



**University of
Zurich** UZH

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2013

**Thou and you in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English witness
depositions**

Leitner, Magdalena

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.14.1.04lei>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-104825>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Leitner, Magdalena (2013). Thou and you in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English witness depositions. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 14(1):100-129.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.14.1.04lei>

***Thou* and *you* in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English witness depositions**

Magdalena Leitner
University of Glasgow

In contrast to Early Modern English, little is known about address pronouns in Scotland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This paper investigates early Scottish pronoun usage in more detail by presenting a case study on singular pronominal address in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English witness depositions from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The source texts drawn from the *Criminal Trials in Scotland 1488–1624*, the *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots 1450–1700* and *A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760* are examined with a quantitative and qualitative approach based on historical pragmatics and historical sociolinguistics. *Thou* is found to be relatively frequent in the Scottish and Northern English data in comparison with the rapid decline in *thou* recently found in South-Eastern English depositions. However, there are significant differences in the distributions of pronouns, which are explained by an overrepresentation of upper social ranks in the Scottish sub-corpus.

Keywords: pronouns of address; regional variation; Older Scots; Early Modern English

1. Introduction

Whereas the use of *thou* and *you* has been extensively studied in Early Modern English, second person singular pronouns in early Scottish texts have not received much scholarly attention. The standard view remains that of Finkenstaedt (1963, 142), who states that *thou* appears to have had a longer

existence in Late Middle Scots¹ than in Early Modern English. However, it is not entirely clear on which evidence his claim is based. This paper is intended as a first step in verifying Finkenstaedt's (1963, 142) assumption and contextualising it in the light of recent findings on the longevity of *thou* in northern dialects of Early Modern English (cf. Walker and Kytö 2011, 233). By means of a quantitative and qualitative case study, *thou* and *you*² are investigated in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English witness depositions from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Witness depositions (henceforth depositions) are court records in which “witnesses, or occasionally the accused person, give an account of what they saw, heard or did” (Cusack 1998, 92). The oral report was written down by a clerk, usually before the trial proceedings began and afterwards “read aloud in court” (Cusack 1998, 92). For the present study, the source material representing the two regions is taken from the *Criminal Trials in Scotland from MCCCCLXXXVIII to MDCXXIV Embracing the Entire Reigns of James IV, James V, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI* compiled by Robert Pitcairn (henceforth *Pitcairn Trials*), the *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots 1450–1700* (HCOS) and from *A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760* (CED). The deposition collections in the CED will be searched for texts representing the North of England within the sub-periods of 1560–1599 and 1600–1639. In the *Pitcairn Trials* and the HCOS, all depositions from Scots-speaking areas within the period of 1560–1640 will be examined.

Patterns of pronoun usage in Late Middle Scottish depositions in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are hypothesised to be similar to the use of *thou* and *you* in depositions from the North of England. In other words, I expect to find relatively high occurrences of *thou* for both Scotland and Northern England in the selected material. Moreover, I do not anticipate a significant decline in *thou* after 1600 in the Scottish and Northern English data. These hypotheses derive from Finkenstaedt's (1963, 142) claim of a belated decline of *thou* in Scottish everyday speech.

In addition, Walker and Kytö (2011, 223) found considerably high occurrences of *thou* in Early Modern Northern English depositions as well as no significant decrease of the old second person singular until the mid eighteenth century. If regional factors played a decisive role in the preservation of *thou*, it could be assumed that speakers from neighbouring areas would resemble each other in their use of address pronouns whereas more distant dialects would show greater variation (cf. Trudgill 1999, 7). Therefore, it will be interesting to examine patterns of pronoun usage in Scottish texts alongside sources from Northern England at a time when the use of *thou* was rapidly declining in south-eastern varieties of English (cf. Walker and Kytö 2011,

221). However, the corpora used in the present study differ in their design (see Section 3), a factor which is expected to overshadow regional characteristics.

By focusing on regional distributions of address pronouns I do not want to suggest that the choice of a particular pronoun was only determined by this extra-linguistic factor. In the qualitative analysis of the present study, other variables such as the social status of speaker and addressee, and negative emotion are also taken into account. However, linguistic factors (e.g. verb collocation) will not be considered as there is no evidence that they played a discernible role in the selection of *thou* or *you* (cf. Walker 2007, 293).

The present study is embedded in a threefold methodological framework consisting of corpus linguistics, historical sociolinguistics and historical pragmatics. Due to the limited availability of electronic source texts for Late Middle Scottish depositions the amount of investigated material is smaller than in other corpus linguistics studies. Still, by using the HCOS, an electronic version of the *Pitcairn Trials* and the CED, I profited from the advantages of corpus linguistics with regard to computerised research tools that allow for systematic and time-saving searches (cf. Jucker, Fritz and Lebsanft 1999, 16–17). The methodologies of historical sociolinguistics are relevant to the quantitative approach to region as well as to the qualitative examination of other extra-linguistic factors such as rank (cf. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003). Principles of historical pragmatics will be applied to the micro-analysis of individual speech situations, paying attention to the pragmatic functions of second person singular pronouns (cf. Mazzone 2010, 351, 362).

After having stated the aims and scope of my study, I will undertake a selective survey of previous research done on singular pronominal address in Early Modern English and Late Middle Scots. Section 3 introduces the corpora and comments on methodology. Subsequently, I will discuss the distribution of *thou* and *you* as well as patterns of pronoun usage in the source texts from Scotland and Northern England across the investigated period. Finally, I will summarise the most important findings and draw the relevant conclusions.

2. Previous research

The majority of research on *thou* and *you* has focused on dramatic texts. Nevertheless, the investigation of singular pronominal address in other genres, such as private correspondence, trial proceedings and witness depositions, seems to be catching up. In this section, I intend to give a selective overview of pronoun usage in Early Modern English and Late Middle Scots. Firstly, I will

sketch the historical development of *thou* and *you* in the early modern period. Secondly, I will summarise the relevant findings for address pronouns in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern English depositions including regional variation.

The Early Modern English period – from 1500 to 1700 – is, according to the standard textbooks, the crucial phase in which *you* gains dominance over *thou* (Finkenstaedt 1963, 172; Barber 1997, 1). Barber (1997, 153) defines the function of *you* by 1600 as a “polite form used by inferiors to superiors” and as the “neutral, unemotional form of address between social equals”. In contrast, *thou* is the form of address to social inferiors, the pronoun mutually exchanged among the lower ranks and the marked term for conveying emotional attitudes (Barber 1997, 153).

However, the view that *thou* retains this expressive function has been challenged. Various researchers have mentioned that *you* also co-occurs with negative emotion, such as anger or contempt, as early as in the sixteenth century (Wales 1983, 110; Hope 1993, 387; Walker 2007, 166). Moreover, Lass (1999, 149) argues that pronoun selection in Early Modern English was complex and depended on a wide range of contextual factors.

By the end of the seventeenth century, *you* had supplanted *thou* to a great extent in all social relationships and conversational functions. Even for the expression of emotion *thou* was only rarely used (Barber 1997, 156). However, the decline of *thou* does not proceed at the same rate across all genres and linguistic communities (cf. Finkenstaedt 1963, 226; Walker 2007, 288–289).

Research on the historical development of *thou* and *you* in Scots is scarce. Much of the available information gathered appears to be related to English.³ For the Late Middle Scottish period, i.e. 1550–1700, Macafee (2002, xxxiv, civ–cv) sketches patterns of pronoun usage that closely resemble the situation in Early Modern England. Following the decline of *thou* in sixteenth-century London, the old second person singular subsequently disappeared in Scots too, surviving only in some regional dialects (Macafee 2002, civ). To my knowledge, second person singular pronouns in Scottish court records have only been investigated by Finkenstaedt (1963), and, in general, he does not deal with English and Scottish sources separately. Finkenstaedt (1963) makes only two references to Scottish material:

- (i) He points out that *thou* was still used in Scottish court cases of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with *you* occurring in formulaic phrases (Finkenstaedt 1963, 142). This is, in fact, a rather reverse pattern in comparison with the restricted, formulaic, use of *thou* in English court rooms (cf. Walker 2007, 91).

- (ii) Moreover, Finkenstaedt (1963, 142) notes that *thou* seems to have had a longer existence in Scottish everyday speech than in English, a claim which might be based on the *Pitcairn Trials*.

However, Finkenstaedt (1963) does not suggest any dating for the decrease of *thou* in Scots. In her investigation of the HCOS data, Meurman-Solin (1993, 249–250) discusses the collocations of *thou* and *you* with verb inflexions. Furthermore, mean frequencies of second person pronouns are given for the different sub-periods and text types (Meurman-Solin 1993, 282, 288). However, she makes no distinction between *thou* and *you* in the singular as well as between *you* as a singular or plural pronoun of address (cf. Meurman-Solin 1993: 250). In a later study, Meurman-Solin (2001, 37–40) examines the variation of *ye* and *you* in subject position in Late Middle Scottish correspondence, but not the distinction between *thou* and *you*. Her 2001 study shows another regional characteristic of Scots: in Late Middle Scottish letters, *you* replaces *ye* in the nominative much later than in Early Modern English correspondence (Meurman-Solin 2001, 37). Even more recently, Hickey (2003, 347–348) discusses Scots in his article on pronominal address in nonstandard varieties of English as one of the “separate cases”, providing some quantitative evidence from the HCOS between 1640 and 1700. Even though Hickey (2003, 348) distinguishes between singular and plural *you*, he does not present the ratio of *thou* to singular *you*. Instead, he focuses on the distribution of plural *ye* and plural *you*.

By comparison, address pronouns in Early Modern English depositions have received increasing scholarly attention over the last few decades (cf. Finkenstaedt 1963; Hope 1993 and Walker 2000, 2003, 2007). Walker’s 2007 investigation of the CED and Walker and Kytö’s (2011) analysis of the *Electronic Text Edition of Depositions 1560–1760* (henceforth ETED, available in Kytö, Grund and Walker 2011) are the most recent and the most exhaustive studies of *thou* and *you* in depositions. Moreover, they carefully deal with the characteristics of the genre. In Walker’s (2007, 97) investigation of trials, depositions and drama comedy drawn from the CED and from additional sources between 1560 and 1760, depositions yield the highest percentages of *thou*. The higher occurrences of *thou* in depositions are explained by genre-specific extra-linguistic factors encouraging the use of *thou*, such as the considerable extent of emotion and informality in deposition dialogues as well as regional differences (Walker 2007, 292). Moreover, rank is found to play a key role in pronoun selection (Walker 2007, 170; Walker and Kytö 2011, 224–225).

Regional variation seems to have had an influence on singular pronominal address in Early Modern English depositions. In their investigation

of the ETED materials, Walker and Kytö (2011, 220–233) provide further evidence for the regional variation reported in earlier studies (cf. Kytö, Walker and Grund 2007, 80–83; Walker 2007, 98–103). They find significant differences in pronoun usage between Northern English texts and samples from London and the East. *Thou* “was rarely used in London and the East after 1600” and “not at all in the 18th century” (Walker and Kytö 2011, 223, 233.). By contrast, the Northern English data yields considerably high percentages of THOU until the mid eighteenth century with “no real pattern of decline in the use of THOU in this region” (Walker and Kytö 2011, 223). With regard to the South and West of England, the ETED data sets do not reveal clear patterns. Furthermore, qualitative analysis shows that other extra-linguistic factors, such as the level of formality or emotion, may override the influence of region and rank on pronoun selection in deposition samples from all four areas (Walker and Kytö 2011, 233).

3. Corpus and methods

In what follows, I will present the corpora and methods used for this study. After introducing the *Pitcairn Trials*, the HCOS and the CED, I will describe the material drawn from the corpora, also providing a working definition for the variable of region. Limitations of the data will be considered accordingly. Furthermore, I will explain the theoretical approach and the classification system for rank applied in the micro-analysis. Finally, the overall structure of the data is examined with respect to the parameters of rank, sex and age in order to assess the representation of different social groups.

The *Pitcairn Trials* are a nineteenth-century printed edition of selected records from the High Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh compiled by Robert Pitcairn. Encompassing the period of 1488–1624, the *Pitcairn Trials* include a wide range of text types. Among the texts representing the actual court proceedings are indictments, verdicts, summonses, warrants, and depositions. The edition used in this study is an electronic facsimile of the 1833 print publication.

The HCOS is an electronic corpus compiled by Anneli Meurman-Solin (1995, 50, 2000, 156) and consists of approximately 850,000 words. It comprises fifteen different Scottish non-literary prose genres across the period 1450–1700. Witness depositions do not constitute a separate genre, but are part of trial text samples.

The *Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760* (CED) was compiled under the supervision of Merja Kytö and Jonathan Culpeper. Consisting of

approximately 1.2 million words, the computerised corpus contains text samples from five genres which are intended to represent Early Modern English spoken interaction (cf. Kytö and Walker 2006). Among these genres, depositions are classified as “authentic dialogue”, i.e. texts which purport to record real speech events (Kytö and Walker 2006, 12). The 200-year period of the CED is divided into five 40-year sub-periods: 1560–1599, 1600–1639, 1640–1679, 1680–1719, 1720–1760 (Kytö and Walker 2006, 12–13).

The material used for the present study is partly taken from the *Pitcairn Trials* and the HCOS and partly from the CED within the focus on genre and region. As the interest of this investigation is in depositions, I have chosen texts representative of this genre from the corpora. The regions are defined on the basis of previous research. Late Middle Scottish depositions are selected from areas in which Scots was spoken as the first language from at least 1500 onward. Thus, depositions which can be situated in Central Scotland and the Lowlands can be assumed to contain native speakers of Late Middle Scots.⁴ Records from the West, the North, and the North-West had to be excluded from the data as the first languages spoken by people in these parts were Gaelic or Norn⁵ (Macafee 2002, xxxix, xlvi). If speakers could be identified as dwellers from Southern or Central Scotland, their utterances are still included in the sub-corpus, although the depositions themselves might relate to cases in a Gaelic- or Norn-speaking area. The *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus used for the present study consists of all deposition texts that correspond to this working definition of the Scottish region. In table 1 below, the approximate word count is provided for the selections of deposition texts from each of the source corpora, with the total sum stated at the end.

Table 1. The *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus used for the present study

Period	Source	Speech events	Publ. date	Word count
1560–1599	<i>Pitcairn Trials</i> Vol. I.i	1561–1567	1833	7,030
	<i>Pitcairn Trials</i> Vol. I.ii	1576–1591	1833	9,920
	HCOS (Trial 1500–1640)	1561–1595	1889	940
1600–1624	<i>Pitcairn Trials</i> Vol. II	1600–1608	1833	15,960
	<i>Pitcairn Trials</i> Vol. III	1609–1622	1833	8,890
	HCOS (Trial 1570–1640)	1601	1831	160
Total word count (approx.)				42,900

The dates in the column “speech events” indicate the time span in which depositions are recorded in the given volume or sub-period while the

publication dates refer to the year in which the source texts were edited for printing (for more details on the Scottish material see tables 4, 5, 6 and 7 in appendix 1).

Some material of the *Pitcairn Trials* has also been sampled for the HCOS (cf. Meurman-Solin 1995, 58–62). In the present study, this material has only been considered once, namely in the *Pitcairn Trials*, in order to avoid an overlap between the two corpora. The depositions in the *Pitcairn Trials* are not gathered in collections, but rather scattered all over the source material. In addition to separately recorded depositions attached to individual cases, citations of earlier speech events in the context of trial proceedings were included in the sub-corpus, e.g. deposition records read out during an indictment. The latter also correspond to the type of deposition texts extracted from the HCOS trial samples.

Early Modern Northern English depositions are chosen according to the demarcation of the Chester-Humber line (cf. Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003, 166). Thus, the deposition collections in the CED whose geographical origins are north of this division are taken as texts representing Northern England. Moreover, the North-East and the North-West are combined into one region as the use of second person singular pronouns appears to be very similar in these two areas (cf. Kytö, Walker and Grund 2007, 81). The details of the source texts drawn from the CED are given in table 2 below. For each deposition collection, the approximate word count is given with the total sum stated at the end. The file name is listed in order to provide the exact reference from the CED.

Table 2. The CED sub-corpus used for the present study

Period	File name	Speech event	Publ. date	Short text title	Word count
1560–	D1WDURHA	1560–88	1845	<i>Courts of Durham</i>	9,480
1599	D1WCHEST	1561–66	1897	<i>Bishop’s Court, Chester</i>	11,040
1600–	D2WPENDL	1612	1613	<i>Witches in the Covntie of Lancaster</i>	10,080
1639	D2WDIOCE	1627–37	1858	<i>High Commission Court ... Diocese of Durham</i>	7,260
Total word count (approx.)					37,860

With respect to the selected source texts, it is also necessary to discuss the reliability of depositions as allegedly “faithful” recordings of real conversations in the past. Among other linguistic features, the original use of second person

singular pronouns might be misreported by witnesses and defendants or erroneously transcribed by scribes and editors (cf. Kytö and Walker 2003, 224–230). Especially late print versions may suffer considerably from editorial alterations (cf. Kytö and Walker 2006: 30). As a result, the possible divergence from the source text must be taken into account when analysing the material (Kytö and Walker 2003, 230). All Scottish depositions included in the present study have been drawn from nineteenth-century editions. Second person singular pronouns have been verified against surviving manuscripts. Six examples of *thou* were found to have been inaccurately transcribed as *you*, four of which are in the *Pitcairn Trials*, and two in the *St Andrews Kirk Sessions* (HCOS). However, for some depositions in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus, no contemporaneous manuscripts could be retrieved (see appendices 1 and 3 for further details). A few of these were printed in the same year of their recording and these early imprints have been consulted for this study (see appendix 2). Nevertheless, for approximately 30 per cent of the Scottish data the degree of editorial alteration remains unknown.⁶ Regarding the Northern English samples, three of the four deposition collections are based on nineteenth-century editions (D1WDURHA, D1WCHEST and D2WDIOCE, see appendix 2 for bibliographical information). The occurrences of *thou* and *you* have been verified against the corresponding manuscript-based source texts in the ETED (Kytö, Grund and Walker 2011) and against Terry Walker's (priv. comm.) preliminary analysis of address pronouns in the surviving manuscripts of the CED data.⁷ However, there appear to be no surviving manuscript records for the Lancaster collection (D2WPENDL).⁸ Nevertheless, this deposition collection is based on a contemporaneous imprint and is thus not as far removed from the original speech event as the other samples. There are seven cases in which *thou* was erroneously transcribed as *you*, six of which are in D1WDURHA and one in D2WDIOCE. In D1WCHEST, there is one case of *you* erroneously transcribed as *her other*. The results of the manuscript checks have been taken into account in the quantification and analysis of address pronouns in the data.

Since the examination of non-electronic resources went beyond the scope of this case study, the investigated period is restricted. Unfortunately, the publications of Late Middle Scottish trials by Pitcairn do not go beyond 1624. The HCOS data are also limited with respect to depositions; for the second sub-period defined for this study, i.e. 1600–1640, there is only one small deposition record of 1601 (see table 6 in appendix 1). After 1640, there is only one trial sample in the HCOS, which does not yield sufficient deposition data to reveal patterns of pronoun usage.⁹ Therefore, Late Middle Scottish depositions from later periods, such as the end of the seventeenth century, are

yet to be collected. Because of the limitations of the *Pitcairn Trials* and the HCOS, the second sub-period for the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus (i.e. 1600–1624) is shorter than the corresponding sub-period in the CED (i.e. 1600–1639). This caveat has to be borne in mind when interpreting the results.

The citation of corpus examples from the *Pitcairn Trials* is based on the printed source texts of 1833 while references are given with respect to the volume numbers as follows: I.i, I.ii, II, and III. The examples from the CED and the HCOS are quoted according to the plain text files in the corpora, omitting the coding within the texts. As far as possible, spacing and orthography are faithfully reproduced. Older font forms of the letter *s*, however, are replaced by their modern equivalent. Moreover, as the lineation had to be adjusted to MS Word for all Scottish examples cited, there will be no further indication concerning these changes. Square brackets, “[]”, represent my editorial comment. Because Late Middle Scots contains words and spellings of which many readers might be unfamiliar, translations of the utterances will be provided for each example. The translations are based on the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* and the OED. Furthermore, instances of *thou* and *you* are marked in bold for emphasis.

The approach applied to the examination of corpus examples is a combination of the micro-pragmatic analysis suggested by Jucker (2000) and the micro-sociolinguistic method by Grannis (1990). Concerning the study of *thou* and *you*, Jucker (2000, 161) calls for a “more micro-pragmatically motivated perspective” that pays attention to the “interactional status of the interactants” and to the “individual progression of specific conversations”. The aim is a sensitive study of how interlocutors may negotiate their relationship and how the situational context may temporarily override the relatively stable variable of social status (Jucker 2000, 158). In a similar vein, Grannis (1990, 109) emphasises that limited sets of data should be “investigated at the individual or small-group level” while the findings should not be equated with the language use of society as a whole.

For the present study, the social status of interlocutors is classified according to the models of Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003, 36, 136) and Walker (2007, 25). Thus, a basic division is made between non-commoners, i.e. those who owned land and great possessions, and commoners, i.e. those who had to work for a living. The emerging middle ranks are difficult to subsume under these terms. Although professionals and “wholesale merchants” were wealthy, they still pursued a working career (Coward 1988, 3–4; Walker 2007, 25). In this analysis, interlocutors of the middle ranks are classified as non-commoners, but inferior to the gentry and nobility.

Regarding the overall structure of the data, there is an overrepresentation of the upper ranks in the *Scottish Trials* material. Non-commoners, especially noblemen, account for 66 per cent of all the interlocutors¹⁰ in the Scottish data, while only 18 per cent can be classified as commoners. By contrast, the CED sub-corpus features both the higher and the lower echelons in fair numbers, i.e. 30 per cent of non-commoners and 52 per cent of commoners. However, the social position of 16 per cent of the Scottish interlocutors and 18 per cent of the Northern English interlocutors could not be inferred from the source texts.

As a result, the two sub-corpora are distinct in their representation of social levels, which is most plausibly explained by the different aims of the source corpora. The predominance of nobles in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus might be due to Pitcairn's (1833 (I.i), v) selection of cases of historical importance, e.g. high treason. It turns out that the leading figures of conspiracies, which make up a considerable part of the Scottish data, usually belonged to the higher end of the social scale. By contrast, the CED was compiled to enable linguistic research, especially in the fields of variationist studies and historical pragmatics (Kytö and Walker 2006, 11). Thus, the sampling of the source texts was governed by the aim to represent "a range of social ranks, especially the lower end of the scale" (Kytö and Walker 2006, 26). The effect of these social differences on the results will be taken into account in the discussion of the findings.

As for the factors of age and sex, adults and men predominate in the data. While women are generally rare in the *Scottish Trials* material, there is a shortage of upper rank female interlocutors in both sub-corpora. As a consequence, the pronoun usage of women is probably more influenced by their social position than by their sex. Thus, a comparison of singular pronominal address between men and women is not feasible. Due to the scarcity of age groups other than adults in both the Scottish and Northern English data, the age parameter cannot be systematically exploited for the present analysis either.

4. Pronoun usage in Scotland and Northern England

This section includes the results of a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of *thou* and *you* in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English depositions. I will present the overall frequencies of address pronouns in the *Scottish Trials* and the CED sub-corpus across the investigated period. Furthermore, I will discuss the findings with regard to the initially formulated hypotheses.

Subsequently, patterns of pronoun usage will be analysed from a micro-perspective in order to discover the decisive factors motivating the choice of *thou* or *you*. Although I will occasionally provide raw figures in the micro-analysis, there is not enough data to substantiate statistical testing. Rather the figures should give an idea of the relative frequencies with which patterns of pronoun usage occur.

4.1 Regional distributions of *thou* and *you*

The use of *thou* and *you* in Late Middle Scottish depositions was hypothesised to resemble patterns of pronoun usage in Early Modern Northern English depositions. Furthermore, it was assumed that relatively high occurrences of *thou* would be found in both sub-corpora across the investigated period. As a concomitant process, the decline of *thou* was not expected to be marked in either the Scottish or the Northern English data.

The overall distribution of *thou* and *you* in the two regions across the two sub-periods is shown in table 3 and figure 1 below:

Table 3. *Thou* and *you* in the *Scottish Trials* and the CED sub-corpus 1560–1624/1639 (raw figures and percentages). The difference between *thou/you* distributions in the regions is statistically significant by sub-period ($\chi^2=12.25$; $df=3$; $p < .01$)

Region	1560–1599		1600–1624/1639		Total
	<i>thou</i>	<i>you</i>	<i>Thou</i>	<i>you</i>	
Scotland	25 (32%)	52 (68%)	50 (31%)	110 (69%)	237
Northern England	109 (44%)	139 (56%)	53 (49%)	55 (51%)	356
Total	134	191	103	165	593

In total, the *Scottish Trials* and the CED sub-corpus yielded 593 instances of second person singular pronouns. The incidence for pronouns in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus is 5.5 per 1000 words. With 9.4 per 1000 words, the figure in the CED sub-corpus is higher, yet still rather low. By comparison, other genres such as trials or drama have higher occurrences of *thou* and *you* (Culpeper and Kytö 2000, 185). The relatively low occurrences of second person singular pronouns in the deposition genre are due to the fact that direct speech is often rendered as indirect speech (Walker 2007, 13).

Even though *thou* is generally less frequent than *you* in the data from Scotland and Northern England, the occurrences of *thou* are still rather high in comparison with the rapid decrease of *thou* in South-Eastern English depositions after 1600 (cf. Walker and Kytö 2011, 221). In both sub-periods, the percentages of *thou* in the Late Middle Scottish depositions are over 30 per cent. With regard to the Early Modern Northern English source texts, the occurrences of *thou* are notably higher with over 40 per cent in both sub-periods. There is a statistically significant difference in the occurrences of *thou* between the two regions across the whole investigated period ($\chi^2=22.69$; $df=1$; $p < .01$). However, rather than indicating regional variation, these findings are explained by the abovementioned overrepresentation of the upper ranks in the Scottish data (see section 3) and their use of address pronouns (see section 4.2 below).




Figure 1. Ratio of *thou* to *you* by region and sub-period (in percentages)

Likewise, the predominance of *you* is significantly stronger in the *Scottish Trials* material than in the CED sub-corpus across the investigated period. In the Scottish data, *you* prevails over *thou* with 68 per cent between 1560 and 1599 and with 69 per cent in the second sub-period. By comparison, the figures for *you* in the Northern English depositions amount to 56 per cent and 51 per cent respectively. Thus, in the second sub-period of the CED sub-corpus, *you* outnumbers *thou* only by two percentage points. Again, the statistically significant differences in the overall occurrences of *you* between the Scottish

and the Northern English data might not represent regional variation but are rather due to the distinct representation of social ranks in the two sub-corpora (see section 3 above and section 4.2 below).

In spite of the differences between the Scottish and Northern English data, the two regions resemble each other in the lack of evidence for a decline in the use of *thou*. There is no statistically significant change in the frequency of *thou* after 1600 in either the Scottish or the Northern English samples (*Scottish Trials* sub-corpus 1560–1624: $\chi^2=0$; $df=1$; $p=1$; CED sub-corpus 1560–1639: $\chi^2=0.6$; $df=1$; $p=.44$). The results correspond to the absence of a significant decrease in *thou* after 1600 stated by Walker and Kytö (2011, 221) for their Northern English deposition data. Furthermore, the findings are particularly striking when considering the rapid decline of *thou* in South-Eastern English depositions after 1600 (Walker and Kytö 2011, 221).

4.2 A micro-analysis of regional patterns

The quantitative findings will now be supplemented by a more in-depth examination of address pronouns in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English depositions. Patterns of pronoun usage will be described and illustrated by a selection of examples. Since the Scottish data for the first sub-period is too scarce to discover any patterns, the correlations of *thou* and *you* with extra-linguistic factors will be discussed across the whole period of 1560–1624/39. Because of the abovementioned uneven representation of men and women and of different age groups (see section 3), the investigation into patterns of pronoun usage concentrates on the social status of interlocutors, applying the classification system introduced in section 3. However, the middle ranks and the upper commoners are not discussed separately, since the Scottish data for these estates is insufficient to show clear patterns. They will only be considered with respect to their relative social power as inferiors or superiors. Moreover, since many of the dialogues are charged with negative feelings, the co-occurrence of *thou* and *you* with expressions of strong negative emotion will be another focus of analysis. In the analysis of individual dialogues, the parameters of age and sex will also be taken into account wherever they are relevant, together with other extra-linguistic factors such as the interactional status or the situational context.

Concerning the use of address pronouns among the upper ranks, *you* is the normal pronoun in any context in both Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English depositions. Thus, *you* is given to upper rank equals and superiors, such as royal persons, irrespective of the emotional load of the speech event. The use of *thou* among the higher echelons seems to be an

exceptional option. In the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus, there is only one situation in which an upper rank speaker addresses his noble interlocutor as *thou* (example (1) below). It occurs at the moment when the alleged conspiracy of John Ruthven, third Earl of Gowrie, against James VI is exposed:

- (1) And gaiting word that his Maiestie wes nocht cum furth, they wer
altogidder at my lord of Gowryis zett; and ‘Tressoun!’ being cryit
furth at ane skoir wyndo, that luikis to the Water-gait, Schir Thomas
Erskyne tuik my lord of Gowrie be the gorget, and sayd, ‘O Tratour!
This is **thy** deid!’
‘Oh traitor, this is **thy** deed!’
(*Pitcairn Trials* II, 200, my emphasis and translation)

Sir Thomas Erskine is at this point still a member of the gentry, and not yet granted the title of first Earl of Kellie, and thus inferior in rank to the Earl of Gowrie (ODNB). However, the social distance between them is not very great. When discovering Gowrie as the author of the conspiracy against James VI, Erskine – as a loyal servant to the King – may claim a higher degree of nobility than Gowrie. Furthermore, Erskine’s choice of *thou* – collocating with *traitor* – is “the ‘heraldic’ or honour-based THOU of defiance” (anon. priv. comm.).¹¹ The speech event in example (1) is reported by three deponents, among them Erskine himself (cf. *Pitcairn Trials* II, 181, 200). All of them are similar in their wording and state Erskine’s use of *thou*. Except for this one case, the Scottish data suggest an upper rank preference for *you* even in situations charged with negative feelings.

Likewise, there is only one upper rank addressee in the CED sub-corpus who receives *thou* (example (2) below):

- (2) In August last, by force of another warrant,
did arreast Lumsdenn in Newcastle upon Tyne, wherupon he
did revile examine [i.e. R. Mitford], and would not obey his arreast,
saieinge,
“Hange **the**, rogue, art **thou** comen with a fase warrant to
arreast me againe? I will not stirr my foote for **the**.” Examine
was forced to goe to Mr. Robert Andersonn, a magistrate of
Newcastle, whoe, after peruseall, tolde Lumsdenn the warrant
was sufficient to apprehend him.
(*High Commission Court ... Diocese of Durham*, 1627–1637, 23,
emphasis added)

Robert Mitford, a gentleman of 34 years, has been put in charge to arrest Lumsden, a man of unknown rank and age. Lumsden’s use of *thou* collocates

with his angry and contemptuous behaviour toward Mitford. Even if Lumsden was a gentleman himself, his choice of *thou* must have been felt as extremely impolite. However, as Mitford is the deponent in this case, it is also possible that he reported *thou* instead of *you* in order to make Lumsden appear more condescending than he actually was.

In the CED sub-corpus, there is only one gentleman who angrily uses *you* toward another gentleman's wife. Thus, the use of emotionally negative *you* among Northern English upper rank interlocutors is too infrequent to reveal patterns. Based on a larger amount of Early Modern English deposition data, Walker and Kytö (2011, 225) note that members of the gentry "do not exchange THOU (with one exception)".

When addressing their social inferiors upper rank speakers in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus primarily use *you* in more neutral contexts while *thou* is almost exclusively reserved for emotional contexts. As shown in examples (3) and (4) below, Alexander Ruthven, younger brother to the third Earl of Gowrie, first addresses Andrew Henderson, Gowrie's chamberlain, with *you*, while switching to *thou* in anger:

- (3) The deponer [i.e. Andrew Henderson] inquired at the Maister [i.e. Alexander Ruthven], 'What have ye to do, sir?' The Maister answered, 'Ye must go in heere, and tarry untill I come backe; for I will take the key with me.' So he locked the deponer in the round, within the chamber, and tooke the key with him.
'Ye must go in here, and wait until I come back; since I will take the key with me.'
(*Pitcairn Trials* II, 222, my emphasis and translation)

- (4) FURTHER, the sayde Andrew Hendersoun depones, that, when he had taken the Maisters hand out of the Kings Majesties mouth, and was opening the windoe, Maister Alexander sayde to him, 'Wilt **thou** not helpe? Woe betyde **thee**, **thou** wilt make vs all die!' 'Wilt **thou** not help? Woe betide **thee**, **thou** wilt make us all die!'
(*Pitcairn Trials* II, 223, my emphasis and translation)

When Henderson shows disloyalty to the Ruthven brothers by saving James VI from Alexander Ruthven's attack he is no longer addressed with *you*, which seems to be the pronoun he usually receives from his superiors. However, as Henderson is the deponent of the passages quoted in examples (3) and (4), his report of Ruthven's shift to *thou* might also be an attempt to make Ruthven appear more aggressive.

Although Scottish superiors tend to prefer *thou* when railing at their inferiors, the use of emotionally negative *you* is recorded, too. In the *Scottish Trials* depositions, there are 16 cases of emotionally negative *thou* whereas five instances of *you* occur in heated dialogues. For example, when Gowrie's porter misinforms the Earl concerning the King's passing of the gate, Gowrie scolds him: *ye lie, knaif! He is furth.* (*Pitcairn Trials* II, 186). The deponent in this case is Andrew Ray, one of the bailiffs of the burgh of Perth. Interestingly, the porter receives an angry *you* even though the social distance between him and Gowrie is greater than between Andrew Henderson and Alexander Ruthven in example (4). As chamberlain, Henderson managed the household and was at the head of the other servants. According to Johnson (1966, 264), servants in noble households who are in a position of responsibility should be considered as members of the middle ranks. In an alternative account of the same speech event, Robert Crystie, the porter himself, cites Gowrie's utterance with *thou*: *Thow leid! He is furth at the bak yett, and throw the Inche* 'Thou lied! He went out at the back gate, and through the meadow' (*Pitcairn Trials* II, 187, my translation). The differing report of pronoun usage suggests that both *you* and *thou* would have been possible in such a situation while the negative connotation of *thou* is stronger than that of *you*.

Thou also prevails in emotionally negative addresses of Northern English upper rank speakers to their inferiors. Ralph Ogle, for instance, a young gentleman, uses *thou* toward John Ross, a young labourer, shortly before trying to attack him in the churchyard. The inferior Ross himself retorts with *you* (*Courts of Durham*, 1560–1588, 260; for detailed discussions of this example cf. Hope 1993, 386–387 and Walker 2007, 127–128.). Similar to the Scottish data, the Northern English depositions also record the use of emotionally negative *you* toward inferiors, albeit very infrequently. There is one case in which a gentleman addresses a clergyman as *you* in the context of abusing him with several insulting terms (*High Commission Court . . . Diocese of Durham*, 1627–1637, 183).

The choice of *thou* toward inferiors in the absence of negative feelings might have been influenced by other extra-linguistic factors that could have been more decisive than the difference in social status. In the Scottish data, *thou* is only rarely used by superiors to address inferiors in more neutral contexts. One of the four examples occurs in Duncan McClellan's deposition relating to the rebellion on Orkney. It is assigned to James Lyon, the illegitimate son of Sir Thomas of Auldbar, master of Glamis, who can thus be identified as an upper rank native speaker of Scots (ODNB). McClellan himself was courier to Patrick Stewart, second Earl of Orkney, and he delivered messages between the Earl and Robert Stewart, the Earl's illegitimate

son. Robert Stewart was meant to lead the rebellion on Orkney and re-conquer his father's strongholds, while James Lyon should accompany him. Prior to their second attempt, Robert and James had some problems raising the money for their undertakings. McClellan later testified that during that time James Lyon had said to him: *Yff we go to Orknay, no man sall haif the credite of carrying our Letteris to and fra, bot yow* [MS: *thow*] 'If we go to Orkney, we shall confide in no one but you [thee] to carry our letters to and fro' (*Pitcairn Trials* III, 327, author's translation and my corrections). Pitcairn (1833 (III), 327) transcribed this utterance with *yow*, but in the 1614 manuscript of this deposition *thow* is recorded. Since the Scottish material shows an upper rank preference for addressing social inferiors as *you* in less emotional situations, the finding of an erroneous transcription of *thou* in this case radically changes the micro-analysis of pronoun usage. McClellan had shown himself very reliable in his service as a courier. Therefore, James Lyon's choice of *thou* may not have been primarily motivated by superior power but could also have been an expression of acknowledging the courier's trustworthiness by making him an accomplice in the rebellion.

A closer look at the Northern English data reveals that many examples of upper rank *thou* to inferiors in less emotional situations could have been at least co-determined by a difference in age. There are eleven occurrences of *thou* which are given by older upper rank speakers to younger commoners in more neutral contexts. However, the influence of the age factor varies, since there are eight older superiors who address their younger inferiors with *you*. Moreover, the use of *thou* by superiors to inferiors could have been further motivated by some implicit condescending attitude.

Both Scottish and Northern English inferiors address superiors exclusively with *you* in more neutral situations. Concerning the pronoun usage of inferiors toward superiors in contexts of anger or contempt, the Scottish data remains anecdotal. In fact, there is only one emotionally negative dialogue in which an inferior addresses a noble interlocutor (example (5) below):

- (5) [...] the Lord Maxvell come vpoun this deponar [i.e. Archibald Cunningham] with ane drauin suerd, saying, 'Fals knaif! oppin þe zett, or ellis I shall hew **the** all in bladdis!' The deponar ansuerit, 'Schamit theif! quhat ar **ze** doand heir?' And then the Lord Maxvell incontinent straik at this deponar with his drawin suord, and mwtilat him of his left arme; and gif the said Williame Maxvell had nocht savit the deponar from the said Lord Maxvellis furie, he had slane the deponar. 'False knave! Open the gate, or otherwise I shall hack **thee** all in pieces!' – 'Disgraceful thief! What are **ye** doing here?' (*Pitcairn Trials* III, 41–42, my emphasis and translation)

The speech event allegedly takes place when John, Lord Maxwell breaks into the Castle of Edinburgh to free James Makconeill, who is imprisoned there. Cunningham, the master porter of the Castle of Edinburgh, states that both Lord Maxwell and Cunningham himself used derogatory terms of address (i.e. *fals knaif, schamit theif*). However, whereas Maxwell's vocative collocates with *thou*, Cunningham reports the use of *you* to Maxwell for himself. Maxwell's superior status allows him to choose between *thou* and *you*. Cunningham's choice of singular pronominal address, however, could be restricted to *you* by his inferior position.

The evidence of the CED sub-corpus suggests that superior addressees have to be close enough to allow the choice of emotionally negative *thou*. Whereas *you* is exclusively used by lower commoners toward professionals and upper commoners in less emotional contexts, *thou* seems to be an option for expressing negative feelings. For instance, James Walton, supposedly a lower commoner, switches from *you* to *thou* when he starts provoking and insulting Richard Mylner, a clergyman (*Courts of Durham*, 1560–88, 292; for detailed discussions of this example cf. Hope 1993, 384–385 and Walker 2007, 128–129). Thus, when inferiors address close superiors in emotionally negative situations, the status rule can be wiped out by the momentary emotional heat.

By comparison, the Northern English data do not show whether the choice of emotionally negative *thou* would have been possible in relationships of greater social distance. There is only one dialogue between a commoner and a member of the upper ranks that is presumably charged with some degree of anger. Roger Doon, *a poore man*, consistently sticks to *you* when addressing Anthony Ratcliff, a gentleman, even though Ratcliff accuses Doon of sheep stealing and condescendingly addresses the inferior interlocutor as *thou* (*Courts of Durham*, 1560–1588, 62–63). Based on a larger amount of data, Walker (2007, 167–168) states that commoners never employ *thou* toward the gentry, not even in anger, while they indeed use it when addressing professionals. The difference is explained by the minimised social distance between professionals, especially clergymen, and commoners with respect to their status and relationship (Walker 2007, 168).

Among lower commoners, *thou* still tends to prevail over *you* in both the Scottish and Northern English data. The patterns in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus suggest that *thou* is the preferred pronoun among the lower echelons in any kind of situation. In total, there are 24 *thou* and three *you*. Six cases of *thou* collocate with expressions of strong negative feelings. Most of the remaining 18 instances of lower commoner *thou* in the Scottish data cannot be classified as “neutral” since they either involve members of the same family or implicit negative emotion. Of the few occurrences of *you* none are explicitly marked by

anger or contempt. In example (6) below, Issobel Greirsoun, a labourer's wife, addresses Margaret Donaldson, a married woman of presumably equal lower status (cf. *Pitcairn Trials* II, 523). Greirsoun's *thou* co-occurs with a heavy curse:

- (6) Eftir the quhilk time, scho [i.e. Issobel Greirsoun] heiring hir name to be sklanderit, and scho to be namit a Witche, quha had skill to lay on and tak of seiknes; scho, movit with rage and invy, of new agane, come to the said Margrattis hous, and spak to hir mony devillisch and horribill wordis, saying to hir, 'The fagget of Hell lycht on **thé**, and Hellis culdroune may **thow** seith in!' And with thais, and vther the lyk devillisch speicheis, scho past away.
'The faggot of hell light on **thee**, and hell's cauldron may **thou** see the in!'
(*Pitcairn Trials* II, 526, my emphasis and translation)

The use of *thou* in example (6) is contrasted by Margaret Donaldson's husband's use of *you* to Greirsoun in an earlier speech event (example (7) below):

- (7) Quhairvpoun, he [i.e. Robert Peddan, Margaret Donaldson's husband] than come to hir [i.e. Issobel Greirsoun], and satisfeit hir the said soume, and thryse askit his health att hir, for Godis saik; saying, 'Gif **3e** haif done me ony wrang or hurt, repair þe samin and restoir me to my health!' And thaireftir, the said Robert Peddane, within, xxiiij houris, recoverit his health.
'If **ye** have done me any harm or injury, repair the same and restore me to my health!'
(*Pitcairn Trials* II, 525, my emphasis and translation)

Robert Peddan's utterance is not explicitly charged with negative feelings. However, he must have been quite desperate, suffering from an incurable disease allegedly laid on him by Greirsoun's magic powers as a punishment for not paying back his debts to her. By bringing her the money, he hopes to soothe her wrath.

With ten examples of mutual *thou* and no mutual *you*, the data for lower commoners in the CED sub-corpus is scarce. Furthermore, eight instances of *thou* co-occur with strong negative emotion such as in example (8) below:

- (8) the said Margaret answerid & said, "dost **thou** deny hit? then **thou** art a false thief!" and apon that, Fazakerley answerid & said,
"**thou** art as like a hoore, as I a thief." and therapon she said, "**thou**

art a thief; and I am able to prove **the** for a thief; & **thou** art a thief!”
and to his knowledge she spake of all his kin; and so ther was angry
wordes betwene them;
(*Bishop’s Court, Chester*, 1561–1566, 204, emphasis added)

Margaret Wirrall is reported to have a master and can thus be assumed to be a female servant. Henry Fazakerley is supposedly a labourer since he is working with an axe near the house of someone else (cf. *Bishop’s Court, Chester*, 1561–1566, 117). The use of *thou* of both interlocutors collocates with abusive nominal forms of address (i.e. *thief, hoore*) and the report of angry words between them. In a presumably less emotional context, Wirrall also chooses *thou* toward a female servant of another household (*Bishop’s Court, Chester*, 1561–1566, 206). This is in fact one of the two instances of *thou* that are not characterised by extreme negative feelings. The results of Walker and Kytö’s (2011, 225) analysis of a larger amount of deposition material indicate that *thou* could have been the reciprocal pronoun of lower commoners in Early Modern England, albeit declining toward the end of the seventeenth century. With respect to the North, Walker and Kytö (2011, 233) tentatively conclude that *thou* might still have been the preferred pronoun among the upper and lower commoners in the late sixteenth century.

In sum, qualitative analysis shows similar patterns of pronoun usage in the *Scottish Trials* and the CED sub-corpus. These micro-analyses suggest that in Late Middle Scottish depositions members of the upper and lower ranks favour the same address pronouns in heated and less emotional exchanges as their Northern English neighbours. This finding sheds new light on the quantitative results presented above. The higher overall occurrences of *you* in the Late Middle Scottish depositions are explained by the overrepresentation of the nobility and their prevailing choice of *you*. By analogy, the higher occurrences of *thou* in the Early Modern Northern English depositions are accounted for by the more balanced representation of commoners, who tend to receive more *thou* from superiors and from each other than non-commoners. Thus, the quantitative distributions of *thou* and *you* reflect the distinct representation of social ranks of the two sub-corpora.

The underrepresentation of commoners in the Scottish data certainly affects the frequency of *thou* since the influence of rank outweighs the regional factor. Further research on Late Middle Scottish depositions with a larger number of lower rank interlocutors would probably result in higher occurrences of *thou* and would thus provide better evidence for the preservation of the old singular in this regional variety. At the current stage, Finkenstaedt’s (1963, 142) claim for the longevity of *thou* in Scotland can only be tentatively verified. It receives some confirmation from the lower commoners’ preference

for *thou* found in the Scottish data. Moreover, the relatively high, unchanging frequency of *thou* in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus stands in contrast to the rapidly declining use of *thou* in South-Eastern depositions after 1600 while at the same time tending to resemble developments in Northern English source texts (cf. Walker and Kytö 2011, 223, 233). Thus, the belated decline of *thou* appears not to be a feature that distinguishes Late Middle Scots from Early Modern English in general, but it must be seen in the context of a regionally more diversified pronoun usage.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this corpus-based case study has been to analyse the use of second person singular pronouns in Late Middle Scottish depositions alongside Early Modern Northern English source texts from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Although relatively high occurrences of *thou* were found in both regions, the frequency of *thou* in the Northern English data was significantly higher than in the Scottish data. The quantitative findings were affected by the distinct social structure of the two sub-corpora. As a consequence, the higher occurrences of *you* in the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus were explained by an overrepresentation of the upper ranks rather than indicating regional variation. The micro-analysis revealed a resemblance between Scottish and Northern English depositions with regard to patterns of pronoun usage determined by rank and strong negative emotion. In addition, the expected absence of a decrease in *thou* after 1600 was corroborated by the quantitative results. Furthermore, the in-depth examination of individual dialogues showed that the use of address pronouns varied on the higher and lower levels of the social structure in both regions. In spite of preferences for either *you* or *thou*, the opposing second person singular pronoun was recorded too, if only infrequently.

In the light of these findings on depositions, and in the light of other recent research on regional variation of *thou* and *you* in Early Modern English, it can – tentatively – be claimed that Finkenstaedt's (1963, 142) assumption of the preservation of *thou* in Scottish everyday speech needs to be modified. It seems that the belated decline of *thou* is a regional characteristic of not only Scottish but also Northern English depositions. Furthermore, it appears that, from the study of these depositions, the lower ranks had a distinct preference for *thou*, whereas *thou* was only exceptionally used by the higher echelons, although of course the data for the former are limited. Due to the overrepresentation of upper rank interlocutors and the scarcity of middle and

lower rank data, the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus did not provide enough evidence for all social strata. In addition, some address pronouns recorded in the Scottish depositions might be subject to manipulation as a result of the transmission process, which could not be evaluated for all source texts due to some missing manuscripts. Further research along the lines adopted here, extending across other periods and other genres may provide more interesting insights into the diachronic development of *thou* in Scotland and thus complement previous findings on singular pronominal address in different varieties of English.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Andreas H. Jucker for encouraging me to write this paper and for his valuable support throughout the process. Likewise, I am very grateful to Jeremy J. Smith for assisting me in tackling the last, yet not the least, obstacles in the revision. Thanks are also due to Irma Taavitsainen and the anonymous reviewers for their constructive criticism. Furthermore, I am greatly indebted to Terry Walker for providing me with the preliminary results of her manuscript checks for the CED data, to the staff of the National Archives of Scotland and the National Library of Scotland for helping me tracking down the manuscripts for the Scottish source texts, and to Miles Turner for proofreading my paper. I am of course responsible for any errors or infelicities that remain.

Notes

1. The term Late “Middle Scots” refers to the linguistic variety of Scots in the period 1550–1700 (Macafee 2002, xxxiv).
2. For the present study, all forms of second person singular pronouns have been taken into account. The forms of *thou* include *thou*, *thee*, *thyself*, *thine* as well as the determiner *thy*. *You* subsumes *ye*, *you*, *yourself*, *yours* and the determiner *your*. For both *thou* and *you* all possible spelling variants have been considered. Variants have been checked against the spellings in *A Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots* (2008).
3. Incidentally, Late Middle Scots has received more attention in other domains of linguistic research, such as variationist studies in morphology or syntax (e.g. Meurman-Solin 1993, 2001).
4. For a map showing the boundaries between Gaelic and Scots in 1500 see Macafee (2002, xlvii).
5. Norn is a descendant of Old Norse, and was spoken on the Orkney and Shetland Islands (Macafee 2002, xxxix).
6. The missing manuscripts mainly relate to the cases of James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell and John Ruthven, third Earl of Gowrie. Some of the documents relating to the Bothwell case were found among the MS collections of the National Library of Scotland. However, they are late seventeenth or eighteenth century transcripts of the originals, and thus

not contemporaneous. Moreover, anglicised spellings and punctuation practices in these records suggest that they suffer from considerable editorial alteration, which might also affect the transcription of *thou* and *you*. Therefore, differences in pronoun usage between these later manuscripts and the Pitcairn Trials have not been considered in the quantitative results of this study.

7. When selecting the data for the present study, the manuscript-based ETED was not yet available. Some, but not all of the CED depositions of Northern England have been re-sampled for the ETED.

8. This information is provided by Terry Walker.

9. Due to limited financial resources, existing collections of Scottish court records in print or manuscript form could not be considered for the present study.

10. Interlocutors are counted according to the number of utterances and not with regard to their actual identities. Thus, one person can be counted as more than one speaker or addressee.

11. This context-specific function of *thou* is a valuable point added by one of the anonymous reviewers.

Sources

CED = *A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760*. 2006. Compiled under the supervision of Merja Kytö (Uppsala University) and Jonathan Culpeper (Lancaster University).

HCOS = *Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots 1450–1700*. 1995. Compiled by Anneli Meurman-Solin (Helsinki University).

Pitcairn Trials = *Criminal Trials in Scotland from MCCCCLXXXVIII to MDCXXIV Embracing the Entire Reigns of James IV, James V, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI. Compiled from Original Records and MSS with Historical Notes and Explanations by Robert Pitcairn*. 1833. TannerRitchie Publishing and the University of St. Andrews (eds.). 3 vols. CD-ROM. Burlington, Canada: TannerRitchie Publishing, 2005.

References

A Linguistic Atlas of Older Scots, Phase 1: 1380–1500. 2008. Ed. by Keith Williamson. University of Edinburgh. Available at: <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laos1/laos1.html> (accessed 4 January 2011).

Barber, Charles. 1997. *Early Modern English*. Revised edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Coward, Barry. 1988. *Social Change and Continuity in Early Modern England 1550–1750*. London: Longman.

- Culpeper, Jonathan, and Merja Kytö. 2000. "Data in Historical Pragmatics: Spoken Interaction (Re)cast as Writing." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 2: 175–199.
- Cusack, Bridget (ed.). 1998. *Everyday English, 1500–1700. A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue (DOST)*. 2004. Ed. by Margaret. G. Dareau. In *Dictionary of the Scots Language (DSL)*, ed. by Susan Rennie. University of Dundee, Scotland. Available at: <http://www.dsl.ac.uk/dsl/> (accessed 16 January 2012).
- Finkenstaedt, Thomas. 1963. *You und Thou: Studien zur Anrede im Englischen*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Grannis, Oliver. 1990. "The Social Relevance of Grammatical Choice in Shakespeare." *Deutsche Shakespeare Gesellschaft West, Jahrbuch 1990*: 105–118.
- Hickey, Raymond. 2003. "Rectifying a Standard Deficiency: Second Person Pronominal Distinctions in Varieties of English." In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 107), ed. by Irma Taavitsainen and Andreas H. Jucker, 345–374. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hope, Jonathan. 1993. "Second Person Singular Pronouns in Records of Early Modern 'Spoken' English." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 94: 83–100. Reprinted in *A Reader in Early Modern English*, ed. by Mats Rydén, Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, and Merja Kytö, 377–396. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Johnson, Anne Carvey. 1966. "The Pronoun of Direct Address in Seventeenth Century English." *American Speech* 41 (4): 261–269.
- Jucker, Andreas H. 2000. "Thou in the History of English: A Case for Historical Semantics or Pragmatics?" In *Words: Structure, Meaning, Function. A Festschrift for Dieter Kastovsky*. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 130), ed. by Christiane Dalton-Puffer, and Nikolaus Ritt, 153–163. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jucker, Andreas H., Gerd Fritz, and Franz Lebsanft. 1999. "Historical Dialogue Analysis: Roots and Traditions in the Study of the Romance Languages, German and English." In *Historical Dialogue Analysis*. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 66), ed. by Andreas H. Jucker, Gerd Fritz, and Franz Lebsanft, 1–33. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kytö, Merja, und Terry Walker. 2003. "The Linguistic Study of Early Modern English Speech-Related Texts: How "Bad" Can "Bad" Data Be?" *Journal of English Linguistics* 31: 221–248.

- Kytö, Merja, und Terry Walker. 2006. *Guide to A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760*. (Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 130). Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Kytö, Merja, Peter J. Grund, and Terry Walker (eds.). 2011. *Testifying to Language and Life in Early Modern England (Including CD-ROM An Electronic Text Edition of Depositions 1560–1760 (ETED))*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kytö, Merja, Terry Walker, and Peter Grund. 2007. “English Witness Depositions 1560–1760: An Electronic Text Edition.” *ICAME Journal* 31: 65–85.
- Lass, Roger. 1999. “Phonology and Morphology.” In *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Volume 3, ed. by Roger Lass, 56–186. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macafee, Caroline. 2002. “A History of Scots to 1700.” In *A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue from the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth*. Vol. 12, ed. by Margaret G. Dareau, Lorna Pike, and Harry D. Watson, xxiv–clvii. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mazon, Gabriella. 2010. “Terms of Address.” In *Historical Pragmatics*. (Handbook of Pragmatics 8), ed. by Andreas H. Jucker, and Irma Taavitsainen, 351–376. Berlin and New York: Mouton De Gruyter Mouton.
- Meurman-Solin, Anneli. 1993. *Variation and Change in Early Scots Prose. Studies based on the Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 65). Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Meurman-Solin, Anneli. 1995. “A New Tool: *The Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots (1450-1700)*.” *ICAME Journal* 19: 49–62.
- Meurman-Solin, Anneli. 2000. “Change from Above or from Below? Mapping the Loci of Linguistic Change in Scottish English.” In *The Development of Standard English 1300–1800*, ed. by Laura Wright, 155–170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meurman-Solin, Anneli. 2001. “Women as Informants in Reconstructing Geographically and Socioculturally Conditioned Language Variation and Change in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Scots.” *Scottish Language* 20: 20–46.
- Nevalainen, Terttu, and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman.
- ODNB = *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2011. Oxford University Press. Available at: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/> (accessed 2 February 2012).

OED = *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2011. Oxford University Press. Available at: <http://www.oed.com/> (accessed 17 January 2012).

Pitcairn, Robert. 1833. "Historical Notes and Explanations". In *Criminal Trials in Scotland from MCCCCLXXXVIII to MDCXXIV*. Embracing the Entire Reigns of James IV, James V, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI. Compiled from Original Records and MSS with Historical Notes and Explanations by Robert Pitcairn. 3 volumes. CD-ROM, ed. by Robert Pitcairn. Burlington, Canada: TannerRitchie Publishing, 2005.

Trudgill, Peter. 1999. *The Dialects of England*. 2nd edition. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Wales, Kathleen M. 1983. "'Thou' and 'You' in Early Modern English: Brown and Gilman Re-appraised." *Studia Linguistica* 37 (2): 107–125.

Walker, Terry. 2000. "The Choice of Second Person Singular Pronouns in Authentic and Constructed Dialogue in Late Sixteenth Century England." In *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory: Papers from the Twentieth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora*. (ICAME 20), ed. by Christian Mair, and Marianne Hundt, 375–384. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Walker, Terry. 2003. "You and Thou in Early Modern English Dialogues: Patterns of Usage." In *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. (Pragmatics and Beyond Series 107), ed. by Irma Taavitsainen, and Andreas H. Jucker, 309–342. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Walker, Terry. 2007. *Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues: Trials, Depositions, and Drama Comedy*. (Pragmatics and Beyond Series 158). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Walker, Terry, and Merja Kytö. 2011. "Linguistic Variation and Change in the Depositions." In *Testifying to Language and Life in Early Modern England* (Including CD-ROM *An Electronic Text Edition of Depositions 1560-1760 (ETED)*), ed. by Merja Kytö, Peter J. Grund, and Terry Walker, 215–245. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Author's address

Department of English Language
School of Critical Studies
University of Glasgow
12 University Gardens
Glasgow G12 8QQ
Scotland, UK

m.leitner.1@research.gla.ac.uk

About the author

Magdalena Leitner is a PhD student in the Department of English Language at the University of Glasgow. Previous to this, she studied at the University of Zurich, Switzerland, where she completed a Master's thesis on pronouns of address in Late Middle Scottish and Early Modern Northern English witness depositions. Her doctoral thesis focuses on linguistic forms of (im)politeness in Scottish texts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Appendix 1: The Scottish Trials sub-corpus

In tables 4–7 below, the depositions are grouped either according to the case or to the sample to which they belong. The name of the accused person (or the principal defendant if there was more than one) is added in order to facilitate the identification of the record. The depositions for which no contemporary manuscript or early imprint was found are marked by an asterisk (*) following the deponent’s name.

Table 4. The *Pitcairn Trials* depositions in Volume I.i and I.ii used for the present study

Case	Deponents	Speech event	Publ. date	Page no.	Vol.	Word count
William Balfour: <i>Rioting to Restore the Popish Religion</i>	unknown	1561	1833	416–418	I.i	740
James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell: <i>High Treason – Conspiracy to Seize the Queen’s Person</i>	unknown	1565	1833	462–464	I.i	1,020
James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell: <i>High Treason – Murder of King Henry</i>	William Powrie*	1567	1833	493–495	I.i	1,770
	John Hay of Talla*	1567		496–498		1,410
	John Hay of Talla*	1567		500		290
	Laird of Ormistoun*	1573		511–513		1,800
Total word count Volume I.i (approx.)						7,030
Elizabeth (Bessie) Dunlop: <i>Sorcery, Witchcraft and Incantation</i>	Elizabeth Dunlop	1576	1833	51–58	I.ii	3,110
Bessie Roy: <i>Sorcery – Incantation - Witchcraft</i>	unknown	1590	1833	207–209	I.ii	920
John Fian (or Feane): <i>Treasonably Conspiring the Death of the King – Sorcery – Witchcraft – Incantation</i>	unknown	1590	1833	209–213	I.ii	1,590
John Mowbray: <i>Wilful Error on Assise – Acquitting a Witch</i>	unknown	1591	1833	244–247	I.ii	1,670
Eufame Makcalzane: <i>Treasonably Conspiring against his Majesty’s Life – Witchcraft – Sorcery – Murder</i>	unknown	1591	1833	249–255	I.ii	2,630
Total word count Volume I.ii (approx.)						9,920

Table 5. The *Pitcairn Trials* depositions in Volume II used for the present study

Case	Deponent	Speech event	Publ. date	Page no.	Word count
John Ruthven, third Earl of Gowrie: <i>The Earl of Gowrie's Conspiracy</i>	Thomas Cranstoun	1600	1833	156–157	850
	Duke of Lennox*	1600		171–174	1,530
	Andrew Henderson*	1600		174–179	2,330
	Abbot of Lundoris*	1600		181	280
	Thomas Erskine*	1600		181–182	630
	Andrew Ray*	1600		186–187	700
	Robert Crystie*	1600		187–188	310
	Robert Liddell	1600		204	70
	James Weimis	1600		218–219	700
	William Rynd	1600		219–221	990
	Andrew Henderson	1600		221–223	1,550
George Sprott: <i>High Treason – Concealment of Gowrie's Conspiracy</i> <i>Treasonable Expressions Made Use of by Hary Ruthven alias Freeland</i>	J. Prymrois	1600	1833	260–261	800
	Alexander Blair	1610	1833	325–326	780
	Hary Ruthven	1610		326–327	660
	Henry Rattray	1610		328	130
	Constantine Hynd	1610		329	160
William Galbraith: <i>Perjury before the Lords of Council and Session</i>	William Galbraith	1605	1833	476–477	750
Issobel Greirsoune: <i>Witchcraft – Sorcery - Incantation</i>	unknown	1607	1833	524–526	1,390
Bartie Patersoun: <i>Sorcery – Witchcraft – Incantation - Poisoning</i>	unknown	1607	1833	535–536	480
<i>Depositions of Issobell Haldane, Suspect of Witchcraft</i>	Stephen Ray	1623	1833	537	80
	Issobell Haldane	1623		537–538	180
<i>Beigis Tod: Sorcery, Witchcraft</i>	unknown	1608	1833	542–544	610
Total word count Volume II (approx.)					15,960

Table 6. The *Pitcairn Trials* depositions in Volume III used for the present study

Case	Deponent	Speech event	Publ. date	Page no.	Word count
John, Lord Maxwell: <i>Treason – Breaking the King’s Ward – Treasonable Murder</i>	James Makconeill	1609	1833	10–11	860
	Archibald Cunningham			41–42	320
	Robert Maxwell			43–46	1,950
	William Johnston			46–47	1,080
The Lords Auchindrane: <i>Treason – Slaughter – Murder under Trust</i>	James Pennycuik	1611	1833	148	650
	Edward Mekill-John			149	190
James Lyon of Glamis: <i>High Treason – Resisting the King’s Lieutenant and his Forces – Rebellion in Orkney</i>	Duncan McClellan	1614	1833	326–327	340
George, Walter, Ingram and Jok Scott: <i>Barbarous Slaughter and Maiming of Sheep – Oppression</i>	unknown	1616	1833	382–386	1,620
Margaret Wallace: <i>Witchcraft – Sorcery – Charming – Incantation – Soothsaying – Abusing the People</i>	unknown	1622	1833	520–522	850
	Charles Pollok			525	250
	Marion Mitchell			526–528	680
	John Pincartoun			529	100
Total word count Volume III (approx.)					8,890

Table 7. The HCOS depositions (1560–1640) used for the present study (not including the Criminal Trials samples, since they have already been considered in the electronic version of the *Pitcairn Trials*)

Sample	Deponent	Speech event	Publ. date	Word count
William Morton: <i>St. Andrews Kirk Sessions</i> (1559-1561)	unknown	1561	1889	430
Helen Hunter: <i>St. Andrews Kirk Sessions</i> (1589-1592)	Bessy Law	1590	1889	310
Patrick Bonkle: <i>St. Andrews Kirk Sessions</i> (1589-1592)	John Maknair	1592	1889	70
Catherine Anderson: <i>St. Andrews Kirk Sessions</i> (1589-1592)	Catherine Anderson	1595	1889	130
<i>Trial David Roy</i> (1601)	David Roy*	1601	1831	160
Total word count HCOS depositions (approx.)				1,100

Appendix 2: References for printed material

The references to the printed material from which depositions chosen for the CED sub-corpus and the Scottish Trials sub-corpus have been drawn are given below (see section 3):

Furnivall, F. J. (ed.). 1897. *Child-Marriages, Divorces, and Ratifications &c. in the Diocese of Chester, A. D. 1561-6* (Early English Text Society Original Series 108). London: Early English Text Society. (source for CED, D1WCHEST)

Govvreis Conspiracie a Discourse of the Vnnaturall and Vyle Conspiracie Attempted against the Kings Majesties Person at Sanct-Iohnstoun vpon Twysday the 5. of August. 1600. Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Charteris. (Scottish contemporaneous imprint for *Pitcairn Trials II*: 218–223)

Longstaffe, W. H. D. (ed.). 1858. *The Acts of the High Commission Court within the Diocese of Durham* (Surtees Society 34). Durham/London/Edinburgh: Surtees Society. (source for CED, D2WDIOCE)

Raine, James (ed.). 1845. *Depositions and Other Ecclesiastical Proceedings from the Courts of Durham, Extending from 1311 to the Reign of Elizabeth* (Surtees Society 21). London/Edinburgh: Surtees Society. (source for CED, D1WDURHA)

The Earle of Gowries Conspiracie against the Kings Maiestie at St Iohnstoun vpon Tuesday the Fift Day of August: and in the Sixteenth Hundred Yeare of Our Lord God. 1600. London: Printed by Valentine Simmes, dwelling on Adling hill at the signe of the white Swanne. (primary source for *Pitcairn Trials II*: 218–223)

The Wonderfyll Discoverie of Witches in the Covntie of Lancaster [...]. 1613. London: Printed by W. Stansby for Iohn Barnes. (source for CED, D2WPENDL)

Trial of David Roy, Cook to Colin Eviot of Balhousie, 1st February 1601. 1831. Edinburgh: Johannis Whitefoard Mackenzie Armigeri. (source for HCOS, David Roy)

Appendix 3: Manuscript references

The following list contains the full references for the manuscripts verified for the *Scottish Trials* sub-corpus in alphabetical and chronological order. Within each reference, the name(s) of the deponent(s) or – if the deponent is unknown – the name(s) of the defendant(s) and the date of recording are provided as rendered in Tables 4–7, appendix 1. For the manuscript references for the CED deposition collections see Kytö, Grund and Walker (2011, 335–336).

Pitcairn Trials 1560–1599

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. Court Books – Old Series, MS JC1/11 (no pagination): William Balfour, 1561; alternative copy of this case in MS JC1/47 (no foliation). MS JC1/12 (no pagination): James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell, 1565.

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. High Court Book of Adjournal – Old Series, MS JC2/1 (digitised version): ff. 15-18 (Elizabeth Dunlop, 1576). MS MFilP/JC2/2 (no pagination): Bessie Roy, 1590; John Fian, 1590; John Mowbray, 1591; Eufame Makcalzane, 1591.

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. David Crawford's MSS Collections Chiefly Relating to Affairs in Scotland during the Time of Queen Mary, Adv.MS.35.1.1(II): pp. 42–50 (John Hay, 1567). Alternative copy of this deposition in Swinton's Kirk Manuscripts, 2nd Vol., Adv.MS.32.2.19: ff. 195r-197v. Mary Queen of Scots (collected by James Anderson), Adv.MS.6.1.19: ff. 60-64v (Laird of Ormiston, 1573).

Pitcairn Trials 1600–1624

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. High Court Book of Adjournal – Old Series, MS JC2/4 (digitised version): pp. 110–113 (William Galbraith, 1605), pp. 348–349 (Issobel Greirsoune, 1607), pp. 402–403 (Bartie Patersoun, 1607), pp. 442–446 (Beigis Tod, 1608), pp. 830–831 (The Lords Auchindrane, 1611). MS JC2/5 (digitised version): f. 203v (George, Walter, Ingram and Jok Scott, 1616). MS JC2/6 (digitised version): f. 65 (Margaret Wallace, 1622), f. 68r (Charles Pollok, 1622), f. 69r–70v (Marion Mitchell, 1622), f. 71v (John Pincartoun, 1622).

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. High Court of Justiciary Processes, 1610–1619, MS JC26/7: f. 74 (Duncan McClellan, 1614).

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. Portfolio of Papers Relating to the Gowrie Conspiracy, 1600–1609, MS PA7/23/2/1: f. 108/1 (Thomas Cranstoun, 1600), f. 108/10 (John Brown and Robert Liddell, 1600).

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. Privy Council Papers 1st Series, 1607–1609, MS PC10/8A: f. VIII/3 (James Makcconeill, 1609), f. VIII/5 (Robert Maxwell, 1609), f. VIII/14 (George Sprott, 1608), f. VIII/119 (William Johnston, 1609), f. VIII/121 (Archibald Cunningham, 1609).

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. Privy Council Papers 2nd Series, 1613–1660, MS PC11/8/2B: f. 8/231 (Stephen Ray and Issobell Haldane, 1623).

National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh. Privy Council: Supplementary Papers, 1601–1610, MS PC15/5: f. SP108/13 (Alexander Blair and Hary Ruthven, 1610), f. SP108/14 (Henry Rattray and Constantine Hynd, 1610).

St Andrews Kirk Sessions 1559–1600

Special Collections, University of St Andrews. Kirk Session of St. Andrews 26 Oct 1559 – 7 Oct 1600. MS CH2/316/1/1: p.56 (William Mortoun, 1561), p.428 (Bessie Law, 1590), p.462 (John Maknair, 1592), p.504 (Catherine Anderson, 1595).