a long draught; another, mentioned only once, is fairly common in other Elizabethan plays:

A2.4.126 H "Rivo!" says the drunkard.

It was probably derived from Spanish *arriba* "up."

#### (f) **Formulae associated with meals**

The Falstaff plays contain both invitations to meals and scenes in which some kind of food and drink is served. F asks Master Gower:

B2.1.198 Shall I entreat you with me to dinner?

(*entreat* occurring in the phrase books, although more often collocated with *company*), and Fo asks more directly:

D3.2.54 I have good cheer at home; and I pray you all go with me. *Good cheer* was the regular collocation, used by both guest and host with reference to the meal; cf. Florio: "Come and dine with me . . . I thanke you, I wil come: what good cheare shal I haue?" (Florio 1, p.35) and *Fr. Sch.*: "Now eate, and make good cheere."<sup>20</sup> The invitation accepted, the servant is requested to lay the table:

B5.3.9 S Spread, Davy.

This is perhaps slightly more old-fashioned than Eliot's "Cover the Table" (op. cit. p.35), which is also found in the Falstaff plays in the 1st Drawer's instructions to his fellow:

B2.4.11 Why then, cover, and set them down [i.e. dishes].

The host invites his guests to table:

B3.2.105 S Will you sit?

and the meal begins, after grace, with a formula which is roughly equivalent to *Bon appetit!* The common formula is *Much good may it do you*, which may also be uttered at the end of a meal. When P thanks him for his gift of venison, S replies:

D1.1.84 Much good do it your good heart!

and with comic effect Fluellen, forcing Pi to eat a leek, exclaims:

C5.1.55 Much good do you.

Sixteenth-century books of manners such as Seager's *School of Virtue* and Rhodes's *Book of Nurture*<sup>21</sup> advocate the use of the formula at the beginning or end of the meal, and it is even made the occasion for a jest in Marston's *What you Will* (ed. H. Wood, II, 285):

*Sim.* (rising from table) I must needs rise, much good do it you.

*Qua.* Doost thou thinke thy rising will do them much good?

The alternative formula was *Proface*, from Italian *pro vi faccia*. The *OED* examples suggest that its life was fairly short (recorded from 1515 to 1638), although it must have been common at one time as an occurrence in the *Gull's Horn Book* would imply: "in stead of *Grace*, every one drew out a knife . . . and cryed *Proface* you mad *Rogues*, and so fell to."<sup>22</sup> It is used by Davy (B5.3.28).

### (g) **Summoning**

A frequent occurrence in drama is the summoning of a character off-stage; the most common formula, used in entirely serious contexts, is *What ho!*:

D4.2.9 MP What ho! gossip Ford! what ho!

More frequently used to servants is *What*:

D3.3.1 MF What, John! what, Robert!

Attention is also attracted by *ho* alone:

D1.4.136 Fe Who's within there? ho!

and an impatient summons is expressed by *why*:

B5.1.8 S Why, Davy! (a second call).

Finally, *I say*—the only form to survive in Standard English—is used alone or in combination:

B5.1.2. S What! Davy, I say.

**(h) Handing over an object**

A formula which hardly exists now in English, but which is so common in other languages that foreign students usually invent it for us, is some kind of utterance on handing something to another person, e.g. Swedish *Var så god!*, French *S'il vous plaît*. The Elizabethan Englishman used a very simple formula, *Hold! There is x for you*, which occurs very frequently indeed, not only in the drama, where it might be thought of as a device to aid stage business, but also in the phrase books, where it occurs in normal conversation. Only one example need be given:

D1.4.162 Fe Hold, there's money for thee.

**(i) Hue and cry**

Another formula which has disappeared was one necessitated by the processes of Elizabethan justice—the pursuit of thieves by the constables and their demand for assistance from the onlookers. When Ho loses his horses to the “Germans” he cries out in distraction:

D4.5.94 Fly, run, hue and cry, villain!

*Hue and cry*, of AN origin, is first recorded in an English context in 1502: “One persone . . . that wyll not helpe . . . officers . . . when hue and crye is made . . .” is liable to be punished. After the first call of *hue and cry*, the constables summoned help in the words used by the Host elsewhere:

D3.1.113 Follow me . . . follow, follow, follow.

But if the thief had friends in the crowd he might make his escape, when the cry would go up which was made by the sheriff's officer Fang when he feared that B was about to defend his intended prisoner:

B2.1.63 A rescue! a rescue!

**(j) Telling the time**

Methods of computing time naturally enough differ, and so involve a change of formula. What is strange, however, is our retention of an archaic formula in an answer to a question about time, but not in the question itself:

A2.1.36 G What's o'clock? 1st C. I think it be two o'clock.

Other references to time in the Falstaff plays are:

A2.1.1 1st C An't be not four by the day (=in the morning, a.m.). . .

A2.1.20 1st C . . . since the first cock (=midnight).

The Arden edition (A, p. 38) comments on the conventional times of cock-crow used in computing the hour: 1st cock was midnight, 2nd cock was 3 a.m. and 3rd cock an hour before day.

**(k) Miscellaneous**

Finally, there is a large number of utterances appropriate to various less clearly-defined situations; some of the more important are listed here. Excusing oneself:

D3.5.27 Q I cry you mercy.

D1.1.319 Fo You shall not choose, sir.

Thanking someone:

A pressing invitation:

D1.1.86 S I thank you always with my heart.

Offering assistance:

B3.2.65 S What is your good pleasure with me?

Brief thanks (ironically):

A3.3.58 F God-a-mercy!

## 2. The interdependence of speech and situation allows spoken language to be less explicit than written

The "ideal" sentence of the written language contains NP + VP (functioning as S and Pred.) but the spoken language may occur without one or the other, e.g. without VP:

A2.2.69 Peto How many be there of them?  
G Some eight or ten.

without subject NP:

B2.4.298 F Shalt have a cap tomorrow. (This is the reading only of Quarto; Folio "improves" to "Thou shalt.")

This example may be analogous to the Mod. Eng. loss of subject pronoun at the beginning of a main clause which is not preceded by a co-ordinating conjunction, e.g.:

What did he say? Don't really remember.

where the place of the pronoun may be "supplied" by a gesture or glance. The loss of the 1st person pronoun seems to have resulted in the common collocation *pray you/God/heaven* as in:

D4.2.118 2nd Ser Pray heaven, it be not full . . .

and there is one indisputable example, not corrected in the Folio, in *The Tempest*, 2.2.136:

Ste Here: swear then, how thou escapedst.  
Trin Swam ashore, man, like a duck.

Otherwise, regular loss of the pronoun subject is confined to the *thou* forms in questions, e.g.:

B2.4.297 F What stuff wilt have a kirtle of? (F=wilt thou).  
A2.1.32 1st C Canst not hear? . . . hast no faith in thee?  
A2.1.43 2nd C Ay, when? canst tell?

But this apparent loss may merely reflect the assimilation of the initial consonant of the pronoun to the final consonant of the verb and the failure of the compositor (or author) to record the unstressed vowel. Assimilation and lack of stress is indicated by the form of the final pronoun in:

B2.1.65 Q Thou wo't, wo't ta? (=wilt).<sup>23</sup>

Loss of *thou* is very common; evidence for the loss of the 3rd person pronoun is scanty, but it may be suggested by the following:

A2.1.13 1st C Poor fellow! never joyed since the price of oats rose. Here also the compositor may have failed to show the unstressed form of the pronoun, normally spelt *a*; alternatively the punctuation adopted by Arden makes *fellow* the subject of *joyed*. On the whole the evidence suggests that, as in Mod. Eng., the personal pronoun subject might disappear in the spoken language.

Another instance of the less explicit nature of the spoken language is the frequent occurrence of structures where VP contains only an auxiliary verb, the finite lexical verb being contained in the previous utterance. These are, of course, equally common in Mod. Eng. as response sentences, but

the exponents differ. In Elizabethan English the first element, *Ay*, *Yes*, *Nay*, *No*, depended on agreement or disagreement with a positive or negative verb in the preceding utterance; the second element was frequently an asseveration (the commonest being *marry*), and NP and V were subject to inversion in certain conditions. A fuller account appears elsewhere;<sup>24</sup> a few examples are:

- D2.1.186 Fo Does he lie at the Garter? P Ay, marry, does he.  
 D1.1.156 F Did you pick . . . Slender's purse? Sl Ay, by these gloves, did he.  
 D4.2.216 MP He beat him . . . pitifully. MF Nay, by the mass, that he did not.  
 C2.3.29 N They say he cried out of sack. Q Ay, that a' did.  
 C2.3.32 Q Nay, that a' did not. Boy Yes, that a' did.

### 3. Interchange between two speakers in a situation

Mutual awareness, or "orientation towards the addressee," is given linguistic expression by various devices.

#### (a) Questions, commands, exclamations

Questions are characteristic of the spoken language, although they can of course occur in a few forms of the written, e.g. official documents and questionnaires. In addition to questions demanding information (for which Elizabethan English has a choice between inversion and *do*-structures), there are also question tags denoting the speaker's desire for an opinion or approval, e.g.:

- B3.2.11 S He is at Oxford still, is he not?  
 and echo questions (sometimes punctuated as exclamations):  
 B2.4.44 F You make fat rascals, Mistress Doll.  
 D I make them! . . . I make them not.

Commands are also appropriate to the spoken language, and again the Elizabethan speaker had a wider range of forms from which to choose than we have now. The selection of the appropriate question or command depended on emotional or linguistic factors, which will be discussed below (p. 55). Exclamations are also characteristic of the spoken language, and the Falstaff plays are rich in exclamatory utterances of all kinds. Where they have sentence form, they may differ from Mod. Eng. in structure, although the commonest, as now, take *how* or *what a* as the initial element, e.g.:

- A2.4.587 H Hark, how hard he fetches breath.  
 B2.4.312 H What a life dost thou lead!  
 Other exclamatory sentences have *if*, *O that*, *to x* as initial elements:  
 C.2.1.38 Q O well-a-day, Lady! if he be not drawn now.  
 D2.1.102 MF O, that my husband saw this letter!  
 B3.2.37 S To see how many of mine old acquaintance are dead!

Exclamations introduced by *how* and *what a* take inversion of NP and V where V = an auxiliary.

#### (b) Forms of address

The most obvious evidence of mutual awareness is the use of forms of address which occur outside the syntactic structure of the sentence as

“vocatives.” These forms of address may consist of personal names, terms of family relationship, generic names (*man, boy*), names of occupations, titles of courtesy, endearments and terms of abuse, and the personal pronouns. The following is a list of such terms; their use, dependent on emotional factors, will be discussed below (p. 56).

Elizabethan English is extremely rich in terms of address, particularly since, like some modern Europeans, Englishmen of c.1600 liked to assign a man his place in the social hierarchy when addressing him in a fairly formal manner. If no title of occupation was available, some other designation was desired, even if as meaningless as *neighbour*. Modern and Elizabethan forms of address also differ grammatically because of the possibility in Elizabethan usage of colligating adjective and personal name (now reserved mainly for adjectives of a limited class in post-position, e.g. *John dear*). The Elizabethan adjectives also belonged to a limited class, *sweet, good, honest, gentle, fair*, but they occurred very frequently indeed.

(i) *Personal names* were used as now, except that both Christian and surname are often used in direct address:

C4.1.88 C Court Brother John Bates, is not that the morning?

D1.1.240 S Cousin Abraham Slender, can you love her?

D2.3.101 C Come at my heels, Jack Rugby.

(ii) *Terms of relationship* were more commonly used than now:

C2.1.93 Q Good husband, come home presently.

D4.2.193 MF Nay, good sweet husband!

D1.1.201 P Wife, bid these gentlemen welcome.

D4.2.128 Fo What, wife, I say!

D5.5.194 Sl Father Page! (to a future father-in-law).

D5.2.2 Fo Remember, son Slender (to a future son-in-law).

D1.1.195 P Nay, daughter, carry the wine in.

B3.2.228 S Cousin Silence . . .

D1.1.213 S Come, coz; come, coz.

D3.4.39 Sl Pray you, uncle . . .

*Cousin* was normally followed by a personal name; when alone, it was usually abbreviated. *Cousin* and *uncle* were used fairly vaguely — Sl uses both terms in addressing S, probably because of the latter's seniority which seemed to require *uncle*. *Cousin* also seems to have been interchangeable with *nephew* and *grandchild* (cf. *Othello* 1.1.112).

(iii) *Generic terms of address* also contrast with modern usage:

*Man* is used in singular and plural:

D1.4.96 Q Notwithstanding, man, I'll do your master . . .

D1.4.38 Q Run in here, good young man.

D4.2.153 Fo Empty the basket, I say! MF Why, man, why?

C2.2.126 Q Sweet men, come to him.

*Woman* occurs in the singular only:

D1.4.139 Fe How now, good woman!

D2.2.96 F Woman, commend me to her.

D2.1.43 MP What's the matter, woman?

*Gentleman* is used in singular and plural, and is also abbreviated:

B5.3.108 S Honest gentleman, I know not your breeding.

B3.2.324 F Fare you well, gentle gentlemen.

D3.2.95 Fo Will you go, gentles?

*Gentlewoman* is rare in the Falstaff plays, but is the normal term of address to a woman in the phrase-books:

B2.4.382 H (to D) You, gentlewoman, . . .

*Boy* is the term of address to a page, and metaphorically to adults:

D2.2.140 F Boy, go along with this woman.

B5.5.48 F (to H) My sweet boy!

D2.1.237 Ho Here, boys, here, here!

*Lad* occurs here only with reference to adults:

A1.2.44 F (to H) Thou sayest true, lad.

D1.3.40 F (to Pi and B) My honest lads . . .

*Maid* is used to an unmarried girl and *wench* to a woman of any age:

D5.5.243 MP Why went you not with Master doctor, maid?

B2.4.409 F You see, my good wenches . . .

(iv) *Terms of address indicating occupation:*

*Justice* LCJ is addressed by his title (B5.5.49) and Justice Shallow is so addressed by Ho, though others use *Master*:

D2.1.201 Caveliero-justice, I say!

*Knight* was used in direct address:

D5.5.186 P Yet be cheerful, knight.

B2.4.199 Pi Sweet knight, I kiss thy neif.

*Esquire* is used by S himself, and by others (no doubt ironically):

B4.3.140 F There will I visit Master Robert Shallow, esquire.

The title was applicable to all who bore arms, and (in D1.1.) SI points out that S was *armiger*.

*Innkeepers* were always addressed as *mine host* and their wives as *hostess* (D passim, and A2.4.309 F Hostess, clap to the doors).

*Military ranks* mentioned in the Falstaff plays are:

*Captain* (Fluellen), *Ancient* = Ensign (P), *Lieutenant* (B), *Corporal* (N).

*Lieutenant* is used in address (not *Mr* e.g. C2.1.2), and a private is addressed as *Soldier* (e.g. C4.7.126). Ranks seemed to have caused some difficulty to the uneducated:

B3.2.247 Mouldy And, good Master corporal captain . . .

B3.2.190 Bullcalf Good my lord captain . . .

B3.2.238 Bullcalf Good Master Corporate Bardolph . . .

*Other occupations* used in address:

D2.3.18 Ho Bully doctor!

D1.4.81 Q Parson Hugh . . .

B2.4.108 F Call him up, drawer.

B3.2.171 F Well said, good woman's tailor!

A2.1.36 G Good morrow, carriers.

A2.1.30 1st C What, ostler!

(Sometimes names of occupations function as surnames:

B5.1.11 S William cook, bid him come hither.)

*Other designations:*

A2.1.49 2nd C Come, neighbour Mugs.

B2.4.93 Q "Neighbour Quickly," says he.

C4.1.88 Court Brother John Bates . . .

D4.2.195 MP Come, Mother Prat (a form frequently used to elderly women of the lower classes; cf. *Mother Hubbard*).

(v) *Titles of courtesy*, which include direct and indirect terms of address. The indirect forms still survive, but in very limited use:

A3.3.120 Q (to H) I heard your Grace say so.

B1.2.128 F (to Lord Chief J.) An't please your lordship . . .

D2.2.36 Q (to F) Give your worship good morrow.

*Your worship* was very common, and may have functioned syntactically as a 2nd person:

D1.4.152 Q Have not your worship a wart?

There was a very large set of titles, several of which have not survived: *Lord* occurs passim in the forms *my lord*, *good my lord*, *my good lord*.

*Lady*, originally the female equivalent of *lord*, became widened in application to the wife of a gentleman, often referred to as *my lady your wife* (OED 1528). It was a much-coveted title: Dekker notes that citizens' widows long to marry knights and would give £100 to be "dubbed ladies" (Arden, B, p. 51). Mrs Q shares their wish; she upbraids F because he swore to "marry me and make me my lady thy wife" (B2.1.103). F promises the same to MF: "I would thy husband were dead . . . I would make thee my lady" (D3.3.52); Q obtains her wish once when, no doubt ironically, H addresses her as "my lady the hostess" (A2.4.319). S asks B concerning F in the correct terms "how my lady his wife doth" (B3.2.72).

*Sir* is an unstressed form of *sire* used regularly before the Christian name of a priest (from mid-14th to mid-17th century) as the translation of *dominus* (the title of a graduate); it was also the distinctive title of a knight or baronet. *Sir Hugh* is a form of address to the parson in D, and *Sir John* occurs passim for Falstaff.

*Madam* was another title coveted by women; as early as the 14th century it was noted as an advantage gained by a citizen's wife when her husband became an alderman (*Cant. Tales*, Prol. 376). It was the correct form of address to the wives of lords and knights; Shakespeare satirizes its misuse by the ignorant in *Taming of the Shrew*, Ind. ii, 110; Sly the tinker is induced to believe that he is a lord and meets his "wife":

Sly What must I call her?

Lord Madam.

Sly Al'ce madam, or Joan madam?

Lord Madam, and nothing else: so lords call ladies.

Mrs Q, speaking of her expected marriage to F, alleges that F said she should break off her friendship with the butcher's wife and such poor people, who "ere long . . . should call me madam" (B2.1.112).

*Master* was a title originally prefixed to the name of men of rank, but by the 16th century it had been extended to all gentlemen, whether by birth or by virtue of their office, e.g. Master Tisick the Deputy, and Master Fang and Master Snare the sheriff's officers; Eliot comments: "Maister Sergeant (for he is a gentleman by his office)" (op. cit. p. 99). The sheriff himself is "Master Sheriff" (A2.4.562), the page-boy is "Master page" (B5.3.27), and the Ho is affected enough to address someone as "Master guest" (D2.3.75). The title also belongs to doctors and parsons (*Master doctor Caius* and *Master parson Evans*). Generally, there is a very clear class-distinction in its use; it is never prefixed to the name of a servant such as Simple, Davy and Rugby, nor to the names of the countrymen being re-

cruited for the militia, Mouldy, Bullcalf, Feeble, Shadow. It is, however, somewhat surprisingly, used for citizens like Master Dombledon and Master Smooth the silk merchants. The exact use of this title also caused some problems for the uneducated; Dogberry instructs Verges to write down the name of their prisoner as "Master gentleman Conrade" (*Much Ado*, 4.2.18).

*Mistress*, originally a title distinguishing gentlewomen, is here used for all women, whether married or single, and of whatever rank; it is applied equally to the wives of P and Fo, and P's daughter Anne, to the Hostess Q (a servant of Dr Caius in D) and to the prostitute Doll. It can precede the Christian name alone (*Mistress Doll* B2.4.38) as well as the surname or both names (*Mistress Anne Page* D1.1.48).

*Sirrah* seems to be related to *sir*, although its etymology is obscure. It seems to have answered the need for a respectful form of address to a youth not yet old enough to be called *master*:

D4.1.21 MP (to her son William) Come on, sirrah.

and to page-boys:

B2.4.408 F (to page) Pay the musicians, sirrah.

It is also used, without any apparent lack of respect, with the names of occupations:

A2.1.46 G Sirrah carrier, what time do you mean to come?

*Goodman*, which is first recorded in 1340 as the title of the master of an establishment, is later (1484) prefixed to designations of occupation — "a good man labourer." In describing the status of yeomen, Sir Thomas Smith notes: "These [yeomen] be not called masters, for that . . . pertaineth to Gentlemen onely. But to their surnames men adde Goodman . . . amongst their neighbors, I meane not in matters of importance or in lawe" (*OED*). There are two occurrences: reference is made to "Goodman Puff of Barson" (B5.3.91) and "Goodman Adam" (A2.4.107).

*Goodwife* is recorded from 1325 for the mistress of a house, but as *mistress* was so widely used in the 16th century for all women, possibly *goodwife*, as a title of address, was slightly derogatory by c.1600. Q's reference to a neighbour (whose acquaintance she ought to shun if she were married to F) as "Goodwife Keech" suggests the lowliness of the neighbour's status; on the other hand, F addresses Q herself (as servant of Dr Caius) as "good wife" (D2.2.37). The title remains as *Goody* in *Goody Two-Shoes*.

*Dame*, like other titles, originally belonged only to women of rank, but became extended in application. It was still officially in 1614 (*OED*) the title of a knight's wife, but had already become degraded in meaning to "old woman," perhaps because of the traditional collocation with *Partlet*. The name was applied to fussy, scolding women, and is used by F in addressing Q:

A3.3.60 How now, Dame Partlet the hen!

(vi) *Terms of endearment and abuse* occur profusely in the Falstaff plays, but the latter are very much more frequent. As these terms are chosen in accordance with the participants' mutual attitudes, their use will be discussed below (p. 58).

(vii) *Personal pronouns* are, of course, the most common form of address. The choice between *you* and *thou* depended largely upon mutual

attitudes, whether permanent (e.g. master to servant) or temporary; usage will be discussed below (p. 59).

(c) **Ethic dative**

Interchange and mutual awareness between two speakers can be indicated by a reference to one or other speaker which has no meaningful place within the structure of a sentence, i.e. by the device known traditionally as the "ethic dative." It occurs very frequently in F's speech:

A2.4.227 I made me no more ado.

D1.3.63 I have writ me here a letter to her.

*You* as an "ethic dative" is characteristic of S's speech:

B3.2.304 A' would manage you his piece . . . and come you in, and come you in.

B3.2.52 And carried you a forehead shaft.

The use of *you(r)* = *one(s)* is analogous to the "ethic dative" in effect, and also occurs in the speech of both F and S:

B1.2.189 F Your ill angel is light.

B3.2.24 S You had not four such swinge-bucklers . . .

(d) Finally, the "conative" function of language will of necessity cause the speaker to use a selection of lexis (other than terms of address) appropriate to the emotions which he feels towards the addressee; the choice is, very generally, between formal and intimate ("slang") vocabulary. (See below, Section II 3(d) **Lexis and attitude**.)

## II. THE LINGUISTIC REALIZATION OF ATTITUDES

For nearly every feature which characterizes spoken language, described in the preceding section, there is a set of exponents from which the speaker makes a selection appropriate to his attitude to the other speaker, the situation and the messages exchanged. Many of these exponents have been described, and some attempt will now be made to show how and when they are selected. Attitudes towards the other speaker are suggested by the choice of ritual formulae, the selection of types of question, command and exclamation, the use of forms of address (when they are not automatically dictated by a man's rank or relationship) and the choice of lexis (e.g. a friendly and informal attitude might involve the use of "slang" terms).

### 1. The use of ritual utterances

#### (a) Greeting formulae

The neutral form is *Good morrow*; characteristic of good friends and equals are *How now* and *Well met*, which are used by the F/P group and by F and his close friends. The "blessing" formulae (apart from *God save you*, which is probably neutral in tone) are characteristic of formal and deferential attitudes (S; Fo when disguised as Brook; Q). Especially deferential are the full forms *God give you* . . . (F to LCJ; Q).

#### (b) Parting formulae

The neutral forms are *Farewell* and *Adieu*; friendly attitudes are indicated by the formulae for leaving together; deference is shown by the "blessing" forms used by Q and S; and the tone of master to servant by *Be gone*.

(c) **Summoning formulae**

Social inferiors are summoned by *What, why, I say*, but equals are called by *What ho* (e.g. MP to MF and vice-versa).

(d) **"Giving" formulae**

*Hold* seems to have been used only to inferiors. When Q gives F a letter she says only (D4.5.129): "Here is a letter."

2. **The degree of explicitness in speech**

It has already been suggested that speech does not need to be as explicit as writing; it is doubtful however whether the degree of explicitness depends on, or reveals, mutual attitudes.

3. **Orientation towards the addressee**(a) **Questions, commands, exclamations**

Commands and certain questions may denote, as well as awareness of another speaker, an attitude towards that speaker. Certain tag questions can imply irony, annoyance or impatience:

D4.2.185 Fo She comes of errands, does she?

D3.3.215 MF You use me well, Master Ford, do you?

B2.1.65 Q Thou wo't, wo't thou? thou wo't, wo't ta?

These attitudes may be indicated by positive + positive, or negative + negative, and their use is apparently that of current English.

Tag questions asked by the 2nd speaker indicate an attitude of friendly agreement, but occur rarely in Shakespeare:

*Troilus* 1.2.135 O! he smiles valiantly.

Does he not?

The choice of exponent for commands may reveal courtesy, deference, condescension to a subordinate, or brusqueness. The unmarked form, attested in 16th-century grammars, is V + pronoun:

D2.3.77 Ho Go you through the town.

Courtesy may be expressed by the addition of *Pray you, Prithee*, and deference by the use of a title instead of the pronoun:

B5.3.26 Davy Sweet sir, sit . . . most sweet sir, sit.

Orders to a servant are given without pronoun:

D4.2.153 Fo Empty the basket, I say!

These distinctions, which are not used altogether consistently, are likely to disappear in certain linguistic contexts which are described elsewhere.<sup>25</sup>

3rd person commands typically reveal attitudes to the extent that they usually represent prayers or blessings, and imprecations, e.g.:

B3.2.315 S Sir John, the Lord bless you!

Such prayers typify the speech of the elderly, e.g. S and Q. Imprecations, which characterize the speech of F and his companions, are usually variations on the verb *hang* — a grim and highly emotive curse in the context of Elizabethan justice; they are more often 2nd person forms:

D3.3.195 MP Hang him, dishonest rascal!

B2.4.57 D Hang yourself, you muddy conger.

A1.2.146 Po Tarry at home and be hanged.

Exclamations, when used excessively as by Q, seem to indicate a naive attitude to the situation or message, rather than to the other speaker.

(b) **Forms of address**

Mutual attitudes are perhaps most clearly indicated by the choice of forms of address. The possible exponents for "vocative" have been described above (pp. 50-51); the following is a summary account of their use in the expression of attitude.

(i) *Personal names*: In the group connected with the "Boar's Head" the use of surnames is common between close (male) friends, even though, as H reports, he is on Christian name terms with the tapsters (A2.4.8). When Christian names are used, as commonly between H and F, and sometimes between H and Po, they are nicknames — *Hal*, *Jack* and *Ned*; F himself comments on this usage:

B2.2.144 *Jack* Falstaff, with my familiars; *John*, with my brothers and sisters, and *Sir John* with all Europe.

In spite of the normal Christian name terms between H and F, H may revert to using *Falstaff* in anger:

A2.4.289 H Falstaff, you carried your guts away . . . nimbly.

To Poins, H and F use surname or Christian name inconsistently, but more usually the surname. The two women are usually addressed as *Mistress Quickly* or *hostess*, and *Mistress Doll* or *Mistress Doll Tearsheet*. In spite of Q's alleged familiarity with F, who is said to have offered her marriage, she invariably addresses him as *Sir John*; but where some genuine affection seems to be implied, as between F and D, they address each other as *Jack* and *Doll*.

In the Gloucestershire group, S and Si, although cousins, never address each other by Christian name alone. F always addresses S as *Master*, but characteristic of his usage is the following example of Christian name + surname:

B5.1.3 You must excuse me, Master Robert Shallow.

Men address their male servants by surname.

In the Windsor group, the two couples are on surprisingly formal terms and always use some kind of title to one another. Wives and husbands rarely use Christian names, although women use Christian names to male servants, e.g. MF to John and Robert, and to Robin the pageboy. Men use surnames, or both names, to servants. The cousins S and Si address each other by some form of title. Pi, B, N and F are on surname terms. This brief survey shows

- (1) by comparison with Mod. Eng., the greater degree of intimacy required to use Christian names;
- (2) the greater likelihood of fluctuation between Christian and surname;
- (3) the possibility of addressing a man by both names. F, in so addressing S, has a slightly condescending air, and it is noticeable that, after his sudden fall from favour and Hal's rejection, he speaks to his companion simply as "Master Shallow."

(ii) *Terms of relationship*: Husbands and wives on good terms call one another by their titles, i.e. *husband* and *wife*, and indicate greater affection by the use of an epithet, e.g. "honey-sweet husband" (Q in C2.3.1). That the use of titles was common is shown, not only by the phrase-books, but also explicitly by Sly the tinker in *The Taming of the Shrew*: "Are you my wife, and will not call me husband?" On being told

that he must address the supposed woman as "madam" he continues: "Madam wife . . ." To imply an unfriendly attitude, a wife would address her husband as *master* + surname, as does MF when she complains to Fo of his ill-treatment, and the husband would reciprocate with "Mistress . . ."

(iii) *Generic terms of address*: *Man* and *woman* are invested with a tone of intimacy or brusqueness according to the context. MF addressing Fo as "man" sounds impatient (D4.2.154) but addressing MP as "woman" (D2.1.44) sounds teasing and friendly. *Lad* applied to a man is, as F himself remarks, a "term of good fellowship."

(iv) *Titles of courtesy*: *Your worship* was commonly used, in moderation, to social superiors, but excessive use marks some kind of attitude, e.g. the wish to flatter (Q to F when engaged in the wives' plot). *Your worship* also indicated polite formality between equals; it is used by Anne Page to the detested Sl to whom, as her father's guest, she is constrained to be polite, but whom she does not wish to encourage (D1.1.277). *Sir*, when used to excess, also marks flattery and excessive deference (Davy to S in B5.1 and B to F in A3.3) but it is a polite form when used in the plural:

B2.4.245 F (to musicians) Play, sirs.

*Master* was used deferentially:

D1.4.73 Q Good master, be content.

but in the plural as a term of friendship:

A2.2.108 F (to friends) Come, my masters.

B2.4.112 Q (to friends) Feel, masters, how I shake.

*Sirrah*, if used to anyone other than a boy, or without a title of occupation, denoted either contempt or possibly intimacy. The former is clearly expressed by Fo when he calls F, as he thinks, to leave his hiding-place:

D4.2.146 Come forth, sirrah!

Contemptuous annoyance is denoted by H's use of the term on learning that F has made untrue allegations about him:

A3.3.152 Sirrah! do I owe you a thousand pound?

Contemptuous amusement may be suggested by Po to F who has lost his mount:

A2.2.76 Sirrah Jack, thy horse stands behind the hedge.

but intimacy by H's address to Po:

A2.4.6 Sirrah, I am sworn brother to a leash of drawers.

The drawers also use the term among themselves, possibly to denote good fellowship.

*Goodman*, being a rank lower than gentleman, came to have a pejorative meaning, so that D addresses the sheriff's officers contemptuously as "Goodman death! goodman bones!" (B5.4.31) in referring to their leanness.

*Gossip* was a term used only between intimates, although originally it meant a sponsor at baptism. It is a common form of address between MF and MP, and Goodwife Keech addresses Q as "Gossip Quickly"; it is a polite but friendly usage, occurring in the phrase-books (*gossip* and *shee gossip* appear in one).

(v) *Terms of endearment and abuse*: There is a larger set of terms for abuse than for endearment, and they occur more frequently—at least in the Falstaff plays. The most common term of endearment was

*heart*, which could be used between men and women or between members of the same sex, in singular and plural:

B5.5.48 F My king . . . I speak to thee, my heart!

D4.2.77 F (to women) Good hearts, devise something.

It occurred more often with a prepositional phrase or a preceding adjective: *hearts of gold* is among the terms of "good fellowship" listed by F (A2.4.310) and *heart of elder* is used by Ho (D2.3.30) to Caius, who does not understand that it is an insulting variation on *hearts of oak*. Adjectives which collocate with *heart* are:

*poor* (C2.1.124) used sympathetically by Q about the dying Falstaff; *old* (C4.1.34) used by H in addressing affectionately an elderly man; *good* (D3.5.39) used by Q and expressive of sympathy towards MF; *sweet*, the most frequent collocation, used by woman to woman, e.g. Q to D (B2.4.24) sympathetically, when D is ill, and by MP to MF (D4.2.12) in greeting — "How now, sweetheart!" It is also used ironically by MF to F (D5.5.26). It could not have been a term of great intimacy, since MF and MP otherwise normally use the formal *you* rather than *thou*.

Other forms of address expressing affection are rare. They include:

*wag* F (to H) "sweet wag" (A1.2.17, 26, 66), "mad wag" (A1.2.50).

(*Wag* was probably derived from the verb, and is found from 1553.)

*bully* Ho (to F) D4.5.22 Let her descend, bully.

Ho is addicted to the use of *bully*, and applies it to everyone, of every rank. First recorded in 1538, it was originally applied to both sexes but by 1600 probably only to men, and meant "good friend," "fine fellow." Ho also uses it as an epithet, e.g. *bully knight*, *rook*, *Hector*, *Hercules*.

*chuck* Pi (to Flu) C3.2.27 Use lenity, sweet chuck!

The term, which may have been a variant of *chick*, is not uncommonly applied to spouses and close friends. Here it is used only by Pi, who is also responsible (C3.2.37) for the very unusual *bawcock* (Fr. *beau coq*).

*joy* D (to F) B2.4.51, more usually found as *my joy*, is replaced in the Folio by *I marry*, and was therefore in all likelihood obsolete by 1623. D more frequently uses abusive epithets as terms of endearment, e.g. B2.4.232 "You sweet little rogue . . . poor ape . . . you whoreson chops . . . Ah, rogue!"

The large number of terms of abuse answers the requirements of the Falstaff plays, with their violent, aggressive and blustering characters. These terms rarely occur alone but are collocated with a limited (though fairly large) set of adjectives which includes *arrant*, *scurvy*, *filthy*, *lousy* (used by Welsh characters), *muddy*, *whoreson*.

*Knave* is a favourite term of F, Q and D. When F uses it descriptively and not as a term of address, he adds a number of abusive (and imaginative) epithets which are characteristic of his speech, e.g. *bacon-fed*, *gorbellied*. *Rascal* is frequently used by F and D, and when descriptive is collocated, mainly in F's speech, with unusual epithets, e.g. *fat-kidneyed*, *tripe-visaged*, *bottle-ale*, *cut-purse*, *coney-catching*.

*Rogue* is undoubtedly a term from thieves' cant, and is used mainly by F. It often occurs without epithet, in the form *you rogue*; but when epithets are used they are again highly unusual, e.g. *frosty-spirited*, *mechanical salt-butter*, *blue-bottle*.

*Slave*, unlike the three preceding terms, is not very common in address,

although it can occur, e.g. B2.4.153 D "You a captain, you slave!" It is commonly used descriptively.

*Varlet* is also less commonly used in address, and may be slightly old-fashioned or affected: F, speaking formally in his imitation of H's father, addresses H as "Thou naughty varlet." F also dismisses the sheriff's men with "Away, varlets!" (B2.1.52).

*Villain* is probably the most frequent term of abuse with characters other than F, though it belongs to his vocabulary too:

D4.2.123 Fo Set down the basket, villains.

There are many other terms of abuse, but they were probably not in common use, e.g. *chops*, *ye fat paunch*, *muddy conger*.

(vi) *The choice between "you" and "thou"*: This subject has been the topic of many investigations and it is not proposed to examine it in detail here; the general rules of usage are stated by Franz (§289).<sup>26</sup> A major difficulty for the 20th-century reader is the inconsistency of use by which a speaker may change abruptly from one to the other while still addressing the same person, as is the case with Christian names and surnames. A cursory examination suggests that certain very common collocations tended to retain *thou* forms almost automatically, just as certain common verbal collocations such as *Know you?* retained the older inversion form of the question. It is also possible that considerations of euphony dictated the use of *you* rather than *thou* in some contexts (cf. p. 67 below).

In *The Merry Wives* the norm (or unmarked form) is *you*, except in addressing most servants (e.g. F and Fe to Q, Q to Rugby, MP to Q, although Simple and Robin are normally addressed as *you*, perhaps indicating a higher status for both — as a pageboy, Robin may have belonged to an upper-class family); and in the speech of Pi and Ho, which is clearly an affectation, though it is hard to understand why Fo, at least, does not take exception to being *thou'd* when Pi first calls on him to report his wife's infidelity. Ho reverts to *you* in addressing Fe when he is despondent after the loss of his horses (D4.6.6). Finally, *thou* is used in moments of strong emotion, pleasant or otherwise. The context shows whether *thou* is being used affectionately or scornfully. Some examples are: Fo's apologies to his wife on understanding the true situation (D4.4.6); F's first wooing of MF (D3.3); P to F on their reconciliation (D5.5.186); MP to Robin, expressing her pleasure in his loyalty (D3.3.33).

The other Falstaff plays support these conclusions, and show in addition *thou* used between men on close terms (H to F and Po, and sometimes in return) and between a man and a woman (F and D) who are not married.

### (c) Ethic dative

While the use of the ethic dative draws special attention to the speaker or listener, it is impossible to come to any firm conclusion about its function in expressing attitude; it was probably merely characteristic of somewhat old-fashioned speech.

### (d) Lexis and attitude

Finally, the mutual attitudes of the speakers may be indicated by lexical devices; intimacy, whether friendly or hostile, may be demonstrated by

the use of slang terms, i.e. items of vocabulary which never occur in the written language, except in familiar private letters, and which are usually ephemeral. They tend to cluster about areas of human experience which arouse the emotions of pleasure, fear and guilt, and in the Falstaff plays are especially concerned with the pleasures and pains of drinking (*jap* "drunk," *malt-worms* "topers," *dye scarlet* "drink deep," *ticklebrain* "strong drink") and of sex (*pagan*, *pinnace* and *stewed prunes* are a few among the many terms connected with prostitution). A different kind of slang is the "ritual riposte" which indicates a familiarity with the other speaker which may be friendly or hostile. A friendly riposte, giving emphatic assurance to what has just been said, is:

B2.1.176 Q You'll pay me altogether?  
F Will I live?

More common are the hostile ripostes:

A2.1.42 G I prithee, lend me thine (a lantern).

2nd C Ay, when? canst tell?

B2.4.134 Pi I know you, Mistress Dorothy. . .

D Since when, I pray you, sir? . . .  
much!

A3.3.56 (F has just referred to B's fiery face)

B 'Sblood, I would my face were in your belly.

All of these are known as common ripostes by their occurrence in other sources, including the phrase-books; it is probable that there were many others such as "with that face?" (*LLL*) and "I took you for a joint-stool" (*Lear*). A third type of slang, not easily distinguished from the vocabulary of the written language, is the use of phrasal verbs consisting of a native element + adverb particle (+ preposition). These do, of course, occur in the written language but in Mod. Eng. their use is specially characteristic of the spoken. It is possible that, since many of the Latin loan-words which are now their written equivalents were introduced into the language in the 16th century, a similar distinction was found c.1600. What is quite certain is that there were many phrasal verbs in use then which are now obsolete, e.g. *come off* "pay," *go about* "attempt," *go to* "stop, be quiet," *lay by* "stand and deliver," *look about* "be careful."

The question of slang and its use is far too wide to be examined here; all that can be attempted is to draw attention to the function of slang within the spoken language as a medium for the expression of mutual attitudes.

Section II has been concerned so far with the expression of the mutual attitudes of the participants in a situation by their selection of exponents for ritual utterances, questions, commands and exclamations, and for forms of address; and with the selection of appropriate lexical items. The remainder of the Section deals with linguistic means of indicating a speaker's attitudes towards the situation or to the messages conveyed within the situation. These are of two kinds:

1. **Exclamations**, which imply attitudes to the situation or the message.
2. **Asseverations**, which assert the truth of the message and thereby imply the speaker's emotional involvement in it. Elizabethan English was extraordinarily rich in exclamatory utterances (which include oaths) and asseverations, and unlike Mod. Eng., used the name of God as unhesitatingly

as some Modern European languages. It also used asseverations of a horrifying and violent nature; the plague and the pox were matters of loathsome reality, yet featured in male speech, at least, as frequently as the equally horrifying references to hanging in imprecations. Women's speech was more reticent, as H shows when he objects to the gentle affirmations used by his wife, and tells her to swear "a good mouth-filling oath" (A3.1.258). Fashionable society sought after unusual oaths and asseverations; F meditates accordingly on the possibility of a new oath, to the discomfiture of B:

A3.3.37 If thou wert any way given to virtue, I would swear by thy face; my oath should be, "By this fire, that's God's angel."

The Puritan middle classes, who objected to the use of the name of God in trivial oaths, voiced their opposition so successfully that in 1606 such oaths were banished from the stage; Shakespeare comments on the situation in *Cymbeline*, where Cloten remarks:

2.1.4 A whoreson jackanapes must take me up for swearing . . .  
When a gentleman is disposed to swear, it is not for any standers-by to curtail his oaths, ha?

Puritan forms of oath were distortions of the name of God and his attributes such as appear in the speech of Sl, *Od's heartlings* (D3.4.59), S and P, *By cock and pie* (B5.1.1 and D1.1.319) and in a reference by Q, *Od's nouns* (D4.1.26). Otherwise they used the "pretty oaths that are not dangerous" to which Rosalind refers in *AYLI* 4.1.199. While the use of oaths and asseverations in itself implies such emotions as astonishment, annoyance, suspicion or pleasure in relation to situation or message, the excessive use of certain types implies, in addition, a violent, aggressive or exuberant attitude to life in general, or, with some types of oaths, a naive one.<sup>27</sup>

### 1. Exclamations are of two kinds:

(a) Utterances (mostly consisting of a single syllable) with no referential meaning, e.g. *alas*, *fie*. Some of these, like *alas*, were once meaningful but were certainly no longer so in 1600.

(b) Utterances consisting of word or phrase with referential meaning, but functioning in the context purely as emotive cries, e.g. *'sblood*.

Utterances of type (a) mostly express pessimistic attitudes:

(i) Regret is indicated by *alas*; *alas the day*; *out, alas*, uttered by women (especially Q) and rarely by men (B *out, alas!* D4.5.64). *Ay me*, expressing both regret and anxiety, is used by Q. *Well-a-day* (first recorded in 1570 as a variant of *well-a-way*) expresses regret and anxiety, and is also used by women (Q and MP).

(ii) Disdain is expressed by *fie*, which seems to be a lower-class word elsewhere but is used by both sexes and all classes in the Falstaff plays. It is also indicated by *pish*, used only by N and Pi. *Tilly-fally*, perhaps best translated by *Nonsense!*, is used here only by Q, and occurs only rarely elsewhere.

(iii) Resignation is denoted by *heigh-ho*, used by the carrier on having to rise early (A2.1.1).

(iv) Impatience is indicated by *tut*, which Harvey associates with the speech of gentlemen (Arden D, p. 12). It is used only by men—F, Po and G.

(v) Surprise is suggested by *heigh*, used once by H (A2.4.542), and probably by *lo* (Q B2.4.35).

(vi) A desire for agreement or corroboration by the other speaker is indicated by *ha* (= Mod. Eng. *eh?*). It is specially characteristic of the speech of S and Ho:

B5.3.63 S By the mass, you'll crack a quart together: ha! will you not?

(vii) *La* is an indication of emphasis by the speaker on the message conveyed; its function is not now easy to understand, and a few examples are necessary:

D2.2.108 Q You have charms, la; yes, in truth.

D1.1.325 Sl Truly, I will not go first: truly, la!

D1.1.28 S I thank you always with my heart, la! with my heart.

The exclamation is characteristic of naive and stupid people, and may be identical with the form which is written *lor'* (= *lord*) in later literature.

(viii) *Via* (from Italian) is an expression of encouragement, relating to one of the speakers rather than the situation, e.g.:

D2.2.161 F (meditating on his apparent success with MF)  
Have I encompassed you? go to; *via!*

(ix) *oh* and *ah* are used for a variety of emotions as in Mod. Eng., and *ha ha* is not an exclamation but an attempt to represent laughter. It seems to be limited to foolish characters like Shallow.

(x) A few utterances which function emotively in the same way as the preceding exclamations, but which also have referential meaning, may be mentioned here briefly. An exclamation of pleasure is often *O excellent!* *O brave!* or *O rare!*, and of annoyance, *O monstrous!*<sup>28</sup>

Utterances of type (b), consisting of words and phrases with referential meaning, are usually oaths and asseverations. Oaths which name the Deity or his attributes, the Devil, or various diseases, share the vocative characteristic of lack of syntactic relationship to the remainder of the utterance. They are impulsive reactions to the situation or message which are difficult to classify, since they depend so much on context and intonation for their meaning.

(i) God is usually named by reference to an attribute:

*Zounds*, *'sblood* occur in male speech (usually denoting anger or surprise). *Godsbody* is used by a carrier (A2.1.29) to express annoyance.

*'Slid* (?=*eyelid*) is used by Sl (D3.4.24) in bravado.

*Bodikins*, a diminutive of *body*, is used by S, who affects unusual oaths and asseverations. At D2.3.46 it seems to suggest bravado.

*God's light* is used by D to express extreme anger (B2.4.140, 158).

*'Od's heartlings* expresses surprise (Sl, D3.4.59).

(*O*) *Jesu* is a favourite of Q's, to express pleasure, surprise, excitement.

(*O*) *Lord* is the favourite expletive of lower-class speakers. It is used by Francis the drawer (A2.4), servants, rustics and Q, and covers a wide range of emotions.

*Marry* is a form of *Mary*, and is so frequently used in answering a question that it is hardly an expletive at all:

A2.4.319 H What sayest thou to me? Q Marry, my lord,  
there is . . .

*Christ* is not used as an expletive by English speakers, but the form *Chrish* is used by MacMorris.

(ii) *A/the devil, a plague, a pox* are used after *what* and *why* to express annoyance and surprise:

B2.4.1 1st Drawer What the devil hast thou brought there?

A1.2.51 F What a plague have I to do with a buff jerkin?

A1.2.53 H What a pox have I to do with my hostess?

Women usually substitute milder expletives:

D1.4.126 Q We must give folks leave to prate: what, the good-ger!

D3.2.20 MP I cannot tell what the dickens his name is.

(iii) *A pox, plague, vengeance* are also used as imprecations directed towards the situation or the other speaker (usually by males):

A2.2.30 F A plague upon't.

B1.2.276 F A pox of this gout!

D4.1.65 Q Vengeance of Jenny's case!

2. **Asseverations** take the form preposition + noun (*by, before, in, for*), and are used when the speaker calls on some person or thing to witness to the truth of his words and the sincerity with which he speaks them. Normally, the witness would be of religious significance, but partly because of Puritan opposition to the use of the name of God, and partly for fashion's sake, the names of objects with no religious significance were sometimes substituted, or the name of God was altered.

(i) *Asseverations by God*: *Before/fore God* are used by F and H; *By cock and pie* S and P; *By God's liggins* (?*Lidkins*) S.

(ii) *By the Lord*: extremely common in F's speech.

(iii) *By'r lady*: H and Sl.

(iv) *Objects connected with the Church*:

*By the mass* is characteristic of the speech of S, but it is also used by others including MF. It is probably especially appropriate to the elderly.

*By the rood* seems also to be old-fashioned: it is used only by S.

(v) *Virtues associated with Christianity*:

*By my fidelity*: S only.

*By my troth, in good troth*: used by women especially, and mostly by Q.

*By my faith, i'faith, faith*: used by all, but especially Q.

*In truth*: used by Q; possibly lower-class speech.<sup>29</sup>

*Forsooth*: undoubtedly a lower-class word; F castigates a tradesman as "a rascally yea-forsooth knave" (B1.2.40) and the word is used continually by servants, and by the children William and Robin.

*In good sadness* (=sincerity): used by Fo in disguise as Brook, and by women.

(vi) *Objects or attributes of importance to the speaker*:

*Upon my life, upon my death, on my word*: used by all speakers, the second being a particularly serious asseveration.

*By this hand, by these hilts*: used by men, the second being appropriate to soldiers, e.g. F A2.4.233.

*By this hat, by these gloves*, used by the affected Sl.

(vii) *Miscellaneous asseverations*: Many of these occur only once, and do not seem to be part of normal usage, e.g. B2.1.156 Q *By this*

heavenly ground I tread on. The asseveration *By yea and nay* (S, and F in an affected letter) seems to have been a Puritan usage.

Finally, there is a completely different type of asseveration of the structure "as I am a/n + Noun," which Shakespeare often uses ironically: *As I am a gentleman/honest man/true knight/true woman/soldier/true spirit* (the last referring to F in disguise in D5).

### III. THE LINGUISTIC EFFECT OF THE MEDIUM OF DISCOURSE

#### 1. The impermanence of the medium and lack of premeditation

(a) In actual speech (i.e. not in a dramatic imitation) the most obvious result of lack of permanence and premeditation is a divergence between linguistic competence and actual performance. This effect is most apparent in lengthy monologue; the Elizabethan dramatist then had to choose between an imitation of normal speech, at the risk of delaying the unfolding of the plot which was so important to him, and the creation of well-formed monologue by means of the current devices of rhetoric. Shakespeare chose to imitate natural speech only to a limited extent, for the purposes of characterization; examples may be found in the speech of Q, of the Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*, and Pompey in *Measure for Measure*:

B2.4.91 Q I was before Master Tisick, the deputy, t'other day; and, as he said to me, — 'twas no longer ago than Wednesday last, — "Neighbour Quickly," says he; — Master Dumbe, our minister, was by then; — "Neighbour Quickly," says he, "receive those that are civil, for," said he, "you are in an ill name;" now, a'said so, I can tell whereupon; "for," says he, "you are an honest woman, and well thought on."

(b) Lack of premeditation and absence of written record may also lead to repetition of either structures or of message; again, Shakespeare uses the device to characterize the stupid or elderly, e.g. Q repeats adverbial groups:

B2.1.96 Thou didst swear to me upon a parcel-gilt goblet, sitting in my Dolphin-chamber, at the round table, by a sea-coal fire, upon Wednesday in Wheeson week, when the prince broke thy head . . .

S repeats complete sentences:

B3.2.1 Come on, come on, come on, sir; give me your hand, sir, give me your hand, sir.

or repeats material in different words:

B5.1.6 I will not excuse you; you shall not be excused; excuses shall not be admitted; there is no excuse shall serve; you shall not be excused.<sup>30</sup>

(c) Lack of premeditation also causes the speaker to fail to complete a structure. Excessive use of such a feature would be tedious in drama, but Shakespeare uses it occasionally to denote emotion:

B2.4.419 Q I have known thee these twenty-nine years, come peascod-time; but an honest, and truer-hearted man, — well, fare thee well.

(d) The speaker is likely to pause while formulating his next utterance (the writer does too, of course, but without visible effect). The speaker is also likely to fill the resulting pause with an indeterminate sound or a meaningless phrase, and while the dramatist is again limited in the extent to which he can use this device, Shakespeare shows it as an occasional characteristic of the speech of the uneducated (and sometimes of others). He notices, for example, that speakers of all kinds tend to preface their opening words with *well*, *why*, or *now*.<sup>31</sup> For examples see especially A1.2. Some pause-fillers are designed to retain attention by the other speaker: these are *come*, *hear ye*, *hark ye*, *look you*, *trust me*, and are especially noticeable in F's speech. Pause-fillers characteristic of Q are *I warrant you* (see especially D2.2.68), *as they say*, *you know*, *indeed*: others use *for mine own part*. There are also pause-fillers which function as signals of attention from the second speaker, when the first hesitates; these are *well*, *very well*.

(e) As a consequence of the impermanence of spoken language, there is a special device, rare in written language, which prevents possible ambiguity. The sentence is preceded by a "title," i.e. the subject or object is stated, there is a pause, and the sentence is resumed with repetition of subject or object as pronoun. The device is sometimes known as "cross-reference"; it is common in Mod. Eng. and was probably used at all periods of the language.<sup>32</sup> It is particularly characteristic of F's speech, but in the form of a prepositional phrase:

(i) cross-reference to subject:

A3.3.196 F For the robbery, lad, how is that answered?

A2.4.64 H For the sugar thou gavest me, 'twas a pennyworth, was't not?

(ii) cross-reference to object:

B1.2.215 F For my voice, I have lost it with hollaing.

A4.2.77 F For their poverty, I know not where they had that.

It also occurs as in Mod. Eng. without preposition:

B5.1.11 S Yea, marry, William cook, bid him come hither.

The structure occasionally occurs with cross-reference between two pronouns, and lack of concord:

B1.2.219 F He that will caper with me for a thousand marks, let him lend me the money.

C2.1.67 B He that strikes the first stroke, I'll run him up to the hilts.

C4.7.132 Williams Who, if a' live and ever dare to challenge this glove, I have sworn to take him a box o' the ear.

(f) Just as cross-reference is a device which helps to avoid the dangers of ambiguity within the clause in an ephemeral medium, so the selection of simple structures without subordination helps to avoid ambiguity and the defects of memory within the larger unit of the "paragraph," if such a term may be applied to the spoken language. Natural speech tends towards parataxis to the extent that non-restrictive relative clauses are relatively uncommon, and particularly uncommon as interpolations within the main clause as subject qualifiers. It is in this respect that Shakespeare's imitations of the spoken language deviate most from reality; hypotaxis is used freely, and although its effect is dramatically impressive, as in the first long speeches

of A1.2, it would call for much suspension of disbelief were we not accustomed to accept such structures as characteristic of the language of Elizabethan drama.<sup>33</sup>

(g) As the repetition of simple structures is easier for speaker and listener, so the repetition of lexical collocations in the spoken medium helps both memory and comprehension, as well as being valuable to the dramatist for the purposes of characterization. These lexical collocations are the features of language which have most frequently been examined as "colloquialisms", and have been adequately discussed in editions and glossaries. Many of these collocations have been described by King as "vulgarisms" because they occur in the speech of satirized characters or obviously lower-class speakers, but more evidence is needed from Elizabethan drama as a whole before we can be sure that they did not simply denote the everyday speech of all classes. Many of these colloquialisms, and in particular the metaphorical usages, are remarkably vivid; as Miss St. Clare Byrne has shown (and as even the phrase-books occasionally demonstrate), such vividness seems characteristic of Elizabethan speech of all classes.<sup>34</sup> The following are random illustrations.

(i) Figurative usages: metaphors, similes, etc.:

- D1.4.90 Q I'll ne'er put my finger in the fire (=court danger).  
 D3.5.146 Fo There's a hole made in your best coat (=infidelity).  
 B2.1.48 F How now! whose mare's dead (=what's the matter?).  
 A2.1.9 2nd C As dank . . . as a dog.  
 B1.2.198 F Not worth a gooseberry.  
 A2.4.145 F Then am I a shotten herring.

(ii) Idiomatic phrases:

- B5.3.9 S Well said (=well done).  
 D1.4.27 Sim Between this and his head (=anywhere).  
 D1.1.226 Sl Simple though I stand here.  
 D1.4.111 Q That's neither here nor there.  
 D2.2.62 Q Marry, this is the short and the long of it.  
 A4.2.80 H I'll be sworn.  
 D2.2.128 Q No remedy (=that's the end of the matter).  
 B2.2.46 H For fault of a better.  
 D3.4.68 Sl Happy man be his dole!

(iii) Adjectives in repeated use in a variety of collocations: certain adjectives were frequently used with little other meaning than general approbation (cf. Mod.Eng. *nice*). They include: *brave*, the excessive use of which is satirized in *AYLI* 3.4.41: "O, that's a brave man! he writes brave verses, speaks brave words, swears brave oaths, and breaks them bravely."

*tall*

- B5.1.64 Sl (to pageboy) Welcome, my tall fellow.  
 D2.2.11 F You were good soldiers and tall fellows.  
 B3.2.68 B (of F) . . . a tall gentleman.  
 D1.4.26 Si He is as tall a man of his hands . . .

*pretty*

- D3.2.18 Fo (of pageboy) Where had you this pretty weathercock?  
 B2.1.160 F . . . pretty slight drollery.  
 B5.1.29 S . . . any pretty little tiny kickshaws.

*honest* and *fair* occur passim, collocated with *man/gentleman* and with the names of women, e.g. *fair Mistress Anne*.

Terms expressive of general disapproval were less common:

*monstrous*

A2.4.537 B A most monstrous watch is at the door.

A2.4.347 B . . . his monstrous devices.

## 2. The linguistic effects of physical features of utterance

Speech differs most obviously from writing through the presence of stress, rhythm and intonation; these have had certain effects on the arrangement of elements within the sentence which are also reflected in the written language, as in Mod. Eng. *Put up your umbrella/Put it up; Here comes John/Here he comes; Give me the book/Give it to me*. The same variations in structure existed in Elizabethan English, but there are also others which have disappeared because the structures themselves are obsolete: *Doth not the king lack subjects/Do I not bate?; Fear not your advancements/Persuade me not!; Hear thou this letter/Tell us your reason*.<sup>35</sup> There are other variations in the order of sentence elements which are due to rhythm, but they will not be discussed further as they are common to spoken and written English. Stress and lack of stress are responsible, however, for a double set of forms in the spoken language which does not occur in the written, except in so far as the forms are recorded in imitation of the spoken language. These are stressed and unstressed forms of personal pronouns, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, the articles and conjunctions; they have been listed by Franz and Kökeritz<sup>36</sup> but have not been studied systematically, although the contrast in usage with Mod. Eng. is of great interest. An adequate description would require detailed study of both the Folio and Quarto texts; in addition, as not all of the unstressed forms seem to be graphically realized, the evidence must be drawn partly from verse and its metrical indication of reduced forms. Usage of c.1600 is particularly interesting because it represents the change from an older system to one which is roughly that of Mod. Eng.; and also because much of the earlier system is preserved in 20th-century dialect speech.

The effects of rhythm and stress most obviously differentiate the spoken from the written language, but certain difficulties of pronunciation may also involve syntactic change. Where the *-st* suffix of the *thou*-form stood in close proximity to consonants whose assimilation was difficult, or would have resulted in syntactic ambiguity, there were two possible (though as yet unproved) effects in the spoken language:

(a) *Thou* might be replaced by *you*. C. Williams has commented on the oddity of Sir Toby's first address to Sir Andrew in *Twelfth Night* where, instead of using *thou*, which he consistently prefers elsewhere, he uses *you*: "You mistake, knight." Williams suggests that he is avoiding the difficult "Thou mistakest, knight," in conformity with what is said to be Shakespeare's concern for euphony.<sup>37</sup>

(b) A similar desire for euphony might account for some of the uses of unstressed *do*:

A3.3.114 What didst thou lose?

C4.8.53 It was ourself thou didst abuse.

Both of these difficulties might have militated against the use of *thou* in speech and contributed to its eventual disappearance from the language, since they were particularly prevalent in the case of French and Latin loans introduced so freely in the 16th century.

This survey has shown many contrasts between Elizabethan and 20th-century English speech; it has also illustrated, incidentally, several similarities between Elizabethan usage and that of some modern European languages. They include the use of certain ritual formulae, such as those connected with meals and with handing an object to another person, the retention of the 2nd person singular pronoun, the use of formal modes of address which are the equivalent of "your worship," the liking for titles ("Master Doctor," "Neighbour Mugges"), and the greater freedom with which the name of the Deity is used in oaths and asseverations. While the semi-detached house remains the most obvious symbol of England's divergence from European culture, it is clear that there are less obvious indications of that divergence in our use of language.

---

#### NOTES

- 1 "Colloquial" is used here to denote the language *spoken* in everyday situations. The description is often applied to the *written* language of private letters, because the two forms of language share many features in contrast to the formal language of narrative, scientific and legal writings. But there are many differences between the spoken and written forms of colloquial language, and only the former is considered here; references to "written language," however, are intended to exclude private letters.
- 2 M. St. Clare Byrne, "The Foundations of Elizabethan Language," *Shakespeare Survey*, XVII (1964), 239.
- 3 B. Ifor Evans, *The Language of Shakespeare's Plays*, 2nd ed. (London, 1959), p. 96.
- 4 L. Borinski, "Shakespeare's Comic Prose," *Shakespeare Survey*, VIII (1955), 60. Borinski finds what he calls "the older style" in Shakespeare's prose in so far as it is "still full of semipoetic *emphasis*, emphatic particles and short clauses, 'faith', 'pray', 'by my troth', 'I assure you' . . . [and] exclamations of all sorts." Far from characterizing medieval speech, as he suggests, this kind of language is typical of natural speech of c.1600.
- 5 David Abercrombie, "Conversation and Spoken Prose," in *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics* (London, 1965); see especially pp. 3-4.

- <sup>6</sup> *A History of Modern Colloquial English*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1953), p. 360. He adds: "the various aspects of colloquial speech life must be examined, and the different elements arranged and grouped according to some principle of classification" (p.361). C. and M. Cowden Clarke's *The Shakespeare Key* (London, 1879) lists numbers of these elements, but as might be expected of a pioneering work, fails to systematize the material.
- <sup>7</sup> C. Holyband and P. Erondelle, *The French Schoole-Maister* (London, 1606), f.A3.
- <sup>8</sup> John Eliot admits to translating Rabelais: *Ortho-epia Gallica. Eliots Frvits for the French* (London, 1593), f.B3r.
- <sup>9</sup> John Florio, *Firste Frutes*, ed. A. del Re (Formosa, 1936), p. 43: cited below as 'Florio 1.'
- <sup>10</sup> Alexander Schmidt, *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, rev. G. Sarrazin (Berlin, 1902). Valuable glosses may be found in the Arden editions: *1 Henry IV*, by A. R. Humphreys (1960): *2 Henry IV*, by R. P. Cowl (1923): *Henry V*, by J. H. Walter (1954): *Merry Wives of Windsor*, by H. C. Hart (1904). These will be cited as 'Arden.'
- <sup>11</sup> According to Arthur H. King, *The Language of Satirized Characters in Poetaster*, Lund Studies in English X (Lund, 1941). King makes many interesting observations on language and social class which are relevant to the Falstaff plays.
- <sup>12</sup> *Hamlet* II. ii. 622.
- <sup>13</sup> See R. Jakobson, "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics," in *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas Sebeok (New York, 1960), p. 355.
- <sup>14</sup> For a general discussion of "dialect," "register" and "style" see M. A. K. Halliday, A. McIntosh and P. Strevens, *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching* (London, 1964), especially pp. 87-94. The author is also indebted to R. Quirk, "Colloquial English and Communication," in *Studies in Communication* (London, 1955), pp. 169-180 and to A. H. Smith and R. Quirk, "Some Problems of Verbal Communication," in *Trans. Yorkshire Dialect Society*, IX (1955), Part LIV, 10-20.
- <sup>15</sup> The following abbreviations are adopted here:  
 A = *1 Henry IV*  
 B = *2 Henry IV*  
 C = *Henry V*  
 D = *Merry Wives of Windsor*  
 The edition quoted here is that of W. J. Craig (London, 1905 repr. 1955).
- <sup>16</sup> John Florio, *Second Frutes*, ed. R. C. Simonini (Gainsville, 1953), p. 35. Cited below as 'Florio 2.'
- <sup>17</sup> The names of the characters in the plays are abbreviated as follows: B (Bardolph), 1st and 2nd C (Carriers), D (Doll Tearsheet), F (Falstaff), Fe (Fenton), Fo (Ford), G (Gadshill), H (Prince Henry), Ho (Host), LCJ (Lord Chief Justice), MF (Mistress Ford), MP (Mistress Page), N (Nym), P (Page), Pi (Pistol), Po (Poins), Q (Quickly), S (Shallow), Si (Silence), Sl (Slender), Ser (servant).
- <sup>18</sup> C. Holyband, *The French Littleton*, ed. M. St Clare Byrne (Cambridge, 1953), p. 46.

- <sup>19</sup> G. Mason, *Grammaire Angloise* (1622), ed. R. Brotanek (Halle, 1905), p. 76.
- <sup>20</sup> Holyband, *French Schoole-Maister*, p. 52.
- <sup>21</sup> *The Babees Book*, ed. F. J. Furnivall (London, 1868), pp. 342 and 81.
- <sup>22</sup> Thomas Dekker (London, 1609, repr. 1941), p. 86.
- <sup>23</sup> Cf. modern dialects, e.g. "How hast a' been?" Several examples are listed in Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*.
- <sup>24</sup> For a fuller account see "Sentence Structures in Colloquial Shakespearean English," *Trans. Philological Society* (1965), p. 134. The function of these "comments" is discussed by D. Abercrombie in "Making Conversation," in *Problems and Principles in Language Study*, 2nd ed. (London, 1963), pp. 57-69.
- <sup>25</sup> See *TPS* (1965) on commands, pp. 130-132.
- <sup>26</sup> Recent investigations of the use of *thou* include: T. Finkenstaedt, *You und Thou* (Berlin, 1961); A. McIntosh, "As You Like It: a grammatical clue to character," *Review of English Literature*, IV (April 1963), 68-81, and "King Lear, Act I, Scene i. A Stylistic Note," *Review of English Studies*, n.s. XIV (1963), 54-56.
- <sup>27</sup> Among recent studies of oaths and exclamations are: Inna Koskeniemi, *Studies in the Vocabulary of English Drama 1550-1600* (Turku, 1962) and B. White, "Decline and Fall of Interjections," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, LXIV (1963), 356-372.
- <sup>28</sup> William Bullokar includes "O brave" in a list of interjections classified semantically in his *Bref Grammar for English*, ed. M. Plessow, *Palaestra*, LII (1906), 373.
- <sup>29</sup> See King, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
- <sup>30</sup> See Quirk, "Colloquial English . . ." on "redundancy," p. 179.
- <sup>31</sup> Quirk, *ibid.*, on "intimacy signals," p. 178.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 176.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171. It is possible that the necessity of avoiding ambiguity led to the development of certain *do*-forms in the spoken language; see *TPS* (1965), 135.
- <sup>34</sup> "Foundations . . ." pp. 236-237. "The use of imagery, proverbs, 'sayings', word-play . . . is generally first encountered by Elizabethan students in its most exaggerated form, as in *Euphues*. To meet these elements of popular speech, therefore, in their natural surroundings . . . is to realize how freely and effectively ordinary folk . . . used proverbial phrasing and lively imagery in normal expression."
- <sup>35</sup> For the loss of pronoun subject see *TPS* (1965), p. 131.
- <sup>36</sup> H. Kökeritz, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (New Haven, 1953).
- <sup>37</sup> "The Use of the Second Person in *Twelfth Night*," *English*, IX (1953),