ACTA UNIVERSITATIS UPSALIENSIS
Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia
132

Editores
Rolf Lundén, Merja Kytö & Monica Correa Fryckstedt

Sara Lilja

Gender-Related Terms in English Depositions, Examinations and Journals, 1670–1720

UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Dissertation presented at Uppsala University to be publicly examined in Ihresalen, Engelska parken, Humanistiskt centrum, Thunbergsvägen 3L, Uppsala, Saturday, March 31, 2007 at 10:15 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The examination will be conducted in English.

Abstract
Lilja, S. 2007. Gender-Related Terms in English Depositions, Examinations and Journals, 1670–1720. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. *Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia* 132. 245 pp. Uppsala. ISBN 978-91-554-6801-9.

This dissertation focuses on gender-related terms as well as adjectives and demonstratives in connection with these terms used in texts from the period 1670–1720. The material in the study has been drawn from both English and American sources and comes from three text categories: depositions, examinations and journals. Two of these text categories represent authentic and speech-related language use (depositions and examinations), whereas the third (journals) is representative of a non-speech-related, non-fictional text category. While previous studies of gender-related terms have primarily investigated fictional material, this study focuses on text categories which have received little attention so far.

The overarching research question addressed in this study concerns the use and distribution of gender-related terms, especially with regard to referent gender. Data analyses are both quantitative and qualitative, and several linguistic and extra-linguistic factors are taken into account, such as the semantic domain to which the individual gender-related term belongs, region of origin and referent gender. Adjectives and demonstratives collocating with the gender-related terms are also investigated, as previous research has shown that referent gender has an impact on the use of adjectives as well.

The results show that the use of gender-related terms is influenced by both region of origin and referent gender. It is suggested that this is due in part to the difference in nature between Early Modern English society and the early American colonies, and in part due to the social roles which men and women had. Referent gender also has an impact on the type of adjectives used in connection with gender-related terms: adjectives collocating with gender-related terms denoting men have positive connotations to a larger extent than do adjectives collocating with their female counterparts; meanwhile, gender-related terms denoting women tend to collocate with negative adjectives.

Keywords: adjectives, corpus linguistics, A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760, demonstratives, depositions, Early Modern English, examinations, female, gender, gender-related terms, historical sociolinguistics, journals, male, Salem Witchcraft Papers

Sara Lilja, Department of English, Box 527, Uppsala University, SE-75120 Uppsala, Sweden

ISSN 0562-2719
ISBN 978-91-554-6801-9
urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-7508 (http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-7508)

Printed in Sweden by Elanders Gotab, Stockholm 2007
Distributor: Uppsala University Library, Box 510, SE-751 20 Uppsala
www.uu.se, acta@ub.uu.se

To my family, with gratitude and love

Contents

Tables and Lists

Tables

Lists

Acknowledgements

This is a project that has been some years in the making, and while there has been occasional frustration, for the most part this has been a time filled with the joy of learning and doing research. During my time as a doctoral student, a number of people have helped me by sharing my happiness when things have gone well and by offering advice and unending support when things have not. Even though I will not be able to thank all those who deserve it in the space allotted to me here, please know that you all have my heartfelt thanks.

A few people, however, deserve special mention. First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Merja Kytö, whose astute comments and suggestions have driven me to look further and delve deeper into the material than I otherwise might have. I would also like to thank my assistant supervisor, Dr. Pia Norell, for her many excellent suggestions and ideas. For her invaluable help with language checking, my thanks go to Dr. Angela Falk, who spent part of her Christmas vacation reading and commenting on my manuscript.

I am also very grateful to the seminar group in English linguistics in Uppsala: Linnéa Anglemark, Docent Ingegerd Bäcklund, Dr. Angela Falk, Docent Christer Geisler, Dr. Peter Grund, Dr. Karin Hansson, Dr. Christine Johansson, Aili Lundmark, Susanna Lyne, Donald MacQueen, Göran Rönnerdal, Dr. Erik Smitterberg, Dr. Hanna Sveen, Dr. Terry Walker, Ying Wang and Dr. Margareta Westergren Axelsson. Your input has been instrumental in helping me hone my ideas and strengthen my analysis. Thank you all for the hours you devoted to reading my manuscript and participating in my seminar sessions.

The administrative staff members at the department, Ruth Hvidberg and Åke Eriksson, have been a great help to me during my years here, as have the Senior Lecturers. I would especially like to thank Richard Glover, who, years ago, encouraged me to apply for the doctoral programme, and who has always been there to offer support and advice on matters private as well as work-related.

This dissertation would not have come into being without the assistance of the staff at various libraries. My sincere thanks go to the helpful and patient librarians at the Karin Boye Library and Carolina Rediviva. Also, the Pepys Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge, kindly granted me

permission to use the two images which can be seen on the cover of this volume.

On a more personal note, I would like to thank my wonderful parents, Gun and Tomas Lilja, for the help and encouragement they have always given me throughout my education. My brother Benjamin and my sister Beatrice, and their respective families, have also been a great support to me. Although we, like all siblings, have had our disagreements, I have never doubted that they would be there for me if I needed them, as I would be there for them. I could not ask for a better family.

Several of my colleagues at the department also deserve mention for always making me feel loved and appreciated. During my years at Uppsala they not only made me laugh but also buoyed my spirits and refused to let me give up. Linnéa, Terry, Susanna, Kicki, Johanna and Katherina: what would I have done without you?

I would also like to thank my friends outside the English department for reminding me that, in addition to academic topics, there are other facets in life: Ylva, Catta, Lina, Joakim, Emma, Monica, Pia and Anders R. A special mention goes to my best friend Stina and her husband Anders, for always welcoming me into their home and plying me with food and (more importantly) tea. Thank you both for your kindness and all the interesting discussions on languages, books, teaching and everything else of importance.

My wonderful choir, Dissonantia, which I have had the pleasure of heading for the past eight years, provided me with a helpful and healthy distraction from my studies and patiently weathered a choir leader who at times has been absent-minded and obsessed with gender studies, grammar and the history of English. Thank you all for making my Monday evenings times of relaxation and happiness.

Lastly, I would like to thank Daniel for keeping my feet on the ground, my nervousness at bay and my future looking bright.

Uppsala, January 2007
Sara Lilja

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Aim and Scope

The aim of the present study is to investigate how Early Modern notions of men and women and the place occupied by men and women in society were reflected in the terms used to describe and address people in texts from this period. These terms will henceforth be called *gender-related terms*, and will be described further in Chapter 3. Previous research on this and similar topics has primarily examined fictional material, such as novels (Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005) and drama (Norberg 2002). So far, however, little research has been done in this area using non-fictional material. In the present study, I investigate the use of gender-related terms in non-fictional speech-related material, depositions and examinations, from England and New England in the period 1670–1720. In doing so, I hope to supplement the findings from earlier studies, and shed new light on the use of these terms. In addition to the authentic speech-related material, I have selected some non-speech-related, non-fictional texts from the same period for investigation.[1] These texts belong to a genre not previously studied with regard to gender-related terms: journals. This selection will be discussed further below and in Chapter 2.

In recent years, the linguistic study of terms used to denote men and women has increased (cf. Persson 1990; Bäcklund 1996, 2006; Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Norberg 2002; Sveen 2005). The underlying assumption of these studies, as well as the present one, is that by looking at *what terms* are used to denote men and women in a speech community, and seeing *how* these terms are used, we gain insights into how various male and female norms are created and realised in the language of the time period under discussion.

The line of research followed in the present study is related to gender studies, and in particular to the concept of *gender roles*. Howard and Hollander define gender roles as "the characteristics and behaviors believed to be appropriate for men or for women" (1997: 15). This concept is based on the assumption, heralded by West and Zimmerman (1987) among others,

[1] I have chosen to use the terms *speech-related* and *non-speech-related* when referring to the material sets rather than *spoken* and *written* as all the material used in the present study comprises written sources.

that gender,[2] rather than being something given and unavoidable, is something we learn both to perform and to take into account when assessing other people's performance (cf. Butler 1990; Ochs and Taylor 1995: 98; Kimmel 2000: 100–107; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 9–51). From a very young age, children learn how to act in accordance with their sex; boys learn to act as men, girls as women. This knowledge of how to "do" our gender, to act as is appropriate for men and women respectively, is in time internalised and thus considered "normal" by society. As Eckert and McConnell-Ginet have put it, "[g]ender is not an individual matter at all, but a collaborative affair that connects the individual to the social order" (2003: 31). Language, both spoken and written, is one central medium through which gender roles are mediated and maintained (cf. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 60 ff.). In the words of Cameron: "Like other representations (for example, those of the visual arts), linguistic representations [...] give a clue to the place of women in the culture" (1990b: 12). Naturally, the same applies to the place of men. Thus, by studying select linguistic features, we may gain insights into these gender roles, how they are prescribed, and how they are actually performed. Gender-related terms, being the terms used to denote and address people, constitute one such linguistic feature worthy of study. One can also consider the adjectives which occur in connection with gender-related terms, since they may provide valuable insights into the characteristics being seen as desirable or unwanted in men and women respectively. In the present study, I will examine both the gender-related terms themselves, as well as the use of adjectives and demonstratives in connection with them.

Since there is such a vast number of terms that can denote men or women, in the present investigation I have chosen to focus on gender-related terms belonging to eight semantic categories:

- central terms (e.g. *man*, *woman*),
- relational terms (e.g. *husband*, *wife*),
- epicene terms (e.g. *child*, *person*),
- occupational terms (e.g. *maid*, *weaver*),
- title terms (e.g. *gentleman*, *lady*),
- depreciative terms (e.g. *rogue*, *witch*),
- appreciative terms (e.g. *saint*, *hero*) and
- religious, social and political terms (e.g. *Jacobite*, *Protestant*).

[2] In this study I follow the now common convention among sociolinguists to separate the concepts of *sex* and *gender* (see, for instance, Bing and Bergvall 1996: 2–3; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 10–15). In this dichotomy, *sex* is defined as the biological difference between male and female, whereas *gender* is held to be a social construct, which, while taking biological sex into account, goes beyond mere biology and includes notions of appropriate appearance and conduct. Consequently, the present study will be more concerned with *gender* than with *sex*, and it is hence predominantly the former term that will be used in the analysis.

These categories were chosen as they were felt to be particularly relevant when investigating the hypotheses posed for the present study (see below). I will return to the gender term categories in Chapter 3, where they will be further explained and exemplified.

In this investigation, the main research question that I will address is how gender-related terms are used in material from Early Modern England and New England, 1670–1720; in particular, I will investigate the role which referent gender plays in the use and distribution of these terms. This overarching research question is based on previous research, which indicates that there is a link between referent gender and the use of gender-related terms, both as regards the terms themselves and the aspect or aspects of the referent they denote, as well as how they are modified or complemented by adjectives (cf. Persson 1990; Bäcklund 1996, 2006; Romaine 1999; Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Norberg 2002; Sveen 2005).

Several hypotheses are central to addressing this research question. First of all, I hypothesise that the gender-related terms referring to men will be more numerous and exhibit more variation than will the corresponding terms referring to women. As pointed out by Romaine (1999: 108–109), even in Western society today where men and women are relatively equal, at least as compared with Early Modern times, men are mentioned more frequently than women are, and often in more detail. This presumably leads to both a greater frequency of words denoting men and greater variation in these terms. Given the predominant position of men in Early Modern society, one might expect this to be true in texts from this period as well.

Secondly, I hypothesise that the gender-related terms will tend to focus on different aspects of the referent's life (e.g. marital status or occupation), depending on whether the referent is male or female. This hypothesis is inspired by previous socio-historical research, which indicates that in Early Modern times men were more commonly referred to by their occupation (e.g. *carpenter*, *weaver*) than were women; conversely, it was more common to refer to women by their relation to others in the community, especially by their marital status, for instance, as a *wife*, *spinster* or *widow* (Shoemaker 1998: 148); the division of terms into semantically based gender term categories is explained further in section 3.2.

Thirdly, I hypothesise that adjectives used in connection with gender-related terms will denote different qualities (e.g. appearance, sociability) depending on whether the person to whom the gender-related term refers is a man or a woman. This, too, is grounded in previous research (e.g. Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005; and Bäcklund 2006), which has shown that this is the case in both fictional material (drama and literature) and letters in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (see further section 6.1). More specifically, researchers in this field have found a tendency for women to be described with adjectives denoting physical appearance to a greater extent than men, whereas adjectives denoting social and cognitive properties are

more prominent in descriptions of men than of women (Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005; Bäcklund 2006). Using these lines of argument, it is not unlikely that adjectival modifiers and complements will display similar gender differences in Early Modern speech-related material as well.

Fourthly, since previous research (e.g. Persson 1990: 55–57; Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 58–71) has shown that adjectives used with male referents tend to be more positive than adjectives used with reference to women, I hypothesise that a similar trend will be found in the present material. This will be discussed further in section 6.1.

In the course of the investigation, I will also look into the use of demonstratives (*this*, *these*, *that* and *those*) in connection with gender-related terms. As mentioned above, research carried out on adjectives used in connection with words denoting men and women has shown that there is distinct gender patterning concerning the denotations of adjectives. However, to my knowledge the use of demonstratives with these terms has not been studied in historical material before. One function which demonstratives can fill in the clause is to indicate the emotional stance of the language producer toward the referent (cf. Lakoff 1974; Quirk et al. 1985: 372–375; Biber et al. 1999: 273). For this reason, a study of the use of demonstratives with gender-related terms was deemed to be of interest to the aims of the present investigation (see further sections 4.3.3 and 6.3).

Apart from these main hypotheses, two additional factors will be taken into consideration in the analysis. First, I will investigate the possible influence of text category[3] on the use of gender-related terms, to find out whether their usage varies according to whether they occur in depositions or examinations (see further Chapter 2). Since both depositions and examinations were produced as part of the judicial process, a highly formal setting (see further section 1.2), I predict that there will not be a great difference between these two text categories. The findings from the speech-related texts will also be contrasted with corresponding data from the non-speech-related material – the journals – to see if there are any differences between these two sets of material.

[3] Throughout the study, I will use the term *text category* to refer to texts that have certain characteristics of form and purpose in common. In doing this, I use the functional-situational definition of text categories, as explained by Kohnen (2001: 197–198). Kohnen has argued that neither the functional-situational definition nor the formal definition of text categories (i.e. looking at linguistic parameters such as morpho-syntactic variables) fully address the complex interplay between form, context and function in the texts, and instead advocates a definition of text category (or text type, in his terminology) that combines features of both (2001: 198). I agree with Kohnen that such a 'mixed' definition can help the researcher see how linguistic and extralinguistic features both change and affect each other. However, since there is no comprehensive description of the linguistic repertoire from the Early Modern period, I have chosen to abide by the functional-situational definition of text category, in line with most studies within historical sociolinguistics.

Secondly, I will consider the question of regional variation. Studies of Early Modern English often focus on the language spoken in the British Isles, the most important and influential region in which English was spoken at this time. However, by the turn of the eighteenth century, English was no longer confined to present-day Britain and Ireland, but also spoken in the English colonies on the North American east coast. In the present study, I take that into consideration by including material from both sides of the Atlantic; that is, from both England and New England. Thus, I study Early Modern English as a larger entity, and my investigation aims to contribute to research on the early development of American English (henceforth AmE).[4]

There are reasons for suspecting that the use of gender-related terms may indeed vary between the two regions. As shown by, for instance, Thompson (1974), living conditions in the American colonies differed to some extent from those in England in the Early Modern period, especially for women. In the American colonies, the relative scarcity of women[5] led to their being sought after and wooed, even in cases where their economic or social position might not have been considered ideal by their presumptive marriage partners (Thompson 1974: 24, 131–132). Consequently, as long as the immigration rate was high, leading to an uneven ratio between the sexes, women had a strong position from which to bargain for marital rights and privileges, and thus a stronger position overall in society. In England, on the other hand, the emigration of a large number of marriageable men entailed an increase in dowries as parents tried to entice suitors to marry their daughters. Such conditions made it difficult for poor women to marry well, or even at all (Thompson 1974: 48–49). This led to a temporary weakening of women's place in English society, until emigration slowed and the proportion of males to females returned to prior levels. Owing to this difference in the social status of women between New England and England, I predict that any gender differences as regards the use of gender-related terms will be greater in the British English (henceforth BrE) material than in the texts from New England.

I address the hypotheses outlined above in three separate chapters. Chapter 4 provides an overview of the data, where the general distribution of the gender-related terms is given. In Chapter 5, the focus lies on the gender-related terms themselves as lexical items. In connection with this, I look at the general distribution of the gender-related terms across gender term category, text category, place of textual origin (England or New England)

[4] Algeo has argued that using the terms *American English* and *British English* is misleading when dealing with the period before 1776, since he feels that no such distinction can be made before America gained independence (1992: 288–289). In the present study, I will nevertheless use these terms to signify the two varieties, since the terms are easily understood and self-explanatory.

[5] Most immigrants who came to the colonies, both as freeholders and as indentured servants, were men (Thompson 1974: 25).

and referent gender, to see whether any or all of these factors influence the use of gender-related terms. Chapters 4 and 5 thus address the first two main hypotheses given above, namely the overall distribution of gender-related terms and the influence of gender term category on their use, as well as the question of whether text category or geographical origin affect the use of these terms.

In Chapter 6, I consider adjectival modification and complementation of gender-related terms, thus aiming at answering the third hypothesis put forth above, that referent gender might influence the distribution and type of adjectives used in connection with gender-related terms. The chapter also deals with the use of the demonstratives *this*, *that*, *these* and *those* in connection with gender-related terms.

The texts that constitute the material for this study were produced between 1670 and 1720 in two English-speaking regions: England and New England. This time period is of particular interest for the present investigation for two reasons. First, the societal upheavals occurring around the time of the British Civil War, the Interregnum and the subsequent Restoration had challenged traditional gender roles. Before the outbreak of the Civil War, the King's power over his subjects had often been likened to a husband's power over his wife: the people should show their sovereign the same unquestionable loyalty as the husband could expect from his marriage partner. As a consequence, in order to challenge the King's right to sovereign power, parliamentarians had to rethink and question the subordinate position which married women held in the household, which "led them to reconceptualize the traditional view of marriage as hierarchical and irrevocable" (Kent 1999: 19). The traditional gender roles, with the woman being the unheeded subject of her husband's will, were thus being subtly undermined. These gender roles were challenged even further during the British Civil War and the Interregnum (1649–1660), when women emerged as active participants on both sides of the conflict (Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 394–418; Kent 1999: 21–23). During the latter half of the seventeenth century, a desire emerged to return to conditions as they had been before the Civil War. A new monarch, Charles II, was crowned and measures were taken to return to the hierarchical, patriarchal order that had been the norm before the conflicts began (Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 418–419). Among the measures taken was the publication of a manual of parliamentary procedure, which explicitly stated for the first time that women, no matter how wealthy or influential, would not be permitted to vote (Kent 1999: 44). This dissolution and later re-instatement of conservative gender roles in England meant that the question of what was proper and improper behaviour for men and women respectively must have been a highly debated topic around the year 1700, which makes this particular time period interesting to investigate in a study of gender-related terms.

Secondly, one aim of the present investigation is to study Early Modern English not only focusing exclusively on the language as it was used in England, but examining material from the American colonies as well. In order to fulfil this aim, a sufficient amount of speech-related material needed to be found which corresponds, to some degree at least, with that collected from English sources (for differences and similarities between the English and American material, see Chapter 2). A suitable source of speech-related texts from colonial America was found in *The Salem Witchcraft Papers*, consisting of the trial proceedings produced in connection with the Salem witch trials of 1692–1693, which constitutes one of the most thoroughly recorded speech-events in Early Modern times (Archer 2002: 1–2). *The Salem Witchcraft Papers* provide ample material as regards both examinations and depositions, something which few other sources from colonial America would do. Thus, by investigating the period around the turn of the eighteenth century, I have access to a comparable set of speech-related material representing both British and American English.

For the above-named reasons, the period around 1700 was deemed suitable for a study on gender-related terms. A fifty-year period was decided on, encompassing three decades before and two decades after the turn of the eighteenth century, which gives the precise period 1670–1720.

As mentioned above, previous research into the use of gender-related terms in historical times has to a large extent used fictional material. Studying the use of gender-related terms, such as *man* and *woman*, in fictional texts provides valuable insights into prototypical and stereotypical views of members of either gender; in novels and plays the authors or playwrights present their impression on how these terms typically are (or perhaps should be) used by people in the same position as their characters. Although dramatic dialogue has been shown to contain many features typically associated with speech (for instance turn-taking, lexical repetition and ellipsis; cf. Culpeper and Kytö 2000; Barber 1997: 29–40), it has also been pointed out that dialogues occurring in written texts such as novels and plays do differ from authentic spoken utterances in that other features of orality are missing (cf. Salmon 1967: 39–41; Barber 1997: 35; Culpeper and Kytö 2000: 186–187). For this reason, a study of how gender-related terms were used in non-fictional speech-related texts can provide further insights into this field.

It is of course not possible to obtain true spoken language from the period 1670–1720; instead, one must rely on written records that are based on authentic speech-events. One source of such records is trial proceedings, especially recorded examinations and witness depositions (these categories will be explained further in Chapter 2). Studies on the linguistic characteristics of examinations have shown them to possess speech-like qualities, such as lexical repetition and a high density of first- and second-person pronouns (e.g. Kryk-Kastovsky 2000; Culpeper and Kytö 2000), and

judicial examinations have been used in several studies aiming at investigating spoken Early Modern English (e.g. Evans 1951; Barber 1997: 29–31). I will return to the issue of the reliability of the texts in section 2.2.4. Although such records can never be expected to reproduce speech verbatim, they do offer a window into how 'spoken' Early Modern English may have been used by people of that time. For that reason, the speech-related material used in the present study has been drawn from witness depositions and examination material from trial proceedings.

Even though witness depositions and examinations offer a glimpse of interaction in Early Modern England, it is important to bear in mind the very specific setting in which these texts were produced, and the limitations this setting imposes on the material. The courtroom constitutes a highly formal setting with a strict hierarchical structure, with the presiding magistrates at the top, and the defendants at the bottom of the scale. This power structure in turn influences the language produced in the courtroom. I will return to the Early Modern English courtroom, the power structure therein and the linguistic implications thereof in section 1.2 below.

As stated above, the present investigation also includes a set of non-speech-related texts to allow for some limited comparison. It would have been desirable to compile a larger corpus of non-speech-related material to compare and contrast with the speech-related texts, but the scarcity of appropriate texts from New England from this time period precluded a large-scale investigation of corresponding non-speech-related texts. The reason for including some non-fictional non-speech-related texts nonetheless is twofold. First, as stated above, non-fictional texts, speech-related and non-speech-related, have received little attention in studies on gender-related terms; consequently, an investigation of non-fictional non-speech-related texts, albeit of limited scope, is needed. Secondly, investigating the use and distribution of gender-related terms in non-speech-related texts and contrasting this with how these terms occur in speech-related texts will provide an indication of whether further research into this area would be fruitful.

When selecting texts for the non-speech-related component, I selected a text category that has as of yet received little attention in studies on gender-related terms, namely journals (in this case, diaries and travelogues). One advantage of using journals for a study of this kind is that, as a text category, journals tend to be less formal in nature, which might offer a window into everyday use of written language (see section 2.2.5). Some journals were written with subsequent publication in mind, whereas others were not, as far as we can tell. Other text categories, such as drama and fiction, could have come into consideration for the present study, but owing to the Puritan influence on early American literature and culture in general, texts written in the American colonies tended to be of a utilitarian nature (Kytö 1991: 30, with reference to Piercy 1939). The journal from New England included in

the present study is an exception in this regard, and allows some comparison with journals representative of travel writing in England.

The journals included in this study consist mostly of travelogues, but I also examine texts reminiscent of diaries. In tone, the BrE journals are more matter-of-fact than the New England journal, which is written in a rather humorous fashion, replete with sarcasm, as will be noted in the analysis (cf. sections 3.3.2, 5.2.6 and 6.2.3). This difference in tone does not preclude comparison between the BrE and AmE journals, although due caution must be exercised in the process. Journals as a text category will be discussed in more detail in section 2.2.5.

The material used for the present investigation is of a specialised nature, which limits the possibility or making generalisations regarding Early Modern English as whole. However, as has been shown by for instance Romaine (1982) and Rissanen (1999: 188), historical texts are worth studying in their own right, as this gives researchers the opportunity of making comparisons between texts.

1.2 Power Structures in the Discourse of the Early Modern English Courtroom

It has been long acknowledged within pragmalinguistics (cf. Blakar 1979; Thomas 1985; Fairclough 2001; Archer 2005) that one factor influencing language use is the relative power[6] of the people involved in the specific setting of the discursive event. In the words of Thomas (1985: 766), "the power relationship obtaining between the participants in an interaction and the institutional norms within which that interaction takes place are central to the way in which the discourse is developed and individual utterances interpreted". As the speech-related material used for the current study comes from a judicial setting within which special discursive restrictions and strategies occurred, in turn influencing the use of gender-related terms (see section 6.3.4), it is of interest for the present investigation to outline briefly the power structures, as well as the general procedural structure, of the Early Modern English courtroom. These power structures will furthermore be of interest when the data is analysed (see, for instance, sections 5.2.5 and 6.3.4).

As has been recognised by numerous studies in the past (cf. Thomas 1985; O'Barr and Atkins 1998; Archer 2002), language produced in the courtroom, contemporary and historical, differs from other forms of linguistic interaction, owing to the formality of the setting, the form the

[6] As regards the term *power* in this context, I follow Fairclough's definition: "power in discourse is to do with powerful participants *controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants*" (2001: 38–39, italics in the original).

discourse takes (mostly questions and answers), and the very strict, explicit power structures that operate in judicial proceedings. One important characteristic of discourse taking place in the courtroom (or in other institutional contexts where there is a marked power imbalance between the participants) is that it consists to a very large extent of questions and answers in which the magistrates do the questioning and the defendants and witnesses provide the answers. These questions can be neutral in tone, implying neither approval nor censure, but they can also be condemning, assuming the guilt of the defendant.[7] The very nature of courtroom discourse thus both allows the magistrates to control the discourse, by directing and limiting the answers from the witness or defendant (cf. Harris 1984; Woodbury 1984; Archer 2002, 2005), and affirms and maintains the superordinate position of the magistrates as compared with the person on the stand (Archer 2002: 6).

The imbalance in power between magistrates and defendants was even greater in the Early Modern period than it is today. In the present-day courtroom, defendants are protected to a certain extent from overly accusatory tones when examined as they are presumed innocent until proven guilty (Archer 2002: 7). This was not so, however, in the Early Modern courtroom, where burden of proof lay on the defendant rather than on the accuser. Simply put, it was believed that an innocent person would be able to prove his or her innocence in the courtroom by convincingly refuting the accusations made by the prosecution, rather than the prosecution having to prove the defendant's guilt (Beattie 1986: 341). Archer (2002: 12–18) has even argued that in the case of the Salem witch trials, the presiding magistrates consistently assumed the guilt of the accused – even when he or she maintained his/her innocence – presuming the accused to be guilty, but unwilling to confess (see also Hiltunen 1996: 24–25).

To add further to the power imbalance in the Early Modern English courtroom, the defendants had to prove their innocence without legal aid from a trained practitioner, which led to the defendants being forced to take a more active role in the proceedings as compared with their modern counterparts (Archer 2005: 85). Defence counsel was by and large prohibited in the English courtroom until the beginning of the eighteenth century (Beattie 1986: 356), since it was widely believed that the prisoner's interest would best be served by his own spontaneous reactions to the accusations made by the prosecution:

> [I]t requires no manner of Skill to make a plain and honest Defence, which in Cases of this Kind is always the best; the Simplicity and Innocence, artless and ingenuous Behaviour of one whose Conscience acquits him, having something in it more moving and convincing than the highest Eloquence of

[7] As pointed out by Harris (1984: 7), the subordinate position of the witness vis-à-vis the magistrates can make it difficult for the latter to ask a truly neutral question, which the witness will not perceive as being accusatory.

> Person speaking in a Cause not their own. [On the other hand,] the very Speech, Gesture and Countenance, and Manner of Defence of those who are Guilty, when they speak for themselves, may often help to disclose the Truth, which probably would not so well be discovered from the artificial Defence of others speaking for them. (William Hawkins, *A Treatise of the Pleas of the Crown: or a System of the principal matters relating to that subject, digested under their proper heads*, vol. II, 1721: 400. Quoted in Archer 2005: 88)

The defendants also had to act on their own behalf in cross-examining the witnesses, something for which very few of them would have been trained (Archer 2005: 88). According to Beattie (1986: 356), it was not until the 1730s that defendants were allowed their own counsel on a regular basis. Until then, it was only in treason cases (from 1696 and onwards) and in cases of misdemeanour that the defendant was granted professional counselling (Langbein 1978: 267). The description of the trial procedure given in the present section thus holds true for the period covered by this investigation.

Another factor which contributed further to the power imbalance between magistrates on the one hand and witnesses and defendants on the other is that for a large part of the Early Modern period, the prosecution was not represented by a professional lawyer (Archer 2005: 86).[8] Instead, it was the role of the presiding judge to question the accuser, the defendant and the witnesses. This brings us to the second major difference between the Early Modern and present-day courtrooms, namely the part played by the magistrates. In court cases today, the judge does not play an active part in the questioning procedure; he/she presides over the proceedings but for the most part leaves the process of extracting information from defendant, plaintiff and witnesses to the prosecution and defence lawyers. In contrast, as was stated above, the Early Modern judge often functioned as the principal examiner and as such could influence the proceedings (Beattie 1986: 342–346). In the words of Beattie: "[The judge] had ample opportunity to comment on the testimony as it was being given and to shape it as he thought it deserved to be presented, to emphasize and underline its strengths and weaknesses" (1986: 345).

The judicial proceedings of the Salem witchcraft trials, from which the AmE material is collected, differ from those in England to a certain extent. First, they were more intimate in their setting than their English counterparts (Hoffer 1992: 25), with most participants (magistrates as well as witnesses and defendants) being known to one another. Furthermore, whereas the English courtroom was dominated by magistrates with formal judicial education, the Puritan dislike of the practice of law in England led to the

[8] In State trials, however, common practice since the sixteenth century had been for the Crown to be represented by a counsel, who acted as prosecutor. This role was often filled by the attorney general or the solicitor general (Archer 2005: 86–87).

Salem trials being for the most part presided over by lay people who lacked formal education (Hoffer 1992: 39–40). Nevertheless, as pointed out by Doty and Hiltunen (2002: 301), there was an attempt on the part of the magistrates to adhere to current legal format when conducting the hearings. Owing to the very nature of the crimes under investigation – allegations of witchcraft – the Salem trials are often very emotional. To the Puritans, witchcraft was a despicable crime, not least since they believed in the physical manifestation of Satan and that he could work actively towards sundering pious communities and sow discord (Doty and Hiltunen 2002: 302). Perhaps as a consequence of this, the examination material from Salem did not follow the strict question-answer format of the English trials; the interaction between magistrates and the accused periodically was interrupted by vocal outbursts and physical reactions (such as falling into fits) from the accusers. The Salem magistrates also interacted directly with the accusers at times, asking for their input and views, which is a very rare occurrence in the BrE material.

Although the magistrates presiding over the courtroom in Salem (or, more precisely, over the town meetinghouse, where the examinations took place, see Doty and Hiltunen 2002: 302) were thus typically not formally educated in legal procedure, the power imbalance between them and the accused was no less pronounced. On the contrary, the very seriousness of the crime – the accused were in effect pleading for their lives – and the assumption of guilt on the part of the magistrates and those attending the trials, led to the accused being very much subordinate in terms of power.

As the above account demonstrates, the Early Modern courtroom, in England and in New England, constituted an environment where the relative power of the participants was highly imbalanced. This imbalance was expressed and maintained in several ways, not least in the use of gender-related terms, as will be demonstrated in the analysis (see section 5.2.6 and 6.3.4).

1.3 Conventions Regarding Orthography, Corpus Citations and Statistical Analysis

In examples, the gender-related terms under discussion have been marked in bold type, whereas any other highlighted construction has been underlined. As far as possible, the orthographic conventions found in the source text have been kept in the examples, including spelling and use of italics. When possible, coding used in the electronic corpora (for instance for italics and superscript) has been rendered as typographical devices to promote legibility. For other conventions used in the corpora (e.g. editorial commenting), I refer to the published corpus manuals and guides to the

material (Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977; Kytö 1991; Biber, Finegan and Atkinson 1994; Kytö 1996; Kytö and Walker 2006).

After each example, I have indicated which region the text quoted comes from (England or America), which text category it belongs to – depositions (Depo), examinations (Exam), or journals (Jour) – and from which text the example is taken. To exemplify, the label "BrExam" is used to denote an examination text from the BrE material, whereas "AmDepo" indicates that the quoted text is a deposition text from the AmE material. The text names used in the examples (e.g. "Tryal ... of Algernon Sidney") are as they are given in the text sources (books or electronic corpora), or in the guides and manuals published in connection with the text sources.[9] To facilitate finding the examples in the original text sources, page numbers have been provided where possible (no page numbers have been indicated in *A Corpus of Histocial English Registers* (ARCHER1), so no such references could be given here).

In the running text, italics are used for concepts and terms, as well as for emphasis. Double quotes ("...") will be used in the running text for citations, either from secondary sources or from the material. Single quotes ('...') will be used for concepts. Lemmas are given in small caps (e.g. BE, SEEM).

Throughout the analysis, the chi-square test will be used to test the statistical significance of distributions of data, when relevant. For the purposes of this investigation, the significance level will be set to 0.05, and chi-square values (χ^2) and degrees of freedom (df) indicated in connection with each test. Where the expected values in any cell or cells of a contingency table fall below five, the test will not be applied since it is generally agreed that this renders the test unreliable (Woods et al. 1986: 144).

1.4 Outline of the Study

The remainder of the study will be structured as follows. In Chapter 2, I present the material in more detail, commenting on the characteristics of the text categories under investigation. I also present the sources from which the material was collected. Chapter 2 further describes the method by which the relevant data was extracted from the material and contains definitions of adjectives and demonstratives as these terms are used in the present work. Chapter 3 provides further information on gender-related terms as regards

[9] For the texts from the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, see Kytö (1996: 131–163); for the texts from the *Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760*, see Kytö and Walker (2006: 15–16); for the text from the *Corpus of Early American English*, see Winship (1935: 1–72); for *The Salem Witchcraft Papers*, see Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 1049–1070. The text names for the texts from *A Corpus of Historical English Registers* follow the information given at the top of the electronic files. For more on these text sources, see section 2.2.

terminology and definitions. In connection with this, I also discuss the semantic shifts that have taken place as regards certain gender-related terms, in order to connect the present investigation with previous research into this field and put it in context.

In Chapter 4, I present an overall view of the data and the distribution of the data. First, section 4.2 discusses the distribution of the gender-related terms across four parameters: text category (depositions, examinations, journals), gender term category, region of origin (England or New England) and referent gender. Thereafter, in section 4.3, I turn to the frequency and distribution of adjectives and demonstratives in connection with the gender-related terms. Chapter 5 provides a more in-depth analysis of the gender-related terms, according to text category (section 5.2), region of origin (section 5.3) and referent gender (section 5.4), taking the gender term categories as a starting point for the discussions.

Chapter 6 is concerned with the use of adjectives and demonstratives in connection with the gender-related terms. In section 6.1 I return to the hypotheses of my study and discuss them in more detail. Section 6.2 is concerned with the use of adjectives with gender-related terms; first, in 6.2.2, I discuss adjectives denoting appearance and apparel, and how they distribute across referent gender. Subsequently, in 6.2.3, I look more closely at whether referent gender influences adjective connotation, i.e. whether the adjective denotes a positive or negative quality in the referent. In 6.2.4, I discuss characterising *of*-phrases in connection with gender-related terms, a structure semantically parallel to adjectives. Section 6.3 considers the use of demonstratives with gender-related terms. Three linguistic and extralinguistic factors are examined in connection with demonstrative use in this context: the function filled by the demonstrative in the clause (6.3.2), referent gender (6.3.3) and the judicial roles played by the language producer, the referent and the addressee respectively (6.3.4).

The study will conclude with a summary in Chapter 7, where I recapitulate the aims of the study, and outline and discuss the most important findings of the investigation.

Chapter 2. Material and Methodology

2.1 Introductory Comments

This chapter has two aims. The first of these aims is to introduce the material and the sources from which it was gathered, as well as to define and exemplify the text categories investigated (section 2.2), and the second aim is to provide an account of how the data was extracted from the material and subsequently treated prior to analysis (section 2.3).

The material chosen for the present investigation falls into two broad categories: speech-related and non-speech-related texts, the main focus being on the speech-related texts. An overall view of the material is given in 2.2.1. The ensuing section, 2.2.2, discusses the speech-related data, exemplifying the two text categories examinations and depositions, after which the texts included in the investigation are presented in 2.2.3. In 2.2.4, I discuss the issue of text reliability with regard to speech-related texts. Subsequently, analogous with sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, sections 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 discuss the non-speech-related text category, namely journals, and the journal texts sampled.

As regards the method for extracting data used in the present study, I distinguish between two data sets: the gender-related terms themselves on the one hand, and adjectives and demonstratives used in connection with these gender-related terms on the other. Section 2.3.1 describes how the gender-term data has been drawn from the material and subsequently entered into a database. In section 2.3.2, I explain how the demonstratives adjectives were extracted. The definitions given for adjectival functions and the distinction made between adjectives and verbal participles will also be introduced. The chapter concludes with a summary in section 2.4.

2.2. Material

2.2.1 The Texts Studied: An Overview

The speech-related material used in this study is representative of two text categories, both having been produced during the general setting of trial proceedings. The first of these categories consists of examinations, which in

my material are usually dialogic in form, although the AmE material also contains examinations rendered in the third person. The second category comprises witness depositions, typically rendered in the third person. Both these text categories are discussed further below. The material does, however, also contain examples of depositions that are rendered in the first person as well as depositions where the scribe alternates between the first-person and third-person formats, as will be discussed and exemplified below.

Furthermore, the material investigated here includes a smaller corpus of non-speech-related texts, which is comprised of journals. As explained in section 1.1 above, I included the non-speech-related texts for two reasons: first, journal texts have not yet been studied with regard to gender-related terms; and secondly, including them might give an indication of whether a large-scale study on the difference between non-speech-related and speech-related material with regard to gender-related terms might yield interesting results.

To enable a cross-Atlantic comparison, material was collected from both British and American sources. The English speech-related material was taken from the recently compiled *Corpus of English Dialogues (1560–1760)* (CED), and the corresponding texts from New England from *The Salem Witchcraft Papers* (SWP). The journal texts were gathered from three corpora: the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* (HC), *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers* (ARCHER1) and *A Corpus of Early American English (New England) 1620–1720* (EAmE). I will discuss these sources further below.

Table 2.1 (p. 35) lists the text groupings included in the present study, along with the region represented, the dates of the speech-event (in the case of examinations and depositions) or the alleged composition (in the case of journals), and word counts. Table 2.1 shows that the word counts vary not only among the different text categories, but also among the different corpora used.[10] The focus of the present study is on speech-related texts; thus, the text categories depositions and examinations are considerably better represented than the journals. For instance, the deposition texts consist of 121,392 words (36,697 words from the BrE material and 84,695 words from the AmE texts), whereas the journals comprise a total of 27,576 words (17,235 words from the BrE texts and 10,341 words from the AmE journal). The scarcity of suitable material in computerised form made achieving a more even word count between the different text categories unattainable, although it would of course have been desirable to be able to do so. To counteract the differing text category lengths, the figures given in the tables

[10] However, as has been shown by Romaine (1982: 105–114), not obtaining complete comparability between samples does not render a study fruitless, since "each individual text could be considered as a separate sample" rather than as part of an overarching text category (1982: 114).

will be normalised to indicate frequencies per 10,000 words, unless otherwise indicated.

Table 2.1. Corpora included in the present study, their places of origin, dates of the individual speech-events (examinations and depositions) or alleged text composition (journals), and word counts.

	Text category	**Region represented**	**Corpus**	**Date of speech-event/composition**	**Word count**
Speech-related	Examinations	England	CED	1680–1716	98,173
		New England	SWP	1692–1693	36,617
	Depositions	England	CED	1680–1716	36,697
		New England	SWP	1692–1693	84,695
Non-speech-related	Journals	England	HC	1672–1698	10,470
			ARCHER1	1704–1716	6,765
		New England	EAmE	1704–1705	10,341
Total word count					**283,758**

2.2.2 The Speech-Related Material

As mentioned, the speech-related material used for the present investigation consists of two text categories: examinations and depositions. In this section, I will first define these two text categories further, discussing the circumstances under which the texts were produced and providing prototypical examples. I will then discuss the texts themselves and the corpora from which the texts have been collected. In this discussion, I hope to illustrate the discourse from which the terms have been gathered, as this is a point of relevance to the subsequent analysis (cf. sections 5.3.2, 6.3.4).

2.2.2.1 Examinations

I categorise texts as *examinations* which report conversations between the magistrate(s) and the accused and/or witnesses in a turn-based, dialogic format (for a discussion, see e.g. Kytö and Walker 2003: 222; Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 150; Kytö and Walker 2006: 20). These conversations occurred either in connection with the preliminary hearings (as is the case in the material taken from the Salem witch trials, cf. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 8), or as part of the trial proceedings proper (as with the texts drawn from the CED). Even though it was produced during different parts of the trial proceedings, the material from the CED and the SWP was considered comparable, since the purpose of the conversation in both cases was to elicit information concerning the crime from the accused and/or witnesses, and

since the power relation between those involved is similar. Note that the term *examination* will be used throughout the study to refer both to the AmE preliminary examinations and to the BrE trial proceedings (the latter are referred to as "Trials" in the CED).

The examination texts were produced on the basis of the questioning of the accused and witnesses, carried out in the courtroom or similar settings (Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 150). In these situations, one or several scribes wrote down what the different participants (such as judges, lawyers, defendants, witnesses and clerks) in the trial said and, in some cases, what they did. These transcripts were produced in order to provide the court with a record of the proceedings, which could be referred to and read out, for instance in cases where the defendants or witnesses contradicted their earlier statements. When a trial had popular interest, as was the case with, for instance, the trial against Charles I in 1649, the examination transcripts also provided a basis for later publication of the proceedings (Barber 1997: 29). Examination texts may also contain scribal intervention in addition to giving an account of what was being said, but this is typically limited to identifying the speaker or providing information on extralinguistic events, such as people being brought in or gestures, including pointing at others.

As stated above, AmE examination texts typically take the form of a turn-based dialogue, where the presiding officials (magistrates or judges) interrogate the accused, the defendant or a witness for either party (Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 150). Any long confessions or statements from the accused are usually prompted by the magistrates' questions. To exemplify, a few exchanges between a magistrate and a witness, taken from a prototypical AmE examination text, are given in (1). The BrE trial texts follow the same dialogic pattern, as shown in example (2).

(1)	Q.	w't have you done since whereby there is further trouble in your appearance?
	An.	nothing at all.
	Q.	but have you nott since bin tempted?
	An.	yes S'r, but I have nott done itt, nor will nott doe itt
	Q.	here is a great change since we last spake to you, for now you Afflict & torment againe; now tell us the truth whoe tempted you to sighne againe?
	An.	itt was Goody Olliver; shee would have mee to sett my hand to the book, butt I would nott neither have I. neither did consent to hurt them againe. (AmExam: Deliverance Hobbs v. Bridget Bishop et al. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 91)
(2)	*Mr. Att. General.*	Mr. *Lightfoot*, Pray give an account to the Jury and the Court of the manner of Election and

chusing of a Common Hall, and the manner of it.

Mr. Lightfoot. My Lord, I have been almost 25 Years an Attorney, I always took it that the Serjeant of the Chamber had order to go down to the Clerks or Beadles of the Companies, to summon a Common Hall by such a day.

Mr. Att. Gen. By whose Command?

Mr. Lightfoot. By my Lord Mayor's.

Mr. Att. Gen. In all your time did the Sheriffs ever summon any?

Mr. Lightfoot. O no. (BrExam: Tryal of Tho. Pilkington [etc], p. 12)

As pointed out by Grund, Kytö and Rissanen (2004: 150), the Salem witch trial documents contain not only examinations consisting of direct speech, as in (1), but also examinations where the speech of the language producers is being reported in the third person, as well as examinations where the scribe alternates between the two modes. An example of such alternation is given in (3), where direct speech has been indicated by means of bold type to illustrate how the scribe changes from direct to indirect speech or narration.

(3) Q. **How did you afflict folks?** A. **I pinched them**, and she said she had no puppets, but she went to them that she afflicted. Being asked whether she went in her body or her spirit, she said in her spirit. She said her mother carried her thither to afflict. Q. **How did your mother carry you when she was in prison?** A. **She came like a black cat.** Q. **How did you know that it was your mother?** A. **The cat told me so that she was my mother.** She said she afflicted Phelp's child last saturday, and Elizabeth Johnson joined with her to do it. She had a wooden spear, about as long as her finger, of Elizabeth Johnson, and she had it of the devil. She would not own that she had ever been at the witch meeting at the village. This is the substance. (AmExam: Examination of Sarah Carrier (II). Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 202)

Not surprisingly, the format of the examinations affects the linguistic features these texts display. These differences are summarised succinctly by Grund, Kytö and Rissanen:

> The examination in direct speech contains direct questions, discourse markers and interjections, first and second person pronouns, a variety of present tense forms, and a more limited set of polysyllabic words. The examination in indirect speech, on the other hand, is characterized by the use of third person pronouns, past tense forms, a more complex sentence structure indicated by the employment of present participles and subordinating conjunctions, and a wider range of polysyllabic words. (2004: 151–152)

In contrast to the SWP examinations, the examinations sampled from the CED only consist of texts reporting the exchange in direct speech, as in (2) above, with minor scribal interventions. In order to make the two data sets as comparable as possible, and since, as suggested by the scholars quoted above, converting spoken interaction to written, indirect speech seems to affect lexis to some extent, the examinations from the SWP that report only indirect speech were excluded from the study. Examinations where the scribe uses a mix of direct and indirect speech, as in (3), were included, provided that the passages of direct speech consisted of more than a couple of utterances.

For some examinations, the SWP contains more than one account. These multiple accounts of the same speech event are often very similar in form, with only minor differences between them. Nevertheless, in cases where the same examination exists in multiple copies, I have chosen to include all accounts thereof for the sake of completeness. Note will be made in the analysis in cases where the similarity between accounts affects the data.

2.2.2.2 Depositions

Depositions are "statements from court cases, where witnesses, or occasionally the accused person, give an account of what they saw, heard or did" (Cusack 1998: 92). These statements were typically recorded in the third person by the scribe, as in example (4), although, as mentioned in section 2.2.1, the SWP contain depositions recorded in other formats. The depositions frequently contain some degree of scribal interference. Often, the scribal comments clarify statements that might otherwise be ambiguous.[11] An AmE example of such scribal comments can be seen in (5). In this narrative, which is given in the first rather than the third person (see further below), the deponent reports not only what has happened, but also what the accused, Sarah Cole, has allegedly said. Hence, when a first-person pronoun occurs, the scribe has added the clarifying remark "s'd Browne" to indicate who is being referred to (for further discussion of clarifications of this kind added by the scribe, see Kytö and Walker 2003: 223).

(4) This Informant saith, That while the Bonefire was burning, last Night, before the *Star-Inn*, the Major of the Regiment, and Mr. *Baker* of *Wadham-College*, were standing at the Gate of the said Inn, and this Informant saw Mr. *Baker* call several of the Soldiers to him, and clap'd them upon the Back; and as soon as they went from him, they fell to breaking Mr. *Hurst's* Windows, the Major and *Mr. Baker* still standing at the Gate, and looking upon them: And this Informant likewise saw three Soldiers break *Mr. Cole's*, the Glazier's, Windows, and said, *Damn him, we will break his Windows, because*

[11] For a more detailed discussion of this, see Cusack (1998: 94–95).

he is a Glazier, and can mend them himself. (BrDepo: Depositions Concerning the Late Riot in Oxford, pp. 10–11)

(5) The Deposition of Jno Browne aged about twenty five years: This Deponant Testifieth & saith that about the latter end of August Last 1692 being at the house of Jno Dole: coming out of s'd house Sarah Cole leaving her husband talking with mee, she Broke out into these expressions, that all Church members were Devills & that her husband was going to be a Devill too hee was then going to Joine with the Church; whereupon I **s'd Browne** Replyed to her she had often expressed her selfe very Badly & that if she didnot suddenly amend & leave of such expressions against Church members, their was them that would take notice of it & she must answer for such speeches wherupon she was silent & looked stedfastly upon mee & I was taken Ile #[in about a week] presently as my evidence doth Declare. [...] (AmDepo: John Brown v. Sarah Cole. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 231, bold type added by me)

Linguistically, depositions differ from examinations in that they are not records of dialogic discourse; there are typically no explicit linguistic markers in the depositions that indicate that the witnesses' statements were prompted or guided by questions from another party (Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 155). Furthermore, whereas the speech-events which form the basis for the examination material take place in a courtroom setting in front of magistrates and witnesses, the depositions might be recorded elsewhere, later to be brought into the court and read there if necessary (Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 154; Beattie 1986: 22).

Unlike the CED material, which seems mostly to have been recorded by experienced scribes, a substantial part of the SWP was written by scribes with no formal training, who were thus unfamiliar with the normal procedures involved in recording witnesses' statements. As pointed out by Grund, Kytö and Rissanen, it is probable that these laymen scribes were less language-conscious than their professionally trained counterparts and consequently less prone to tampering with the language used or reported by the witnesses (2004: 160). As a consequence, apart from prototypical, third-person depositions, the SWP material contains a number of depositions written in the first person, as exemplified in (5) above, and below in (6). First-person depositions make up 73% of the total deposition material selected from the SWP for the present study.

(6) [The d]eposition of Ann putnam who testifieth and saith that I being at [A]ndevour on the 26 day of July 1692 I saw there Mis Mary [Brad]bery the wife of Capt Tho: Bradbery of Salisbury or hir [App]erance most grevious afflecting and tormenting of Timothy Swan of Andevor allmost Redy to kill him also severall times before and sence that time I have seen mist. Bradbery or hir Apperance most greviously afflecting Timothy Swan and I beleve

> that Mis Bradbery is a most dreadfull wicth for sence she has been in prison she or hir Apperance has com to me and most greviously afflected me ann putnam ownid before the grand Inquest this har evidens to be the truth one the oath that she hath taken: this: 8 day of September 1692 (AmDepo: Ann Putnam Jr. v. Mary Bradbury. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 121–122)

The SWP also contains depositions where the scribe switches between reporting the exchange in the first and the third person. These 'mixed' depositions make up ca. 3% of the total deposition material. This is exemplified in (7), where I have added bold type to mark direct speech.

(7) Eliz Woodwell upon the oath she formerly has taken in this Court: did affirm to the Jury of Inquest: that: she saw Giles Cory at meeting at Salem on a lecture day. **since he has ben at prison he or his apearition came in & sat in the middlemost seat: of the mens seats: by the post this was the lecture day before. Bridget Bishop was hanged and I saw him come out: with the rest of the people** mary Walcot: affirmed: that she saw s'd Cory: as above. sit in the same place at the same time he or his appearance & that she did se him goe out with the rest of the people: this she affirmed to the Jury of Inquest. Sept 9: 1692 (AmDepo: Elizabeth Woodwell and Mary Walcott vs. Giles Corey. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 243)

The SWP material used for the present study thus contains depositions given in the first person and in the third person, as well as depositions where the scribe alternates between the two forms. The texts sampled from the CED do not include any first-person depositions, nor do they include any 'mixed' depositions, but only depositions in the third person, as in (4). Thus neither the first-person nor the 'mixed' depositions in the SWP have a direct counterpart in the BrE material. The two material sets (BrE and AmE) should be comparable nonetheless, since the mode of narration (first or third person, or alternating between the two) will not be a basis for exhaustive quantification in this study. Nonetheless, I will comment on it in connection with the qualitative analysis, in cases where it might prove of interest.

As with any large quantity of source material, the texts investigated in the present study display a certain amount of internal variation. For instance, sometimes the typical question-answer format in the examinations is interrupted, either by a longer statement on the part of the person being interrogated, or by a spontaneous outburst from witnesses standing by. The latter is a feature found predominantly in the SWP material.

2.2.3 The Speech-Related Texts Included in the Study

The speech-related texts included in the present study have been drawn from two sources representing two geographical areas: England and New England (see sections 1.1 and 2.2.1). The BrE material comes from the CED, and the AmE material from the SWP. In what follows, I will first discuss the BrE texts, examinations and depositions alike, and then move to the AmE texts.

2.2.3.1 The BrE Texts

The BrE speech-related material was drawn from a pilot version of the CED, a recently-compiled electronic corpus comprising some 1.2 million words (Kytö and Walker 2006: 11).[12] The texts included in the present investigation are representative of both depositions and examinations as defined in section 2.2.2 above.[13] Lists of the texts included in the study are given in Tables 2.2 and 2.3 (p. 42), along with the number of words in each text.

Table 2.2. The examination texts included from the CED, along with the trial date and number of words in each text.

Text	**Date**	**Word count**
Tryal of John Giles	1680	6,280
Triall of Elizabeth Cellier	1680	4,160
Tryal ... of Stephen Colledge	1681	7,840
Tryal of Nathanael Thompson [etc]	1682	4,620
Informations against Three Witches	1682	1,543
Tryal of Tho. Pilkington [etc]	1683	12,020
Tryal ... of Algernon Sidney	1683	9,380
Tryal ... of John Hambden	1683	9,190
Tryal of Charles Lord Mohun	1692	9,970
Tryal of Ambrose Rookwood	1696	9,520
Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc]	1702	9,680
Tryal of Francis Francia	1716	13,970
Total word count		**98,173**

The CED was compiled with the aim to "construct a computerised corpus of dialogue texts for research purposes"; in addition, the compilers wished to highlight "the role that impromptu speech and interactive two-way communication play in language change" (Culpeper and Kytö 1997: 60–61). This focus on dialogic communication, coupled with the fact that two of the five genres represented in the corpus (witness depositions and trial

[12] In the case of the examinations, all the texts included in the CED's period 4 (1680–1720) were sampled from the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century imprints. The same is true for the majority of the depositions from the same period, with the exception of the depositions from the Castle at York, which were taken from an 1861 edition, and the Trials at Manchester, sampled from an edition from 1864. The Trials at Manchester and Informations against Three Witches were subsequently excluded from the release version of the corpus.

[13] In the CED, the term *Trials* is used to denote the texts that I here call *examinations* (see section 2.2.2.1 above).

proceedings, the other three genres representing constructed dialogue) relate to language recorded in an authentic speech situation made the CED a highly suitable source of material for the present study (for more information on the compilation and contents of the CED, see Kytö and Walker 2006).

Table 2.3. The deposition texts included from the CED, along with date of trial/speech event and number of words in each text.

Text	Date	Word count
Depositions from the Castle of York *4*	1680–1689	9,580
Examination of Joan Buts	1682	980
Informations against Three Witches	1682	1,750
Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales	1688	7,990
Duke and Dutchess of Norfolk	1691	3,270
Trials at Manchester	1694	10,197
Depositions Concerning the Late Riot in Oxford	1716	2,930
Total word count		**36,697**

2.2.3.2 The AmE Texts

As an AmE counterpart to the speech-related texts taken from the CED (see above), I also included material from the SWP in the present study. This collection of trial proceedings, witness accounts, warrants and other legal documents was produced in connection with the witch trials in Salem Village, Massachusetts, 1692–1693. The material is extensive: the edition by Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum (1977) runs to some 274,000 words, and covers most of the legal proceedings that took place in Salem and the surrounding areas during the trials. It also includes documents produced in the first decades of the eighteenth century, when accounts were settled and the names of some of the accused witches cleared.[14] The material used for the present study includes more than half of the total SWP material.

Since the number of examination and deposition texts from the SWP included in the present investigation is so great, giving a full list here would be impractical. Instead, a list is given in Appendix II. The total number of words included in each text category is given in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4. The number of words in the AmE speech-related text categories.

Text category	Word count
Examinations	36,617
Depositions	84,695
Total	**121,312**

The SWP offer a valuable source of material for a linguistic study of this kind (cf. Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 146). The need to record the trial proceedings, witness depositions, summonses and other documents

[14] For an account of the Salem witchcraft trials, see e.g. Starkey (1949), Rosenthal (1993) and Trask (1997).

generated an increased demand for scribes, which the professional scribes on location in Salem Village could not meet. Therefore, a substantial part of the SWP documents, mostly depositions, was written by men[15] who had had no formal scribal training and who, consequently, might be more inclined to record the language as they heard it, rather than changing it to conform to prescriptive language written norms (see further section 2.2.2.2 above, Grund, Kytö and Rissanen, 2004: 160). The material from the SWP thus offers a nearly-unique source of relatively accurately recorded speech-related early American English, making it an interesting set of texts to investigate in a study such as the present one.

The texts included in the present investigation have been taken from Boyer and Nissenbaum's 1977 edition, and page references given in connection with examples refer to this edition. The Boyer and Nissenbaum edition is based on a typewritten version of the SWP compiled in the 1930s as a project funded by the Works Progress Administration (WPA). Boyer and Nissenbaum carefully point out that the WPA project was not supervised by trained historians and linguists, and that there might be misinterpretations and errors in the transcriptions (1977: 32). As the recent Salem Editorial Project (see Grund, Kytö and Rissanen 2004: 147; Rosenthal et al. forthcoming) has shown, the Boyer and Nissenbaum edition is not completely faithful to the original manuscripts; at times transcribers missed words or whole lines, and other words have been misinterpreted. However, since no other, more linguistically accurate edition of the SWP was available at the time when the present study was instigated, the Boyer and Nissenbaum edition had to be used for the purposes of my investigation. Furthermore, since the present study deals primarily with lexis rather than, for instance, orthographical or morphological variation, it was deemed that the occasional misread or missed word would have only a minor impact on the analysis overall.

2.2.4 The Issue of Text Reliability

When studying speech-related texts, it is important to consider the notion of the faithfulness of the transcriptions to the original speech-events, especially if the aim of the investigation is to contrast, in one way or another, material constructed by an author with authentic dialogue. As the present study aims at complementing the previous research conducted in this area, which has largely focused on constructed texts such as fiction and drama, the question of text reliability becomes crucial, since if the scribes have themselves constructed the text to a certain extent, the material becomes, in effect, fictional. The complex topic of text reliability has been discussed in some

[15] All of the identified scribes recording the proceedings of the Salem witchcraft trials are men (cf. Hiltunen and Peikola 2007).

detail elsewhere (cf. Short, Semino and Wynne 2002; Kytö and Walker 2003), and will only be touched upon briefly in this context.

In linguistic research, a record of a speech-event is generally understood not to record every aspect of the spoken interaction in question. Some features of spoken language are difficult to transfer into writing without resorting to comments in the third person (for example prosody, pauses between words, sighs and ironic intonation). Other features are conventionally omitted from most forms of writing since they add little to the text (for instance pause fillers and stuttering). As pointed out by Kytö and Walker, "[w]hat a 'faithful' or 'verbatim' record is generally expected to convey, to a large extent, is the lexical items and grammatical structures" (2003: 224). A transcription is thus almost never an exhaustive reproduction of the speech-event it records, but that need not mean that it is unsuitable for linguistic study. Since the present study is concerned with the use of gender-linked terms, a topic that falls within the study of lexis, the omission of the features described above is unlikely to present a problem.

Moreover, while discussing the usefulness of British trial proceedings as evidence of spoken Early Modern English, Evans points out that the speech-events were recorded instantly and argues that this is a reason to trust their accuracy, or "faithfulness" (1951: 401). Concurrently, textual evidence seems to indicate that it was a matter of some importance that the transcripts were not based on hearsay but taken down during the proceedings; at times, the scribes wrote statements to affirm that they had been present in the courtroom at the time of the examination. An example of this, taken from the SWP, can be seen in (8).

(8) This is true account of the Examination of Dorcas Hoar without wrong to any party according to my original from characters at the moments thereof Witness my hand (AmExam: Examination of Dorcas Hoar. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 391)

Statements such as this cannot be taken as irrefutable evidence that the scribe was actually on location, since such passages could simply be added to increase the credibility of the texts. However, as mentioned above, they do indicate that in the Early Modern era it was seen as important that scribes should be present during the proceedings, which makes it more probable than not that they actually were.

Further, transcripts produced by scribes are not necessarily verbatim accounts (Kytö and Walker 2003: 224–230). Since the records were in all likelihood based on notes in shorthand and later expanded to produce a full text, there is the possibility that the scribes, consciously or unconsciously, omitted words or clauses, or even altered the text (for a more thorough debate on how Early Modern English trials were recorded, cf. Kryk-Kastovsky 2000). While this leaves the question of scribal interference open

to debate, it would, as Barber points out, be in the court's interest to have the scribes produce records that were as accurate as possible, especially in important trials (1997: 29). For this reason, one can assume that the examination transcripts are at least approximations of the speech-events that they record. Furthermore, as shown by Culpeper and Kytö (2000: 187–188), examination records display many speech-like language features, something that argues for the records being relatively reliable as representations of formal speech-events.[16] Consequently, while they should be approached with caution, examination transcripts and witness depositions nonetheless offer a valuable source of material for researchers investigating speech-related texts.

2.2.5 The Non-Speech-Related Material

As was stated in section 1.1 above, the non-speech-related material used in my study comprises diaries and travelogues, referred to collectively as *journals* for the purposes of the present investigation. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, journal-keeping was a pastime on the increase in Britain, with many prominent people (e.g. Samuel Pepys, Sir John Evelyn and Mary Countess Cowper, to mention but a few) keeping and publishing diaries or writing travel accounts (Morris 1949: xxiv–xxv). These journals were sometimes not discovered and published until long after their authors had passed away, but others appear to have been written specifically with subsequent publication in mind, signalling a shift in the function these texts were expected to fill; they were no longer meant for private perusal only, but as reading material for a wider public. An example of a typical journal text is given in (9).

(9) Sunday, January 1. Mr. Kingsford dined with us. The subject of his conversation generally turns upon himself and he seems to have it always in his eye to raise in you a mighty esteem for his riches and wealth, and though at the same time he is glad to get a dinner from any of his friends, he would fain make you believe he is worth a prodigious estate. A strange kind of ambition and vanity indeed to be thought a rich beggar! A man that appears like a poor fellow and yet is worth L40,000. He was complaining of the prodigious covetousness of his son-in-law Venner and setting him forth in very lively colours as a man that would sooner part with all his friends and relations than lose the least sum of money by them. (BrJour: Dudley Ryder. The Journal of Dudley Ryder)

[16] It is, of course, possible that the scribes, in analogy with playwrights, added speech-like features to their records in order to make them seem more realistic, but without further evidence that this is the case, I have decided to regard relative faithfulness to the original speech-event as being the more probable scenario.

There are two main reasons for using journals for the present study, instead of other non-speech-related text categories. First, as stated in Chapter 1, this is a text category which has not been studied in any detail with reference to gender-related terms, making it particularly interesting to include in this investigation. Secondly, unlike other non-fictional text categories, such as, for instance, handbooks, the journals were not necessarily meant to be primarily educational. Consequently, one might expect the language we find in these texts to be fairly informal which, as stated in section 1.1, might provide insights into everyday Early Modern written language.[17] The AmE journal included is even more informal than its BrE counterparts, and even though this must be taken into consideration in the analysis, the AmE journal makes a valuable addition to the material.

The journal texts are presented according to author in Table 2.5, along with the word counts, dates and places of origin.

Table 2.5. The journals according to author, place of origin and dates. Text source given in parentheses.

Author	**Place of origin**	**Date**	**Word count**
Celia Fiennes (HC)	Britain	1698	5,140
John Fryer (HC)	Britain	1672–1681	5,330
Thomas Pocock (ARCHER1)	Britain	1704	2,294
Joseph Taylor (ARCHER1)	Britain	1705	2,191
Dudley Rider (ARCHER1)	Britain	1716	2,280
Sarah Kemble Knight (EAmE)	New England	1704–1705	10,341
Total word count			**27,576**

The texts will be presented in more detail in the following section (2.2.6).

2.2.6 The Non-Speech-Related Texts Included in the Study

2.2.6.1 The BrE Texts

The BrE non-speech-related material used in the present study comprises five journal texts, sampled from two diachronic corpora: two from the HC [18] and three from the ARCHER1 corpus.[19]

The two journals drawn from the HC were written by Celia Fiennes and John Fryer and take the form of travelogues, that is, narratives produced in

[17] Of course, not all handbooks were written in a formal manner; some are rather informal in their language, probably for pedagogical reasons.
[18] These were the only two travelogues from the period studied included in the HC. For more information on the HC, see Rissanen, Kytö and Palander-Collin (1993); Kytö (1996).
[19] For more information on ARCHER, see Biber, Finegan and Atkinson (1994).

connection with a journey and detailing the events thereof. The extract from Fiennes' writing comes from her 1698 journey to Newcastle and Cornwall and was taken from an edition of the journal from 1947, edited by C. Morris. In its entirety, the extract runs for some 5,100 words (Kytö 1996: 188). The extracts from John Fryer's writing are taken from two parts of Crooke's 1909 edition of Fryer's *A New Account of East India and Persia. Being Nine Years' Travels, Begun 1672, And Finished 1681* and run to some 5,300 words in all (see Table 2.5). Three texts were also sampled from ARCHER1 for the current investigation: Tomas Pocock's *Sea Diary* from 1704, Joseph Taylor's *The Pennyles Pilgrimage* from 1705 and *The Diary of Dudley Rider* from 1716 (see Table 2.5). All in all, the BrE non-speech-related material runs to some 17,200 words.

2.2.6.2 The AmE Text

To supplement the journals included from the HC and ARCHER1 and provide an American counterpart to the British texts, my material also includes the journal of Sarah Kemble Knight, drawn from *A Corpus of Early American English* (EAmE).[20] Knight's journal was originally written between October 1704 and January 1705 as a travel diary, when the widowed Knight travelled by horse from her home in Boston to see relatives in New Haven. The original journal manuscript was lost during the course of the nineteenth century; the material for this study has been taken from the 1935 edition, itself a facsimile of an edition from 1920. That edition is in turn based on an edition from 1825, purportedly based on the original manuscript, although the editor admits to having omitted some details (Winship 1935: xiii).

For this study, I had very limited access to records containing journals produced in America at this time, especially records available in electronic format. This made it difficult to include additional journal texts representative of New England; for this reason, AmE journal writing is only represented by this one text. This will be taken into consideration in the analysis.

2.3 Methodology

Once all the texts had been selected and collected from the various sources, the next step was to determine how best to extract the relevant data from the material. As stated above (section 2.1), the data extraction was completed in two steps. First, the gender-related terms belonging to the eight semantic categories under investigation (see further section 3.2) were extracted, as will be explained in more detail in section 2.3.1. Subsequently, the extracted

[20] For more information on the EAmE, see Kytö (1991: 45–51).

gender-related terms were examined for any adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with them (section 2.3.2). In this section, I will describe the methodology used to extract the relevant information from the material, and, in the case of the adjectives, discuss the grounds on which they were included.

2.3.1 Extracting the Gender-Related Terms

In order to find all the gender-related terms relevant for the present investigation, as well as all the variant spellings of those terms, I made use of the WordList function in WordSmith Tools, a computer program designed to help search and manipulate electronic corpora. This function provides a list of all orthographic words occurring in the selected texts, enabling the researcher to find all relevant gender-related terms. It also provided an efficient way of dealing with the orthographic variation in the texts, as all spellings of any one of these terms were included in the list.[21] The list was subsequently edited manually to exclude all words that were irrelevant for the present study.

When the list of terms had been compiled, a lexical search for these items was carried out using WordSmith Tools to extract all instances of the terms together with their immediate context. All the different realisations of a term were pooled together, so that instances of the plural forms of the terms were sorted together with their counterparts in the singular, as were instances of the genitive form and any spelling variants of the terms. Lastly, to minimise the risk that some term had been overlooked owing to unexpected spelling or oversight, the material was checked manually when it was coded for the data parameters (see further below).

The data was then arranged in a database, using Microsoft Excel, and coded for several additional linguistic and extralinguistic parameters, namely term category (see section 3.2), sex of referent, immediate context, text source (e.g. CED), text category (e.g. examinations), text (e.g. Rookwood) and sex of language producer (the author in the case of the non-speech-related texts). These particular parameters were chosen as they are of interest when investigating the hypotheses outlined in section 1.1 above.

Once collected and arranged in a database, the gender-related terms were examined for patterns, using as starting points the linguistic and extralinguistic parameters coded for in the database. When needed, new databases were set up in order to facilitate an overview of the data, as for instance when examining adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with gender-related terms.

[21] To illustrate the degree of orthographic variation in the texts, in the Salem Witchcraft Papers the lexeme GIRL (including the plural form) is realised as, for instance, “girl”, “girls”, “girle”, “gerle”, “gurll”, “gurls”, “garl”, “garle” and “gaurl”.

In Chapter 4, an overall view of the frequency and distribution of the gender-related terms across the text categories is given.

2.3.2 Extracting the Adjectives and Demonstratives

The second part of the present investigation involves looking at adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with gender-related terms. Since only those adjectives and demonstratives that occur with gender-related terms are of interest to the present study, it was possible to use the already extracted gender-related terms as a starting-point for this analysis (see section 2.3.1). Decisions pertaining to the identification and treatment of adjectives were often complex, and are discussed in more detail below. The gender-related terms determined by a demonstrative (*this*, *that*, *these* and *those)*[22] were extracted from the large database containing all the gender-related terms and arranged in a new database (for terminology pertaining to demonstratives, see section 4.3.3).

2.3.2.1 Screening for Adjectives: Grounds for Inclusion

Adjectival modification of the NP head can fill several syntactic functions in the clause. Huddleston and Pullum list three such functions as being the primary ones filled by adjectives, namely attributive, predicative complement and postpositive (2002: 528). The three functions are exemplified below with instances taken from my material. In (10), the adjective fills an attributive function, in (11) the adjectives function as predicative complements, and (12) exemplifies the use of a postpositive adjective (for a discussion on the distinction between adjectival and verbal participles, see further below).

(10) *Coun*. You came back to *Mrs Busbys* did not you say that you had been with the young **Gentlewoman**, who was eating Fowls and Bacon? (BrExam: The Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 7)

(11) Do not you see these **children** & **women** are rational & sober as their neighbours when your hands are fastened (AmExam: Examination of Martha Corey. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 254)

(12) Hee entertained me with the Adventurs he had passed by late Rideing, and eminent Dangers he had escaped, so that, Remembring the Hero's in Parismus and the Knight of the Oracle, I didn't know but I had mett wth a **Prince** disguis'd. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 4)

[22] The lexemes *yon* and *yonder*, which filled a similar role in Early Modern English to the demonstratives listed here, are not attested in my material.

In giving these three functions as the main ones performed by adjectives, Huddleston and Pullum agree with Quirk et al. (1985: 416–419). Biber et al., on the other hand, while agreeing that attributive and predicative functions are primary functions of adjectives, place less importance on the postpositive function (*postposed adjectives* in their terminology), listing it under the heading "Adjectives in other syntactic roles" (1999: 510–521). In this study, I will use the terminology employed by Huddleston and Pullum as being largely self-explanatory.[23]

Before moving on to the criteria for inclusion in the study, a brief discussion of the different syntactic functions of adjectives is in order. Adjectives occurring in attributive position function as phrase-internal premodifiers in the NP, as in (10) above. As predicative complements the adjectives are dependents in the clause structure, functioning as subject complements after copular verbs such as BE, SEEM, or FIND or object complements after complex-transitive verbs, such as THINK or CALL. As in the case of those adjectives occurring attributively, postpositive adjectives are phrase-internal NP modifiers, but occur after the NP head. Since the occurrence of postpositive adjectives in English is subject to severe syntactic constraints (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 418–419; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 528–529), this is a much less common position in which to find adjectives than are the attributive and predicative positions.

To these three functions can be added a fourth, namely predicative adjuncts (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 529).[24] Predicative adjuncts are adjectives which are syntactically free modifiers of the NP; that is, while they function semantically as modifiers of the NP head, they are, like predicative complements, not syntactically part of the NP proper (see example (13)). Unlike predicative complements, however, predicative adjuncts are not part of the verb phrase.

(13) SIMON ARROWSMITH who being asked whether he knew John Lunt and what he knew of him sayd y^{t} in the year 1690 he the s~d Simon being undergaoler at Lanc^{r}, the s~d Lunt was then a **prison^{r}** there, very poor and shabby, but made himself buisy wth some other of the prison^{rs} (BrDepo: Trials at Manchester, p. 16)

Biber et al. (1999: 520–521) point out that this construction is characteristic of fiction, where predicative adjuncts commonly occur sentence-initially. In the material used for the present study, this construction is rare.

[23] As regards the syntactic functions of adjectives, the terminology used by Huddleston and Pullum (2002) to a large extent follows that in Quirk et al. (1985). They do, however, differ slightly on some points; for example, Quirk et al. refer to adjectives as being *predicative*, whereas Huddleston and Pullum refer to them functioning as *predicative complements*.

[24] Predicative adjuncts correspond to the detached predicatives in Biber et al. (1999: 520–521) and to the supplementive adjective clauses in Quirk et al. (1985: 424–426).

Many studies on adjectival descriptions of men and women (or male and female fictional characters) have focused on adjectives occurring in attributive position (e.g. Persson 1990; Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Bäcklund 2006). In order to obtain a fuller view of how adjectives were used when characterising men and women in the Early Modern period, I have chosen to broaden the scope, and include adjectives occurring in other syntactic functions as well.

For the purposes of the present study, the material was first scanned for NPs containing gender-related terms. From the context of these NPs, I then extracted all adjectives occurring attributively, predicatively, postpositively, or as predicative adjuncts.

Apart from these adjectives, one additional phrase structure was extracted, as it was considered to be of interest for the present investigation, namely constructions of the type "an X of Y", where X represents a gender-related term, and Y is an NP being a part of a prepositional phrase acting as a postmodifier to the head, and pointing to one or several characteristics of the referent (example (14)). These structures will henceforth be called *characterising* of-*phrases* in the discussion.[25]

(14) *Serj. Maynard*, Here is a high Offence against the Government and Justice of the Nation, against the Reputation of a **Person** of Worth and Integrity, after they had murdered his *Person*, to endevour the murdering of his *Good Name*. (BrExam: Tryal of Nathanael Thompson [etc], p. 14)

Semantically, this structure parallels adjectives in that it is used to describe people by highlighting a certain aspect (or aspects) of their character (Biber et al. 1999: 636), and it is used on several occasions in the material. This makes it relevant to the present study and prompted its inclusion in this part of the investigation.

2.3.2.2 Distinguishing between Adjectives and Verbal Participles

Owing to the great similarity and overlap between some adjectives and participles (past and present) of verbs, distinguishing between the two is not always easy, something that has been pointed out in several grammars and linguistic studies (e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 413–416; Gleby 2002: 29–31, 45–84; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 540–542; Sveen 2005: 51–53). Many diagnostic criteria have been put forward by scholars to help distinguish between verbal participles and adjectives, based on both syntactic and

[25] Raumolin-Brunberg (1991: 223) mentions this construction (in her terminology, *of*-phrases denoting quality) in her study on the noun phrase in early sixteenth-century English, but does not discuss it in detail. Bäcklund (2006) also includes some characterising *of*-phrases in her data, treating them as a construction parallel to adjectives.

semantic characteristics (e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 413–416; Gleby 2002: 130–139; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 540–542; Sveen 2005: 49–53). Of these, I have selected three criteria as being particularly suitable for the present study, two which consider the syntactic construction of the problematic lexeme, and one which focuses on the semantic properties of the lexeme in question. If a given lexeme fulfils at least one of these criteria, it has been considered adjectival, and thus included in the analysis. To some extent, this constitutes applying present-day grammaticality judgement criteria on EModE data; however, the advantages of having a rigorous framework to apply on the data have nevertheless been considered profitable enough to outweigh any disadvantages.

First, in accordance with Gleby (2002: 43), co-occurrence with other central[26] adjectives was considered a sign of adjectival status (see example (15), where the adjectival status of *lasting* is confirmed by its co-occurrence with *swift*).

(15) [...] these are our Guides, and hold our Horses while we Mount, look after them and the Equipments, as Bridles and Furniture, (the most mean of which are Silver) when we alight; and are not only swift, but lasting **Footmen**. (BrJour: John Fryer: A New Account of East India and Persia [...], p. II, 181)

The second syntactic criterion for adjectival status considered in this study concerns whether the lexeme can occur with copular verbs other than BE. Whereas verbal passives can normally only occur with BE, adjectival complements also occur in connection with other copular verbs, such as SEEM, REMAIN and LOOK. If another copular verb can replace the verb BE in the phrase containing the ambiguous lexeme, this indicates adjectival status (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 540–541, 1437). An example of this taken from my corpus is given in (16) below. In (16), the copular BE in the phrase "never was any **man** more ingaged to another" can be substituted with, for instance, SEEM, to make a new phrase "never did any **man** seem more ingaged to another". Thus, *engaged* in (16) has been considered to have adjectival status, and has been included in the analysis.

(16) *Lord Clare*. *I* have told you what *I* know, my Lord is too full of discourse for me to answer all he says; but for Colonel *Sidney*, he did with great asseverations assert, that he was as innocent as any man breathing, and used great Encomiums in his praise, and then he seemed to bemone his misfortune, which *I* thought real, for never was any **man** more ingaged to another, than he was

[26] A central adjective is an adjective which can occur in both attributive and predicative position (e.g. "a swift **man**", "the **man** is swift") (Quirk et al. 1985: 403–404).

to Colonel *Sidney*, *I* believe. (BrExam: Tryal ... of Algernon Sidney, p. 36)

Thirdly, adjectives and verbal participles are also semantically distinct in that verbal participles tend to indicate action whereas adjectives typically denote states (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 79, 541). Thus, to use Huddleston and Pullum's example sentences, *broken* in "it was broken deliberately, out of spite" is a verbal participle, since it denotes the action of breaking, whereas in "it did not look broken to me", it describes the state of an object and thus has an adjectival function (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 79). To exemplify, in (17) and (18) the participle *baptised* is used in connection with gender-related terms. In (17) it denotes a state (not being baptised), and was thus included in the present investigation, whereas the instance in (18) denotes the act of baptism and was not included. The verbal status of *baptised* in (18) is further attested by its being followed by an overt *by*-agent.

(17) Abigail Hoobs said to me Margaritt are you baptized: and I said yes; then said she my **mother** is not baptized. but said I will baptize hir and immediatly took watter and sprinckeled in hir mothers face and said she did baptized hir in the name of the father son and Holy Ghost (AmDepo: Margaret Knight v. Abigail Hobbs. Boyer and Nissenbaum. 1977: 415)

(18) Rebeca Eames further acknowledgeth & declareth that she was baptized aboute three years agoe in five Mile pond and that her **son** Daniell was also then baptized by the Divell (AmDepo: Second Examination of Rebecca Eames. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 281)

Employing a semantic criterion such as the one presented here is unavoidably somewhat subjective, as it is based on close readings of the participles and my "general semanto-pragmatic impressions rather than syntactic characteristics" (Smitterberg 2005: 30).

Apart from the difficulty in distinguishing between adjectives and verbal participles, two lexical items were problematic, since they could not be classified definitely as adjectives, namely *own* (nine instances in the material) and *pretty* (two instances). In the case of *own*, linguists are not in agreement as to whether *own* should be classified as an adjective or as a determiner,[27] whereas *pretty* could be either an adjective or an adverb (see example (19)).

[27] Quirk et al. give *own* determiner status, calling it an "emphatic determinative" (1985: 362). The compilers of the recently published *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English* agree that *own* should be considered a determiner, even though the word is not discussed in greater detail (Biber et al. 1999: 271, 282). On the other hand, Huddleston and Pullum consider *own* an adjective, although they point out that it is restricted in its use (2002: 482–483).

(19) Q. w't kind of Man Is Mr. Burroughs A a pretty little **man** and he has Come to Us Somtimes In his Spiritt in the Shape of a Catt & I think somtimes In his prop'r Shape [...] (AmExam: Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier. 1977: 523)

For the purposes of the present study, I have decided to err on the side of caution and exclude both *own* and *pretty*[28] from the subsequent analysis.

An overall view of the adjectival and demonstrative data is presented in section 4.3.

2.4 Summary and Concluding Remarks

The material used for the present study consists of both speech-related and non-speech-related material, and amounts to 283,758 words. The focus of the study will be on the speech-related material, which consequently makes up the lion's share of the material, comprising a total of 256,182 words. The non-speech-related material amounts to 27,576 words and was included in the present study in part to fill a gap in the research which has been carried out on gender-related terms to date, and which has focused primarily on fictional, non-speech-related material, and in part to allow me to examine the possibility of further research into the differences in gender-term usage between speech-related and non-speech-related material from this period.

The speech-related material is made up of texts from two text categories, both taken from the general setting of trial proceedings – depositions and examinations – whereas the non-speech-related material consists of journals. All the material was produced between 1670 and 1720. In the case of the speech-related material, the year of the speech-event was taken as the relevant date. For the non-speech-related texts, I regarded the corresponding date to be the year of alleged composition.

To enable some cross-Atlantic comparison, the speech-related and the non-speech-related material was gathered from sources from both England and New England. The speech-related texts were gathered in part from *A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760* (BrE), in part from *The Salem Witchcraft Papers* (AmE). The non-speech-related material consists of journals, by both male and female authors, gathered from three text corpora: the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers* and *A Corpus of Early American English*.

The gender-related terms were extracted from the material using the WordSmith Tools computer program and then coded into a database in Microsoft Excel. Information on linguistic and extralinguistic parameters

[28] There were no instances of *pretty* with a clear adjectival meaning in my material (e.g. "a pretty **child**").

was entered in the database, namely term category, sex of referent, immediate context, text source, genre, text and, where applicable, sex of the language producer.

From the extracted gender-term data, I scanned the data again for adjectives and demonstratives (*this*, *that*, *these* and *those*) that were used in connection with these terms. I extracted those terms that were thus modified, complemented or determined, and created new databases with this data. The present study includes adjectives occurring in any of four different functions: attributive, predicative complement, postpositive and predicative adjunct. Moreover, one additional phrase structure was included, since it fills a function parallel to adjectives, namely characterising *of*-phrases (for instance *a man of honour*). Although not a very frequent construction (see section 4.3.2), the characterising *of*-phrases do reveal some interesting tendencies, as will be discussed in section 6.2.4.

Chapter 3. Gender-Related Terms

3.1 Introductory Comments

The purpose of the present chapter is twofold. First, in section 3.2, I will further define and exemplify the terms around which the present study revolves, namely *gender-related terms*. In section 3.2, I will also discuss and define the eight semantic categories of gender-related terms that have been included in the present investigation (see section 1.1), as well as provide examples of the terms which have been included in each category.

Secondly, this chapter aims at providing an overview of the semantic shifts which a number of gender-related terms have undergone due to the social status accorded to their referents (section 3.3). Some of the gender-related terms included in the present study have been subject to semantic shifts to various degrees since the turn of the eighteenth century. Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that the connotations which these terms carry today are not necessarily the same as they carried at the time when the material examined here was produced (cf. the shift in meaning for the term *mistress*, discussed further below). The primary focus will be on female terms, since they have undergone such semantic shifts to a greater extent than their male counterparts. The discussion will take the findings of the present study as its starting point and forms the background to the subsequent analysis, where it will be shown that referent gender does influence how gender-related terms are used.

Section 3.3 will discuss the semantic development of gender-related terms from three angles. First, as a general background to this topic, I will discuss the semantic pejoration of female gender-related terms over time (section 3.3.1). The next section, 3.3.2, deals with terms that can be used to refer to adult women in Present-day English, and their use in my material, whereas section 3.3.3 discusses the use of gender-neutral terms with gendered referents. The chapter concludes with a summary in section 3.4.

3.2 Terminology and Definitions

By the expression *gender-related term* I mean a word used to denote a person, man or woman, in the singular or in the plural. Such a term can refer to the person's age and/or sex (*girl*, *man*), his/her relationship to someone

else (*sister*, *client*, *neighbour*), his/her occupation (*midwife*, *mayor*, *captain*), desirable or undesirable qualities he/she is believed to possess (*rogue*, *saint*, *witch*), etc. It should be noted that gender-related terms also include gender-neutral terms such as *child* and *person*, since these words also denote gendered people.

From the above definition it becomes clear that the cover term *gender-related terms* includes a vast and unwieldy number of terms denoting various aspects of human life. Thus, a certain amount of pruning had to take place in order to keep the data manageable. Consequently, when the terms present in the material had been identified (see section 2.3.1 for a description of how the data was extracted), they were divided into semantic categories based on what aspect of the referent they denoted. Eight categories were then selected as being the ones most likely to help test the hypotheses (for definitions, see further below):

- central terms (e.g. *man*, *woman*),
- relational terms (e.g. *husband*, *wife*),
- epicene terms (e.g. *child*, *person*),
- occupational terms (e.g. *maid*, *weaver*),
- title terms (e.g. *gentleman*, *lady*),
- depreciative terms (e.g. *rogue*, *witch*),
- appreciative terms (e.g. *saint*, *hero*) and
- religious, social and political terms (e.g. *Jacobite*, *Protestant*).

Each instance of a gender-related term had to be categorised individually, on the basis of the context in which it occurred. This proved to be a necessary measure, since there are gender-related terms which, depending on the context, can belong to several categories. One such term is *man*, which, although prototypically central, could also be occupational (when denoting a servant), or relational (as, for instance, in the formulaic *man and wife*). Also, as explained further below, sarcastic uses of nominally appreciative terms needed to be identified and placed among the depreciative terms.

The above-mentioned semantic categories form the basis of the subsequent analysis, where the words belonging in each category are examined according to different parameters (for instance geographical origin, referent gender), to see if any patterns emerge as regards their distribution (see further Chapters 5 and 6). In what follows, I will define and exemplify these gender term categories further. Full lists of the terms occurring in each category are given in Appendix I.

Central terms

Central terms are words that clearly specify the gender of the referent and that denote a person without mentioning their relation to anyone else, their

profession, title or current activity, and without obviously implying censure or approval. Examples of central terms are *lad*, *lass*, *man* and *woman*.

Relational terms

In the relational terms I have included gender-linked terms that are used to define the relation between two or more people and that clearly specify gender, including terms denoting kinship, marital and pre-marital[29] relations (or lack thereof) and social relationships. This category includes terms such as *aunt*, *daughter*, *kinsman* and *widow*. Terms denoting pure business relationships (such as are implied by the terms *apprentice* and *client*) have, however, been categorised as occupational terms (see below).

Epicene terms

As epicene terms I have counted those terms which fulfil the criteria specified for the central and relational terms, but which do not, in themselves, specify the gender of the referent.[30] One reason for including these terms in the study is that, even though they are supposedly gender-neutral, previous studies have shown their use to be gender biased to some extent (e.g. Wallin-Ashcroft 2000: 63–76; Norberg 2002: 100–111. See also section 3.3.3). Terms belonging to this category include *child*, *neighbour* and *twin*.

Occupational terms

The occupational terms include gender-linked terms denoting profession or commissions or titles that are not hereditary (a term such as *princess* is therefore not included in this category; see below). Military and ecclesiastical titles have been included in this category since they imply that the referent has duties to perform as part of his or her vocation. Here I have also included terms denoting business relationships. Examples of occupational terms include *aid de camp*, *clergyman*, *midwife*, *primate*[31] and *weaver*.

Title terms

As title terms I have counted terms of address as well as hereditary titles. By *term of address* I here mean a word denoting a person's position in society, such as *goodman*, used either on its own or in conjunction with a name to refer politely to that person. The title terms also include honorifics used when addressing or referring to royalty or high officials such as *Your Honour* and *Your Majesty*. Other examples of title terms are *baron*, *Mrs*, *princess* and *sir*.

[29] Extra-marital relationships have also been included in this category.
[30] Note that the gender of the referent can in some cases be inferred from the context.
[31] In this context an ecclesiastical term denoting an archbishop or a bishop, holding the first place among the bishops of a given region (*OED*, s.v. *primate*, 1 June 2005).

Depreciative terms

The depreciative terms include all gender-linked terms that are used in a condescending or depreciative way in the material. Here I have also included words that are not used as actual insults in the texts, but whose connotations are so negative that they cannot normally be used in a neutral way. The following words can be mentioned as examples of depreciative terms: *bitch*, *fool*, *murderer*, *traitor* and *witch*.

Appreciative terms

As appreciative terms I have counted all gender-linked terms that are used appreciatively about an individual in the material, expressing approval or affection. The appreciative terms also include words whose connotations are positive enough that they cannot normally be used in a neutral way, even if they are not used as actual endearments in the texts. This category includes the terms *hero*, *saint* and *sweetheart*, provided these terms are not used sarcastically. Instances of sarcastic use have been included with the depreciative terms (see above).

Religious, social and political terms

Among the religious, social and political terms (henceforth RSP terms), I include words that denote a person with respect to the religious, social or political group that s/he belongs to, or where s/he lives. In this category, I have placed terms such as *Dutchman*, *Jacobite*, *Papist* and *Protestant*.

The generic use of *man* (denoting mankind rather than an individual) has been excluded from the present study, as have collective nouns, including, for instance, *family* and *people*. The justification for excluding the latter category is that their collective nature often made it hard to establish the gender of the individuals comprising the group, which in turn made these terms less valuable for a study employing a gender perspective.

In the examinations, some gender-related terms occur not only in the reported interaction, but also in the speaker names given by the scribe to indicate who is talking (primarily title terms, such as *Mr* and *Lord*). These terms have not been included in the gender term data, since they are not part of the interaction per se. However, for reasons of convenience, all speaker names have been included in the word counts.

3.3 The Semantics of Gender-Related Terms: An Overview

3.3.1 The Semantic Pejoration of Female Terms

Linguists have long noted that the English language exhibits a gender bias when it comes to the words used to denote men and women respectively. Since men have traditionally held political power and social supremacy in Western society, men have long been regarded as the 'norm' with women representing the deviant 'other' (cf. Shoemaker 1998: 2–3; Romaine 1999: 10; Kimmel 2000: 5–8; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003: 2). This view has had many consequences, not the least within medicine (cf. Fletcher 1995: 34 on the Galenic view of the female body), but the idea of the 'male as norm' can also be seen in the language as words denoting females are linguistically 'marked' for femininity, signalling their 'otherness' (Graddol and Swann 1989: 99–100; Holmes and Sigley 2002: 247). This markedness can take two forms which are not mutually exclusive: formal markedness, where an affix is added to an otherwise unmarked stem (for instance *bachelorette* and *princess*), and semantic markedness. When a word is semantically marked, it carries a specialised meaning, which leads to the word not being easily transferred to other objects (cf. Graddol and Swann 1989: 99–100). To exemplify, a term which is semantically marked for femininity cannot be used to encompass males, whereas male terms, often being semantically unmarked, can be used with reference to women as well (cf. *guys*, *actors* in Present-day English). Importantly, whereas no pejoration is meant by including females in the unmarked male term, it can be considered an insult to refer to a male (especially a male human) by a female term (for instance in a sentence such as "You girl, you" when said to a man) (Schulz 1975: 65; Sunderland 1995: 165; Romaine 1999: 93).

The semantic markedness of terms denoting women leads to their carrying different, and often more lowly, connotations than their male equivalents. This is an example of how the status of the social group to which these terms pertain affects the semantic value of the terms themselves; since women in the Western world have traditionally been ranked lower in the social hierarchy than their male counterparts (cf. Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 15; Romaine 1999: 7, 12), the words used to refer to them have taken on negative connotations over time, as noted by Schulz (1975: 64–74):

> Again and again in the history of the language, one finds that a perfectly innocent term designating a girl or woman may begin with totally neutral or even positive connotations, but that gradually it acquires negative implications, at first perhaps only slightly disparaging, but after a period of time becoming abusive and ending as a sexual slur. (Schulz 1975: 65)

Schulz attributes this to women's little social or political influence in history and their lack of opportunity to contribute to any great extent to the art, literature, higher education, or philosophical teachings in Western society. Since it is the language of influential persons that becomes standardised, women have thus been "borrowers of the language" (Spender 1985: 12), in other words using it, but not being allowed to contribute to it to any large extent. Consequently, the English language has established and perpetuated a world view of the male as the norm and the female as the deviant (Schulz 1975: 64; Spender 1985: 7–16).[32]

The semantic pejoration of female gender-related terms becomes especially apparent if one considers word-pairs which were once semantically equivalent, such as *master–mistress*, or *lord–lady*. In these word-pairs, the male term has either retained its original meaning or acquired (further) positive connotations. The female term, on the other hand, has either taken on sexual connotations that were not there originally, or undergone pejoration, in accordance with the tendency described by Schulz in the above quote.

In the case of *master–mistress*, one of the most oft-cited examples of pejoration of female terms, both terms in the word-pair originally referred to a person in charge of others, either as head of a household or a business, or as a teacher. From the thirteenth century onward, the term *mistress* started to be used metaphorically, to refer to a woman for whom one felt deep love, i.e. 'the mistress of one's heart', and it is from this second metaphorical sense that the common present-day meaning of 'object of (illicit) love' stems (cf. Graddol and Swann 1989: 113; Lakoff 2004: 58–59; *OED*: s.v. *master*, *mistress*, 5 July 2006). In the material used for the present study, this derogation of *mistress* did not, however, appear, and when used, the term functions as a respectful title, often collocating with a surname (e.g. *mistress Osgood*).

In the case of title terms overall, the terms referring to women have tended to undergo semantic derogation, whereas their male equivalents have not. This is especially noticeable in the word-pair *lord–lady*, where, as has been pointed out by several scholars (e.g. Schulz 1975: 65; Romaine 1999: 93; Nevalainen 2002: 190; Lakoff 2004: 51–56), *lord* retains its original meaning, whereas the corresponding term for women, *lady*, has undergone what Schulz refers to as "democratic leveling" (1975: 65). Originally, *lady* was used exclusively to address and refer to women of the highest rank,

[32] This is of course not true only of women, but also of other groups whose subordinate social status has affected the semantic value of the words pertaining to them. Leith (1983: 80–81) brings up several terms to illustrate this point, among them *villain* and *churl*. *Villain* (from OF *villein*) originally designated a low-born peasant (cf. *village*), whereas a *churl* (from OE *ceorl*) was a man without rank, as opposed to the nobility (*OED*: s.v. *villain*, *churl*, 5 July 2006). In time, the lowly status of these groups led to the terms taking on disparaging connotations of thievery and rude behaviour, connotations they have subsequently retained.

analogous with *lord*. In the fifteenth century, *lady* was extended downwards, as a courteous form of address for the wives of the lower gentry, i.e. knights and baronets (Nevalainen 2002: 190). As Table 3.1 shows, however, *lord* was used exclusively for the nobility throughout the Early Modern period in England, and has retained much of that exclusivity up until the present day.

Table 3.1. A generalised view of the terms *lord* and *lady* in Early Modern England and their corresponding rank (adapted from Nevalainen 2002: 190).

Term/Rank	***lord***	***lady***
Nobility	x	x
Knights and baronets	–	x
Gentry	–	–

Later, *lady* was extended further to include the wives of gentlemen and members of the wealthy middleclass. Today, *lady* can be used about practically all women, and, as shown by Romaine (1999: 126–127) can even be used derogatorily as a put-down. I will return to the use of *lady* both in Present-day English and in my material in section 3.3.2 below.

3.3.2 *Women*, *Ladies* and *Girls*: Talking about Adult Females

It has been pointed out that in Present-day English the semantic derogation of female gender-related terms is also noticeable in the most basic word-pair relating to adult humans: *man–woman*. Romaine comments on the fact that *woman* is used comparatively infrequently when addressing or, especially, referring to adult females, at least as compared with the use of *man* to refer to adult males. She writes that "[m]en have been reluctant to use the simple term *woman*, which according to some men is too blunt, too overtly sexual, too demeaning, or too common" (1999: 125). Hence, instead of referring to and addressing adult females as *women*, people today prefer to use either *lady* or *girl* in an attempt to avoid the seemingly negative connotations of *woman*.[33] In this section, I will discuss the use of these two terms, *lady* and *girl*, to refer to adult females in my material, drawing parallels to Present-day English when relevant. This is done in order to see whether the use of *lady* and *girl* to denote adult, non-noble females had begun by the turn of the eighteenth century, thus my aim is to further the understanding of how these terms were used in the material examined for the present study. Overall, *woman* is the term most frequently used to denote adult females in my material, although, as will be discussed further below, there are occurrences of *lady* to refer to women who were not members of the nobility; likewise, there are occurrences of *girl* where the referents might be adults.

[33] These alternative terms have attracted severe criticism, the objection being that both *lady* and *girl* carry with them connotations of their own, which are not necessarily better than those attached to *woman* (cf. Graddol and Swann 1989: 114–118; Romaine 1999: 125–130).

As was mentioned in the previous section (3.3.1), the first of the two terms under discussion, *lady*, was originally used exclusively to refer to female members of the nobility, analogously with *lord*. In the speech-related material used for the present study, *lady* is still mostly used in this way, as in examples (20) and (21).

(20) The Discourse we had, was, that Mrs. *Knifton* told her, when I came from *London*, on *Fryday* Night, that she told me she was glad I was come, for she expected her Throat to be cut every Night since my Lord Duke went to *Portsmouth*, I askt her the Reason of her Fear, she answered, *Germain* has laid with my **Lady** Dutchess ever since my Lord Duke went to *Portsmouth*, that when he came Home, he would hear of it, and he would kick her for a Bawd; and if she should tell my Lord, *Germain* would cut her Throat (BrDepo: Duke and Dutchess of Norfolk, p. B2VC1–B2VC2)

(21) Isabella *Countess of* Roscommon *Deposeth*, That on the 10th of *June* last, she stood by the **Lady** *Sunderland* in the Queens Bed-Chamber, while the Queen was in Labour, and saw the Prince of *Wales*, when he was taken out of the Bed by the Midwife.
I. Roscommon. (BrDepo: Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales, p. 10)

However, there are also instances where *lady* is used to refer to women who, although of a high social standing, are not members of the peerage. One example of such usage can be seen in (22), where Mrs Pleasant Rawlins, who, in the title of the examination manuscript is described as an "heiress of a considerable fortune", is referred to as a *lady*. Also, in the same text, but by a different speaker, the term is used to refer to some women who are of respectable ancestry, but since the women in question are obliged to lodge with a Mrs Baynton, who seems to run a fairly modest establishment, one may assume that they are not nobles (example (23)).

(22) Mrs. *Busby*. [...] I begg'd of him to let us come out, Hartwel had his Arms about Mrs. Rawlins's side, and said, 'tis this **Lady** and you that I am concerned about. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 5)

(23) *S. G.* Have you any knowledge of Mrs. *Baynton*?
Night. Yes. *S. G*. How came you acquainted with her?
Night. One Mrs. *St. John* came to me to know whether I took Boarders? I said, I had taken some, but would take no more, unless it were the same **Ladies** again. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 3)

It would thus appear from my material that by the turn of the eighteenth century, *lady* was no longer used exclusively to refer to members of the uppermost social class, but had begun to be employed as a polite and respectful way of referring to adult females of some social standing.

As mentioned in section 3.3.1 above, *lady* has not only lost its exclusive link to the nobility, but has also acquired negative connotations over time (cf. Graddol and Swann 1989: 116; Romaine 1999: 126–127). This is probably a consequence of *lady* being used euphemistically as a politeness device to women of lower and lower social status, the speaker thus elevating the addressee to a status to which she could not normally aspire. Over time, *lady* has become increasingly derogatory, and, although it is normally seen as a more positive word than *woman*, today it can even be used in an insulting manner, as pointed out by, for instance, Romaine (1999: 126–127).

Interestingly, this negative use of *lady* can be found in my material as well, despite the relatively early dates of composition. The non-speech-related material examined for the present study contains an example of *lady* being used with a derogatory note, to denote a young woman whom the author of the journal, Knight, finds ill-mannered and rude (example (24)). The woman, living in rural New England, is clearly not noble, nor does she seem to have a place positioned particularly high in the social hierarchy, which is why the use of *lady* is unlikely to be used to denote respect. Furthermore, Knight often employs sarcasm in her descriptions of the people she encounters on her journey; thus, it is probable that the use of *lady* in the quoted abstract is meant to be taken sardonically rather than at face value. In order to illustrate the contempt felt by Knight towards the young woman in question, a fairly extensive part of the passage in question is quoted in example (24).

(24) But had not gone many steps into the Room, ere I was Interogated by a young **Lady** I understood afterwards was the Eldest daughter of the family, with these, or words to this purpose, (*viz.*) Law for mee - what in the world brings You here at this time a night? - I never see a woman on the Rode so Dreadfull late, in all the days of my versall life. Who are You? Where are You going? I'me scar'd out of my witts - with much now of the same Kind. I stood aghast, Prepareing to reply, when in comes my Guide - to him Madam turn'd, Roreing out: Lawfull heart, John, is it You? - how de do! Where in the world are you going with this woman? Who is she? John made no Ansr. but sat down in the corner, fumbled out his black Junk, and saluted that instead of Debb; she then turned agen to mee and fell anew into her silly questions, without asking mee to sitt down. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 5–6)

The example quoted in (24) is the only instance of *lady* used in a clearly derogatory way, but, taken together with the use of *lady* to refer to non-

nobles (cf. examples (22) and (23)), it indicates that the semantic derogation of *lady* was underway at the time period investigated in the present study.[34]

The use of the other term under discussion here, *girl*,[35] to denote adult women is not very common in my data. In my speech-related material (i.e. the examinations and depositions), there are no clear examples of *girl* being used to refer to an adult woman. In the non-speech-related texts, however, there are a couple of examples of *girl* being used to refer to young women. One young woman thus referred to is, the author informs us, approximately 18 years old (example (25)), and whereas the age of the other, Mrs[36] Lloyd, is never specifically stated, a previous entry in the journal makes it clear that the author considers her old enough to play kissing games (example (26)).

(25) about 3 in the afternoon, I sat forward with neighbor Polly and Jemima, a **Girl** about 18 Years old, who hee said he had been to fetch out of the Narragansetts, and said they had Rode thirty miles that day, on sory lean Jade, wth only a Bagg under her for a pillion, which the poor **Girl** often complain'd was very uneasy. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 27)

(26) Saturday, January 7. Rose at past 9. Was merry with cousin and Mrs. Loyd. They stayed to dinner and went away at past 4. Mrs. Loyd is a very smart **girl**, has good natural sense and reads pretty much, but wants something of good breeding. (BrJour: Dudley Ryder: The Diary of Dudley Ryder)

Although it is hard to know at precisely what age the common nomenclature for a young female would change from *girl* to *woman* in the Early Modern period, contemporaries seem to have considered childhood to end at age 14, which would make at least the young woman in (25) an adult (Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 78–79). It could thus be that the use of the term *girl* for adult women had started by the time period investigated in the present study, although *woman* was still the most common term.

[34] Note also the sardonic use of *madam* in (24), a term which was initially used instead of a given name when addressing a lady of high rank, especially by servants addressing their mistress. In time, however, in analogy with *lady*, language producers extended the use downwards as a politeness strategy, giving higher nominal status to their addressees (*OED*: s.v. *madam*, 7 July 2006).

[35] For a discussion on how *girl* has changed over time, see Curzan (2003: 133–179).

[36] Note that *Mrs* does not necessarily imply married status at this time, but could also be affixed to the surname of an unmarried woman, especially one of respectable social rank (cf. *OED*: s.v. *Mrs*, 23 August 2006).

3.3.3 The Use of Epicene Terms with Gendered Beings: *Creatures*, *Persons* and *Children*

An interesting subset of gender-related terms consists of those terms that do not actually specify the gender of the referent, the so-called *epicene terms*. As has been explained in section 3.2 above, I have chosen to include these terms in my investigation despite their being 'non-gendered', since they nevertheless denote human beings and are thus of interest to a study of this kind. Previous research (e.g. Persson 1992; Wallin-Ashcroft 1992, 2000; Norberg 2002) has shown that epicene terms are not, despite their nomenclature, always used without regard to referent gender, but can display a gender bias. Furthermore, this gender bias is not always stable over time, but can shift, from gender-neutrality to biased use, or vice versa. Terms can even go from primarily being used with referents of one gender to occurring mostly with referents of the other. In this section, I will look more closely at the semantic history of three epicene terms which have been shown to be particularly interesting in this regard: *creature*, *person* and *child*. These terms further display interesting patterns in my data, as will be discussed in the analysis (see section 5.4.3).

The term *creature* (from Lat. *creatura* 'anything created') came into English in the eleventh century, and was originally used to indicate anything created by God, animate or inanimate, and thus included both men and women, as well as animals, plants, etc. By ca. 1300, *creature* had become more specialised and was taken to refer only to animate beings. At this time, the term had two primary functions. First, it was used to refer to created beings in general, and then especially animals, as distinct from humans (*OED*, s.v. *creature* 2 a, 12 July 2006). However, the *OED* also records another meaning that was prevalent at the same time:

> **3.** **a.** A human being; a person or individual (as in 'every creature in the room'). Common in the phrase 'our fellow-creatures'. [So F. *créature*.]
>
> **b.** With qualifications expressing (*a*) admiration, approbation, affection, or tenderness (sometimes playfully); (*b*) compassion or commiseration (sometimes with a shade of patronage).
>
> **c.** Expressing reprobation or contempt. (Originally with qualifications as in b, but at length used alone = creature of a kind which one forbears to specify.) (*OED*, s.v. *creature* 3, 12 July 2006)

As is evident from the above definition and also from the quotations given in *OED*, *creature* could thus be used in a variety of ways, to express vastly different sentiments, ranging from affection to patronage to contempt.

Given the versatility of the term, one might reasonably expect *creature* to occur equally with referents of both genders; however, in historical material this is not the case. Wallin-Ashcroft found that in eighteenth-century fiction, *creature* is found predominantly with female referents: of 123 instances of the term in her material, 86 occur with female referents and only 14 with male (2000: 53).[37] Looking at male and female terms in Shakespeare's comedies, Norberg found the same pattern, with eleven instances of *creature* being used about women, compared to seven instances denoting men (2002: 100–101). The material used for the present study displays the same tendency, as will be shown in section 5.4.3 below: when *creature* occurs, it is never with male-only reference. Rather, it is used either to denote pitiable humans in general – male and female – or with female reference.

In her discussion, Wallin-Ashcroft suggests that this gender bias with regard to *creature* is due to the subordinate position of women in Early Modern society. Since women were considered to be less rational and more ignorant of matters both worldly and spiritual than men, and furthermore more or less dependent on them for their social status and, to some extent, survival, they were more likely to inspire feelings of compassion, affection and tenderness than were men, and thus came closer to the prototypical *creature* as defined by the time:

> The prototypical values for the spiritual and mental aspects of [*creature*] must therefore be 'soulless' and 'ignorant' and for the social aspect 'dependent'. Again, the combined set of prototypical values agreed better with the concept of 'female' than with that of 'male'. (Wallin-Ashcroft 2000: 73)

Furthermore, collocating adjectives occurring with *creature* show that the term carried different connotations depending on whether it was used with male or female referents. Both Wallin-Ashcroft (2000: 55) and Norberg (2002: 104–105) report that when *creature* refers to a woman, it is much more likely to collocate with positive adjectives (such as *dear*, *innocent* and *worthy*) than when it occurs with a male referent. Male *creatures* tend to be described in a much more negative light, as being *greedy*, *perfidious* and *wicked*. Wallin-Ashcroft (2000: 73–74) and Norberg (2002: 105) both conclude that the difference in adjective usage with *creature* is linked to the term's predominant use with female referents: when used to denote a man, *creature* implies that the referent is not a prototypical male, but rather a deviation from the norm, which attracts negative adjectives.

In Present-day English, the use of *creature* to denote human beings seems to be on the decline. In a study of *creature* in the LOB and Brown corpora, Persson (1992: 105) found a total of 31 instances of the term used to denote

[37] The remaining 23 occurrences are non-gender-specific.

humans, which, considering the size of the two corpora (one million words each), must be considered a small number of tokens. Of these 31 instances, there were nearly twice as many occurrences of *creature* used to denote men specifically as were used to refer to women: eleven and six instances respectively. Although no conclusions can be drawn on the basis of so few examples, Persson's findings indicate that *creature* is no longer used predominantly with female referents in Present-day English.

If *creature* has tended to be used with female reference in historical material, the opposite seems to be true for *person*, another term which is, in theory, gender-neutral. *Person* originally denoted people of distinction, especially when acting in a certain capacity (cf. *personage*), but later came to be used for any individual human being, regardless of age and gender, as opposed to animals and things (*OED*, s.v. *person*, 1, 2 a–c, 12 July 2006). By the beginning of the eighteenth century, *person* acquired a pejorative and contemptuous note and could be used to signify low status or little worth (*OED*, s.v. *person*, 2 d, 12 July 2006).

In her material, Wallin-Ashcroft found 105 instances of *person* with male reference, compared to only half that, 56, when the term denoted a woman (2000: 56). Norberg (2002: 101) found fewer examples of the term in her material, but there, too, the instances with male referents (five) outnumber those with female referents (three). Wallin-Ashcroft discusses this gender bias in her thesis, speculating that it is linked to the fact that *person* is used in opposition to animals and things, and thus contains prototypical values such as having a soul, intelligence and a role in society; in eighteenth-century England, these values were more prototypically 'male' than 'female' (2000: 68–69).[38]

Similar to Wallin-Ashcroft's findings, my speech-related material also displays a gender bias with regard to the use of *person*. However, this bias was found to be connected with the region in which the texts were produced: in the BrE speech-related material, 61 occurrences of *person* had male reference compared to only one with female reference, thus being in line with the previous research carried out by Wallin-Ashcroft and Norberg. In the corresponding AmE material, however, the opposite trend was found. In these texts, there were only four instances of *person* with clearly male reference, compared to 120 instances denoting women (note that unspecified cases, where the term is or might be used to encompass people of both sexes, have not been counted here; see further section 4.2.3). Even when these figures have been normalised to reflect instances per 10,000 words, the

[38] As a point of interest it can be noted in connection with this that Parliament declared in the mid-nineteenth century that the term *person* only applied to men, a distinction that held fast until 1929. The cause for this declaration was that women suffragists claimed that they had the right to enter into previously male-dominated professions such as medicine and law, since the statutes regulating eligibility to these occupations used the gender-neutral *person*, which arguably included women as well (Wallin-Ashcroft 2000: 68).

difference between the BrE and AmE material is noticeable (see Table 3.2). The figures presented in Table 3.2 are statistically significant (χ^2: 164.6, df: 1, $p<0.01$).

Table 3.2. The occurrence of *person* in the speech-related material, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	M	**F**
BrE	4.5 (61)	0.1 (1)
AmE	0.3 (4)	9.9 (120)

The reason behind this preponderance of *person* with female reference in the AmE speech-related material is probably that *person* was often used to denote the accused, the majority of which were women in the AmE trials. The non-speech-related material contains no examples of *person* being used with female-only reference and three instances where it is used with distinctly male reference. This is discussed further in section 5.4.3.

In Present-day English, *person* has become used increasingly in occupational terms in a bid to make them gender-neutral and thus more applicable to all practitioners of the profession (e.g. *chairperson*, *spokesperson*). However, since, as has been pointed out by, for instance, Caldas-Coulthard (1995: 231), the new terms are used predominantly with female referents, it might be that *person* is losing its male gender bias in favour of a female one.

The last epicene term which I will bring up in this section is *child*. The *OED* gives the earliest meaning of the word as that of an unborn or newly-born infant, a meaning which was later extended to covering the age span up until puberty (*OED*, s.v. *child*, 12 July 2006). With regard to gender, the *OED* points out that in certain dialects *child* has been applied especially to female infants, as in the following quote from Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*:

> Shepherd: [...] Mercy on's, a barn: a very pretty barn! A boy, or a **child**, I wonder? (Act III, Scene iii, bold type added by me)

The *OED* further states that "[i]t has been pointed out that *child* or *my child* is by parents used more frequently (and longer) of, and to, a girl than a boy. No instances are found in Shakespeare of 'my child' being used of or to a son, but frequently of or to a daughter" (*OED*, s.v. *child* 8 b, 12 July 2006). From this, there thus seems to be a certain gender bias inherent in the term, predisposing it to occur predominantly with female referents.

Wallin-Ashcroft and Norberg both find that *child* is used more with female referents than with males in their material, in keeping with the trends noted by the *OED*: out of the 56 uses of the term with gender-specific referents in Wallin-Ashcroft's material, 54 are used with female reference, and only two with males (2000: 60). In the Shakespeare plays studied by Norberg, *child* occurs equally often with referents of either gender, but since in these plays women are, overall, referred to much more seldom than are men, Norberg concludes that there is still a gender bias in the material as regards this term (2002: 107). As with *creature* above, Wallin-Ashcroft explains this gender bias with the prototypical semantic properties for *child* co-occurring to some extent with Early Modern notions of what was prototypical female attributes, such as diminutive stature, dependency and ignorance; attributes which would evoke tenderness and condescension in others (2000: 65–66). A female could thus (and perhaps can still, if the passage from *OED* quoted above remains valid) retain childlike qualities, and hence be referred to as a *child* without insult necessarily being implied, for a longer time than could a male (Norberg 2002: 107–108). A parallel development, where the use of a gender-related term is expanded along the age parameter can be seen in the use of *girl* to denote adult women, as described in section 3.3.2 above.

In the speech-related material used for the present study, *child*, like *person* above, shows a gender bias which varies between the two regions studied. Table 3.3 shows the distribution of *child* across referent gender and geographical origin. The numbers given in Table 3.3 are statistically significant (χ^2: 84.21, df: 1, $p<0.01$).

Table 3.3. The occurrence of *child* in the speech-related material, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	M	**F**
BrE	5.8 (78)	1.3 (17)
AmE	0.5 (6)	5.0 (61)

In the BrE material, *child* is used predominantly with male reference, with 5.8 instances per 10,000 words as compared to only 1.3 with female reference. The AmE material, on the other hand, shows the opposite trend, with 0.5 instances per 10,000 words of *child* being used to denote males, and 5.0 instances where a female is denoted. The non-speech-related material only contains four instances (two with male reference and two with female) all told, which precludes any conclusions to be drawn from their distribution.

I will return to the distribution of *child* across the genders in the speech-related material in section 5.3.3.

3.4 Summary and Concluding Remarks

This chapter has aimed at providing a definition of gender-related terms as a concept, as well as introducing, defining and exemplifying the semantic categories which will form the starting point for much of the subsequent analysis (see Chapters 4 and 5). The eight gender term categories which I will investigate in the present study are *central terms*, *relational terms*, *epicene terms*, *occupational terms*, *title terms*, *depreciative terms*, *appreciative terms* and *religious*, *social and political terms* (*RSP terms*).

In addition, this chapter has aimed at showing that the semantics of gender-related terms are not stable over time, but are subject to change. Moreover, the connotations and implications of these words are closely linked to the social status of the groups of people they denote, so that a change in the latter will lead the former to adapt as well. Generally speaking, the trend within English is for terms denoting women to be 'marked' for gender, and thus inapplicable to men, whereas the male terms can be used to encompass people of both sexes. Using a female term to denote a man is often considered an insult. This is, of course, coupled with the low status which women have traditionally had in Western society (cf. Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 15; Romaine 1999: 7, 12); men have not wanted to be associated with women and have seen such associations as degrading. Women's low status has also led to a semantic pejoration of female terms in general, so that even terms which were once used to denote respect and reverence for the referent (e.g. *lady*, *mistress*) have either been pejorised or acquired new, often sexual, connotations.

Notions of what is prototypically male and female respectively also influence the use of theoretically gender-neutral, or epicene, terms, as has been shown to be the case with *creature*, *person* and *child*, which have all shown a gender bias in historical material. Wallin-Ashcroft has suggested that since, according to the male-centred worldview prevalent in Early Modern times, women possessed fewer of the qualities that separated adult humans from children and animals (for instance rationality and independence), they were more often referred to with terms such as *creature* and *child*. *Person*, on the other hand, which denotes humans as opposed to animals and things, more readily occurs with men than with women, for the same reason.

In view of this, the study of gender-related terms in historical material, the semantic fields to which they belong, and the contexts in which they occur can reveal new facets of the society in which the text studied were produced, at least as regards the roles played by and expectations on

members of both sexes. Moreover, such a study offers insights into how far the semantic pejoration of certain words had gone at the time period studied, thus allowing us to trace the history of gender-related terms and revealing changes in the meaning of a term.

Chapter 4. An Overall View of the Data

4.1 Introductory Comments

As stated in section 1.1 above, the analysis will be divided into two main parts. The first of these will focus on the gender-related terms as lexical items (Chapter 5), whereas the second will deal with adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with these terms (Chapter 6). In these two chapters, I will give a detailed analysis of the use of gender-related terms on the one hand, and the use of adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with them on the other, in relation to certain linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (such as gender term category, region of origin and referent gender). However, before I move on to this in-depth analysis, in the present chapter, I will survey the data by looking at the overall distribution of the gender-related terms as well as of the adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with these terms.

As discussed in Chapter 3, the broad definition of gender-related terms used for the purpose of this study (namely any word used to refer to men and/or women, in the singular or in the plural) entails that a great number of words can be defined as gender-related terms. In order to keep the data at a manageable level, eight semantic categories were selected as being especially pertinent to the hypotheses tested in the study (for a discussion of these hypotheses, see section 1.1):

- central terms (e.g. *man*, *woman*),
- relational terms (e.g. *husband*, *wife*),
- epicene terms (e.g. *child*, *person*),
- occupational terms (e.g. *maid*, *weaver*),
- title terms (e.g. *gentleman*, *lady*),
- depreciative terms (e.g. *rogue*, *witch*),
- appreciative terms (e.g. *saint*, *sweetheart*) and
- religious, social and political terms (e.g. *Jacobite*, *Protestant*).

These categories were described and exemplified further in section 3.2 above. Lists of all the terms in each category are given in Appendix I.

Before moving on to the overall distribution of gender-related terms in the material, I will briefly discuss my use of the concepts *type* and *token*. In my study, the term *type* is used to refer to the lexical items present in the

material, whereas *token* refers to the individual occurrences of these lexical items. Thus, if a text only repeated the same lengthy sentence over and over, it would contain a low number of *types*, but each type would manifest a large number of *tokens*.

In a study such as the present one, which investigates the words that were used to denote people in England and New England, calculating the type/token ratio of a given data set can yield valuable clues about what information was regarded as important. As stated by Biber (1988: 104), a high type/token ratio indicates that the text has a high information density. Moreover, it also marks

> [...] very precise lexical choice resulting in an exact presentation of informational content. A high type/token ratio results from the use of many different lexical items in a text, and this more varied vocabulary reflects extensive use of words that have very specific meanings. (Biber 1988: 104)

In other words, if the material included in this study were to show a high type/token ratio for any gender term category, this would indicate a desire on the part of the language producers to refer to other people with a high level of specificity. This in turn might indicate that making such distinctions was important in England and New England at this time, for social and/or political reasons.

It might be expected that the type/token ratio will differ between the speech-related and the non-speech-related material. When producing non-speech-related texts, authors have the advantage of being able to premeditate their statements, and even to alter their wording at a later stage in the writing process. This gives them further opportunity to use a high number of types, in order to avoid unnecessary repetition, but also to provide the reader with additional information (see further Salmon 1967; Chafe and Danielewicz 1987). For speakers, on the other hand, there are fewer opportunities for premeditation: they must produce their utterances fairly speedily, and an utterance, once made, cannot be altered. Speech-related material, although not speech per se, could still be affected by the immediacy of the spoken medium, and consequently display less varied language. As a result, it can be expected that, even if one takes possible scribal interference into account, speech-related material will evince a lower type/token ratio than non-speech-related texts (see further Chafe and Danielewicz 1987: 87–91); I hypothesise that this will be the case in my data.

The remainder of the chapter will be organised as follows. In section 4.2, I discuss the distribution of gender-related terms according to three extralinguistic parameters: text category (4.2.1), regional variation (4.2.2) and referent gender (4.2.3). In section 4.3, I turn to the overall distribution of the adjectives and demonstratives. Section 4.4 gives a brief summary of the chapter.

4.2 The Overall Distribution of Gender-Related Terms

4.2.1 Distribution across Text Category

In this section I will describe how the gender-related terms are distributed across the text categories, using the above-mentioned gender term categories (central terms, relational terms, etc.) as a starting point. At this point in the analysis, I will not make any distinction between the BrE and AmE material, nor will I analyse the difference between gender-related terms with male and female reference. As stated in section 2.2.1, in order to compensate for the difference in size between the text categories, all figures in the subsequent tables have been normalised to reflect instances per 10,000 words, with raw figures given within parentheses. Note that when percentages are given in tables, they have been calculated on the basis of the sum total of all the gender-related terms present in the data set and gender term category under discussion.

It must be borne in mind throughout this discussion that the number and nature of gender-related terms in any text will, to a great extent, be a result of the topics of the text in question. Hence, the differences found in the distribution of gender-related terms across the text categories might be influenced by the topics, a factor difficult to control with any systematicity. The topics of the texts under discussion will be commented on only where deemed relevant in the analysis.

The overall distribution of gender-related terms is given in Tables 4.1 (types) and 4.3 (tokens). Note that in the total figures for the types (the column furthest to the right in Table 4.1), lexical items which can belong to more than one gender term category have been counted as separate types, once for each semantic category in which they occur in the material. By way of illustration, the lexical item *man* occurs both as a central term and as an occupational term (signifying servant) in the material, and has thus been counted twice in the overall total. However, the same type when occurring in different text categories (for instance in both depositions and examinations) has only been counted once when calculating the total, which is why the column totals in tables giving type figures need not equal the sum of types for the different text categories. Thus, the number of central term types in Table 4.1 is seven for depositions, seven for examinations and 12 for journals, but since the same types occur in more than one of these text categories, the total number of types in the material as a whole amounts to 13. In Table 4.1 and subsequent tables, the names of the gender term categories have been abbreviated as follows: *Cent* for central terms, *Rel* for

relational terms, *Epic* for epicene terms, *Occup* for occupational terms, *Titles* for title terms, *Depr* for depreciative terms, *Appr* for appreciative terms and *RSP* for religious, social and political terms.

Table 4.1. Types: distribution across text and gender term categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	**Rel**	**Epic**	**Occup**	**Titles**	**Depr**	**Appr**	**RSP**	**Total**
Depo	0.6 (7)	1.7 (21)	1.7 (21)	8.3 (101)	2.6 (32)	2.2 (27)	0.1 (1)	1.3 (16)	**18.6 (226)**
Exam	0.5 (7)	1.2 (16)	1.8 (24)	5.9 (80)	2.2 (29)	1.5 (20)	0.1 (1)	1.4 (19)	**14.5 (196)**
Jour	4.4 (12)	5.8 (16)	8.0 (22)	29.0 (80)	13.1 (36)	4.7 (13)	0.4 (1)	9.1 (25)	**74.3 (205)**
Total	**0.5 (13)**	**1.0 (28)**	**1.3 (38)**	**6.6 (186)**	**1.7 (48)**	**1.6 (46)**	**0.1 (3)**	**1.4 (40)**	**14.2 (403)**

The type data in Table 4.1 shows an overall higher number of types per 10,000 words in the journals as compared to the other text categories, which might indicate a more varied vocabulary. This is in line with the general tendency discussed in section 4.1 that the premeditation that is possible when producing a non-speech-related text generally leads to more variation in lexis. I will return to the question of type/token ratio below.

The gender term category with the highest number of types is, in all three text categories, the occupational terms. The occupational terms will be examined in more detail in sections 5.2.4, 5.3.4 and 5.4.4 below. It is also interesting to note the very low number of appreciative term types in the material: in the material as a whole, there are only three types, with one type each in the deposition, examination and journal material.

If one considers the distribution of the types in percentages across gender term categories in each of the material sets (see Table 4.2, p. 77), one finds that the distribution is rather similar among the text categories. The journal texts have a slightly higher percentage of RSP terms and titles, and a lower percentage of depreciative terms than do the two speech-related text categories, and there is a higher percentage of occupational terms in the depositions than in examinations and journals. Apart from these exceptions (which will be discussed further in sections 5.2.4, 5.2.5, 5.2.6 and 5.2.8), however, the distribution of gender-related terms across gender term category is similar among the three text categories.

Table 4.2. Types: distribution across text and gender term categories, percentages. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	Rel	Epic	Occup	Titles	Depr	Appr	RSP	Total
Depo	3% (7)	9% (21)	9% (21)	45% (101)	14% (32)	12% (27)	0% (1)	7% (16)	**100% (226)**
Exam	4% (7)	8% (16)	12% (24)	41% (80)	15% (29)	10% (20)	1% (1)	10% (19)	**100% (197)**
Jour	6% (12)	8% (16)	11% (22)	39% (80)	18% (36)	6% (13)	0% (1)	12% (25)	**100% (205)**
Total	**3% (13)**	**7% (28)**	**9% (38)**	**46% (186)**	**12% (48)**	**11% (46)**	**1% (3)**	**10% (40)**	**100% (403)**

I will now move on to considering the distribution of gender term tokens across text category. Table 4.3 gives the normalised distribution of tokens across text category and gender term categories, whereas Table 4.4 shows in percentages how the gender-related terms are distributed across each text category.

Table 4.3. Tokens: distribution across text and gender term categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	Rel	Epic	Occup	Titles	Depr	Appr	RSP	Total
Depo	29.7 (361)	64.3 (781)	37.0 (449)	55.3 (671)	156.9 (1,905)	23.5 (285)	0.2 (2)	4.3 (52)	**371.2 (4,506)**
Exam	38.9 (525)	28.2 (380)	33.0 (445)	66.0 (890)	241.2 (3,251)	22.3 (301)	0.4 (5)	5.0 (67)	**435.0 (5,864)**
Jour	27.9 (77)	29.4 (81)	32.6 (90)	85.2 (235)	75.4 (208)	5.1 (14)	1.1 (3)	25.4 (70)	**282.1 (778)**
Total	**33.9 (963)**	**43.8 (1,242)**	**34.7 (984)**	**63.3 (1,796)**	**189.0 (5,364)**	**21.1 (600)**	**0.4 (10)**	**6.7 (189)**	**392.9 (11,148)**

Table 4.4. Tokens: distribution across text and gender term categories, percentages. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	Rel	Epic	Occup	Titles	Depr	Appr	RSP	Total
Depo	8% (361)	17% (781)	10% (449)	15% (671)	42% (1,905)	6% (285)	0% (2)	1% (52)	**100% (4,506)**
Exam	9% (525)	6% (380)	8% (445)	15% (889)	55% (3,251)	5% (302)	0% (5)	1% (68)	**100% (5,865)**
Jour	10% (77)	10% (81)	12% (90)	30% (235)	27% (208)	2% (14)	0% (3)	9% (70)	**100% (778)**
Total	**9% (963)**	**11% (1,242)**	**9% (984)**	**16% (1,796)**	**48% (5,364)**	**5% (600)**	**0% (10)**	**2% (189)**	**100% (11,148)**

If one begins by comparing the overall number of gender term tokens in the three sets of material – depositions, examinations and journals – one finds that the examinations contain considerably more tokens per 10,000 words

(435.0) than do depositions (371.2) and journals (282.1) (see Table 4.3). This is to a large extent due to the title terms being more numerous in the examination material than in the other two text categories. I will return to the use of title terms below, and in sections 5.2.5, 5.3.5 and 5.4.5.

The data given in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 also reveals that the number of tokens per 10,000 words in the relational gender term category is considerably higher in the depositions than in either the examinations or the journals. One possible reason for this could be a perceived need on the part of the people involved in recording the deposition (either the speaker or the scribe) to explain how the people mentioned in the text are related to one another. This is explored further in section 5.2.2.

Furthermore, Table 4.3 reveals that title terms occur much more frequently in the speech-related material as compared to the journals; whereas the journals contain 75.4 tokens per 10,000 words, the corresponding figures for depositions and examinations are 156.9 and 241.2 respectively. Considering the nature of the gender term category, this is not surprising: since title terms include terms of address, which would tend to occur in situations where people address each other directly, a set of non-speech-related texts such as the journals, where indirect speech would be the norm, would be expected to contain relatively few title terms. There is further support for this in that the examination material (which consists mainly of direct speech) contains more title term tokens per 10,000 words than the depositions do. I return to this in section 5.2.5.

Table 4.3 further shows that the material contains very few appreciative terms, as regards tokens as well as types (see further Table 4.1 above). I hypothesise that this is due to the nature of the legal proceedings, in the case of the speech-related material, and, in the case of the journals, the subject matter of the texts (see further section 5.2.7).

Before moving on to considering the distribution of gender-related terms across the texts from England and New England respectively, I will briefly address the issue of type/token ratio in the material. In Table 4.5 (p. 79), the type and token data presented in Tables 4.1 and 4.3 is collated and the type/token ratio for each gender term category given. The type/token ratio figures have been given with two decimal points rather than, as has been the case in previous tables, one, since the numbers are so small that further reduction of decimal points obscures the data.

Table 4.5 Type/token ratios for each text category according to gender term category. Raw type and token figures given in parentheses.

	Cent	**Rel**	**Epic**	**Occup**	**Titles**	**Depr**	**Appr**	**RSP**	**Total**
Depo	0.02 (7/361)	0.03 (21/781)	0.05 (21/449)	0.15 (101/671)	0.02 (32/1,905)	0.09 (27/285)	0.50 (1/2)	0.31 (16/52)	**0.05 (226/4,506)**
Exam	0.01 (7/525)	0.04 (16/380)	0.05 (24/445)	0.09 (80/890)	0.01 (29/3,251)	0.07 (20/301)	0.20 (1/5)	0.28 (19/67)	**0.03 (196/5,864)**
Jour	0.16 (12/77)	0.20 (16/81)	0.24 (22/90)	0.34 (80/235)	0.17 (36/208)	0.93 (13/14)	0.33 (1/3)	0.36 (25/70)	**0.26 (205/778)**
Total	**0.01 (13/ 963)**	**0.02 (28/ 1,242)**	**0.04 (38/ 984)**	**0.10 (186/ 1,796)**	**0.01 (48/ 5,364)**	**0.08 (46/ 600)**	**0.30 (3/ 10)**	**0.21 (40/ 189)**	**0.04 (403/ 11,148)**

As stated in section 4.1, one can expect the non-speech-related material to contain higher type/token ratios overall as compared to the speech-related texts, since the non-immediacy of the written medium affords the language producers further opportunity to vary their vocabulary and hence be more specific in their descriptions of people. The data displayed in Table 4.5 shows that this is indeed the case in the material used for the present study: the journals have an overall type/token ratio of 0.26, compared to 0.05 and 0.03 in the depositions and examinations respectively.

As mentioned in 4.1, a high type/token ratio indicates a desire on the part of the language producer to differentiate between semantically-related terms in order to achieve a higher degree of specificity. Thus, given the socio-historical research carried out for the period around the year 1700, which has indicated that factors such as occupation, religious affiliation and political opinions were important in assigning an individual a place in the social hierarchy (cf. Kent 1999: 27; Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg 2003: 136–137; Walker 2005: 28), one would expect to find a high type/token ratio in the occupational and RSP gender term categories. As can be seen from Table 4.5, these gender term categories do display higher type/token ratios than, for instance, epicene or central terms, thus supporting this hypothesis.

The appreciative terms also show high type/token ratios, but considering the very low number of both types and tokens in this category, no conclusions can be drawn from this fact.

4.2.2 Distribution across Region of Origin

In this section, I will consider the possible impact that regional variation might have on the overall data, presented in section 4.2.1 above. The focus will be on the speech-related material in the depositions and examinations, since dividing the journals according to place of origin will render the

samples too small for any useful investigation (for a discussion of the journal material, see section 2.2.5 above).

The overall distribution of the gender term types in the speech-related material is given in Table 4.6, with percentage figures stating how these types are distributed across each text category given in Table 4.7 (p. 80).[39] In these and subsequent tables in the analysis, the abbreviations Depo and Exam are used for depositions and examinations respectively, prefixed with Br- or Am- according to whether the material represents BrE or AmE.

Table 4.6. Types: distribution across the speech-related text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Cent	**Rel**	**Epic**	**Occup**	**Titles**	**Depr**	**Appr**	**RSP**	**Total**
BrDepo	1.4 (5)	3.3 (12)	3.5 (13)	24.3 (89)	8.2 (30)	6.0 (22)	0.0 (0)	3.0 (11)	**49.6 (182)**
BrExam	0.7 (7)	1.1 (11)	2.0 (20)	7.6 (75)	2.6 (26)	1.4 (14)	0.1 (1)	1.5 (15)	**17.1 (168)**
AmDepo	0.8 (7)	2.2 (19)	1.5 (13)	3.4 (29)	1.4 (12)	1.1 (9)	0.1 (1)	0.6 (5)	**11.2 (95)**
AmExam	1.4 (5)	3.6 (13)	3.0 (11)	4.4 (16)	3.6 (13)	2.2 (8)	0.3 (1)	1.4 (5)	**19.7 (72)**
Total	**0.3 (7)**	**0.9 (23)**	**1.3 (33)**	**5.4 (138)**	**1.5 (38)**	**1.5 (38)**	**0.1 (2)**	**1.0 (25)**	**11.9 (305)**

As illustrated by Table 4.6, the text category with the highest normalised type count is the BrE depositions with 49.6 types per 10,000 words. This is well over twice as many types per 10,000 words as compared to the AmE and BrE examinations (at 19.7 and 17.1 types per 10,000 words), and more than four times as many as the AmE depositions contains (11.2 types per 10,000 words). The gender term category which contributes most to this is the occupational terms, which make up almost half (49%) of the types in the BrE depositions (see Table 4.7, p. 80). As will be discussed in further detail in section 5.3.4 below, the BrE material in general contains a greater variety of occupational terms than its AmE counterpart, possibly due to a higher level of work specialisation in England at the time investigated. Table 4.7 further shows that the occupational terms make up a large portion of the total gender term types in the BrE examinations as well (44%). It should be pointed out that the occupational term types make up a sizeable part of the total gender term types in the AmE text categories as well (31% in the AmE depositions and 22% in the AmE examinations), but the percentage of

[39] Note that since the same type can occur in text categories representative of different regions, the type totals in Table 4.6 need not equal the sum of the types occurring in each gender term category (see further section 4.2.1 above).

occupational terms is considerably higher in the BrE material (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7. Types: distribution across the speech-related text categories, percentages. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	**Rel**	**Epic**	**Occup**	**Titles**	**Depr**	**Appr**	**RSP**	**Total**
BrDepo	3% (5)	7% (12)	7% (13)	49% (89)	16% (30)	12% (22)	0% (0)	6% (11)	**100% (182)**
BrExam	4% (7)	7% (11)	12% (20)	44% (74)	15% (26)	8% (14)	1% (1)	9% (15)	**100% (168)**
AmDepo	7% (7)	20% (19)	14% (13)	31% (29)	13% (12)	9% (9)	1% (1)	5% (5)	**100% (95)**
AmExam	7% (5)	18% (13)	15% (11)	22% (16)	18% (13)	11% (8)	1% (1)	7% (5)	**100% (72)**
Total	**2% (7)**	**8% (23)**	**11% (33)**	**45% (138)**	**12% (38)**	**12% (37)**	**1% (2)**	**8% (25)**	**100% (305)**

Tables 4.8 and 4.9 give the overall distribution for the gender term tokens across the speech-related categories. In Table 4.8 the normalised figures are given, whereas Table 4.9 (p. 82) shows the distribution in percentages across each text category.

Table 4.8. Tokens: distribution across the speech-related text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	**Rel**	**Epic**	**Occup**	**Titles**	**Depr**	**Appr**	**RSP**	**Total**
BrDepo	31.3 (115)	30.5 (112)	48.5 (178)	120.2 (441)	372.8 (1,368)	26.4 (97)	0.0 (0)	9.3 (34)	**639.0 (2,345)**
BrExam	29.2 (287)	17.4 (171)	19.1 (188)	81.5 (800)	294.0 (2,886)	18.3 (180)	0.3 (3)	6.1 (60)	**465.8 (4,573)**
AmDepo	29.0 (246)	79.0 (669)	36.7 (311)	27.2 (230)	63.4 (537)	22.2 (188)	0.2 (2)	2.1 (18)	**259.9 (2,201)**
AmExam	65.0 (238)	57.1 (209)	70.2 (257)	24.6 (90)	99.7 (365)	33.0 (121)	0.5 (2)	2.2 (8)	**354.2 (1,297)**
Total	**34.6 (886)**	**45.3 (1,161)**	**36.5 (934)**	**60.9 (1,560)**	**201.3 (5,156)**	**22.9 (586)**	**0.3 (7)**	**4.7 (120)**	**406.4 (10,410)**

Table 4.8 shows several interesting trends as regards the distribution of gender term tokens across the BrE and AmE text categories. First, the relational tokens are more numerous in the AmE texts, where the depositions and examination materials contain 79.0 and 57.1 tokens per 10,000 words respectively, which is considerably more than their BrE counterparts (the corresponding figures are 30.5 for BrDepo and 17.4 for BrExam). One

possible reason for this preponderance of relational terms in the AmE material is the setting of the Salem witch trials, from which the material is gathered. The witch trials took place within a limited geographical area, where one may assume that the majority of participants were familiar with each other, or had at least heard of each other. In such settings, it is not unlikely that the participants of the trial were identified to a large extent by their relationships to one another, for instance as wives, sons, sisters or grandfathers. I will return to this in section 5.3.2.

Secondly, and not surprisingly considering the type distribution (see above), there are considerably more occupational term tokens in the BrE material than in the AmE text categories. The BrE deposition material contains a total of 120.2 occupational term tokens per 10,000 words, whereas its AmE counterpart contains a mere 27.2. The difference between the sets of examination material from the two regions is not as large, but nonetheless striking at 81.5 tokens per 10,000 words in the BrE examinations and 24.6 in the AmExam category. This will be discussed further in section 5.3.4.

As with the occupational terms, titles and RSP terms also tend to cluster around the BrE material. This is in all likelihood due to the difference in social structure between England and the New England colonies, which differed significantly in terms both of the presence (or non-presence) of a titled aristocracy, and religious, national and ethnic diversity. This will be discussed further in sections 5.3.5 (titles) and 5.3.7 (RSP terms) respectively.

Table 4.9 gives the distribution of gender term tokens in the speech-related material in each of the four sets of the material.

Table 4.9. Tokens: distribution across the speech-related text categories, percentages. Raw figures given within parentheses.

	Cent	**Rel**	**Epic**	**Occup**	**Titles**	**Depr**	**Appr**	**RSP**	**Total**
BrDepo	5% (115)	5% (112)	8% (178)	19% (441)	58% (1,368)	4% (97)	0% (0)	1% (34)	**100% (2,345)**
BrExam	6% (287)	4% (171)	4% (188)	17% (799)	63% (2,886)	4% (180)	0% (3)	1% (60)	**100% (4,574)**
AmDepo	11% (246)	30% (669)	14% (311)	10% (230)	24% (537)	9% (188)	0% (2)	1% (18)	**100% (2,201)**
AmExam	18% (238)	16% (209)	20% (257)	7% (90)	28% (365)	9% (121)	0% (2)	1% (8)	**100% (1,297)**
Total	**9% (886)**	**11% (1,161)**	**9% (934)**	**1% (156)**	**50% (5,156)**	**6% (586)**	**0% (7)**	**1% (120)**	**100% (10,410)**

If one considers the data presented in Table 4.9, one notices certain differences between the BrE and AmE material. Apart from the differences already noted regarding the relational and occupational terms, the BrE

material contains a considerable number of title terms, which make up more than half the gender-related terms in both the depositions (58%) and the examinations (63%). The corresponding figures for the AmE material are considerably lower, with titles making up 24% of the gender-related terms in the AmE depositions, and 28% in the examinations from that region. As was mentioned above, this is possibly due to the difference in social structure between England and the New England colonies, and, consequently, to the difference in social status of the people participating in the trials (see further section 5.3.5).

In sum, the data displayed in Tables 4.6–4.9 indicates that in several gender term categories, the geographical variable seems to influence the distribution of gender-related terms. I will return to this and provide further analysis in section 5.3 below.

4.2.3 Distribution across Referent Gender

In this section, I will add yet another parameter to my analysis, namely the gender of the referent. In other words, I will investigate whether the use of gender-related terms differs according to whether the term refers to a man, a woman, or to an individual, whose gender is not specified in the material. The following codes were used to code each instance of a gender-related term in the database:

- *M* if the referent is male
- *F* if the referent is female
- *FM* if the term refers to people of both sexes (*unspecified* use)

Instances where the gender of the referent could not be established beyond reasonable doubt were omitted from this part of the investigation.

At this point, a comment is in order on how the gender-related terms have been treated as regards the distribution of *types* across the gender categories, since some terms can occur with either male (M), female (F), or unspecified referents (FM). In such cases, the type in question has been included in *all* the relevant gender categories. To exemplify, since the occupational term *servant* occurs in the material with both male and female referents and with plural reference, it has been entered as a type in both the *M*-category (when the referent is male), in the *F*-category (when the referent is female) and in the *FM*-category (for instances in the plural). The same type is thus counted three times, once for each gender category. For this reason, the total number of types in a text, as presented in previous sections (e.g. Table 4.1), need not equal the sum total of the types with male, female, or unspecified referents in this section; the latter number can exceed the former.

In this section I will present an overview of the data in which I discuss the overall distribution of terms in the material according to the gender of the referent. Further analysis of the impact of referent gender on the use of gender-related terms, along with a detailed look at the different gender term categories, will be given in section 5.4.

Table 4.10 gives an overview of the gender-related term types in the speech-related and non-speech-related material, according to referent gender. As in section 4.2.2, I have not separated the journal texts according to their geographical origin, but chosen to keep all the journal material together in one category. At this initial stage of the analysis I thus distinguish between five text categories: BrDepo, BrExam, AmDepo, AmExam and Journals.

Table 4.10. Types: the distribution of gender-related terms, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given in parentheses.

	M	**F**	**FM**	**Total**
BrDepo	38.7 (142)	10.9 (40)	3.8 (14)	**49.3 (181)**
BrExam	13.2 (130)	3.3 (32)	2.4 (24)	**16.6 (163)**
AmDepo	7.7 (65)	4.0 (34)	1.1 (9)	**10.9 (92)**
AmExam	10.1 (37)	8.5 (31)	3.0 (11)	**18.6 (68)**
Journals	55.1 (152)	12.0 (33)	11.2 (31)	**73.3 (202)**
Total	**10.9 (309)**	**3.0 (84)**	**2.0 (56)**	**13.7 (388)**

The figures given in Table 4.10 are statistically significant (χ^2: 35.50, df: 8, $p<0.01$). As Table 4.10 shows, in all five text categories, there are more gender term types with male referents than with female ones, whereas the terms with FM referents are consistently the least frequent. This is in accordance with the first hypothesis presented in section 1.1, which predicted that gender-related terms with male reference would be more varied than their female counterparts. The difference between terms with male and female reference is most pronounced in the journals, with 55.1 instances of male gender-related terms per 10,000 words, and a mere 12.0 instances of female terms. Overall, very few women figure in the journal texts, partly due to the fact that some of the texts deal with areas such as warfare and travelling to distant lands, activities which were normally only undertaken by men in the Early Modern period.

In the speech-related material, the BrE texts evince a greater difference between terms with male and female reference than do the AmE texts: the BrE depositions have 38.7 instances of male gender-related terms per 10,000 words compared to 10.9 instances of gender-related terms with female reference. The corresponding figures for the BrE examinations are 13.2 and 3.3 respectively. In contrast, the AmE material shows less of a difference as regards referent gender. The AmE depositions contain 7.7 male and 4.0 female gender-related terms per 10,000 words, whereas the AmE examinations contain 10.1 male and 8.5 gender-related terms per 10,000 words.

Further aspects of the distribution of gender-related terms across referent gender and geographical origin can be seen if one compares the type figures presented in Table 4.10 with token figures (Table 4.11). The figures presented in Table 4.11 are statistically significant (χ^2: 2,406, df: 8, $p<0.01$).

Table 4.11. Tokens: the distribution of gender-related terms, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures given in parentheses.

	M	**F**	**FM**	**Total**
BrDepo	450.2 (1,652)	169.5 (622)	14.7 (54)	**634.4 (2,328)**
BrExam	404.1 (3,967)	46.0 (452)	10.7 (105)	**460.8 (4,524)**
AmDepo	94.6 (801)	142.0 (1,203)	10.7 (91)	**247.4 (2,095)**
AmExam	124.5 (456)	171.0 (626)	35.8 (131)	**331.3 (1,213)**
Journals	201.6 (556)	49.0 (135)	28.6 (79)	**279.2 (770)**
Total	**261.9 (7,432)**	**107.1 (3,038)**	**16.2 (460)**	**385.2 (10,930)**

As was the case with the gender term types, the predominance of male terms in the speech-related BrE material and the journals carries over into the tokens as well. As an example, the BrE examinations contain 404.1 instances per 10,000 words of tokens with male referents, whereas the corresponding figure for female referents is decidedly lower, at 46.0.

This dominance of male term tokens is not found in the AmE material: on the contrary, the gender term tokens in these text categories have female reference more often than male reference, despite the preponderance of male referents for the different term types in these texts (Table 4.10). This pattern indicates that although men were mentioned with more specificity than women in the speech-related AmE texts, women were mentioned more frequently. Given the nature of the AmE speech-related material, this finding

is as could be expected; the majority of those accused in the Salem witch trials were women, and since the accused will naturally be referred to with great frequency in any trial situation, this predominance of women can be expected to lead to many gender-related terms with female reference in this part of the material.

With the majority of gender term tokens denoting female referents, the question arises as to why the majority of gender-related term types occurring in the AmE speech-related material have male reference. I suggest that this preponderance of male term types can be in part explained by the occupational terms which occur in the material. As was mentioned in section 1.1, social historical research (cf. Shoemaker 1998: 148) has indicated that it was more common for men to be referred to by their occupational title than women; consequently, one can expect the occupational terms which occur in the material to refer predominantly to men, which, as a closer inspection of the material will reveal (see section 5.4.4), is also the case.

To conclude, the first hypothesis presented in Chapter 1, that the male gender-related terms would outnumber the female as regards both types and tokens, could only be partly verified. As regards types, there are more terms with male reference than female in both the BrE and AmE material, which supports the hypothesis. In the AmE speech-related material, however, there are more tokens with female reference than with male reference, probably due to the majority of the participants (witnesses and defendants) in the Salem witch trials being women.

4.3 Adjectives and Demonstratives: An Overall View

4.3.1 Introductory Remarks

Having looked at the overall distribution of gender-related terms in the previous section (4.2), I now turn to the distribution of adjectives and demonstratives occurring in connection with the gender-related terms.

As stated in section 1.1 above, two of the hypotheses addressed in the current study concern the use of adjectival modification and complementation of gender-related terms. The first of these hypotheses suggests, on the basis of previous research (cf. Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005; Bäcklund 2006), that the quality which the adjective denotes is to some extent linked to referent gender. The second hypothesis predicts that there will be a link between referent gender and the positive or negative quality conveyed by the adjective onto the referent. I will return to these hypotheses in Chapter 6, where the adjectival data presented in this section will be limited to include only adjectives from two semantic domains, namely adjectives denoting appearance and adjectives denoting assessment,

to allow for analysis targeted specifically to test the hypotheses (see further sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3). In the present section, however, all the adjectives occurring in connection with gender-related terms in the material will be listed and discussed. I will also provide a list of the characterising *of*-phrases present in the material (see further section 2.3.2.1).

Furthermore, in this study I also investigate the use of the demonstratives (*this*, *that*, *these* and *those*) occurring with gender-related terms (see section 1.1). In this section, I present the overall distribution of demonstratives in connection with gender-related terms, contrasting the proximate forms *this* and *these* with the distant forms *that* and *those* (4.3.3). I will return to the demonstratives in 6.3, where I discuss them according to the function they perform in the clause, referent gender and the judicial roles played by the speaker, addressee and referent respectively.

4.3.2 The Adjectival Data: Overall Distribution

All in all, the material contains 1,023 tokens of adjectives, representing 258 types,[40] as well as 45 tokens of characterising *of*-phrases, representing 34 types. In what follows, I will start by discussing the overall distribution of the adjectives, after which an overview of the *of*-phrases will be presented.

To illustrate the semantic variety displayed by the adjectives in the material, Table 4.12 (p. 88) presents the adjectives which occur ten times or more, and shows how they are distributed across referent gender. As in section 4.2.3, in the subsequent tables M stands for male reference, F for female reference and FM for referents of unspecified gender.

Many of the most commonly occurring adjectives are linked to the subject matter and situational context of the speech-related material investigated, that is, the trial procedure. The most obvious example of this is guilty, which occurs 11 times in connection with a gender-related term, but other adjectives, such as black (54 occurrences, see further below), afflicted (53 occurrences, used to describe the alleged victims of witchcraft), said (51 occurrences, used in legal parlance to clarify to whom the language producer is referring) and honoured (13 occurrences, used in connection with the term magistrates) are also linked to the courtroom situation. Other commonly occurring adjectives, less clearly linked to the subject matter, include old (43 occurrences), young (39 occurrences), good (31 occurrences), poor (23 occurrences) and little (19 occurrences). Today, these adjectives are all listed as being among the 1,000 most commonly occurring words in both written and spoken English in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English

[40] As in section 4.2.3, an adjective type which occurs with male (M), female (F) and unspecified (FM) reference in the material is counted as one type when discussing totals, but as separate types when a distinction is made between adjective tokens with male, female, and unspecified reference respectively, as in Lists 4.1–4.5 below. The total number of types in tables and lists need therefore not correspond to the sum total of all the types in the material.

(2005, s.v. old, young, good, poor, little). Furthermore, Sveen (2005: 67) found that these adjectives are commonly used to describe the characters in children's fiction, both modern and from the Victorian period. They could thus be expected to occur frequently in descriptions of humans in Early Modern English texts as well.

Table 4.12. Adjectives occurring ten times or more in the material.

Adjective	**Total**	**M**	**F**	**FM**
Black	54	52	2	0
Afflicted	53	0	37	16
Said	51	37	14	0
Common	49	47	2	0
Old	43	23	20	0
Young	39	19	19	1
Good	31	24	5	2
Aforesaid	29	2	27	0
Same	25	7	18	0
Poor	23	8	12	3
Present	23	14	5	4
Dreadful	22	10	12	0
Little	19	12	7	0
Honoured	13	13	0	0
Dead	12	8	1	3
Honest	12	11	1	0
Abovenamed	11	0	9	2
Guilty	11	8	0	3
Aforementioned	10	0	10	0

The full list of adjectives occurring with gender-related terms in the material is given in Lists 4.1–4.5. As Table 4.12 shows, some adjectives occur much more frequently with nouns denoting men (e.g. *black*, *good*, *honoured*), whereas others (e.g. *afflicted*, *aforesaid*, *poor*) tend to occur with nouns with female reference. To show this difference clearly, and to make the lists as accessible as possible, the adjectives have been classified according to whether the gender-related terms which they modify or complement refer to a man or a woman, and also according to how many times they occur in the material. First, Lists 4.1 and 4.2 present the adjectives which occur twice or more in the material; the adjectives in List 4.1 occur in connection with gender-related terms with male reference, whereas the adjectives in List 4.2 modify or complement gender-related terms with female reference. Note that in all lists as well as in the subsequent discussion, the spelling of the adjectives has been modernised, and comparative and superlative forms subsumed under the base form. The number of occurrences of each lexeme is given in parentheses in the lists, provided that the lexeme occurs more than once.

List 4.1. Adjectives occurring more than once with male gender-related terms. Total number of types: 70. Total number of tokens: 478.

≥10 instances	Black (52)	Old (23)	Little (12)
	Common (47)	Young (19)	Honest (11)
	Said (37)	Present (14)	Dreadful (10)
	Good (24)	Honoured (13)	
5–9 instances	Chief (9)	Tall (8)	New (5)
	Dead (8)	French (7)	Reverend (5)
	Guilty (8)	Same (7)	Shining (5)
	Late (8)	Ill (6)	Sick (5)
	Poor (8)	Fit (5)	Wicked (5)
	Scotch (8)	Named (5)	
2–4 instances	Great (4)	White (3)	Grey-headed (2)
	Humble (4)	Acquainted (2)	Holy (2)
	Learned (4)	Affable (2)	Instrumental (2)
	Less (4)	Aforesaid (2)	Loyal (2)
	Particular (4)	Alive (2)	Married (2)
	Bad (3)	Ancient (2)	Mentioned (2)
	Born (3)	Certain (2)	Noble (2)
	Concerned (3)	Civil (2)	Pitiful (2)
	Courteous (3)	Dear (2)	Principal (2)
	Dangerous (3)	Dying (2)	Ready (2)
	Fine (3)	Engaged (2)	Rich (2)
	Next (3)	English (2)	Suspected (2)
	Quiet (3)	Few (2)	Worthy (2)
	Well (3)	Gone (2)	Wounded (2)

List 4.2. Adjectives occurring more than once with female gender-related terms. Total number of types: 43. Total number of tokens: 292.

≥10 instances	Afflicted (37)	Young (19)	Dreadful (12)
	Aforesaid (27)	Same (18)	Poor (12)
	Old (20)	Said (14)	Aforementioned (10)
5-9 instances	Abovenamed (9)	Indian (7)	Good (5)
	Aforenamed (8)	Little (7)	Present (5)
	Abovesaid (7)	Eldest (6)	
2–4 instances	Bad (4)	Likely (3)	Discreet (2)
	Dear (4)	Married (3)	Dumb (2)
	Rational (4)	Short (3)	Given (2)
	Abovementioned (3)	Sick (3)	Miserable (2)
	Deaf (3)	Sober (3)	Only (2)
	Disturbed (3)	Troubled (2)	Precious (2)
	Great (3)	Aged (2)	Wicked (2)
	Grown (3)	Black (2)	Wretched (2)
	Innocent (3)	Common (2)	

As Lists 4.1 and 4.2 illustrate, among the adjectives occurring more than once in the material, there are considerably more adjectives modifying or complementing gender-related terms with male referents than female: whereas the material contains 478 adjective tokens (representing 70 types)

referring to men, the corresponding figure for adjective tokens referring to women is only 292 (representing 43 types). However, given that, as shown in Table 4.11 (section 4.2.3), the material contains decidedly more gender-related terms with male reference than female reference as a whole (7,432 vs. 3,038), this distribution is not surprising. I will return to this below.

As was mentioned above, some of the most commonly occurring adjectives in the material (*old*, *young*, *good*, *poor*, *little*) are such as could be expected to occur frequently in English texts. Of these, most occur roughly the same number of times with male and female referents, such as *old* (23 M, 20 F), *young* (19 M, 19 F) and *poor* (8 M, 12 F). However, *good* stands out from this pattern, being used more often with gender-related terms with male referents, than with female referents (24 M, 5 F).[41] In 23 instances, *good* is used as an assessment adjective, evaluating the referents' behaviour or ability. These instances will be commented on further in section 6.2.3, where the assessment adjectives are discussed. In the remaining seven instances of *good*, the adjective is used as part of an address (27).

(27) *Mr. Att. Gen*. Pray good my **Lord**, Why did you joy my Lord *Howard*, had you any reason to mistrust my Lord? (BrExam: Tryal ... of John Hambden, p. 29)

Among the seven instances where *good* is part of an address, six are used with male gender-related terms (five from the BrE material, one from the AmE texts), and one, from the BrE material, is used to refer to a woman. Of course, this need not show a tendency for gender bias in the use of *good* in this context, but might merely reflect the higher number of male participants in the BrE trials.

The most common adjective occurring with male reference in the material is *black*, which is used 52 times with male and twice with female gender-related terms. The high frequency of this particular adjective is largely due to the common use of the phrase "black **man**" in the AmE speech-related texts to refer to the alleged male witches, or to the devil. This phrase will be commented on in detail in section 6.2.3 below.

Among the adjectives with female reference, the most common lexeme is *afflicted*. As stated above, this adjective is used when the language producers refer to the supposed victims of witchcraft in the Salem material – the only texts in the material examined where this adjective can be found in connection with gender-related terms. Its predominant use with terms denoting women lies in the relative proportion of men and women among the persons involved in the Salem proceedings: the majority of people who claimed to be afflicted by witchcraft were women.

[41] There are a further two instances of *good* occurring with gender-related terms with unspecified referents (see Table 4.12).

The adjectives occurring once in the material are given in Lists 4.3 and 4.4. As with Lists 4.1 and 4.2, the adjectives have been divided into two lists according to whether the gender-related term they modify or complement has male (List 4.3) or female (List 4.4) reference.

List 4.3. Adjectives occurring once with male gender-related terms in the material. Total number of types and tokens: 114.

Able	Eldest	Lost	Silly
Abovesaid	Excellent	Loving	Sober
Absent	Extravagant	Male	Sole
Abusive	False	Mean	Sought-after
Afore-named	Famous	Naked	Southern
Alone	Foreign	Natural	Sovereign
Angry	Frank	Natural-born	Strong
Anointed	Free	Necessitous	Studious
Barbadian	Fresh	Nimble	Suborned
Base	Friendly	Northern	Swift
Black-bearded	Full	Notorious	Tatter-tailed
Black-haired	Generous	Paltry	Titular
Bold	Gracious	Peaceable	Troubled
Broken	Grave	Perjured	True
Capable	Grievous	Pleased	Trusty
Careless	Hilly-faced	Popish	Unhappy
Cheerful	Honourable	Proper	Unsatisfied
Choice	Impudent	Protestant	Unwell
Close	Indian-like	Prudent	Wayfaring
Cruel	Indigent	Public	Wedded
Deceased	Infamous	Right	Western
Discontented	Ingenious	Roman	White-haired
Disguised	Interested	Sackless[42]	Willing
Disorderly	Intimate	Secure	Virtuous
Displeased	Kentish	Senior	Wise
Disturbed	Known	Sensible	Worshipful
Drowned	Last	Shabby	Wrong
Dutch	Lasting	Sharp	
Dutiful	Lewd	Short	

[42] *OED*: s.v. *sackless* 2b: 'Innocent of wrong intent', 'guileless', 'simple'; also, of a thing, 'harmless'. Hence, in disparaging sense, 'feeble-minded'; 'lacking energy', 'dispirited'. (*OED*, 30 June 2005). Cf. "Isaac Warde, of Cronkley, spoke these words in the heareing of this informer, 'There was a sakles **man** goeing to jaole' meaning Ralph Maddison [...]" (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York).

List 4.4. Adjectives occurring once with female gender-related terms. Total number of types and tokens: 65.

Accused	Fast	Malicious	Skilful
Active	Female	Mentioned	Smart
Afraid	Full-mouthed	Mistaken	Strange
Angry	Gone	Modest	Strapping
Baptised	Handsome	Near	Sunburnt
Bewitched	Holy	Negro	Surly
Born	Honest	Neighbourly	Tender
Charged	Idle	Nigh	Thriving
Civil	Ill	Pale	Underwritten
Confessing	Ill-carriaged[43]	Passionate	Unwell
Conscientious	Irish	Pious	Unwilling
Dead	Kind	Popish	Unworthy
Destitute	Last	Proud	Wearied
Distressed	Limber-tongued	Prudent	Well
Double-tongued	Loose	Ragged	Virtuous
Dutiful	Loving	Ready	Wise
Dying			

Among the adjectives occurring once in the material more adjectives are used with male reference than with female reference. Adding up the totals in Lists 4.1 and 4.3 and those in Lists 4.2 and 4.4, respectively, reveals that there are 592 adjective tokens (184 types) referring to men, compared to 357 adjective tokens (108 types) referring to women. Considering the predominance of male gender-related terms overall in the material, this is not surprising (see above, and section 4.2.3). Table 4.13 correlates the information given in Table 4.11 on the relative distribution of gender-related terms across referent gender with the corresponding information regarding the distribution of adjectives.

Table 4.13. The distribution of gender-related terms (tokens) compared to the distribution of adjectival modification or complementation (tokens) across referent gender, percentages. Raw figures given in parentheses.

	M	**F**	**FM**	**Total**
Gender-related terms	68% (7,432)	28% (3,038)	4% (460)	**100% (10,930)**
Adjectives	58% (592)	35% (357)	7% (74)	**100% (1,023)**

[43] *OED*: s.v. *carriaged* a. Having a carriage, deportment, bearing; behaved, mannered (*obs.*); [...] Only with qualifying adv., as ***handsome-***, ***ill-***, ***many-***, ***well-carriaged*** (*OED*, 6 April 2006). Cf. "Lt Jer: Neal: was asked what he could say of this woman Neal s'd she had been an ill carriaged **woman**:" (AmExam: Examination of Ann Pudeator. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 702).

As Table 4.13 shows, 68% of the gender-related term tokens occurring in the material have male reference, compared to 28% term tokens denoting females. The corresponding figures for adjectives are 58% and 35%. The difference between these two sets of figures was tested with the chi-square test, and found to be statistically significant (χ^2: 49.68, df: 2, $p<0.01$). Thus, the general distribution of adjectives in connection with gender-related terms seems to be gender-conditioned, in that adjectives are more likely to occur in connection with gender-related terms referring to women. I will return to the nature of the adjectives in Chapter 6.

Another question worthy of investigation is type/token ratio; that is, whether referents of either gender tend to be described repeatedly with expressions using the same adjective construction. Sveen found that female characters in Victorian fiction were described frequently with a limited set of adjectives, and that authors portrayed these characters in an idealistic light rather than realistically (2005: 160). If a similar tendency were found in the present material, such patterning could be indicative of language producers seeing women not as individuals but as members of a group sharing the same characteristics. Even though the material used for Sveen's study is vastly different from that examined here, the issue will be briefly addressed.

A test was carried out to test for differences as regards type/token ratio in the material. In this test, 357 adjective tokens with male reference were randomly selected from the data set, to provide an equally-sized counterpart to the adjective tokens denoting females. This was done using Microsoft Excel's RANDOM function, which randomly assigns each token a value between 0 and 1. The tokens were sorted numerically, the first 357 tokens in the resulting list extracted and the number of types counted. The resulting data is given in Table 4.14 below and is contrasted with the corresponding data for adjective tokens with female reference.

Table 4.14. Types, tokens and type/token ratios for the randomly-selected sample of adjectives with male reference and adjectives with female reference.

Referent gender	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Male	139	357	0.372
Female	108	357	0.298

The difference between male and female types as presented in Table 4.14 is not statistically significant. It can thus not be said that the material is gender biased in that women are described repeatedly with the same adjective to a larger extent than the men, as Sveen's analysis of her data revealed.

This finding is further supported by the fact that referent gender does not seem to have an impact on the proportion of adjectives being used only once in the material: the percentage of adjective types occurring once with gender-related terms is roughly the same, just above 60%, for adjectives with both male and female reference. It would therefore seem that men and

women are described with an equally large range of adjectives in the material. The issue of what semantic shades these diverse adjectives carry and possible gender differences therein will be addressed further in section 6.2.3, albeit only with a limited set of adjectives.

Lastly, List 4.5 gives the adjectives occurring with gender-related terms with unspecified (FM) reference (see section 4.2.3 above). Since this last category contains so few adjectives, these have not been divided further, but kept in a single list.

List 4.5. Adjectives occurring with unspecified gender-related terms in the material. Total number of types: 30. Total number of tokens: 74.

Afflicted (16)	Named (3)	Young (1)	Idle (1)
Unborn (6)	Suspected (3)	Abovesaid (1)	Natural-born (1)
Present (4)	Abovenamed (2)	Absent (1)	Particular (1)
Innocent (4)	Good (2)	Accused (1)	Private (1)
Poor (3)	Bewitched (2)	Charitable (1)	Slothful (1)
Dead (3)	Born (2)	European (1)	Talkative (1)
Dissenting (3)	Kind (2)	Evil (1)	
Guilty (3)	Former (2)	Human (1)	

Since the present investigation is primarily concerned with the relationship between adjective use and referent gender (see the hypotheses as stated in section 1.1), the adjectives presented in List 4.5 are of secondary importance, and will not be discussed further here. So as not to misrepresent the data, they are nonetheless included in the tables in Chapter 6, and their presence in the material will be noted when of interest.

As discussed in 2.3.2.1, another construction which will be examined in the present investigation is the characterising *of*-phrase, that is, constructions of the type "an X of Y", where the X represents a gender-related term (e.g. *man*), and the Y represents a noun phrase (e.g. *honour*). The characterising *of*-phrase parallels adjectives in that it highlights certain characteristics in the referent, either positive (example (28)) or negative (example (29)).[44]

(28) Mr. Davenport is a **person** of great courage and gallantry, and was the first who landed at the New Mole; and good reason for his expressions of Capt. Whitaker, who had falsely charged him with plundering. (BrJour: Thomas Pocock, Sea Diary)

(29) Mr. *Williams*. My Lord, You have had a long Conversation with the knowledge of Mr. *Hambden*, you say. What say you as to his Disposition; Because this Indictment says he is a **Person** of a Turbulent,

[44] Note that the underlined *of*-phrase in (28) has been counted as two phrases in Lists 4.6 and 6.6, since it denotes two separate qualities: great courage and gallantry. The same is true of all such multiple *of*-phrases in the material (e.g. examples (141) and (143)).

Factious, Seditious Spirit? (BrExam: Tryal ... of John Hambden, p. 32)

In the NP, the characterising *of*-phrase functions as a modifier within the NP structure (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 658–659). This use should not be confused with *of*-phrases functioning as complements in the NP structure, as in (30) (example taken from Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 658, with bold face and underlining added by me in analogy with previous and subsequent examples).[45]

(30) the **son-in-law** of Dick Brown

In most cases, nouns only accept genitive NPs as complements, and so subordinate NPs are normally related to the head noun, either by being inflected for genitive case ("Dick Brown's **son-in-law**") or, as in (30), by an *of*-construction filling the same function (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 658). In contrast, an *of*-phrase functioning as NP modifier, such as the constructions under scrutiny in this section, "makes an independent contribution to the meaning" of the NP (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 659). In the words of Biber et al., these phrases express "a close semantic relationship between the head noun and the following noun phrase, where there are parallels with noun and adjective premodification [...], rather than with the genitive" (1999: 636). To exemplify the point made by Biber et al., the characterising *of*-phrase "a **man** of honour" parallels "an honourable **man**", rather than "?the honour's **man**". It is worth noting that the attributes highlighted by the characterising *of*-phrase are generally abstract (compare "a **man** of great wit" with the questionable "a **man** of big hands") (Quirk et al. 1985: 704).

List 4.6 (p. 96) shows the characterising *of*-phrases which occur in the material, together with the gender of the referent, whether they carry positive (pos.), negative (neg.), or indeterminate (indet.) connotations, and the text category from which the examples come.

[45] A comprehensive list of the different forms of prepositional phrases beginning with *of*, including partitive constructions (e.g. *one of your sons*), is given in Biber et al. (1999: 635–636).

List 4.6. The *of*-phrases occurring with gender-related terms in the material.

***Of*-phrase**	**Gender of referent (M/F)**	**Connotations (pos./neg./ indet.)**	**Text category**
Gentleman of reputation (2)	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Magistrates of the highest quality	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of a middle stature	M	Indet.	AmExam
Man of common sense	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Man of conscience	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of estate (2)	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of good capacity	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of good sense	M	Pos.	Journals
Man of great finesse	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of great freedom in discourse	M	Neg.[46]	BrExam
Man of great wit	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of honour (7)	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of integrity	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of interest	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of justice	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Man of low spirits	M	Neg.	BrExam
Man of ordinary sense	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Man of readiness in discourse	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of sagacity	M	Pos.	Journals
Man of weak body	M	Neg.	BrExam
Man of virtue	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of 50 or 60 Thousand Crowns (2)	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of a sound and healthy body	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Person of a Turbulent, Factious, Seditious spirit	M	Neg.	BrExam
Person of gallantry	M	Pos.	Journals
Person of great courage	M	Pos.	Journals
Person of integrity	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of quality	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of worth	M	Pos.	BrExam
Woman of a very turbulent unruly spirit	F	Neg.	AmDepo
Woman of an unruly turbulent spirit (3)	F	Neg.	AmDepo
Woman of bad fame	F	Neg.	BrDepo
Woman of quality	F	Pos.	AmDepo
Woman of worth	F	Pos.	AmDepo
Types: 34 (29 M, 5 F), Tokens: 45 (38 M, 7 F)			

[46] For a discussion of why this *of*-phrase has been considered negative, see section 6.2.4.

As List 4.6 shows, the vast majority of characterising *of*-phrases are used with male reference: 29 instances out of 34, compared to only five instances of characterising *of*-phrases with female reference. Furthermore, if one considers the quality highlighted by the phrase, most of the characterising *of*-phrases with male reference denote positive qualities, whereas three of the five instances of female *of*-phrases denote qualities that would be categorised as negative. I will return to a detailed analysis of this, as well as offer some suggestions as to why this is so, in section 6.2.4 below.

4.3.3 The Demonstrative Data: Overall Distribution

In addition to adjectival descriptions, I will address the use of *this*, *that*, *these* and *those* (henceforth collectively referred to as *demonstratives*, following Lakoff 1974[47]) in connection with gender-related terms. Apart from indicating the relative spatial distance between the referent and the language producer and/or addressee (e.g. "Can you see that **woman**?"), the demonstratives can also be used to establish and act out social roles, by associating the language producer with certain people, while distancing him/her from others by indicating emotional stance towards the referent or addressee. Through the use of a demonstrative, for instance in conjunction with a gender-related term, the language producer can indicate disapproval (compare, e.g. "Where is James?" with "Where is that **boy**?"). The functions filled by demonstratives in Present-day English will be discussed further in section 6.3.2 below.

This potential for demonstratives to indicate the manner of relationship which the language producer and referent/addressee have was the foremost reason for including a section on demonstrative use in this chapter, since, provided the same potential was present in Early Modern English, these lexemes might carry information about how people of both sexes were viewed by those talking about them. However, on closer inspection the material evinced very little in the way of emotional demonstrative use. I discuss this further in section 6.3.2.

Nevertheless, since studies on the use of the English demonstratives in historical times are few and far between, a section on demonstrative use is included in the present study, in order to contribute to the research done in this field. In addition to outlining the general distribution of the demonstratives with regard to their form and function, I will investigate two extralinguistic factors which so far have received little attention from scholars using historical data: the potential connection between the use of

[47] Lakoff's term *demonstratives* corresponds to Quirk et al.'s term *demonstrative pronouns* (1985: 372), Biber et al.'s term *demonstrative determiners* (1999: 272) and Huddleston and Pullum's term *demonstrative determinatives* (2002: 373). In the present study, I have adopted Lakoff's term as being the most concise.

demonstratives with reference to humans and referent gender, and the possibility of a link between demonstrative use and the situational roles played by language producer, addressee and referent respectively. As the present study deals with the use of terms denoting people of both genders, and as demonstratives are frequently used in connection with gender-related terms in the material, the data gathered here lends itself well to investigating both factors. I will return to these two factors in sections 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 below, where the data will be presented and analysed.

The non-speech-related material contains a very small number of demonstratives in connection with gender-related terms; of the 778 gender-related terms occurring in the non-speech-related material, only 11 instances are preceded by a demonstrative. This can be compared to the speech-related material, where 238 gender-related terms (out of 10,370) occur in connection with demonstratives. The low raw number of demonstratives in the journals has prompted me to limit this part of the analysis to the speech-related texts, that is, depositions and examinations. For the present study, the main point of interest thus lies in the use of the demonstratives in the courtroom.

In the NP, the demonstratives can function either as demonstrative pronouns (31) or as determiners, premodifying the head (32).

(31) This is unbelievable.

(32) This mug is mine.

In this study, I will only deal with demonstratives functioning as determiners, since it is only in this function that they collocate with gender-related terms. When discussing the use and distribution of demonstratives, one can distinguish between the forms *this* and *these* (henceforth the *proximate* demonstratives), which indicate nearness to the speaker, and *that* and *those* (henceforth, following Biber et al. 1999: 274–275, the *distant* demonstratives), which indicate distance from the speaker (cf. Biber et al. 1999: 274–275; Quirk et al. 1985: 374).[48] The present section investigates the relative distribution of these forms with gender-related terms in courtroom material from the Early Modern period.

Table 4.15 (p. 99) shows the distribution of the proximate and the distant forms occurring with gender-related terms in the material.

[48] In Present-day English, the relative distribution of proximate and distant forms in a text is in part linked to text genre. In their *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, Biber et al. found that proximate and distant demonstratives were distributed almost equally in Conversation and Fiction. In the two expository genres News and Academic Writing, however, there were between four and five times as many proximate demonstratives as distant forms (Biber et al. 1999: 274–275).

Table 4.15. The distribution of proximate and distant demonstratives in the material.

	Proximate forms	**Distant forms**	**Total**
Number of occurrences	178 (75%)	60 (25%)	**238 (100%)**

As can be seen from Table 4.15, the proximate forms outnumber their distant counterparts by a ratio of three to one: of the 238 demonstrative tokens occurring in connection with gender-related terms 178, or 75%, are proximate. Dividing the occurrences further into the four different demonstrative forms reveals that in both the proximate and distant demonstrative category the singular demonstratives (*this*, *that*) outnumber their plural counterparts (*these*, *those*), although this difference is more pronounced among the proximate forms (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.16. The distribution of demonstratives in the material. (Percentages reflect relative distribution within the proximate and distant forms respectively.)

Demonstrative		**No. of occurrences**	**Total**
Proximate forms	*This*	128 (72%)	**178 (100%)**
	These	50 (28%)	
Distant forms	*That*	36 (60%)	**60 (100%)**
	Those	24 (40%)	

Compared to the distribution reported for the four genres in Biber et al. (see above, footnote 48), the relative distribution of proximate and distant demonstratives in the present material (Table 4.15) is more in line with that in the expository written genres (News and Academic writing), than Conversation and Fiction. Naturally, the material used here is far from equivalent to that used in Biber et al.'s grammar. If, however, the basic characteristics of expository writing have not changed in the three hundred years separating the two sets of material, this finding might reflect the format of the courtroom dialogues; the answers which witnesses give the magistrates often contain long narrative passages, making them rather more expository in nature than dialogue normally is. In these narrative passages, demonstratives are used frequently with gender-related terms, both to refer to people present in the courtroom and to people previously referred to in the discourse itself.

The predominance of the singular forms (see Table 4.16) conforms to Biber et al.'s findings in Present-day English (1999: 274–5), where *this* and *that* are decidedly more common than *these* and *those*. Biber et al. conclude

that the distribution of demonstratives reflects the overall predominance of singular nouns in the material, which was prevalent in all four genres studied. The dominance of singular demonstratives in the present material might indicate a similar trend concerning these lexemes.

To sum up, gender-related terms in the speech-related material occur three times as often with the proximate demonstratives *this* and *these* as with the distant forms *that* and *those*, which might derive from the narrative passages in the witnesses' depositions and statements. A future study comparing demonstrative use in Early Modern courtroom material with corresponding material from Present-day English might reveal whether this is a feature of courtroom language overall, or a feature typical of the Early Modern period.

I will return to the demonstratives in section 6.3 below, where, as stated above, I will investigate the use of these words according to the function performed by the demonstrative, referent gender and the judicial roles played by speaker, addressee and referent respectively.

4.4 Summary and Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have aimed at providing an overview of the data, both as regards the gender-related terms themselves and as regards the use of adjectives and demonstratives in connection with these terms. Some interesting observations could be made on the basis of this overview, the most striking of which will be brought up here.

First, a look at the overall distribution of gender-related terms across gender term category revealed that the relative distribution of the term types across the categories is roughly similar in the three text categories, depositions, examinations and journals. One exception to this is, however, the title term tokens, which occur much more frequently in the speech-related texts than in the non-speech-related material. Since the title terms include terms of address such as *sir* and *madam*, this pattern is not surprising: the natural environment in which one might expect to find terms of address is in connection with direct speech, where such terms would be used to acknowledge the addressee.

When looking at how the gender-related terms are distributed across region, contrasting BrE and AmE, some interesting trends were found. The BrE examinations contain decidedly more gender-related term types per 10,000 words than do the BrE depositions or the AmE material. I have speculated that this could be due to the high number of occupational terms present in this material set. Overall, the higher degree of job specialisation in England at this time, as compared to the American colonies, would lead one to expect a greater variation of occupational terms in the BrE material than

in the AmE texts, which, as shown in section 4.2.2, is also the case (this is discussed further in section 5.3.4).

If one considers the distribution of gender term tokens, some term categories occur more frequently in texts from one region. Apart from the occupational terms, of which there are more in the BrE material as regards tokens as well as types (see above), the titles and RSP terms also occur more frequently in the texts from England. I have postulated that this is due to the difference in social structure between England and New England at this time, the population of New England being more homogenous and lacking a landed aristocracy in the European sense. Presumably there would thus have been less cause for using either titles or RSP terms when addressing or referring to others. The AmE speech-related material, in turn, contains more relational terms than does its BrE counterpart, possibly as a consequence of the AmE trials taking place in a geographically limited area, where most people would be known and referred to in terms of their relationship with others.

Plotting the distribution of the gender-related terms across referent gender revealed that in all text categories, there were more gender term types with male reference than with female reference. The preponderance of male term types was especially pronounced in the BrE material. When the data for the gender term tokens was taken into account as well, a more complex picture emerged, with the male term tokens still outnumbering their female counterparts in the BrE material, but the opposite being true in the AmE texts, with more female tokens than male. Thus, although men are referred to with more specificity than women in both the BrE and AmE speech-related material, women are mentioned more frequently in the latter texts, which, considering the nature of the Salem witch trials, is not surprising. The first hypothesis given in section 1.1 could thus only be partly verified.

As regards the adjectives occurring in connection with gender-related terms, the material was shown to contain more adjectives with male reference than female. However, when compared to the total number of gender-related terms in the material, a gender bias could be found in favour of adjectives occurring in connection with female gender-related terms. The characterising *of*-phrases showed two interesting tendencies. First, they occur predominantly with male reference: of the 34 *of*-phrases found in the material, only five refer to females. Furthermore, the *of*-phrases referring to males mostly denote positive qualities, such as honour and virtue. This will be discussed in more detail in section 6.2.4.

With regard to the overall distribution of demonstratives to determine gender-related terms, the material was shown to contain roughly three times as many proximate forms (*this*, *these*) as distant forms (*that*, *those*), possibly due to the long narrative passages that occur at times in witness statements and that make the courtroom material somewhat expository in style.

Chapter 5. The Use of Gender-Related Terms

5.1 Introductory Comments

In the previous chapter, an overall view of the data was presented, both as regards the distribution of gender-related terms across text category, region of origin and referent gender, and as regards the distribution of adjectival modification and demonstratives in connection with these terms. The present chapter will look more closely at the use of gender-related terms across the parameters stated above and aims at addressing the second hypothesis put forth in section 1.1. This hypothesis predicts that the aspect of the referent's life which is indicated by the gender-related term (concerning, for instance, marital status or occupation) is linked to the gender of the individual such that men and women are described with regard to different aspects. As stated in section 1.1, previous research has indicated that it was more common in Early Modern times for women to be referred to in terms of their relation to others (for instance as wives, daughters or sisters) than it was for men (Shoemaker 1998: 148). The present chapter also aims at taking a more in-depth look at the material, providing qualitative analysis to shed further light on the data presented in Chapter 4. I will return to the use of adjectives and demonstratives in connection with gender-related terms in Chapter 6.

In section 5.2, I will consider the possible influence of text category on the use and distribution of gender-related terms. As stated in section 1.1, I do not expect the two speech-related text categories (depositions and examinations) to differ to any significant degree, since the material from both categories was produced in the formal setting of trial proceedings. The findings from the speech-related material will also be contrasted tentatively with corresponding data from the non-speech-related material (journals), to assess whether further research into the difference between speech-related and non-speech-related material in this respect would be profitable.

Secondly, in section 5.3, I will consider the influence of another extralinguistic factor on the use of gender-related terms, namely geographical origin. The difference in social status between women in New England and women in England was significant at the time period investigated here (see further section 1.1 and Thompson 1974). Alongside the overall difference in social structure between the two regions (for instance the lack of landed nobility in New England; see Thompson 1974: 8), this difference in social status might have influenced the use of these

terms. It is therefore not inconceivable that such a difference between the material from New England and that from England will be evident.

Subsequently, in section 5.4, I will consider the impact that referent gender has on the use of gender-related terms. In this section I will address the hypothesis stated above, namely that different aspects of the referents' lives will be in focus through the use of gender-related terms. I will also address the overall nature of the terms used to refer to men and women respectively. The chapter ends with a summary in 5.5.

5.2 The Distribution of the Gender-Related Terms across the Text Categories

The overall distribution of the gender-related terms across the text categories (depositions, examinations and journals) was given in section 4.2.1. In this section, I will look more closely at this distribution, taking the gender term categories distinguished as my starting-point. At this point in the analysis, I will not refer to any other variables, such as regional variation or referent gender. These other variables will be discussed in subsequent sections (5.3 and 5.4 respectively). In the ensuing sections (5.2.1–5.2.8), the distribution of terms in the material is investigated further, with one section being devoted to each gender term category.

5.2.1 Central Terms

Table 5.1. The relative incidence of central terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	**Types**	**Tokens**	**Type/token ratio**
Depositions	0.6 (7)	29.7 (361)	0.02
Examinations	0.5 (7)	38.9 (525)	0.01
Journals	4.4 (12)	27.9 (77)	0.16
Total	**0.5 (13)**	**33.9 (963)**	**0.01**

As Table 5.1 shows, there are a total of 963 central term tokens in the material. Of these, 361 can be found in the deposition texts, 525 in the examinations and 77 in the journals. Normalised, these figures translate into 29.7 token instances per 10,000 words in the depositions, compared to 38.9

instances in the examinations and 27.9 instances in the journals. Although the number of central term tokens is thus rather sizeable, Table 5.1 also reveals that the number of types in this gender term category is low, with a total of 13 types, or 0.5 instances per 10,000 words, in the material overall (see Appendix I for a list of these types). Considering the overarching nature of these terms (central terms do not indicate anything other than gender and relative age; see section 3.2), one might expect that they would be rather few in number.

Not surprisingly, the journals contain more central term types per 10,000 words than the two speech-related categories, with more than seven times the instances as in depositions: 4.4, as compared to 0.6. Consequently, the journals also exhibit a type/token ratio which is decidedly higher for central terms than the corresponding ratios for the deposition and examination material. As was discussed in section 4.1, one can expect non-speech-related material to display greater variation with regard to vocabulary than speech-related texts, and thus exhibit higher type/token ratios. As subsequent sections will show, the journals consistently show higher type/token ratios than the other text categories as regards all the gender term categories.

Overall, when normalised to adjust for text length, the central term tokens are fairly evenly distributed across the text categories, even though the examinations display a slightly higher frequency of central term tokens than do the other text categories (see Table 5.1).

5.2.2 Relational Terms

Table 5.2. The relative incidence of relational terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	**Types**	**Tokens**	**Type/token ratio**
Depositions	1.7 (21)	64.3 (781)	0.03
Examinations	1.2 (16)	28.2 (380)	0.04
Journals	5.8 (16)	29.4 (81)	0.20
Total	**1.0 (28)**	**43.8 (1,242)**	**0.02**

The material contains a total of 1,242 relational term tokens, most of which can be found in the depositions: 781 instances, which amounts to 64.3 instances per 10,000 words. This is a higher figure than the corresponding figures for the examinations and the journals, which contain 28.2 and 29.4

instances of relational term tokens per 10,000 words respectively (corresponding to 380 and 81 raw instances). The higher frequency of relational term tokens in the depositions material seems to be due to a perceived need on the part of the language producer, the person giving the deposition, to explain the relationship between the people involved in the event being described. It could also be that the scribe taking down the deposition added such information in order to make such relationships more readily understandable to subsequent readers. An example of this is given in (33), where the person about whom the deponent speaks is identified not only by her marital status (*widow*), but also by her familial relationship to the accused Daniel Awty.

(33) *Joseph Lockwood, of Kirkheaton, clothyer*, saith, that one Mercy Hutchinson, **widow**, **sister** to Daniell Awty, alias Otty, of the city of York, did severall times at Dewisbury, about two or three yeares ago, as allso severall times in York within the space of six monthes last past, tell this deponent that her said brother got the plate which was stolne out of York Minster some yeares ago [...] (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, pp. 281–282)

As with any material produced as part of a judicial proceedings, one can expect that the depositions would have to be very precise regarding identification of people referred to, either by describing their physical appearance (see further section 6.2.2), or by referring to their relationship with others, which explains the high frequency of relational terms in this text category.

Another example, (34), shows how a woman and a man are described and identified with the use of relational terms, in this case *wife* and *husband* respectively.

(34) July 14, 1683. Before Peter Hudson, Mayor of Doncaster, and Thomas Lee. *Mary*, ***wife*** *of John Oddy*, *of Rossington bridge end*, saith, that the taller man, who calls himselfe by the name of John Reed, came to her house yesterday about noone (this deponent and her **husband** keeping a publique house att Rossington bridge), and pretended to stay for some company to call of him there (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, p. 256)

As stated above (section 1.1), previous research has indicated that in public records women were often identified according to their relationship with others, through marriage or by blood (Shoemaker 1998: 148). This is exemplified in (34), where the deponent is identified as "Mary, wife of John Oddy" in the second sentence. However, since it is Mary Oddy, as the deponent, who is the 'focus' of the deposition, John Oddy is referred to as her *husband* the next time he is mentioned. Thus, men, as well as women, could be identified through their relationship with people around them. I will

return to the relative frequency of relational terms with male and female reference in section 5.4.2 below.

As with the central terms (section 5.2.1), there are more types of relational terms per 10,000 words in the journals than in the speech-related material, as might be expected considering the difference between spoken (and hence speech-related) and written language (see section 4.1 above). However, it must be borne in mind that the relational terms are a fairly limited gender term category; under normal circumstances only a small number of words belonging to this category could be used when describing the relationship between any two people. Thus, the high ratio of types per 10,000 words in the journals might be a result of the limited amount of material from this text category, rather than being due to any desire to avoid repetition on the part of the authors.

5.2.3 Epicene Terms

Table 5.3. The relative incidence of epicene terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Depositions	1.7 (21)	37.0 (449)	0.05
Examinations	1.8 (24)	33.0 (445)	0.05
Journals	8.0 (22)	32.6 (90)	0.24
Total	**1.3 (38)**	**34.7 (984)**	**0.04**

There are a total of 984 epicene term tokens in the material, representing 38 types (Table 5.3). If one considers the normalised token figures, one finds that the epicene terms are distributed fairly evenly across the text categories, with 37.0 instances per 10,000 words in the deposition material, compared to 33.0 instances in the examinations and 32.6 instances in the journal texts. Furthermore, as with the gender term categories discussed above, the journals display a higher type/token ratio as regards the epicene terms than do the other text categories (Table 5.3).

5.2.4 Occupational Terms

Table 4.1 in the previous chapter showed that, as regards types, the occupational terms are the most frequently occurring gender-related terms in the material, with a total of 186 types. The number of occupational tokens,

1,796, was also decidedly higher than that of most other gender term categories (see Table 4.3). If one considers the relative distribution of these types and tokens across the three text categories, one finds that there is a discernable difference between how often these terms are used in the depositions, examinations and journals respectively (Table 5.4).

Table 5.4. The relative incidence of occupational terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Depositions	8.3 (101)	55.3 (671)	0.15
Examinations	5.9 (80)	66.0 (890)	0.09
Journals	29.0 (80)	85.2 (235)	0.34
Total	**6.6 (186)**	**63.3 (1,796)**	**0.10**

Not surprisingly, the journals contain more instances per 10,000 words, both as regards types and tokens (see further section 4.1 above). Among the speech-related text categories, the depositions contain more occupational term types than do the examinations, but the opposite is true of the tokens.

The high number of occupational terms in the speech-related data is not surprising, given that, as shown by previous research (see section 1.1), men, and to some extent women, were often identified not only by name, but also by profession in official documents, as in examples (35) and (36):

(35) The Deposistion of John putnam **weaver** (AmDepo: John Putnam, Jr. and Hannah Putnam v. Rebecca Nurse, Mary Easty, and Sarah Cloyce. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 601)

(36) And further saith, That she did hear the said *Susanna* to say and further confess, that she did prick and torment one *Dorcas Coleman* the Wife of *John Coleman* of *Biddiford* aforesaid **Marriner**. (BrDepo: Informations Against Three Witches, p. 31)

Given this, and considering the official nature of the legal proceedings, one might expect to find a number of occupational terms in the texts as language producers identify the participants in the courtroom.

Table 5.4 also reveals that the type/token ratio is relatively high as regards the occupational terms in both the depositions and in the examinations, at least when compared to corresponding figures for the other gender term categories. This pattern indicates that it was important for the people

involved in the legal proceedings to distinguish among different occupations, which corresponds with what has been said by socio-historians: a person's profession would have a significant impact on his/her social status, and it was thus an important factor in determining the place individuals occupied in the social hierarchy, relative to the people around them (Shoemaker 1998: 148). Since this was the case, it is little wonder that the question of what occupations others had was felt to be a matter of some importance and something that needed to be made explicit. Naturally, the significance placed on a person's occupation would also lead to a high degree of term specialisation, and, as a consequence, a large number of terms in the lexicon.

As regards the high frequency of occupational terms in the journals, this could be due to the descriptive nature of the texts. The authors would naturally seek to describe the people in their surroundings, which, for the same reasons as were mentioned above, in many cases would include stating the individuals' professions.

5.2.5 Title Terms

As Table 4.3 in the previous chapter showed, the title terms are the most frequently occurring gender-related terms in the material as regards tokens. All in all, there are 5,364 occurrences of title term tokens in the material, which is considerably more than any other gender term category. Table 5.5 shows that the majority of these title tokens (3,251 raw instances, or 241.2 instances per 10,000 words), are found in the examination material.

Table 5.5. The relative incidence of title terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Depositions	2.6 (32)	156.9 (1,905)	0.02
Examinations	2.2 (29)	241.2 (3,251)	0.01
Journals	13.1 (36)	75.4 (208)	0.17
Total	**1.7 (48)**	**189.0 (5,364)**	**0.01**

The primary reason behind this high figure is that terms of address (which are included among the title terms, see the definition in section 3.2) are used extensively in direct speech in the courtroom, as exemplified in (37) and (38). Note that in these examples only title terms used to refer to the interlocutor have been marked in bold type.

(37) *Mr. Sol. Gen.* Pray call Mr. *West*. *Who appeared.*
Col. *Sidney.* I pray one word, **my Lord**, before Mr. *West* be sworn, I have heard, **my Lord**, Mr. *West* hath confessed many Treasons, and I desire to know whether he is pardoned, or no.
L. C. J. I don't know that.
Col. *Sid.* **My Lord**, how can he be a Witness then?
L. C. Just. Swear him: for I know no Legal Objection against him. He was a good Witness in my Lord *Russel's* Tryal.
Col. *Sidney.* **My Lord**, if another did not except against him, 'tis nothing to me.
(BrExam: Tryal ... of Algernon Sidney, p. 13)

(38) How far have you complyed w'th Satan whereby he takes this advantage ag't you?
Sir, I never complyed but prayed against him all my dayes, I have no complyance with Satan, in this. What would you have me do?
(AmExam: Examination of Mary Easty. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 288–289)

As Table 5.5 shows, the speech-related material contains more title terms per 10,000 words than do the journals. A closer inspection of the journals reveals that this is due to the infrequent occurrence of direct speech in this text category. In the journals, only two title terms occur in direct speech (examples (39) and (40)).

(39) Upon this, to my no small surprise, son John arrose, and gravely demanded what I would give him to go with me? Give you, sais I, are you John? Yes, says he, for want of a Better; And behold! this John look't as old as my Host, and perhaps had bin a man in the last Century. Well, **Mr.** John, sais I, make your demands. Why, half a pss. of eight and a dram, sais John. I agreed, and gave him a Dram (now) in hand to bind the bargain. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 3)

(40) But as we were impatient to come to our Journy's end, we enquir'd of every one we met, the distance from Edenborough, and could not forbear smiling, when the people ask't us their usuall Question, What's your Woll **Sir**, for tho' they understood us very well, yet they would not be beaten out of their old road: It being a Custom amongst them, to repeat those words before they return an Answer: (BrJour: John Taylor. The Pennyles Pilgrimage)

The fact that the journals contain very few direct speech acts, in which terms of address could occur when referring to the interlocutor, goes a long way to help explain the relative dearth of title terms in the non-speech-related material, as compared to the speech-related material.

As is evident in Table 5.5, the title terms evince fairly low type/token ratios for the speech-related material. Thus, the lexical items characteristic of this category are used extensively, even though there are few of them, something which tallies well with the nature of this gender term category. Compared to, for instance, occupational terms, there are rather few terms of address available for the speakers to use, and not all of them would be appropriate in a given situation. Furthermore, since they are used for marking respect (which would be important in the highly formal setting of the courtroom), language producers in the speech-related material would have to use them frequently, especially if they were witnesses or the accused in a trial situation. Two examples are given in (41) and (42) to illustrate this.

(41)

Mr. *Attorney General*.	Yes, my **Lord**, by all means.
Mr. *Serjeant Tremaine*.	If your **Lordships** please, the Witnesses will be most Conveniently heard, if they come and stand here
Mr. *Attorney General*.	If your **Lordships** please, it will not be possible either for my **Lord** at the Bar, or for us to hear what the Witnesses say: Unless they be brought into this place to stand between us.
Lord High Steward.	My **Lord** Great Chamberlain, be pleased to give order for them to be brought in thither. (BrExam: Tryal of Charles Lord Mohun, p. 11)

(42) Was there any else in company?
No, **Sir.**
What did you afflict others by? Did they bring images?
Yes.
Who brought the images?
Goody Wild & Goody Osburn.
What did you put into those images.
Pins, **Sir**. (AmExam: Examination of Deliverance Hobbs. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 421)

Exchanges such as these, involving the magistrates and the witnesses and accused, provide an explanation for the high frequency of title terms in the examination texts.

5.2.6 Depreciative Terms

There are 600 depreciative term tokens in the material, overall. Regarding the speech-related text categories, these terms are distributed rather evenly, both as regards types and tokens (Table 5.6, p. 111).

Table 5.6. The relative incidence of depreciative terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Depositions	2.2 (27)	23.5 (285)	0.09
Examinations	1.5 (20)	22.3 (301)	0.07
Journals	4.7 (13)	5.1 (14)	0.93
Total	**1.6 (46)**	**21.1 (600)**	**0.08**

Given the setting and topic of these text categories, the presence of insulting or condescending terms is understandable (see examples (43) and (44)).

(43) Then Lunt said, he now having gott gent^{n} to assist him, he would turne off both Womball and Willson, for they were a couple of **blockheads**, could say nothing but as he had taught them. (BrDepo: Trials at Manchester, p. 30)

(44) Proctor replyed he was going to fetch home his **jade** he left her there last night & had rather given 40d than let her come up sd Sibly askt why he talt so Proctor replyed if they were let alone so we should all be **Devils** & **witches** quickly they should rather be had to the Whipping post but he would fetch his **jade** Home & thresh the Devil out of her & more to the like purpose crying hang them, hang them. (AmDepo: Samuel Sibley v. John Proctor. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 683)

Looking at the non-speech-related material, one finds that there are very few instances of depreciative terms to be found. This could be due to a greater reluctance to use insults committing words to paper in general, or perhaps be an effect of the premeditation that the non-immediacy of the written medium affords the author (see section 4.1 above).

Despite the few types of depreciative terms in the journals, the type/token ratio for this text category is very high: only one depreciative type in this text category is used on more than one occasion. If one is to speculate as to why there are depreciative terms present in the non-speech-related journals at all, this could be due to the patronising attitude the authors had towards their surroundings, especially as they travelled through rural areas and foreign lands. All the authors were members of the upper and middling ranks rather than of the lower ranks, and at times the contempt and condescension they feel for those less fortunate shines through in the text. Such a

condescending attitude can, for instance, be detected in the following extract from Knight's journal (45):

(45) Being at a merchants house, in comes a tall country fellow, wth his alfogeos full of Tobacco; for they seldom Loose their Cudd, but keep Chewing and Spitting as long as they'r eyes are open, - he advanc't to the midle of the Room, makes an Awkward Nodd, and spitting a Large deal of Aromatick Tincture, he gave a scrape with his shovel like shoo, leaving a small shovel full of dirt on the floor, made a full stop, Hugging his own pretty Body with his hands under his arms, Stood staring rown'd him, like a Catt let out of a Baskett. At last, like the creature Balaam Rode on, he opened his mouth and said: have You any Ribinen for Hatbands to sell I pray? The Questions and Answers about the pay being past, the Ribin is bro't and opened. **Bumpkin** Simpers, cryes its confounded Gay I vow (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 42–43)

The description of the "country fellow" given by Madame Knight in (45) leaves little doubt that she finds his manners and appearance uncouth and derisive: in the passage quoted, she likens him to a cow (chewing cud), a cat and a donkey ("the creature Balaam Rode on").

Lastly, it is interesting to note that, as well as today, the people of the Early Modern Era sometimes used appreciative terms sarcastically to patronise or talk down to their interlocutors. My material provides one example of this, given in (46). The exchange occurs as Black Will, a moor, is called to give his testimony concerning his master's action in front of the court.

(46) *Rookwood* *Will*, Pray give an account of your Master, and of his Life and Conversation.
Mr. *Phipps*. You are sworn to tell the Truth, **Sweet-heart**. (BrExam: Tryal of Ambrose Rookwood, pp. 66–67)

Given the situation and Will's status both as a servant and a non-European, as well as his subordinate position in the courtroom as compared to the questioning magistrate, it would be difficult to interpret the above use of *sweetheart* as positive or appreciative. For this reason, this instance has not been classified as an appreciative term (see the following section), but has been included among the depreciative terms instead.[49]

[49] The *OED* records the use of *sweetheart* as early as c. 1290. However, the ironic use of *sweetheart* is only attested in the *OED* from 1890 (*OED*: s.v. *sweetheart*, 28 December 2005).

5.2.7 Appreciative Terms

There are very few instances of appreciative terms in the data: only ten tokens, representing three types (Table 5.7).

Table 5.7. The relative incidence of appreciative terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Depositions	0.1 (1)	0.2 (2)	0.50
Examinations	0.1 (1)	0.4 (5)	0.20
Journals	0.4 (1)	1.1 (3)	0.33
Total	**0.1 (3)**	**0.4 (10)**	**0.30**

In the speech-related material, this dearth of data is probably due to the setting and topic of the texts: the courtroom is not the setting best suited for terms of endearment. In depositions, too, deponents are more likely to report on unfavourable things having been said, thus using depreciative terms rather than appreciative terms. In the speech-related data, even when terms that carry appreciative connotations occur, they can be used almost defensively rather than as marks of true affection, as in (47):

(47) Pray God discover you, if you be guilty.
Amen Amen A false tongue will never make a guilty person.
You have been a long time coming to the Court to day, you can come fast enough in the night. said Mercy Lewes.
No, **sweet heart**, said the examinat, And then Mercy Lewes, & all, or many of the rest, were afflicted
(AmExam: Examination of Susannah Martin, Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 552)

As stated in section 5.2.6 above, there is also one instance of an appreciative term used sarcastically. That particular instance has been regarded as a depreciative term, and is consequently discussed in that context.

Lastly, I will consider the use, or rather lack thereof, of appreciative terms in the journals, where one might be more inclined to expect appreciative terms to occur, given their more private nature, as compared to my speech-related material. As Table 5.7 shows, the journals contain a meagre three token instances of appreciative terms, representing only one type: *hero*. It might be that the subject matter of many of the texts (for instance the travelogues) precluded the use of appreciative terms, since these texts were

mainly an account of places that the author had visited, and events that had taken place. As it is, the incidence figures are so low that no fruitful conclusions can be drawn from them.

5.2.8 RSP Terms

The material contains a fair number of RSP terms, both as regards types and tokens. All in all, there are 189 token instances in the texts, representing 40 types (Table 5.8).

Table 5.8. The relative incidence of RSP terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses and type/token ratio provided.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
Depositions	1.3 (16)	4.3 (52)	0.31
Examinations	1.4 (19)	5.0 (67)	0.28
Journals	9.1 (25)	25.4 (70)	0.36
Total	**1.4 (40)**	**6.7 (189)**	**0.21**

Comparing the normalised figures for the three text categories, one finds that the RSP terms occur with similar frequency in the two speech-related categories, depositions and examinations, but rather more often in the journals. As has been discussed above (see section 4.1), this is as could be expected, given the difference in nature between speech and writing in general.

Table 5.8 further shows that the RSP terms evince rather high type/token ratios across the text categories. As was the case with the occupational terms (see section 5.2.4 above), this indicates a desire to make clear distinctions among people of different backgrounds, in this case people of different religions, nationality or political convictions. As a person's political, social or religious position would clearly affect their relative social standing in any given congregation, it would in all likelihood be seen as worthy of mention when describing them. The same holds true for terms denoting nationality, since this would mark the person in question as an outsider, to a certain degree. It is also probable that knowing a person's nationality, religious affiliation or political standpoint would influence how others would behave towards him/her, as well as what behaviour would be expected from that person.

That the question of religious affiliation could be a loaded one, and thus one of some importance can be seen from the exchange given in example (48). In this example, the accused, Giles, tries to persuade those listening that he is not a Papist.

(48) *Giles*, My Lord, I beseech you I may speak to this man, Do you hear, Sir, Were not these the words that I said when you charged me to be a **Papist**, That I knew of no Popish Plot, and they that said I was a **Papist**, or knew any of the Plot, were Rogues or Whores, or worse.
Bridges, You said thus, That the **Papists** were the best Religion, and that those that were not of that Religion were Damn'd.
Giles Have not you been a **Papist** Sir?
Bridges, I am not now.
Giles, Will you say that I am a **Papist**?
Bridges, I say you defended it so much I thought you were. (BrExam: Tryal of John Giles, p. 27)

In a courtroom situation, where so much can depend on courting the favour of those listening, the question of religious, social and political affiliation was certainly an important issue. It is thus not surprising that the material contains a fair number of terms denoting these aspects, nor that the type/token ratios indicate that they are used with a high degree of specificity.

In the journals, the high frequency of RSP terms may be due to the topics in many of the texts included here. For instance, John Fryer's account of his Asian travels contains many references to the nationality and religious beliefs of the people he encounters, which is one reason for the large number of RSP terms in this text category. An example of this is given in (49):

(49) [...] where the ***Portugals*** acting all nefarious Outrages, contrary to their Promise, the ***Arabs*** re-armed themselves with Courage and fresh Succors, and at length beat them from hence to *Ormus* in the Gulf of *Persia*; from whence also they were routed by the help of the ***English*** (we then being at war with them); the first blow to their Greatness in these Parts (BrJour: John Fryer. A New Account of East India and Persia [...], p I, 193)

To sum up, the material contains quite a few RSP terms, both as regards types and tokens, but given the importance which religious, social and political affiliation can be expected to have in a trial situation, and the nature of the journals, this is to be expected.

5.2.9 Section Summary

If one considers the distribution of gender-related terms across the three text categories depositions, examinations and journals, certain trends emerge. First, as could be expected from previous research into the differences between spoken and written language (see section 4.1), the non-speech-related material, being the text category which can be expected to be furthest from spoken language in the present material selection, evinced a decidedly higher type/token ratio in all gender term categories, as shown by Tables 5.1–5.8.

Secondly, the data collected from the material supports statements made previously by historians working with the Early Modern period (cf. Shoemaker 1998: 148), which suggest that factors such as profession, nationality, religious affiliation and political opinions were felt to be important in determining the social status of an individual. This can be seen in the high type/token ratios found as regards both the occupational and the RSP terms, which indicates a high degree of specialisation when it comes to using these terms. This in turn points to a perceived need to distinguish between different subsets of professions or political groups.

The journals contain very few instances of depreciative term tokens, unlike the speech-related material, where quite a few such terms were found. The relative high number of depreciative terms in the depositions and examinations is due to the nature of courtroom discussion, whereas the relative dearth of these terms in the journals might be due to reluctance on the authors' part to appear too condemning in the eyes of their readers. That depreciative terms can be found in the journals at all could, however, indicate a certain patronising attitude towards the subjects of their writing.

Lastly, very few instances of appreciative terms were found in the material; neither the topic nor the setting of the speech-related material appeared to promote the use of terms of admiration or endearment.

5.3 Regional Variation

In this section, I will consider the possible impact that regional variation might have had on the data presented in section 5.2 above. The focus will be on the speech-related material (depositions and examinations), since, as was mentioned in section 4.2.2, dividing the journals according to place of origin renders the samples too small for any useful investigation.

As in section 5.2, the gender term categories will be investigated with one section being devoted to each category (5.3.1–5.3.7). The paucity of appreciative terms in the speech-related material (see section 5.2.7) makes it impossible to draw even tentative conclusions about their distribution over

region of origin. Therefore, this gender term category will not be addressed in this section.

5.3.1 Central Terms

As regards the distribution of central term types, the speech-related material displays a similar number of raw figures across the board, with either five or seven types in each text category. Due to the difference in text length, however, this translates into somewhat more varied normalised figures, ranging from 0.7 (BrExam) to 1.4 (BrDepo and AmExam) types per 10,000 words (Table 5.9).

Table 5.9. The relative incidence of central terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
BrDepo	1.4 (5)	31.3 (115)	0.04
BrExam	0.7 (7)	29.2 (287)	0.02
AmDepo	0.8 (7)	29.0 (246)	0.03
AmExam	1.4 (5)	65.0 (238)	0.02
Total	**0.3 (7)**	**34.6 (886)**	**0.01**

If we look at the distribution of tokens, the picture is somewhat different. Whereas the geographical origin does not seem to influence the distribution of central terms in the deposition material to any large extent (the British deposition material contains 31.3 token instances per 10,000 words, compared to 29.0 instances in the corresponding American texts), the examination material shows an interesting difference in token frequency between the AmE and the BrE texts: the AmE examinations contain more than twice the normalised number of central term tokens (65.0) as compared to their BrE counterparts (29.2). A closer look at the material reveals that this is due to the use of two terms: *man* and *woman*. Both terms occur decidedly more often per 10,000 words in the American examinations than in the British, as shown in Table 5.10 (p. 118). The figures given in Table 5.10 are statistically significant (χ^2: 48.51, df: 1, $p<0.01$).

Table 5.10. The relative incidence of the central terms *man* and *woman* across the examination material, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw instances given within parentheses.

	Man	*Woman*
BrExam	23.0	3.3
	(226)	(32)
AmExam	36.3	24.3
	(133)	(89)

In the AmE examination material, the term *man* is often used to refer to a specific male, often one of the accused, and often as part of the opening of an examination, where the magistrate asks the witnesses to identify the accused (see example (50)). In these cases, the central terms *man* and *woman* are frequently employed (see also example (52).

(50) Who is this **man**? Ann Putman named him. – Mary Walcot said she had seen his shape. What do you say to this? I never did hurt them. Who hurt you Ann Putman? That **man**. I never hurt her. (AmExam: Examination of Nehemiah Abbott, Jr. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 49)

Furthermore, in the AmE material, *man* is used to refer vaguely to a character that could be either human or satanic (example (51)). In the latter case, the term *man* is often premodified by the adjective *black*, a colour traditionally associated with evil. I will return to the use of this adjective in connection with *man* in section 6.2.2.

(51) Sus:Sheldon cried she looks upon the black **man**.
Ann Putman complained of a pin stuck in her.
What black **man** is that?
I know none
Ann Putman testifyed there was.
Mary Warrin cryed out she was prickt.
What black **man** did you see?
I saw no black **man** but your own presence. (AmExam: Examination of Martha Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 185)

Woman occurs 24.3 times per 10,000 words in the AmE examinations, compared to only 3.3 times in the corresponding BrE material. This is a result of the use of the term to describe the accused in the AmE trials, (who, as previously noted, were women more often than not). Examples are given in (52) and (53).

(52) Is this the **woman**?
They made signes but could not speak, but Ann Putman afterwards Betty Hubbard cryed out Oh. Goody Easty, Goody Easty you are the

woman, you are the **woman** (AmExam: Examination of Mary Easty: Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 289)

(53) Mr. Harthorn. What do you say (speaking to one afflicted) have you seen this **Woman** hurt you?
Yes, she beat me this morning
Abigial. Have you been hurt by this **Woman**?
Yes (AmExam: Examination of Rebecca Nurse. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 584)

Together, the many occurrences of *man* and *woman* account for the clustering of central terms in the AmE material.

5.3.2 Relational Terms

Compared to the distribution of central term types across the text categories (see Table 5.9), the relational terms distribute more variedly: the AmE examinations contain 3.6 type instances per 10,000 words, the BrE depositions contain 3.3, the AmE depositions 2.2 and the BrE examinations 1.1 types per 10,000 words. The frequency of relational tokens in the four text categories also varies greatly, ranging from 17.4 instances per 10,000 words in the BrExam material, to 79.0 instances in the AmE depositions (see Table 5.11). The token figures presented in Table 5.11 are statistically significant (χ^2: 675.441, df: 3, $p<0.01$).

Table 5.11. The relative incidence of relational terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
BrDepo	3.3 (12)	30.5 (112)	0.11
BrExam	1.1 (11)	17.4 (171)	0.06
AmDepo	2.2 (19)	79.0 (669)	0.03
AmExam	3.6 (13)	57.1 (209)	0.06
Total	**0.9 (23)**	**45.3 (1,161)**	**0.02**

It is interesting to note that whereas the distribution of relational types is roughly the same in the AmE depositions and their BrE counterparts, the AmE examinations contain approximately three and a half times as many types per 10,000 words as do the BrE examinations (these figures are,

however, not statistically significant). This difference between the BrE and the AmE material is accentuated even more in the distribution of the tokens, where relational terms are considerably more frequent in the AmE texts than in the BrE ones.

The relatively high frequency of relational terms in the AmE examinations could be due to the more private milieu in which they were recorded (see section 4.2.2). In a village where people would know almost everyone else, it is not unlikely that the participants in a trial would be defined by their relation to each other and other members of the community. An example of this, where people are identified through their relationship with others, is given in (54).

(54) The depotion of Hannah Harres Aiged twenty seven yeares or thareabouts Testifieth and saith that she Lived at the hous of Georg Burros at falmouth & the above said hannah harres many times hath taken notic that when she hath had anny Discorse with the above said burross **wife**-when the above said burros was from hom that apone has Returne he hath often scolded **wife** and told her that he knew what they said when he was abroad and further saith that upone a time when his **wife** had Laine In Not above one weak that he fell out with his **wife** and kept her by Discorce at the Dore till she fell sicke In the place and grew wors at night so that the above said hannah harres was afraid she would dye and thay called In thare Naibours and the above said burroses **Daughter** told One of the women that was thare the cause of her **mothers** Ellness and the a bove said burros chid his **Daughter** for telling and the a bove said burros Came to the a bove said hannah harres and told her If that his **wif** Did otherwise than well she should not tell of It & the abovsaid hannah harres told him that she would not be confined to anny such thing (AmDepo: Hannah Harris v. George Burroughs. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 163)

In contrast, the participants in the British trials were not related to each other by blood or marriage to the same extent. However, relational terms do occur in this part of the material as well (example (55)).

(55) Then Mr. *W. Busby* is called for and Sworn. He is asked, Do you know Mrs. *Pleasant Rawlins*?
Mr. Serg. Darnel. Give an Account of her.
Busby. She is the **Daughter** of *William Rawlins* Deceased, who left his Estate to Dr. *Bright* and my self, to be sold for payment of his Debts and Legacies, and left the surplusage to his **Daughter**, which is about 2000 *l*. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 3)

Consequently, there are fewer normalised relational term tokens in the BrE material overall, as compared to the AmE texts.

5.3.3 Epicene Terms

As Table 5.12 shows, the token distribution among the epicene terms varies greatly across the text categories. In descending order, the AmE examinations contain 70.2 instances per 10,000 words, the BrE depositions 48.5, the AmE depositions 36.7 and the BrE examinations 19.1 tokens per 10,000 words. The token figures given in Table 5.12 are statistically significant (χ^2: 50.146, df: 3, $p<0.01$).

Table 5.12. The relative incidence of epicene terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
BrDepo	3.5 (13)	48.5 (178)	0.07
BrExam	2.0 (20)	19.1 (188)	0.11
AmDepo	1.5 (13)	36.7 (311)	0.04
AmExam	3.0 (11)	70.2 (257)	0.04
Total	**1.3 (33)**	**36.5 (934)**	**0.04**

A more in-depth look at the data reveals that one reason for the high frequency of epicene terms in the AmE examinations is the many uses of the term *child* to refer both to participants in the proceedings (56) and to deceased children allegedly murdered by acts of witchcraft (57):

(56) Tell us who hurts these **children**.
I do not know.
If you be guilty of this fact do you think you can hide it.
The Lord knows --
Well tell us w't you know of this matter
Why I am a Gosple-woman, & do you think I can have to do with witchcraft too
How could you tell then that the **Child** was bid to observe what cloths you wore when some came to speak w'th you.
(AmExam: Examination of Martha Corey. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 248)

(57) Did not they bring the image of John Nichols his **child**?
Yes.
Did not you hurt that **child**?
Yes.
(AmExam: Examination of Deliverance Hobbs. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 421)

All in all, the term *child* is used 116 times in the AmE examinations, which translates as 31.7 occurrences per 10,000 words. The corresponding figures for the BrE examinations are ten occurrences and 1.0 instance per 10,000 words. Removing the term *child* from the data in all four text categories evens out the token figures somewhat, as shown in Table 5.13.

Table 5.13. The relative incidence of epicene terms (tokens) across the text categories, when *child* is omitted from the data, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw instances are given within parentheses.

Text category	**Tokens**
BrDepo	21.8 (80)
BrExam	18.1 (178)
AmDepo	24.6 (208)
AmExam	38.5 (141)
Total	**23.7 (607)**

Table 5.13 shows that, although the normalised token figures become slightly more even when the term *child* is omitted from the data, there is still a difference between the BrE and the AmE material in that epicene term tokens occur more frequently in the latter material set. Another term which can be found more often in the AmE material than in its BrE counterpart is *person*, which is frequently used in the phrase "afflicted person/s" to describe the alleged victims of witchcraft in the trials (58). This particular expression is used so often in the Salem material as to acquire a status of being a set phrase in the proceedings.

(58) The Deposition of Bray Wilkins of Salem Village aged about eighty & one years with reference to John Willard of s'd Salem, lately charged with Witchcraft when he was at first complained of by the afflicted **persons** for afflicting of them (AmDepo: Bray Wilkins v. John Willard. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 847)

Person appears in the BrE material as well, but not with as high a frequency. I will return to the use of *person* and how it distributes in the material in section 5.4.3 below.

5.3.4 Occupational Terms

As is shown in Table 5.14, there is a striking difference between the geographical regions as regards the distribution of occupational tokens: there is a decidedly lower frequency of occupational terms in the AmE material than in the BrE texts.

Table 5.14. The relative incidence of occupational terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
BrDepo	24.3 (89)	120.2 (441)	0.20
BrExam	7.6 (75)	81.5 (800)	0.09
AmDepo	3.4 (29)	27.2 (230)	0.13
AmExam	4.4 (16)	24.6 (90)	0.18
Total	**5.4 (138)**	**60.9 (1,560)**	**0.09**

Whereas the BrE depositions and the BrE examinations contain 120.2 and 81.5 token instances per 10,000 words respectively, the corresponding numbers for the AmE depositions and examinations only amount to 27.2 and 24.6 instances per 10,000 words. Testing the raw token instances presented in Table 5.14 with the chi-square test revealed that this difference is statistically significant (χ^2: 733.634, df: 3, $p<0.01$).

As pointed out in section 5.2.4 above, the relatively high occurrence of occupational term tokens in the BrE material is not surprising, since people were often identified not only by name, but also by occupation in Early Modern times (see examples (35) and (36)). Thus, the question is not why there are so many occupational terms in the data, but why they cluster in the BrE texts, rather than being distributed evenly throughout the material.

One reason for the relative lack of occupational terms in the American texts could be that the legal proceedings were held in a small community where people were known to each other, so that their names and relation to one another would be sufficient to identify them even without stating their professions (see further section 5.3.2 above). Another possible explanation could be that rural frontier life in New England had yet not allowed for a substantial portion of the villagers to specialise to the extent that they could be called *weavers* or *carpenters*. In a community where nearly everyone was a jack-of-all-trades, there would be little reason to select only one of the many occupations a person had in order to identify him. Such an

interpretation of the data would corroborate claims made by for instance Merrill Jensen (1968: 27), that most immigrants were farmers, tenant farmers and farm labourers, rather than artisans. Furthermore, the people of Salem would have no need for occupations to be explicitly stated in order to assign people a place in the social order (see section 5.2.4), since that order would already be known to most people involved.

5.3.5 Title Terms

The category evincing the highest frequency of gender-related terms is title terms. As can be seen in Table 5.15, taken together the speech-related material contains 201.3 title terms per 10,000 words. There is, however, a noticeable difference in how these title terms are distributed over the different text categories.

Table 5.15. The relative incidence of title terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
BrDepo	8.2 (30)	372.8 (1,368)	0.02
BrExam	2.6 (26)	294.0 (2,886)	0.01
AmDepo	1.4 (12)	63.4 (537)	0.02
AmExam	3.6 (13)	99.7 (365)	0.04
Total	**1.5 (38)**	**201.3 (5,156)**	**0.01**

Overall, the title terms occur decidedly more frequently in the BrE material than in the AmE texts. In the BrE depositions the title terms amount to 372.8 instances per 10,000 words, whereas the corresponding figure in the AmE depositions is considerably lower, at 63.4 instances per 10,000 words. As concerns the examination material, the BrE examinations contain 294.0 title terms per 10,000 words, whereas the corresponding AmE texts contain 99.7. The difference between the text categories as regards title term tokens is statistically significant (χ^2: 3084.507, df: 3, $p<0.01$), indicating that the distribution of title terms is connected to the geographical origin of the texts.

As mentioned in section 5.2.5, the high overall frequency of title terms in the speech-related material is probably due to the courtroom situation: when addressing a magistrate or a member of the nobility, especially in the formal context of the court room, it was natural for the speakers to use a substantial number of both terms of address and titles to mark their respect and

subordinate status relative to their interlocutors, as shown in examples (59) and (60). As in 5.2.5 above, only title terms used to refer to the interlocutor have been marked in bold type in these examples.

(59)

L. C. J.	Did she never ask you any Questions about the Life of the King?
Mr. *G.*	**My Lord,** when the King was very ill at *Windsor*, and all People were fearful that he would die, she did move the Question to me.
L. C. J.	What Question?
Mr. *G.*	To know whether I thought his Majesty would live or die: but it was her fear that he would die.
L. C. J.	Had you seen the King?
Mr. *G.*	No, **my Lord.**
L. C. J.	How then did she expect you should give her an Answer? from your Art?
Mr. *G.*	From my Art, **my Lord**.
	(BrExam: The Triall of Elizabeth Cellier, p. 9)

(60)

Mr. Serj. Jefferies,	Did you see my Lord Mayor down, and his Hat off?
Mr. Weston,	I saw his Hat off, **Sir** *George,* but I can't tell how it came off.
Mr. Williams,	You say, you saw my Lord's Hat off, can you tell whether my Lord was so courteous to take his Hat off or no?
Mr. Weston,	I dare say, my Lord did not.
Mr. Williams,	Did he, or no? I ask you upon your Oath.
Mr. Weston,	I can't tell that, **Sir**.
	(BrExam: Tryal of Tho. Pilkington [etc], p. 24)

Considering this, and also the nature of the gender term category, one could assume that title terms would be more frequent in direct speech than in indirect speech (see section 5.2.5). Nevertheless, the BrE deposition material, which consists of third-person narratives, contains 372.8 tokens per 10,000 words, a higher incidence figure than is found in the corresponding examination material, which has 294.0 title terms per 10,000 words. Furthermore, although there are examples of title terms being used in quotations, that is, stretches of text given in the first person where the deponent renders a citation, allegedly verbatim, most title terms in the BrE deposition material occur in passages given in indirect speech (61).

(61) Then the Judge asked **M^{r}** Lunt againe if, before the deliv~y of those Comissions to **S^{r}** Rowland Stanley and **S^{r}** Thomas Clifton, he did p~sonally know those **gent^{n}**, he answered, he did not till then know either of them. Whereupon **S^{r}** Giles Eyres the Judge did say there was then no such mighty matter in Lunt's mistake as the prison^{rs} made of it in diversifying the two **gent$^{n's}$** names that were strangers

> to him, haveing been told when he first saw them that those were the 2 p~sons. (BrDepo: Trials at Manchester, pp. 10–11)

A closer look at the material provides an explanation for the surprisingly large cluster of title terms in the BrE examinations. The text that contributes most to this high frequency concerns the birth of the Prince of Wales. In the depositions relating to this incident, the very subject matter prompts the deponents to use terms belonging to this category, such as *queen*, *king*, *prince*, *lord*, *lady*, *dame* and *sir*, when referring to the people present during and immediately following the birth of the Prince.

As can be seen in Table 5.15, all in all, title terms occur less frequently in the AmE speech-related material than in its BrE counterpart. This could be due to the nature of the early American settlements, where hereditary titles would be less frequent than in England. As Thompson (1974: 8) points out, "feudal institutions were never successfully established in British North America. Nor was there an aristocracy in the European sense, imposing its standards and economic and social control over the classes beneath it". Consequently, there would be less reason for title terms to occur in texts from the, relatively speaking, egalitarian colonies than there would in the BrE material from the same time.

Another reason why there are fewer title terms in the AmE texts is, of course, the nature of the trials included in each text category: it could be expected that a set of depositions pertaining to the birth of the Prince of Wales, for example, would yield more hereditary titles than would depositions containing allegations of witchcraft in a small colonial town.

The vast difference between the AmE and the BrE material makes especially pertinent the question of how much of an impact the topic of text has on the distribution of gender-related terms. Should it prove possible to explain this great dichotomy in terms of trial topic, this might be an indication that smaller differences in the regional distribution of terms would also be influenced by this factor. Thus, in order to test the hypothesis that the topic of the trials has an impact on how many title terms were used during the proceedings, the BrE material dealing with allegations of witchcraft was extracted. All in all, this part of the material contains 4,619 words and consists of the following texts:

- *An Account of the Tryal and Examination of Joan Buts, for Being a Common Witch and Inchantress* (980 words)
- *A True and Impartial Relation of the Informations Against Three Witches* (deposition material: 1,750 words, examination material: 1,543 words)
- *Depositions from the Castle of York* (only the first sample deposition was included here; a deposition against Elizabeth Fenwick, accused of witchcraft) (346 words)

This sample material was then examined for title terms. The resulting type and token data are presented in Table 5.16, together with corresponding data extracted from the full AmE material.

Table 5.16. The title term types and tokens normalised per 10,000 words in the BrE witch trial-related material, as contrasted with the AmE material. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types	**Tokens**
BrE witch texts	17.3	67.1
	(8)	(31)
AmE material	1.3	73.9
	(16)	(896)

Even though it is important to remember that the BrE sample is very small (4,619 words, compared to the 121,312 words in the AmE texts), it is interesting to note that as regards the normalised token figures, this part of the BrE material seems to conform more readily to the AmE texts than do the texts in the BrE text categories as a whole. One reason why the BrE witch texts contain so many more title term types per 10,000 words than the corresponding AmE material could be the absence of nobles and high dignitaries other than the presiding magistrate at the Salem trials. With the majority of those present belonging to the lower or middle ranks, there is a limited number of title terms that can be used about the people involved in the proceedings. That being the case, a longer sample of text might not produce a sufficiently high number of new types to compensate for the increase in sample length, which in turn would lead to a decrease in the number of types per 10,000 words. In any case, the figures in Table 5.16 do indicate that the topic of the trial in question did influence the use of title terms.

5.3.6 Depreciative Terms

As can be seen in Table 5.17 (p. 128), the type/token ratio for the BrE depositions is higher than the corresponding ratios for the other text categories, at 0.23 as compared to 0.05 (for the AmE depositions), 0.08 (for the BrE examinations) and 0.07 (for the AmE examinations). This is largely due to the varied nature of the many reported insults in this text category.

Table 5.17. The relative incidence of depreciative terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	Types	Tokens	Type/token ratio
BrDepo	6.0 (22)	26.4 (97)	0.23
BrExam	1.4 (14)	18.3 (180)	0.08
AmDepo	1.1 (9)	22.2 (188)	0.05
AmExam	2.2 (8)	33.0 (121)	0.07
Total	**1.5 (38)**	**22.9 (586)**	**0.06**

The token figures in Table 5.17 are statistically significant (χ^2: 40.580, df: 3, $p<0.01$). Whereas the AmE depositions contain nine types of depreciative terms, the most prolific of which is *witch* (137 instances, or 73% of the tokens in the text category), the BrE depositions contain a total of 22 types. Two examples from the latter material set are given in (62) and (63).

(62) *Margaret Ellwood* saith, she had a Company to see the Lodgings at *Windsor*, in the first Year of King *James*, about three or four of the Clock in the Afternoon, a Woman told her my Lady was not there, but she opening the door, she saw Lady upon the Stools in an ill Posture, Mr. *Germaine's* Breeches were down, he pulled them up, and laid his hand on his Sword, saying, God Damn you for a **Whore**, how have you the Impudence to come here? (BrDepo: Duke and Duchess of Norfolk, p. A4VC1)

(63) And the said Hutchinson, on the same day, in the house of one Anne Wiseman, said, with several oaths, "Hang these Popish **dogs**, wil we have any of these Popish **dogs** to be our King?" (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, p. 284)

The difference in the number of depreciative terms between the BrE examinations and depositions could be due to reluctance on the part of the language producers to use these kinds of terms in front of high-ranking officials, such as the magistrates. It is, however, difficult to say with any certainty why there are more varied insults in the BrE depositions than in the corresponding AmE texts. One possible reason could be that the colonists in New England viewed insults differently from the people in England. As pointed out by Kytö (1991: 25–26, and references therein), in New England "illicit speech (lying, swearing, slander, blasphemy etc.) was held to be of

immediate concern owing to the subversive threat it was seen to pose to social order". It is of course also possible that the fact that the BrE and AmE material deal with different topics is behind this difference.

5.3.7 RSP Terms

Turning lastly to the RSP terms, Table 5.18 shows that the frequency of these terms is higher in the English material than in the American texts. There are some possible explanations for this. First, since the Salem proceedings mostly concern local people, there are very few instances of words denoting nationality in the AmE material, since it would only be relevant to discuss a person's nationality if it differed from the expected norm.

Table 5.18. The relative incidence of RSP terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

Text category	**Types**	**Tokens**	**Type/token ratio**
BrDepo	3.0 (11)	9.3 (34)	0.32
BrExam	1.5 (15)	6.1 (60)	0.25
AmDepo	0.6 (5)	2.1 (18)	0.28
AmExam	1.4 (5)	2.2 (8)	0.63
Total	**1.0 (25)**	**4.7 (120)**	**0.21**

There are also fewer terms denoting religious affiliation in the AmE material than there are in the English legal proceedings. As has already been discussed (see section 5.2.8), in England at the time, the question of a person's religious standpoint was seen as highly significant when judging his or her character, as shown in examples (48) and (64).

(64) *Sir B. Shower*. Where is Black *Will*?
Cryer. Black *Will*.
(He appeared and was a Moor.)
L. C. J. H. Ask him if he be a **Christian**.
Cryer. I have ask'd him, and he says he's a **Christian**.
Sworn. *(Then he was sworn.)* (BrExam: Tryal of Ambrose Rookwood, p. 66)

The importance of a person's religious beliefs, coupled with the prevalent fear of Papist plots, contributes to the BrE trial texts containing a rather large number of RSP terms. The fact that the AmE material contains so few RSP terms denoting religious affiliation (only two: *Christian* and (church) *member*) might be due to the religious homogeneity in New England at the time (Thompson 1974: 7). As already stated, affiliation would only be seen as important to discuss if it somehow differed from the expected norm. The token figures given in Table 5.18 are statistically significant (χ^2: 49.908, df: 3, $p<0.01$).

5.3.8 Section Summary

In this section, I have investigated the distribution of gender-related terms in the speech-related material, using the geographical setting of the legal proceedings as the starting-point. As the non-speech-related material is too small when divided according to region of origin, it was omitted from this discussion.

As has been shown in sections 5.3.1–5.3.7, the data displays certain trends. First, the intimate setting of the Salem trials, as opposed to the more formal setting in the British trial proceedings, appears to affect the distribution of certain gender term categories, such as the relational terms. These terms cluster in the AmE material, possibly due to the fact that the people participating in the trials were familiar with each other, and thus could be identified through their mutual relationships.

Another trend that can be seen emerging in the data is the relatively low frequency of occupational terms in the AmE speech-related material, both as regards types and tokens. I have suggested that this could be due to, on the one hand, the abovementioned intimate setting of the Salem witch trials, and, on the other, less job specialisation among the early American settlers. In a community where nearly everyone had to handle several tasks (such as farming, cobbling, carpentry, etc), it was less likely or even unlikely that people would be identified in terms of their profession.

There are also comparatively few title term tokens in the AmE speech-related texts, when contrasted with their BrE counterparts. A small sample study of the BrE witch trial-material showed that this is probably due to the topic of the texts, although the paucity of title terms might also be in part attributed to the nature of the American settlements in New England, especially in the rural communities, where there might not only be fewer dignitaries, but also a less-formalised setting at the trials and hence fewer title terms mentioned.

Lastly, it was shown that the RSP terms cluster in the BrE material, a fact that also ties in, in part, with the familiar setting of the AmE trials: as the Salem trials only involved people living in the immediate area, fewer terms denoting, for instance, nationality would be needed. Also, in Britain at the

time, the prevalent fear among Protestants that Papists were plotting to overthrow the government led to the question of religious affiliation becoming highly important when judging a person's character. Therefore it is only to be expected that gender-related terms dealing with people's beliefs would occur more frequently in BrE trial texts than in AmE ones.

5.4 The Distribution of Gender-Related Terms across Referent Gender

In this section, I will introduce another extralinguistic factor to the analysis of the gender-related terms, namely referent gender. As explained in section 4.2.3, all instances of gender-related terms where the gender of the referent could not be established beyond reasonable doubt have been omitted from this part of the investigation, which is why the total number of terms here is smaller than that in the previous two sections. Note that instances of terms with referents of both genders (unspecified reference) have been included, however. The overall distribution of the terms across the genders (male [M], female [F] and unspecified [FM]) is given in section 4.2.3 above. As in the two previous sections, the current section will focus on the distribution of these terms according to the gender term categories.

Note that the tables in this section will only be concerned with the gender distinctions that are attested in each data set. This means that for gender term categories where the material does not, for instance, contain any examples of unspecified referents (as is the case with, for example, the central terms – see Table 5.19 in section 5.4.1), the table in which the data is presented will only give figures for male (M) and female (F) referents.

5.4.1 Central Terms

All in all, there are very few central term types for either gender (the definition of central terms precludes the existence of any instances with unspecified gender in the material, see section 3.2) across the text categories. As shown in section 5.2.1, overall there are 13 central term types in the material. These types are distributed equally between the genders, with seven types being used with male reference, and six when denoting women (Table 5.19, p. 132). Table 5.19 also shows that in all text categories, there is roughly the same number of types with male and female referents, often with a slight bias towards male types.

Table 5.19. The relative incidence of central terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types		**Tokens**		**Type/token ratios**	
	M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**
BrDepo	0.8 (3)	0.5 (2)	24.0 (88)	7.4 (27)	0.03	0.07
BrExam	0.4 (4)	0.3 (3)	25.3 (248)	4.0 (39)	0.02	0.08
AmDepo	0.5 (4)	0.4 (3)	12.3 (104)	16.8 (142)	0.04	0.02
AmExam	0.5 (2)	0.8 (3)	37.4 (137)	27.6 (101)	0.01	0.03
Journals	2.5 (7)	1.8 (5)	18.1 (50)	9.8 (27)	0.14	0.19
Total	**0.2 (7)**	**0.2 (6)**	**22.1 (627)**	**11.8 (336)**	**0.01**	**0.02**

It is worth noting that, despite the speech-related material evincing a roughly equal number of central types referring to men and women respectively, in all but one text category a considerable majority of the central tokens refer to men. In the BrE examinations, there are a total 287 token instances of central terms, of which 248, or 86%, have male reference. Male referents are also in the majority in the BrE depositions, the AmE examinations and in the journals. In contrast, the AmE depositions contain a higher number of central terms with female reference than with male reference. Out of the 246 token instances of central terms in this text category, 142 instances, or 58% denote women, as compared to 104 instances denoting men.

The token figures presented in Table 5.19 are statistically significant (χ^2: 126.3, df: 4, $p<0.01$), indicating that the distribution of gender term tokens is due to a factor other than chance. The reason why a majority of the central term tokens in the BrE material have male referents is probably, as was stated in section 4.3.2 above, that there were more men than women involved in the British trial proceedings. There would therefore be more reason to refer to men both in conversation and when giving testimonies (65).

(65) Sir *F. Winington,* Do you believe he killed himself now Mr. *Farewell*?
L. C. J. Were his Eyes *Fly-blown* and Shut?
Surgeon, There was something in the Corners of his Eyes that looked like matter; but I can't say it was *Fly-blown*. His Eyes were open and Blood-

shotten, like a **Man** that has had an extraordinary violence used towards that part; or like a **Man** that hath had an extraordinary Cold. (BrExam: Tryal of Nathanael Thompson [etc.], p. 13)

As we have seen (section 4.2.3), the situation was quite different with the Salem trials, where the majority of the trial participants were women: overall, the speech-related AmE material contains more instances of female gender-related terms than male. Despite this, the figures presented in Table 5.19 show that the percentage of central term tokens with male referents is larger than could be expected, given that so many of those accused of witchcraft and those testifying were women (as can be seen in the list of cases in the Salem trials given in Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: vii–ix). In the AmE examinations, the number of central tokens with male reference even exceeds those referring to women. A look at the data reveals that this is in part due to the frequent use of the term *man* to describe both the devil and alleged witch masters, who had reputedly appeared to the accused or the accusers to tempt them, and whose spectres the accusers at times claimed to see during the trials. Examples of this are given in (66)–(68).

(66) Mary Walcot, Susan: Sheldon, & Abigail Williams said they saw a black **man** whispering in her ears.
Oh! you are liars, & God will stop the mouth of liars
You are not to speak after this manner in the Court
I will speak the Truth as long as I live.
Mary Walcot & Susan: Sheldon & Eliz: Hubbard said again there was a **man** whispering in her ear, & said she should never confess.
Goody Bibber free from fits hitherto said there was a black **man** with her & fell into a fit.
(AmExam: Examination of Dorcas Hoar. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 390)

(67) She confesses, that about 11 years ago, when she was in a melancholy state and condition, she used to walk abroad in her orchard; and upon a certain time, she saw the appearance of a cat, at the end of the house, which yet she thought was a real cat. However, at that time, it diverted her from praying to God, and instead thereof she prayed to the devil; about which time she made a covenant with the devil, who, as a black **man**, came to her and presented her a book, upon which she laid her finger and that left a red spot: And that upon her signing, the devil told her he was her God, and that she should serve and worship him, and, she believes, she consented to it. (AmExam: Examination of Mary Osgood. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 615)

(68) the Evening of the same day Came to mee the Appariton of these three John Willard Elizabeth Colson And one old **man** which I

> knew not whom tempted her with their Boocks and money And Afflicted her sorely All the fore parte of the night I saw this willard suckle the Apparition of two black piggs on his breasts And this Colson suckled As it Appeared A yellow bird this old **man** Which I knew not Suckled A black snake then willard tempted mee Again with his Boocke I said to Willard how long have you binn A wizard hee told mee twenty years and forth with they kneelled to Prayer to the Black **man** with a loung Crouned hat which then was with them and then they vanished away – (AmDepo: Susannah Sheldon v. John Willard and Elizabeth Colson. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 838)

Even discounting the references to the devil, it is evident that the men involved in the Salem witch trials are mentioned frequently using the central term *man*, rather than, for instance, depreciative terms, such as *wizard* or *witch* (see further section 5.4.6). One possible explanation for this lies in the fact that to the people of the Early Modern Era, the stereotypical witch was female. Sharpe (1996: 169) mentions that in England, some 90 percent of those ever tried for witchcraft at the assizes were women, and it is very likely that the colonists would have brought with them this stereotype of the witch as a woman to their new home.[50] It is therefore possible that, since any male involvement in the Salem witch trials was unexpected and outside the norm, the established terminology had to be modified in order to include the accused men. From my material, it would appear that the people of Salem and its environs opted for the central term *man* to refer to the accused men. (As will be shown in section 5.4.6, the term *witch* is at times used with male referents, but remains predominantly a female term in the AmE speech-related texts.)

5.4.2 Relational Terms

The relational types are fairly evenly distributed between the male and female referents in the speech-related material (Table 5.20, p. 135). In the journals, though, there are more than twice as many relational term types referring to men (4.0 per 10,000 words) as to women (1.8 per 10,000 words).

[50] For a further discussion of why women, especially old ones, were seen as likely practitioners of witchcraft, see Sharpe (1996: 169–189).

Table 5.20 The relative incidence of relational terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types		**Tokens**		**Type/token ratios**	
	M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**
BrDepo	1.4 (5)	1.9 (7)	18.0 (66)	12.5 (46)	0.08	0.15
BrExam	0.5 (5)	0.6 (6)	10.2 (100)	7.2 (71)	0.05	0.08
AmDepo	1.2 (10)	1.1 (9)	23.9 (202)	55.1 (467)	0.05	0.02
AmExam	1.6 (6)	1.9 (7)	14.2 (52)	42.9 (157)	0.12	0.04
Journals	4.0 (11)	1.8 (5)	17.0 (47)	12.3 (34)	0.23	0.15
Total	**0.6 (16)**	**0.4 (12)**	**16.5 (467)**	**27.3 (775)**	**0.03**	**0.02**

One possible explanation for this is that more male "characters" figure in the texts, and would therefore be mentioned more often, and referred to with terms from all the gender term categories, relational terms included. Also, as discussed previously (cf. section 4.1), the properties of non-speech-related texts give the producer of the text the opportunity of varying his or her language so as to avoid unnecessary repetition and produce statements with a higher degree of specificity. These two factors combined provide a plausible explanation for the predominance of male relational term types in the journals.

Turning to the speech-related material, Table 5.20 reveals that whereas – in analogy with the central terms (section 5.4.1) – the relational tokens in the BrE texts occur somewhat more frequently with male referents, the relational tokens in the AmE material cluster around female referents: 70% of the relational tokens in the AmE depositions and 75% of those in the AmE examinations refer to women. This difference between the number of term tokens with male and female reference in the speech-related material, statistically significant to the 0.01 level of significance (χ^2: 97.94, df: 4, $p<0.01$), is probably due not only to the higher percentage of women taking part (as witnesses or defendants) in the Salem trials, but also to the fact that, as discussed for example in section 5.2.2 above, women tended to be identified in official records not by their profession but by their relationship to others, and predominantly by their relationship to men. Examples of this are given in (69–71).

(69) Elizabeth Booth aged 18 yeares or thereabouts deposeth & saith That Sarah Procter and Mary Derish the **wife** of Michell Derish apeared to this Deponent in the Night and Called her Jade, Mary Derish asked her what made her say any thing about #[Sarah Procter] Sarah Procter #[Replyed] said it was well.she did not come to the Village that Day: and with all afflicted, & Pinched, her, this Deponent most greviously and so Continues to afflict her this Deponet still and John Procter and his **wife** Likewise whos name is Elizabeth: Procter: (AmDepo: Elizabeth Booth v. Sarah Proctor and Mary DeRich. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 692)

(70) The Depotion of Elizabeth Balch of Beverly Aged aboute Eight & thirty years & **wife** unto Benjamin Balch ju'r This Deponant Testifieth hereby & saith that she being at Salem on the very Day that Cap't Georg Curwin was buried & in the evening of s'd Day Cominge from s'd Salem unto s'd Beverly on horse back with her **sister** then known by the name of Abigaile Woodburie now Abigaile Waldon Living in Wenham **wife** unto Nathaniell Waldon Rideing behinde her & as they were Rideing as befour & were Come soe far as Crane River Common soe Called Edward Bishop & his **wife** over tooke us (on horse back) who are both now in prison under suspition of witchcraft & had some words of Difference it seemed unto us. (AmDepo: Elizabeth Balch and Abigail Waldon v. Sarah Bishop. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 111–112)

(71) The Deposition of [Sarah Holton] **Relique** of Benjamine Holton Deceased who testifieth and saith that about this time three years my deare and loveing **Husband** Benjamine Holton Deceased: was as well as ever I knew him in my life: [...] (AmDepo: Sarah Holton v. Rebecca Nurse. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 600)

There are also occasions where the woman in question is not named at all, but only referred to in relation to her husband, as seen in the last instance of *wife* in (70) above, and also in (72).

(72) [...] she told me also: she was the caus of: Jeremiah Neals **wifes** death: (AmDepo: Mary Warren v. Ann Pudeator. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 706)

Naturally, men too were mentioned in terms of their relationship with women, especially in first person narratives, as can be seen in example (71) above, but when identifying a male deponent, it is more common in the material to find that the scribe did so by giving his occupation. This difference between methods of identifying men and identifying women is illustrated in (73).

(73) John Bly sen'r and Rebecka Bly his **wife** of Salem, both Testifie and say that s'd Jno Bly Bought a Sow of Edw'd Bushop of Salem **Sawyer** and by agreement with s'd Bushop was to pay the price

> agreed upon, unto **Lt** Jeremiah Neale of Salem, and Bridgett the **wife** of Said Edward Bushop because she could not have the mony or vallue agreed for, payd unto her, she [came] to the house of the deponents in Salem and Quarrelled w'th them aboute it [...] (AmDepo: John Bly, Sr. and Rebecca Bly v. Bridget Bishop. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 103)

When considering these scribal conventions of the Early Modern Era, the overall predominance of female referents with relational terms is well in line with what could be expected. That the BrE speech-related material despite this contains more instances of male relational term tokens is, again, due to the fact that so few women were involved in the trial proceedings.

5.4.3 Epicene Terms

As shown in Table 5.21, there is an interesting difference in the distribution of epicene tokens between male and female referents if we compare the BrE speech-related material with its AmE counterpart, similar to the distributions found in the central and the relational terms (sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2).

Table 5.21. The relative incidence of epicene terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types			**Tokens**			**Type/token ratios**		
	M	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**
BrDepo	2.5 (9)	0.8 (3)	1.9 (7)	35.7 (131)	2.2 (8)	7.9 (29)	0.07	0.38	0.24
BrExam	1.2 (12)	0.7 (7)	1.1 (11)	5.8 (57)	0.7 (7)	6.7 (66)	0.21	1.00	0.17
AmDepo	1.1 (9)	0.7 (6)	0.6 (5)	4.6 (39)	13.3 (113)	7.2 (61)	0.23	0.05	0.08
AmExam	0.5 (2)	1.4 (5)	2.2 (8)	0.8 (3)	23.5 (86)	25.7 (94)	0.67	0.07	0.09
Journals	4.4 (12)	2.9 (8)	4.4 (12)	13.1 (36)	6.2 (17)	12.3 (34)	0.33	0.47	0.35
Total	**0.8 (22)**	**0.6 (16)**	**0.7 (21)**	**9.4 (266)**	**8.1 (231)**	**10.0 (284)**	**0.08**	**0.07**	**0.07**

Whereas the BrE material (both depositions and examinations) contains a substantial number of epicene term tokens with male referents and very few with female referents, the opposite is true for the AmE texts. This difference in gender term tokens was found to be statistically significant to the 0.01 level of significance (χ^2: 333.5, df: 8, $p<0.01$).

The material reveals that the factor contributing most to this is, again, the difference in the gender distribution of the people participating in the trials. In this case, it is the use of the term *person* to refer to people both present and absent that affects the gender distribution the most (see further section 3.3.3). In the BrE depositions, *person* occurs 25 times with a male referent, and never unambiguously with a female referent. For the BrE examinations, the corresponding figures are 36 for male referents and one for female. These figures can be contrasted with the AmE depositions, where *person* on 85 occasions refers to a woman and three times refers to a man, and the AmE examinations, where it occurs 35 times with female referents and once with a male referent. Examples are given in (74)–(77).

(74) And this Informant further saith, that she did never know her said Husband *Anthony Jones* to be taken in any Fits or Convulsions, but a **person** of a sound and healthy Body ever since he had been this Informants Husband. (BrDepo: Informations Against Three Witches, p. 32)

(75) *L. C. J. H.* Is this **Person** Mrs. *Baynton*'s Brother?
Mrs. *Night.* This is he that went for her Brother.
(BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p.4)

(76) The deposistion of Rose Foster who testifieth & saith I have ben most greviously afflected and tormented by Abigail Falkner of Andeveour also I have seen Abigail Falkner or hir Apperance most greviously afflect and torment Martha sprague s sara phelps and Hannah Bigsbe sence the begining Augst and I veryly beleve that Abigail Falkner is a wicth and that she has often afflected me and the afforesaid **person** by acts of wicthcraft: (AmDepo: Rose Foster v. Abigail Faulkner. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 330)

(77) I Think I have afflicted 3 at the Village – 2 in the Ministers house one of them a grown **person** the other a Child the growne **person** was the Mrs of the house, the Younger **person** was one Abigail Williams (AmExam: Examination of Richard Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 529)

Also worth mentioning is the use of the ostensibly epicene term *creature*. Like *person*, the use of *creature* in the material has been discussed briefly in section 3.3.3 with reference to previous research. In this section I will discuss it in somewhat more detail, and give examples taken from the material to illustrate further how this term is used. As mentioned in section 3.3.3, in the material investigated here, *creature* is used to refer to humans in two ways: either generically to refer to pitiable humans in general (78), or with female reference (79). Overall, *creature* is used with general reference on seven occasions and with female reference six times. It is never used to refer to a specific, male individual.

(78) So takeing leave of my company, tho' wth no little Reluctance, that I could not proceed wth them on my Jorny, Stop at a little cottage Just by the River, to wait the Waters falling w^{ch} the old man that lived there said would be in a little time, and he would conduct me safe over. This little Hutt was one of the wretchedest I ever saw a habitation for human **creatures**. It was suported with shores enclosed with Clapbords, laid on Lengthways, and so much asunder, that the Light come throu' every where; [...] (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 23)

(79) She was brought in & Mary Warren in a violent fit; Q. how dare you come in here & bring the divill w'th you to aflict these pore **creatures.** A. I know nothing of it, but upon lacys laying her hand on warrins arme she was then recovered from her fit. (AmExam: Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 520)

It would thus appear that when *creature* is used, it is always used with referents that the language producer pities in some way, and when the words are used to refer to specific individuals (as in example (79)), it appears that these referents are more likely to be women than men. This corresponds with Wallin-Ashcroft's findings, as discussed in section 3.3.3. To recapitulate briefly, Wallin-Ashcroft argues that prototypical values of *creature* are 'soulless', 'ignorant' and 'dependent', values that agree more with the eighteenth-century concept of 'female' than 'male' (2000: 73). Thus, the prototypical human *creature* of eighteenth-century literature would tend to be a woman, rather than a man. The findings presented here suggest that this holds true for speech-related texts and journals from the same general period as well.

5.4.4 Occupational Terms

As socio-historical research would lead one to suspect (cf. Shoemaker 1998: 148), the majority of occupational terms in the material have male referents (Table 5.22, p. 140). This is true of both types and tokens, and across the text categories. As mentioned earlier (cf. 5.4.2), some of this dominance of male referents is accounted for by the tendency for scribes to describe men by referring to their occupation and women by their relations to others (see example (73) above).

Table 5.22. The relative incidence of occupational terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types			Tokens			Type/token ratios		
	M	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**
BrDepo	22.6 (83)	1.6 (6)	0.3 (1)	104.9 (385)	13.6 (50)	0.5 (2)	0.22	0.12	0.5
BrExam	7.3 (72)	0.5 (5)	0.1 (1)	78.0 (766)	3.0 (29)	0.2 (2)	0.09	0.17	0.5
AmDepo	3.1 (26)	0.4 (3)	0.1 (1)	25.7 (218)	1.1 (9)	0.1 (1)	0.12	0.33	1
AmExam	3.8 (14)	0.8 (3)	0.0 (0)	22.7 (83)	3.0 (11)	0.0 (0)	0.17	0.27	-
Journals	25.4 (70)	2.2 (6)	1.8 (5)	78.7 (217)	4.0 (11)	1.8 (5)	0.32	0.55	1
Total	**6.0 (171)**	**0.5 (14)**	**0.2 (7)**	**58.8 (1,669)**	**3.9 (110)**	**0.4 (10)**	**0.10**	**0.13**	**0.70**

Another factor that comes into play in the speech-related data is the legal setting of the proceedings, where many members of the legal profession (which was exclusively a male domain) were present and therefore frequently referred to ((80)–(81)).

(80) In my **Lord Chief Justice** *Holts* time, in the Trial of *Cranborn*, and *Lowick*, *April* 22. 1696. an Exception was taken to the Indictment; that it was not said *Contra Naturalem Ligeantiam*; and in that Case, *Calvin's* Case was agreed to be Law. It was held, that in case of an Alien, he ow'd only a general Allegiance, and it was agreed, that in case of an Alien, it must not be *Contra naturalem ligeantiam*; and my **Lord Cheif Justice** *Holt* says, if it were so, it would be ill. (BrExam: Tryal of Francis Francia, pp. 45–46)

(81) The deposition of Sam: Parris aged about. 39. years and Nathanael Ingersoll aged about fifty & eight years & also Thomas Putman aged about fourty years all of Salem – testifieth & saith that divers of the afflicted by Witchcraft were much tortured at the examination of John Proctor of Salem Farmes before the honoured **Magistrates** the IIth April.1692. (AmDepo: Samuel Parris, Nathaniel Ingersoll, and Thomas Putnam v. John Proctor, Elizabeth Proctor, and Sarah Cloyce. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 686)

In the non-speech-related material (the journals) there is also a clear tendency for occupational term tokens with male referents (78.7 instances per 10,000 words, as compared to 4.0 with female referents), despite the fact that the authors would, in all likelihood, have had an opportunity to meet

with working people of both sexes, especially when travelling. Again, this could simply be due to authorial conventions when referring to people, as mentioned above. Also, due to the topics discussed in the texts, terms denoting members of the military and clergy abound ((82)–(83)).

(82) Many of our boats were stav'd in pieces, and our **seamen** began to retreat in great confusion, imagining they were trapanned by the enemy; but, none appearing, **Capt.** Whitaker led them to the brow of the rock and ordered them to their several posts. Some took possession of a chappel on the south part of the Peninsula, where they found many of the best of the inhabitants, especially the women with their children: here they met with rich plunder; but the **captains** shar'd it among themselves, and took away that which the **seamen** had got. (BrJour: Thomas Pocock. Sea Diary)

(83) Upon these scores it was not long before I was employed to wait on the **Father Superior** of the *North*, a Learned Man, and a *Spaniard* by Nation, of the Order of the **Jesuits**. (BrJour: John Fryer. A New Account of East India and Persia [...], p. I, 182)

Similar to the legal profession, both the military and the clergy were dominated by men, which helps explain why the majority of the occupational terms in these texts refer to men.

5.4.5 Title Terms

As can be seen in Table 5.23 (p. 142), the distribution of title terms across the text categories differs depending on the gender of the referent. Looking at the speech-related material, one finds that the BrE texts differ from their AmE counterparts not only in how many title terms are present in the material (see section 5.3.5 above), but also in how these terms are distributed between male and female referents. Whereas the title terms in the BrE texts cluster around male referents, the opposite is true for the AmE texts; in the latter part of the material, most title term tokens refer to women. The token figures presented in Table 5.23 are statistically significant to the 0.01 level of significance (χ^2: 1,030, df: 8, $p < 0.01$).

Table 5.23. The relative incidence of title terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types			**Tokens**			**Type/token ratios**		
	M	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**
BrDepo	4.6 (17)	3.5 (13)	0.3 (1)	243.9 (895)	128.1 (470)	0.8 (3)	0.02	0.03	0.33
BrExam	1.8 (18)	0.8 (8)	0.1 (1)	263.7 (2,589)	30.2 (296)	0.1 (1)	0.01	0.03	1.00
AmDepo	0.8 (7)	0.5 (4)	0.1 (1)	23.0 (195)	39.9 (338)	0.5 (4)	0.04	0.01	0.25
AmExam	1.9 (7)	1.4 (5)	0.3 (1)	43.7 (160)	53.8 (197)	1.9 (7)	0.04	0.03	0.14
Journals	9.4 (26)	3.3 (9)	0.0 (0)	58.4 (161)	16.7 (46)	0.0 (0)	0.16	0.20	–
Total	**1.2 (34)**	**0.5 (15)**	**0.0 (1)**	**141.0 (4,000)**	**47.5 (1,347)**	**0.5 (15)**	**0.01**	**0.01**	**0.07**

A closer look at the AmE material reveals that the term contributing most to the number of titles with female referents being so high is *goodwife*. In both the AmE depositions and examinations, the term *goodwife*, along with the abbreviated forms *goody* and even *good*, occur both when referring to the women accusers and witnesses, and to denote the alleged female witches. The term is used together with the referents' family name, analogous to *Mrs* and *Miss*, as can be seen in example (84). All in all, the AmE texts contain a total of 429 token instances of *goodwife* and abbreviated forms of the term, whereas the BrE material contains only two.

(84) John tarball being at the house of thomas putnams upon the: 28 day of this instant march being the yeare 1692 upon descource of many things i asked them some questions and among others i asked this question wheter the garle that was afflicted did first speack [of] of **goody** nurs before others mentioned her to her they said she told them she saw the apperishton of apale fast woman that Sat in her granmothers seat but did not know her name: then i replyed and said but who was it that told her that it was **good** nurs: mercy lewes said it was **goody** putnam that said it was **goody** nurse: **goody** putnam said it was mercy lewes that told her: thus they turned it upone one an other saying it was you & it was you that told her: this was be fore any was afflicted at thomas putnams beside his daughter that they told his daughter it was **goody** nurs Samuel nurs doth testifie to all above written (AmDepo: John Tarbell and Samuel Nurse for Rebecca Nurse. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 603)

As mentioned previously, given that the majority of the witnesses and defendants in the Salem proceedings were women, it is hardly surprising that there are so many instances of title terms with female referents in the AmE material. Likewise, due to the predominance of men participating in the BrE trial proceedings (as magistrates, witnesses and defendants), the BrE speech-related material could be expected to yield a higher percentage of title terms referring to men than to women, which, as shown in Table 5.23, is also the case.

Interestingly, however, Table 5.23 reveals further that in the BrE depositions, roughly a third of the total number of title term tokens have female reference: 470 (34%) out of 1,368 instances. This might at first seem rather high, considering the genre in question and the trial participants; since the dignitaries in legal environments at this time were male, as was the vast majority of others involved in the BrE trials, one might expect the percentage of female title terms to be lower. A closer inspection of the data shows that the high percentage of female title term tokens, relatively speaking, is due to the topic of some of the texts. A text contributing greatly to the number of female title terms contains statements given in regard to the birth of the Prince of Wales, in which high-ranking women (such as duchesses, ladies, and most notably Her Majesty the Queen) feature quite prominently. A passage from this text is quoted in (85). In this extract from the text, thirteen title terms occur, eleven of which have female reference.

(85) In a very little time after, another Man came up to the Altar to the Deponent, and said, the **Queen** was in Labour, and the Deponent must come to her **Majesty**, who then went directly to the **Queens** Bed-Chamber. As soon as the Deponent came in, her **Majesty** told her, this Deponent, she believed she was in Labour. By this time the Bed was warmed, and the **Queen** went into Bed, and the **King** came in. The **Queen** asked the **King**, if he had sent for the **Queen Dowager**; He said he had sent for every Body. The said Deponent stood at the **Queen's** Boulster, the **Lady** *Roscomon*, **Mrs.** *Delabadie*, and the Midwife on that side of the Bed, where the **Queen** was Delivered. (BrDepo: Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales, p. 9)

This particular deposition text alone accounts for a great many of the female title term referents in the BrE depositions: as many as 349 token instances are found in this text, or 74% of the total 470 instances in this text category.

Title terms with unspecified referents only occur in the speech-related texts. In each and every case, these unspecified titles are instances of the term *majesty*, which is used in the plural to refer jointly to the King and the Queen, as in (86) below. Since, in theory at least, the throne of Britain at the time was occupied not by one monarch, but two, William of Orange and Mary II being joint sovereigns (Hoak 1996: 1), references to the crown in

my material either mention both the king and queen separately, as in example (87), or jointly in the plural, as in (86).

(86) The Deposistion of Joseph Herrick senr. who testifieth and saith that on the first day of March 1691/2: I being then Constable for Salem: there was delivered to me by warrant from the worshipfull Jno. Hathorne and Jonathan Corwin Esqrs. Sarah good for me to cary to their **majesties** Gaol at Ipswich and that night I sett a gard to watch her at my own house namely Samu'l: Braybrook michaell dunell Jonathan Baker (AmDepo: Joseph Herrick, Sr., and Mary Herrick v. Sarah Good. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 370)

(87) JOSHUA ASHURST another witness for the **King** and **Queen** swore y^{t} he carryed 3 boxes, w^{ch} he rec~d from Womball, to M^{r} Dicconson's house, but does not know that they were armes, but said a serv^{t} paid him for the carriage. (BrDepo: Trials at Manchester, p. 13)

Moving on to the journals, one finds that, as was the case with the BrE material, the title terms in this text category occur predominantly with male reference. Of the 207 token instances, 161 (78%) refer to men, compared to 46 instances (22%) referring to women (normalised, this amounts to 58.4 and 16.7 instances per 10,000 words respectively). This is perhaps as could be expected, considering the political nature of some of the texts included in this text category. As an example, in her writing Celia Fiennes discusses both local and national politics, and since the political power at this time rested almost completely in the hands of men, terms denoting high-ranking men abound, whereas women are not mentioned as regularly. An excerpt from Fiennes' text, where she describes a number of paintings in a manor, is given in (88) as an illustration.

(88) Next day I went to Euston Hall which was the **Lord** Arlingtons and by his only daughters marriage with the **Duke** of Grafton is his sons by her, its two mile from Thetford; it stands in a large parke 6 miles about, the house is a Roman H of brick, 4 towers with balls on them, the windows are low and not sarshes else the roomes are of a good size and height; a good staircase full of good pictures, a long gallery hung with pictures at length - on the one side the Royal family from **K.** Henry the 7th by the Scottish race his eldest daughter down to the present **King** William and his **Queen** Mary, the other side are forreign **princes** from the **Emperour** of Moroccoe the Northern and Southern **princes** and **Emperour** of Germany; there is a square in the middle where stands a billiard table hung with outlandish pictures of Heroes, there is **Count** Egminton Horn [\Counts Egmont and Hoorn\] etc., at the end of the roome is the **Duke** and **Dutchess** of Graftons pictures at length also; thence I enterd into dineing and drawing roome and bed chambers of a very good size and good fretwork on the cieling, in one of the

roomes was the **Dutchess** of Cleavelands picture in a Sultaness dress - the **Duke** of Grafton being **King** Charles the Seconds base son by her - there was also another picture of the Royal family **King** Charles the Firsts 5 Children altogether, I have often seen 3 which was **King** Charles the Second **King** James and the **Princess** of Orange, but here was also the **Lady** Elizabeth and the **Duke** of Glocester a little Infant on a pillow; in another place there is the **Queen Mothers** picture and **Lady** Heneretta drawn large; (BrJour: Celia Fiennes. The Journeys of Celia Fiennes, pp. 150–151)

5.4.6 Depreciative Terms

As with the title terms (see section 5.4.5), the depreciative terms differ in how they distribute between male and female referents across the text categories (Table 5.24).

Table 5.24. The relative incidence of depreciative terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types			**Tokens**			**Type/token ratios**		
	M	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**
BrDepo	3.3 (12)	2.5 (9)	0.5 (2)	19.3 (71)	5.7 (21)	0.5 (2)	0.17	0.43	1.00
BrExam	0.9 (9)	0.2 (2)	0.5 (5)	16.6 (163)	0.5 (5)	1.0 (10)	0.06	0.40	0.50
AmDepo	0.8 (7)	0.6 (5)	0.1 (1)	4.7 (40)	14.5 (123)	2.7 (23)	0.18	0.04	0.04
AmExam	1.6 (6)	1.1 (4)	0.5 (2)	5.7 (21)	19.1 (70)	8.2 (30)	0.29	0.06	0.07
Journals	4.0 (11)	0.0 (0)	0.4 (1)	4.4 (12)	0.0 (0)	0.4 (1)	0.92	–	1.00
Total	**1.1 (32)**	**0.5 (14)**	**0.2 (7)**	**10.8 (307)**	**7.7 (219)**	**2.3 (66)**	**0.10**	**0.06**	**0.11**

If one looks at the speech-related material, one finds that here, too, the BrE material contains more term tokens with male referents than female, whereas in the AmE texts, the majority of the depreciative term tokens are used to refer to women. The token figures given in Table 5.24 are statistically significant (χ^2: 284.9, df: 8, $p<0.01$). Considering that, as mentioned in section 1.1, women generally had a stronger position in New England than in England due to the greater number of men, the predominance of depreciative terms with female reference in the AmE material is somewhat paradoxical. However, it should be remembered that people appearing in trial material are not representative of the general population, something which holds true for the BrE and the AmE material alike. It could thus be that women were

generally held in higher esteem in New England than in England, but that this might not be visible in trial material.

Thus, rather than ascribing the difference in how the depreciative terms distribute across the genders to differing views of men and women in New England and England, one can argue that the gender of the people participating in the trial proceedings is a decisive factor in how the depreciative terms distribute across referent gender. As mentioned in section 5.4.1, however, it is possible that stereotypical norms and expectations with regard to gender have influenced the distribution of these terms. For example, in the AmE depositions, the most frequently-occurring depreciative term is, not surprisingly, *witch*, which is used 134 times. Of these, 107 raw instances (80%) have female referents (for an example, see (89)), whereas only four instances (3%) refer exclusively to men (90).[51]

(89) She said that, when she was brought to Salem, her brother Bridges rode with her; and that, all along the way from Andover to Salem, her brother kept telling her that she must needs be a **witch**, since the afflicted accused her, and at her touch were raised out of their fits, and urging her to confess herself a **witch**. She as constantly told him that she was no **witch**, that she knew nothing of witchcraft, and begged him not to urge her to confess. However, when she came to Salem, she was carried to a room, where her brother on one side, and Mr. John Emerson on the other side, did tell her that she was certainly a **witch**, and that she saw the Devil before her eyes at that time [...] (AmDepo: Rev. Increase Mather's Report of his Conversation in Prison with Martha Tyler. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 777)

(90) Tho. Carr'r being acused of witchcraft Conffeseth that he was guilty of witchcraft & that he had been a **witch** a week & that his Mother taught him witchcraft – (AmDepo: Examination of Thomas Carrier, Jr. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 203)

The AmE examinations evince a similar distribution of *witch* across the male and female gender categories: of the 108 raw instances of the term in this text category, 67 (62%) instances refer to women and 12 (11%) to men.[52] Thus, overall, *witch* is a term used predominantly with female reference. When referring to men accused of witchcraft, the depreciative term used tends to be *wizard*, a term that is only used with male reference (91).

(91) Look there, she accuseth you to your face, she chargeth you that you hurt her twise. Is it not true?
What would you have me say? I never wronged no man in word nor deed.

[51] The remaining 23 instances of *witch* have unspecified (FM) reference.
[52] The AmE examinations also contain 29 instances of *witch* with unspecified (FM) reference.

Here are 3 evidences.
You tax me for a **wizard**, you may as well tax me for a buzard[53] I have done no harm. (AmExam: Examination of George Jacobs, Sr. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 475)

The material contains a total of 26 instances of the term *wizard*, which is decidedly fewer than the predominantly female term *witch*.

As stated above, the men accused of witchcraft are more often referred to by the central term *man* than anything else (see section 5.4.1). Thus, it would appear that in Early Modern New England, the depreciative and condemning term *witch* was used more often with female referents, whereas the men accused of consorting with darker powers tended to be referred to with the central *man*, although the depreciative terms *witch* and *wizard* were also in use.

Looking more in-depth at the speech-related material reveals certain trends as regards the semantic fields covered by the depreciative terms, especially in the depositions. The abusive terms used about women in these text categories reveal a strong tendency to imply either sexual licentiousness (*adulteress*, *bawd*, *bitch*, *whore*) or the women in question having undue power over others (*devil*, *enchantress*, *witch*). Some examples are given in (92)–(95).

(92) *Judith Stourton* saith, that she was Servant to the Dutchess of *Norfolk* when the Report was of the Dutchess and Mr. *Germain*, which was about a week before the Duke and Dutchess went to *France*, she was asked by the Lord *Peterborough* in the presence of the Duke of *Norfolk* in the Dukes house in St. *James's Square* (where they shut the Door) as she would answer it before Almighty God, if she did not know whether his Daughter was an **Adulteress**? Her answer was, as she hoped to see God in Heaven, the Dutchess was as Vertuous as any woman alive [...] (BrDepo: Duke and Duchess of Norfolk, p. C2VC2)

(93) Mr. *Thompson,* Did he speak any thing to you further concerning the Plot?
Bridges, Not further.
Giles, My Lord, I beseech you I may speak to this man, Do you hear, Sir, Were not these the words that I said when you charged me to be a Papist, That I knew of no Popish Plot, and they that said I was a Papist, or knew any of the Plot, were Rogues or **Whores**, or worse. (BrExam: Tryal of John Giles, p. 27)

[53] It is interesting to note the word play between *wizard* and *buzzard* in (91), by which the accused George Jacobs seeks to ridicule and dismiss the allegations of witchcraft that he faces, and which certainly expresses the anger he feels at being accused and put on trial (cf. Kahlas-Tarkka and Rissanen 2007).

(94) The Witnesses being sworn, the Parents of *Mary Farmer* swore, That their Child being taken ill in an extraordinary and violent manner, the Neighbours told them it was bewitched, and perswaded them to go to Dr. *Bourn*, which they did, and *Bourn* told them, That their Child was under an ill Tongue, and advised them to save the Childs water, and put it into a Bottle, stopping it close, and bury it in the Earth, and to burn the Childs Clothes, assuring them, that then the ***Witch*** which had done her the hurt, would come in; and that accordingly they did so; and when the Childs clothes was burning, *Joan Buts* came in, and sat her down upon a Stool, looking with a most frightful and gastly Countenance; (BrDepo: Examination of Joan Buts, p. 1)

(95) And this Informant further saith, That her Husband *Anthony Jones*, observing her the said *Susanna* to gripe and twinkle her Hands upon her own Body, said unto her, Thou **Devil**, thou art now tormenting some person or other. (BrDepo: Informations Against Three Witches, pp. 31–32)

In contrast, the depreciative terms which have male referents in the BrE speech-related material tend to imply criminality, ill manners, madness, poverty or stupidity on the part of the referent: *blasphemer*, *blockhead*, *dog, housebreaker*, *pedlar*, *prisoner*, *rat*, *rogue*, *villain*, etc., as in examples (96)–(98).

(96) Lord *Townshend.* [...] And I believe the manner I treated Mr. *Harvey* will justifie me, with all that know any thing of it, from the Suspicion of such Intentions against him. All that I did was in regard to the **Prisoners** wretched Circumstances, and before Mr. *Stanhope*; and I never desir'd any thing of him, but to tell the Truth, and the whole Truth.

Prisoner. You told me I should be hang'd, drawn, and quartered; and your Lordship told me many a time, Damn you, you **Dog**, now I have got Mr. *Harvey* in my Clutches, and you will let him go from me. (BrExam: Tryal of Francis Francia, p. 53)

(97) SIMON ARROWSMITH who being asked whether he knew John Lunt and what he knew of him sayd y^{t} in the year 1690 he the s~d Simon being undergaoler at Lanc^{r}, the s~d Lunt was then a **prison^{r}** there, very poor and shabby, but made himself buisy wth some other of the **prison^{rs}** to witt some Ireish men who had lately served in King James's army, asking if he might list them, some of them replyed, what has thou to do to list any body thou pawtry **pedlars** son? (BrDepo: Trials at Manchester, p. 16)

(98) Mr. *Att. Gen.* Pray go on Sir, what follow'd after that?

Mr. *Page.* I say, Capt. *Hill* made several Blows at me, and Cry'd you **Villain**, Stand. I received several of them upon my Cane, but there was none that hurt me; [...] (BrExam: Tryal of Charles Lord Mohun, p. 17)

This tallies well with previous findings by, among others, Wallin-Ashcroft (2000), which indicate that insults used about women often targeted their sexual behaviour (cf. Hitchcock and Cohen 1999b: 15). Wallin-Ashcroft further suggests that the predominance of male referents with insults denoting criminality, poverty, etc. might derive from men being the "doers" in Early Modern society, and that they were therefore more likely to be judged by their actions than the more passive women (2000: 142). The findings of the present study strengthen the argument that insults directed towards men imply criminal behaviour and poverty; however, the depreciative terms used with female referents do not suggest passivity on the part of the referent, but rather undue activity as regards either their sexuality or their tampering with dark magic.

5.4.7 Appreciative Terms

Table 5.25 gives the distribution of the appreciative terms across the text categories, according to whether the referent is male or female. However, the low figures make it impossible to draw any conclusions based on this material. Thus, no further analysis can be carried out.

Table 5.25. The relative incidence of appreciative terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types		**Tokens**		**Type/token ratios**	
	M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**
BrDepo	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	–	–
BrExam	0.1 (1)	0.1 (1)	0.2 (2)	0.1 (1)	0.50	1.00
AmDepo	0.1 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.2 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.50	–
AmExam	0.0 (0)	0.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.5 (2)	–	0.50
Journals	0.4 (1)	0.0 (0)	1.1 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.33	–
Total	**0.1 (2)**	**0.1 (2)**	**0.2 (7)**	**0.1 (3)**	**0.29**	**0.67**

5.4.8 RSP Terms

As can be seen in Table 5.26, in both the BrE speech-related material and the journals, the RSP term tokens cluster around male and unspecified referents. In none of these text categories is an RSP term ever used to refer to women exclusively. The distribution of RSP term tokens is statistically significant (χ^2: 145.0, df: 8, $p<0.01$).

Table 5.26. The relative incidence of RSP terms (types and tokens) across the text categories, according to referent gender, normalised per 10,000 words. Raw figures are given within parentheses.

	Types			**Tokens**			**Type/token ratios**		
	M	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**	**M**	**F**	**FM**
BrDepo	3.0 (11)	0.0 (0)	0.8 (3)	4.4 (16)	0.0 (0)	4.9 (18)	0.69	–	0.17
BrExam	1.4 (14)	0.0 (0)	0.5 (5)	3.8 (37)	0.0 (0)	2.2 (22)	0.38	–	0.23
AmDepo	0.2 (2)	0.4 (3)	0.1 (1)	0.4 (3)	1.1 (9)	0.2 (2)	0.67	0.33	0.50
AmExam	0.0 (0)	0.8 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	1.6 (6)	0.0 (0)	–	0.50	–
Journals	4.7 (13)	0.0 (0)	4.7 (13)	10.9 (30)	0.0 (0)	14.1 (39)	0.43	–	0.33
Total	**1.0 (28)**	**0.2 (5)**	**0.7 (19)**	**3.0 (86)**	**0.5 (15)**	**2.9 (81)**	**0.33**	**0.33**	**0.23**

In the speech-related BrE texts, an interesting trend emerges upon closer inspection: in these texts the majority of RSP term tokens with male referents denote either nationality or political conviction, as in (99)–(100). Furthermore, no RSP terms referring to nationality or political standpoint have female reference.

(99) *Prisoner*, My Lord, he would speak better with an Interpreter.
L. C. J. Let an Interpreter be called for.
L. C. J. What Country-man are you?
Prisoner, My Lord, he is a ***Dane.***
The Interpreter, a Jury-man, was sworn, and beginning to talk with *Scoreman,* and he then said, he's none of my Country, he is a ***Dutch-man***, I don't understand him. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 10)

(100) This Informant saith, That last *Tuesday* Night he was standing by the Bonfire at the *Star*, and saw the Soldiers break Mr. *Hurst's* Windows all to Pieces; and when they had so done, they began to throw Stones

at other People's Windows, and particularly Mr. *Cooper's* the Barber; and some one that stood by said, *It was pity to break them, for he was a poor Man*; whereupon the Major ask'd what he was? and Mr. *Wisdome* the Cutler answer'd, *He is not right*, or *He is not a* ***Whig***, but this Informant is not sure which he said: (BrDepo: Depositions Concerning the Late Riot in Oxford, pp. 30–31)

The reason why all the terms denoting political standpoints occur with male referents is in all likelihood due to the fact that politics were viewed as a strictly male area.[54] Why no nationality terms (*Dane*, *Frenchman*) occur with exclusively female referents could simply be due to there being so few women present during the legal proceedings, but might also be indicative of women being more inclined than men to remain in the country of their birth. Whereas men might travel, or even move, to foreign lands as part of their profession (e.g. as sailors or merchants), the occupations traditionally held by women provided fewer opportunities for travel (for a discussion on the occupations normally held by women in the early modern era, see Clark 1992 [1919]; Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 256–344; Shoemaker 1998: 145–208).

In the BrE speech-related material, most of the RSP terms with unspecified referents denote religious affiliation, as in (101). This is because terms denoting religious affiliation are often given in the plural to refer to the entire group of believers, men as well as women.

(101) Mr. *Hickm.* [...] So a while ago since this business with *Haynes's* swearing against my Lord of *Shaftsbury*, I bethought my self of some other businesses I had heard: To find out the Knavery I went to the *Fleet*, where he hath a very ill Character as well amongst the **Papists** as the **Protestants**. Whereupon I asked one fellow that was a kind of a Porter, if he knew any thing of him; said he, Go you to such a one --

Mr. *Serj. Jeff.* We must not permit this for Example sake, to tell what others said.

(BrExam: Tryal ... of Stephen Colledge, p. 40)

As stated above, in the journals, too, the RSP terms never occur with female referents; when a term is not used generically to refer to a group of people (102), it is used to denote one or several men (103).

[54] As *The Lawes Resolution of Womens Rights*, an anonymous legal treatise from 1632, declared: "Women have no voyse in Parliament, they make no laws, they consent to none, they abrogate none. All of them are understood either married or to be married and their desires ar subject to their husband" (quoted in Gowing 1996: 11).

(102) [...] their buildings are of timber of loame and lathes and much tileing, the fashion of the Country runs much in long roofes and great cantilivers and peakes; out of these great streetes runs many little streetes but not very narrow, mostly old buildings except a few houses builded by some **Quakers** that are brick and of the London mode; the town did extend it self to the sea but now its ruines sets it 3 mile off; the low grounds all about the town are used for the whitening their Bayes for which this town is remarkable, and also for exceeding good oysters, but its a dear place and to grattifye my curiosity to eate them on the place I paid dear; its a town full of **Dessenters** 2 meeteings very full besides **Anabaptists** and **Quakers**, formerly the famous Mr. Stockton was minister there till he dyed. (BrJour: Celia Fiennes. The Journeys of Celia Fiennes, p. 143)

(103) We talked also about Lord Oxford. He argues very much also against his being guilty of treason and thinks it impossible to prove him guilty of it according to the laws of the land, and is very much concerned that they should go about to prove it, for he thinks they will strain the law which which <sic> will be breaking in upon the constitution and acting directly contrary to the true and general principles of the **Whigs** themselves. Indeed he is pleased with nothing that is done by the present government and thinks the ministers act upon principles of revenge and not according to reason. He thus exactly argues as a **Tory** does and yet I believe he is a true **Whig**. (BrJour: Dudley Ryder. The Diary of Dudley Ryder)

As Table 5.26 shows, there is a noticeable difference in the use of RSP terms in the speech-related AmE material (depositions and examinations) as compared to the corresponding texts from England. Whereas in the BrE texts, as we have seen, RSP terms never occur exclusively with female reference, but only with male or unspecified reference, the RSP terms in the AmE material occur more frequently with female reference than with either male or unspecified reference ((104)–(105)). In (104), the referent to the term *negroe* is the accused, Mary Black.

(104) Her Master saith a man sat down upon the farm with her about a twelve month agoe.
What did the man say to you?
He said nothing.
Doth this **Negroe** hurt you?
Severall of them said yes.
(AmExam: Examination of Mary Black. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 113)

(105) Also Tho: Putman aged about fourty years & Ezek: Cheevers aged about thirty & six years testify to the whole of the aboves'd & all the three deponents aforesaid farther testify that after the said **Indian** began to confess she was her self very much afflicted & in the face of authority at the same time & openly charged the

> abovesaid Good Osburne as the persons that afflicted her the aforesaid **Indian** (AmDepo: Thomas Putnam and Ezekiel Cheever v. Tituba. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 757)

That the majority of RSP terms in the AmE material refer to women is naturally due to the fact that the majority of the witnesses and defendants in the Salem witch trials were women, as opposed to the witnesses and defendants in the legal proceedings in England.

5.4.9 Section Summary

As sections 5.4.1 through 5.4.8 have shown, examining the gender-related terms according to referent gender reveals some interesting trends, of which I will briefly restate the most salient here. First, although the majority of the people accused of witchcraft in the AmE material were women, as was discussed in section 4.2.3, the data showed a disproportionately large number of central terms occurring with male referents. I have suggested that this could be due to the fact that words denoting witchcraft (such as *witch*) were seen as predominantly pertaining to women. Thus, these words would not be as likely to have male referents as female, and consequently men accused of witchcraft would be referred to with words belonging to other semantic domains. In my material, the term most often used is the central term *man*.

Furthermore, my data has shown a difference in how men and women are identified in legal documents, in that men tend to be identified by their occupation, whereas women are identified through their relationship with other people in the community, especially by their marital status (see sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.4 respectively). This pattern is in line with what has previously been reported by socio-historians dealing with the Early Modern Era.

The BrE material also evinces an interesting difference in the types of depreciative terms occurring with male and female referents respectively: whereas women are insulted using terms that imply sexual licentiousness or having satanic powers, the depreciative terms referring to men tend to question their good breeding, manners, monetary solvency or intelligence.

Lastly, it was found that the RSP terms, denoting religious, social and political affiliation, are predominantly used with male or unspecified reference in the BrE speech-related material, whereas they are used more often with women in the corresponding AmE material. Nationality terms were found to never occur with female reference, possibly due to conditions that made women less mobile than men during the Early Modern period.

5.5 Summary and Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I have investigated the distribution of gender-related terms taking the eight semantically-based gender term categories (see section 3.2) as the starting point for the discussion. In addition to the semantic categorisation, three other parameters were taken into account: text category (examinations, depositions and journals), region of origin (England and New England) and referent gender. Summaries of the findings have been presented in sections 5.2.9, 5.3.8 and 5.4.9. In this section, I will recapitulate the most pertinent of these findings, and relate them to the hypotheses as given in section 1.1.

It was hypothesised that the material would evince a tendency for women to be described and identified mainly through their relationship with others, whereas men would be referred to by their occupation (section 1.1). This hypothesis was considered likely to be true on the basis of previous research into the Early Modern period, which has shown such a pattern to exist, and was borne out by the material: when identifying people, both in the speech-related and non-speech-related texts, the language producers indicate relations with others (especially marital status) when referring to women, and occupation when referring to men. It has been suggested that this is also one reason why such an overwhelming majority of occupational terms have male reference.

The occupational terms were also found to be more common in material from England than in texts from New England. I have postulated that this could be because the newly-established colonies could still not support wide-spread job specialisation; settlers had to practise a multitude of crafts as part of their daily life, which is why it was more difficult to identify people by naming one of their many occupations.

Another gender term category found more commonly in the BrE material than in the AmE texts was the RSP terms. These terms display high type/token ratios, which indicated that language producers thought it important to be specific when referring to people's religious, social or political affiliations and to distinguish among different denominations (see section 4.1). In England at the time, the volatile political climate made establishing a person's political and religious background a matter of import, which was likely the reason both for the high type/token ratios and the clustering of RSP terms in the BrE material. Moreover, in the BrE material, the RSP terms never occurred with exclusively female referents, possibly owing to women not being allowed to involve themselves politically and rarely leaving the country of their birth.

Lastly, depreciative terms were found to occur rather frequently in the speech-related material, but only rarely in the journals, where they mostly indicated patronising or even contemptuous feelings for the referents. Looking more closely at the depreciative terms in the speech-related material

revealed that the terms referring to women tended to imply either that these women were sexually licentious, or that they had entered into a pact with the devil, in order to gain satanic powers. Depreciative terms denoting men, on the other hand, had a tendency to focus on the referents' poor manners, lack of intelligence or pecuniary troubles.

Chapter 6. Modification of Gender-Related Terms

6.1 Introductory Comments

In the two previous chapters, 4 and 5, I investigated the first two main hypotheses put forth in section 1.1. These hypotheses predicted that gender-related terms with male reference would be more numerous and refer to different aspects of the referents' lives as compared to terms denoting women. The data supported both hypotheses. The overall data presented in Chapter 4 showed that there are considerably more gender-related terms with male reference than female (68% of the total number of gender-related term tokens have male reference, compared to 28% with female reference and 4% with unspecified reference). As for the second hypothesis, as shown in Chapter 5, the material also evinces gender differences as regards the quality or feature the gender-related terms refer to. Men are referred to more often by their occupation, whereas women are frequently referred to by their relationship to others. Differences owing to referent gender were also found as regards other gender term categories, notably the epicene terms (section 5.4.3) and depreciative terms (section 5.4.6).

In the present chapter, I turn my attention to the third and fourth hypotheses presented in section 1.1, which predict that the different conceptions which Early Modern English people had of men and women respectively affected not only the use of gender-related terms per se, but also the use of adjectives and demonstratives in connection with these terms (I will return to these hypotheses below). In what follows, I will elaborate further on this, and present the research questions which I will be addressing in this chapter.

For the sake of convenience, throughout this chapter, I at times state that adjectives "refer" to men or women, respectively. This should be understood as a brief way of stating that the adjectives in question modify or complement gender-related terms which in turn refer to a man or a woman, respectively. Similarly, when an adjective is said to have, for instance, female reference, this should be understood to signify that the gender-related term which the adjective modifies or complements has female reference.

One of the more common linguistic factors to investigate when trying to assess the norms that pertain to a group of people (such as men or women) is

the use of adjectives in connection with words denoting this group. Adjectival modification of terms referring to men and women is a research topic that has attracted a considerable amount of attention recently (e.g. Persson 1990; Romaine 1999; Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005; Bäcklund 1996, 2006). It also has a definite bearing on the present study: looking at the adjectives that are used in connection with terms denoting men and women can help reveal the traits and characteristics that were considered appropriate or, conversely, undesirable in the individuals described, which in turn reveals important clues to Early Modern gender roles. Previous research on fictional historical material (Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005) has shown clear differences between adjectival phrases used to describe male and female characters, but it remains to be seen whether these differences also pertain to non-fictional material from the Early Modern period. This study aims at contributing to the research done in this area by investigating the use of adjectives modifying gender-related terms in the non-fictional genres examined here: depositions, examinations and journals. Even though adjectives can be expected to occur more frequently in fictional material than in non-fictional texts, owing to the need for characterisation in the former, the material used in the present study has been shown to contain a sufficient number of adjectives for analysis to be carried out (see section 4.3.2). In my analysis, I will take both linguistic and extralinguistic factors into consideration, namely the semantic domain to which the adjectives belong, the gender of the referent, the situational context, and, in the case of the demonstratives, the respective ranks of the language producer and the referent.

The two hypotheses which form the basis of this chapter are given in section 1.1, but are restated here for ease of reference:

- Adjectives denoting some aspect of the referent's appearance will occur more often in connection with terms denoting women.
- There will be a link between the gender of the referent and the evaluative meaning of the adjectives (positive or negative). In other words, adjectives denoting positive character traits will tend to occur more frequently with terms referring to members of one gender.

The first of these hypotheses is based on previous socio-historical linguistic research (Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005; Bäcklund 2006), which suggests that adjectives denoting physical appearance occur more often in connection with female referents than with male referents. When discussing the collocations of adjectives with central male and female terms (which largely correspond to the central terms in this study), Wallin-Ashcroft finds that

> [j]ust as more female than male terms include a physical aspect, so do their collocating adjectives. This is to be expected in a society where, at least among the middle and upper classes, women were judged mainly for what they were (appearance and personal qualities) and men for what they did. (2000: 101)

The social norms described by Wallin-Ashcroft – men being described as the 'doers' and women as 'objects' – are not confined to the past but also exist today, as shown by, for instance, Romaine (1999: 251–290) and Vestergaard and Schrøder (1985). Previous research on gender roles, both using modern and historical material, thus leads one to suspect that adjectives denoting appearance will occur more frequently in connection with gender-related terms referring to women. Moreover, given the strong connection between women and comments about physical appearance in England in historical times, and the fact that this connection has persisted into modern times, it is reasonable to expect that these sentiments would have been carried to the American colonies as well, thus being a possible factor influencing both the English and the American parts of my material. This hypothesis will be addressed in section 6.2.2.

The second hypothesis given above predicts a link between the gender of the referent and the connotations carried by the adjectives in question. Previous research, within the disciplines of social sciences as well as linguistics, examining both modern and historical material, more often than not finds that women are described in more negative terms than are men (cf. Persson 1990: 55–57; Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 58–71). Investigating the lives of women in Early Modern England, Mendelson and Crawford bring up the various stereotypical images of women that were prevalent at the time, through proverbs, sayings, images, plays, etc. Several of these popular stereotypes, such as the scold, the witch, the unfaithful wife and the old widow, were such as would be described with negative adjectives, since they described characters that did not conform to the social prescriptions for how a woman should behave. There were also stereotypical female social roles that were associated with positive characteristics, such as the maid (in the sense 'young, unmarried woman' rather than 'servant') and the faithful wife and mother, but adhering to these positive roles meant not stepping outside the prescribed boundaries of those positions: the maid must not allow herself to become 'an old maid', and the wife must be faithful, submissive and accept the guidance of her husband. Should the women fail to live up to these expectations, they would be viewed in a negative way, even though still technically maids and wives (Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 65–71). There were, of course, male stereotypes in Early Modern times as well, such as the cuckold, but as of yet little research has been carried out within this field, which is why further discussion is not possible here (for a discussion

on masculinity in England during this period, see Foyster 1999; Hitchcock and Cohen 1999).

Studies have indicated that, to a certain extent, the negative descriptions of women continued after the end of the Early Modern period as described by Mendelson and Crawford (1998). In her linguistic study of nineteenth-century texts, Bäcklund (2006) found that the texts from the first 70 years of the century contained significantly more positive adjectival descriptions of men than women. In the last 30 years of the century, however, there was an equal number of positive adjectives occurring with male and female referents, indicating a possible linguistic change to match the increased social influence which women came to enjoy during this time.

Thus, according to most socio-historical and linguistic research, one could expect that adjectives denoting negative traits would occur more frequently with female referents than with male ones in my material. However, a recent study by Wallin-Ashcroft (2000) locates patterns that point in another direction. Looking at eighteenth-century fiction, she finds that adjectives with male referents often conveyed negative emotions or respect, whereas adjectives used with female terms were often positive or patronising. She concludes from this that "[t]enderness and condescension are apt responses to beings that are small, ignorant and dependent, while fear and respect are more adequate for those who are big and powerful" (2000: 208).[55] As discussed above, given that other research (e.g. Mendelson and Crawford 1998) has indicated that women tended to be portrayed negatively in Early Modern literature and plays, this finding is rather remarkable. Of course, the social roles played by women (for instance as daughters, mothers, wives and widows) are too many and too complex to be easily lumped into one overarching category. One possible explanation for Wallin-Ashcroft's findings could thus be that the majority of female characters in her material had such roles in the narratives (as heroines, mothers, faithful wives, etc.) as to warrant a more positive or patronising description, whereas more negative stereotypes, such as scolds and 'loose' women did not play a significant part in them.[56]

---

[55] Likewise, in her linguistic study of contemporary and Victorian children's fiction, Sveen (2005: 64–66) has found that in the Victorian texts both male and female characters were described with positive adjectives more often than with negative ones.

[56] The one text in Wallin-Ashcroft's corpus where one could expect more condemning descriptions of women is Defoe's *Moll Flanders*, but since this work is narrated in the first person, the adjectival descriptions of the main character, as well as of her fellow outlaws, often express pity and sympathy rather than censure: "Had this been the custom in our country, I had not been left a poor desolate **girl** without friends, without clothes, without help or helper in the world, as was my fate; [...]" (Defoe, *Moll Flanders*. Originally published in 1722, sampled from the Gutenberg Project's website [http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext95/mollf11.txt], 29 November 2005). Bold type and underlining have been added by me.

Since my material is collected from non-fictional genres, it will be interesting to see whether the adjectives occurring with gender-related terms in my data will conform to Wallin-Ashcroft's findings or be more in line with the negative stereotypes as discussed above. This will be addressed further in section 6.2.3 below.

In this chapter, neither genre nor geographical variation will be in focus, although I will comment on these factors in cases where they prove to be of interest. Since this approach entails that incidence figures will be compared to the whole corpus, normalised figures in the subsequent analysis have been converted to reflect instances per 100,000 words, rather than, as in previous chapters, per 10,000 words.

Note also that, as was the case in sections 4.2.3 and 5.4, adding up the total of adjective types with male (M), female (F) and unspecified (FM) referents in the tables might not produce a number equal to the total number of adjective types overall in the material. This is due to the fact that the same type (for instance the adjective *little*) might occur in connection with terms referring to members of both sexes (indeed, most commonly-occurring adjective types are used with both male and female referents). When counting the number of types with male and female reference respectively, these adjectives are counted twice (once as male, and once as female). The total number of types *overall*, however, remains the same, with the adjective in question being counted only once. Also, as in section 5.4, all adjectives occurring in connection with gender-related terms where the gender of the referent could not be positively established have been omitted from the analysis.

The rest of the chapter will be organised as follows: In 6.2, I will look at the use of adjectival modifiers in the material. Section 6.2.2 addresses the first of the two hypotheses dealt with in this chapter, discussing the use of adjectives which denote appearance. Subsequently, section 6.2.3 brings up the second hypothesis, namely the question of positive and negative connotations and the possible connection between referent gender and evaluative meaning. Section 6.2.4 deals with the use of characterising *of*-phrases in connection with gender-related terms. In 6.3, I bring up demonstrative use with gender-related terms and discuss the possible implications of this use. The chapter will end with a summary in 6.4.

6.2 Adjectival Modifiers

6.2.1 Introductory Remarks

The overall figures for the adjectival data are given in section 4.3 above, with Lists 4.1–4.5 presenting the adjectives occurring with male, female and

unspecified referents respectively. As the data in these lists indicates, the adjectives modifying gender-related terms in the material come from a wide range of semantic domains, not all of which are equally relevant to my study. As stated in section 6.1, the purpose of this part of the investigation is to address two hypotheses. The first of these concerns the distribution of adjectives denoting appearance across referent gender and predicts that gender-related terms with female referents will be more likely to be modified by these adjectives than gender-related terms referring to men. In order to test this hypothesis, I have extracted the adjectives denoting appearance from the complete adjective data, as given in Lists 4.1–4.5. The resulting data is presented and discussed in section 6.2.2.

The second hypothesis addresses the question of the evaluative meaning of the adjectives and predicts, on the basis of previous research, that there will be a link between adjective connotation (positive or negative) and referent gender. Some studies have shown that men are more often described using positive adjectives, whereas Wallin-Ashcroft's study indicated the opposite (2000). For this part of the study, and for reasons further explained in 6.2.3 below, I extracted the adjectives which concern the interaction between the referent and his/her surroundings. A list of these adjectives is presented in connection with the analysis and discussion (section 6.2.3).

When dividing the adjectives according to semantic domain, it proved impossible in a few cases to establish conclusively to which category a semantically ambiguous adjective token belonged, the context not yielding enough clues as to which meaning was intended by the language producer (see further 6.2.3 below, where this is discussed in connection with the use of *poor* in the material). These tokens (six instances of *little*, two instances of *fine* and one of *poor*) have been omitted from the investigation.

6.2.2 Adjectives Denoting Appearance

In this section, I will address the first hypothesis presented in section 6.1 above, namely that adjectives denoting some aspect of the referent's appearance (henceforth Appearance adjectives) will occur more often in connection with terms denoting women. As Appearance adjectives, I have counted all adjectives relating to what a person looks like, or to what s/he is wearing. The hypothesis investigated here predicted, on the basis of previous research, that adjectives denoting appearance would tend to occur more frequently with gender-related terms denoting women, since physical attributes have often been considered more important for women than for men. As stated in section 4.3.2 above, 68% of the gender-related term tokens in the material denote men, whereas 28% denote women, and if the Appearance adjectives were distributed equally across the genders, we could expect a similar distribution here.

The most frequently occurring Appearance adjective in the material is *black*, which commonly occurs in the AmE speech-related texts in the phrase "black **man**". This phrase is used 49 times to refer either to the alleged male witches or, ambiguously, to the devil (106).

(106) Q. has he not apeared to you like a black **man** A Yes he mostly apears to me like a black **man** (AmExam: Examination of Elizabeth Johnson. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 500)

Mead (1899) showed that *black* (or *blæc*) was used symbolically about evil spirits and in references to hell and lost souls as early as the Old English period (Mead 1899, quoted in Kerttula 2002: 47), and the phrase *black man* had been used to refer to the devil long before the Salem witchcraft trials (the *OED* lists an extract from 1591 as its earliest example of the phrase). The very ambiguity of the phrase *black man* gave the deponents in Salem an opportunity to refer to mysterious evil beings without specifying if the referent was human or demonic (107), leaving that to the listeners to decide for themselves. This may be one reason why the phrase was employed so frequently by witnesses in the Salem trials.

(107) on the foarth day at night Came goody olliver and mrs English and good man Core and ablak **man** with a hi crouned hatt with books in their hands (AmDepo: Susannah Sheldon v. Bridget Bishop, Mary English, Phillip English, Giles Corey, and Martha Corey. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 105)

It is worth noting that black is a colour traditionally associated with evil and death in Western culture.[57] The *OED* lists figurative uses of *black* as denoting death, disaster and gloom as far back as the sixteenth century (*OED*: s.v. *black* II, 29 August 2005), and in his book on the Salem proceedings, Rosenthal mentions the early American image of the devil as 'the black man', an association as much due to racial prejudice as anything else:

> We have here that early American association of the dark person with the devil, with its racial and metaphysical implications. [...] That the devil appeared as a "black man" no doubt had something to do with a typology of demonism associated with darkness [...]. (Rosenthal 1993: 149–150)

Conversely, there are instances of witnesses describing encounters with *white* men and *shining/shiny* men. One such instance is Susannah Sheldon's deposition against John Willard, where the shining man appears to be a benevolent being of superhuman powers, perhaps an angel, who counteracts the malevolent actions of the accused wizard (Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977:

[57] For a list of the semantic connotations of *black*, cf. Ohtsuki (2000: 124–132).

837).[58] It is possible that witnesses would add colour adjectives to strengthen or add weight to their descriptions of people as evil and good respectively, consciously or unconsciously playing on the cultural connotations these colour terms carried. However that may be, the frequent use of *black man* in the courtroom material certainly adds to the predominance of Appearance adjectives occurring with gender-related terms denoting men.

Furthermore, this use of *black* is categorical in this fixed expression; in other words, it does not allow variation as regards the collocating noun: when the devil is alluded to, he is consistently described as a "black man", never as a "black boy" or "black creature", and so on. Consequently, these instances have been excluded from the subsequent analysis.

List 6.1. Appearance adjectives occurring with gender-related terms in the material, *black man* excluded.

Male referents	**Female referents**
Black (3)	Black (2)
Black-bearded	Full-mouthed
Black-haired	Great (2)
Disguised	Handsome
Extravagant	Likely[59]
Fresh	Little
Grey-headed (2)	Pale
Hilly-faced	Ragged
Indian-like	Short (3)
Less (4)	Smart
Little (7)	Strapping
Paltry	Sunburnt
Shabby	
Shining (5)	
Short	
Tall (8)	
Tatter-tailed	
White (3)	
White-haired	
Types: 19 **Tokens: 93**	**Types: 12** **Tokens: 16**

[58] Kerttula mentions that Mead found that *white* (*hwit*) was used symbolically in Old English to refer to angels (2002: 47). Further, in the King James Bible, *white* is often used symbolically to indicate purity and goodness, as in Matthew 17:1–2: "And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was *white* as the light" (http://www.biblegateway.com, accessed 3 December 2006). Italics added by me.

[59] *OED*: s.v. *likely* 4a: Having the appearance, or giving evidence, of vigour or capacity; strong or capable looking. (*OED*, 30 June 2005). Cf. "[...] about two years agoe, the Child was alikely Thriveing **Child**" (AmDepo: William Stacy v. Bridget Bishop. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 94).

The 49 examples from the material in which "black **man**" is used categorically to allude to the devil have been excluded from the subsequent tables, lists and analysis. The resulting list of remaining adjective lexemes (60 tokens, representing 28 types) is presented in List 6.1 (p. 163).

Of the 60 Appearance adjective tokens, 44 (73%) are used with gender-related terms denoting men (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1. Appearance adjectives (types and tokens) across referent gender, *black man* excluded.

Referent gender	Types	Tokens
Male	19 (68%)	44 (73%)
Female	12 (43%)	16 (27%)
Total	**28 (100%)**	**60 (100%)**

As Table 6.1 shows, the distribution of Appearance adjective tokens across the genders is rather similar to the distribution of male and female gender-related term tokens in the material (68% and 28% respectively). However, even though these adjectives seem to distribute proportionally between the genders when contrasted with the number of gender-related terms, one cannot dismiss off-hand the possibility of their going against a trend in the general adjective distribution in the material, thus concealing information. To investigate whether this is the case, the token figures in Table 6.1 were contrasted with the token figures for the rest of the adjectives and subjected to the chi-square test of independence. The resulting figures are given in Table 6.2. Note that the adjectives with unspecified reference (FM) have been omitted in Table 6.2, making the total number of adjectives 948.

Table 6.2. The distribution of Appearance adjectives (tokens) across referent gender (M and F) in percent, contrasted with the remaining adjectives.

Referent gender	Appearance adjectives	Remaining adjectives	Total
Male	73% (44)	62% (548)	**63% (592)**
Female	27% (16)	38% (340)	**37% (356)**
Total	**100% (60)**	**100% (888)**	**100% (948)**

Even though there is a slight difference in distribution across referent gender between the Appearance adjectives and the remaining adjectives, as shown in Table 6.2, this did not prove to be statistically significant. There is thus no indication of the Appearance adjectives going against a general trend in the material, nor could any gender bias be attested for these lexemes.

Nevertheless, these adjectives do not occur predominantly with female gender-related terms in the material, as previous research might lead one to expect.

Having looked at how the Appearance adjectives are distributed across referent gender, I now proceed to discussing them qualitatively. First, plotting these adjectives across the speech-related and non-speech-related text categories reveals that the majority of Appearance adjectives with male referents can be traced to the speech-related material from the courtroom (Table 6.3).

Table 6.3. Distribution of Appearance adjectives (token instances) across the speech-related and non-speech-related material, and across referent gender.

	M	**F**	**Total**
Speech-related material	78% (39)	22% (11)	**100% (50)**
Non-speech-related material	50% (5)	50% (5)	**100% (10)**
Total	**73% (44)**	**27% (16)**	**100% (60)**

The paucity of Appearance adjective tokens in the non-speech-related material (ten instances) makes it difficult to analyse them in a meaningful way. For this reason, I have chosen to exclude them from the qualitative discussion, which thus focuses on the use of adjectives denoting appearance in the speech-related material. Furthermore, the difference in distribution between the speech-related and non-speech-related material sets was shown not to be statistically significant, which is why it was felt that the ten instances of Appearance adjectives in the non-speech-related material could safely be excluded.

List 6.2 presents the Appearance adjectives occurring in the speech-related material, the categorical use of "black **man**" excluded. As List 6.2 shows, few Appearance adjectives occur with both male and female reference in the material: the only ones to do so are *black* (3 M, 2 F), *little* (7 M, 1 F) and *short* (1 M, 3 F), and none of these show any clear difference in shades of meaning that can be linked to referent gender.

List 6.2. Appearance adjectives included in the analysis.

Male referents	**Female referents**
Black (3)	Black (2)
Black-bearded	Great (2)
Black-haired	Likely
Fresh	Little
Grey-headed (2)	Pale
Hilly-faced	Ragged
Less (4)	Short (3)
Little (7)	
Paltry	
Shabby	
Shining (5)	
Short	
Tall (7)	
White (3)	
White-haired	
Types: 15 **Tokens: 39**	**Types: 7** **Tokens: 11**

The first adjective, *black*, is used on four occasions to describe the normal complexion (for instance hair or skin) of the referent (108), and once to describe the appearance of the newborn Prince of Wales, with whom the language producer believes something is amiss (109).

(108) [...] then the said hucheson & Ely putnam stabed with their raperres at a ventor then said mary & abigell you have killed a greet black **woman** of Stonintown. and an Indian that comes with her for the flore is all covered with blod.then the said mary and abigaill looked out of dores & said they saw a greet company of them one a hill & there was three of them lay dead the black **woman** & the indian & one more that they knew not [...] (AmDepo: Benjamin Hutchinson v. George Burroughs. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 172)

(109) When the *Deponent* brought the Vinegar, she did desire to see the Child, Mrs. *Delabadie* having it in her Arms. The **Child** looked black, whereupon the *Deponent* desired Doctor *Waldegrave* to look to it, believing it was not well: [...] (BrDepo: Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales, p. 15)

The second Appearance adjective occurring with referents of both genders is *little*, which appears once modifying a gender-related term with female reference, and seven times as a modifier of gender-related terms denoting men. Of the latter seven instances, however, six are used to refer to the same man: George Burroughs. Burroughs was one of the people accused of witchcraft in the Salem witch trials, and from the descriptive statements

produced by witnesses, it would appear that his short stature was seen as noteworthy (examples (110) and (111)).

(110) The deposistion of Sarah viber who testifieth and saith that on the 9'th day of may 1692. as I was agoeing to Salem village I saw the apperishtion of a little **man** like a minister with a black coat on and he pinched me by the arme and bid me goe along with him but I tould him I would not but when I cam to the village I saw theire Mr. George Burroughs which I never saw before and then I knew that it was his apperishtion which I had seen in the morning [...] (AmDepo: Sarah Bibber v. George Burroughs. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 167–168)

(111) And we were in two Companys at the Last I think there was a few Men w'th them I heard Sarah Good talk of a minister or two – one of them was he that had ben at the Estward & preached once at the Village, his name Is Burroughs and he Is a little **man** [...] (AmExam: Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 528–529)

Just as *little* with male reference appears mainly in connection with descriptions of a particular individual, so does *short* with female reference: all three instances of *short* modifying a female gender-related term (in all three cases *woman*) appear in descriptions of Susannah Martin (112). Like George Burroughs, Martin was one of the accused parties in the Salem proceedings.

(112) The Deposistion of Ann putnam jun'r who testifieth and saith sume time in April 1692 there appered to me the Apperishtion of an old short **woman** that toald me hir name was martin and that she came from Amsbery who did Immediatly afflect me urging me to writ in hir book [...] (AmDepo: Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Susannah Martin. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 576)

In all three descriptions of Martin, the language producers point to her age (*old*) and stature (*short*), two traits that must have been seen as central to identifying her as the witch afflicting the witnesses.

An adjective semantically related to *short* is *less*, which occurs four times in the material, always in the comparative form *lesser*. Moreover, it always refers to the same individual, namely one of a pair of thieves. The text in which this adjective occurs is a BrE deposition in which an innkeeper's wife described how two men had robbed her and her husband. The deponent never gives a close description of the two men, but differentiates them in her testimony by referring to their respective height (113).

(113) When they had drunke the ale, the taller **man** locked the dore, and the lesser **man** seized upon a boy, called Francis Chambers, apprentice to this deponent's husband, who filled them ale, and told him G--d --- him, if hee did not tell him where the money lay hee would run him through, as the boy informed this deponent. (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, p. 256)

Unlike *less*, however, *tall* occurs with several different referents in the material, albeit only with reference to men (seven tokens). This contrasts with Sveen's investigation, where *tall* occurred with referents of both gender, with approximately the same frequency (2005: 98).[60] The material used in the present sample evinces far too few examples of *tall* for any conclusions to be drawn, but should this finding be corroborated by a larger study into the use of adjectives in Early Modern English, it might be that *tall* has moved from being an adjective used predominantly with male reference to one that can be used with referents of both genders.

Regarding the general character of the Appearance adjectives with male and female reference respectively, it is interesting to note that the adjectives with male reference include lexemes which explicitly refer to a limited part of the referent, more specifically to the referents' face and hair (e.g. *black-bearded*, *hilly-faced*, *white-haired*) (List 6.2). There are no similar Appearance adjectives with female reference in this set of the material.[61] Instead, Appearance adjectives with female reference tend to describe the person denoted as a whole, rather than by drawing attention to a specific body part. Again, there are too few examples present in the material to allow definite conclusions to be drawn, but this does point to a potential tendency as regards the use of adjectival modifiers in speech-related courtroom material. Many instances of Appearance adjectives discussed here occur as part of an identification procedure, where the witness describes the physical appearance of someone involved in the case (see examples (114)–(115)).

(114) Mr. *Serj. Jefferies*. Mr. *Trice Hammon*, I would only ask you, Who did you see, who did you observe to be there?
Mr. *Hammon*. About 9. a clock at Night, or something before, I stood at the Door that leads to the *Common-Pleas*, and there came in Alderman *Cornish* and *Good-enough*, and Old *Key*, an old white-hair'd **man** [...] (BrExam: Tryal of Tho. Pilkington [etc], p. 28 [30])

[60] Sveen found eight instances of *tall* in her Victorian material (4 M, 4 F), and eight in her contemporary material (5 M, 3 F) (2005: 98). Each corpus (Victorian and contemporary) consisted of a total of 95,000 words.

[61] There is, however, one example of such an adjective with female reference in the journals: "But our Hostes, being a pretty full mounth'd old **creature**, entertain'd our fellow travailer, y^{e} french Docter wth Inumirable complaints of her bodily infirmities [...]" (AmJour: Sarah K. Knight. The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight).

(115) Q. Rich'd can you name any that ware at the mettings A. Jno. Willard Jno. Procter & his Wife Goody Nurse. Goodm Gory & his wife. Goody. how Mrs Bradbery & Goody Oliver &c. – Jno. Willard Is a black hared **Man** of a Midle Statture & he told me his Name [...] (AmExam: Examination of Richard Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 529)

In such descriptions, it would be natural for the witnesses to remark not only on the general, overall appearance of the person described, but also to point out any specific physical traits which might help identify the person described as, for instance, the defendant. Since the courtroom material (especially the BrE material) contains a great many texts where both the perpetrator and many of those otherwise involved are male, this could account both for why Appearance adjectives occur mainly with male reference in the material, and why there are more Appearance adjectives referring specifically to facial traits and hair colour in descriptions of men than of women.

In sum, the first hypothesis addressed in this section could not be verified. Instead, it appears that Appearance adjectives occur more frequently with male referents. It could be that whereas the bias towards women identified by, for instance, Wallin-Ashcroft (2000), Sveen (2005) and Bäcklund (2006) is valid for fictional material (such as drama and fiction) and letters, this is not necessarily the case for other non-fictional text categories, such as depositions or journals.

6.2.3 Referent Gender and Adjective Connotation

The second hypothesis to be addressed in this section predicted a connection between referent gender and the connotative value of the adjective, that is, whether the adjective denotes a positive or negative character trait. When addressing this aspect, examining all the adjectives proved unwieldy, especially when trying to determine whether the adjectives in question represented a positive or negative assessment on the part of the language producer. Many of the adjectives, for instance those denoting religious or political affiliation, could be either, depending on the feelings (and affiliations) of the language producer, and therefore provided little useable data for investigating the present hypothesis. Consequently, I have chosen to include only adjectives which denote the interaction between the individual and his/her surroundings in this part of the study (see further below). These adjectives (henceforth called Assessment adjectives) have been singled out for this study for two reasons. First, adjectives of this kind are the ones that one would expect to be the most emotionally loaded, since they include assessments (i.e. evaluations) of a person's behaviour and personality. This is thus an interesting group of adjectives to examine in an investigation of

possible gender differences in the attitudes conveyed through adjectival modifiers. Secondly, as mentioned above, whereas adjectives denoting other aspects of a person (such as nationality, physical state or age) are difficult to categorise as regards their evaluative meaning, the majority of Assessment adjectives can be categorised as carrying either positive or negative connotations. (I will return below to the question of how these adjectives were classified according to their connotations.) The Assessment adjectives thus constitute a source of data which can be treated relatively easily when investigating whether the choice of adjectival modifiers is influenced by the gender of the referent. These adjectives are also well-represented in the material, both as regards types and tokens.

As stated above, the Assessment adjectives are concerned with the interaction between the gender-term referents and their surroundings. Thus, this category contains both adjectives denoting the gender-term referents' attitudes towards others (example (116)) and the assessments the language producer makes of their characteristics, behaviour and performance (examples (117)–(118)).

(116) This gentleman is a very curteous and afable **person**, much Given to Hospitality, and has by his Good services Gain'd the affection of the people as much as any who had bin before him in that post. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 45)

(117) *Berkley*. I went to Mr. *Swendsen* himself, and said is this wicked **Woman** your Sister? Says he, I cannot say she is, but I have made her my Tool, and she has done my business, and I would get rid of her to morrow, but that being *Sunday* I will not, but on *Monday* I'll give her a reward for what she has done, and then I'll discharge her, and never see her more. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 6)

(118) [...] shee told us that shee did not thinke that they were accused for shee said if they were wee could not blame the devill for making witches of them for they were idle sloathfull **persons** and minded nothing that was good. (AmDepo: Edward Putnam and Ezekiel Cheever v. Martha Corey. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 261)

A total of 278 adjective tokens were found belonging to this category, representing 111 types. The full list of these adjectives is given in List 6.3 (p. 171).

List 6.3. Assessment adjectives occurring with gender-related terms in the material.

Male referents		**Female referents**	**Unspecified reference**
Able	Impudent	Afraid	Charitable
Abusive	Ingenious	Angry	Evil
Affable (2)	Instrumental (2)	Bad (4)	Good (2)
Angry	Interested	Civil	Guilty (3)
Bad (3)	Learned (4)	Common (2)	Innocent (4)
Bold	Lewd	Conscientious	Kind (2)
Capable	Lost	Dear (2)	Poor (3)
Careless	Loyal (2)	Discreet (2)	Slothful
Cheerful	Natural	Distressed	Talkative
Choice	Peaceable	Disturbed (3)	
Civil (2)	Perjured	Double-tongued	
Common	Pitiful (2)	Dreadful (12)	
Concerned (3)	Pleased	Dutiful	
Courteous (3)	Poor (3)	Given (2)	
Cruel	Proper	Good (4)	
Dangerous (3)	Prudent	Great	
Dear (2)	Quiet (3)	Honest	
Discontented	Right	Ill-carriaged	
Disorderly	Sackless	Innocent (3)	
Displeased	Secure	Kind	
Disturbed	Sensible	Limber-tongued	
Dreadful (10)	Sharp	Loose	
Dutiful	Silly	Malicious	
Engaged (2)	Sober	Miserable (2)	
Excellent	Studious	Modest	
False	Suborned	Neighbourly	
Fine	Troubled	Pious	
Fit (5)	Trusty	Poor (11)	
Frank	Unhappy	Precious (2)	
Free (2)	Unsatisfied	Proud	
Friendly	Wicked (5)	Prudent	
Full	Willing	Rational (4)	
Generous	Virtuous	Skilful	
Good (17)	Wise	Sober (3)	
Gracious	Worshipful	Strange	
Grave	Worthy (2)	Surly	
Grievous	Wrong	Tender	
Guilty (8)		Troubled (2)	
Honest (11)		Unwilling	
Honourable		Unworthy	
Honoured (13)		Wicked (2)	
Humble (4)		Virtuous	
Ill (3)		Wise	
		Wretched (2)	
Types: 80 **Tokens: 171**		**Types: 44** **Tokens: 89**	**Types: 9** **Tokens: 18**

Of the 278 Assessment adjective tokens in the material, 171, or 62%, are used to modify male gender-related terms. The corresponding figure for female referents is 89 token instances, or 32% of the total. The percentages of male and female referents respectively for the Assessment adjectives are thus close to those for male and female gender-related terms in the material as a whole: 68% and 28% (see further section 4.3.2).

As with the Appearance adjectives in 6.2.2, it is possible that the distribution of Assessment adjectives across referent gender deviates from the distribution of adjectives in general, while conforming to the distribution of male and female gender-related terms overall. In order to investigate whether this is the case, the distribution of these adjectives was contrasted with that of the remaining adjectives (see Table 6.4).

Table 6.4. The distribution of Assessment adjectives across referent gender (M and F), contrasted with the remaining adjectives.

Referent gender	**Assessment adjectives**	**Remaining adjectives**	**Total**
Male	171 (66%)	421 (61%)	**592 (62%)**
Female	89 (34%)	267 (39%)	**356 (37%)**
Total	**260 (100%)**	**688 (100%)**	**948 (100%)**

The figures presented in Table 6.4 show that the distribution of the Assessment adjectives across referent gender is more or less proportionate to that of the remaining adjectives. The difference between the two data sets was subjected to the chi-square test of independence and was not found to be statistically significant. Thus, both when taking the predominance of male terms in the material into account, and considering the distribution of the adjectives as a whole, it would appear that the Assessment adjectives are distributed fairly proportionally across referent gender.

Of the 110 Assessment adjective types present in the material, only 17 occur with both male and female reference: *angry* (1 M, 1 F), *bad* (3 M, 4 F), *civil* (2 M, 1 F), *common* (1 M, 2 F), *dear* (2 M, 2 F), *disturbed* (1M, 3F), *dreadful* (10 M, 12 F), *dutiful* (1 M, 1 F), *good* (17 M, 4 F), *honest* (11 M, 1 F), *poor* (3 M, 11 F), *prudent* (1M, 1F), *sober* (1 M, 3 F), *troubled* (1 M, 2 F), *wicked* (5 M, 2 F), *virtuous* (1 M, 1 F) and *wise* (1 M, 1F). Most of these lexemes occur roughly the same number of times with male reference as with female reference, with the three exceptions to this being *good*, *honest* and *poor*.

As regards *good*, there does not seem to be any semantic difference between the instances where the adjective has male reference and those where it has female reference. However, it is worth noting that three of the four tokens found with female reference (as well as three with male

reference) come from the same text: the journal of Sarah Kemble Knight (example (119)).

(119) Being come to mr. Havens', I was very civilly Received, and courteously entertained, in a clean comfortable House; and the Good **woman** was very active in helping off my Riding clothes, and then ask't what I would eat. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 16)

Apart from this one text, *good* does thus not seem to appear readily with female reference in the material examined here, although additional research is needed to see whether this is true of non-fictional texts from this period in general.

As mentioned above, *honest* occurs in the material twelve times as a modifier of gender-related terms. Of these twelve instances, one instance modifies a female gender-related term (*woman*, see example (120)).

(120) I applyed myself to doctor crosbe who gave me a grate deal of visek but could make non work tho he steept tobacco in [bofit] drink he could make non to work where upon he tould me that he beleved I was behaged: and I tould him I had thought so a good while: and he asked me by hom I tould him I did not care for spaking for one was counted an honest **woman**. (AmDepo: James Carr v. Mary Bradbury. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 125)

Apart from this one example, however, *honest* only co-occurs with gender-related terms denoting men in the material: it occurs with *man* on ten occasions, and once with *gentleman*. Nine of these tokens come from the BrE courtroom material, where *honest* tends to be used to describe the character (or, at times, what the language producer has assumed to be the character) of the accused or one of the witnesses ((121)–(122)).

(121) *Coll*. Do you know this *Bryan Haynes*, pray?
Mrs. *Wingfield*. Yes, very well.
Coll. What do you know of him?
Mrs. *Wingfield*. I know nothing of him, but he is an honest **Man**; he married my Daughter, and always carried himself like a Gentleman; he scorns the thing that is unhandsome, and never did any thing that is unhandsome in my life. (BrExam: Tryal ... of Stephen Colledge, p. 43)

(122) [...] afterwards, when they came from the house, he was sollicited to joyne with them, Captaine Baker p~ticularly inviteing him, sayeing he was assured he was an honest **man**, and hoped he would serve his King and Country in that buisness; [...] (BrDepo: Trials at Manchester, p. 18)

In the limited scope of the present investigation, *honest* thus shows a tendency to occur mainly with male referents and mainly as a premodifier of the central term *man*. A possible explanation for this apparent gender bias can be found in the division of labour in Early Modern times. In Early Modern society, trade and other monetary business was seen as the being the domain of men. Women, being legal minors under the guardianship of their fathers or husbands, were not normally allowed to engage in trade, even though some widows, having become legal persons on the death of their husbands, might do so (Evans 1989: 35; Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 330; Shoemaker 1998: 196). At this time, business transactions were mostly done on credit, and although wealthy and literate traders wrote down agreements, oral promises had to suffice for the rest (Foyster 1999: 7). Consequently, in any transaction, the buyer and the seller needed to trust the honesty of the other, and so a reputation for honesty would be crucial for any man wanting to do business with others. It was thus seen as an important characteristic for men in Early Modern society, and one worth emphasising. For women, who were less likely to engage in business transactions, honesty was presumably still a positive trait, but one of less general importance. This might explain why the adjective *honest* occurs predominantly with gender-related terms with male referents.

Categorising the semantic domain of a specific adjective was not always an easy task. As pointed out by Sveen (2005: 57), the borders of these domains can overlap. This inevitably leads to a certain amount of subjectivity being introduced into the classification, although an effort was made to minimise this, mainly by relying on the textual context for clues as how to classify individual occurrences of an adjective. The classification was made more complicated by the fact that some adjectives can belong to several semantic domains, depending on the context. One example of this is *poor*. *Poor* can either denote financial need, as in (123), or convey the sympathy which the language producer feels for the referents, without referring to their financial situation, as in (124) (Biber et al. 1999: 509). When used to express sympathy, *poor* also shows a certain degree of condescension, since it implies that the language producer is in a position from which s/he can pity the referent.

(123) This Informant saith, That last *Tuesday* Night he was standing by the Bonfire at the *Star*, and saw the Soldiers break Mr. *Hurst's* Windows all to Pieces; and when they had so done, they began to throw Stones at other People's Windows, and particularly Mr. *Cooper's* the Barber; and some one that stood by said, *It was pity to break them, for he was a* <u>*poor*</u> ***Man***; [...] (BrDepo: Depositions Concerning the Late Riot in Oxford, p. 30)

(124) *Sh.* You were charged about 12 years since, and did you never see the Devil but this time?

Temp. Yes, once before: I was going for Brooms, and he came to me and said, *Thou poor* ***woman*** *has a great burthen*; and would help ease me of my Burthen: and I said, *The Lord had enabled me to carry it so far, and I hope I shall be able to carry it further*. (BrExam: Informations against Three Witches, p. 40)

Poor is the only semantically ambiguous adjective in the material which demonstrates robust gender patterning: its meaning is to a certain extent connected with the gender of the referent. All in all, *poor* was found 22 times in the material.[62] Apart from the 17 instances of *poor* functioning as an Assessment adjective (3 M, 11 F, 3 FM) (see List 6.3), the material also contains five instances where it denotes financial poverty, all with male reference. Table 6.5 illustrates how the 22 adjective tokens are divided across referent gender.

Table 6.5. The distribution of *poor* (raw figures) across the two semantic meanings and referent gender.

Meaning of *poor*	**M**	**F**	**FM**	**Total**
'Poverty'	5	0	0	**5**
'Sympathy'	3	11	3	**17**
Total	**8**	**11**	**3**	**22**

The figures presented in Table 6.5 could not be tested for statistical significance, since the expected frequencies were below five. As mentioned above, the instances of financial *poor*, indicating poverty, all have male referents. This is not surprising, since in Early Modern times men were not only the main wage-earners, but also the nominal owners of the family's property (cf. Erickson 1993: 24–26; Shoemaker 1998: 91). Hence, it would be more common to refer to someone's financial situation if that person were male, since married and young single women could not normally possess things in their own right. It is interesting to note that, as mentioned previously (see footnote 62), the only instance of a possible financial *poor* with a gender-related term with female reference occurs with the term *widow*, widows being among the few women who could be legal owners of property in their own right (Shoemaker: 1998: 138; Erickson 1993: 25).

Whereas instances where *poor* refers to financial poverty predominantly occur with gender-related terms with male referents, the opposite is true

[62] There is also one instance of *poor* occurring with the term *widow*, which could be either financial or sympathetic: "[...]this informant, being laid downe in the wherry, it being night tyme, rose up and said, 'Here hath bene hard tymes already for a poore widdow to make shift with a charge of children, pray God send us peace and quietnes.'" (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York). As explained in section 6.2.1, all instances where an adjective could not be placed conclusively in one semantic category have been omitted, and so this instance is not included in this discussion.

when the adjective expresses sympathy. Nearly two-thirds of the tokens of sympathetic *poor* (11 out of 17) occur in connection with gender-related terms that denote a woman (see Table 6.5) (examples (125)–(126)).[63]

(125) [...] I sat forward with neighbor Polly and Jemima, a Girl about 18 Years old, who hee said he had been to fetch out of the Narragansetts, and said they had Rode thirty miles that day, on sory lean Jade, wth only a Bagg under her for a pillion, which the poor **Girl** often complain'd was very uneasy. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 27)

(126) [...] here Is an Argument of hope for this poor **Creature** that she Will be Snatched out of the Snare of the Divel becaue there Semes to be Somthing of repentance. (AmExam: Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 525)

The material thus evinces a gender bias in the use of *poor*: when the word is used to express sympathy, it is most often used about women; when it refers to a man, on the other hand, financial poverty is meant more often than not. This is perhaps linked to the condescending tone which *poor* can carry, in that it would normally be easier at the time to maintain a superior position vis-à-vis a woman than a man (see above).

Testing the hypothesis addressed in this section requires that the Assessment adjectives be classified further according to whether they carry mainly positive or negative connotations. Since the focus here is on the possible link between the evaluative meaning of the adjectives and referent gender, the 18 adjective tokens modifying gender-related terms with unspecified gender (FM) have not been included in this analysis. The sum total of adjective tokens included in the subsequent analysis is therefore 260, rather than 278.

When deciding whether an adjectival token denotes a positive or a negative quality in the referent, I have, in accordance with Sveen (2005: 58–60) and Bäcklund (2006: 23), followed the principle set forth by Persson (1990). This principle bases the classification on whether or not the adjective in question denotes a quality which is generally seen as desirable to possess, that is, "'[i]s it generally thought better to be X than not to be X?'" (Persson 1990: 52). If the answer is yes, the adjective in question has been regarded as a *positive* adjective. The same question reversed has been used to determine what adjectives are negative, that is, "is it generally thought better *not* to be X than to be X?" If so, the adjective has been considered *negative*.

[63] Of the remaining six token instances of *poor*, three occur in connection with gender-related terms of unspecified gender (FM). In all three instances, however, the gender-related term in question is *creature*, which, as was shown in section 5.4.3 above, has a tendency to be used about women, rather than men.

Deciding whether or not an adjective in an Early Modern text carries positive or negative connotation is a perilous task when undertaken by a scholar some 300 years removed from the environment in which the material was produced. As previously, I have based this categorisation on the context, looking for textual clues as to whether or not the adjective is likely to carry positive or negative meaning. If an adjective could not be said to be either positive or negative, either because it is a lexeme which does not carry overt evaluative connotations or because the context did not yield sufficient information for interpretation, I considered it to be *indeterminate*. Persson (1990: 52) uses the term *neutral* to describe those adjectives which are neither wholly positive nor wholly negative. However, although it is possible that the language producer meant for a certain adjective to carry neither positive nor negative evaluative meaning, one must also consider the possibility that he or she meant for the adjectives in question to be interpreted in a positive or negative light, although this interpretation is not obvious to a modern reader. For this reason, I have opted for the term *indeterminate* rather than *neutral* when describing adjectives which are not obviously positive or negative. Examples of adjectives representing positive (127), negative (128) and indeterminate (129) assessments are given below.

(127) He is an honest cheerful **man** that does not grumble and be uneasy about his paying his money. (BrJour: Dudley Ryder: The Diary of Dudley Ryder)

(128) goody Lacey the Mother brought into the Chamber, To whome the Court s'd thus, Here is a Poor Miserable **Child** a Wretched **Mother** & **Granmother**; (AmExam: Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 524)

(129) Mr. *West*. [...] My Lord, this was the Account I had of the matter in general of Mr. *Ferguson*; but he said they were disappointed. Afterwards he told me the **Prisoner** at the Bar and **Major** *Wildman* were very instrumental in working of it off, because they could not agree upon the Declaration to be made upon the Insurrection. (BrExam: Tryal ... of Algernon Sidney, p. 15)

Patronising or condescending adjectives, such as *poor* (denoting sympathy), have been placed among the negative adjectives, as have otherwise positive adjectives when clearly used ironically. An example of a clearly ironic use of an otherwise positive adjective is given in (130). The example is given with a fair amount of context to illustrate that the author, Madame Knight, does not think highly of the landlady in question.

(130) But our Hostes, being a pretty full mounth'd old creature, entertain'd our fellow travailer, y^{e} french Docter wth Inumirable complaints of her bodily infirmities; and whisperd to him so lou'd, that all y^{e} House had as full a hearing as hee: which was very divirting to y^{e} company, (of which there was a great many,) as one might see by their sneering. But poor weary I slipt out to enter my mind in my Jornal, and left my Great **Landly** with her Talkative Guests to themselves. (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 22)

Ironic adjective use is not common in the material, and apart from the instance given in (130), there are only two examples of normally positive words being used in a negative sense: one instance of *excellent* and one of *fine*, both with male referents.

Lists 6.4 and 6.5 present the Assessment adjectives according to the semantic connotations they carry: positive, negative or indeterminate. The adjectives have been divided into two separate lists: one for adjectives modifying gender-related terms with male referents (List 6.4), and one for adjectives modifying gender-related terms denoting women (List 6.5).

Lists 6.4 and 6.5 indicate a certain gender bias in how the Assessment adjectives were used with regard to their evaluative meaning. Of the adjective tokens occurring with gender-related terms with male referents, 102 out of the total 171 instances (or 60%) carry positive connotations, whereas 65 tokens (38%) have negative connotations. The remaining four instances (2%) are indeterminate.

List 6.4. The Assessment adjectives occurring together with gender-related terms with *male* referents, presented according to semantic connotation.

Positive	Negative	Indeterminate
Able	Abusive	Instrumental (2)
Affable (2)	Angry	Natural
Bold	Bad (3)	Wrong
Capable	Careless	
Cheerful	Common	
Choice	Concerned (3)	
Civil (2)	Cruel	
Courteous (3)	Dangerous (3)	
Dear (2)	Discontented	
Dutiful	Disorderly	
Engaged (2)	Displeased	
Fit (5)	Disturbed	
Frank	Dreadful (10)	
Free (2)	Excellent	
Friendly	False	
Generous	Fine	
Good (17)	Full (of discourse)	
Gracious	Grievous	
Grave	Guilty (8)	
Honest (11)	Ill (3)	
Honourable	Impudent	
Honoured (13)	Interested	
Humble (4)	Lewd	
Ingenious	Lost	
Learned (4)	Perjured	
Loyal (2)	Pitiful (2)	
Peaceable	Poor (3)	
Pleased	Sharp	
Proper	Silly	
Prudent	Suborned	
Quiet (3)	Troubled	
Right	Unhappy	
Sackless	Unsatisfied	
Secure	Wicked (5)	
Sensible		
Sober		
Studious		
Trusty		
Willing		
Virtuous		
Wise		
Worshipful		
Worthy (2)		
Types: 43 **Tokens: 102**	**Types: 34** **Tokens: 65**	**Types: 3** **Tokens: 4**

List 6.5. The Assessment adjectives occurring together with gender-related terms with *female* referents, presented according to semantic connotation.

Positive	Negative
Civil	Afraid
Conscientious	Angry
Dear (2)	Bad (4)
Discreet (2)	Common (2)
Dutiful	Distressed
Good (4)	Disturbed (3)
Honest	Double-tongued
Innocent (3)	Dreadful (12)
Kind	Given (to gossiping) (2)
Modest	Great
Neighbourly	Ill-carriaged
Pious	Limber-tongued
Precious (2)	Loose
Prudent	Malicious
Rational (4)	Miserable (2)
Skilful	Poor (11)
Sober (3)	Proud
Tender	Strange
Virtuous	Surly
Wise	Troubled (2)
	Unwilling
	Unworthy
	Wicked (2)
	Wretched (2)
Types: 20 **Tokens: 33**	**Types: 24** **Tokens: 56**

If one considers the corresponding figures for adjectives occurring with female gender-related terms, one finds that they are nearly reversed: 33 token instances out of a total 89 (37%) carry positive connotations, whereas 56 instances (63%) are negative (see Table 6.6).

Table 6.6. The distribution Assessment adjectives across referent gender and adjective connotation.

Adjective connotation	**M**	**F**	**Total**
Positive	102 (60%)	33 (37%)	**135 (52%)**
Negative	65 (38%)	56 (63%)	**121 (46%)**
Indeterminate	4 (2%)	0 (0%)	**4 (2%)**
Total	**171 (100%)**	**89 (100%)**	**260 (100%)**

This indicates that when an Assessment adjective occurs in connection with a male gender-related term, this adjective is more likely to be positive than negative. For female gender-related terms, the opposite is true. Testing these figures using the chi-square test of independence revealed that this difference is statistically significant (χ^2: 15.62, df: 2, $p<0.01$).

When seeking an answer as to why male terms are predominantly used with positive adjectives and female terms with negative adjectives, it is important to consider the texts in which the Assessment adjectives occur. The greater part of the material used for the present study consists of speech-related courtroom material, and, as can be seen in Table 6.7, it is in these texts that most of these adjectives are found.

Table 6.7. The Assessment adjective tokens as distributed across the speech-related and non-speech-related parts of the material.

Text category	**M**	**F**	**Total**
Speech-related	149 (58%)	73 (28%)	**222 (85%)**
Non-speech-related	22 (8%)	16 (6%)	**38 (15%)**
Total	**171 (66%)**	**89 (34%)**	**260 (100%)**

The fact that the speech-related texts were produced in the highly formal environment of the courtroom, an environment dominated by men of high status, provides a two-fold explanation as to why, on the majority of occasions, women are described with negative adjectives. First, the judicial roles assigned to women in the courtroom were such as would not normally be the recipient of respectful adjectives. Secondly, especially in the Salem proceedings, women were often both the victims of witch-related crimes and the suspected perpetrators of the same, which encouraged the use of sympathetic/patronising or disparaging adjectives when talking to or about them.

To elaborate on these points, in the courtroom texts, the women present are nearly always in a subordinate position. In the examination material, women only appear as witnesses, accusers or defendants, which places them under the presiding male magistrates in the courtroom hierarchy. In one of the deposition texts, the above-mentioned *Concerning the Birth of the Prince of Wales* (1688), there are instances of high-ranking women giving testimony, but apart from this text the women producing these statements are of lower rank than the magistrates, even outside the social setting of the courtroom. The highest-ranking women featuring in the texts, the Queens Mary of Modena and Mary II, while frequently mentioned, are nonetheless never physically present at the trials; nor do they give any statements. The courtroom thus constitutes an environment where the judicial roles played by women (as witnesses, deponents, accusers or defendants) are in some way

subordinate. The roles played by men in the courtroom were more varied, since, in addition to those also played by women, they included such higher-ranking positions as magistrates, jurors, solicitors, attorneys, clerks and members of the law enforcement (such as sheriffs). It is the people playing these latter roles (all men) who were addressed respectfully, attracting formulaic phrases which include adjectives such as *honoured*, *learned* and *worshipful*, not the women (examples (131)–(133)). This pattern corresponds well with Wallin-Ashcroft's statement that respect was seen as an apt response to men, who were often big and powerful (2000: 208, see also section 6.1 above).

(131) at the same moment that I was hearing my Evidence read by the honoured **Magistrates** to take my Oath I was again re-assaulted & tortured by my before mentioned Tormentor Rebekah Nurse. (AmDepo: Ann Putnam Sr., v. Martha Corey and Rebecca Nurse. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 605)

(132)

Lord. *Howard*.	Pray will you ask him, if my Lord of *Clare* used to fall out with me upon those discourses.
E. of *Clare*.	My Lord was always good Company.
Mr. Att. Gen.	You mean *a Propos*, My Lord.
E. of *Clare.*	I understand what you mean by *a Propos*, you are a Learned **man**, I know. (BrExam: Tryal ... of John Hambden, p. 28)

(133) The examination of Sarah Good before the worshipfull **Assts** John Harthorn Jonathan Curren (AmExam: Examination of Sarah Good. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 356)

The second part of the explanation suggested above as to why women are described with adjectives carrying negative connotation concerns the fact that in both the speech-related and non-speech-related texts women are often portrayed either as defenceless victims of crimes, or, especially in the case of the witch trials, as malicious wrongdoers. The former are often described using adjectives such as *miserable* or *poor*, whereas the latter are *bad, dreadful* or *wicked* (examples (134)–(137)).

(134) After w'ch time the s'd Elizabeth told this deponent that as shee was milking of her cow the s'd susana martin came behind her and told her that shee woold make hir the miserablest **creatur** for defa[m]ing her name at the Court & wep greevously as shee told it to this deponent. (AmDepo: William Brown v. Susannah Martin. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 559)

(135) My hostess catechis'd John for going so cheap, saying his poor **wife** would break her heart [...] (AmJour: The Journal of Sarah Kemble Knight. Winship 1935: 3–4)

(136) And then s'd Bishop Directed his speech unto us as we Rode along & s'd that she had ben a bad **wife** unto him ever since they were marryed [...] (AmDepo: Elizabeth Balch and Abigail Waldon v. Sarah Bishop. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 112)

(137) *Berkley*. I went to Mr. *Swendsen* himself, and said is this wicked **Woman** your Sister? Says he, I cannot say she is, but I have made her my Tool, and she has done my business, and I would get rid of her to morrow, but that being *Sunday* I will not, but on *Monday* I'll give her a reward for what she has done, and then I'll discharge her, and never see her more. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 6)

The present study thus evinces a tendency for women to be described with adjectives with negative connotations to a greater extent than men, probably due to the social roles they played in the judicial proceedings. My findings, based on authentic material, are thus so far more in line with the traditional view of how women were described in historical times, rather than Wallin-Ashcroft's fiction-based findings (see section 6.1). Of course, as mentioned above, the social context of the material used and the roles played by the women appearing in the courtroom are influential factors in this.

So far, the analysis presented in this section has mostly considered the relative proportions of positive and negative adjectives with referents of either gender. The question thus remains whether there are further semantic differences among the positive and negative adjectives depending on whether they occur with female or male gender-related terms. Since the adjectives occurring with referents of both genders have been discussed above, here I will focus on the adjectives which occur exclusively with male or female referents. These adjectives are presented anew in List 6.6 (p. 184).

Interestingly, the positive adjectives with female reference found in the material mostly denote passive or inner qualities, highlighting characteristics such as rationality (*conscientious*, *rational*), unobtrusiveness (*discreet*, *modest*) and nurturing ability (*kind*, *tender*). In contrast, the positive adjectives with male reference, while certainly including similar adjectives (e.g. *sensible*, *quiet*), also include adjectives which denote qualities of a more active and social nature, highlighting ability (*able*, *capable*, *fit*), the benefits of a formal education (*ingenious*, *learned*, *studious*), sociability (*affable*, *cheerful*, *courteous*, *engaged*, *frank*, *friendly*, *generous*, *trusty*) and the respect which the language producer feels for the referent (*gracious*, *honourable*, *honoured*, *worshipful*, *worthy*). The adjectives with female reference do include one instance of an adjective denoting ability (*skilful*) and one of a clear social nature (*neighbourly*), but otherwise there are no counterparts with female reference to the male reference adjectives listed above. What is remarkable here is not just the fact that so many adjectives

with active and social connotations are used with the male gender-related terms, but that there are comparatively so few such adjectives occurring with the female terms. Note also that whereas referents of both genders occur with adjectives denoting intellectual ability (*rational*, *ingenious*), those occurring with male reference often highlight such traits that are associated with formal education (e.g. *learned*, *studious*).

List 6.6. The adjectives occurring exclusively with male or female reference, with evaluative meaning

Positive		Negative	
Male	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**
Able	Conscientious	Abusive	Afraid
Affable (2)	Discreet (2)	Careless	Distressed
Bold	Innocent (3)	Concerned (3)	Double-tongued
Capable	Kind	Cruel	Given (2)
Cheerful	Modest	Dangerous (3)	Great
Choice	Neighbourly	Discontented	Ill-carriaged
Courteous (3)	Pious	Disorderly	Limber-tongued
Engaged (2)	Precious (2)	Displeased	Loose
Fit (5)	Rational (4)	Excellent	Malicious
Frank	Skilful	False	Miserable (2)
Free (2)	Tender	Fine	Proud
Friendly		Full	Strange
Generous		Grievous	Surly
Gracious		Guilty (8)	Unwilling
Grave		Ill (3)	Unworthy
Honourable		Impudent	Wretched (2)
Honoured (13)		Interested	
Humble (4)		Lewd	
Ingenious		Lost	
Learned (4)		Perjured	
Loyal (2)		Pitiful (2)	
Peaceable		Sharp	
Pleased		Silly	
Proper		Suborned	
Quiet (3)		Unhappy	
Right		Unsatisfied	
Sackless			
Secure			
Sensible			
Studious			
Trusty			
Willing			
Worshipful			
Worthy (2)			
Types: 34 **Tokens: 65**	**Types: 11** **Tokens: 18**	**Types: 26** **Tokens: 40**	**Types: 16** **Tokens:19**

Among the negative adjectives with female reference, the majority of lexemes can be placed into one of two categories. The first of these categories contains adjectives which denote mental perturbation (*afraid*, *distressed*, *miserable*, *wretched*). These adjectives are passive in nature, suggesting that something or someone has distressed the referent, and they could be argued to be somewhat condescending, since the language producer is in a position where s/he can feel sorry for the referent. The second broad category into which many negative adjectives with female reference can be placed contains adjectives of a more active sort, namely adjectives denoting bad manners and behaviour (*double-tongued*, *given* (to tattling/to speak bad words), *ill-carriaged*, *limber-tongued*, *loose*, *malicious*, *proud*, *surly*).

Many of the negative adjectives occurring with male reference can also be placed into these categories, with *discontented*, *displeased*, *disturbed*, *pitiful*, *unhappy* and *unsatisfied* denoting mental perturbation, and *abusive*, *careless*, *cruel*, *dangerous*, *disorderly*, *full* (of discourse), *impudent*, *lewd* and *sharp* referring to bad manners and behaviour. There are also some adjectives which are clearly linked to the courtroom situation (*concerned*, *guilty*, *interested*, *perjured*, *suborned*). This last semantic adjective category has no equivalent among the negative adjectives with female reference, but apart from this difference, referent gender does not seem to influence the semantic shades of the negative adjectives to any greater extent.

As pointed out elsewhere, the paucity of adjectival data necessitates caution when interpreting the results. However, looking at the adjectives does indicate the qualities and characteristics that were seen as notable and worthy of pointing out in men and women. The positive adjectives occurring with only female reference point to characteristics such as rationality, unobtrusiveness and kindness as being seen as desirable traits in a woman. The corresponding adjectives with male reference highlight similar qualities, but moreover include sociability, intellect and ability among the praised characteristics. Not surprisingly, bad manners and unsociable behaviour were subject to censure regardless of the gender of the referent.

Another aspect of adjective use which is of interest to the present study is whether the gender of the language producer influences the connotative values of the adjectives used to refer to people of either gender. In her study of adjective use in nineteenth-century drama, fiction and letters, Bäcklund (2006) found that men writers had a greater tendency to use negative adjectives when referring to women than to men, whereas women writers used more negative adjectives about men than about women. Writers of both genders were, however, more inclined to use positive adjectives to describe female referents than to describe men (2006: 42–43).[64] Although Bäcklund's study deals with both a different time period and different text genres than

[64] Both men and women writers use more indeterminate adjectives (*neutral* in Bäcklund's terminology) about referents of their own gender.

does the present investigation, it does indicate that the connotations carried by adjectives used to describe male and female referents can depend on the gender of the language producer.

In order to investigate whether this is the case in the material I examine, the Assessment adjectives were classified according to the gender of the language producer and then plotted according to the evaluative meaning they carried as well as the gender of the referent. The few instances of scribal comments containing Assessment adjectives were thus considered to be produced by men (see section 2.3.2.2 above).

Table 6.8 gives the distribution of Assessment adjectives in language produced by men, whereas Table 6.9 gives the corresponding data for adjectives in instances where the language producer is female.[65]

Table 6.8. Distribution of Assessment adjectives in language produced by *men* across evaluative meaning and referent gender.

	M	**F**	**FM**	**Total**
Pos.	77 (63%)	9 (28%)	3 (38%)	**89 (55%)**
Neg.	41 (33%)	23 (72%)	5 (63%)	**69 (42%)**
Indet.	5 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**5 (3%)**
Total	**123 (100%)**	**32 (100%)**	**8 (100%)**	**163 (100%)**

Table 6.9. Distribution of adjectives in language produced by *women* across evaluative meaning and referent gender.

	M	**F**	**FM**	**Total**
Pos.	31 (60%)	18 (37%)	6 (60%)	**55 (50%)**
Neg.	21 (40%)	31 (63%)	4 (40%)	**56 (50%)**
Indet.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**0 (0%)**
Total	**52 (100%)**	**49 (100%)**	**10 (100%)**	**111 (100%)**

Tables 6.8 and 6.9 show that the tendency for positive adjectives to be used about men and negative adjectives to be used about women holds true for both male and female language producers. Among the negative adjectives used by male language producers, a somewhat larger percentage (72%)

[65] In addition to the data presented in Tables 6.8 and 6.9, there are four additional instances of Assessment adjectives which occur in depositions where a man and a woman testify jointly. All of the four instances refer to women; two of these adjectives have positive connotations and two are negative.

refers to women when compared to the corresponding adjectives used by female language producers (63%). In order to make the data more accessible, the distribution of positive and negative adjectives used by male and female language producers has been correlated (Tables 6.10 and 6.11). Table 6.10 presents the distribution of positive adjectives across referent gender, whereas 6.11 gives the corresponding data for negative adjectives.

Table 6.10. Distribution of positive adjectives across referent gender and gender of language producer.

	Male referents	**Female referents**	**Unspecified referents**	**Total**
Male language producers	77 (87%)	9 (10%)	3 (3%)	**89 (100%)**
Female language producers	31 (56%)	18 (33%)	6 (11%)	**55 (100%)**
Total	**108 (75%)**	**27 (19%)**	**9 (6%)**	**144 (100%)**

Table 6.11. Distribution of negative adjectives across referent gender and gender of language producer.

	Male referents	**Female referents**	**Unspecified referents**	**Total**
Male language producers	41 (59%)	23 (33%)	5 (7%)	**69 (100%)**
Female language producers	21 (38%)	31 (55%)	4 (7%)	**56 (100%)**
Total	**62 (50%)**	**54 (43%)**	**9 (7%)**	**125 (100%)**

The data presented in Tables 6.10 and 6.11 is statistically significant (Table 6.10: χ^2: 16.48, df: 2, $p<0.01$; Table 6.11: χ^2: 6.47, df: 2, $p<0.05$). As Table 6.10 shows, male language producers are more inclined to use positive adjectives when the referent is male. Female language producers also use a higher percentage of positive adjectives when referring to men than when referring to women, but the difference is more pronounced among the male language producers. As discussed earlier, the predominance of positive adjectives with male referents is likely to be due to the fact that the judicial roles which would attract positive assessments (judges, magistrates, etc.) were all occupied by men.

As regards the negative adjectives, it was found that women are described with negative adjectives more than are men in the material as a whole (see Tables 6.8 and 6.9). However, dividing the adjectives according to the gender of the language producer reveals that male language producers are use negative adjectives more when describing male referents, whereas female language producers use them more often when referring to women. The latter finding is linked to the fact that the majority of witnesses and

defendants in the Salem witchcraft trials were women. There was thus ample cause for women deponents to use pejorative adjectives when referring to their (female) alleged tormentors. In contrast, the majority of negative adjectives with male reference come from the BrE material, where, as mentioned previously, men dominated both as witnesses and defendants, which helps explain why male language producers use negative adjectives with male referents more often than with women. In other words, the above results reflect the rather specialised nature of my datasets.

6.2.4 Characterising *of*-phrases

The last aspect which will be addressed in connection with adjectival modifiers of gender-related terms is the use of characterising *of*-phrases (for a definition, see 2.3.2.1). As was mentioned in section 4.3.2 above, the material contains several instances in which *of*-phrases are used to highlight certain characteristics in a person, either positive (example (138)) or negative (example (139)).

(138) *Capt. Harris.* [...]And he talk'd something of bringing the Garter, and of attacking the Coach; but he went out of the Room, and afterwards he came in and declared, *We were all* ***Men*** *of Honour, and that the Business we were going about, was to attack the Prince of* Orange; but *Durant* came in after that, and said, *The Prince of* Orange *did not go out that Day*. (BrExam. Tryal of Ambrose Rookwood, p. 52)

(139) Dec. 11, 1680. Before (Sir) Thos. Loraine. Whereas information uppon oath is made before me by Nicolas Rames, that one Elizabeth Fenwicke, of Longwitton, did threathen the sayde Nicolas Raymes what he had done she, the saide Elizabeth Fenwicke would make him repent it; and she, the sayde Elizabeth Fenwicke, being a **woman** of bad fame for withcraff severall yeares hearetofore, he the saide Nicolas Rames doth affirme and complaine that his wife, lyeing under a sad and lamentable torment of sickeness, doth daylye complaine that she the sayde Elizabeth Fenwicke doth continuallye torment her, and is disabell to her in her saide perplexatye; (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, p. 247)

Note that in this section I consider *all* instances of characterising *of*-phrases, regardless of the aspect of the referent's character they refer to.

A list of all the characterising *of*-phrases in the material was presented in List 4.6 above and is reprinted here as List 6.7 for ease of reference (p. 189).

List 6.7. The *of*-phrases occurring with gender-related terms in the material.

***Of*-phrase**	**Gender of referent (M/F)**	**Connotations (pos./neg./ indet.)**	**Text category**
Gentleman of reputation (2)	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Magistrates of the highest quality	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of a middle stature	M	Indet.	AmExam
Man of common sense	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Man of conscience	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of estate (2)	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of good capacity	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of good sense	M	Pos.	BrJour
Man of great finesse	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of great freedom in discourse	M	Neg.	BrExam
Man of great wit	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of honour (7)	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of integrity	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of interest	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of justice	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Man of low spirits	M	Neg.	BrExam
Man of ordinary sense	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Man of readiness in discourse	M	Pos.	BrExam
Man of sagacity	M	Pos.	BrJour
Man of weak body	M	Neg.	BrExam
Man of virtue	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of 50 or 60 Thousand Crowns (2)	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of a sound and healthy body	M	Pos.	BrDepo
Person of a Turbulent, Factious, Seditious spirit	M	Neg.	BrExam
Person of gallantry	M	Pos.	BrJour
Person of great courage	M	Pos.	BrJour
Person of integrity	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of quality	M	Pos.	BrExam
Person of worth	M	Pos.	BrExam
Woman of a very turbulent unruly spirit	F	Neg.	AmDepo
Woman of an unruly turbulent spirit (3)	F	Neg.	AmDepo
Woman of bad fame	F	Neg	BrDepo
Woman of quality	F	Pos.	AmDepo
Woman of worth	F	Pos.	AmDepo
Types: 34 (5 F, 29 M), Tokens: 45 (7 F, 38 M)			

The material contains 45 tokens of characterising *of*-phrases, representing 34 types (see List 6.7). It is interesting to note that the *of*-phrases only occur

with a very limited set of gender-related terms: *gentleman*, *magistrate*, *man*, *person* and *woman*. This might indicate that characterising *of*-phrases were not free to occur with any term, but were a part of a fixed frame. Possibly, this phrase structure occurred primarily in the repertoire of educated language users. I will return to this further on.

As was noted in section 4.3.2, the majority of characterising *of*-phrases modify terms with male reference. This is consistent with what Wallin-Ashcroft found regarding the use of characterising *of*-phrases with the term *person*: 14 out of the 17 examples she found of this type of construction with *person* referred to men (2000: 57). In the present material, 38 of the 45 tokens of characterising *of*-phrases (84%) occur with gender-related terms which denote a man, compared to only seven characterising *of*-phrases (16%) referring to women. As has been shown above (section 4.3.2), 68% of the gender-related terms in the material have male reference, and 28% have female reference. If the characterising *of*-phrases were distributed equally across the genders, one could expect similar percentages here, but that is not the case. In Table 6.12 percentages and raw figures are given for gender-related terms post-modified with characterising *of*-phrases as well as for the remaining gender-related terms in the material.

Table 6.12. The distribution of characterising *of*-phrases and gender-related terms in percent, according to referent gender (M or F). Raw figures within parentheses.

	M	**F**	**Total**
Characterising *of*-phrases	84% (38)	16% (7)	**100% (45)**
Remaining gender-related terms	71% (7,394)	29% (3,031)	**100% (10,425)**

Subjecting the raw figures in Table 6.12 to the chi-square test reveals that this difference is statistically significant (χ^2: 3.946, df: 1, $p<0.05$). Thus, whereas adjectives are, overall, used about men and women to an extent that is roughly equivalent (see section 4.3.2), this is not the case with characterising *of*-phrases, which are much more likely to occur with male terms.

Not only are characterising *of*-phrases used to describe men more often than women, but referent gender also seems to influence the nature of the qualities which these phrases highlight. Of the 38 token instances of characterising *of*-phrases with male referents, only four refer to negative qualities in the referent, three of which are contained in examples (29) above and (140) below.

(140) *L. Ch. Just.* Take your own Method, Mr. *Sidney*; but I say, if you are a **man** of low Spirits and weak Body, 'tis a Duty incumbent upon the Court, to exhort you not to spend your time upon things that are

not material. (BrExam: Tryal ... of Algernon Sidney, p. 34)

The remaining instance of negative evaluation, *a man of great freedom in discourse*, does not imply censure as obviously as do the other two. The instance appears in example (141).

(141) *Mr. Att. Gen*. Pray good my Lord, Why did you joy my Lord *Howard*, had you any reason to mistrust my Lord?
L. *Paget*. No other reason, then because I knew he was a **man** of great freedom in discourse, and might be concerned upon that account.
Mr. Att. Gen. And he would frequently discourse against the Government I suppose?
L. *Paget.* No, I never heard my Lord discourse against the Government in my life. (BrExam: Tryal ... of John Hambden, p. 29)

From the context preceding the text quoted in (141), it becomes clear that whereas the speaker judges the ability to converse easily with people as something generally positive, he fears that in this particular instance the referent's predisposition towards free conversation might have led to him being unjustly suspected of plotting against the government. This is thus an instance of an otherwise positive quality being judged negatively in a particular circumstance.

Of the remaining 34 *of*-phrases with male referents, 33 denote positive characteristics in the persons concerned. Most often these qualities pertain to mental qualities, such as wit, honour, courage and integrity (example (142)), but they may also concern worldly matters, such as wealth and estate (example (143)).

(142) John Dear, brother's tenant, was there. He is an honest cheerful man that does not grumble and be uneasy about his paying his money. He is, too, a **man** of very good sense and sagacity and talks well of the affairs in which he is conversant, viz. farming, and seems to have a great memory. (BrJour: Dudley Ryder. The Diary of Dudley Ryder)

(143) Mr. *Ward*. Though it is difficult for us to be put to explain any of those Letters, yet we will call some Witnesses to explain one, which mentions **Persons** of 50 or 60 Thousand Crowns a Year, and shew that it was meant of one that was concerned in the Revenue in *France*, and suffered by it. (BrExam: Tryal of Francis Francia, p. 50)

The remaining *of*-phrase with male reference carries an indeterminate connotation. This instance has already been given in example (115), but is repeated here as (144).

(144) Q. Rich'd can you name any that ware at the mettings A. Jno. Willard Jno. Procter & his Wife Goody Nurse. Goodm Gory & his wife. Goody. how Mrs Bradbery & Goody Oliver &c. – Jno. Willard Is a black hared **Man** of a Midle Statture & he told me his Name [...] (AmExam: Examination of Richard Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 529)

In contrast, the characterising *of*-phrases occurring with gender-related terms denoting women carry predominantly negative connotations. In only two instances out of the seven present in the material does the *of*-phrase refer to positive qualities in the persons denoted (example (145)).

(145) This Deposition of Thomas Boarman sen'or aged 47 This Deponent testifieth and saith that som **wimen** of worth and quality: Desired me To Aquaint the seven men that Rachell Clinton was a great Dissturber unto them in the house in hunching them with hur Elboo: (AmDepo: Thomas Boarman v. Rachel Clenton. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 217)

The remaining instances of characterising *of*-phrases with female referents all denote negative qualities in the referent, namely *an unruly, turbulent spirit*, *a very turbulent unruly spirit* and a bad reputation (*bad fame*). The instances of the first two of these types all come from the Salem material, where they are used in what seems to be an almost formulaic way in descriptions of one of the alleged witches, Sarah Bibber, who seems to have been a woman of temperament (examples (146) and (147)).

(146) Likewise Lidia porter Testifieth, that Goodwife Bibber And her Husband would often quarrel & in their quarrels shee would call him, very bad names, And would have strange fitts when she was crost, and a **woman** of an unruly turbulent spirit, And double tongued (AmDepo: John Porter and Lydia Porter v. Sarah Bibber. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 79)

(147) I did observe and take notice, that Goodwife Bibber was a woman, who was very idle in her calling And very much given to tatling & tale Bareing makeing mischeif amongst her neighbors, and very much given to speak bad words and would call her husband bad names & was a **woman** of a very turbulent unruly spirit (AmDepo: Joseph Fowler v. Sarah Bibber. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 79)

The difference in evaluative meaning between characterising *of*-phrases with male and female referents is statistically significant (χ^2: 13.703, df: 1,

$p<0.01$). However, as has been pointed out, four out of the seven instances of *of*-phrases used in connection with gender-related terms referring to women are used about the same person, Sarah Bibber of Salem Village, and they appear to be part of a set phrase used to describe her. It is therefore doubtful that any generalisations can be made on the basis of these results, at least as regards the use of characterising *of*-phrases with female referents. Nevertheless, it does seem that this construction occurs mainly with male referents, and mainly denotes positive characteristics in the person referred to.

One reason as to why this might be so can be attributed to the information structure of the NPs in question. As has been pointed out (section 4.3.2), the characterising *of*-phrases provide a semantic parallel to adjectival modification; *a* ***man*** *of honour* parallels *an honourable* ***man***, and, looking at the deep-structure of the clause only, these NPs seem interchangeable. However, it might be that the choice between these two alternative phrasings is conditioned by the degree of emphasis which the language producer wishes to put on the highlighted characteristic. When discussing the difference between the genitive and the *of*-construction, Quirk et al. state that the choice of one construction over the other

> is also conditioned by the linear organization of utterances in discourse, in particular factors (such as end-focus and end-weight [...]) that encourage the placing of more complex and communicatively more important constituents towards the end of the superordinate noun phrase. (1985: 1282)

The end-weight factor described in the above quote could come into play as regards the choice between an adjectival modification and a characterising *of*-phrase as well. In other words, even though the underlying meaning of the alternative NPs is the same, using a characterising *of*-phrase instead of a premodifying adjective gives the characteristic referred to more weight in the clause, and hence more emphasis. With this in mind, it seems that, to some extent, the fact that characterising *of*-phrases are used predominantly with male referents to highlight positive characteristics is connected with the social setting of the speech-related texts and the judicial roles played by the language producer and the referent. In many statements containing characterising *of*-phrases, the referent is the alleged victim of the crime, and the language producer a witness for the crown. In such cases, it is judicially prudent to stress these positive character traits, extolling the virtues of the victim and thus making the accused seem all the more culpable. It might also be that the higher social standing which men enjoyed in the Early Modern era encouraged the use of characterising *of*-phrases stressing positive characteristics when referring to men, as compared to women. The present material contains too few examples of characterising *of*-phrases to allow generalisations, but identifies an interesting field for further study.

No difference was found in the frequency of characteristic *of*-phrases between the speech-related and non-speech-related parts of the material when taking the differing sizes of these text categories into account. However, *of*-phrases were found to occur more frequently in the BrE speech-related material than in the corresponding AmE texts. When the data is normalised for text length, there are 25.21 characterising *of*-phrases per 100,000 words in the BrE material (34 raw instances, 33 with male referents, one with a female referent), and 5.77 characterising *of*-phrases per 100,000 words in the AmE texts (seven instances, one with a male referent, six denoting women) (see Table 6.13).[66]

Table 6.13. The distribution of characterising *of*-phrases (tokens) in the speech-related material across referent gender and region of origin, normalised per 100,000 words. Raw figures within parentheses.

	M	**F**	**Total**
BrE	24.47 (33)	0.74 (1)	**25.21 (34)**
AmE	0.82 (1)	4.95 (6)	**5.77 (7)**
Total	**13.27 (34)**	**2.73 (7)**	**16.00 (41)**

Note that the instances of characterising *of*-phrases from the journals have not been included in Table 6.13. As Table 6.13 shows, even when adjusting for the difference in text length between the two sets of material, the BrE texts contain more than four times as many characterising *of*-phrases as do the AmE texts, a difference which is statistically significant (χ^2: 28.09, df: 1, $p<0.01$).

It is difficult to give a definite answer as to why the characterising *of*-phrases are more prevalent in the BrE material than in the AmE texts. One might speculate that it is somehow linked to the difference in situational context between the two sets of material. As previously stated, the Salem witch trials, which constitute the AmE speech-related material, took place in a courtroom setting which, if compared with the long-standing tradition prevailing in the mother country, was probably of a less formalised nature (Hoffer 1992: 25). Since the characterising *of*-phrases occur more frequently in the more formalised setting, it could be that this structure had a certain degree of formality to it in Early Modern times.

Furthermore, the level of education which the language producers have might also be a factor in the use of characterising *of*-phrases. In the BrE material, the language producers who use this structure are mostly highly educated men; among them we find magistrates, lords of the realm and what

[66] The BrE courtroom material contains 134,870 words, and the AmEng courtroom material 121,312 words (see section 2.2.1).

appears to be a government official. There are also a few instances of characterising *of*-phrases in depositions given by common, and hence perhaps less-educated people, but they could sometimes be ascribed to scribal interference; see example (148).

(148) Dec. 11, 1680. Before (Sir) Thos. Loraine. Whereas information uppon oath is made before me by Nicolas Rames, that one Elizabeth Fenwicke, of Longwitton, did threathen the sayde Nicolas Raymes what he had done she, the saide Elizabeth Fenwicke would make him repent it; and she, the sayde Elizabeth Fenwicke, being a **woman** of bad fame for withcraff severall yeares hearetofore, he the saide Nicolas Rames doth affirme and complaine that his wife, lyeing under a sad and lamentable torment of sickeness, doth daylye complaine that she the sayde Elizabeth Fenwicke doth continuallye torment her, and is disabell to her in her saide perplexatye; (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, p. 247)

In the AmE material, as has been pointed out, four of the seven instances of characterising *of*-phrases occur in three depositions against the same woman, namely Sarah Bibber. A closer look at these depositions reveals that they were written by the same, as of yet unidentified scribe (Peter Grund, personal communication, 8 November 2006), so no definite conclusions can be drawn on the basis of these instances. To my knowledge, no research has been carried out on whether characterising *of*-phrases are used more in formal text categories or by educated language producers (none of the grammars consulted in this study discuss this), but the findings in the present study suggest that this might be the case.

Furthermore, the participants of the Salem trials were to a large extent known to one another; thus the magistrates would often have been aware of the personality traits of both witnesses and accused beforehand. It could be, therefore, that the characterising *of*-phrases were used less often in the AmE material simply because the referents and their characteristics were already known, both to the addressee and to the audience, by and large. This is a less likely explanation than the one above, however, since, if it were true, one would, for the same reason, expect there to be decidedly fewer Assessment adjectives in the AmE material as well, which is not the case: of the 270 Assessment adjectives in the corpus, 113 are from the BrE material and 114 from the AmE material. It is thus more likely that the more formal setting in the BrE courtrooms encouraged the use of *of*-phrases.

6.2.5 Section Summary

In this section, I have investigated the use of adjectives and characterising *of*-phrases to modify gender-related terms, in order to address two hypotheses. The first of these hypotheses predicted that adjectives denoting

appearance would occur more frequently as modifiers when the gender-related term modified denoted a woman. This prediction was based on previous research into the use of adjectives with referents (real and fictional) of both genders, which has shown this to be the case.

However, this pattern was not verified in the present material. Instead, gender-related terms denoting men were modified with Appearance adjectives slightly more often than their female counterparts. This is in direct opposition to what previous research has found, namely that adjectives from this semantic domain tend to occur in descriptions of women or female fictional characters. Furthermore, it was found that whereas there were several examples of Appearance adjectives with male reference in the speech-related material which refer explicitly to a specific part of the referents' head area (such as hair, face, beard), the speech-related material did not contain similar expressions with female reference. No conclusion could be drawn from this, due to the small number of examples found, but a tentative explanation offered was that this might be due to the many descriptions of suspects (male as well as female) occurring in the material, where the witnesses would presumably be encouraged to forward information on specific physical attributes as well as overall descriptions of stature, complexion, etc.

The second hypothesis addressed in this section suggested a link between referent gender and the connotations carried by the adjective. For this part of the investigation, adjectives denoting the interaction between the referent and his/her environment were extracted (Assessment adjectives). Regarding the overall distribution of these adjectives, a pattern emerged which showed that the majority of the adjectives with male reference carried positive evaluative meaning, whereas the opposite was true of the adjectives with female reference. A two-pronged explanation was suggested for this. First, the judicial roles which would encourage the use of respectful adjectives in connection with terms denoting them (for instance magistrates, jurors, attorneys) were all played exclusively by men. Secondly, the roles played by women in the courtroom (as witnesses and defendants) were such as would lead language producers to feel sympathy for them, encouraging the use of patronising or condescending adjectives (*poor*, *miserable*) or to denounce them, leading to the use of disparaging adjectives, such as *wicked* or *malicious*.

Looking more closely at the Assessment adjectives occurring exclusively with male or female reference revealed that the positive characteristics highlighted by the use of adjectival modification differed somewhat with regard to referent gender. The qualities held forth as positive for female referents mostly revolved around characteristics such as unobtrusiveness, kindness and rationality. The corresponding adjectives with reference to men also included several lexemes denoting social competence, ability and intellect. Although the sample investigated here is small, it points to

traditional gender roles with passive, caring women and outgoing, active men being the desirable norm. This is in line with what previous research examining historical data has indicated (e.g. Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005). Further studies would, however, be needed to confirm this tentative finding.

The Assessment adjectives were also classified according to the gender of the language producer, in order to investigate whether this parameter affected the distribution of positive and negative adjectives across referent gender, as it had been found to do in a previous study (Bäcklund 2006). The material evinced certain trends in this regard. First, language producers of both genders were more inclined to use positive adjectives when referring to men. Secondly, both male and female language producers were found to use negative adjectives more when referring to members of their own gender. It was hypothesised that this was linked to the gender distribution in the two speech-related datasets; in the Salem material, the majority of both witnesses and accused are women, whereas the corresponding people in the BrE trials are men.

Lastly, the use of characterising *of*-phrases was examined, since these phrases provide a semantic parallel to adjectival constructions. It was found that characterising *of*-phrases are used predominantly with male referents in the material, and they tend to highlight positive characteristics in these men. The *of*-phrases occurring with female referents in the material tended to point to negative character traits, but since four of the six token instances of negative *of*-phrases referred to the same woman, no generalisations could be made on the basis of this.

It was postulated that one reason why characterising *of*-phrases mainly highlight positive characteristics in men is that the language producers wanted to put additional emphasis on these character traits. This might in part be due to the social context in which the speech-related texts were produced. It is also possible that the higher social standing enjoyed by men in the Early Modern era prompted the language producers to stress these positive characteristics with male referents, but not with female referents.

Finally, it was found that the BrE speech-related material contained considerably more characterising *of*-phrases than did its AmE counterpart, possibly due to the different setting of the American and British trials and the higher level of education which the participants in the BrE trials had.

The number of characterising *of*-phrases occurring with gender-related terms in the material is too small for any general conclusions to be drawn about their use in the Early Modern period. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the difference in the use of these constructions with referents of either gender. In the next section, I turn to the use of demonstratives in connection with gender-related terms.

6.3 The Use of Demonstratives with Gender-Related Terms

6.3.1 Introductory Remarks

The general distribution of demonstratives in the material was discussed in section 4.3.3. In this section, I will delve deeper into the data and examine not only the function performed by demonstratives in the clause, but also the influence of two extralinguistic variables on demonstrative usage. First, I will investigate whether the use of demonstratives is in any way influenced by referent gender. Given the many instances in historical and Present-day English where the gender of language producer and/or addressee influences language use (cf. Romaine 1999; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003; Sveen 2005), it is not inconceivable that the demonstratives could display similar tendencies in Early Modern material.

Secondly, to deepen the study of potential factors at work, I investigate whether the use of demonstratives is influenced by what functions the language producer, the addressee and the referent have in the courtroom. This question is connected to the theory within sociolinguistics that we often perceive those around us as members of social groups rather than as individuals, and that it is on the basis of their membership in these groups that we form our (especially initial) impressions of them (cf. Culpeper 2001: 70–86). Culpeper (2001: 75–76) divides these social groups into three categories, based on their characteristics: *personal categories* (including knowledge of character traits, such as shyness, interests and preferences), *social role categories* (including knowledge of people's social functions, such as kinship roles, occupational roles and relational roles) and *group membership categories* (including knowledge of sex, age, nationality, etc.). Whereas membership in some of these groups is fairly static and unlikely to change rapidly (for instance nationality, age group), others are more dynamic in character.

Among these more dynamic roles are those included in the social role category, and these roles are the ones which are of primary interest to the present study. The fluidity of the social roles, which are created and maintained according to the situational context, means that a person can move rapidly between different roles and even combine them. (For instance, a doctor treating her child can be both a mother and a physician simultaneously.) According to van Dijk (1988: 130), knowledge of these social roles, and of the characteristics believed to pertain to them, is socially embedded. Furthermore, people belonging to a given society not only share knowledge of these social roles but reproduce this knowledge through their daily interactions, thus maintaining the roles (van Dijk 1988: 133; 1990: 165). One important way in which this reproduction and confirmation of

social roles is carried out is through language. Culpeper (2001: 72–73) gives the example of an employee using deferential forms when addressing his employer since he feels subordinate to the latter, and by doing so confirming and maintaining the inferiority of his social role.

In the present study, I am interested in discovering whether the situation-dependent roles played by the people involved in the courtroom proceedings (for instance as magistrates, witnesses and defendants – henceforth *judicial roles*) influence the use of demonstratives in their discourse. As stated in section 4.3.3 above, this part of the analysis is limited to the speech-related courtroom material.

In what follows, section 6.3.2 discusses the different functions which the demonstratives can fill and the relative distribution of these functions in the present material. The subsequent section, 6.3.3, addresses the issue of referent gender and its potential influence on demonstrative use. Lastly, I consider the judicial roles played by the language producer, the addressee and the referent in turn, to see if this factor has a bearing on demonstrative use (section 6.3.4). The section ends with a brief summary in 6.3.5.

6.3.2 Demonstrative Functions in the Material

In Present-day English, the demonstratives have three predominant uses in the clause (Lakoff 1974: 345–346; Quirk et al. 1985: 372, 374–375): spatio-temporal deixis,[67] discourse deixis[68] and emotional deixis. In what follows, I will briefly outline these functions, using examples from my data to illustrate them, before addressing the question of how these functions are distributed in my material.

In their first function, spatio-temporal deixis, demonstratives refer to the extralinguistic situation. In this context, the demonstratives are used as verbal pointing-devices, and refer to physical objects near to or distant from the language producer. In a figurative sense, spatio-temporal deixis may be used for temporal reference as well, also indicating either nearness to or distance from the language producer (e.g. “this year”, “that month”). An example of spatio-temporal deixis is given in (149).

---

[67] Grammars vary in their terminology with regard to these demonstrative functions. Lakoff’s term “spatio-temporal deixis” corresponds to Quirk et al.’s “situational reference” (1985: 374), “situational reference” and “time reference” in Biber et al. (1999: 273), and the “central deictic use” in Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1505–06). In this study, I will follow Lakoff’s system of classification and accordingly adopt the terminology used by her.

[68] In Quirk et al. and Biber et al. “discourse deixis” corresponds to “anaphoric reference” and “cataphoric reference”, depending on whether the demonstratives refer back to previous parts of the discourse, or to upcoming parts of the same (Quirk et al. 1985: 375–376; Biber et al. 1999: 273). Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1506–09) also consider that demonstratives have anaphoric reference, but only refer to cataphoric reference in the limited sense of “anticipatory anaphora”, as in “There are still these candidates to interview: Lugton, Barnes, Airey, and Foster” (example from Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1509).

(149) As soon as she came into the meeting-house many fell into fits
Hath this **Woman** hurt you?
Abig: Williams said it is Goody Martin, she hath hurt me often (AmExam: Examination of Susannah Martin -- Second Version. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 553)

In (149), the magistrate uses the demonstrative *this* when referring to a woman (Susannah Martin) who was physically present in the room at the time when the utterance was produced. Martin's presence in the courtroom is verified by the preceding sentence: "As soon as she came into the meeting-house many fell into fits".

Secondly, demonstratives can be used for discourse deixis, referring to previous (or upcoming) parts of the present dialogue, as in (150).

(150) *Row*. Yes, all four together, in a Confusion they seemed to be, for they were Pushing to and agen, and the Boy had hold of one of the Gentlemen's Arms when he bid him alter his Resolution.
[...]
E. of *Mulgrave.* Do you know who that **Boy** was? (BrExam: Tryal of Charles Lord Mohun, p. 21)

In example (150), the Earl of Mulgrave uses the phrase "that **boy**" to refer back to a previous part of the discussion when a boy had been mentioned. There is no indication in the text that the boy under discussion is present in the courtroom, which makes it difficult to interpret this instance as a case of spatio-temporal deixis. One important criterion for labelling a demonstrative as an instance of discourse deixis is that the demonstrative must refer to something that has been (or will be) mentioned explicitly, and not to something that can be inferred from previous (or future) statements (Lakoff 1974: 346–347).

Lakoff also mentions a third function which demonstratives can fill in a clause, namely emotional deixis (1974: 346–349). Emotive-deictic demonstratives occur when the demonstratives are used to indicate emotional stance, that is, positive or negative feelings on the part of the language producer for the referent. Since prosodic features, such as intonation, are not available to me in the present material set, only textual evidence could be used when scanning the material for emotional deixis. For the purposes of the present investigation, it was decided that instances of demonstratives occurring with gender-related terms where the immediate context shows incontestably that the language producer feels strong emotion at the time of the speech-event should be seen as being emotive-deictic. A

text extract, in which two such emotive-deictic demonstratives occur, is given in (151).

(151) And the said Hutchinson, on the same day, in the house of one Anne Wiseman, said, with several oaths, "Hang these Popish **dogs**, wil we have any of these Popish **dogs** to be our King?" (BrDepo: Depositions from the Castle of York *4*, p. 284)

In (151), the context makes it clear that the speaker being quoted, Hutchinson, is emotional at the time of the speech-event. The fact that he uses an oath – "Hang these Popish dogs" – coupled with the use of the depreciative noun *dogs* to denote the referents indicate that he does not hold the referents in high regard and that he feels strongly for the subject. Demonstrative instances such as the one quoted in (151), where the emotional stance of the language producer is undeniably visible in the text, have been regarded as instances of emotional deixis, even though they may also fill a spatio-temporal or discursive function. It is possible that some of the examples of spatio-temporal or discursive demonstratives originally had emotive function as well, the latter being transmitted through prosody. However, since only text-based criteria are used for the categorisation, it has not been possible to take this into consideration when classifying the demonstratives.

Lakoff, in her discussion of demonstratives in Present-day English, specifically states that only distant demonstratives (*that*, *those*) can be used in emotive-deictic function. It is interesting to note that the demonstratives in (151) are proximate (*these*). Further study into the use of emotional deixis in the historical perspective, might therefore be a fruitful venture.

For the purposes of the present study, the demonstratives occurring with gender-related terms in the material were divided into groups according to which of these three functions they filled. It is worth stressing the fact that the boundaries between these three functions are not always clear-cut. As Huddleston and Pullum point out, a demonstrative can be both spatio-temporal and discursive if it refers to an object or a person present in the room that has already been mentioned (2002: 1506). Huddleston and Pullum exemplify this with the exchange given in (152). Even though the demonstrative in question in (152) is an example of a demonstrative pronoun rather than a determiner determining the NP head (the latter being the object under investigation in the present study, cf. examples (31) and (32) in section 4.3.3), it still serves to illustrate how demonstrative functions may overlap.

(152) A: Look at the necklace she's wearing. B: That's the one I gave her. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 156)

Since the objective of the present analysis is to compare the distribution of the three demonstrative functions in the material, overlapping cases where the context shows that the demonstrative fills both a spatio-temporal and a discursive function have been excluded from the analysis owing to their ambiguity. An example of such an overlapping case, where the demonstrative could be interpreted as both discursive and spatio-temporal, is given in (153).

(153) Q. Do you know Goody Cloyse and Goody Proctor? A. Yes, here is Goody Cloyse. (Cloyse) when did I hurt thee? A. A great many times. (Cloyse) Oh! you are a grievous liar. Q. What did this **Goody** Cloyse do to you? A. She pinched and bit me till the blood came. (AmExam: Examination of Sarah Cloyse and Elizabeth Proctor. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 659)

In (153), the referent to whom the NP under discussion refers, Goody Cloyse, has been mentioned previously in the discussion, and is also demonstrably present in the courtroom during the time of the speech-event, since she asks the witness a question. It is therefore not possible to say whether the demonstrative *this* is used in a spatio-temporal or discursive function, or even both, and this instance has thus been excluded from further consideration. A total of nine instances of demonstratives were excluded from the analysis owing to their overlapping functions and will not be discussed further in this section, nor are they included in Table 6.9. However, as has already been mentioned, instances of emotional deixis have been counted as such even if they fill a spatio-temporal and discursive function as well.

After the nine overlapping cases have been excluded, the total number of demonstrative tokens discussed below will be 229 (rather than, as in 4.3.3, 238).[69] Owing to the nature of the courtroom material, one can expect a large percentage of the demonstratives to be either spatio-temporal or discursive, as the language producers refer either to people in the room or to people mentioned previously as part of the discourse. In Table 6.14 (p. 203) the occurrences of demonstratives with gender-related terms are plotted across the three deictic types. The low number of emotive-deictic demonstratives causes the expected values to fall below five, which is why statistical significance analysis could not be carried out on the figures in Table 6.14 as a whole. However, if one only considers the distribution of demonstrative forms across the spatio-temporal and discursive deictic categories, the figures are statistically significant (χ^2: 52.28, df: 3, $p<0.01$).

[69] Note, however, that the omitted instances will be included in subsequent discussions where the type of deixis is not one of the factors investigated (e.g. in section 6.3.3).

Table 6.14. The distribution of demonstratives across the three types of deixis (spatio-temporal, discourse and emotional) in the courtroom material.

Deixis type	***This***	***These***	***That***	***Those***	**Total**
Spatio-temporal	91 (75%)	25 (52%)	14 (39%)	0 (0%)	**130 (57%)**
Discourse	29 (24%)	20 (42%)	21 (58%)	23 (96%)	**93 (41%)**
Emotional	1 (1%)	3 (6%)	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	**6 (3%)**
Total	**121 (100%)**	**48 (100%)**	**36 (100%)**	**24 (100%)**	**229 (100%)**

As can be seen from Table 6.14, the material does, as expected, evince considerably more spatio-temporal (130 occurrences, or 57%) and discursive (93 occurrences, or 41%) demonstratives than emotive uses (six occurrences, amounting to 3%).

The uneven distribution of demonstratives across the three deictic types prompts the question of why this is so. A closer look at the data reveals that the predominance of spatio-temporal forms is due to the fact that the person under discussion is, in the majority of cases, either the defendant or the witness being questioned at the time, and thus present in the room during the discourse. The fact that so few demonstratives could be classified as instances of emotional deixis might in part be due to the formal setting of the courtroom encouraging witnesses and magistrates alike to keep an even tone, and avoid showing strong emotion in their language, which would preclude using emotive-deictic demonstratives to show contempt for the referent. It is interesting to note that five of the six instances of emotive-deictic function are given as part of reported speech, where witnesses relate what they have heard (example (154)), or (in one case, example (155)) said outside the courtroom. This might indicate that the language producers were striving to keep an even tone when they were not reporting previous conversations; however, owing to the low number of instances, no conclusions can be drawn with any degree of certainty.

(154) And further saith, That after the Soldiers had broke the Windows, about the Town, the Major came by this Informant's House, and said, *God Damn* <u>*these*</u> **Jacobite-*Rascals*,** *we have made them suffer for it now*. (BrDepo: Depositions Concerning the Late Riot in Oxford, p. 8)

(155) *Sol. Gen.* Mrs. *Berkly*, pray was you present when the Prisoner was taken up, and do you know whether he and Mrs. *Baynton* were Brother and Sister.

Berkley. I went to Mr. *Swendsen* himself, and said is <u>this</u> wicked **Woman** your Sister? Says he, I cannot say she is, but I have made her my Tool, and she

> has done my business, and I would get rid of her to morrow, but that being *Sunday* I will not, but on *Monday* I'll give her a reward for what she has done, and then I'll discharge her, and never see her more. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 6)

Table 6.14 also reveals that the demonstrative *those* is only used discursively in the material, although the reasons for this are unclear. Overall, with 21 token occurrences of *that* and 23 of *those*, the distant forms are used much more often for discourse deixis than for either spatio-temporal or emotional deixis. One reason for this might be that the people in the courtroom were often physically too close to each other for the distant forms to be used naturally for spatio-temporal deixis, although this is, of course, mere speculation since relative distances between the courtroom participants are not known to us.

To sum up, the most common use of demonstratives in the material is spatio-temporal deixis, which might be attributed to the fact that the referents of the gender-related terms determined by the demonstratives tend to be either witnesses being questioned or defendants in the court case, and thus present in the room. The material contained very few clear cases of emotional deixis (six examples, in total).

6.3.3 The Influence of Referent Gender on Demonstrative Use

In this section, I will investigate the possible influence that referent gender might have had on demonstrative use in the material. In what follows, I will first consider the overall distribution of demonstratives across referent gender and then consider how these demonstratives are distributed as regards proximate and distant forms.

In Table 6.15, the distribution of demonstratives is given across referent gender and demonstrative type.

Table 6.15. The distribution of the demonstratives, across referent gender and form of the demonstrative.

Referent gender	***This***	***These***	**Prox. forms, total**	***That***	***Those***	**Distant forms, total**	**Sum total**
M	70 (55%)	23 (46%)	**93 (52%)**	21 (58%)	19 (79%)	**40 (67%)**	**133 (56%)**
F	58 (45%)	17 (34%)	**75 (42%)**	15 (42%)	3 (13%)	**18 (30%)**	**93 (39%)**
FM	0 (0%)	10 (20%)	**10 (6%)**	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	**2 (3%)**	**12 (5%)**
Total	**128 (100%)**	**50 (100%)**	**178 (100%)**	**36 (100%)**	**24 (100%)**	**60 (100%)**	**238 (100%)**

Overall, 56% of the demonstratives occur in connection with male gender-related terms, compared to 39% with gender-related terms denoting women (Table 6.15). The question is, however, whether the two factors at work here – referent gender and whether or not the gender-related term is determined by a demonstrative – are independent of each other or whether there is a link between them in such a way that demonstratives are more likely to occur with referents of one gender. To address this question, the data given in Table 6.15 was cross-referenced with that given in Table 4.11 in Chapter 4, to identify the relative proportions of gender-related terms occurring with and without demonstratives respectively for each gender category (M, F and FM). The resulting figures are given in Table 6.16 below.

Table 6.16. The distribution of male and female reference in gender-related term tokens, according to whether or not the terms are determined by demonstratives.

Referent gender	**Gender-related terms determined by demonstratives**	**Gender-related terms *not* determined by demonstratives**	**Total**
M	133 (56%)	7,299 (68%)	**7,432** **(68%)**
F	93 (39%)	2,945 (28%)	**3,038** **(28%)**
FM	12 (5%)	448 (4%)	**460** **(4%)**
Total	**238** **(100%)**	**10,692** **(100%)**	**10,930** **(100%)**

The data in Table 6.16 was then subjected to the chi-square test of independence to see whether it indicated a link between demonstrative use and referent gender. The test showed that this relationship is statistically significant (χ^2: 16.79, df: 2, $p<0.01$), suggesting that the two factors are not working independently of each other. There is thus a female gender bias among the demonstratives, as demonstratives occur more often with female terms than they would, had no bias existed (39% vs. 28%).

In Table 6.17 (p. 206), the figures given in Table 6.15 have been pooled to show proximate and distant demonstratives occurring with male and female gender-related terms, giving the relative percentages of both demonstrative groups. Note that the 12 demonstrative tokens with unspecified referents (FM) present in Table 6.15 are thus not included in Table 6.17, reducing the total number of occurrences from 238 to 226. As shown in Table 6.17, 70% of the demonstratives referring to men are proximate in form and 30% are distant. The corresponding figures for demonstratives referring to women are 81% and 19% respectively. In other words, if one considers the figures for either gender separately, there is a higher percentage of distant demonstratives with male referents than with female ones. These figures fall just short of being statistically significant.

Table 6.17. The relative distribution of proximate and distant demonstratives with gender-related terms with male and female reference.

Referent gender	Proximate forms	Distant forms	Total
M	93 (70%)	40 (30%)	**133 (100%)**
F	75 (81%)	18 (19%)	**93 (100%)**
Total	**168 (74%)**	**58 (26%)**	**226 (100%)**

As Table 6.15 shows, this difference is especially noticeable in the case of the distant form *those*, where 19 out of 24 occurrences have male referents, compared to only three occurrences referring to women (the remaining two instances have referents of unspecified gender). One explanation for this could be that many of the women referred to with a demonstrative + gender-related term were participants in the Salem witch trials, and they were, in the majority of cases, present as the utterance was made (examples (156)–(157)). The many cases of spatio-temporal demonstratives occurring with female gender-related terms in the AmE material could also help explain the gender bias present in the material (see above), since the majority of both witnesses and accused in the Salem trials were women. As will be discussed in section 6.3.4 below, demonstratives often occur in NPs where the gender-related terms refer to witnesses or accused.

(156) Mr. Harthorn. What do you say (speaking to one afflicted) have you seen this **Woman** hurt you?
Yes, she beat me this morning
Abigial. Have you been hurt by this **Woman**?
Yes
Ann Putman in a grievous fit cryed out that she hurt her.
Goody Nurse, here are two An: Putman the child & Abigail Williams complains of your hurting them What do you say to it (AmExam: Examination of Rebecca Nurse. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 584)

(157) Q. John! does she hurt you? A. This is the woman that came in her shift and choaked me. Q. did she ever bring the book? A. Yes, Sir. Q. What to do? A. to write. Q. What, this **woman**? A. Yes, Sir. (AmExam: Examination of Sarah Cloyse and Elizabeth Proctor. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 660)

Thus, when female gender-related terms are determined by a demonstrative, that demonstrative tends to be spatio-temporal in nature, and, as mentioned in section 6.3.2, spatio-temporal demonstratives seem to be predominantly proximate in form, possibly due to the confined nature of the courtroom.

I will return briefly to the question of referent gender in section 6.3.4 below, where I discuss the possible influence of judicial roles on demonstrative use.

6.3.4 The Influence of Judicial Roles on Demonstrative Use

The second extra-linguistic factor that I will look at concerns the judicial roles played by those involved, directly or indirectly, in any instance of demonstrative use, namely the language producer, the addressee and the referent (see further section 6.3.1). In order to address this question, the language producer, addressee and referent of any NP containing a demonstrative + gender-related term were classified into four categories according to the judicial roles they played in the proceedings: magistrates (comprising judges, attorneys, solicitors, clerks, and members of the jury), witnesses, defendants (defined as those being accused in the current case) and "others", comprising all others referred to, but not actually present in court at the time, such as members of the community. Seven instances of demonstratives were omitted from the results: four clerical comments (see example (158)), since they lie outside of the dialogue proper, and three occurrences where the language producer (in all three cases a magistrate) makes a general comment addressed to the whole room rather than any given individual (159). Furthermore, since the focus of this investigation is on the people present in the courtroom, the 61 occurrences of NPs referring to "others" will not be considered in the subsequent analysis. The total number of demonstratives in this part of the investigation is therefore 170.

(158) *Cryer*. Sir *John Nicholas*, Sir *Philip Floyd*, *William Bridgeman* Esquire; make room there Officers, go out, make room for the Witnesses to come in.
These three **Gentlemen** were sworn. (BrExam: Tryal of Nathanael Thompson [...], p. 3)

(159) Court here Is an Argument of hope for this poor **Creature** that she Will be Snatched out of the Snare of the Divel becaue there Semes to be Somthing of repentance. (AmExam: Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 525)

The material contains only three examples of magistrates being referred to with a demonstrative + gender-related term. Two of these instances occur when one magistrate refers to another – both times when speaking to each other rather than addressing witnesses or the accused party (examples (160) and (161)).

(160) *Mr. At. Gen.* [...] My Lord, this must tend to the preventing all manner of Justice; it is against all common Sense or Reason; and it never was offered at by any Lawyer before, as I believe, at leastwise never so openly, and therefore I wonder that these **Gentlemen** shou'd do it, who acknowledge, at least one of them did, that as often as it has been offered it has been over-ruled; and I know not for what end it is now offered, but to make a noise in the Court: they know that it is irregular as much as any thing that cou'd be offered.

Mr. Soll Gen. Indeed, my Lord, if the Prisoner at the Bar had offered this matter it had been excusable; but that Gentlemen of the Long Robe, and who are so well acquainted with the Practice of the Courts of Law, shou'd pretend to do such a thing, is unaccountable. (BrExam: Tryal of Ambrose Rookwood, p. 64)

(161) *Mr. Serj. Jefferies*, Give us leave to go on: Gentlemen, let us prove what we think fit, and if we have not made it out, then make your Exceptions.

Mr. Holt, Mr. Serjeant, I think it is proper to put it now, for if there be no such Election, there can be no such Riot; for they have made it a Riot in a special manner.

Mr. Serj. Jefferies, *Mr. Holt*, under your favour, it is not a time for it now.

Mr. Att. General, This is the oddest way these **Gentlemen** take upon them so: I will not prove it; and pray be quiet till I come to my time. (BrExam: Tryal of Tho. Pilkington [etc], pp. 21–22)

The material also contains one instance where a witness refers to a magistrate with a demonstrative in what appears to be a rather insulting manner (example (162)). However, apart from these three instances, all combinations of demonstratives and gender-related terms in the material are used to refer to people other than the magistrates.

(162) *Mr. Cowper*. You say he gave you a List of Names: Pray, when he gave you that List, what Discourse happened in the Room, just before, or after the giving of the List?

Capt. Harris. Sir, I think I told the Court that before.

Mr. Cowper. Sir, I desire you would repeat it.

Capt. Harris. My Lord, I humbly desire to know whether I am to answer that **Gentleman** [*SOURCE TEXT: Gentlemen*] that Question?

L. C. J. Holt. Yes, you are to answer, being upon your Oath, and to tell the whole Truth. (BrExam: Tryal of Ambrose Rookwood, p. 54)

The main reason why magistrates are so seldom referred to with the demonstrative + gender-related terms is that since they were the ones presiding in the courtroom, the other language producers would be inclined to show them proper respect by addressing them directly and by using their titles (e.g. *sir*) rather than by using a demonstrative + gender-related term (e.g. *that* ***man***). Consequently, in the majority of statements including demonstratives, the magistrates are either the language producers or the addressees, whereas the referents tend to be witnesses or defendants.

Whereas the combination demonstrative + gender-related term is seldom used to refer to magistrates, there are decidedly more combinations of this kind referring to witnesses and defendants. In Table 6.18 the instances of demonstratives used with gender-related terms referring to witnesses have been plotted according to the judicial roles played by the language producer (horizontally in the table) and the addressee (vertically in the table) respectively. The same data is given in Table 6.19 (p. 210) for demonstrative instances used with gender-related terms referring to defendants. The question of statistical significance could not be determined, since the expected values fall below five.

As can be seen from Tables 6.18 and 6.19, magistrates refer to witnesses and defendants with a demonstrative + gender-related term the same number of times: in either case, the material evinces 45 demonstrative occurrences. Furthermore, there is a pattern to this usage. Magistrates are more likely to use demonstratives to refer to a defendant when addressing a witness, and when referring to witnesses when addressing a defendant.

Table 6.18. The distribution of demonstratives with gender-related terms referring to a *witness*.

Judicial role of language producer	**Judicial role of addressee**			
	Magistrate	**Witness**	**Defendant**	**Total**
Magistrate	13 (19%)	24 (36%)	8 (12%)	**45 (67%)**
Witness	11 (16%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	**12 (18%)**
Defendant	10 (15%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**10 (15%)**
Total	**34 (51%)**	**25 (37%)**	**8 (12%)**	**67 (100%)**

Table 6.19. The distribution of demonstratives with gender-related terms referring to a *defendant*.

Judicial role of language producer	**Judicial role of addressee**			**Total**
	Magistrate	**Witness**	**Defendant**	
Magistrate	8 (8%)	35 (35%)	2 (2%)	**45 (45%)**
Witness	52 (52%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**52 (52%)**
Defendant	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	**3 (3%)**
Total	**63 (63%)**	**35 (35%)**	**2 (2%)**	**100 (100%)**

This is of course due to the nature of the questioning which the defendants and witnesses are subjected to and the situational context of the courtroom (see section 1.2 for a description of the Early Modern courtroom). The witnesses tend to be asked about their experiences regarding the defendant (examples (163)–(164)), and the defendants are often confronted with references to the witnesses' statements (examples (165)–(166)). In each case, the speaker would be likely to refer to the other using a spatio-temporal demonstrative.

(163) As soon as she came near all fell into fits
Bridget Byshop, You are now brought before Authority to Give acco. of what witchcrafts you are conversant in
I take all this people (turning her head & eyes about) to witness that I am clear.
Hath this **woman** hurt you speaking to the afflicted.
Eliz: Hubbard Ann Putman, Abigail Williams & Mercy Lewes affirmed she had hurt them. (AmExam: Examination of Bridget Bishop, First Version. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 83)

(164) *L. C. J. H.* Is this **Person** Mrs. *Baynton*'s Brother?
Mrs. *Night*. This is he that went for her Brother. (BrExam: Tryals of Haagen Swendsen [etc], p. 4)

(165) (H) desired the children all of them to look upon her, and see, if this were the person that had hurt them and so they all did looke upon her and said this was one of the persons that did torment them – presently they were all tormented.
(H) Sarah good doe you not see now what you have done why doe you not tell us the truth, why doe you thus torment these poor **children** (AmExam. Examination of Sarah Good. Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 356)

(166) Mr. *Attorney General*. Whither did you carry them from thence?
Dixon. To the place from whence they came, in *Drury Lane*.
Lord High Steward. Will your Lordship say any thing to this **man**?
Lord *Mohun*. I desire he may be asked, whether he had not Orders to go out of Town with us, as soon as Mrs. *Bracegirdle* was put into the Coach. (BrExam: Tryal of Charles Lord Mohun, p. 15)

The same pattern is seen in the statements produced by witnesses and defendants respectively: the witnesses use more demonstratives when referring to the defendants than when referring to any other group (52 occurrences), and vice versa (defendants use demonstratives when referring to witnesses on ten instances, compared to three when referring to other defendants). Since the defendants would naturally be the subjects of a substantial number of the witnesses' statements and vice versa, this is far from surprising. It is also worth noting that, as shown in Tables 6.18 and 6.19, witnesses and defendants rarely use demonstratives when addressing people other than the magistrates: in the material, there is only one instance of this, where a witness uses a demonstrative when addressing another witness (see Table 6.18). The largest contributing factor to this fact is probably that witnesses and defendants most often address magistrates when discussing the people around them, which is the most likely context in which NPs of the kind demonstrative + gender-related term would occur.

I now return briefly to the question of referent gender to investigate whether plotting the demonstratives according to both the judicial role of the speaker and the gender of the referent reveals that these two parameters have a combined effect on demonstrative use. The resulting data for male and female referents is given in Table 6.20 (p. 212).[70] Note that since only the judicial role of the language producer is included in this part of the analysis, the seven instances previously omitted in this section, that is, the four clerical comments (see example (158)) and the three occurrences where the language producer addresses the whole room (example (159)), have been included in Table 6.20 as have the 61 instances referring to "others" previously omitted (see above).

[70] Apart from the data given in Table 6.20, there are also twelve instances of unspecified referents: five in statements produced by magistrates, six in witnesses' statements and one in a statement given by a defendant.

Table 6.20. The distribution of demonstratives in the speech-related material, across referent gender and the judicial role played by the language producer.

Gender of referent	Judicial role of language producer			Total
	Magistrate	Witness	Defendant	
M	69 (59%)	57 (61%)	7 (44%)	**133 (59%)**
F	47 (41%)	37 (39%)	9 (56%)	**93 (41%)**
Total	**116 (100%)**	**94 (100%)**	**16 (100%)**	**226 (100%)**

The distribution of demonstratives across referent gender in the magistrates' statements is very similar to that in the statements produced by witnesses. Of the total 116 demonstratives occurring with gender-related terms used by magistrates, 69 tokens (59%) are used in NPs that refer to men and 47 tokens (41%) are used when a woman is being referred to. The corresponding figures for demonstratives in witnesses' statements are 57 (61%) and 37 (39%) out of the total 94 tokens respectively. Magistrates and witnesses thus seem to use demonstratives similarly with respect to referent gender.

The statements made by the defendants yield only 16 raw instances of demonstratives, distributed roughly equally across the genders (seven tokens, or 44%, referring to men and nine tokens, or 56%, referring to women). The few instances make it difficult to draw any conclusions, but one possible explanation for the relatively equal distribution across the genders (compared to the corresponding numbers in statements made by magistrates and witnesses) could lie in the fact that ten of these 16 instances come from the Salem material. As already stated (see above), the defendants tend to use demonstratives when referring to witnesses who have testified against them, and in the Salem material many of the witnesses were women – more so than in the BrE material. However, given the paucity of the data, no definite statements can be made at this point.

To sum up, the tendency is for demonstratives not to occur when the referent is a magistrate, and the language producer is not a magistrate himself. Non-magisterial language producers only refer to a magistrate using the phrase structure demonstrative + gender-related term once in the material (see example (162)). Instead, demonstratives tend to occur when magistrates refer to witnesses or defendants, or when witnesses and defendants refer to each other. However, since the nature of the trial proceedings encourages a dialogical pattern where magistrates discuss the witnesses with the defendants, and the defendants with the witnesses, it is hard to say whether this finding is due to the nature of the discourse or some more wide-spread tendency not to use demonstratives when referring to superiors. Moreover, no obvious gender bias was detected in that language producers did not seem more likely to use demonstratives when referring to members of either sex.

6.3.5. Section Summary

This section has been concerned with the use of the demonstratives (*this*, *that*, *these* and *those*) in connection with gender-related terms. First, the general distribution of the demonstratives across function (spatio-temporal, discursive and emotive) was examined. Subsequently, I investigated the influence of two extralinguistic factors on demonstrative use, namely referent gender and the judicial roles played by the language producer, addressee and referent respectively.

More than half the demonstratives in the material, 57%, have a spatio-temporal function, whereas 41% are discursive, and the remaining 3% were instances of emotional deixis. The predominance of spatio-temporal forms was found to be due to a pattern in which most demonstratives refer to either defendants or witnesses, all of whom would have been present in the courtroom at the time of the proceedings.

The material evinced a statistically significant gender bias with regard to demonstrative use in that gender-related terms with female reference were relatively more likely to occur with demonstratives than were the male terms. Furthermore, the female terms tended to be determined with proximate forms, functioning spatio-temporally. These findings are possibly due to the many forms found in the material from Salem, where many of the participants were women present in the court and in relatively close proximity to the language producers.

Lastly, the demonstratives were found to occur mainly in interactions between magistrates and witnesses on the one hand, and magistrates and defendants on the other. Moreover, when the person referred to is a magistrate, the demonstratives occur on only three occasions. This is probably a side-effect of the nature of the courtroom situation where the magistrates would be either the language producer or addressee in the majority of the statements containing demonstratives. Only in a rare case would witnesses or defendants refer to a magistrate in the third person rather than address him directly.

6.4 Summary and Concluding Remarks

This chapter has been dedicated to the use of adjectives (including the characterising *of*-phrases) and of demonstratives in connection with gender-related terms. Since detailed summaries of the findings have already been given in the section summaries (6.2.5 and 6.3.5), I will only point to the most important findings here, and relate them to the hypotheses put forth in section 6.1.

In section 6.2, I investigated the use of adjectives to modify or complement gender-related terms. Previous research into this area has

indicated that adjectives denoting appearance occur more frequently with gender-related terms denoting women, reflecting the greater importance imposed on women's looks by social norms. It was hypothesised that the present investigation would confirm these results. However, the hypothesis was refuted by the findings concerning the Appearance adjectives, as these occurred with male terms at a slightly higher frequency than with female terms. The present investigation differs from many previous studies into the use of adjectives with male and female terms in that the material used here is non-fictional, and the main body of it is speech-related. It could thus be the case that whereas the gender bias with regard to Appearance adjectives reported in, for instance, Wallin-Ashcroft (2000), Sveen (2005) and Bäcklund (2006) holds true for fictional material and letters, this is not necessarily so for authentic speech-related texts, such as the courtroom material investigated in the present study.

Previous research also predicted a link between referent gender and the connotations carried by the adjective. Whereas some studies carried out by historians and linguists alike have suggested that the many unflattering stereotypical images of women prevalent in Early Modern times would lead to women being described with adjectives denoting negative characteristics, Wallin-Ashcroft's study (2000) pointed in the opposite direction. The present study showed that of the adjectives extracted for investigating this question (i.e., the Assessment adjectives), the majority with male reference denoted positive qualities, whereas the opposite was true for the corresponding adjectives with female reference. It was suggested that this was in part due to two factors, both related to the courtroom material: first, the adjectives used when referring to the magistrates (all male) often reflected the respect which the language producer wished to project. These adjectives naturally denote positive qualities. Secondly, the women participating in the trials were frequently either the victims or the alleged offenders in the case, prompting adjectival descriptions of them to express either sympathy or censure. The findings in the present study are thus more in line with the traditional view of women being described negatively, rather than with the findings in Wallin-Ashcroft's study.

Regarding the nature of the adjectives used with members of either gender, the study showed that these adhered to the traditional gender roles. The positive qualities highlighted in women were unobtrusiveness and kindness, whereas the positive qualities highlighted in men also included sociability, ability and intellect. In both genders, the qualities denounced were social ineptitude and bad ethics.

The Assessment adjectives evinced two further trends when the gender of the language producer was taken into account. First, regardless of whether the language producer was a man or a woman, a higher percentage of the adjectives used with male referents were positive, as compared to the corresponding adjectives used with female referents. Secondly, the language

producers in the material were found to be more inclined to use negative adjectives when referring to members of their own gender. To exemplify, in material produced by men a higher percentage of the adjectives used with male referents were negative a compared to the adjectives used when referring to women. I have suggested that this is due to the gender distribution among witnesses and accused in the two sets of material: in the AmE material women dominated both judicial roles, whereas most of the participants in the BrE trials were men.

Apart from adjectival descriptions, the present investigation also considered the use of characterising *of*-phrases as being semantically parallel to the former. Three tendencies were found relating to how these phrases were used. First, they displayed a gender bias in that they occurred predominantly with male referents. Secondly, they tended to highlight positive characteristics in their male referents. When occurring with female reference, the majority of the *of*-phrases denoted undesirable qualities, but since many of these were used to refer to the same individual, this was not necessarily indicative of any general tendencies concerning the use of *of*-phrases to portray women. It was postulated that these two tendencies might be connected to the greater emphasis which is placed on the characteristic described when using an *of*-phrase, as compared to using a premodifying adjective. This could lead to positive characteristics, especially in the alleged victims of the crimes in the speech-related material, being expressed with *of*-phrases to put additional emphasis on them, leading to the predominance of positive characteristics being expressed with this structure. Furthermore, the dominant position held by men in Early Modern society could have encouraged language producers to use characterising *of*-phrases with male referents rather than with female referents, thus emphasising their deference and respect for the referents.

The third tendency found as regards the use and distribution of *of*-phrases was that this structure mainly occurred in the BrE material. I speculated that this might be due to the difference in setting between the English and American courtrooms, especially the degree of education attained by the participants in the trial. It was postulated that the characterising *of*-phrase might be a structure found more frequently in the repertoire of educated language producers (see section 6.2.4), and that this might explain why it appears so seldom in the language of the colonial town Salem. More research, however, is needed in order to confirm or reject this hypothesis.

Section 6.3 addressed the question of how demonstratives were used in connection with gender-related terms in the speech-related material. Some tendencies were discovered. Concerning the different functions which demonstratives can fill in the clause, the function found most commonly in the material was spatio-temporal deixis. The data revealed that this was due to the demonstratives often being used with gender-related terms which refer

to either the defendants or the witnesses being questioned, all of whom would have been present at the time of the speech event.

The material contained very few clear examples of emotional deixis; six in all. Owing to the scarcity of data, a larger study would need to be carried out in order to ascertain how this demonstrative function was used in Early Modern times.

To conclude, studying the gender-related terms in their immediate context rather than as isolated units has revealed some new facets concerning their usage and offered some insights into how men and women were viewed in Early Modern times. In the next chapter, I will briefly recapitulate the aims of the study and give a summary of the main findings.

Chapter 7. Summary and Conclusions

This study investigated the use of gender-related terms to describe and address people in texts from the period 1670–1720, with the underlying presumption that words used to describe and address men and women in different situations can, to a certain extent, reflect the social norms prevalent during the time period. By looking at the terms used to denote people of either gender, as well as other linguistic items, such as adjectives and demonstratives, used in connection with these terms, we can gain new insights into the position men and women had in society.

The main body of the material investigated consists of non-fictional speech-related texts produced as part of the Early Modern judicial process in England and New England (depositions and examinations). The majority of texts examined in this investigation thus come from a very particular setting, namely that of the courtroom, a setting which places certain restrictions on the language produced therein (see section 1.2). The material also includes a smaller set of texts consisting of non-speech-related journals. Thus, my investigation aims at complementing and adding to previous studies in the field, which have focused mainly on letters and fictional material, such as drama and fiction.

As the material used was available in electronic format, a systematic search for gender-related terms was possible, enabling a more comprehensive study of these terms than would otherwise have been possible within the limited timeframe of this investigation. Nevertheless, owing to the vast number of possible gender-related terms, the study focused on eight gender term categories, including terms from eight different semantic domains:

- central terms
- relational terms
- epicene terms
- occupational terms
- title terms
- depreciative terms
- appreciative terms
- religious, social and political terms (RSP)

The overarching research question which the present study investigated is how gender-related terms are used in material from Early Modern England and New England, 1670–1720, with special emphasis placed on referent gender. This rather broad question has been divided into several research questions of a more limited and thus more manageable scope, and hypotheses have been put forth in connection with these (see section 1.1). In this chapter, I will summarise the findings of the investigation and link them to the research questions and hypotheses.

The first hypothesis put forth in this study predicted that there would be more gender-related term types referring to men, and that these terms would evince a larger number of tokens than gender-related terms denoting women. An overall look at the data revealed that this was indeed the case: of the 403 gender term types present in the material, 309 (77%) occurred exclusively with male reference, compared to only 84 terms (21%) occurring exclusively with female reference. There were also 56 terms (14%) which occurred with referents of unspecified gender, which could include members of both sexes, as well as 15 terms (4%) where the gender of the referent could not be established beyond reasonable doubt.

Gender-related terms denoting men were not only more varied than female terms in that there were considerably more types with exclusively male reference, they were more numerous as well. Of the 10,930 gender-term tokens where referent gender could be established with reasonable certainty, 7,432 token instances (68%) referred to men. This can be compared with 3,038 (28%) instances of female gender-related terms and 460 instances (4%) of gender-related terms with unspecified reference. This predominance of male terms, both as regards types and tokens, is in line with what has been shown in previous studies (for instance, Romaine 1999: 108–109), which have pointed to the fact that men are spoken about more frequently than women and with more specificity. Romaine's study deals with Present-day English, but my study indicates that this bias in favour of men might have been present in Early Modern times as well.

Pursuing this further and dividing the material according to text category (depositions, examinations and journals) and distinguishing the speech-related material according to region of origin (England or New England) revealed some differences between the different material sets: whereas the male types outnumbered their female counterparts in all five material sets (BrDepo, BrExam, AmDepo, AmExam and Journals), the female tokens outnumbered the male ones in the American speech-related material. Naturally, the subject matter of the material also plays an important part in the proportion of male to female terms, as does the gender of those participating in the judicial proceedings. The examinations and depositions from which the BrE material was gathered involved mainly men: the participants – officials, witnesses and the accused – were mostly male, although some women did participate, chiefly as witnesses. This might

account for some of the apparent gender bias in the BrE material. In the AmE speech-related material, on the other hand, gathered from the witchcraft proceedings in Salem, Massachusetts, the majority of witnesses and the accused were women, which might account for the fact that most of the gender term tokens occurring in these texts had female reference. It is interesting to note, however, that the male types still outnumbered their female counterparts in this part of the material, possibly indicating a perceived need on the part of the language producers to be more specific when describing the male participants in the judicial proceedings.

The second hypothesis addressed in this study concerned the aspects of the referent's life that would be referred to by the gender-related term used, and considered whether this aspect would differ depending on referent gender. Previous studies of the Early Modern period have indicated that men tended to be referred to in official documents by their occupation (e.g. *carpenter*, *weaver*, *captain*), whereas women were more likely to be described according to their relationship with others (e.g. *wife*, *daughter*, *sister*). If this holds true for the present material as well, then gender-related terms belonging to the occupational terms would occur more often with male terms, and relational terms would be used more frequently with female referents. As in the case of the previous hypothesis, this one also found support in the present investigation: of the occupational terms, 1,669 token instances (93%), representing 171 types, occurred with male reference in the material, as compared to 110 tokens (6%), representing 14 types, with female reference. There is thus a marked difference in the number of occupational terms occurring with male and female reference respectively.

In connection with this, the study also demonstrated a difference in how the occupational terms were distributed with regard to region of origin. There were considerably more occupational terms, as regards both types and tokens, in the BrE speech-related material than in the corresponding AmE texts. I have hypothesised that this might in part be due to the fact that the AmE trials took place in a relatively small community, where many of those participating would have known each other, thus eliminating the need for further specification by stating, for instance, the referent's occupation. Another possible reason for the relative dearth of occupational terms in the AmE speech-related material could be that Salem at this time was still a fairly small, frontier-type community, which had an economy that did not allow much in terms of job specialisation. In a community where most inhabitants would have to try their hands at several occupations, it would be hard for language producers to determine which of all the trades practised by the referent would be best to refer to, in order to set him or her apart from others.

The relational terms also showed a certain gender bias, in that they were used more often with female referents than with male ones. Of the overall 1,242 relational tokens in the material, 775 (62%) had female reference,

compared to 467 token instances (38%) of male relational terms. As regards types, however, the male relational types outnumbered female types with 16 to 12. Thus, the material did evince the expected gender bias both as regards the occupational and the relational terms, lending further support to statements made by socio-historians suggesting that this would be the case (see, for instance, Shoemaker 1998: 148).

It has been shown by historians (cf. Thompson 1974: 23–24, 48–49, 131–132) that, overall, women in the early American colonies enjoyed a higher social standing than did their counterparts in England, as long as the immigration rate was high. In section 1.1, I speculated that this might lead to discernible differences between how women were addressed and referred to in material from the two regions. However, no such indications were found.

The following two hypotheses addressed in the present investigation focused on adjectives occurring in connection with gender-related terms, further describing or specifying certain traits in the referent. In connection with this, I also investigated the use of demonstratives to determine gender-related terms (see further below). The first of these hypotheses predicted that adjectives pertaining to the physical appearance of the referent would occur more frequently with female reference than with male reference. This prediction was made on the basis of previous research, which has indicated that this is often the case, both in historical and present-day material (e.g. Wallin-Ashcroft 2000; Sveen 2005; Bäcklund 2006). Surprisingly, the material used in the present study contained more adjectives denoting appearance in connection with male gender-related terms, than with female terms, thus disproving the hypothesis. Once the categorical use of *black* in the phrase *black man* had been excluded so as not to skew the data, the difference between appearance adjectives with male and female reference was only slight, but the male adjectives still outnumbered their female counterparts. In any case, the material did not support the above hypothesis.

One possible explanation as to why the present investigation identified patterns that contrasted with previous studies in this regard could be that the judicial proceedings demanded that language producers should give descriptions of the accused person/persons in the court case in question, regardless of referent gender. Since, as mentioned above, the alleged criminals in the BrE examinations were predominantly male, this could account for the relative abundance of Appearance adjectives with male reference. Owing to the small number of Appearance adjectives in the material, however, no conclusions could be safely drawn with regard to this.

The last main hypothesis addressed in this study concerned the evaluative connotations carried by adjectives occurring in connection with gender-related terms and whether these connotations varied depending on referent gender. Previous studies have indicated that there is a link between the genders of the referents and whether the adjectives used in connection with them denote a positive or a negative quality; however, these studies have

differed somewhat in their findings. Most previous research (e.g. Persson 1990: 55–57; Mendelson and Crawford 1998: 58–71; Bäcklund 2006) has reported a pattern in which negative adjectives occurred more often with female referents, and in which positive adjectives occurred more often with male referents, but Wallin-Ashcroft's findings (2000) to extent identify contrasting patterns partly go against this. In her study on eighteenth-century fiction, adjectives used in connection with women tended to be either positive or patronising, whereas male adjectives were negative or denoted respect. The material used in the present study evinced a trend more in line with Persson (1990), Mendelson and Crawford (1998) and Bäcklund (2006): of the Assessment adjectives used with male reference, 60% carry positive connotations, compared to 38% with negative connotations (the remaining 2% were indeterminate). The corresponding figures for adjectives with female reference were nearly inverted, with 38% denoting positive qualities and 63% referring to negative character traits. These figures were shown to be statistically significant.

A two-pronged explanation was suggested which might account for this gender bias in the material. First, adjectives used to denote the respect felt for the referent on the part of the language producer (e.g. *worshipful*, *honoured*) would have been predominantly used with male reference, since only men could have held magisterial positions in the Early Modern courtroom.[71] Secondly, the women who appeared in the courtroom context were mostly present either as victims/witnesses or as alleged perpetrators, two judicial roles which would attract sympathetic/patronising or disparaging adjectives, both of which groups have been classified as negative in the present investigation.

The material further showed a gender bias in the kind of qualities that were highlighted as being positive and negative with male and female referents respectively. Positive adjectives occurring in connection with female gender-related terms often referred to passive, inner qualities, such as rationality (*conscientious*), unobtrusiveness (*discreet*) and nurturing ability (*tender*). Positive adjectives occurring with male referents included adjectives denoting all of the above qualities, but further encompassed adjectives referring to traits of a more social and active nature, such as ability (*capable*), intellect (*ingenious*), sociability (*affable*) and the respect which the language producer felt for the referent (*honourable*). With referents of both genders, the adjectives denoting negative qualities highlighted social ineptitude and bad ethics.

In connection with this last hypothesis, the study also found an interesting gender bias in the use of the adjective *poor*. *Poor* is a semantically ambiguous adjective in that it can denote either a person's financial situation

[71] Most Assessment adjectives come from the speech-related material, i.e. the courtroom texts.

or express sympathy for the reference (as in, for instance, "poor you"). In the material investigated here, 'financial' *poor* was only used with male referents, whereas 'sympathetic' *poor* was used predominantly with women (11 instances out of 17). This is as could be expected, since men were normally the legal owners of the family's property, and thus more often than not the only ones who could be said to be *poor* in the financial sense of the word. That 'sympathetic' *poor* is used primarily with women could be due to the fact that *poor* is only used in this way about others when the language producer feels himself to be in a superior position to the referent. Given the subordinate status which women had in Early Modern times, it would, generally speaking, be easier for most people to feel superior to a woman than to a man.

In the course of the investigation, another structure providing a semantic parallel to adjectives was investigated, namely the characterising *of*-phrase (for example *a man of honour*). The material contained a modest number of these phrases, 45 tokens in all, representing 34 types. For this reason, only tentative conclusions can be drawn. Nevertheless, three tendencies were located in the material. First, these phrases occur predominantly with male referents in the material. Of the 45 instances of characterising *of*-phrases, only seven (representing five types) had female reference. Secondly, the male *of*-phrases showed a distinct tendency to denote positive qualities in the referent. It was suggested that this could be linked to the choice of sentence structure: by using a characterising *of*-phrase rather than a premodifying adjective to highlight a characteristic in the referent (for example by saying *a man of honour* rather than *an honourable man*), greater emphasis was placed on the characteristic so described. In a courtroom, where so much depends on how the magistrates perceive, for instance, the alleged victims of the crime, using a characterising *of*-phrase to express positive qualities in these victims would stress these qualities more, and thus perhaps increase the sympathy which the magistrates would have felt for the referents. Moreover, the subordinate position which men held in Early Modern society might have been conducive to language producers using characterising *of*-phrases in connection with male referents rather than with female ones to further stress the respect they felt for the person referred to.

Thirdly, the characterising *of*-phrases were found to occur mainly in the BrE material, where most of the scribes seem to have been experienced and well-versed in their jobs, indicating a rather high degree of formal education. It is possible that characterising *of*-phrases occur more readily in the language repertoire of educated people than among people with less schooling. Further investigation is needed within this field, however, to test whether there is such a connection between the use of characterising *of*-phrases and the level of education of the language producer.

In addition to the use of adjectives in connection with gender-related terms, the present study also included a brief investigation of how the

demonstratives *this*, *that*, *these* and *those* are used in this context. Initially, the main justification for this was to discover whether the potential for these words to demonstrate or refute a bond between the language producer and the referent, as reported in Present-day English (cf. Lakoff 1974: 345–346; Quirk et al. 1985: 372, 374–375), was also present in Early Modern English. However, there were too few instances of demonstratives used with this function (emotional deixis) for any meaningful quantitative analysis to take place. Nevertheless, it was deemed justifiable to address the use of the demonstratives filling spatio-temporal and discursive deictic functions with gender-related terms, since studies of the demonstratives in historical English material are few in number. Only the speech-related material (depositions and examinations) was included in this part of the study.

The material evinced certain tendencies with regard to the use of demonstratives in connection with gender-related terms. First, it was found that the most common function filled by the demonstratives in the material was spatio-temporal deixis, primarily owing to these words being used to refer to either witnesses or defendants, who would have been present at the time of the utterance. Secondly, it was shown that female gender-related terms were more likely to occur with demonstratives than were their male counterparts, when taking the relative proportion of male and female terms into account. Moreover, the demonstratives occurring with female reference tended to be proximate (*this* or *these*) and have a spatio-temporal function in the clause. It was proposed that these findings were due to so many demonstratives having appeared in the AmE material, where a large percentage of the participants were women who were present in the court and relatively close to the language producer, warranting both proximate forms and spatio-temporal deixis.

Thirdly, and lastly, the phrase structure demonstrative + gender-related term was shown to occur predominantly when magistrates interacted with witnesses on the one hand and with defendants on the other. Very rarely was the referent of the gender-related term a magistrate: this only happened on three occasions in the material. It was suggested that this could be due to the courtroom situation, where the majority of statements would be either produced by or directed to a magistrate.

To sum up, the present study has shown that the use of gender-related terms in speech-related courtroom material from the period 1670–1720 displays trends which can be linked to referent gender, region of origin and the aspect of the referent's life that was being referred to. Importantly, both similarities and differences were discovered between the findings of the present study and previous research carried out on fictional material and letters. This indicates that the use of language could vary between fiction and non-fiction as much in Early Modern English as in the English we speak and write today.

The findings of the present investigation have also hinted at research areas where further studies might be profitable. The tentative comparisons drawn between the speech-related material and the smaller body of non-speech-related texts (both of which material sets are non-fictional) indicate that the latter differs from the former to some degree, especially as regards the specificity with which the referents were described. Further studies contrasting the use of gender-related terms in speech-related material on the one hand and non-speech-related material on the other might prove a rewarding endeavour, perhaps especially if the material used includes both fictional and non-fictional texts.

Furthermore, a diachronic study of the use of gender-related terms in courtroom material might be a worthwhile undertaking; further investigation could contrast material from, for instance, Early Modern England with corresponding material from Victorian and present-day courtrooms. Examining how the use of these very important and potentially loaded (cf. Romaine 1999) words has changed (or not changed) over time might reveal interesting aspects of the change (or stability) in social norms pertaining to men and women. The use of demonstratives in historical material might also be worth investigating further, perhaps especially with regard to the use of emotive-deictic demonstratives.

In conclusion, the present study has shown that studying the terms used to describe and address men and women can offer interesting insights both into what place men and women filled – and were expected to fill – in historical times and what aspects of their lives were seen as significant and worthy of mention.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Corpora

ARCHER1-3 = *A Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers 1–3*. Compiled under the supervision of Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan at Northern Arizona University, University of Southern California, University of Freiburg, University of Heidelberg, University of Helsinki, Uppsala University, University of Michigan, University of Manchester and Lancaster University.

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

EAmE: *A Corpus of Early American English (New England), 1620–1720*. Being compiled by Merja Kytö (Uppsala University).

HC: *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. 1991. Helsinki: The Department of English, University of Helsinki.

Other

SWP: *The Salem Witchcraft Papers – Verbatim Transcripts of the Legal Documents of the Salem Witchcraft Outbreak of 1692*. Edited by Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum. New York: Da Capo Press, 1977.

References

Algeo, John. 1992. What is a Briticism? In Hall, Joan H., Nick Doane and Dick Ringler (eds.), 287–304.

Archer, Dawn. 2002. "Can Innocent People Be Guilty?" A Sociopragmatic Analysis of Examination Transcripts from the Salem Witchcraft Trials. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 3 (1). 1–30.

Archer, Dawn. 2005. *Questions and Answers in the English Courtroom (1640–1760). A Sociopragmatic Analysis*. (Pragmatics and Beyond New Series 135.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bäcklund, Ingegerd. 1996. Males and Females in Jane Austen's World: A Study of Terms. In Persson, Gunnar and Mats Rydén (eds.), 9–28.
Bäcklund, Ingegerd. 2006. Modifiers Describing Women and Men in Nineteenth-Century English. In Kytö, Merja, Mats Rydén and Erik Smitterberg (eds.), 17–55.
Barber, Charles. 1997. *Early Modern English*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Beattie, John M. 1986. *Crime and the Courts in England 1660–1800*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Bergvall, Victoria L., Janet M. Bing and Alice F. Freed (eds.). 1996. *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Longman.
Biber, Douglas. 1988. *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Biber, Douglas, Edward Finegan and Dwight Atkinson. 1994. ARCHER and its Challenges: Compiling and Exploring a Representative Corpus of Historical English Registers. In Fries, Udo, Gunnel Tottie and Peter Schneider (eds.), 1–13.
Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
Bing, Janet M. and Victoria L. Bergvall. 1996. The Question of Questions: Beyond Binary Thinking. In Bergvall, Victoria L., Janet M. Bing and Alice F. Freed (eds.), 1–30.
Blakar, Rolv M. 1979. Language as a Means of Social Power: Theoretical-Empirical Explorations of Language and Language Use as Embedded in a Social Matrix. In Mey, Jacob L. (ed.), 131–169.
Boyer, Paul and Stephen Nissenbaum (eds.). 1977. *The Salem Witchcraft Papers – Verbatim Transcripts of the Legal Documents of the Salem Witchcraft Outbreak of 1692*. New York: Da Capo Press.
Bruck, Anthony, Robert A. Fox and Michael W. LaGaly (eds.). 1974. *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Bucholtz, Mary (ed.). 2004. *Language and Woman's Place. Text and Commentaries. Revised and Expanded Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen R. 1995. Man in the News: The Misrepresentation of Women Speaking in News-as-Narrative-Discourse. In Mills, Sara (ed.), 226–239.
Cameron, Deborah (ed.) 1990a. *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
Cameron, Deborah. 1990b. Introduction: Why Is Language a Feminist Issue? In Cameron, Deborah (ed.), 1–28.
Cawley, A. C. and R. C. Alston (eds.). 1967. *Leeds Studies in English, New Series: Volume I*. Leeds: The University of Leeds School of English.
Chafe, Wallace and Jane Danielewicz. 1987. Properties of Spoken and Written Language. In Horowitz, Rosalind and S. Jay Samuels (eds.), 83–113.
Clark, Alice. 1992 [1919]. *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*. London and New York: Routledge.
Coates, Jennifer (ed.). 1998. *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Crooke, William (ed.). 1909. *John Fryer's East India and Persia. Vol. I.* (Works Issued by the Hakluyt Society, Second Series XIX.) London: Hakluyt Society.
Culpeper, Jonathan. 2001. *Language and Characterisation. People in Plays and Other Texts*. London: Longman.
Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö. 1997. Towards a Corpus of Dialogues, 1550–1750. In Ramisch, Heinrich and Kenneth Wynne (eds.), 60–73.
Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö. 2000. Data in Historical Pragmatics. Spoken Interaction (Re)cast as Writing. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 1 (2). 175–199.
Curzan, Anne. 2003. *Gender Shifts in the History of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cusack, Bridget (ed.). 1998. *Everyday English 1500–1700. A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
van Dijk, Teun A. 1988. Social Cognition, Social Power and Social Discourse. *Text*, 8 (1–2). 129–157.
van Dijk, Teun A. 1990. Social Cognition and Discourse. In Giles, Howard and W. Peter Robinson (eds.), 163–183.
Doty, Kathleen and Risto Hiltunen. 2002. "I Will Tell, I Will Tell": Confessional Patterns in the Salem Witchcraft Trials, 1692. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 3 (2). 299–335.
Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2003. *Language and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Edlund, Lars-Erik and Gunnar Persson (eds.). 1992. *Language – the Time Machine. Papers in Honour of Bengt Odenstedt on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday, July 21, 1992*. (Umeå Studies in the Humanities 107.) Umeå: Acta Universitatis Umensis.
Erickson, Amy Louise 1993. *Women and Property in Early Modern England*. London and New York: Routledge.
Evans, Maurice. 1951. Elizabethan Spoken English. *The Cambridge Journal*, IV (4). 401–414.
Evans, Sara M. 1989. *Born for Liberty: A History of Women in America*. London and New York: Macmillan.
Fairclough, Norman. 2001. *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Longman.
Fletcher, Anthony. 1995. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Foyster, Elizabeth A. 1999. *Manhood in Early Modern England. Honour, Sex and Marriage*. London and New York: Longman.
Fries, Udo, Gunnel Tottie and Peter Schneider (eds.). 1994. *Creating and Using English Language Corpora. Papers from the Fourteenth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Zürich 1993*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Giles, Howard and W. Peter Robinson (eds.). 1990. *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
Gleby, Arne. 2002. English Deverbal Adjectives. Their Identification and Use in a Corpus of Modern Written English. Ph.D. thesis. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg (stencil copy).
Gowing, Laura. 1996. *Domestic Dangers. Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Graddol, David and Joan Swann. 1989. *Gender Voices*. Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Grund, Peter, Merja Kytö and Matti Rissanen. 2004. Editing the Salem Witchcraft Records: An Exploration of a Linguistic Treasury. *American Speech*, 79 (2). 146–166.
Hall, Joan H., Nick Doane and Dick Ringler (eds.). 1992. *Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honor of Frederic G. Cassidy*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.
Hall, Kira and Mary Bucholtz (eds.). 1995. *Gender Articulated. Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York and London: Routledge.
Harris, Sandra. 1984. Questions as a Mode of Control in Magistrates' Courts. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 49. 5–27.
Hiltunen, Risto. 1996. "Tell Me, Be You a Witch?": Questions in the Salem Witchcraft Trials of 1692. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, IX (25). 17–37.
Hiltunen, Risto and Matti Peikola. 2007. Trial Discourse and Manuscript Context: Scribal Profiles in the Salem Witchcraft Records. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 8 (1). 43–68.
Hitchcock, Tim and Michèle Cohen (eds.). 1999a. *English Masculinities 1660–1800*. London and New York: Longman.
Hitchcock, Tim and Michèle Cohen. 1999b. Introduction. In Hitchcock, Tim and Michèle Cohen (eds.), 1–22.
Hoak, Dale. 1996. The Anglo-Dutch Revolution of 1688–89. In Hoak, Dale and Mordechai Feingold (eds.), 1–26.
Hoak, Dale and Mordechai Feingold (eds.). 1996. *The World of William and Mary. Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Hoffer, Peter C. 1992. *Law and People in Colonial America*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins.
Holmes, Janet and Robert Sigley. 2002. What's a Word like *Girl* Doing in a Place like This? Occupational Labels, Sexist Usages and Corpus Research. In Peters, Pam, Peter Collins and Adam Smith (eds.), 247–263.
Horowitz, Rosalind and S. Jay Samuels (eds.). 1987. *Comprehending Oral and Written Language*. San Diego and London: Academic Press.
Howard, Judith A. and Jocelyn A. Hollander. 1997. *Gendered Situations, Gendered Selves. A Gender Lens on Social Psychology*. Thousand Oakes, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kahlas-Tarkka, Leena and Matti Rissanen. 2007. The Sullen and the Talkative: Discourse Strategies in the Salem Examinations. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 8 (1). 1–24.
Kent, Susan K. 1999. *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640–1990.* London and New York: Routledge.
Kerttula, Seija. 2002. *English Colour Terms: Etymology, Chronology, and Relative Basicness*. (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique LX.) Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
Kimmel, Michael S. 2000. *The Gendered Society*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Kohnen, Thomas. 2001. On Defining Text Types within Historical Linguistics: The Case of Petitions/Statutes. *European Journal of English Studies*, 5 (2). 197–203.
Kryk-Kastovsky, Barbara. 2000. Representations of Orality in Early Modern English Trial Records. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 1 (2). 201–230.

Kytö, Merja. 1991. *Variation and Diachrony, with Early American English in Focus. Studies on CAN/MAY and SHALL/WILL*. (University of Bamberg Studies in English Linguistics 28.) Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York and Paris: Peter Lang.
Kytö, Merja. 1996. *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. 3rd ed. Helsinki: Department of English, University of Helsinki.
Kytö, Merja and Terry Walker. 2003. The Linguistic Study of Early Modern English Speech-Related Texts. How "Bad" Can "Bad" Data Be? *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31 (3). 221–248.
Kytö, Merja and Terry Walker. 2006. *Guide to* A Corpus of English Dialogues 1560–1760. (Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 130.) Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
Kytö, Merja, Mats Rydén and Erik Smitterberg (eds.). 2006. *Nineteenth-Century English. Stability and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. 1974. Remarks on *This* and *That*. In Bruck, Anthony, Robert A. Fox and Michael W. LaGaly (eds.), 345–356.
Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. 2004. Language and Woman's Place. In Bucholtz, Mary (ed.), 39–118.
Langbein, John H. 1978. The Criminal Trial before the Lawyers. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 45 (2). 263–316.
Lass, Roger (ed.). 1999. *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Volume III: 1476–1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Leith, Dick. 1983. *A Social History of English*. London and New York: Routledge.
Mendelson, Sara and Patricia Crawford. 1998. *Women in Early Modern England 1550–1720*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mey, Jacob L. (ed.). 1979. *Pragmalinguistics. Theory and Practice*. (Rasmus Rask Studies in Pragmatic Linguistics 1.) The Hague, Paris and New York: Mouton.
Mills, Sara (ed.). 1995. *Language and Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. London and New York: Longman.
Morris, Christopher (ed.). 1949. *The Journeys of Celia Fiennes*. Revised ed. London: The Cresset Press.
Nevalainen, Terttu. 2002. Language and Woman's Place in Earlier English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 30 (2). 181–199.
Nevalainen, Terttu and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2003. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Longman.
Norberg, Cathrine. 2002. Whores and Cuckolds. On Male and Female Terms in Shakespeare's Comedies. Ph.D. thesis. Luleå: Luleå University (stencil copy).
O'Barr, William M. and Bowman K. Atkins. 1998. "Women's Language" or "Powerless Language"? In Coates, Jennifer (ed.), 377–387.
Ochs, Elinor and Carolyn Taylor. 1995. The "Father Knows Best" Dynamic in Dinnertime Narratives. In Hall, Kira and Mary Bucholtz (eds.), 97–120.
OED = Oxford English Dictionary Online. 1989 (second ed.); 2001 (draft), 2005 (draft). Oxford UP. http://dictionary.oed.com (as accessed in January 2007).
Ohtsuki, Minoru. 2000. *A Cognitive Linguistic Study of Colour Symbolism*. (Contributions Towards Research and Education of Language 5.) Tokyo: Daito-Bunka University Press.
Persson, Gunnar. 1990. *Meanings, Models and Metaphors. A Study in Lexical Semantics in English*. (Umeå Studies in the Humanities 92.) Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Persson, Gunnar. 1992. The Shifting Image of the Creature. In Edlund, Lars-Erik and Gunnar Persson (eds.), 103–113.
Persson, Gunnar and Mats Rydén (eds.). 1996. *Male and Female Terms in English. Proceedings of the Symposium at Umeå University, May 18–19, 1994*. (Umeå Studies in the Humanities 129.) Umeå: Acta Universitatis Umensis.
Peters, Pam, Peter Collins and Adam Smith (eds.). 2002. *New Frontiers of Corpus Research: Papers from the Twenty First International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Sydney 2000*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
Piercy, Josephine K. 1939. *Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth Century America (1607–1710)*. New Haven: Yale University Press and London: Humphrey Milford and Oxford University Press.
Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
Ramisch, Heinrich and Kenneth Wynne (eds.). 1997. *Language in Time and Space. Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Viereck on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
Raumolin-Brunberg, Helena. 1991. *The Noun Phrase in Early Sixteenth-Century English*. *A Study Based on Sir Thomas More's Writings*. (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique L.) Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
Rissanen, Matti. 1999. Syntax. In Lass, Roger (ed.), 187–331.
Rissanen, Matti, Merja Kytö and Minna Palander-Collin (eds.). 1993. *Early English in the Computer Age. Explorations through the Helsinki Corpus*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Romaine, Suzanne. 1982. *Socio-Historical Linguistics: Its Status and Methodology*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 34.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Romaine, Suzanne. 1999. *Communicating Gender*. Mahwah, NJ and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Rosenthal, Bernard. 1993. *Salem Story. Reading the Witch Trials of 1692*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rosenthal, Bernard, Gretchen Adams, Margo Burns, Peter Grund, Risto Hiltunen, Leena Kahlas-Tarkka, Merja Kytö, Matti Peikola, Benjamin Ray, Matti Rissanen and Richard Trask (eds.). Forthcoming. *Records of the Salem Witch-Hunt*.
Salmon, Vivian. 1967. Elizabethan Colloquial English in the Falstaff Plays. In Cawley, A. C. and R. C. Alston (eds.), 37–70.
Schulz, Muriel R. 1975. The Semantic Derogation of Woman. In Thorne, Barrie and Nancy Henley (eds.), 64–75.
Sharpe, James. 1996. *Instruments of Darkness. Witchcraft in England 1550–1750*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
Shoemaker, Robert B. 1998. *Gender in English Society, 1650–1850. The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* London and New York: Longman.
Short, Mick, Elena Semino and Martin Wynne. 2002. Revisiting the Notion of Faithfulness in Discourse Presentation Using a Corpus Approach. *Language and Literature*, 11 (4). 37–70.
Smitterberg, Erik. 2005. *The Progressive in 19th-Century English. A Process of Integration*. (Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics 54.) Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
Spender, Dale. 1985. *Man Made Language*. 2nd edition. London and New York: Pandora.

Starkey, Marion L. 1949. *The Devil in Massachusetts: A Modern Enquiry into the Salem Witch Trials*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Sunderland, Jane. 1995. "We're Boys, Miss!": Finding Gendered Identities and Looking for Gendering of Identities in the Foreign Language Classroom. In Mills, Sara (ed.), 160–178.
Sveen, Hanna. 2005. *From "Honourable" to "Highly-Sexed". Adjectival Descriptions of Male and Female Characters in Victorian and Contemporary Children's Fiction*. (Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 129.) Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
Thomas, Jenny A. 1985. The Language of Power. Towards a Dynamic Pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9. 765–783.
Thompson, Roger. 1974. *Women in Stuart England and America*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Thorne, Barrie and Nancy Henley (eds.). 1975. *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Trask, Richard B. 1997. *"The Devil Hath Been Raised". A Documentary History of the Salem Village Witchcraft Outbreak of March 1692*. Danvers: Yeoman Press.
Vestergaard, Torben and Kim Schrøder. 1985. *The Language of Advertising*. Oxford and New York: Blackwell.
Walker, Terry. 2005. Second Person Singular Pronouns in Early Modern English Dialogues 1560–1760. Ph.D. thesis. Uppsala: Uppsala University (stencil copy).
Wallin-Ashcroft, Anna-Lena. 1992. "Poor Creatures!" In Edlund, Lars-Erik and Gunnar Persson (eds.), 183–189.
Wallin-Ashcroft, Anna-Lena. 2000. Great Men and Charming Creatures. On Male and Female Terms in Eighteenth Century Novels. Ph.D. thesis. Umeå: Umeå University (stencil copy).
West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1 (2). 125–151.
Winship, George P. (ed.). 1935. *The Journal of Madam Knight*. New York: Peter Smith.
Woodbury, Hanni. 1984. The Strategic Use of Questions in Court. *Semiotica*, 48 (3/4). 197–228.
Woods, Anthony, Paul Fletcher and Arthur Hughes. 1986. *Statistics in Language Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix I. The Gender-Related Terms

Central terms

Boy
Chap
Damsel
Fellow
Girl
Lad
Lass
Maid
Maiden
Male
Man
Swain
Woman

Relational terms

Aunt
Brethren
Bridegroom
Brideman
Brother
Daughter
Father
Godfather
Godmother
Granddaughter
Grandfather
Grandmother
Grandson
Heir
Husband
Kinsman
Mother
Nephew
Niece
Relique
Singlewoman
Sister
Son
Son-in-law
Suitor
Uncle
Widow
Wife

Epicene terms

Accomplice
Acquaintance
Babe
Baby
Boarder
Child
Companion
Comrade
Confederate
Conspirator
Correspondent
Cousin
Creature
Deceased
Elder
Enemy
Foe
Friend
Guardian
Guest
Infant
Instrument
Kin
Leader
Lodger
Lover
Neighbour
Parent
Partner
Patient
Person
Relation
Slave
Spouse
Stranger
Subject
Tenant
Twin
Vassal
Youth

Occupational terms

Adjutant
Admiral
Aid de camp
Alderman
Alehouse-keeper
Apothecary
Apprentice
Artisan
Assistant
Associate
Attorney
Author

Bailiff
Barber
Bishop
Blacksmith
Body-maker
Brachim
Broker
Butcher
Butler
Capitaneo
Captain
Cardmaker
Carpenter
Carrier
Centurion
Chamberlain
Chancellor
Chandler
Chaplain
Chapman
Chief
Churchwarden
Clergyman
Clerk
Client
Clothier
Coachman
Cobbler
Colonel
Commissary
Confessor
Constable
Consul
Cook
Cooper
Coroner
Corporal
Council
Councillor
Crier
Curate
Customer
Cutler
Deacon
Dean
Deputy-governor
Doctor
Dragoon
Draper
Drummer
Dry nurse
Emissary
Ensign
Envoy
Exchequer
Executioner
Expositor
Farmer
Father
Footman
Foreman
Friar
Gardener
General
Glazier
Governor
Groom
Guard
Guide
Handmaid
Helper
Hemp dresser
Historian
Horse-keeper
Host
Hostess
Hostler
Incumbent
Interpreter
Ironmonger
Joiner
Jougy
Judge
Jurator
Juror
Justice
Knitter
Labourer
Land-bailiff
Landlady
Landlord
Laundress
Lawyer
Lieutenant
Magistrate
Maid
Major
Maker
Man
Manager
Marine
Mariner
Marshal
Mayor
Member
Merchant
Midwife
Miller
Minister
Moralist
Muleteer
Musqueteer
Nurse
Officer
Oracle
Padre
Page
Parson
Penman
Physician
Porter
Post
President
Priest
Primate
Printer
Privy-councillor
Quarter-master
Recruit
Rector
Representative
Salesman

Sawyer
Schoolmaster
Scrivener
Sculler
Seaman
Searcher
Secretary
Sentinel
Sentry
Sequestrator
Sergeant
Servant
Servitor
Sharper
Sherriff
Shipmaster
Sister
Slater
Soldier
Spinner
Statesman
Steward
Student
Superintendent
Supervisor
Surgeon
Sutler
Swordsman
Tailor
Tapster
Trader
Translator
Turnkey
Under-gaoler
Upholsterer
Vintner
Walker
Waterman
Weaver
Workman
Writer

Title terms

Baron
Brother
Count
Countess
Dame
Don
Dowager Queen
Duchess
Duke
Earl
Emperor
Esquire
Father
Fidalgo
Freeman
Gaffer
Gentleman
Gentlewoman
Goodman
Goodwife/Goody
Honour
King
Knight
Lady
Laird
Lord
Lordship
Madam
Majesty
Marchioness
Marquis
Master
Miss
Mistress
Monsieur
Mr
Mrs
Nobleman
Peer
Petty-monarch
Pretender
Prince
Princess
Queen
Sir
Viscount
Worship
Yeoman

Depreciative terms

Adulteress
Animal
Assassin
Bastard
Bawd
Beggar
Bitch
Blasphemer
Blockhead
Brat
Bumpkin
Buzzard
Churl
Conjuror
Contriver
Delinquent
Devil
Dog
Enchantress
Fool
Heathen
Housebreaker
Impostor
Jade
Liar
Lubber
Madman
Monster
Murderer
Pedlar
Prisoner
Rabble

Rascal
Rat
Rogue
Savage
Sinner
Sirrah
Sophister
Sweetheart
Thief
Traitor
Villain
Whore
Witch
Wizard
Wretch

Appreciative terms

Hero
Saint
Sweetheart

Religious, social and political (RSP) terms

Alien
Anabaptist
Arab
Baptist
Black
Catholic
Christian
Citizen
Countryman
Dane
Deist
Dissenter
Dutchman
Egyptian
Englishman
Foreigner
Franciscan
Frenchman
Indian
Irishman
Jacobite
Jesuit
Kingsman
Loyolist
Man
Member
Moor
Native
Negro
Papist
Paulistine
Persian
Portugal
Professor
Protestant
Quaker
Scot/Scotsman
Spaniard
Tinker
Tory
Whig

Appendix II. Texts Included from the SWP

The names of the texts are presented in this appendix as they appear in Boyer and Nissenbaum (1977) and listed alphabetically according to the first name of the individual referred to first. For ease of reference, the depositions have been divided into two groups. The first group consists of the depositions cited as examples in this dissertation. The page references correspond to Boyer and Nissenbaum (1977). The second group consists of the other depositions which have been included in the material examined in this dissertation, the page references for which can be found in the Index in *The Salem Witchcraft Papers* (Boyer and Nissenbaum 1977: 1049–1070). The same division into two groups applies to the examinations. In cases where there are two texts with the same name in *The Salem Witchcraft Papers*, they have been marked (I) and (II) in the lists, according to the order in which they appear.

Depositions

Depositions cited in the examples

Ann Putnam Jr. v. Mary Bradbury, pp. 121–122
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Susannah Martin, p. 576
Ann Putnam Sr., v. Martha Corey and Rebecca Nurse, pp. 603–605
Benjamin Hutchinson v. George Burroughs, pp. 171–172
Bray Wilkins v. John Willard, pp. 847–848
Edward Putnam and Ezekiel Cheever v. Martha Corey, pp. 260–262
Elizabeth Balch and Abigail Waldon v. Sarah Bishop, pp. 111–112
Elizabeth Booth v. Sarah Proctor and Mary DeRich, p. 692
Elizabeth Woodwell and Mary Walcott vs. Giles Corey, p. 243
Examination of Thomas Carrier, Jr, p. 203
Hannah Harris v. George Burroughs, p. 163
James Carr v. Mary Bradbury, pp. 124–125
John Bly, Sr. and Rebecca Bly v. Bridget Bishop, p. 103
John Brown v. Sarah Cole, p. 231
John Porter and Lydia Porter v. Sarah Bibber, p. 79
John Putnam, Jr. and Hannah Putnam v. Rebecca Nurse, Mary Easty, and Sarah Cloyce, pp. 601–602
John Tarbell and Samuel Nurse for Rebecca Nurse, p. 603
Joseph Fowler v. Sarah Bibber, p. 79
Joseph Herrick, Sr., and Mary Herrick v. Sarah Good, p. 370
Margaret Knight v. Abigail Hobbs. p. 415
Mary Warren v. Ann Pudeator, Boyer and Nissenbaum, pp. 705–706

Rev. Increase Mather's Report of his Conversation in Prison with Martha Tyler, pp. 777–778
Rose Foster v. Abigail Faulkner, p. 330
Samuel Parris, Nathaniel Ingersoll, and Thomas Putnam v. John Proctor, Elizabeth Proctor, and Sarah Cloyce, p. 686
Samuel Sibley v. John Proctor, pp. 683–684
Sarah Bibber v. George Burroughs, pp. 167–168
Sarah Holton v. Rebecca Nurse, p. 600
Second Examination of Rebecca Eames, pp. 281–282
Susannah Sheldon v. Bridget Bishop, Mary English, Phillip English, Giles Corey, and Martha Corey, pp. 105–106
Susannah Sheldon v. John Willard and Elizabeth Colson, p. 838
Thomas Boarman v. Rachel Clenton, p. 217
Thomas Putnam and Ezekiel Cheever v. Tituba, p. 757
William Brown v. Susannah Martin, pp. 558–559

Depositions not cited

Abigail Hobbs and Mary Warren v. George Burroughs et al.
Abigail Hobbs v. Alice Parker
Abigail Martin and John Bridges v. Samuel Wardwell
Abigail Williams and Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Mary Easty, John Willard, and Mary Witheridge
Abigail Williams v. Elizabeth Proctor
Abigail Williams v. George Jacobs, Sr. (I)
Abigail Williams v. George Jacobs, Sr. (II)
Abigail Williams v. John Proctor
Abigail Williams v. John Willard
Abigail Williams v. Martha Corey
Abigail Williams v. Rebecca Nurse
Abigail Williams v. Sarah Osborne, Tituba, and Sarah Good
Abigail Williams v. Susannah Martin
Abraham Wellman v. Sarah Cole
Allen Toothaker v. Martha Carrier
Ambrose Gale v. Wilmott Reed
Andrew Elliott v. Susannah Roots
Andrew Foster v. Martha Carrier, Mary Toothaker, and – Toothaker
Ann Putnam Jr. v. Mary Bradbury
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Abigail Faulkner
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Abigail Faulkner II
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Abigail Hobbs
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Ann Pudeator
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Ann Pudeator
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Dorcas Good
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Dorcas Hoar
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Elizabeth Hart
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Elizabeth Proctor
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. George Burroughs
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. George Burroughs
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. George Jacobs, Sr.
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Giles Corey
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. John Proctor
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. John Willard
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Mary Easty
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Rebecca Nurse
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Rebecca Nurse, Martha Corey, and Sarah Cloyce
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Sarah Buckley
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Sarah Good
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Sarah Osborne
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Tituba
Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Wilmott Reed Samuel Parris, Nathaniel Ingersoll and Thomas Putnam v. Elizabeth Proctor
Ann Putnam, Jr. vs. Sarah Wilds
Ann Putnam, Jr., Thomas Putnam and Robert Morrill v. Thomas Farrer
Ann Putnam, Sr. v. John Willard, William Hobbs, and Martha Corey
Ann Putnam, Sr., v. Rebecca Nurse, Sarah Cloyce, Bridget[?] Bishop, and Elizabeth Cary
Benjamin Abbott v. Martha Carrier
Benjamin Gould v. Giles Corey

Martha Dutch v. Alice Parker
Martha Sprague v. Abigail Faulkner
Martha Sprague v. Samuel Wardwell
Mary Andrews v. Susannah Martin
Mary Cummings v. Elizabeth How
Mary Cummings v. Elizabeth How
Mary Eaton, Sr., v. Sarah Cole
Mary Edwards v. Rachel Clenton
Mary Fuller, Sr., v. Rachel Clenton
Mary Gage v. Dorcas Hoar
Mary Walcott and Elizabeth Hubbard v. John Proctor, Elizabeth Proctor, William Proctor, and Sarah Proctor
Mary Walcott v. Abigail Faulkner
Mary Walcott v. Abigail Hobbs
Mary Walcott v. Alice Parker
Mary Walcott v. Ann Foster
Mary Walcott v. Ann Pudeator
Mary Walcott v. Dorcas Good
Mary Walcott v. Dorcas Hoar
Mary Walcott v. Elizabeth Proctor
Mary Walcott v. George Burroughs
Mary Walcott v. George Jacobs, Sr.
Mary Walcott v. John Willard
Mary Walcott v. Martha Carrier
Mary Walcott v. Mary Bradbury
Mary Walcott v. Mary Bradbury
Mary Walcott v. Mary Easty
Mary Walcott v. Rebecca Nurse
Mary Walcott v. Samuel Wardwell
Mary Walcott v. Sarah Buckley
Mary Walcott v. Sarah Good
Mary Walcott v. Sarah Procter
Mary Walcott v. Sarah Wilds
Mary Walcott v. Susannah Martin
Mary Walcott v. Wilmott Reed
Mary Walcott, Mary Warren, and Ann Putnam, Jr. v. Rebecca Eames
Mary Warren and Mary Ireson v. Jerson Toothaker
Mary Warren v. Abigail Faulkner
Mary Warren v. Abigail Somes
Mary Warren v. Alice Parker
Mary Warren v. Ann Foster
Mary Warren v. Bridget Bishop and Nathaniel Cary
Mary Warren v. Elizabeth Proctor
Mary Warren v. George Burroughs, John Alden, Martha Corey, and Ann Pudeator
Mary Warren v. George Jacobs, Sr.
Mary Warren v. Giles Corey
Mary Warren v. John Proctor
Mary Warren v. John Proctor and Elizabeth Proctor
Mary Warren v. Mary Bradbury
Mary Warren v. Mary Lacey, Sr.
Mary Warren v. Mary Easty
Mary Warren v. Samuel Wardwell
Mary Warren v. Wilmott Reed
Mary Warren, Susannah Sheldon, Ann Putnam, Jr., Sarah Bibber, Mary Walcott, Elizabeth Hubbard, and Elizabeth Booth v. Job Tookey
Mary Webber v. George Burroughs
Mercy Lewis v. Abigail Hobbs
Mercy Lewis v. Dorcas Good
Mercy Lewis v. Elizabeth Proctor
Mercy Lewis v. George Burroughs
Mercy Lewis v. George Jacobs, Sr.
Mercy Lewis v. Giles Corey
Mercy Lewis v. John Willard
Mercy Lewis v. Martha Corey
Mercy Lewis v. Mary Lacey, Sr.
Mercy Lewis v. Phillip English, Mary English, Lydia Dustin, Elizabeth Johnson, and Thomas Farrer
Mercy Lewis v. Sarah Osborne
Mercy Lewis v. Susannah Martin
Mercy Wardwell v. Mary Parker
Moses Pike v. Susannah Martin
Nathaniel Ingersoll and Hannah Ingersoll v. Rebecca Nurse
Nathaniel Ingersoll v. Sarah Wilds
Nathaniel Ingersoll v. Susannah Martin
Nehemiah Abbott v. Elizabeth How
Philip Knight and Thomas Nichols v. John Willard
Phillip Nelson and Sarah Nelson v. Margaret Scott
Phoebe Chandler v. Martha Carrier
Priscilla Chub v. Abigail Hobbs
Rachel Tuck and Hannah Cox v. Dorcas Hoar

Examinations

Examinations cited in the examples

Examination of Martha Corey, pp. 248–255
Examination of Mary Black, pp. 113–114
Examination of Mary Easty, pp. 288–290
Examination of Mary Lacey, Jr., Mary Lacey, Sr., Ann Foster, Richard Carrier, and Andrew Carrier, pp. 520–529
Examination of Mary Osgood, pp. 615–617
Examination of Nehemiah Abbott, Jr, pp. 49–50
Examination of Rebecca Nurse, pp. 584–587
Examination of Richard Carrier, pp. 529–530
Examination of Sarah Carrier (II), pp. 201–202
Examination of Sarah Cloyse and Elizabeth Proctor, pp. 658–661
Examination of Sarah Good, pp. 356–357
Examination of Susannah Martin, pp. 550–552
Examination of Susannah Martin – Second Version, pp. 553–555

Examinations not cited
Examination of Abigail Hobbs, April 19
Examination of Abigail Hobbs, May 12
Examination of Alice Parker
Examination of Ann Foster, Mary Lacey, Sr., and Mary Lacey, Jr., Second Version
Examination of Ann Pudeator
Examination of Bridget Bishop, Second Version
Examination of Candy
Examination of Elizabeth How
Examination of John Jackson, Sr.
Examination of John Jackson, Jr.
Examination of John Willard
Examination of John Willard – Second Version
Examination of Mary Warren, April 19
Examination of Mary Warren, May 12
Examination of Mary Warren in Prison
Examination of Rebecca Eames and Mary Lacey Sr.
Examination of Sarah Buckley 18. May
Examination of Sarah Carrier (I)
Examination of Sarah Osborne
Examination of Sarah Wilds
Examination of Tituba
Examination of Tituba – A Second Version
Examination of William Hobbs

Index