Studia Anglica Posnaniensia 35, 2000

ADDRESS AND THE USE OF ITS POTENTIAL IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

MARIA LIUDVIKA DRAZDAUSKIENE

University of Vilnius

One can hardly find a topic which has not been studied with respect to Shakespeare's plays. In this paper address will be studied as a form of the phatic use of English,[1] the artistic exploitation of which has not appeared as an object of investigation in current publications.[2] Highlighting the relevant observations in a few known literary and linguistic studies of Shakespeare's plays (Ribner 1960; Charney 1961; Jones 1971; Doran 1976; Wilson 1977 and others), the author of the present paper has published on the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays (Drazdauskiene 1984, 1986, 1992a: 42-52; 1992b). Her discovery has been that the phatic use of English is widely used in Shakespeare's plays, is integrated in the development of the dramatic conflict and is stylistically balanced with the highly emotionally charged language. Without this concept, some scholars found it difficult to identify anything general in the method of the composition of at least the opening scenes in Shakespeare's plays (Wilson 1977: 6). The author of the present paper has found that all the scenes in Shakespeare's plays follow the pattern of conventional verbal usage at the beginning and the

---

[1] Defining the use of language as an integrated aspect of speech process, marked by an identifiable goal, which is context-bound and temporarily prominent in the process of communication, it is possible to define the phatic use of English as the use of language aimed at an establishment, maintenance and termination of verbal contact, which is realised in situations promoting mere sociability by the use of the word and a hold-over the interlocutor's attention to prepare him for the ensuing information, when and if it follows, rather than forwarding immediate instruction or an instantaneous exchange of information (cf. Drazdauskiene 1992a: 8).

[2] No studies of the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays have been recorded, for example, in *World Shakespeare Bibliography* prior to the publications of the author of the present paper.

end of speech acts, which represents the phatic use of language, man's most human and subtle mode of expression. Shakespeare employs the phatic use of English as a mode of realism, but he also charges it with dramatic meaning by the subtle variation of the flexible components in conventional verbal units. This has a bearing on the use of address in Shakespeare's plays and will be considered further.

What is customarily emphasised in studies of Shakespeare's language are the author's experiments with the English language as well as the variety and originality of his usage (cf. Colman 1974; Doran 1976; Ewbank 1994). The phatic use of English is such a use of this language which tends to patterns and standardised expression, which again has been little investigated with respect to Shakespeare's plays (cf. Drazdauskiene 1992a: 49-52; 1992b). The author of the present paper has found that lexico-grammatical patterns in the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays include standard forms or otherwise fixed models of address, various formulae of etiquette, very frequent throughout the texts of the plays (e.g., *I pray you. Prithee ... I beseech ... What's you grace's will/pleasure?* etc.) stereotyped patterns of requests for permission to speak (e.g., *A word with you. One word more. Let me ask you/have audience* ... etc.), stereotyped check on verbal contact (e.g., *Dost thou attend? Dost hear? Do you hear ... I charge thee that you attend me* etc.), and acknowledgement as well as the appreciation of speech. The latter two kinds of expression are least stereotyped in Shakespeare, e.g., *This tune goes manly. Sir, you speak nobly. 'Tis nobly spoken. Well said. 'Tis well said again* etc. However fixed, all the patterned utterances in the phatic use of English, including even the filling-in question *How now?*, are charged with emotion in Shakespeare's plays and reflect the tension of the respective contexts. They are therefore semantically, stylistically and artistically integrated in the plays. But the point is that address belongs to the patterned modes of expression. To explain how this comes to be, address as a form of the phatic use of language has to be defined.

Address represents the use of nouns, pronouns, substantivised adjectives and their equivalents to name the subjects and objects to whom speech is directed (cf.: Akhmanova 1966: 276). In the conception of Bühler, Jakobson and Akhmanova, the speech event integrates the conative function or the orientation towards the addressee (Bühler 1934: 28-32; Jakobson 1960: 355-357; Akhmanova et. al. 1966: 167). Since Jakobson considered that the purest expression of the conative function is the vocative and the imperative (1960: 355), address becomes a relevant verbal factor here. But the validity of the conative function has been argued by Halliday (1976: 27), who found that the difference between the conative and the expressive functions is merely psychological. At least the difference between the two functions is not reflected in language system. Halliday found the warranted presence of only one function in the language system, vs. the interpersonal function.

Taking up this argument in the sphere of uses of language rather than the functions of language, it would mean considering the credibility of the expressive and the conative uses of language vs. the phatic use of language. The use of language forms the empirical foundation of functions of language, and all the three uses of language mentioned above would be integrated into the interpersonal function of language. The author of the present paper tends to accept Halliday's view of only the psychological difference between the expressive and the conative uses of language, and the two being one. The issuing use of language would be the emotive use of language. But the emotive use of language cannot integrate address as its form because the purport of the emotive use of language is the expression of attitudes, relations, feelings and emotions to the object of speech and to the listener. Address as a form of reference to the second person (subject or object) is very much in line with the purport of the phatic use of language, the goal of which is the maintenance of verbal contact. Since, by its function, address names the second person and arrests his attention, address approximates the goal of the phatic use of language. There can be no other unit which could establish verbal contact better than address. Provided the grounds of the exclusion of the conative use of language have been credible, the identification of address as a form of the phatic use of language would hopefully be acceptable. Thus address will be considered in this paper as one of the forms of the phatic use of language, rendering all the effectiveness of contact establishment and maintenance in speech.

The phatic use of language is inherent in the process of communication and in English speech. The study of address in Shakespeare's plays as of a form of the phatic use of language is not supposed to put forward the communicative theory of art. Art performs the aesthetic function. The idea of the present study is to verify how integrated the phatic use of language is in drama, how effectively the function of contact establishment and maintenance is performed by address and in what various ways Shakespeare exploits forms of address for communicative and aesthetic purposes.

The present paper thus focuses on the sense and role of address in Shakespeare's plays and intends to reveal the meaning and expressiveness of certain forms of address in turn taking and at the change of the scenes. The point of interest will be the social roles of the characters, the norms of verbal etiquette and the exploitation of the expressive potential of the various forms of address. Although the illustrations below will not cover the total material studied, it must be pointed out that the investigated background texts included two tragedies (*Macbeth* and *King Lear*), two historical dramas (*King John* and *King Henry VIII*), the romance *The Tempest*, and the comedy *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

This selection of the plays was meant to cover all genres rather than specifically tragedies or comedies. It was also hoped that peculiarities of address as social deixis and as a form of politeness may be better revealed if it is analysed both in tragedies and comedies without the exclusion of historical dramas and romances.

Drawing on modern linguistic theories, one cannot overlook that pragmatics may have a bearing on the study of address. Among the various aspects and directions in pragmatics, the phenomenon of politeness deserves attention in this respect. Irrespective of its specific aspects, "'politeness' has become a cover term in pragmatics for whatever choices are made in language use in relation to the need to preserve people's face in general, i.e. their public self-image" (Verschueren 1999: 45). The term "face" appeared in sociolinguistics to account for the relative status of the participants and for their use of language as they encode their assumptions about the presentation of their image of themselves and of the differences in their status (Scollon – Scollon 1995: 35). The use of forms of address is one of the primary indeces of the self-image of the participants and of their relative status.

Politeness may be an abstract quality implied in the person's use of language, dissociated from the particular circumstances of the use of language (Mey 1994: 68). More specifically, politeness means differentiated attitudes expressed in speech, which depend on the social position of the speakers and on specific cases of usage (cf. Mey 1994: 68). The latter approach is considered by Jacob Mey to be more accurate than the concept of politeness in the abstract.

Virtually all authors who considered politeness in their studies in the field of pragmatics identified positive and negative politeness. Different authors, however, resorted to different notions in their explanation of these concepts. Considering politeness with reference to Geoffrey Leech, Jacob Mey, for instance, found that "to maximize the politeness of polite illocutions" was a case of positive politeness, while "to minimize the effects of impolite statements" was a case of negative politeness (Mey 1994: 69). Ron and Suzanne Scollon considered the phenomena of involvement and independence and identified them as positive and negative politeness (Scollon – Scollon 1995: 37). Thus, involvement was considered to be a discourse strategy which indicates attention to others, interest in their affairs, shared points of view and other mutual relations. The use of first names was mentioned as an index of involvement which identifies with positive politeness in terms of other authors. Independence, on the other hand, was considered to be such a discourse strategy which indicates only minimal assumptions about the interests of others and no compelling sense in speech. The use of formal names and titles was treated as a primary index of independence which identifies with negative politeness (Scollon – Scollon 1995: 37).

The definition of positive and negative politeness by the Scollons has a direct bearing on the use of titles and forms of address, which are most relevant in the present paper. These authors were also quite explicit on the constituent aspects of politeness, especially when the regularity of relationship indicated the existence of politeness system. As these aspects of politeness have a bearing on the use of address in English, they will be briefly explained below. Thus Scollon and Scollon introduce the presence or absence of power indicated in human relations because of the difference in social position. The equivalence in rank or social position removes the power factor from a politeness system, while a difference in social positions and relations preserves the power factor (Scollon – Scollon 1995: 42). The same authors also consider the factor of distance in politeness systems. Distance as a factor affecting politeness is typical of hierarchical social relations and of high positioned persons, but is not pronounced in egalitarian and close relationships. There is one more factor which affects positive or negative politeness and that is the weight of imposition. The weight of imposition is usually determined by some exterior circumstances and is directly proportionate to the two categories of politeness: if the weight of imposition increases, negative politeness or independence strategies become active; if the weight of imposition decreases, positive politeness or involvement strategies come to the fore (Scollon – Scollon 1995: 43).

On the basis of how the presence or absence of power and distance affect politeness in communication, the Scollons define three politeness systems (Scollon – Scollon 1995: 44-46): 1) deference, in which the power factor is removed, and the people involved behave as equals but distance is observed in their relations and so their behaviour is marked by correctness; 2) solidarity, in which both the power and distance factors are removed and the people involved treat one another as equals, while the absence of distance marks involvement in their relationship and the absence of the formal signs of correctness; and 3) hierarchy, in which the power factor is preserved, but the distance factor may alternate, and the people involved acknowledge one another's difference in status; the tone of their speech depends on their social status and is usually individual in each particular case. It is obvious that the relationships as described with respect to politeness are likely to be distinctly reflected in the use of forms of address and will be taken into consideration in the analysis of the significance of Shakespeare's use of address further.

Most linguistic studies of Shakespeare's plays require the background knowledge of the state of the English language in Shakespeare's time (cf. Quirk 1974: 47). The general state of the language would be irrelevant in the present study, but the practice of the phatic use of English and the norm of the use of address have to be accounted for. The spread of the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's time is confirmed by the European tradition to use language for socialising purposes. Judging by *The Book of the Courtier* (Castiglione 1975), which served a model of behaviour for the Elizabethan gentleman (cf. Partridge 1968:

33), a developed use of language for socialising purposes existed at Shakespeare's time and it was considerably refined by the nobility.[3]

Considering the norm of address for Shakespeare's time, Shakespeare's plays themselves are the best source which confirms it. The norm encompasses the right ways of using forms of address, which include titles, against the wrong ways of their use. The right way of such usage generally comes about "by use extending over a long period among the title-holders themselves or those allied to them" (*Titles and Forms of Address*: v). Since Shakespeare's use of the forms of address has a system, it is very likely that Shakespeare reflected the existing system, which the royal court and the aristocratic society of his time had, rather than invented it. Moreover, it is known that Shakespeare's usage reflected the status of spoken English of the sixteenth century (Wyld 1936: 101). Thus, it may be assumed with full confidence that the system of the forms of address employed by Shakespeare reflected the usage of his day. Therefore the literal functioning of the forms of address in Shakespeare's plays belongs to his time, whereas deviations from the norm as usage in the transferred sense belong to the playwright's art and have to be appreciated in the context of the plays.

Although the major historical dictionaries refer to Shakespeare for the use of the forms of address, the author of the present paper will use the dictionary data as that coming from an established source. It would be *idem per idem* to use Shakespeare's plays both as a source of the material and a source of the norm. Moreover, the dictionary (*CEOED*) supplies the general information on the usage of Shakespeare's time rather than merely generalising on Shakespeare's usage.

Since spoken language presumes the presence of immediate contact and since drama follows the process of spoken language, it is natural to expect the functioning of address in the contexts in which the phatic use of language has an application, i.e. at the beginning and the end of the scenes.[4] Thus indeed address is employed in Shakespeare's plays, but these contexts do not exhaust its currency. Address is recurrent in continuous conversation in the plays, too. This allows one to believe that address not only names the person to whom speech is addressed but also compels him to speech, which is the true role of the phatic use of language.

[3] It must be remembered that the socialising use of language, which is called the phatic use of English in the present paper, was basically the pastime of the nobility (cf. Ross – McLaughlin 1983: 118-119), and this is also reflected in Shakespeare's plays: the phatic use of English is socially marked by Shakespeare, because it is only the personages who are representatives of the aristocracy that indulge in this use of English. The Queen, too, was known to appreciate social conversation: "... Queen who was not only a multi-lingual scholar and astute politician but a woman who relished the pleasures of life: hunting and hawking, music-making and dancing, theatrical performance and conversation" (The Age of Shakespeare, 12).

[4] The term *scenes* is used here and below to mean both acts and scenes in Shakespeare's plays. Such usage covers all the scenes marked by the author's remarks rather than by the formal division of his plays, which, by itself, was a disputed question (cf. Jones 1971: 66-68, 160). This approach also ensures the most exhaustive study of the text of the plays.

Before the forms of address used by Shakespeare are reviewed, it has to be noted that the present study focuses only on the forms of address which are directed to the second person or to an object and are marked off syntactically in the text (e.g., *Sir, My Lord, Mistress, Your highness, husband, wench*, etc.; *Gods, angels, heavenly bow, spirit, nymph, witch*, etc.). This excludes referential pronouns which do not function as forms of address proper but which are ample in Shakespeare's plays and have been studied with or without reference to Shakespeare (cf. Brown – Gilman 1960; Yang 1991). Moreover, pronouns which can serve the function of vocatives and that of reference "may be used very differently in address and reference ..., or only a sub-set of reference terms may be used in address" (Levinson 1995: 70). Further distinguishing calls, summonses and addresses as different vocatives, Levinson not only notes the syntactical marking off of addresses but also reasons that not all summons forms which are usually expressed by pronouns can be used as addresses (Levinson 1995: 71). The fact that perhaps all addresses can be used as summonses, as assumed by the same author, does not simplify the function of pronouns. By virtue of their specific function and special studies, pronouns as forms of address represent a problem in their own right. That is why, minding a limited volume of the present article, it is considered better to focus exceptionally on the syntactically marked off forms of address rather than include also pronouns and fail to analyse their use comprehensively.

Attempting to delineate differences among the three genre varieties (tragedy, historical drama and comedy) as much as it is reflected in the sense and significance of address in them, the distribution of forms of address expressing positive and negative politeness will be considered. As has been mentioned above, positive politeness means involvement, while negative politeness means independence. These aspects of interrelationship are very subtly expressed by address in Shakespeare's plays, e.g.,

Banquo (to Angus and Ross) ... *Cousins*, a word, I pray you (*Macb.*, I.3)
Lady Macbeth (to Macbeth) ... Why, *worthy thane*,
You do unbend your noble strength, to think
So brain-sickly of things. ... (*Macb.*, II.2)
King John (to Robert Falconbridge) ...
In sooth, *good friend*, your father might have kept
This calf, bred from his cow, from all the world; ... (*K. John*, I.1)
Bastard (to Elinor) Madam, by chance, but not by truth:
what thought? ... (*K. John*, I.1)

Julia (to Lucetta) But say, *Lucetta*, now we are alone,
Wouldst thou then counsel me to fall in love?
Lucetta Ay, *madam*; so you stumble not unheedfully. (*Two Gent.*, I.2)

As has been explained above, positive and negative politeness may arise from three systems of politeness – deference, solidarity and hierarchy, with the differentiated influence of distance, power and imposition. Positive and negative politeness as expressed by address in Shakespeare's plays involves all the three systems of politeness. In addition to this, address in Shakespeare's plays is used to render two more kinds of significance which seem to be outside the three politeness systems. The employment of forms of abuse with or without qualifying words as forms of address (e.g., *O slave; Filthy hags; thou lily-livered boy; liar and slave; abhorred tyrant; hellhound, thou bloodier villain than terms can give thee out; thou slave, thou wretch, thou coward; Thou little valiant, great in villany*, etc.) signify barely tolerable relations. In some scenes such forms of address terminate verbal contact. That is why it has been assumed reasonable to treat such forms of address as emphatic negative politeness. Emphatic negative politeness may also be expressed by positive address, as, for instance, when the First Murderer calls Macbeth *most royal sir.* Such a form of address, however, does not extend the concept of emphatic negative politeness, if only by commitment to verbal contact.

There is one more type of address in Shakespeare's plays which falls out of the above mentioned systems of politeness. It is the rhetorical address or address to the supernatural objects and subjects, and inanimate things. Distance and power are inadequate to describe relations in case of rhetorical address. Since these forms of address have no bearing on human relations and since the sense of such forms of address is essentially contextual, they were identified by the classical term "apostrophe" in Shakespeare's plays, without further specification of relations implied.

The distribution of positive and negative politeness as expressed by address throughout the text of the plays analysed seems to have a bearing on the development of the dramatic conflict. Minding a possible error in calculations in the manual analysis of the functioning of address in Shakespeare's plays, *Macbeth* has been found to include 215 syntactically marked off forms of address. The distribution of positive and negative politeness as expressed by address is more or less regular throughout the play, with no more than three forms of address in succession expressing positive politeness followed by as many or fewer forms of address expressing negative politeness. However, such regularity becomes upset in the middle of the tragedy. Beginning with item 81 of address through item 95 (Act III.1-2) only negative politeness is expressed by the use of address in *Macbeth*, e.g., *my lord* from Banquo, Lady Macbeth and the Murderers to Macbeth; *my liege* from the Murderers to Macbeth; *madam* from a Servant to

Lady Macbeth; *sir* from Macbeth to Banquo, and *sirrah* from Macbeth to a Servant. Then follow three items of Macbeth's endearments in address to Lady Macbeth, one instance of apostrophe when Macbeth addresses *seeling night*, and an instance of positive politeness in address between Banquo and Fleance, which are followed by eleven more items of address expressing negative politeness, e.g., *my lord* and *royal sir* from the Murderers to Macbeth, *sir* and *my good lord* from the noblemen to Macbeth, and *sir* from Lady Macbeth to Macbeth. Otherwise standard, these forms of address stand out in this part of the tragedy because they are used among close people and even family relations. This is the stage in the tragedy when Macbeth communicates with the Murderers and executes Banquo's murder, when Lady Macbeth's deference towards Macbeth is pronounced in solitude and in the presence of the Lords, and when the noblemen also observe deferential relations addressing Macbeth *sir* or *my good lord*. Reacting to Macbeth's ravings at the table, even Ross uses the formal address *Gentlemen* to the noblemen themselves.

The atmosphere in these scenes marked by terror, lack of trust and threat of death is strengthened by the accompanying sense of negative politeness expressed by address. Address in these scenes not only expresses independence but also the weakness and vulnerability of man when he stands alone because he cannot trust or because he violates trust. These are the climactic scenes in the tragedy when the noblemen suffer in solitude fearing the hand accursed. The significance of negative politeness rendered by address in Scenes 1-2 of Act III adds much to the background social sense of isolation.

The distribution of positive and negative politeness is slightly different in *King John*. Like in *Macbeth*, in this drama the scenes in which forms of address creating positive and negative politeness interchange regularly are of less significance. There are, however, scenes in which negative politeness dominates and these scenes include up to eleven or more items of address in succession rendering negative politeness.

The first passage of prolonged negative politeness expressed by address appears in the scene of King John's encounter with Robert Falconbridge and Philip, his bastard brother (Act I.1), e.g., *mighty king* from Bastard to King John, *my ... liege* from the Bastard and Robert Falconbridge to King John, *sir* from the Bastard to Robert Falconbridge, *rude man* and *sirrah* from Elinor and King John to the Bastard, *madam* from the Bastard to Elinor and *sirrah* from King John to Robert Falcombridge. Negative politeness expressed by the standard but distancing forms of address among relations conveys the confusion of the King and his mother Elinor in this scene and their reserved attitude to the bluntly spoken Bastard Philip Falconbridge.

A second brief interlude of negative politeness expressed by address pertains to the scene in which Constance and Elinor argue over who the right heir to the

English throne is (Act II.1). It is not only negative politeness, it is also emphatic negative politeness that mark this scene, e.g., *thou monstrous slanderer* and *thou unadvised scold* from Elinor to Constance, *thou monstrous injurer* from Constance to Elinor, *Bedlam* from King John to both the ladies, and *lady* from King Philip to Constance. The exchange of the emphatically negative forms of address conveys the sense of independence between the arguing parties – women of the royal families of England and France. The Kings' address, though standard but disapproving, marks coldness in this scene.

Another scene in *King John* in which over ten items of address in succession interspersed with a few items of apostrophe convey negative politeness appear in Act III.1, in which Constance raves over the rights of her son Arthur. Constance keeps insulting the Archduke of Austria with resort to a series of abusive address conveying emphatic negative politeness, e.g., *thou slave, thou wretch, thou coward, thou little valiant..., thou Fortune's champion that dost never fight, thou cold blooded slave* from Constance to the Archduke of Austria, *Lady* and *Lady Constance* from King Philip and the Archduke of Austria to Constance, *villain* from the Archduke of Austria to the Bastard, *King John* from Pandulph to King John and *cardinal* from King John to Pandulph. Prolonged negative politeness as conveyed by address in this scene again implies the royal personages at variance over their influence. Another stretch of prolonged negative politeness follows soon in this same scene and in it the Pope's legate and the ladies argue over their right to challenge England (Act. III.1). This scene continues the previous one and the implication of address rendering negative politeness are the challenged powers among the royal personages. Negative politeness thus builds up the dramatic conflict.

The last major stretch of negative politeness expressed by address in the drama *King John* follows the scene of Arthur's death (Act IV.3). In this scene, grief stricken Lords challenge Hubert and accuse him of Arthur's death. The scene is marked by tension and mistrust and the closeness among the Lords is gone, e.g., *distemper'd lords* from the Bastard to the Lords, *Sir* and *Falconbridge* from Pembroke and Salisbury to the Bastard, *Sir* from the Bastard to Salisbury, *Lord* and *Lord Salisbury* from Hubert to Salisbury, *lords* from Hubert to the Lords, and *thou hateful villain* and *dunghill* from Salisbury and Bigot to Hubert. Negative politeness as expressed by address here implies the Lords' composure, anger and individual responsibility, their shock at the Prince's death and wrath, and the forms of address are most of them exceptional and low. Some of them convey emphatic negative politeness.

Although in standard usage forms of address among the nobility and the royal personages exclude the connotations of closeness and familiarity, these forms of address allow sufficient variations to imply friendliness and even affection. As has been mentioned in the preceding analysis, prolonged stretches of

negative politeness expressed by address marked the scenes in which relations among the nobility and the royal personages were wrought with tension because of danger, mistrust, dissatisfaction or grief. The relations as implied by address make part of the dramatic conflict in the plays. Although no prolonged negative politeness has been traced among the personages of lower ranks in the plays analysed, the observations mentioned concerning negative politeness imply its similar exploitation in the tragedy *Macbeth* and in the historical drama *King John*.

Before considering the significance of address in the comedy *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, attention might be drawn to the fact that the number of the syntactically marked off forms of address is almost the same in *King John* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (295 and 301 items, respectively). This may mean that address was so fixed and integrated in conversation in Shakespeare's time that its application in longer texts amounted to almost identical frequency. So much, then, for the quantitative similarity in the employment of address in Shakespeare's plays. Qualitatively, however, the use and distribution of address in the plays analysed are quite different. First, the variety of the forms of address is scarcer in the comedy. Address is mostly limited to the standard forms of *Sir* with or without a name, the first name with or without a qualifying word, *madam, lord, servant* with or without a qualifying word, *man, sirrah* and a few less frequent forms of direct and indirect address. All of these forms of address are used in accord with the norm, except for a few cases of *sir* from Proteus to Speed and the emphatic regulating employment of the first name *Thurio* by the end of the play.

Second, the distribution of positive and negative politeness as expressed by address is different in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Since the employment of different forms of address is standard in virtually all the cases, positive and negative politeness depend on the social position of the character. The play is so harmoniously structured that forms of address expressing positive and negative politeness interchange quite regularly. There are a few scenes with longer stretches of negative politeness expressed by seven to fourteen items of address in succession. These scenes would be the disguised Julia and Silvia's conversation in Act IV.4, at one extreme, and Valentine, Thurio and Silvia's conversation in Act II.4, at the other. The concentration of about ten items of address expressing negative politeness in these scenes has no dramatic significance. It merely means that characters of superior social position are addressed or imply deference themselves more frequently.

Third, the employment of address expressing emphatic negative politeness like the employment of apostrophe are much scarcer in the comedy than in the dramas. Generalising it might be said that the standard employment of address with limited significance is typical of the comedy because this genre does not

require profound emotive accents and striking contrasts. In the tragedy and drama, however, forms of address are more various and their agreement or disagreement with the social status of the character is pronounced as the dramatic conflict requires.

It remains to note that Shakespeare's expressive use of address has been neglected in this analysis. To focus on the expressive use of address, its taxonomic inventory will be given. This taxonomic inventory of the forms of address has been derived from a hand-made catalogue of all the syntactically marked off items of address in contexts from the six plays analysed. The total of the cards in the catalogue was about 2,000. The analysed plays by Shakespeare mentioned above contain standard or otherwise fixed forms of address, which fall into models of eighteen kinds. They may be represented in the following inventory:

a) *sir* with and without the name, with or without a qualifying word;
b) *lady(-ies)* with or without a qualifying word;
c) *(my) lord(s)* with or without a qualifying word;
d) *gentleman (men)* with or without a qualifying word;
e) *madam;*
f) *mistress;*
g) name or surname;
h) common names denoting people (*man, woman, boy, girl, people*, etc.);
i) names of family relations (*father, son, daughter, husband, brother, sister,* etc.);
j) names of positions or professions applied to people (*friend, boatswain,* etc.) with or without a qualifying word;
k) concrete and abstract nouns denoting supernatural creatures (*God, angels, H/heavens, monster, spirit, witch, nymph*, etc.);
l) abstract nouns figuratively denoting people (*beauty, love*, etc.) with or without a qualifying word;
m) names of personified phenomena and things (apostrophe) (*good wind, heavenly bow, hateful hands, thou senseless form, shadow*, etc.);
n) *King, sovereign* with or without a qualifying word;
o) forms of indirect address (*Your highness, Your lordship, Your grace, his majesty*, etc.);
p) titles (*Thane*, etc) with or without a qualifying word;
q) endearments (*my dear one, dear heart, my diligence, dearest chuck, poor bird*, etc);
r) names of abuse (*slave, dog, cat, thou fool, monkey, villain, rascal, kite, tyrant*, etc.) with or without a qualifying word.

The form of address *sir* has the widest currency in Shakespeare's plays. According to *CEOED*, *sir* was used with reference to a person of noble birth, a knight or a baronet, and was placed before the Christian name, rarely before the surname. Used as a single unit of address, it was a respectful form of address to a superior, and, later, to an equal. Otherwise, this form of address retained most general social connotations. As the dictionary notes, the use of *sir* in the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries was socially marked and expressed respect. Out of the modern senses of the form of address *S/sir* (used with respect to a nobleman, to the head of a firm whose name is not known, to a school master, to a firm (pl.), and to a father), only the first and the last may be treated as historical conventional uses. In most of the contexts of Shakespeare's plays, the form of address *sir* is, indeed, used to noblemen and to fathers, as well as to masters, e.g.,

(1) *Ferdinand* (to Alonso) *Sir*, she's mortal (*Temp.*, V.1).
(2) *Gonzalo* (to Adrian) This Tunis, *sir*, was Carthage (*Temp.*, II.1).
(3) *Prospero* (to Ferdinand) Soft, *sir*, one word more (*Temp.*, I.2).
(4) *Miranda* (to Prospero) Your tale, *sir*, would cure deafness (*Temp.*, I.2).
(5) *Lennox* (to Cathness) For certain, *sir*, he is not (*Macb.*, V.2).
(6) *Banquo* (to Macbeth) What, *sir*, not yet at rest (*Macb.*, II.1).
(7) *Porter* (to Macduff) Faith, *sir*, we were carousing till the second cock ... (*Macb.*, II.3).
(8) *Kent* (to Cornwall) *Sir*, I ma too old to learn. Call not your stocks for me ... (*Lear*, II.2).
(9) *Pandulph* (to Louis) Oh, *sir*, when he shall hear of your approach ... (*K. John*, III.4).
(10) *Cranmer* (to King Henry) Let me speak, *sir*, for heaven now bids me ... (*Hen. VIII*, V.4).
(11) *Speed* (to Valentine) *Sir*, I know that well enough (*Two Gent.*, II.1).
(12) *Launce* (to Valentine) *Sir*, there's a proclamation that you are vanish'd (*Two Gent.*, III.1).

As is evident from the examples, the form of address *sir* has no syntactically fixed position and claims attention emphatically when is used initially. It is used in symmetrical relations: among the noblemen, members of the royal or noble family, among the clergy and other persons of high rank. It is also used in asymmetrical relations, especially from the inferior to the superior: from a servant to the king or a baronet, etc. *Sir* is a very handy form of address merely to signal courtesy. It is frequent throughout the scenes and rarer at their beginning and the end. *Sir* is too an inconspicuous form of address to give an accent in scene change.

There is also the form of address *sirrah* which is used in addressing the inferior or people treated as the inferior. It replaces *sir* and often connotes contempt. For example:

(13) *Kent* (to Edgar) *Sirrah*, come on; go along with us (*Lear*, III.4).
(14) *Cornwall*(to Kent) Peace, *sirrah*! ... (*Lear*, II.2).
(15) *Proteus* (to Launce) *Sirrah*, I say, forbear... (*Two Gent.*, III.1).

Except for the described use of *sirrah,* the above presented use of *sir* constitutes the norm for Shakespeare's time. Observing the described social relations, *sir* expresses respect and is a handy unit to ensure verbal contact. As the examples above confirm again, this form of address is very flexible syntactically and very handy because of its brevity.

The observation of the social relations which constitute the norm for the use of *sir* also preserves the potential meaning of this form of address intact. When the described social relations are violated at least by one point, *sir* as a form of address can express irony. This is exploited by Shakespeare in dramatic contexts, e.g.,

(16) *Macbeth* ...
Enter a Messenger.
Thou com'st to use thy tongue: thy story quickly!
Messenger
Gracious my lord,
I should report that which I say I saw,
But know not how to do't.
Macbeth
Well, say, *sir.* (*Macb.*, V.5).

In this context in which Macbeth is furious dreading his end, he is shown by Shakespeare to retain enough consciousness to address the servant ironically on the question of fate which he expects will not befall him. The irony from the cornered Macbeth is dramatically impressive, and Shakespeare achieves it merely by reversing the social relations which determine the neutral use of *sir.*

The use of *Sir* with the proper name represents a similar standard. This usage applies to noblemen when a certain degree of familiarity is permitted, e.g.,

(17) *Chamberlain* (to Sir Thomas Lovell)
Sir Thomas,
Whither were you a-going? (*Hen. VIII*, I.3)
(18) *Buckingham* (to Sir Nicholas Vaux)
Nay, *Sir Nicholas*,
Let it alone; my state now will but mock me ... (*Hen.* VIII, II.1)
(19) *Thurio* (to Proteus) *Sir Proteus*, what says Silvia to my suit? (*Two Gent.*, V.2)
(20) *Thurio* (to Valentine) *Sir Valentine*, I care not for her... (*Two Gent.,* V.4)

As the examples indicate, *Sir* with the proper name is used in symmetrical high status relations. Preserving the same relations, more formality is achieved with the addition of the family name. Shakespeare uses this standard, too, to reflect the relations realistically, e.g.,

(21) *Buckingham Sir Thomas Lovell*, I as free forgive you
As I would be forgiven: I forgive all... (*Hen. VIII*, II.1)

So far the use of *Sir* with a name was illustrated by examples confirming the norm. They were also illustrative of how Shakespeare exploits the norm to reflect the realistic correctness of relations among the noblemen. Keeping merely to the standard, Shakespeare manages to express the subtle attitude of the noble persons. One can consider, for example, Scene 1 from Act II in *The Tempest.* Here address is rare but only standard, with the direct *you* functioning among the lords. As has been illustrated, the dramatically significant use of *sir* was also achieved without any additional means, just by exploiting the potential meaning of this form of address.

Shakespeare achieves new colouring by adding qualifying words to this minute form of address *sir.* The simplest emphasis of meaning in this case is achieved by using positive qualifying words with *sir*, e.g,

(22) *Albany, Cornwall* (to Lear) *Dear sir*, forbear! (*Lear, I.1)*
(23) *Burgundy* (to Lear) Pardon me, *royal sir*,
Election makes not up on such conditions. (*Lear*, I.1)
(24) *Chamberlain* (to Sir Thomas Lovell)
... My barge stays;
Your lordship shall along. – Come, *good Sir Thomas*,
We shall be late else ... (*Hen. VIII*, I.3)
(25) *Silvia* Good morrow, *kind Sir Eglamour.* (*Two Gent.,* IV.3)
(26) *Julia* (to Valentine) O *good sir*, my master charged me
To deliver a ring to Madam Silvia,
Which, out of my neglect, was never done. (*Two Gent.,* V.4)

As may be expected the positive qualifying words add gentleness to the otherwise simple form of address *sir.* Such words can also add emphasis and weight as in *royal sir* from Burgundy to King Lear. But Shakespeare is especially skilled in the expression of gentleness in human relations by the means of the positive qualifiers. One has only to consider scenes with Prospero, Miranda and Ferdinand in *The Tempest* or Scenes 2 and 3 from Act IV in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona.* But the tenderness of relations thus expressed does not exhaust Shakespeare's art in his use of the simplest form of address *sir.* One invariably remembers the famous lines from *Macbeth* in the morning following Duncan's murder:

(27) *Lennox* (to Macbeth)
Good morrow, *noble sir.*
Macbeth
Good morrow both. (*Macb.,* II.3)

A single positive qualifier to the tiny form of address *sir* results in dramatic irony in this scene because the reader/spectator's knowledge of Macbeth's crime clashes with the meaning of honour and perfect qualities expressed by the adjective *noble.*

It is very relevant to point out the similar connotations expressed by the positive qualifier added to the form of address *lady. Lady* as a form of address in Shakespeare's time had a similar standard like *sir.* It was a title to a woman of rank and position as well as a form of address to a beloved. Shakespeare uses the form of address *lady* as a title to a woman of rank and as a form of address to a beloved, e.g.,

(28) *Cornwall* (to Regan) I have received a hurt.
Follow me, *lady.* (*Lear,* III.7)
(29) *Bastard* (to Lady Falconbridge) ...
Who lives and dares but say, thou didst not well
When I was got, I'll send his soul to hell.
Come, *lady,* I will show thee to my kin; ... (*K. John,* I.1)
(30) *Chamberlain* (to Anne Bullen) *Lady,*
I shall not fail to approve the fair conceit
The king hath of you. (*Hen. VIII,* II.3)
(31) *Proteus* (to Silvia)
One, *lady,* if you knew his pure heart's truth. (*Two Gent.,* IV.2)
(32) *Valentine* (to Silvia)
Why, *lady,* love hath twenty pair of eyes (*Two Gent.,* II.4)

Shakespeare makes this form of address ironic with a slight shift of emphasis on the closeness of social relations, e.g.,

(33) *Regan* (to Goneril) *Lady,* I am not well, else I should answer
From a full-flowing stomach. ... (*Lear,* V.3)

Shakespeare also exploited the meaning of the noble form of address *lady* with qualifiers. One has only to compare the meaning of *gentle lady* in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and in *Macbeth* after Duncan's murder:

(34) *Proteus* (to Silvia)
Sir Proteus, *gentle lady,* and your servant. (*Two Gent.,* IV.2)
(35) *Macduff* (to Lady Macbeth)
O *gentle lady,*
'Tis not for you to hear what I can speak. (*Macb.,* II.3)

What becomes Silvia seeing Proteus at her window out of the form of address *gentle lady* is hideously distorted in the meaning *gentle lady* addressed to Lady Macbeth who had just urged her husband to kill King Duncan and herself assisted the crime. Shakespeare again juxtaposes the sweetness of the meaning of the adjective and the savagery of the character to gain dramatic irony by the use of the otherwise shortest form of address.

According to the *CEOED, Lord* was formerly prefixed to a title of nobility. As a prefixed title, it formed part of a person's customary appellation. The dictionary also notes that "in early use the prefixed title had most commonly the form *my Lord*" (*CEOED* 1: 1664). It was formerly the ordinary prefix used in speaking to or of a nobleman. It is exactly this application that is most widely used by Shakespeare in address to the noblemen from the peers, ladies and the inferiors, e.g.,

(36) *Banquo* (to Macbeth)
Ay, *my lord*; our time does call upon's. (*Macb.*, III.1)
(37) *Seyton* (to Macbeth)
All is confirmed, *my lord*, what was reported. (*Macb.*, V.3)
(38) *Kent* (to Lear) *My lord*, when at their home
I did commend your Highness' letters to them ... (*Lear,* II.4)
(39) *Goneril* (to Gloucester)
My lord, entreat him by no means to stay. (*Lear,* II.4)
(40) *Louis* (to King Philip) I do, *my lord*, and in her eye I find
A wonder, or a wondrous miracle ... (*K. John*, II.1)
(41) *Antonio* (to Alonso) We two, *my lord*,
Will guard your person ... (*Temp.,* II.1)
(42) *Proteus* (to the Duke)
A little time, *my lord*, will kill that grief. (*Two Gent.,* III.2)
(43) *Cranmer* (to Gardiner) ... I see your end, –
'Tis my undoing: love and meekness, *lord*,
Become a churchman better than ambition... (*Hen. VIII*, V.2)
(44) *King Henry* (to Wolsey and the noblemen)
'Tis nobly spoken;
Take notice, *lords*, he has a loyal breast ... (*Hen. VIII*, III.2)
(45) *Queen Katherine* (to Wolsey) *My lord, my lord,*
I am a simple woman, much too weak
To oppose your cunning. ... (*Hen. VIII*, II.4)

As is evident from the examples, *Lord* is a more emphatic form of address than *sir,* although it had similar applications. Because of its emphatic force, *my lord* as a form of address in Shakespeare's plays appears basically at the beginning of the utterance both in turn taking and in continuous speech. With respect to its connotations, *lord* or *my lord* may be quite neutral, especially when this is

in accord with moderate tension in the dramatic conflict (cf. 38, 40, 42, 43 and 44). But as the last example illustrates (45), Shakespeare made use of the reiterated *my lord* for emphasis. The emphatic and the dramatic force of *my lord* in single and repeated utterances is especially obvious in those scenes of *Macbeth*, in which Macbeth is haunted by the Ghost of Banquo. The syntactically pointed or reiterated *my lord* from the noblemen and Lady Macbeth sounds dramatic because of its respectful literal meaning and its incongruity with the person of the murderer king.

Like with the other forms of address, Shakespeare exploits the possibility of using qualifying words with the form of address *my lord* to increase its expressiveness. Thus enriched, this form of address conveys dramatic irony in *Macbeth*, seriousness or playfulness and other connotations in other plays. For example:

(46) *Banquo* (to Macbeth)
Ay, *my good lord.* (*Macb.*, III.1)
(47) *Lennox* (to Macbeth)
Here, *my good lord.* What
is't that moves your highness? (*Macb.*, III.4)
(48) *Prospero* (to Gonzalo) *Honest lord,*
Thou hast said well; for some of you there present
Are worse than devils. (*Temp.*, III.3)
(49) *Miranda* (to Ferdinand)
Sweet lord, you play me false (*Temp.*, V.1)
(50) *Proteus* (to the Duke)
Know, *noble lord*, they have devised a mean ... (*Two Gent.*, III.1)

The form of address *my good lord* is fairly frequent in Shakespeare's plays and expresses tenderness and even attachment. But Shakespeare's extension of the form of address *(my) lord* again reaches the heights of dramatic irony especially when a positive adjective is used in contrasting circumstances. Thus, the adjective *worthy* used with *lord* and addressed to an honest nobleman is only emphatic, while the same collocation used in address to Macbeth, the murderer, carries about it the weight of irony and even cynical connotations when it comes from Lady Macbeth herself, e.g.,

(51) *Valentine* (to the Duke)
These banish'd men, that I have kept withal,
Are men endued with worthy qualities;
...
They are reform'd, civil, full of good,
And fit for great employment, *worthy lord.* (*Two Gent.*, V.4)

(52) *Lady* (to Macbeth) *My worthy lord,*
Your noble friends do lack you. (*Macb.*, III.4)

To continue with the related forms of address. In the *CEOED*, *madam* is defined as a form of respectful and polite address to a lady of high rank when the name is not used. It was originally used by servants in speaking to their mistress and by people generally in speaking to a lady of high rank. In his use of this form of address in his plays, Shakespeare essentially complies with the above described norm of usage. But this form of address appears also among family members and royalty. In all these instances, such usage expresses respect and is courteous, e.g.,

(53) *Kent* (to Regan) Why, *madam*, if I were your father's dog,
You should not use me so. (*Lear*, II.2)
(54) *Bastard* (to Lady Falconbridge)
Now, by this light, were I to get again,
Madam, I would not wish a better father. (*K. John*, I.1)
(55) *Wolsey* (to Queen Katherine)
Madam, you wrong the king's love with these fears:
Your hopes and friends are infinite. (*Hen. VIII*, III.1)
(56) *Eglamour* (to Silvia)
Madam, I pity much your grievances ... (*Two Gent.*, IV.3)

It is only in *Macbeth* that the regular politeness expressed by the form of address *madam* sounds extremely undeserved. In ultimate utterances such address virtually connotes dramatic irony in *Macbeth*, e.g.,

(57) *Servant* (to Lady Macbeth)
Ay, *madam*, but returns again tonight. (*Macb.*, III.2)

Rarely used qualifying words with the form of address *madam*, as, for example, from the Cardinals to Queen Katherine in *King Henry VIII,* increase the emotive colouring of this form of address. Reiterated, this form of address expresses tension in accord with the atmosphere of the definite scenes in the plays.

The forms of address *gentlemen* and *mistress* are used by Shakespeare essentially in accord with the norm: the first is applied to men of gentle birth attached to the household of the sovereign or other person of high rank, while the second is used with respect to a sweetheart or lady-love. Names of family relations as forms of address are used in accord with the relations indicated and express attachment as well as tenderness. Depending on the atmosphere of the scene or overemphasis, they may express different emotive colouring. Except for the forms of indirect address and titles, which are courteous and formal, Shakespeare uses all other forms of address (see 46-52 above) with greater or less

emotive colouring. These latter forms of address are poetic and their metaphoric sense only adds to the atmosphere of the respective scenes through their emotive colouring. The use of apostrophe, i.e. the forms of address under 11-14 in the inventory as well as the names of abuse should also be noted for their emotive meaning. Emotive meaning of the forms of address in Shakespeare's plays can hardly be exhaustively described, still less in a short article like the present publication. But one form of address has been left out and deserves mentioning. It is the address by the name.

Address by the name is very peculiar in English because it is frequent and regular only among family members. English people are very restrained in starting to use the first name to strangers. Even today it may take months for the British to start communicating on first name terms. Therefore, the use of the plain name to a person in Shakespeare's plays is rich in connotations. When this takes p)lace among family members, it is regular, but for dramatic situations. The banished King Lear's address to his daughters is marked by pain, especially when combined with endearments or reiterated, e.g.,

(58) *Lear* (to Regan) ...
... *Beloved Regan*,
Thy sister's naught. *O Regan*, she hath tied
Sharp-toothed unkindness, like a vulture, here. ... (*Lear*, II.2)
(59) *Lear* (to the dying Cordelia)
...
I might have saved her; now she's gone for ever.
Cordelia, *Cordelia*, stay a little. Ha,
What is't thou say'st? Her voice was ever soft ... (*Lear*, V.3)

Shakespeare uses address by the first name among the noblemen to express loyalty, trust, and certain closeness, e.g.,

(60) *Ross* (to Macbeth)
The King hath happily received, *Macbeth*,
The news of thy success; ... (*Macb.*, I.3)
(61) *King John* (to Chatillon)
Now, say, *Chatillon*, what would France with us? (*K. John*, I.1)
(62) *King John* (to Bastard)
Go, *Falconbridge*; now hast thou thy desire;
A landless knight makes thee a landed squire. (*K. John*, I.1)
(63) *King Henry* (to Sir Thomas Lovell) ...
Now, *Lovell*, from the queen what is the news? (*Hen. VIII*, V.1)
(64) *Wolsey* (to Cromwell) ...
Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition. (*Hen. VIII*, III.2)
(65) *Alonso* I say Amen, *Gonzalo*. (*Temp.*, V.1)

(66) *Proteus* (to Valentine) ...
If ever danger do environ thee,
Commend thy grievance to my holy prayers,
For I will be thy beadsman, *Valentine*. ... (*Two Gent.*, I.1)

Depending on the atmosphere of the scene, address by the first name used by Shakespeare may acquire connotations of coldness and detachment together with the abruptness of the tone and threat. Shakespeare exploits syntax for that not a bit, e.g.,

(67) *Macbeth*
... *A bell rings.*
I go and it is done; the bell invites me.
Hear it not, *Duncan*, for it is a knell
That summons thee to heaven or to hell. (*Macb.*, II.1)

Address by the first name with qualifiers is given by Shakespeare most various, usually positive connotations. But in the scenes of great tension, address by the name is reiterated and expresses danger, alarm, urge, and other respective overtones, e.g.,

(68) *Macduff* ...
O Banquo, *Banquo*!
Our royal master's murdered. (*Macb.*, II.3)
(69) *First Apparition.*
Macbeth, *Macbeth*, *Macbeth*, beware Macduff!
Beware the Thane of Fife! Dismiss me. Enough. (*Macb.*, IV.1)

Because of reserve as the ethnic reason mentioned above, address by the first name sounds very vigorous in manly conversation in Shakespeare's plays. It is less powerful in the scenes of family members, but it carries about it freshness and flexibility so as to reflect the overtones of the dramatic conflict in the respective scenes.

The limited volume of the present paper does not permit to complete the review and illustration of all the forms of address given in the inventory above. Generalising on the use of the remaining forms of address in the analysed plays by Shakespeare, it might be said that address by the common names denoting people, by the names of family relations and the names of positions or professions imply as a rule unceremoniousness and the closeness of relations, especially that the latter group of names are used from the superior to the inferior. When used among the equals, they appear within the solidarity politeness system and imply friendliness. This is especially obvious in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. The use of concrete and abstract nouns denoting supernatural creatures, of abstract nouns figuratively denoting people, as well as the use of apostrophe and

endearments as forms of address are context bound and their implications are extremely individual. The analysis of endearments in the tragedy *Macbeth* alone would present a lengthy consideration of the hypocrisy of the treacherous. The use of the words *King* and *sovereign*, of indirect forms of address and titles have been, in fact, covered in considering positive and negative politeness above. This then exhausts this review of the use of the fixed forms of address in the analysed plays by Shakespeare.

The analysis of the use of the forms of address which had an established norm in Shakespeare's time allows a number of generalisations. First, the frequency of the various forms of address in Shakespeare's plays attracts attention. Concrete forms of address are used in initial meetings of the characters and at the beginning of the scenes, in contexts when the addressee changes during the speech of one character and throughout conversation in the plays to emphasise symmetrical and asymmetrical relations. The frequency of address in the above mentioned contexts and especially throughout the talk suggests that Shakespeare depicted courteous society in his plays, for whose members the establishment and maintenance of verbal contact mattered and who were careful to express explicitly their consciousness of the presence of the interlocutor to make their speech refined and concentrated.

The various forms of address variously employed expose Shakespeare's exploitation of seven kinds of resources to increase their expressiveness: 1) the form of address complying with the established norm; 2) the form of address violating the established standard of usage; 3) qualifying words to a form of address as a source of emotive meaning and irony when the qualifying words form an acute contrast with the circumstances; 4) the initial, obliging use of address as a means of courtesy and that of the fixing of attention; 5) the permanent use of address, emphasising symmetrical and asymmetrical relations, 6) the reiterated address for emphasis, and 7) the missing address, implying familiarity.

Second, the subtlety of Shakespeare's exploitation of the form of address is especially notable. Address is so subtle and gentle in the wooing scenes, for example, or gallant and manly in the communication of the nobility and gentlemen that Shakespeare impresses the reader as a composer who manages to make use of the most intricate nuances of meaning in the currency of this verbal unit. The frequent address which functions in accord with the norm (cf. 1-12; 17-21; 36-45; 53-57) is used by Shakespeare to represent the social context realistically. Hence the impression that society depicted by Shakespeare was especially correct and courteous in communication and explicitly preserved verbal contact.

Third, the exploitation of address in rendering positive and negative politeness preserves a double function of this unit of communication. On the one hand, positive and negative politeness in this issue saves the face of the characters when address complies with standard usage and creates the image of

coourteous society. On the other hand, flexible balance between positive and negative politeness as rendered by address, especially in discord with the standard, results in senses accompanying dramatic developments in the plays and has a bearing in the dramatic conflict. It is only in the comedy that a concentration of forms of address conveying negative politeness is limited only to the role of realistic social significance.

Fourth, deviations from the norm and supplemented forms of address are used by Shakespeare to preserve harmonious expression in creating tension and dramatic conflict. Shakespeare most skilfully makes use of the potential meaning of address in this case. The concept of potential meaning requires an explanation here. The form of address is a unit of verbal etiquette which is characterised by the fixed rules of usage but its content is flexible. The point is that the content of the form of address is virtually non-existent. The dictionaries, for example, define only the conditions of use of the form of address, i.e. from whom to whom a definite form of address is used. It is possible, however, to sum up the content of the form of address in terms of sociocultural and sociolinguistic concepts which, in fact, constitute the detailed conditions of its application. The form of address *sir*, e.g., may be said to have meant a nobleman, a knight or a baronet, a master and a father in the British society of Shakespeare's time. By virtue of this meaning, this form of address excluded people of inferior rank and servants. It also meant politeness and courtesy, was frequent in speech and had no fixed place in the syntax of the utterance. When all these components of meaning agree with the context of situation, the use of the form of address *sir* constitutes the norm and does not attract attention. A discrepancy between any one of these components of meaning with the constituents of the context of situation has the power to make the user lose the whole unit of address in face of the addressee. *Sir* thus disagreeing contextually stands out in speech to attract the attention of all the present. An error in a single component suffices to lose the whole unit because its content is an arithmetic sum of the socioculturally connected components of meaning. With a single component missing, the sum total of the meaning of the form of address becomes incomplete.

The meaning of the form of address *sir* as described is potential because it remains latent until the unit is correctly used, i.e. in accord with the constituents of the context of situation. An inaccuracy on a single point in the meaning of the form of address activates all other components to be observable and to attract the attention of the people present. Although the concept *potential meaning* is a modern concept, forms of address have always had this potential, and Shakespeare was well aware of it. He managed to make the regular forms of address to mean the radically opposite or suggest contempt and other emotions by the abuse of single components of meaning in a particular form of address (cf. the significance of the forms of address in the analysis of positive and negative po-

liteness and further illustrations, especially in 13, 14, 16 above). This is the first and the most subtle means Shakespeare employed to make the form of address as a conventional unit of meaning expressive in his plays. But this is a powerful and significant means, because it frees the playwright from the conventions of the language to overcome them and gain expressiveness.

Moreover, Shakespeare supplemented the standard forms of address with qualifying words and thus gained new expressiveness owing to poetic overtones of meaning. Shakespeare also manipulated with the increased frequency and omission of the forms of address to add tension or familiarity to the dramatic dialogue. The material adduced above and the mechanism of Shakespeare's exploitation of the potential meaning of address confirm Shakespeare to have been a master both of conventional and poetic as well as dramatic uses of address. His achievement thus is in the realism of the dramatic dialogue and verbal contact maintenance with poetic overtones by means of the exploitation of the meaning of the conventional verbal unit through subtle manipulation with its potential meaning.

REFERENCES

Akhmanova, Olga Sergeevna
1966 *Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov.* [Dictionary of linguistic terms.] Moskva: Sovetskaya Encyclopedia.

Akhmanova, Olga Sergeevna et al.
1966 *O principiakh i metodakh lingvostilicheskogo issledovania.* [On the principles and methods of the study of stylistics.] Moskva: MGU.

Brown, Roger – Albert Gilman
1960 "The pronouns of power and solidarity", in: Thomas Sebeok (ed.), 253-276.

Bühler, Karl
1934 *Sprachtheorie.* Jena: Fischer.

Castiglione, Baldassare
1975 *The book of the courtier.* London: Dent.

CEOED
1971 *The compact edition of the Oxford English Dictionary.* 2 Vols. Glasgow: OUP.

Charney, Maurice
1961 *Shakespeare's Roman plays.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Doran, Madeleine
1976 *Shakespeare's dramatic language.* Madison, Wi.: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Drazdauskiene, Maria L.
1984 "The function of speech in the scenic composition of 'Macbeth'", *Literatura* (Vilnius) 26, 3: 22-29.
1986 "The phatic function in the scenic composition of 'Macbeth'", *Kalbotyra* (Vilnius) 36, 3: 29-39.
1992 *The phatic use of English: Meaning and style.* (Abstract of the second dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philology.) Vilnius: Institute of Information of Lithuania.
1992a "The standardisation of language in Shakespeare's plays", *Kalbotyra* (Vilnius) 43, 3: 30-50.

Ewbank, Inga S.
1994 "Shakespeare and the arts of language", in: Stanley Wells (ed.), 49-66.

Halliday, M.A.K.
1976 "System and function in language", in: Gunther Kress (ed.).

Jakobson, Roman
1960 "Linguistics and poetics", in: Thomas Sebeok (ed.), 350-377.

Jones, Emrys
1971 *Scenic form in Shakespeare.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kress, Gunther (ed.)
1976 *Halliday: System and function in language. Selected papers.* London: OUP.

Levinson, Stephen C.
1995 *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: CUP.

Mey, Jacob L.
1994 *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Partridge, Eric
1968 *Shakespeare's bawdy.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ribner, Irving
1960 *Patterns in Shakespearean tragedy.* London: Methuen.

Ross, James B. – Mary M. McLaughlin (eds.)
1983 *The portable medieval reader.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Scollon, Ron – Suzanne W. Scollon
1995 *Intercultural communication.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sebeok, Thomas (ed.)
1960 *Style in language.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Shakespeare, William
1975 *The complete works of William Shakespeare.* New York: Avanel Books.

Verschueren, Jef
1999 *Understanding pragmatics.* London: Arnold.

Wells, Stanley (ed.)
1994 *The Cambridge companion to Shakespeare studies.* Cambridge: CUP.

Wilson, R.F.
1977 *Shakespeare's opening scenes.* Salzburg: Universität Salzburg.

Wyld, Henry C.
1936 *A history of Modern Colloquial English.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Yang, Yonglin
1991 "How to talk to the Supernatural in Shakespeare", *Language in Society* 20: 247-261.

[no editor]
1955 *Titles and forms of address. A guide to their correct use.* London: Adam and Charles Black.

[no editor]
1978 *The Age of Shakespeare. A British Council Exhibition.* London: British Council Publications.