PRONOMINAL USAGE IN DIALECTAL ENGLISH

WOLFGANG VIERECK

University of Bamberg

ABSTRACT

Altogether six maps taken from *The computer developed linguistic atlas of England* (Viereck and Ramisch 1991, 1997) serve to demonstrate peculiarities of pronominal usage in English dialects. In the area of personal pronouns, phenomena such as pronoun exchange, gender diffusion and the lack of formal gender distinctions are discussed. Moreover, the question is addressed why the weak form of *us* survives today as against the strong forms in *me* and *we*. As regards possessives, anaphoric and deictic functions are differentiated and it is shown that subject-referring possessive pronouns once were reflexive possessives in English, as they were or are in other languages now.

In her book *The English language in modern times (since 1400)* Margaret Schlauch also has a chapter on "Modern English dialects and their literary uses" which contains insightful observations on quite a number of aspects. As regards personal pronominal usage we find the following passage in the section on "Southern English dialects":

> The pronouns preserve traces of O[ld] E[nglish] forms elsewhere replaced by others: the archaic *thou* and *ye* as in Biblical usage, and also *en* (-*m* by assimilation) for the masculine dative – accusative, *em* (never *them*) for the plural of the same case. Personal pronouns are used to refer to inanimate things. Very striking is the use of nominative forms for emphatic accusatives. This is said to be so consistent that it might be more accurate to say that all pronouns have two forms in the accusative: one for emphasis, coinciding with the nominative, and a separate one developed from historical oblique forms, now serving in unemphatic constructions. Barnes illustrates the difference by these expressions: Gi'e *en* the knife; Gi'e *us* the wheat; but: Gi'e the money to *I* (*we*) not to *he* (*they*).
>
> (Schlauch 1959: 165f.).

The phenomena that came later to be called pronoun exchange and gender diffusion had thus already been observed by Schlauch.[1]

Pronominal usage, of course, also varies in the Standard language, not, however, to the same extent as in the dialects. In Standard English:

> Subjective personal pronouns function as subject and sometimes as subject complement; objective personal pronouns as object, prepositional complement, and sometimes as subject complement ... *He* was late, It was *he* [but also] It was *him* ... Although the prescriptive grammar tradition stipulates the subjective case form, the objective case form is normally felt to be the natural one, particularly in informal style. However, the choice occurs chiefly in this restricted and infrequent construction with final pronouns, *ie* in 'object territory' ... After *but, except, than,* and *as* ... there is [also] vacillation ..:

$$\text{Nobody} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{but} \\ \text{except} \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{him} \\ \text{?he} \end{array} \right\} \text{can solve our problems.}$$

$$\text{He is} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{more [or less] intelligent than} \\ \text{as} \qquad\qquad \text{intelligent as} \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{she} \\ \text{her} \end{array} \right\} \text{....}$$

> The prescriptive bias for the subjective forms may account for hypercorrect uses of them, as in *between you and I ... Let you and I do it! He says she saw you and I last night,* which are not uncommon in informal conversation.
>
> (Quirk *et al.* 1972: 208 and 210 f.)

I would like to present some maps from our *computer developed linguistic Atlas of England* (Viereck and Ramisch 1991, 1997) for which the data were taken from Harold Orton's *Survey of English Dialects,* published between 1962 and 1971.

The first three maps (or, for reasons of space, rather the legends to the maps) relate to gender diffusion, namely "If you want to know how heavy a thing is, what do you do? weigh it" (Figure 1), "Jack wants to have Tommy's ball and says to him, not: Keep it!, but ... Give it me" (Figure 2) and "Before your wife brings you the broth, she is certain to have [gesticulate] ... tasted it" (Figure 3). The answers are on the one hand quite similar, yet on the other there are also noticeable differences. On all three legends *it* occurs most often to be followed by

---

[1] Surprisingly, book publications on personal pronouns deal with these aspects only in passing; see, for example, Howe (1996) and Wales (1996).

en, em,[2] *him* and *them.* A look at the frequencies of occurrence of these last-mentioned forms, however, is revealing. On the legend *to weigh it, en* occurs 38 times and *him* 7 times, on the legend *Give it me* the numbers for *en* are 26 and for *em* 13, although *it* was suggested by the question. When we add the numbers for *en/him* and *en/em* they come very close to one another, namely 45 with *to weigh it* and 39 with *Give it me.* The situation is different with the legend *tasted it* where *en* was noted only 8 times and *em* only once. In addition the feminine pronoun *her* was elicited twice. The results are quite similar in questions of a related context, which for proportional reasons could not be mapped in our atlas, namely *to thicken it* (i.e. the gravy) with only 7 *en* forms, some of which added from the incidental material, one *him* and 2 *her* forms, one taken from the incidental material, *to cool it* (i.e. the tea) with one *en* form in Cornwall and *to bind it* (i.e. the corn), again with one *en* form in Cornwall, this time taken from the incidental material.[3] The scarcity of *en* forms in all these last-mentioned cases can hardly be accidental. The answer to account for the differences between the first and the second group of things/objects, not of living entities, lies in the referent. When it is a count noun, such as *thing* and *ball,* it can be referred to with *him, en* and *em* in western and southwestern English dialects, when the referent is a mass noun like *broth* this possibility is quite restricted, almost non-existent. However, ten informants clustered in the north of England apparently consider *broth* a count noun as they answered with *them.*[4] Such reclassifications of mass nouns as count nouns also occur in Standard English, of course: "*What breads have you got today?* meaning 'kind of' or 'type of'" (Quirk *et al.* 1972: 128).

Pronoun exchange works both ways, so to speak: a subjective pronoun can be found in positions that usually require the objective case and vice versa. The *Give it me*-legend (Figure 2) provides examples of the first type: *give it I, give it to I, give en to I.* These cases required the nominative in Barnes' day and region, as noted by Schlauch. As the legend shows, this usage is still attested by Orton's survey in the southwest of England, although it is clearly a receding dialectal phenomenon: *me/us* dominate now even in that part of England. There are scattered instances in other questions of Orton's survey where *he* is used as the objective case, as, for example, in "I knowed *he* by his voice", "brought *he* up or

---

[2] *En* and *em* are derived from the Old English masc. acc. *hine* and the Old English masc. dative *him* respectively. *Hine* survived until the 14th century in the South. In the other areas it was replaced by the dative *him* two centuries earlier. *Em* could also be an assimilated form of *en*: see the answer *give em me* in a number of Devon and Cornwall localities (Figure 2).

[3] In the answers to *to cool it* and *to bind it* the pronoun has, unfortunately, been omitted rather often.

[4] The plural *(th)em* was noted once each in Lancashire and Norfolk with regard to *corn.*

"ask *he*"; *she* as object occurs even less often; cf. "stock *she* up" and "brought *she* up" (Wakelin 1972: 113f.).

The second type of pronoun exchange becomes apparent in the responses to the question "Which of you is English here? As for her you could answer ... she is" (Figure 4). *She* is the dominating form by far, whose Middle English origin is obscure.[5] Moreover, we find *hoo* (from Old English *hēo*), *shoo* and what seems to be the object pronoun *her,* here used in subjective position. However, "*her* may simply be the unstressed reflex ([hə], [ə]) of O[ld] E[nglish] *hēo* 'she' plus the *r* which is often attached to final unstressed [ə]" in rhotic dialect areas (Wakelin 1972: 164; on *she/(h)er* see Black 1999).[6] *Shoo* is confined to southwest Yorkshire. As it occurs between *she* and *hoo* forms to the west, *shoo* seems to be a blend of *she* and *hoo*.

In the answers to some questions of Orton's survey *he*, going back to Old English *hēo* 'she', is found in scattered fashion, such as in Berkshire and Kent.[7] In Middle English the use of *he* meaning 'she' was much more widespread, as the map in McIntosh *et al.* (1986: 308) shows. Wright (1902: *s.v.* 'he') noted *he* meaning 'she' and 'it' for a wide area mainly in the West Midlands and the southwest of England. The *Survey of English dialects* elicited *he* for *it* only occasionally, as in *bank he up* (once in Somerset) and *he is down* (once in Hampshire), both referring to the plashing of a hedge. Thus both uses of *he* are drastically receding in dialectal English and with them the lack of formal gender distinctions in the personal pronoun system which used to be a characteristic feature mainly in the dialects of the West of England.

The following general points emerge from the preceding paragraphs. One is that it is possible in dialectal English for the personal pronouns to exchange their subjective and objective roles, but the conditions under which these exchanges occur are anything but clear. From Elworthy in 1877, via Barnes in 1886, Kruisinga in 1905 and Wright in 1905, to Wakelin in 1972, we get the same explanation, namely that subject forms are used as emphatic object forms and object forms are used for the nominative when the pronouns are unemphatic. The term emphatic is, unfortunately, never specified and I do not see that personal pronouns are used emphatically – in the way I understand this term – in

the responses mentioned: *Give it I* or *to I. I knowed he by his voice, brought he up* or *ask he.*

Other factors must play a role here, such as, for example, adjacency to verbs and/or prepositions or interrogative or question tag contexts (Wagner 2001).[8] Another factor might be style (Ihalainen 1985: 160). All these factors lead to corpus research as the most promising means to single out the conditioning factors for this most interesting phenomenon.

The other point is, apart from the lack of formal gender distinctions, that the plural is used for the singular. On the legend to the map *Give it me* (Figure 2) the use of *us* for *me* is very widespread indeed (see also Wright 1905: *s.v.* 'us'5).

The object case plural of the first person is also interesting with regard to the vowel, as the weak, unstressed form developed into present-day English – in contrast to the object case singular and subject case plural (*me* and *we*) where the strong forms prevailed. How do authors of historical grammars of English account for the difference?[9]

Welna notes: "The long vowel in *ūs* survived throughout the period [of Middle English] (cf. <uus> in the 'Paston Letters'), but an early shortening is evidenced in Orm; cf. <uss>. Like in the pronoun *we/wē, length in us* depended on the presence or absence of stress" (1996: 101).[10] Moreover, Welna offers the following explanation for post Middle English: "The failure of original [uː] to preserve length may have been caused by this short word functioning as an enclitic (cf. *let's*, or *tell's* in Shakespeare)" (1996: 101).

Pinsker (1969: 169) notes: "In weak stress all long vowels are shortened, e.g. *ūs* (Mod. Engl. dial. [auz]!) – *ŭs* (> [ʌs])" (translated from German). The 'e.g.' in the quotation is strange since Pinsker only notes stressed forms for *mē* and *wē*, thus leaving only *ūs* ~ *ŭs* anyhow. Also, the pronunciation [auz] that developed from the strong form and that, according to Pinsker, is found in modern dialectal English was neither recorded by Wright (1905) nor by the *Survey of English-*

---

5 Welna (1996: 102) mentions a number of theories on the origin of *she*.

6 Among the several converting questions of Orton's survey, unfortunately, not a single one relates to *he/him* (on the use of *him* for *he* and vice versa cf. Wright (1902: *s.v.* 'he')), but there is one with regard to *we/us*: "If I say: You people aren't English, you can contradict and say: Oh yes, ...we are". Map M20 in Viereck and Ramisch (1997) attests *we* 283 times and *us* altogether 14 times in Devon and once each in Cornwall, Oxford and Berkshire.

7 The diphthong of Old English *hēo* 'she' was finally monophthongised to [ē] and thus merged with Old English *hē* 'he'.

---

8 Interrogative sentences had already been mentioned by Elworthy (1877) and Kruisinga (1905).

9 I have to be selective here, of course.

10 Fisiak and Krygier (2002: 231) investigate the spellings of selected features of the two manuscripts of Laȝamon's *Brut*: "... both are assigned a date of composition in the second half of the thirteenth century; one of them, Cotton Caligula A IX, is usually localised in Worcestershire, while the other, Otho C XIII, is placed [by McIntosh et al. 1986] in Somerset". Altogether three samples from each manuscript were obtained. With regard to the first person plural pronoun the authors conclude: "The only marked difference concerns oblique cases in the O_3 sample, where virtually the only acceptable spelling is <ous>, almost completely absent from all the other excerpts. This feature confirms the general impression that the later sections of the Otho MS are more advanced and innovative linguistically" (2002: 241). The authors are silent on pronunciation. The spelling <ous>, of course, reflects the long vowel, but taking Orm's evidence into account the spellings <us> and <vs> might well hide an occasional shortening of the vowel.

lish dialects.[11] Faiss (1977: 193f.) has the following to say: "Apart from strong-stressed *ous*, [u:s], there exists in Middle English weakly stressed *us* [ʊs] that survives in Late Middle English and Early Modern English as well as in dialectal English [ʊz], but was replaced in Modern Standard English by [ʌs]. That Middle English [u:s] did not develop even in strong stress into Modern English [aʊs] is quite possibly connected with the little marked length of the vowel: rather [uˑs] than [u:s]" (translated from German). It is inconceivable why only *us* should have had a half-long vowel and not *me* and *we*.

Mańczak (1987), who devotes a whole book to irregular sound change due to frequency, surprisingly does not mention this aspect. However, a look at the frequency figures may help to solve this problem. Hofland and Johansson (1982) present the following figures for British and American English respectively: *me* – 1,554 and 1,181, *we* – 2,926 and 2,653, and *us* only 657 and 672. In Thorndike and Lorge (1944) the discrepancy is still greater: *me* – 23,364, *we* – 17,996, and *us* – 4,943, are the numbers of occurrence in the Lorge magazine count. This is indeed suggestive, as both *me* and *we* must naturally have occurred much more often in stressed position than *us* and, consequently, the likelihood that the strong forms in *me* and *we* developed into present-day English was much greater. This also seems to be the reason why in the 3rd sg masculine subject case the Middle English strong form [he:] prevailed over the weak form [hɛ] in Modern English. The Lorge magazine count notes a frequency of 49,268 for *he*.

Frequency, no doubt, plays an important part in the history of language. The notion should, however, be used with caution. It is, of course, problematic to base diachronically related frequencies on frequency dictionaries of present-day English. However, a frequency dictionary of most of the earlier periods of English is still something we can only dream of, especially for the time between 1200 and 1900.

I would like to conclude with some remarks on possessive pronouns (see also Viereck 1996). The legend to map M20 of Viereck and Ramisch (1991) lists the responses to the question "How do we see?" and the legend to map M21 in Viereck – Ramisch (1997) those to the question "If you were asked, 'How did you know it was me talking outside when you couldn't see me?', you might reply: ...". As the legends show, possessives – not surprisingly – figure most prominently: *with our eyes* (Figure 5) and *I knew your voice* (Figure 6) respec-

tively.[12] Yet, also the definite article occurs in scattered fashion: eight times both on the legends of Figure 5 and Figure 6. This is unusual in English, but normal in many other languages, such as German. Unlike English, German does not require possessives with inalienable possessions and personal belongings, cf. "Peter steckte *die* linke Hand in *die* Tasche" [Peter put *the* left hand in *the* pocket] versus English "Peter put *his* left hand in *his* pocket".

In English possessive pronouns can serve an anaphoric and a deictic function. Both functions can be differentiated by means of the following transformation. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 164) note:

> Coreference between a subject and a noun phrase object blocks the passive correspondence. This constraint occurs with (a) reflexive pronouns ... and (c) possessive pronouns when coreferential to the subject:

(a) John could see $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Paul} \\ \textit{himself} \end{array} \right\}$ in the mirror.

~ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Paul} \\ \textit{*Himself} \end{array} \right\}$ could be seen in the mirror...

(c) The woman shook $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{my hand.} \\ \textit{her head.} \end{array} \right.$

~ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{My hand} \\ \textit{?*Her head} \end{array} \right\}$ was shaken by the woman.

In (c) the possessive could also refer to some antecedent not mentioned in the sentence. This interpretation must be ruled out here since we are concerned with coreference between subject and object. (a) shows that sentences with a reflexive pronoun behave in the same way as those with inalienable possessions.

Our two-frame sentences show this important point, too. In "I knew *your* voice", the possessive could be substituted by other possessives (deictic function), whereas this is not possible in "We see with *our* eyes". In the case of inalienable possessions, the possessive may only refer to an antecedent already mentioned with which it must agree in person and number. A pronoun thus restricted to a mere anaphoric function is in its essence no longer a pronoun and

---

[11] In comparison with *me* and *we*, *us* is the only form without onset. Of the two forms [ʊs] and [aʊs] the more difficult was dropped, perhaps immediately after the vowel shift (P. Gąsiorowski's observation). In agreement with the rules of fricative voicing in unstressed position the pronunciation [ʊz] survived well into the 20th century as [ʊz] or [əz] in dialects; see Wright (1905: *s.v.* 'us' and § 409) and the *Survey of English dialects*.

[12] "The use of the personal pronoun, nominative or objective, instead of the possessive is common in many dialects..." (Wright 1905: § 411). The *Survey of English dialects* still attested *us* 19 times and *we* twice on map M20 – in contrast, however, to an overwhelming *our* (255 occurrences), including *wur*, a mainly northern English variant. According to map M 21 the historical 2nd person singular *thy* was still very much embedded in the mid-20th century.

can therefore be dispensed with. It has lost its possessive function and is possessive only in form.

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 270) also point out that "with reference to parts of the body and following a preposition, *the* is often (my underlining) used instead of possessive pronouns *my, your, her, their, ...*etc.

Mary banged herself on *the forehead.*
They pulled her by *the hair.*
The policeman took the thief by *the arm.*"

Although the frame sentence "We see *with* our eyes" also contains a preposition, the definite article was elicited only very rarely. Thus, the question arises whether the substitution of the possessive pronoun by the definite article can also be accounted for in a different way. The examples above show that the possessive pronoun can be substituted when the antecedent to which it refers is the object of the sentence or, to put it differently, when the owner is not the subject.

When the possessive agrees in person and number with the subject of the sentence, it is not clear whether the pronoun acts in an anaphoric or a deictic function in English (see above, sentence (c)). This is not so in other languages where the deictic function is taken over by a possessive and the anaphoric function by a reflexive possessive. This is the case, for instance, in Polish.

The history of English shows that subject-referring possessive pronouns once were reflexive possessives, just as they were and are in other languages now. Old English had a reflexive possessive *sīn* that was inflected and almost always referred to the subject (in all genders, both singular and plural) of the sentence. It was used almost exclusively in poetry (Bauer 1963). Cf. "and him Hroþgar gewat to hofe sinum" (*Beowulf*, 1236) or "se inwidda ... dryhtguman sine drencte mid wine" (*Judith*, K 129). Besides, the fully declined possessive adjectives, derived from the genitive forms of the personal pronouns, were available in Old English. Apart from cases where the possessor was one other than the subject, in the 3rd person singular *his, hi(e)re,* and plural *hi(e)ra* were largely used instead of *sīn* to express reflexive possessive relationships. Cf. "to þam ælmihtegan gode þe me mid his earmum worhte, her mid handum sinum" (*Genesis*, K 121) where variation between *his* and *sīn* even occurred. *Sīn* (together with *mīn* and *þīn*) inflected like strong adjectives whereas *his* remained uninflected in Old English. Both possibilities existed side by side and seemed to have been completely interchangeable in contrast to other languages, such as Latin (cf. *suus* vs. *ēius*). As early as in late Old English *sīn* had disappeared and *his,* etc., continued alone in this function. Of all the grammars I checked only Strang comments on the importance of this change and tries to explain it: "*John took his book*" would have distinct forms in O[ld] E[nglish] according to whether *his* = *his own* or *another man's*. This useful distinction has had since

M[iddle] E[nglish] to be rendered in more long-winded ways; it is possibly one of the grammatical casualties of a period of bilingualism" (1970: 303).

Diachronic deliberations thus support the thesis of the reflexive character of the English possessive pronouns with reference to inalienable possessions and personal belongings.

REFERENCES

Barnes, William
    1886   *A glossary of the Dorset dialect with a grammar.* (repr. 1970). St. Peter Port/Guernsey: Toucan Press.
Bauer, Gero
    1963   "Über Vorkommen und Gebrauch von ae. *sīn*", *Anglia* 81: 323-334.
Black, Merja
    1999   "Parallel lines through time: speech, writing and the confusing case of *she*", *Leeds Studies in English* 30: 59-81.
Elworthy, Frederic Thomas
    1877   *An outline of the grammar of the dialect of West Somerset.* London: Trübner & Co.
Faiss, Klaus
    1977   *Aspekte der englischen Sprachgeschichte.* Tübingen: Narr.
Fisiak, Jacek – Marcin Krygier
    2002   "Inflections in the two manuscripts of Lagamon's *Brut*", *Language Sciences* 24: 231-245.
Hofland, Knut – Stig Johansson
    1982   *Word frequencies in British and American English.* Bergen: Computing Centre for the Humanities.
Howe, Stephan
    1996   *The personal pronouns in the Germanic languages.* Berlin: de Gruyter.
Ihalainen, Ossi
    1985   "*He took the bottle and put 'n in his pocket.* The object pronoun *it* in present-day Somerset", in: Wolfgang Viereck (ed.), 153-161.
Kruisinga, Etsko
    1905   *A grammar of the dialect of West Somerset: Descriptive and historical.* Bonn: Hanstein.
Mańczak, Witold
    1987   *Frequenzbedingter unregelmäßiger Lautwandel in den germanischen Sprachen.* Wrocław: Ossolineum.
McIntosh, Angus – M.L. Samuels – Michael Benskin, with Margaret Laing – Keith Williamson
    1986   *A linguistic atlas of late mediaeval English.* 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
Orton, Harold
    1962   *Survey of English dialects* (A): *Introduction.* Leeds: A.J. Arnold.
Orton, Harold – Michael V. Barry – Wilfrid J. Halliday – Philip M. Tilling – Martyn F. Wakelin
    1962-1971 *Survey of English dialects* (B): *The basic material.* 4 vols., each in 3 pts. Leeds: E.J. Arnold;
    [1998]   [Reissued London: Routledge].
Pinsker, Hans Ernst
    1969[3]   *Historische englische Grammatik.* München: Hueber.

Pollner, Clausdirk – Helmut Rohlfing – Frank-Rutger Hausmann (eds.)
- 1996   *Bright is the ring of words. Festschrift für Horst Weinstock zum 65. Geburtstag.* Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag.

Quirk, Randolph – Sidney Greenbaum – Geoffrey Leech – Jan Svartvik
- 1972   *A grammar of contemporary English.* London: Longman.
- 1985   *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.

Schlauch, Margaret
- 1959   *The English language in modern times (since 1400).* Warszawa. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Strang, Barbara
- 1970   *A history of English.* London: Methuen.

Thorndike, Edward – Irving Lorge
- 1944   *The teacher's word book of 30,000 words.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Viereck, Wolfgang
- 1996   "Some notes on possessives", in: Clausdirk Pollner – Helmut Rohlfing – Frank-Rutger Hausmann (eds.), 325-331.

Viereck, Wolfgang (ed.)
- 1985   *Focus on: England and Wales.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Viereck, Wolfgang – Heinrich Ramisch
- 1991, 1997   *The computer developed linguistic atlas of England.* Vols. 1 and 2. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Wagner, Susanne
- 2001   "'We don' say she, do us' or: Pronoun exchange – a feature of English dialects?" Paper read at the 3rd UK Language Variation Conference, University of York 20 July 2001.

Wakelin, Martyn F.
- 1972   *English dialects: An introduction.* London: Athlone Press.

Wales, Katie
- 1996   *Personal pronouns in present-day English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wełna, Jerzy
- 1996   *English historical morphology.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Wright, Joseph
- 1898-1905   *The English dialect dictionary,* 6 vols. Oxford: Henry Frowde.
- 1905   *The English dialect grammar.* Oxford: Henry Frowde.

APPENDIX

Figure 1.

M 13: I.7.1 To weigh it

If you want to know how heavy a thing is, what do you do?

Figure 2.

M 19: IX.8.2 Give it me

Jack wants to have Tommy's ball and says to him, not:
Keep it!, but: ...

Figure 3.

M 14: V.7.20.2 tasted it

Before your wife brings you the broth, she is certain to have [gesticulate] ...

Figure 4.

M 18 : IX.7.7.3   she is

Which of you is English here? As for her you could answer...

she is:
Nb1,Nb2,Nb3,Nb4,Nb5
Nb6,Nb7,Nb8,Nb9
Cu1,Cu2,Cu3,Cu4,Cu5
Cu6
Du1,Du2,Du3,Du4,Du5
Du6
We1,We2,We3,We4
Le1,Le2,Le3,Le4,Le5
Y1,Y2,Y3,Y5,Y6,Y7,Y8
Y9,Y12,Y13,Y15,Y17
Y19,Y22,Y24,Y33,Y34
Db2
Nt1,Nt2,Nt3,Nt4
L1,L2,L3,L4,L5,L6,L7
L8,L9,L10,L12,L13,L14
L15
Le11,Le12,Le13,Le14
Le15,Le16,Le17,Le18
Le19,Le110
R1,R2
He7
We1,Wa3
Nth1,Nth2,Nth3,Nth4
Nth5
Hu1,Hu2
C1,C2
Nf1,Nf2,Nf3,Nf4,Nf5
Nf6,Nf7,Nf9,Nf10,Nf11
Nf12,Nf13
Sf1,Sf2,Sf3,Sf4,Sf5
Mon4,Mon5,Mon6
O4,O5
Bk2,Bk4,Bk5
Bd1,Bd2,Bd3
Hrt1,Hrt2,Hrt3
Ess1,Ess2,Ess3,Ess4
Ess5,Ess6,Ess7,Ess8
Ess9,Ess10,Ess11,Ess12
Ess13,Ess14,Ess15
MxL1,MxL2
So1,So2,So3,So4
W3,W8
Sr1,Sr2,Sr3,Sr4,Sr5
K1,K2,K3,K4,K5,K6,K7
Co4,Co5,Co6,Co7
Do2,Do5
Ha2,Ha3,Ha4,Ha6
Sx1
Mon1,Mon2

she be:
Mon4
O2,O3,O6
So1,So11
Brk3
He7
Sx3,Sx4,Sx5,Sx6

she's:
So12
Brk5

Sx2

her is:
La12
Ch5
Db4,Db7
Se2,Se5
S12,S13,S14,S15,S16
S17,S19,S110,S111
He1,He2,He3,He4,He5
He6
Wo1,Wo3,Wo4,Wo6
Wa4,Wa5,Wa6,Wa7
Mon1,Mon2
Gl2,Gl3,Gl4,Gl6,Gl7
O1
Bk3
So5,So6,So7,So8,So9
So13
W2,W4,W6,W9
Brk4
Co1,Co2,Co3
D1,D2,D3,D5,D6,D8,D9
D10,D11
Do1,Do3,Do4
He1,He5

her be:
S18
Wa4
Gl1,Gl5
Bk1
W1,W3,W7
Brk1,Brk2,Brk4
D4,D7

her bin:
Ch6
Se1,Se3,Se4,Se6,Se7
Se8,Se9,Se10,Se11
Wo2

her's:
So10,So12

her bist: Wo5

hoo is:
La5,La6,La7,La8
La9,La10,La11,La13
La14
Y21,Y29,Y30
Ch1,Ch3,Ch4
Db1,Db2,Db3,Db5,Db6
S11

shoo is:
Y23,Y26,Y31,Y32

Symbol	Meaning
○	usually, familiarly
Q	rare, occasionally, less common
○	older, obsolete
⦵	modern, never
⊖	(strong) pressure, suggested form/word
⊗	preferred
⊗	excerpted from incidental material
○'	same symbol for more than one response
×	no response
▪	irrelevant response
▪	unwanted response

she (184)
her (93)
hoo (21)
shoo (4)

Figure 5.

M 20 : VI.3.3   With our eyes

How do we see?

with our eyes:
Nb3
Cu1,Cu2,Cu3
Cu4
Du5
We1
La1,La8,La13
La14
Y2,Y4,Y8,Y16
Y19,Y20,Y25
Y28
Ch1,Ch4,Ch5
Ch6
Db2,Db4,Db6
Db7
Nt1,Nt2,Nt3
Nt4
L2,L5,L6,L8
L9,L10,L12
L13,L14,L15
Se1,Se2,Se3
Se4,Se5,Se6
Se7,Se9,Se10
Se11
S17,S19
Le1,Le2
Le3,Le4
Le5,Le6
Le7,Le8
Le9,Le10
R1,R2
He1,He2,He4
He5,He6,He7
Wo1,Wo3,Wo5
Wo6,Wo7
Wa1,Wa2,Wa3
Wa4,Wa5,Wa6
Wa7
Nth2,Nth3
Nth4,Nth5
Hu1,Hu2
C1,C2
Nf1,Nf2,Nf4
Nf8,Nf9
Nf10,Nf11,Nf12
Sf1,Sf2,Sf3
Sf5
Mon1,Mon2
Mon4,Mon5
Mon6
Gl1,Gl2,Gl3
Gl4,Gl5,Gl6
Gl7
O1,O2,O3,O4
O5,O6
Bk1,Bk2,Bk3
Bk4

Bd2,Bd3
Hrt1,Hrt2
Hrt3
Ess1,Ess2
Ess3,Ess4
Ess5,Ess6
Ess7,Ess8
Ess9,Ess11
Ess12,Ess13
Ess15
MxL1,MxL2
So3,So5,So7
So8,So9,So12
W1,W2,W3
W4,W6,W9
Sr1,Sr3
K2,K3,K4,K5
Co1,Co2,Co3
Co4,Co5,Co6
Co7
D1,D2,D4,D5
D6,D7,D8,D10
D11
Do3,Do4,Do5
Ha2,Ha3,Ha4
Ha5,Ha6,Ha7
Sx1,Sx3,Sx5
Man1

with our een:
Cu6
Du3,Du6
We3,We4
La2,La7,La9
La12
Y3,Y6,Y9,Y18
Y22
S11

by our eyes:
So4,So11
So13
W5,W8
D3
Do1,Do2
Ha1

through our eyes:
Se8
He3

through our een: Wo2

through our eyes: Nf6

out of our eyes: Nf6

out our eyes: D9

with wur een:
Nb4,Nb5,Nb9
La4,La5,La6
La10,La11
Y4,Y5,Y11,Y12
Y13,Y14
Y15,Y17,Y23

with wur eyes:
Nb1,Nb2,Nb6
Nb7,Nb8
Du1,Du2

by wur eyes: L3

with us eyes:
Y24,Y26,Y27
Y32,Y34
Ch2,Ch3
Db5
S15,S16

with us een:
Y24,Y29,Y30
Y34,Y33
Db1,Db3
S12,S13

with your eyes:
S110
Nf13
So2,So6
So10
Brk1,Brk2
Brk3,Brk4
Brk5
Sr1,Sr2
Sr4,Sr5
K1,K6
Sx2,Sx4
Sx6
Man1,Man2

with the eyes:
Cu5
Du4
Y7
Ess14

with eyes: Y14

through the eyes: L7

with looking out your eyes: L11

by the eye:
S14,S16
Ess10

with we eyes:
S11
S14

through your eyes:
Wo4
Mon3

with my own eyes: Nf3

with both eyes: Nf5

with your eye: So1

by your eyes:
W7
K7

Symbol	Meaning
○	usually, familiarly
Q	rare, occasionally, less common
○	older, obsolete
⦵	modern, never
⊖	(strong) pressure, suggested form/word
⊗	preferred
○	excerpted from incidental material
○'	same symbol for more than one response
×	no response
▪	irrelevant response
▪	unwanted response

our (221)
wur (34)
us (19)

Figure 6.

M 21: VI.5.17 I knew your voice

If you were asked: How did you know it was me talking outside
when you couldn't see me?, you might reply: ...

[] I knew your voice
Nb1,Nb3¹,Nb6,Nb7 / Nb8 / Du1 / Ch6 / Db2 / Nf3,Nf4 / L2,L3,L4,L6,L8,L9 / L11 / Sa3 / Si7 / Lei1,Lei3 / He5 / Wa2,Wa3,Wa4,Wa7 / Nth1,Nth4 / Hu1 / C2 / Nf10 / Si1,Si2,Si4,Si5 / O1 / Bk2,Bk3,Bk4 / Bd1,Bd2,Bd3 / Hr2 / Ess1,Ess2,Ess5,Ess6 / Ess8,Ess15 / Mxl1,Mxl2 / K2 / Ha4,Ha7 / Sx2,Sx5

[] I knowed your voice
Nb4 / Nf1 / L12,L13,L14 / Sa4,Sa5,Sa6,Sa7 / Sa8,Sa9,Sa11 / Lei2,Lei4,Lei5³,Lei6 / Lei8,Lei9,Lei10 / R1,R2 / He1,He2,He3,He4 / He6 / Wo1,Wo4,Wo5,Wo6 / Wa5,Wa6 / Nth2,Nth3 / Hu1,Hu2 / C1 / Mon1,Mon3,Mon5 / Mon6 / Gi5 / O2,O5,O6 / Bk1 / Hr1 / Ess11 / So2 / Sr1 / D11

[] by your voice
Si6 / Nf2,Nf7 / Ess7 / W7 / Brk3,Brk4,Brk5 / Sr3,Sr4,Sr5 / Sx1,Sx3,Sx4

[] I could tell your voice
La14 / Y5 / Ch4,Ch5 / Db4,Db7 / Si1,Si10 / Wa6,Wa7 / So1

[] I kenned your voice
Nb1,Nb3,Nb5 / Du2 / La1 / Y1,Y3,Y15,Y16

[] I know your voice
Nb2 / La5 / Si5 / Wa1 / Nf1,Nf11,Nf12

[] I knew by your voice
L5 / Ess10,Ess13 / Sx6

[] I knew your voice
Man2 / Nf2 / Nf6 / Hr3

[] I knew you by your voice
He7 / Mon2 / Ess12 / Brk2

[] I heard your voice
Y2 / Nf9 / So1

[] I went by your voice
Si5 / Ess3 / W1

[] I could tell by your voice
Y28 / Si2 / Wo7

[] I knowed your voice
L15 / Bk5 / W2

[] I telled your voice
Ch2 / L7

[] I could tell you by your voice
Si9 / Gi1

[] I knowed you by your chatter
K4

[] went by your tongue
Nf3

[] I knowed your twang
Sa10

[] I owned your voice
D6

[] knew you by your voice
K3

[] I knew it was you by your voice
Sr2

[] I knew by the sound of your voice
Ess14

[] I heard your voice
Ess3

[] I recognised your voice
O4

[] I knowed by your voice
Si3

[] know your voice
Nf4

[] I told by your voice
Nth5

[] it sounded like your voice
Lei7

[] I tell by your voice
Si4

[] I knowed you by your voice
Sa1

[] I kenned you by your voice
Y15

O I knowed thy voice
La4²,La10 / Y32 / Db5 / Wo2 / Gi2,Gi6 / So3,So4,So5,So7 / So9,So10,So12 / W2²,W3,W4,W5,W6 / W8,W9 / Co2,Co4,Co5,Co6 / Co7 / D1,D2,D3,D4,D5,D7 / Do3,Do4 / Ha1,Ha3,Ha5,Ha6

O I kenned thy voice
Cu1,Cu2,Cu4,Cu5 / Cu6 / Du3,Du4,Du5,Du6 / We1,We2,We3,We4 / La3 / Y6,Y7,Y13,Y19

O I could tell thy voice
La6,La7,La8,La9 / La11,La12,La13 / Y4,Y23,Y33,Y34 / Ch1,Ch3 / Db1,Db3,Db6

O I knew thy voice
Cu3 / La2,La4,La6³,La7 / Y9,Y14,Y18,Y21,Y22 / Y24,Y25,Y27³,Y28 / So11

O I owned thy voice
Y26,Y29 / D6,D9

O I could tell by thy voice
La10 / Y4,Y11,Y33

O I knew by thy voice
Y12,Y31

O I heard thy voice
Y10,Y20³

O I kenned thy voice
Nb9 / Cu3⁷

O I could tell thee by thy voice
Y32 / Gi3

O I telled thy voice
Y17

O I knew it were thy voice
Y27

O we could own thy voice
Y30

O we owned thy voice
Y30

O I knowed it was thee by thy voice
Gi7

O I knew thee by thy voice
So9

O I knowed thee by thy voice
So13

O I could own thy voice
D10

O I'd know thy voice
Do5

I know him by his voice
Man1

kenned his voice
Y8

I knowed his voice
L10 / Ni8 / O3 / So6 / K1 / Co1,Co3 / Do1 / Sx5⁷

I knowed the voice
Sa2

Lei1⁷

I could tell him by his voice
Si3

I can tell his voice
Si6

I could tell by his voice
Si11

I knowed his twang
Wo3

I know his voice
Nf5,Nf13

I heard you
Mon7

I telled thee by the voice
Gi4

heard you yapping
Hr3

I knew the voice
Ess4,Ess9 / K5

I could hear thee
So6

I heard his voice
So8

by the voice
Brk1

I knowed him by his voice
K4,K7

I knowed him by his chatter
K4

I knew him by the voice
K4

I knowed him by his brogue
K7

I knowed he by his voice
Co3⁷

I knowed the voice of em
Co6⁷

I knowed who it were with his yap
Do2

I could tell by the voice
Ha2

[] your (192)
O thy (113)

¹ O usually, familiarly
² O rare, occasionally; less common
³ O older, obsolete
⁴ ① modern, newer
⁵ ⊖ (strong) pressure; suggested form/word
⁶ ⊗ preferred
⁷ O excerpted from incidental material
O same symbol for more than one response
× no response
ⁱ irrelevant response
⁹ unwanted response