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Abstract.

This dissertation is a study of the lexical representation of gender in two contrastive Shakespearean plays to identify ways that gender is represented in Early Modern literary language. I ask if the lexical representation of binary gender features in these two plays match our expectations based on social and literary understandings of the period. Social roles for men and women are often pre-determined in the Early Modern period, and literary critics base their analysis upon these assumptions. I suggest representations of men and women are dependent upon underlying linguistic structures and patterns that are widely ignored in a literary analysis of a text. Macbeth focuses on issues of masculinity; it is contrasted with The Merry Wives of Windsor, a play centered on its female characters.

I conduct three analyses: first, I investigate whether male pronouns are more likely to appear in a subject, rather than object position; I also ask if the feminist literary critics are correct in assuming that women are more likely to appear as objects. I then conduct a close reading of possessive structures using specific lexical clusters (his/her + noun) as they appear in the texts of the plays. I compile three separate corpus linguistic tools based on their strengths - a statistical analysis, a simple concordance compiler, and a distributional analysis – to identify and isolate these patterns in the Early Modern Period, presented in a literary-linguistic context.

Gender representation can be visibly patterned. An analysis of these results shows that linguistic representations of men and women in these plays are not consistent with a literary critic’s understanding of gender in the texts. I argue against the consideration of literary texts as a social reality; instead I combine corpus linguistics methodology with a stylistic, critical discourse approach to literary features gender as presented by the plays.
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Chapter 1. Introduction.

In this chapter, I introduce the frameworks through which I conduct my analysis. This dissertation investigates the lexical representation of male and female in two Shakespearean plays – a literary-linguistic approach to gender in the Early Modern Period. As this dissertation covers a wide range of fields, I present an overview of stylistics, digital humanities, corpus linguistics, sociohistorical studies, feminist literary criticism and sociolinguistics as they inform my study. Building on the work of my predecessors in the digital analysis of linguistic features as they appear in literary texts and previous scholars of the sociolinguistic discourse feature of gender, I then present the outline and goals of this dissertation.

1.1 Stylistics, digital humanities and corpus studies.

In the 1960s, scholars began to conduct linguistic analyses of literary texts to present a linguistic account of how meanings are derived from literary texts. Such stylistic and literary-linguistic studies pioneered by Jakobson 1960 and Halliday 1971 [reprinted 1973] attempted to take an objective approach to literary texts using a linguistic framework for analysis, but this approach has never been widely accepted by literary or linguistic scholars. Stylistics is marketed as a linguistic approach to literature, but “the machinery of categorization and classification merely provides momentary pigeonholes for the constituents of a texts, constituents which are then retrieved and reassembled into exactly the form they previously had. There is in short no gain in understanding; the procedure has been executed, but it hasn’t gotten you anywhere” (Fish 1973: 55). Stanley Fish, a literary critic, ultimately finds these stylistic studies to be still subjective despite striving to be objective. In his 1973 commentary on stylistics, he heavily cites Michael Halliday’s 1971 analysis of William Golding’s *The Inheritors* as exemplary of such a ‘subjective’ study, criticizing Halliday’s abstractions and obscuring of linguistic features in his grammar as “meaningless, for they refer to nothing except the categories of the system that produced, categories which are themselves unrelated to anything outside their circle except by an arbitrary act of assertion. When this grammar is used to analyze a text, it can legitimately do nothing more than provide labels for its constituents” (Fish 1973: 118). Fish’s main criticism of Halliday’s analysis is that it is circular: Halliday has defined the features of the text which he will investigate, and finds a way to apply a set of functional categories to the features until a
reading is sensible. “Each function defines a set of options that is relatively – though only relatively – independent of the other sets” (Halliday 1971: 334). In other words, each functional set that Halliday outlines is dependent upon the reader’s interpretations and their application of other functional sets. Within this framework it is remarkably difficult to remain objective when the stylistic features are categorized by subjective categorization. But despite these criticisms, there is a way to regularize stylistic and literary-linguistic features into a less subjective methodology.

The early 21st century brought a digital approach to humanities scholarship to the forefront of academia. As more texts become readily available in machine-readable (.txt, .pdf, .xml, etc) formats, the possibilities of a replicable, corpus-based analysis of linguistic features in a literary text become a reality. Stylistics especially benefits from this shift into the digital humanities, as computers can now identify linguistic features that are used to create an aesthetic or otherwise literary effect. A literary scholar will attempt to identify these features, but such findings often appear rather speculative rather than concrete or otherwise replicable. The application of a systematic, computer-based approach to the linguistic analysis of literary language becomes a rather successful enterprise, as seen in many studies of specific stylistic and discourse features in texts such as register, affect, gender and genre using corpus linguistic techniques. Building on recent corpus stylistic studies including Fischer-Starcke (2010, 2006, 2005); Mahlberg (2007b); Stubbs (2005); Semino & Short (2004); Argamon et al. (2003, 2006b, 2006i); Culpeper (2002, 2009); Murphy (2006); Mullender (2011); Demmen (2009); and Busse (2002), my study adopts features of corpus methodology and stylistic analysis “for their [ability to find] lexical, phraseological, and grammatical patterns” (Fischer-Starcke, 2010: 55).

Mahlberg (2007b) uses corpus methodologies to identify lexical clusters of statistically significant n-grams in a corpus of Dickens’ writing at a local textual level. Fischer-Starcke’s work conducts similar analyses of n-grams in a corpus of Jane Austen texts to identify key features of the 19th-century novel to construct a pattern of characterization as applied to the
protagonists. Both Mahlberg and Fischer-Starcke show how these linguistic features of characterization create literary meanings, and present ways to extract these literary meanings from the text. An n-gram analysis identifies clusters of words which appear collocated to each other in either direction (± 0, 1, 2, 3, … n etc) with a very high frequency. These patterns of collocations present specific features of literary style. To identify n-grams, both studies use a statistical keyword analysis to identify which specific words or phrases are especially relevant to these texts, as compared to a reference set of texts. Mahlberg and Fischer-Starcke present readings of Dickens and Austen, respectively. Their arguments hinge on the use of keyword analysis as a way to identify thematic features of literary texts.

Semino and Short’s (2004) study does not explicitly look for literary meanings embedded in literary texts. Instead, Semino and Short systematically analyze three fully-tagged corpora and conduct an analysis of many stylistic features including but not limited to the following features: narrative style (both internal narration and external narration), metanarrative style (representation of writing acts, speech acts, and thought acts), and indirect and direct speech. Semino and Short use these categories as a way to score and group their texts into one of the following categories: news reports, prose fiction, and (auto)biography to illustrate linguistic patterns which can be identified in literary and non-literary written texts.

But there are ways to use corpus stylistics to investigate the literary features of language as they appear in written language. Stubbs (2005) highlights a number of tests and techniques that can be used in a quantitative stylistic analysis of a literary text, including log likelihood and other tests of keyness, collocations, recurrent lexical patterns. He successfully applies these techniques to Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*. In his study, he finds that the major recurring motif of the language of uncertainty and vagueness, as identified by previous literary scholars, can be investigated further using a corpus stylistic tool. He proves that the motifs of uncertainty are, in fact, a relevant linguistic feature: *something* appears quite often in the text. In doing so, he successfully shows that a corpus stylistic approach can be used to verify our initial
understandings of a text while arguing strongly against the criticism of a pattern-based analysis in stylistics, saying that “a plausible interpretation is based on presuppositions. A negative statement usually implies that a positive was expected” (2005: 16), reminding the corpus stylist that a negative result is still a result, and deserves to be interpreted rather than dismissed outright. A corpus stylistic study, Stubbs illustrates, is thus an effective way for to test a literary-linguistic hypothesis.

Building on these and other successful corpus stylistic studies of language in literary texts, I continue to expand the knowledge of literary-linguistic features of written texts by applying some of these methodologies and approaches to a study of gender-specific possession using third-person pronouns in Shakespeare. My study continues the work of my predecessors in corpus approaches to stylistic features of Shakespeare – including Argamon et al.’s (2003, 2006) work on gender-specific features of language as they appear in the plays, Culpeper’s use of corpus studies (2002, 2009) as an empirical approach to identify patterns of characterization, Busse’s (2002) study of second-person pronouns in the Shakespeare corpus, Demmen’s (2009) investigation of keyword clusters in the language of male and female characters and Mullender’s (2011) investigation of relative clauses using which in the late plays.

Argamon et al.’s work investigates aspects of computational stylistics through the development of computational approaches to identify features of linguistic style and variation across the gender binary. Their 2003 article focuses on linguistic distribution of male and female writing styles based on as identified in a sample of the British National Corpus, serving as a pilot study for later analysis of gender differences as they are represented through different varieties of discourse. While this study focuses on identifying features of male and female authorship in modern texts, they prove that features of masculinity and femininity can be encoded in written language.

Their earlier studies of writers’ gender-specific features as it is manifested in modern texts proved successful, so they applied this technique to Shakespeare’s language in their 2006
articles “Gender in Shakespeare: Automatic Stylistics Gender Character Classification Using Syntactic, Lexical and Lemma Features” and “Performing Gender: Automatic Stylistic Analysis of Shakespeare’s Characters”. Through the use of natural language processing, a researcher can begin to identify features which mark for maleness and femaleness in a text to observe how a writer will show gender differences. A unigram analysis shows that “female lemmas indicate concern with family relationships and feelings, as well as expression of personal feelings and integrating personal context into the discourse. On the other hand, male features indicate concern with quantification, social status, as well as some more obscure verb forms” (2006b: 4), but tri-grams show that a female characters’ construction of self and others whereas male characters’ tri-grams focus on assertions and social status. Furthermore, they find that

Shakespeare's female characters used more adverbs and adjectives, as well as auxiliary verbs and pronouns. On the other hand, cardinal numbers, determiners, and some prepositions are generally indicative of male characters. These observations are in line with previous work (Argamon et al. 2003) on discriminating author gender in modern texts, supporting the idea that the playwright projects characters’ gender in a manner consistent with authorial gender projections 2006i: 3).

Their (2006b) study also show an “evolution of Shakespeare’s gendering of his characters, based on different patterns between Early and Late” (2006b: 5) plays, including topical changes from Early to Late plays by both male and female characters. Their studies utilize a successful application of computational corpus stylistic methodology to find features of differences of male and female language in modern and Early Modern texts to identify features of gender – both literary and authorial.

Culpeper (2009) uses a keyword analysis in Wordsmith to identify features of characterization in Romeo and Juliet. He conducts his analysis by identifying keywords through a statistical analysis to explore characterization. These keywords are representative of what concepts are especially important to a specific character in conjunction with what the text is ‘about’. Culpeper accepts some of these limitations, saying

The objective with a keyword analysis is to make a claim that a certain set of words is key to a certain set of data relative to a comparative reference corpus. The problem is
that it is easy to retrieve keywords that are key, but not actually general features of the data one is examining. This can lead to some highly misleading characterisations of particular discourses or genres. (2009: 39)

Like Mahlberg and Fischer-Starcke, Culpeper’s study invokes statistically significant keywords, but also investigates statistically-significant parts of speech, to see how linguistic categories (nouns, verbs, prepositions) are used by different characters in *Romeo and Juliet.* This study successfully engages with the literary language of the play-text to identify stylistic features of characterization, but more importantly, Culpeper categorizes “three (Halliday-derived) functional emphases: ideational (as illustrated by Romeo), textual (as illustrated by Mercutio) or interpersonal (as illustrated by the Nurse)” (2009:53). What is especially notable about this second, later study is that Culpeper has managed to refute Fish’s original complaint about stylistics, as cited above. Here Culpeper identifies functional categories, finds relevant examples, and constructs meaning from them without relying on circular evidence. The categories of Ideational, Textual, and Interpersonal which Culpeper describes here are labeled as such following Halliday but are constructed from an independent semantic parser contained in WMatrix (Rayson 2008) rather than artificially constructed by Culpeper himself. As a result, the semantic parser has identified groups of semantic categories based on the statistically-derived keyword list. In other words, Culpeper himself does not dictate the semantic categories of the keywords, but instead uses an automated, analytically-blind\(^1\) system to identify the functional categories provided by a statistical analysis of keyness, which conveniently correlate to sets of Hallidayian functional categories.

Mullender’s 2011 PhD thesis takes a corpus stylistic approach to *which* as it appears in Shakespeare’s late plays. She identifies salient frequencies of *which* in a corpus of the late plays and conducts an analysis of the categories ascribed to *which* as it is used in the play (antecedent and clause marker), and conducts a close-reading analysis of the clause-marker *which* as it

---

\(^{1}\) This system is analytically-blind in that it does not have any preconceived notions about the texts, the language contained therein, or the information the researcher is looking for.
appears in the play-texts. Her study is different than the other studies described above: rather than strictly looking at lexical features, Mullender conducts a syntactic analysis, arguing that the syntactic usage of relative-clause *which* presents a way to further group Shakespeare’s plays within the late period. Her claim is based on both salient frequencies and qualitative linguistic readings of the play-texts. The strength of her analysis lies in acknowledging the difficulties and limitations of a corpus methodology as applied to a stylistic study of linguistic features in Shakespearean language and variation: with “its inability to take account of verse lineation, or the difference between verse and prose […] it is not yet possible to conduct searches on the basis of the position of words or phrases in the line. The result is that versification and lineation can only provide supporting evidence, rather than being determining factors in the search and analysis” (2011: 234). Rather than dismissing issues of verse and prose as they appear in the play-texts, Mullender successfully structures her thesis around the issues of conducting such an analysis, and presents a model for other syntactic studies of Shakespearean stylistic features in a corpus and non-corpus environment.

Using the same WMatrix system of semantic analysis that Culpeper uses, Murphy (2006) investigates stylistic features as they appear in soliloquies taken from 12 later Shakespearean plays, including many of the plays Mullender uses in her analysis. A statistical keyword analysis shows specific lexical items which are more likely to appear in a soliloquy compared to normal dialog; Murphy sets up a similar analysis to Culpeper in that they both quantifiably identify key terms within varying artificially-constructed semantic categories and investigate the literary use of these linguistic features in the specific dramatic form of soliloquy. Thus far, Murphy, Culpeper and Mullender all have focused their studies on a specific group of plays.

Demmen’s (2009) dissertation presents an analysis of key lexical bundles in the Shakespeare corpus, investigates linguistic features of male and female dialogue as it appears in lexical bundles and collocational patterns. Like the other corpus stylistic studies of Shakespearean language I have outlined above, her investigation of gender in Shakespeare is
truly both quantitative and qualitative, contrasting key female lexical clusters and what they tell us about feminine language in the plays to key male lexical clusters and what they tell us about masculine language in the plays to illustrate the stylistic features of characterization across the entire Shakespeare corpus.

Much like Culpeper’s (2009) study, this approach is very successful: through the use of an analytically-blind statistical keyword analysis, she is able to identify, isolate and analyze stylistic features of male and female dialogue on a very large scale. But unlike Culpepper’s study, Demmen’s study focuses on “frequency-based units identified automatically, and as such they are fragments which do not fit neatly into categories at any one language level” (2009: 77). She arranges the characters into social categories of “male” and “female” and conducts her analysis to find multiple characters from multiple play-texts within the corpus using the same features, as these collective features can be used to identify stylistic representations of men compared to women. Her study ultimately is successful in that it shows a feature of male and female language based on both quantitative and qualitative data, and presents strong evidence for stylistic features of feminine language as different from stylistic features of male language as produced in the play-texts. Demmen ultimately shows that a stylistic study of gender as it is represented in the play-texts is both possible and that male and female dialogue will produce different stylistic features, suggesting that male and female linguistic representation in the Shakespeare corpus is in some way measurable.

Busse (2002) presents a stylistic study similar to Demmen’s in that he also addresses issues of linguistic features found in the whole Shakespeare corpus, rather than a selection of plays, but his study of second-person pronouns (you/thou, mine/thine) and their variation is focused more on how they appear in the play-texts. Busse’s study presents a shift from pronominalization as represented in politeness theory (from a formal and informal distinction) to our modern conventions of second-person pronouns. In this quantitative and qualitative study, Busse addresses issues of genre, compositional date, and the use of time-sensitive pronoun
structures in his analysis. His study is successful in that he identifies a pattern of function words which have a set of rules which must be obeyed, and presents a way to identify the shift between the early and later plays in the corpus. Busse’s study of function words – specifically pronouns - in the early modern period proves that a corpus stylistic analysis of such a feature is not only possible, but a productive one. A corpus stylistic study of pronouns, as Busse has illustrated, will highlight a relevant stylistic feature encoded in the play-texts.

Previous corpus stylistic studies, such as the ones I have outlined here, serve as paradigms for a close, quantitative and qualitative study of specific linguistic features as they appear in a literary text. I build upon the work of my predecessors in corpus stylistics, specifically the work of those investigating linguistic features of Early Modern language and especially those focusing on Shakespeare’s language. The Early modern period (1500-1700) represents a shift between early Anglo-Saxon forms of English and contemporary modern English, after the Great Vowel Shift and after most inflectional endings have ceased appearing on nouns and adjectives. Early modern English looks remarkably like contemporary modern English, with some exceptions of syntax and orthographic variation. For these reasons, I find Early Modern English an interesting time in the history of the English language, as it represents a middle ground between Anglo-Saxon Old English and our contemporary modern English. As this period serves as a middle ground between two drastically different periods of the English language, I found myself wondering if the linguistic representation of gender was also undergoing a concurrent shift. Without recorded spoken data, however, this would be difficult to determine. With this in mind, examples of written language from the Early Modern Period are easily accessible in the form of literary texts – especially in plays, which are a form of literary language which is centered exclusively around dialogue in a way that narratively-based literary language is not.

In this study, I pose the question of gender representation in two Early-Modern play-texts. Feminist literary scholars have outlined a framework of oppression through which they
read and identify features of gender representation. Many feminist literary criticisms of Shakespeare have already categorized male and female characters into roles of subject and object or agent and patient, respectively. This dissertation is a study of gender as it is presented in two play-texts using a corpus stylistic approach. I ask whether the lexical representation of male and female through the use of third-person gendered pronouns present salient features of male and female identity.

To do so, I investigate the features of gender-specific pronouns, drawing on a corpus stylistic methodology combined with aspects of sociohistorical studies of gender relations. A study of gender in language implicitly invokes studies of power and discourse, and I address this through the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis. Because I am investigating gender in a literary context, I must also address issues of feminist literary and linguistic criticisms through feminist stylistic and feminist critical thought as applied to the Early Modern Period.

1.1.2 Shakespeare, gender and critical discourse analysis in Literary studies.

Upon selecting literary texts in this period for a stylistic analysis, Shakespeare’s writing was the obvious choice. As a prolific writer with at least 37 plays and 154 sonnets ascribed to him, all of which are widely available in a variety of different formats, Shakespeare is often considered the foremost representative of written language in the Early Modern period. Critical analyses of Shakespeare’s plays and sonnets have generated a huge quantity of academic discourse over the years. Though only recently have strictly “linguistically-inspired approaches” (Crystal 2003: 62) to Shakespeare’s works begun to appear, literary and social critics in the past have been especially interested in the “ways women are represented” (Demmen 2009: 1) in the plays. These literary and social critics have noted that as a writer, especially in regards to the social roles of men and women in the Early Modern Period, Shakespeare is widely regarded as a proto-feminist: “The drama from 1590 to 1625 is feminist in sympathy. Shakespeare’s modernity

---

2 I am disregarding the question of authorship, instead citing the commonly-accepted list of texts the modern canon recognizes as written by Shakespeare.
in his treatment of women has always attracted attention” (Dusinberre 1975: 5). Shakespeare’s female characters are commonly noted for “challeng[ing] early modern (and even modern) conventions for female behavior […]” (Kemp 2010: 173). Examples such as “courtship, illustrated by Loves Labors Lost and The Taming of the Shrew; sexuality, illustrated by Romeo and Juliet, Othello, and A Winter’s Tale; and women of power, illustrated by the Henry VI-Richard III tetralogy and Antony and Cleopatra” (ibid. 173) are all cited as illustrative of Shakespeare as a feminist, presenting women in situations which would be seen as radical in Early Modern society (Amussen 1993; Mendelson and Crawford, 1998; Erikson 1993).

Amussen’s 1993 study of gender and class in the early modern period focuses extensively on the structure of the family. She presents familial structure as a microcosm of social and political structures in the Early Modern period, using records of Norfolk villages as a case study of social identities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Her argument is largely based around the structures of power and authority as represented through gender relations: following her metaphor of the family of a political unit unto itself, Amussen shows that men are representative of the state and his wife and children are his subjects. Perhaps most notably, her study also examines the legal rights of women in these Norfolk villages, and finds that women are not as legally disadvantaged as other studies of Early Modern Society might claim. As the family serves as metaphor of the political state, Amussen successfully outlines the reflection of political turmoil between the king and parliament in her study of social identities in the Early Modern period.

Mendelson and Crawford’s book (1998) presents a comprehensive overview of women’s identity, covering aspects of women’s social status and agency in the Early Modern Period. This study presents a counter-discourse to the strictly patriarchal community outlined in Amussen’s text, identifying different female social groups (including girls, married women, widows) and comparing their social expectations within different, but still marginalized, communities of practice. Although married women would have a different social role than girls, and girls would
have a different socio-political role in the Renaissance than widows, for example, would, Mendelson and Crawford’s identification of these varying social roles adds nuance to their analysis, without disregarding the power dynamic of the Early Modern period. Where Amussen is content to assume that men and women have very strict social roles, Mendelson and Crawford’s study investigates the options women have within their social positions of daughter, wife, mother, and widow. The success of Mendelson and Crawford’s study lies in not constructing male and female social domains as being completely separate, but identifying the overlaps in these socio-political domains. *Women in Early Modern England* opens a dialogue of ways that male and female are similar, rather than further segregating these two communities. While Amussen’s study covers a vast number of historical records, Mendelson and Crawford critically engage with their historical documents.

Similarly, Amy Louise Erickson’s study of women and property in the Early Modern Period is also presented in contrast to Amussen’s views. Like Mendleson and Crawford did in their later text, Erickson argues that women had a much larger social role than we have previously given them credit for, through the study of single women, wives, widows and maids. She structures her study not around patrilineal ownership as dictated by recorded accounts of English Common Law but through the transfer of objects and agency awarded to women therein. Erickson’s study focuses on different types of transferable ownership, rather than issues of strictly legal ownership. Erickson challenges the idea that women had absolutely no agency, instead stressing the realms in which women do exert a form of social agency. While these women may not exert power over men, it was presented through the social realms where women are given similar agency. Erickson’s study contrasts “the laws of property transmission with women’s everyday experience of inheritance, marriage and widowhood” (1993: 4) using demographic public records, illustrating the difference between social expectations and social realities.
Many feminist criticisms of literature and language, including Lenz et al. (1983), Eagleton (1991), Levin (1988), Howard and Rackin (1997), Dusinberre (1975) and Callaghan (2000) – especially Lenz et al. and Callaghan’s collections of feminist criticisms of Shakespeare – equate social and literary realities by utterly disregarding social histories such as Erickson’s or Mendelson and Crawford’s and trusting their own intuitions, perhaps following an Amussen-esque approach to gender and agency in the early modern period. Feminist criticism seems quite content with implying that that the representation of male and female characters in literary texts is in some way exemplary of real-life social interactions. These critics presuppose specific linguistic structures in their representations of gender, and conduct their analysis following these presuppositions. Claire McEarchern identifies the problem in feminist studies of Shakespeare, saying that

advocates of a proto-feminist and a patriarchal Shakespeare have posited a mimetic/determiniministic relationship between art and society – the text is either an innocent mirror of cultural processes or the no-less-idealized agenda of patriarchal ideology. Most proto-feminist advocates […] of a play have found in Shakespeare’s women, particularly in the comedies, evidence of his culture’s incipient challenge to the patriarchy that, according to their reading, the text mirrors. Advocates of patriarchal Shakespeare aligning themselves with the historical revisionism that ascribes to the renaissance an increased suppression of women (1988: 270)

Either Shakespeare is a feminist, and his works should be read to reflect this, or Shakespeare is a part of the patriarchal socio-political system, and his writing is reflective of the social realities of this doctrine. If Shakespeare is to be read as a feminist writer, we must disregard the social implications of giving women a voice on-stage or in a play-text; if Shakespeare is part of this privileging system, we have disregarded the importance of giving female characters a voice. Balancing these two conflicting schools of feminist thought is difficult, and many texts and anthologies of Shakespearean feminist criticism ultimately have to choose one approach, rather than critically engage with the two opposing feminist perspectives. I describe examples of these two opposing ideologies as they are compiled and presented in opposition to each other.
Juliet Dusinberre’s *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women* (1975) serves as an early investigation of the use of feminist approaches to gender and the Early Modern Period, closely analyzing the representation of women and authority, women as property, and issues of the feminine and masculine. Dusinberre explores how women are represented as the objects of men, investigating the ways that society dictates the institution of marriage (among other social identities). While Dusinberre’s analysis is very advanced for her time, she falls dangerously close to claiming that the play-texts are meant to be representative of social realities of the period. As Germaine Greer writes, Dusinberre “accumulates inconclusive and fragmentary information, marshals it under arbitrary heads, and extrapolates a thesis which certainly cannot be proved by such a mountainous collection of piecemeal evidence and probably could never be proved at all” (Greer 1978: 335). Furthermore, “Dusinberre's book illustrates the dangers inherent in sweeping historical survey. […] She has culled passages relating to women and assigned them to a series of concepts - chastity as mystique, woman as property, and so forth - with little or no regard for contexts” (Holm 1978: 111) This idea of normalized patriarchal ideology that Dusinberre identifies created the need for a study of literature through a feminist slant.

These studies need to be careful of their implicit assumptions which mistake literary realities for social realities. Two anthologies present collections of feminist criticism: one as a result of the first-wave feminist movement, the second as a result of the third-wave feminist movement. Each has their strengths, and certainly the later text (Callaghan 2000) builds off of the ideas presented in the first (Lenz et al. 1983), but the issue of conflated social realities is a recurrent problem in feminist literary criticism.

Lenz et al. (1983) present a compilation of feminist criticisms of Shakespeare in their book *The Woman’s Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, addressing issues of women’s identity as it is presented through the play-texts: from issues of rape to the role of sexism (and, as applicable, racism) as embodied by other characters. Other sections of this anthology address the social role of intimate conversation between women in Shakespeare’s plays, female characters as
actors (agents) and audience (experiencers), and the role of chastity in the plays. While Lenz’s compilation of articles is comprehensive, covering many issues of gender representation in the play-texts, it is rather outdated. Callaghan’s anthology *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare* (2000) picks up where Lenz has left off, offering feminist readings of Shakespeare from the late 1990s, illustrating a form of “feminist visibility” (2000: xv) through the study of textual history, the history of feminist criticism as applied to Shakespeare and ways that language can be used to create and enact a matrix of social inequality. Callaghan’s text is grouped into categories including text and language, social economics, race and colonialism, performing sexuality and religion; each category addresses several different plays each. The analyses culled here encompass both socio-historical and socio-cultural elements, truly serving as a more comprehensive update to Lenz et al.’s earlier anthology.

Levin (1988) takes an opposing critical approach to the studies collated by Lenz et al. (1983), Dusinberre (1975), and presumably Callaghan (2000), saying that

Except for *Antony and Cleopatra* (which many of these critics treat separately), the tragic actions all take place in societies dominated by males and male attitudes and could not have taken place in a society that was matriarchal or androgynous or egalitarian, because gender relations are an essential aspect of the "world" of each play, and this "world" is built into the author's dramatic conception so that it is inseparable from the characters and actions, as they are far from it. (1988: 127)

The fundamental problem Levin has with these feminist criticisms is that they are exclusively limited to the social framework of the play-text. Because the play-texts are a form of fiction, their representations of social realities are exclusive to the play-texts. While Levin is correct in saying that “the tragic actions could not have taken place in a society that was matriarchal or androgynous or egalitarian”, the dramatic conception and cognitive actions of reading and/or observing of the play-texts depends upon adopting such a patriarchal social world-view. Characters in the tragedies share this male-dominated world-view, and by entering the dramatic world of the play-text, the reader or audience must also adopt this worldview. Thus a well-executed, careful feminist criticism is both valid and necessary. The social problems presented in
the tragedies are not simply consequences of a patriarchal society; these social issues are to be interpreted as issues of the play-text’s worldspace which we also must occupy, albeit temporarily. Though Levin is aware of the difference between the social and literary realities of the play-texts, he is too ready to dismiss these conceptual differences: the manifestation of a patriarchal structure is an issue to be addressed, not absolutely ignored as Levin does in his analysis.

Howard and Rackin (1997) take a different approach entirely to Shakespeare’s histories, exploring gender specifically as it is presented in the history plays. Their study addresses the things that female characters do that are considered “untraditional”: that is, actions such as being “generals leading victorious armies on the battlefield and as political actors who exercise significant power in the conduct of state affairs” (1997: 24). Based on the social histories presented above, these would be considered wildly unfeasible. Yet other Shakespearean plays – histories or otherwise – will often show “the few female characters who appear on stage are typically confined to domestic settings and domestic roles – as wife, prospective wife, mother, widow, lady-in-waiting” (ibid). Their study is successful in one sense, in that they remain carefully conscious of social realities – especially as noted in the quote above, that such actions on the part of female characters would be “untraditional”. Their weakness is in their contrast of such an untraditional social role for women with more socially acceptable roles, presenting a more acceptable social role as being “traditional”. Howard and Rankin’s study of the histories constructs an open feminist dialogue between these extraordinary and ordinary women and Shakespeare’s portrayal of their relationships to other characters in the history plays, presenting an example of a successful literary study using a feminist framework of criticism.

Of course, feminist literary studies such as these have roots in critical discourse analysis, which combines aspects of social theory and philosophy and applies these theories to stylistic studies to qualitatively study “abuse, dominance, and inequality” as they are “enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text” (Van Dijk 2003: 352). Discourse analysis scholars are
interested in the representation of language and power, using texts such as Halliday’s *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (1985) and Foucault’s *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1972) as the basis for a linguistically driven analysis. Such a theoretical framework was predictably well-received by critics, but was especially embraced by feminist stylistic scholars (Mills 1995, 1989, Mills 1992d; Mills & Mullany 2011; Cameron 2006; Lakoff 1973; Bauer & McKristy 1991). After all, “with respect to gender, stylistics and critical discourse analysis have considerable overlap, and it is not always easy to separate the two approaches” (Bucholtz 2003: 71), as “feminist work has become paradigmatic for much discourse analysis, especially since much of this work explicitly deals with social inequality and domination” (van Dijk 2001: 359). These critics appear to “understand the meaning of a linguistic message solely on the basis of the words and structures of the sentences(s) used to convey that message” and note that as discourse analysts “we certainly rely on syntactic structure and lexical items used in a linguistic message to arrive at an interpretation” (Brown & Yule 1983: 223), though “there are discursive constraints on the roles that women characters are supposed to play in texts” (Mills, 1995: 170). These stylistic studies center their argument around social identities as they are constructed through a system of power and privilege, an idea lifted directly from critical discourse analysis.

Michel Foucault’s book, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1972), is a key text in discourse analysis, as it explores how language is set up to create this system of power and privilege. He begins by identifying features of discourse and language use, saying that “discourse is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is, in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence” (Foucault 1972:107). Language is a system in which specific meanings are encoded; as users of language, we must decide how these meanings are used to construct a hierarchy of discursive formality. Foucault’s argument centers on the history of knowledge, the history of ideas, and the archeology of both knowledge and ideas: who has them, how are they manifested, how they are attributed to individuals and what apparent contradictions are present. These “discourses as practice” are used to “define types of
rules that run through individual oeuvres, sometimes govern them entirely, and dominates them to such an extent that nothing eludes them” (1972: 140). In his study of “discourses as practice”, he presents the ways that individuals are grouped according to different identities and how we ascribe power (or the lack thereof) to a group. The framework of discourse analysis is profoundly gendered, and Foucault’s book serves to present a way to identify and investigate a power struggle as it is presented through linguistically-encoded markers, through the identification of staging, thematic elements, and information structure.

Other scholars have taken aspects of Foucaultian analysis of power as it is constructed through knowledge and the representation of such knowledge and applied further sociolinguistic approaches to discourse analysis. It is not terribly far-fetched, then, for feminist stylistics to continue the work of critical discourse analysis. Stylistics, as I have illustrated, is interested in the way we construct meanings from written language. Critical discourse analysis investigates how power is manifested in language. Combining the two fields into a study of power and privilege as it is manifested in the language of literature and how we thus derive meanings of power and privilege creates feminist stylistics.

Feminist criticisms, as we have established above, have assumed women to exist in an oppressed sector of society. Bauer and McKrinstry’s 1992 collection about feminism and Bakhtin’s dialogic imagination presents a series of readings which elaborate on the political aspects of style and how they are manifested through a dialogue of Bakhtin’s approach to sociolinguistics as it applies to feminist literary and cultural studies. Bakhtin paired a stylistic analysis of literary language to sociolinguistics in The Dialogic Imagination (1975), outlining a heteroglossic approach to language, wherein multiple characters present multiple ideologies from different social positions, but are framed by the author’s personal social identities: a male writer will present female characters differently than a female writer will present female characters. Bakhtin does not draw on any female writers in his analysis, but his social Marxism opens the dialogue of heteroglossia as it is applied to female identity as it is represented in literary texts,
and his approach to style as a sociolinguistic phenomenon is certainly applicable to a feminist approach to stylistics.

Bauer and McKinstry’s anthology functions as the feminist response to Bakhtin’s theory of heteroglossia and sociolinguistic style, compiling feminist critiques of style as it appears in a variety of textual circumstances. In this anthology, Donovan (1972: 85-95) describes the novel, using Bakhtin’s framework, as “the locus of a counterhegemonic resistance to the centralized authority of official disciplines” (85-86). Similarly, Herndl (1972: 7-25) summarizes Baktin’s argument nicely, saying that a male writer constructing female characters is writing from “the place of the other” and will produce a marked difference in the way that women in these texts will use language (1992: 10). Bauer and McKinstry’s compilation critically engages with these concepts through an analysis of ecofeminism, gender theory in novelistic discourse, and representations of power through a stylistic study, among others. Feminist stylistics is clearly a way to combine sociocultural studies with literary interpretation, and others have followed in the footsteps of this book, including the authors discussed below.

Perhaps most notably, Sara Mills’ Feminist Stylistics (1995) presents an outline of how such a stylistic approach to language can be applied to discourse analysis, and synthesizes them into a study of social power as they appear in a variety of contexts. While stylistics explores the way we derive meanings from a text, feminist stylistics explores how we derive issues of gender identity and structure a through a critical close reading to relate “the language of texts to extra-textual political processes” as they appear in a sociocultural context (Mills 1992: 10) while remaining conscious of issues of race, gender, and class as it is encoded in the linguistic features of a text. She outlines a methodology for addressing issues of feminist concern and applies it to a wide range of texts, illuminating how the representation of features of gender, class and race can be identified, interpreted and presented to an audience. The interpretations she presents cover a variety of mediums, including advertising, television, and literary texts.
Lakoff’s article “Language and Women’s Place” (1973) serves as an early approach to the issue of men’s and women’s language through an analysis of normalized gender differences as they are perceived by others. She investigates what is supposed to be characteristic of men’s and women’s language, and how the social identities encoded in gender identity are unaltering. Women can exhibit a form of social gain, adopting features of so-called ‘male speech’, but men cannot drop register and use features of ‘women’s language’ without having their sexuality and masculinity questioned. This is problematic, as it constructs masculinity as unreachable by women, but something that must be upheld by men: “This fact points indeed to a more general conclusion. These words aren't, basically, 'feminine'; rather, they signal 'uninvolved', or 'out of power'. Any group in a society to which these labels are applicable may presumably use these words; they are often considered 'feminine', 'unmasculine', because women are the 'uninvolved', 'out of power' group par excellence” (Lakoff 1973: 53). This idea of power groups – later recast as discourse communities (see Chapter 2) – resurfaces in feminist stylistics and sociolinguistic studies of language and gender.

Deborah Cameron’s compendium On Language and Sexual Politics (2006) uses Mills’ approach to feminist interpretations of stylistic features and builds on Lakoff’s concept of power groups, addressing different ways that language encodes for patterns of gender identity and how they are applied under different circumstances. Articles such as “Is there any ketchup, Vera: Gender, Power and Pragmatics”, “Verbal Hygiene for Women: Linguistics misapplied” both address issues of gender as it is represented through language use. Cameron studies these issues of social gender identity through semantic and pragmatic frameworks, investigating the ways that language is a way of manifesting a power struggle between the perceived dominant group and the perceived subordinate group.

In “Is there any ketchup, Vera: Gender, Power, and Pragmatics” Cameron addresses the possible interpretations of the question ‘is there any ketchup, Vera?’, as it is said by different social groups. Cameron walks us through a variety of different of instances that this question
could be uttered in, and presents several possible interpretations of the question ‘Is there any X, Vera’. These interpretations, briefly summarized, can be read in one of two ways:

a) an ambiguous request for Vera to get X, or

b) as a request of ‘do we have X’.

In both parsings of this request, the sex of the speaker is relevant, as the person making the request is asking Vera to get something. A man asking a woman to get X puts himself in a position of power, requesting that Vera gets X for him; a woman asking another woman (or a man asking another man) this same question would be parsed as the second meaning of ‘do we have X’, which nullifies the power discrepancy of ‘can you get X for me’. The sex of the speaker and the sex of the listener are relevant features in our parsing and interpretation of the power dynamics of a request.

Cameron’s study of social differences as they are manifested through pragmatic and semantic interpretations of social identities as it is applied to a set of opposing social groups, constructed through oppositional identities. “Verbal Hygiene for Women” is critical of so-called communication training and ‘women’s language’ as compared to ‘men’s language’: “the field of language and gender studies has been plagued from its inception with premature generalizations that have turned out on investigation to be false or simplistic […] there is no subject […] about which people are so desperate to generalize as the difference between men and women.” (2006: 110). The sex of speakers and listeners is extremely relevant to the interpretation of a spoken or written utterance. Applying this to play-texts, performativity of gender would have an effect on the derivational implications from (written) utterances of characters.

However, the synthesis of corpus stylistics and discourse analysis is not unheard of: Baker et al.’s study of discourse markers as they appear in a UK news corpus (2008) did this, examining synchronic and diachronic features of the discursive presentations of refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants and migrants in a ten-year period of British news texts while balancing corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis. Their approach to linguistic markers of
refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants and migrants through an analysis of grammatical features
to isolate and recognize lexical patterns through a collocational analysis while remaining
conscious of “social, political, historical and cultural contexts” (2008: 293) surrounding their
data. While they do not explicitly identify literary meanings of their data, thus making their study
not strictly a literary-stylistic one, Baker et al. are successful in their synthesis of corpus
linguistics and critical discourse analysis to identify relevant linguistic features of discourse
markers in a corpus: they illustrate that it is possible to isolate both salient (gender) and non-
salient (race, ethnicity, and class) discourse markers of power using corpus methodology.

With the exception of Baker et al.’s study (2008), a strictly feminist stylistic and
discourse analytic approach is often constrained by the roles that a woman could or should play
rather than roles women do fulfill. Instead of addressing linguistic issues ingrained in text, these
criticisms are wholly dependent upon a predetermined sociocultural context and texts are then
analyzed accordingly. The stylistician or discourse analyst will often decide which aspects of the
text they want to investigate, and read the text in search of these linguistic features. So how do
we eliminate this bias?

1.1.3 A digital approach to stylistics

Introducing stylistics to a digitally quantitative analysis presents a new approach to
stylistic and critical discourse studies. Unlike other methodologies, a corpus linguistic method
presents a digital analysis of very large bodies of texts, designed to find quantitative results of
particular linguistic forms. A digital analysis of a text will therefore be more comprehensive and
“more productively indifferent to linear reading and the powerful directionality of human
attention” (Hope and Witmore 2010: 359). A human reader might not notice specific recurring
patterns, but a computer will - without any prior knowledge or expectations of the text – compile
all of them for our perusal. After all, computers cannot read, but they can follow commands.
These patterns, though always present in a text, might not be easily identified by linear
readers, as Hope and Witmore suggest. As Argamon et al. point out, “literary scholars work
almost exclusively with well-elaborated methods of semantic analysis, developed with all the
strengths and limitations posed by a book-only, eye-centered, subjectivity-dependent research
context’’ (2006: 4). A computer analysis can help a reader detect and keep track of patterns of a
narrative – patterns such as individual words, related phrases or image clusters, and the
association of specific phrases with figures or events (Burgess 1999: 20). But a corpus stylistic
analysis does not end here: “while the computer can produce a concordance of a word, drawing
meaningful conclusions about the word requires a careful qualitative analysis of the contents of
that concordance” (Gregory and Hardie, 2011: 299). Where corpus linguistics is more
quantitative than other linguistic methodologies, concerned mostly with repetitive and otherwise
typical uses, a corpus stylistic approach relies on aspects both quantitative and qualitative
techniques. Statistical and frequency calculations will always be quantitative, while the literary
interpretation of a text still requires qualitative processing (Gregory and Hardie 2011: 299, Biber
et al. 1998: 4). Adopting techniques of corpus studies and applying them to literary texts creates
the opportunity for a close study of specific linguistic features as they appear in a literary
context. A list of relevant search terms can be compiled using a statistical analysis as an initial
investigation, and the secondary application of a concordance to show these search terms in
collocation within the context of the input text (Sinclair 1991: 32) highlights specific lexical and
syntactic patterns which might be otherwise unnoticeable to the human reader of a text.
However, once the data is compiled, the interpretation of these patterns is now open to the
human researcher. A corpus stylistic approach presents an opportunity in literary linguistic
research which uses both quantitative and qualitative data in an analysis – a less subjective
approach to interpreting sociological features of the play-texts.

To me, the ability to digitally highlight and compile a list of every example of a specific
linguistic feature as they appear in the context of a line is an exciting prospect, and the
possibilities of analysis through the identification of patterns within these isolated examples adds a new dimension to the practice of close reading typical of literary study. Shakespeare’s use of language has been under close scrutiny for years; new aspects of Early Modern culture, society and politics keep emerging under each successive analysis. I approached this study by asking whether or not a corpus stylistic study of the lexical representation of gender would match the commonly-accepted feminist responses to female representation in Shakespearean play-texts, and how that will affect our understanding of female and male identities in the Early Modern period. In this dissertation I will illustrate that a corpus stylistics approach is a useful methodology for the identification and analysis of gender-specific representation across two play-texts.
1.1.4 Definitions used in this study.

This study is corpus-based rather than corpus-driven. This distinction is important, as outlined in this discussion of various corpus methodologies:

In the former approach, i.e. corpus-based investigations, corpora are used as sources of empirical data (linguistic, socio-cultural, textual) against which intuitions [...] are tested or preliminary findings from smaller data sets are validated. In the latter, i.e. corpus driven research, corpora themselves are the data from which [...] language uses are uncovered (Vo and Carter 2010: 310, summarizing Tognini-Bonelli 2001: 65-100).

A corpus-based study such as mine is based on empirical data. In other words, a corpus-based study is inclusive of corpus methodology and theory but allows for secondary interpretation of the data. The observation of statistically significant keywords is a cornerstone of corpus studies. A corpus-driven study might stop an analysis at statistically significant lexical items, but identifying keywords in a literary document will only tell us so much about the text – after all, as Mullender says, “statistics cannot replace literary criticism, but they can substantiate its insights” (2011: 35). A keyword calculation will only find words which are in some way outliers – lexical items which appear much more often in one text compared to another. Words which are not outliers, but could still be of interest to the corpus stylistics researcher, might not be identified – a limitation of remaining strictly corpus-driven. Identifying keywords in a literary document will only tell us so much about the text. Words which are not outliers, but could still be of interest to the corpus stylistics researcher, might not be identified – a limitation of remaining strictly corpus-driven. Corpus stylistics allows the identification of linguistic features of a literary text to be the starting point of an analysis, rather than the bulk of analysis itself. Furthermore, it allows for the adoption of certain techniques from corpus methodology as the stylistician sees fit.

As this study investigates linguistic features as they appear in a specific literary context, addressing issues of literary language therefore depends upon the adoption of certain real-world implications into the content domain of a specific text (Vigliocco et al., 2005) by the audience, as Culpeper and Demmen have implied. Literary language is theorized to not function in the same way as natural language does, which is a formal linguistic constraint of working with literary
texts. While this is a controversial claim (cf. Fabb 2009; Thoms 2011), I follow the approach taken by Fabb and Thoms, who both state that literary language is in some way representative of a specific form of speech act. In my study, this specific way of representing such a speech act is exclusive to the form and structure of Early Modern play-texts.

I have elected to keep my analysis within clauses rather than sentences. Mullander, in her 2011 PhD thesis, points out that

even if punctuation is discarded as a guide, Shakespeare’s syntax is often dense and convoluted, and (as in Present Day English) phrases and clauses are frequently embedded at different levels, often resulting in a lack of clarity as to where word groups start and the counting practicable. (2011: 87)

In an attempt to regularize my data, as it is all derived from this convoluted syntactic system, each example from the play-texts will be addressed within the nearest clause rather than the nearest sentence. Examples are cited by the character who said the line and the line number assigned to this example using the numeration system produced by my concordance system. (Appendix A). Citations for the purposes of a literary discussion are from the Open Source Shakespeare texts and follow the Open Source Shakespeare Through-Line Numbering system.

Following conventions of other corpus stylistic studies, the below definitions and conventions apply to this study. The “play-text” discussed is the data under consideration, “to emphasize I am discussing a written form of the plays, not a performed form” (Culpeper and McIntyre 2006: 775). This study is uninterested in performed versions of the plays and deals exclusively with the written editions of the plays, where the language is presented as orthographic symbols rather than spoken utterances. Where relevant, I use the phrase “search term” to define the lexical items of interest rather than “keyword”, as a keyword is a statistically important lexical item in corpus studies. All examples from the play-texts will be in inverted commas (“ “), and relevant information within these quotes will be in italics; titles of a play-text are also italicized.
1.1.5 Concluding thoughts and dissertation outline.

With these definitions and conventions in place, I now present an outline of this dissertation. This project is a study of the lexical representation of gender in two contrastive Shakespearean plays, using a corpus stylistic methodology to identify ways that gender is represented in these two play-texts. I conduct two analyses: first, I investigate whether male pronouns are more likely to appear in a subject, rather than object position; in doing so I also investigate if the feminist literary critics are correct in assuming that women are more likely to appear as objects. With this information, I then conduct a close reading of a specific pattern of possession as ascribed to male and female characters. The methodology I use for this analysis is outlined in detail in Chapter 2. The results produced from my corpus are combined with a close reading and interpretation of linguistic structures presenting possession as they appear in the text in Chapter 3. The results and analysis of this project raise questions for further research; these questions are discussed in Chapter 4. A corpus stylistic study of gender in the Early Modern period examines ways that meaning is encoded using literary language through the use of several available tools for digital analysis. I describe these tools and the results they produce in the chapters that follow.
Chapter 2: Methodology

This project is a corpus-based study of gender-specific grammatical possession in two Shakespearean play-texts. This chapter begins with the theoretical background of literary and linguistic gender as it is understood in the Early Modern Period and moves into an overview of the analysis of digital texts, addressing issues of software, methodology and techniques of identifying patterns of lexical representation in a corpus stylistic study.

Part I. Theoretical Approaches to Literary and Linguistic Gender

2.1.1 Gender in play-texts.

This dissertation addresses issues of gender, which is manifested in language as a sociocultural discourse marker, as it appears in written language. To conduct the analysis I present here, I first must differentiate between sex and gender. Biological sex is presented in contrast to the social construction of male and female as conceptual, binary understandings of gender as represented by characters in the play-texts. The social construction of gender encompasses both biological and psychological features, whereas sex is applied exclusively to biological characteristics. My study represents characters of different binary sexes through a dialog-based discourse analysis in order to identify patterns of gender within the play-texts.

Following Culpeper (2001: 12), “gender is a fundamental social category which people use in making sense of others”. And as Demmen wisely points out, “it is reasonable to suppose that the kinds of language men and women in the plays use statistically frequently will have some relationship with an early modern audience’s understanding of what is possible and appropriate behavior in real life, and in dramatic worlds” (2009: 13) Furthermore,

the study of sex and gender in literary texts is typically approached in one of two ways: one, some scholars attempt to determine male and female authorial styles based on their sex; two, others examine the representation of characters of different sex, through their dialog and/or the ways they are described (Livia 2003: 142)

My study applies Livia’s (2003) approach of representing characters of different binary sexes through a dialog-based discourse analysis to identify patterns of gender within the play-texts.

But it is important to remember that a play-text is not representative of the real world, though it will incorporate aspects of real-world interaction. Interactions set up as dialog between the
genders, but all of the circumstances of a play-text are not entirely possible in the real world. ³
There are certain aspects of language in the real-world which will remain applicable, regardless
of the literary usage of linguistic features, in a play-text. Some of these aspects of language in the
real-world are still relevant in literary texts, especially sociolinguistic factors.

Sociolinguists Deborah Cameron and Penelope Eckert make an important distinction
about gender in the real-world, which must be kept in mind throughout this study. Sociolinguistic
features of language are relevant in the real-world and are re-presented in the social space of the
play-texts, but the social space of the play-texts can only be informed by social realities rather
than be strictly representative. Literary language invokes features of the real-world, but are not
strictly dependent upon it. However, gender is a feature of language which remains static both in
the real-world and in the fictionalized world of play-text.

Cameron and Eckert both stress the following: Lexical items coded as markers of gender
retain a choice in linguistic representation that lexical items coded as markers of ethnicity or
race, for example, do not. “Whether or not the author considers gender an important variable, the
structure of language makes it required information. The same is not true of race […] there is a
[linguistic] category for gender which must be filled” (Livia 2001:36-7). Similarly, social class is
not encoded in a language in the same way that gender is. Avoiding gendered pronouns in
discourse is awkward-sounding, as repetition of the proper name, lexical substitution and the use
of deverbal noun phrases simply draw attention to the lack of pronouns (Livia 2001:38);
furthermore this approach requires lots of effort on the part of the reader (Livia 2001: Chapter 2).
A literary text can avoid discussing race or ethnicity without much difficulty, whereas gender is
viewed as a fundamental fact in characterization.

³ For instance, both the faeries and Nick Bottom’s transformation into a donkey in A Midsummer
Night’s Dream are not plausible things to happen in the real-world, but the gender roles which
these characters inhabit and uphold without being strictly human is still applicable within the
realm of the real world.
Gendered terms and their usages are therefore presented as a struggle for power between the sexes, as Cameron suggests. If the gender category of ‘female’ occupies a subordinated social space, their movement into a place of power is more notable, but also more difficult: this presents a “degree of risk consequently involved in their [a woman] being assertive […] assertive behavior is not neutral with respect to gender but flouts gender norms” (1994: 108). The assertion of power, then, is closely tied to the presentation of gender: “femininity is a culturally defined form of mitigation or denial of power, whereas masculinity is the affirmation of power” (Eckert 1990: 250); similar ideas are explored in Butler (1990, 1993). What makes the study of gender interesting is that the power struggle between male and female is in some way quantifiable in a way that other socio-cultural features are not, as Eckert illustrates: “If one were to think of variables as social markers, then, one might expect gender markers to behave quite differently from markers of class or ethnicity […] to the extent that masculine or feminine behavior marks gender, its use by males and females respectively is more a device for competing with others in the same category and creating solidarity with those in the other category” (Eckert 1990: 249). While gender in a play-text is not directly the issue at hand, it is the manifestation of power struggles - following Butler (1990, 1993), discussed below in 2.1.2 - as it is presented in the linguistic structures of the play-text which is the focus of this study. For these reasons, I elect to structure my analysis around gender representation in two Shakespearean plays.

2.1.2 Addressing gender as a literary-linguistic, sociohistorical feature.

When selecting search terms for the investigation of gender in the Early Modern Period, I decided that they must be prototypically “male” or “female” in some sense, categorized as having the binary categorical feature [± male] or [± female]. The social construction of gender, rather than using strictly biological features to collate and identify groups, is explored in Judith Butler’s 1990 and 1993 texts. Thus the gender binary is not strictly based on biological sex but the presentation of gender identities. Studies which follow this convention of defining gender
using binary features as it is socially presented rather than biologically indicated include Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1992), Cameron (1990, 2006); Culpeper (2001); Demmen (2009); and Livia (2001, 2003). It is clear that this has been a well-established convention in sociological and sociolinguistic studies in the past 20 years.

Butler’s groundbreaking work (1990, 1993) addresses how gender identity is entirely a social construct rather than a biological issue. In *Gender Trouble* (2000) she begins a systematic breakdown of sex binaries, outlining a post-structural approach to gender not as a compulsory heterosexual binary identity but as a system of features which are in perpetual motion rather than strictly categorized and uncompromising. Through a theory of gender performativity as it appears in the stylistization and presentation of a body, Butler presents ways to subvert the need for a hegemonic system of binary identities through a series of previously unquestioned social politics. She presents ways in which the previously stable concepts of woman and man can be deconstructed through the act of gender performativity and its relationship to biological sex (or the lack of a relationship thereof). The body is a social construct, sex the normalized view of ‘male’ and ‘female’, and gender is the cultural construct of both the body and sex. *Gender Trouble* presents this argument in contrast to traditional discourses of gender theory, which was based exclusively on biological features.

This concept is furthered in her book, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (1993). Butler continues her argument of gendered performativity and the material limitations of the body as a socio-political construct. She argues that the materiality of the body itself is a discourse of power. *Gender Trouble* sets the framework for her later work by presenting a spectrum of deviation through performativity; *Bodies That Matter* discusses sexual morphology as it is perceived within this spectrum of deviation, and how this spectrum of deviation through performativity is enacted through external discourse and internal ontology.

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) present the divisions of social groups around the construction of difference and power as it is manifested through what they call “communities of
practice”, building on groups which have been identified through a Bulterian construction of
gender identity, and can be identified through discourse power groups. Their study presents
issues of gender construction through dominance and power-structures through an analysis of
some of the ways that gender difference helps create hierarchical and other kinds of
gender relations; and we indicate how those power relations in turn help construct
“women”, “men”, and their language. Not only are difference and dominance both
involved in gender, but they are also jointly constructed and prove ultimately inseparable
(1992: 462)

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet present their concept of communities-of-practice as grouped by
features of a predominant social identity such as gender, race, ethnicity, or economic class. They
test their theory of communities of practice in a study of linguistic variation on a group of male
and female speakers, to identify whether there are “tendencies toward gender-differentiated
practice that have implications for language” (1992: 470). The point of their study is not to show
why generalizations are problematic, but to illustrate how gender is a form of identity which
colors how we perceive other aspects of identity and interactional relations. Their study
effectively presents a framework through which we can begin to investigate an easily identifiable
and quantifiable feature of language as it is reproduced in usage, and how aspects of power and
discourse can be presented through such a framework.

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet continue this argument in their book, Language and Gender
(2003). Building off other studies and collections, including Butler (1990, 1993); Cameron
(1990, 2006), Lakoff (1973), and other studies, they present a comprehensive overview of how
sex and gender can be used to identify linguistic features of style, variation, and performativity.
Through the construction of social identity, Language and Gender investigates how gender is not
simply a feature someone has, but a feature of what people do and how they perform this aspect
of ‘having’ in their daily lives, through the study of one’s language.

Cameron’s The Feminist Critique of Language is a survey of feminist criticisms of
language through a sociolinguistic, literary-linguistic and discourse-analytic perspective as it
applies to students of gender and feminist studies, sociolinguistics, and literary studies. Her
wide-ranging collection of language as it applies to gender covers women’s writing and sexism in language from the 1920s and 1930s (including an essay by Virginia Woolf and another by Luce Irigaray, among other philosophers and writers), presents a survey of sexism in language from the past 60 years. Cameron’s collection is successful in that it shows the evolution of feminist approaches to language and literature and the evolution towards a more complex analysis of gender representation in language, and creates space for further studies. Her collection discusses feminine (and masculine) ideology as it occurs in linguistic determinism and the dangers of stereotyping gendered speech while isolating and highlighting the inadequacies of using strictly social contextualization for discourse analysis, rather than considering external social factors.

In Livia’s studies of 20th Century modernist fictions (Pronoun Envy, 2001 and “One Man in Two is a Woman: Linguistic Approaches to Gender in Literary Texts”, 2003), she addresses several texts which do not explicitly use gender, and she presents the problems this causes for the reader. While her studies are focused more on the way that gender is represented in literature than in everyday linguistic practices, she conducts her analysis by illustrating how features of discourse and power in texts is interpreted with and without gender markers: “Studies of gender in literary texts have not been confined to stylistic analysis but also include investigations into the representation of men and women and what these literary models can tell us about conversational expectations in the real world” (2003: 146). The texts without explicit gender are the texts which are the most interesting, as the assumptions implicitly made by the reader are more obvious, directly challenging the way we think about gender as it is presented in literary language.

With these studies in mind, I selected a set of lexical items which were representative of both biological sex and the social construction of gender. The use of a gender term would have to be automatically be ascribed to a character and implicitly understood by all characters in a play-text. Linguistic representation of gender is a salient sociolinguistic feature which is present in the
play-texts; most importantly, the way that gender is ascribed does not require the performance of a play-text.

2.1.3 Selecting relevant gender-specific search terms for investigation.

Terms of interest included third-person gendered pronouns and some nouns which are semantically encoded as being inherently male or female. I began with selecting the most prototypical gendered lexical items – pronouns. From there, I looked at the Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary to find other gender-coded terms from the Early Modern Period, and then checked their representation using a log-likelihood process described below in 2.2.1. My initial search terms encompassed the third-person pronouns (he/she, him/her, his/hers), reflexive pronouns (himself, herself) and some nouns (man, woman, women, wife).

Like Modern English, Early Modern English does not mark for grammatical gender in the same way that other languages like French do (Livia 2000, 2003). Third-person gender-specific pronouns in English are very predictable as a purely semantic feature, showing membership in a specific community (Livia 2000: 29). Deviation from grammatically assigned case is not allowed, thus each pronoun retains specific lexical properties: nominative case is ascribed to subjects, whereas accusatives, datives, and genitives are ascribed to different kinds of grammatical objects. These are generally described as follows, inflected for both gender and case:

| Table 1. Third-person gender-specific pronouns, organized by case |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Nominative | Accusative | Dative | Genitive |
| He | Him | Him | His |
| She | Her | Her | Hers |

This study is loosely based upon aspects of Halliday’s *An Introduction To Functional Grammar* (1985: Chapter 6), a text widely used in stylistic analysis, as it discusses ways that meaning is encoded in literary language. Halliday treats language as a feature of sociology and investigates
ways that discourse works to convey a meaning. A functional grammar is unlike a formal grammar, which produces replicable rules; a functional grammar investigates the function of language by its users.

As this study focuses on the usage of already-generated language in a literary context (rather than how this language is generated), I elect to follow, broadly, Halliday’s approach to grammar. The titles he has given to his structures of groupings and phrases, including Thing and Deictic, are applied to this study. I abbreviate them as N and D to be perfectly clear about their syntactic roles: the Deictic is a determiner; the Thing is a noun. I elect to use more these conventional titles of D and N where possible.  

I begin my analysis with Huddleston’s structural grammar of English, as the switch from a structural to a functional grammar works best when the definitions are consistent across both theoretical approaches.

The deictic (D) possessive pronouns his and her are of specific interest because they are variant in ways which I now address. Briefly stepping outside the framework of Systemic Functional Grammar and returning to a basic structural grammar – specifically, Huddleston (1984: 256-298) – of English, there are three pronouns which are considered as markers of possession which could be used in these examples.

i. As a pronominal genitive his/her

ii. As part of a D+N construction (his/her + noun)

iii. As pronominal accusative form, him/her

Her can function either as an accusative or as an attributive genitive, as outlined above. Unfortunately, this construction of possession does not map perfectly across the gender binary.

---

4 The terminology of Thing and Deictic are adapted directly from Halliday (1985). This is a nontraditional use of the term deictic, but Halliday’s phrase-building terminology is appropriate here to describe the effect of creating strings of words with the same functional properties. I apply the title D to Hallidayian deictics, more formally known as determiners, and N to Hallidayian Things, more formally known as nouns.

5 Here I am referring exclusively to the difference between male and female third-person possessive, but not exclusively deictic pronouns.
Though *his* can appear as either an attributive or as an absolute, as shown in (1a) or as part of a D+N construction, as shown in (1b)

(1a) The red hat is *his*

(1b) I called *his mother*

*hers* cannot be part of a D+N construction in the same way. It appears to be ungrammatical, as shown in (1c), but is fine as a pronominal in (1d).

(1c) The red hat is *hers*

(1d) *I called hers mother*

Because *hers* is only absolutive and *his* can be either attributive or absolutive, (1a) and (1b) are acceptable; whereas only (1c) is grammatical; (1d) is not.

*Hers* does not appear in *Macbeth* or *Wives*. I therefore cannot comment on the relationship between the general possessive *his* and the absolute possessive *hers*. However, *hers* is not absent from the rest of the Shakespeare corpus; it occurs 55 times in 47 lines within 23 works. 6 Out of the 37 plays, 154 sonnets and 5 poems (and considered as 43 total works), adding up to a total of 884,429 words, *hers* appears in the corpus with a raw frequency of 55, and appears in 53% of the works – just over half of the Shakespeare corpus. *Hers* appears more frequently in some plays compared to others (*Cymbeline*, for example, has 11 instances of *hers* but *Titus Andronicus* only has one example). Unfortunately the scope of this study does not allow for a full investigation of *hers* and its full representation in the Shakespeare corpus. Instead, I focus my study on two play-texts and the representation of D+N constructions.

A second issue to address in study of the lexical representation of gender using socio-historical data is the semantic overlap between *his* and *its*. Huddleston’s grammar of Modern English says that “*he* is used of males, *she* of females, and *it* elsewhere” (Huddleston 1984: 289).

---

6 These numbers are taken from the Open Source Shakespeare concordance, which includes all of Shakespeare’s poems and plays. Of these 23 works, *Passionate Pilgrim, Venus and Adonis* and *Sonnet 41* are all cited as having one example each.
Huddleston’s generalization is correct for a grammar of modern English. But as Nevalanien points out, in EModE *his* and *its* were synonymous and often used interchangeably:

> The problem that Early Modern English speakers had even after the leveling of object forms of *it* was the non-personal possessive *his* which coincided with the masculine possessive *his* […] This clash between the personal and non-personal gender was resolved by the introduction of the new possessive form *its*, presumably by analogy with the genitive suffix –s (Nevalanien 2006: 81).

This creates the potential for conflation in the number of hits for *his*, as a number of these examples may not be perfectly representative of only male-specific referents. To avoid this confusion, I have eliminated any examples from my data-collection process which use *his* in a D+N construction but are not explicitly referring to a male-coded lexical item.

With some of the basic grammatical structures of Early Modern English pronominalization now in place, I now return to Systemic Functional Grammar as a framework for interpretation and analysis. This study focuses exclusively on D+N constructions using gender-specific deictic forms. I refer to these constructions as “D+N constructions”, where D represents the possessive deictic *his/her* and N represents the [noun] *Thing*.

Though the *Thing* is “the semantic core of the nominal group” (Halliday 1985:167), the *Thing* is not obligatory in other constructions (Halliday 1985: 173), as we have seen above in examples (1a) and (1c). However, it is the textual meaning of a linguistic cluster that contains both a gender-specific deictic and a *Thing* that are the lexical clusters of interest in this study. Keeping this in mind, the relationship of the Head of the phrase to the *Thing* is not implicitly tied to the structure of a D+N construction. The *Thing* is not always the Head of the cluster – the deictic could also function as the Head of the cluster. Grammatical possession using a D+N cluster can present two different, but equally relevant, semantic interpretations of linguistic ownership, such as

(a) Her legs were cold.

(b) His wife’s legs were cold.
where in (b) shows the Thing (wife’s) as the head of the cluster and (a) shows the D (her) as the head of the cluster. Example 1 is parsed as ‘the legs which belong to her were cold’, whereas example (b) would be parsed ‘the wife of him has cold legs’.

With the selection of search terms and a grammatical framework to study them in, I now select two complimentary yet contrastive play-texts using a statistical test. These two statistically selected play-texts will be used as the source for datamining relevant gender-specific lexical items using possessive D+N constructions.

Part II. Digital Play-Texts and Datamining

2.2.1 Selecting relevant play-texts using digital tools.

To select two play-texts for this study, I ran a log-likelihood test on each play in the whole of the Shakespeare corpus to identify which plays would have significantly more or less mention of feminine lexical items. The comparison of Set A (the text to be analyzed) to Set B (a reference text) to identify “distinctive features of something by comparing it with a relevant other”\(^7\) produces statistically significant keywords in a text using chi-squares and logarithmic progressions to determine statistical significance which then illustrates how many more times more likely the data is to appear in Set A as compared to Set B.\(^8\) Wordsmith (Scott 2011) will list a word as being key “if it is unusually frequent (or unusually infrequent) in comparison with what one would expect on the basis of the larger word-list” (Scott 2011). Words which are significant outliers – that is, very likely or very unlikely to appear in a text - uncover distinctive patterns of language use that may not have been otherwise apparent. The absence or remarkable presence of lemmata, especially common words like gender-specific pronouns, present significant differences between two texts. Ultimately, I chose to base my study on Macbeth and The Merry Wives of Windsor for the reasons I describe below.

\(^7\) Muller, M. 2011. [http://wordhoard.northwestern.edu/userman/commonrare.html](http://wordhoard.northwestern.edu/userman/commonrare.html)

\(^8\) Unfortunately, I do not have the space in this dissertation to talk about the derivation of log likelihoods. For more about log likelihoods, please see Dunning 1993.
My initial interest in this project was how women in *Macbeth* were presented lexically. Lady Macbeth is often billed as a strong female character. As *Macbeth* is a tragic play, I wanted to compare it to a comedy – a genre which would be presented in opposition to tragedy. Where “tragedy ends in death”, “comedy ends in marriage” (Whissle 2007: 178). Presumably, the topics and themes of a tragedy would be different than a comedy, and the lexical makeup of the play-texts would reflect this. Running a basic log likelihood test for *Macbeth* compared to the rest of the Shakespeare corpus in Wordhoard, produces the following results:
A log likelihood test such as the one I conduct here presents lemma which are significantly more or less likely to appear in one text compared to a corpus: “The log-likelihood ratio measures the discrepancy of the observed word frequencies from the values which we would expect to see if the word frequencies (by percentage) were the same in the two texts [...] the log-likelihood value tells us how much more likely it is that the frequencies are different than that they are the same” (Muller 2011). This will tell us specific linguistic features of a play-text as they are likely (or unlikely) to appear. The results of a WordHoard log likelihood test presents this information,
normalized data by presenting ratios out of ten thousand, and raw frequencies for the analysis text and the reference corpus, as seen in a chart such as the one in Figure 1.1.

A log-likelihood test such as the one pictured above in Figure 1.1, from WordHoard, shows which word-forms are significantly more or less likely to appear. The first column presents a list of lemma. Lemma are the base form of a word, so that run, running, runs and ran would all be counted under the category of ‘run (verb)’. The second column of the table, representing relative use, shows which lemma are significantly more or less likely to appear in the analysis text as compared to the reference text. The other columns of this text show the statistical results of a log-likelihood calculation. Column three presents the log likelihood calculation itself; the more asterisk next to the calculation, the more statistically significant this calculation is. The remainder of the columns show normalized frequencies (parts per ten thousand) in the analysis text and the reference corpus and raw frequencies for the analysis and reference texts. A log-likelihood test will allow us to check our intuitions about thematic language, as well as show significant differences in the usage of lemma as they appear in a collection of text. Most notably, a log-likelihood test will identify patterns lemma representation which might not be immediately noticeable without conducting such a test.

Function words with a major absence or remarkable presence are not especially noticeable. Content words with remarkable presence in a text, however, are very noticeable. Thematic language is full of content, rather than function, words. The lemma with very high log likelihoods in Macbeth include tyrant, trouble, dagger, fear and horror – all of these are content words and thematic concerns of the play-text. But perhaps most notably, one function word – she – appears significantly less frequently in Macbeth than compared to the rest of the Shakespeare corpus. How would other play-texts compare?

I ultimately selected Wives as a contrastive play for analysis. As a comedy, Wives will be remarkably different thematically than Macbeth: themes, motifs, and issues of importance which will be discussed most frequently will presumably not be about murder and ascension to a
thron. As we have seen, the language of *Macbeth* focuses on themes of danger. We should expect a different set of statistically frequent keywords, grouped around a secondary theme in *Wives*.

Running the same log-likelihood test on *Wives* as it compares to the rest of the Shakespeare corpus, we are presented with the following chart:

![Figure 1.2 A comparative WordHoard log likelihood analysis for *Wives* vs Shakespeare Corpus](image)

Where feminine lexical items were much statistically less likely to appear in *Macbeth* when compared to Shakespeare’s entire corpus, we see that feminine lexical items are much more likely to appear in *Wives*. We see a pattern of both function and content words related to gender – that is, pronouns and nouns being marked as “relatively more frequent” in *Wives*. When
normalized to parts-per-thousand, *mistress*, *wife*, and *she* all appear more frequently in *Wives* than in the Shakespeare corpus as a whole, and content words which are likely to appear in *Wives* include *gartet, fairy, master* and *mistress*. Most importantly, *she* appears in *Wives* in 94.45 parts per ten thousand when compared to the entire Shakespeare corpus. In the Shakespeare corpus, *she* appears in 53.05 parts per ten thousand - the representation of *she* in *Wives* is almost double that of the representation of the Shakespeare corpus. Overall, *she* has a very high relative frequency in *Wives*, but a very low relative frequency in *Macbeth*.

It quickly becomes very apparent that *Wives* is fundamentally different than *Macbeth* in many ways, and serves a contrastive play-text worthy of further analysis. Where *Macbeth* is tragic, *Wives* is lighthearted. Where feminine lexical items were significantly less likely to appear in *Macbeth*, feminine lexical items were much more likely to appear in *Wives*. Based upon our intuitions of the themes of comedy and tragedy, combining the log-likelihood results with my initial interest in the representation of gender-specific lexical items in play-texts lead to a hypothesis that feminine identity in *Wives* might be a much more important feature than feminine identity in *Macbeth*. Furthermore, the representations of this gender-specific identity using D+N possession would be similar across two contrastive genres because of available socio-historical surveys of men and women in the Early Modern Period, as outlined in Chapter 1.1.2.

### 2.2.2 Compiling digital editions of the play-texts.

Electronic editions of the texts often do not cite their source texts. Andrew Murphy points out in his study of three available Internet editions (2010) that although many are based on late 19th and early 20th century editions of the texts (2010: 410), Internet editions are essentially a disposable text, with no indication of who had carried out the editing (or when the editing had been done). If you want free Shakespeare on the Internet, perhaps you have to put up with texts that are, similarly, somewhat unsatisfactory in one way or another, and (to a greater or lesser extent) out of date, uneven, or incomplete (2010: 413).
Like physical, print editions of the play-texts, editorial decisions are made from one publisher to another; similar problems arise in digital editions, as “different editions of the texts compete for authenticity” (Mullender 2011: 44). There is no ‘definitive’ digital edition of Shakespeare’s works, given the breadth of available Internet editions of Shakespeare, including the Moby Shakespeare, The Nameless Shakespeare and Open Source Shakespeare (among others).

Although the fully-parsed Nameless Shakespeare texts are included in the WordHoard software package, they are inaccessible outside of the program. While WordHoard presents very powerful capabilities, the aim of this study was to be inclusive of as many available programs, combining their strengths for a multi-dimensional analysis which might not be evident using just one software package.

I decided to begin with a digital text that contained all 37 Shakespeare plays and the sonnets contained in one text file, rather than already being separated into individual plays. A file containing all the play-texts would serve two purposes: I could manually split the larger file into individual text files without difficulty, and I could retain the larger file with all the play-texts as a whole reference corpus. Each file would be edited to remove all non-literary material (such as headers, punctuation, and scene markers).

I settled on the Project Gutenberg The Complete Works of William Shakespeare e-text. This e-text is readily available online and contains complete editions of the plays and sonnets with a modernized orthography, in a machine-readable, annotatable format. The Project Gutenberg Complete Works of William Shakespeare e-text is adapted from the World Library’s Library of the Future CD-ROM (1993), but does not cite a printed source edition. This would guarantee a certain level of consistency in that they all have come from the same original source. Unfortunately, this period in time was before text-encoding initiatives strongly encouraged citing a printed-edition source in distributable digital texts.

Certainly, as Murphy has pointed out, there is no perfect digital text. The Project Gutenberg e-text is no exception: it is far from perfect. Errors and editorial choices found in
Project Gutenberg’s text are not excusable by any means. But there are different editorial choices in every edition of a Shakespearean play-text, and digital editions are not exceptions to this rule. While we may never know exactly which printed edition The Word Library has used for their source text, we do know that the World Library edition was at one point a widely circulated text. But we cannot guarantee that it was at any point ever considered a standard e-text edition of the plays.

This is simultaneously the danger and benefit of using a play-text as found a mass-market e-text website: the text is not a scholarly edition, but is a text which is widely read and distributed by those interested in reading Shakespeare electronically, but are not interested in minute editorial details. However, the benefit of using such a mass-market e-text is that this text is accessible to anyone interested in simply reading Shakespeare’s complete works. Mass-market e-texts are likely to contain some of the most commonly accepted editorial choices.⁹

2.2.3. Selecting Software and Creating A Concordance

Thus far I have completed a statistical analysis of the text. A simple concordance and database as a means to aggregate and organize patterns of gender-specific lexical representation primes for further stylistic interpretation, giving the researcher what Demmen accurately calls “the best of both worlds” (2009: 20). A statistical analysis will present lexical items which might be interesting to investigate further. A concordance allows the researcher to compile lists of immediate collocations and contextualization of lexical items of interest.

Allowing for the combination of many tools for the larger goal of identifying specific lexical patterns which create an aesthetic (or otherwise literary effect) to be identified and investigated in ways that were previously unavailable, a corpus stylistic study allows the researcher to pick and choose the aspects of corpus studies to include. Unlike a human reader of Commonly accepted editorial choices include issues of Folio/Quarto editions, orthographic variations, and other textual irregularities which may arise in different critical editions of the play-texts.
a text, a computer cannot differentiate between different genres of text on its own; a computer
will have absolutely zero preconceived notions about the texts it is analyzing. If we treat a
literary text as a series of as a series of typographical keystrokes\textsuperscript{10} which have been organized in
a specific order, a computer could find every instance of a string of keystrokes in a specific order
for us. These strings could represent a morpheme, a word, a phrase, or an entire sentence – all
meaningful units of language. This is the benefit of a corpus methodology: without any
preconceived notions of the text or expectations of results, a computer can find patterns for us.
They can find very easily find very example of a specified character search string and compile it
for a researcher; a person will then be able to identify and interpret patterns within the results.

While other software programs designed for concordancing exist (see Anagnostou & Weir
2006 for an overview of some available concordance programs), I elect to take a slightly
different approach. The lightweight text editor AlphaX, a shareware program designed for
computer programming, searches for regular expressions following character-strings and
presents them, annotated by line number in a separate window, using a matching line and regular
expression (RegExp) function. Adapting the principle behind a RegExp search as a concordance
search to find relevant search terms in context, a user is able to identify every example of a
specified character string (hereafter referred to as the search term) in a specified text, organized
chronologically into a concordance, which will open in a new window. This allows us to find
patterns of gender-specific lexical items within a number of contexts: within a line, a clause, a
sentence, a speech, a scene, an act, or the entire play itself without being limited by Keyword In
Context (KWIC) formatting. Most available concordancing software follows KWIC formatting,
providing a five-word span before and after a word of interest as a “window” (Seretan and
Wehrli 2007: 75, Hunston 2010) to identify syntactically related tokens (Gregory and Hardie

\textsuperscript{10} In this chapter, I refer to characters in the computing sense of typographic alpha-numeric
keystrokes in a specific sequence rather than the literary sense. For more about digital character
encoding, please see Wittern (2008) in \textit{A Companion to Digital Literary Studies}. I return to
conventional literary understandings of ‘character’ in Chapter 3.
While this is helpful to identify patterns of collocation, it can be harder to visualize the location of each example within the context of the dramatic structure (Freytag 1968) of a play-text. That said, a RegExp search functions much like a KWIC, but the two-window format allows an aspect of flexibility unavailable in other corpus tools when compiling results into an external database, as I discuss in Appendix A. Concordance techniques present “a collection of the occurrences of a word-form, each in its own textual environment. In its simplest form it is an index. Each word-form is indexed and a reference is given to the place of occurrence in a text” (Sinclair 1991: 32).

By using a program that was not originally designed for corpus studies, but retains many of the same concepts of successful concordancing (as highlighted by Tribble 2010), I can compile a simple concordance which is both comprehensive and not limited to a specific window of collocations, with or without specific annotations or markup, thus adding a level of flexibility to a corpus study. I now outline the role of AlphaX in my study.

As a concordance tool, AlphaX allows the researcher to retain formatting which is likely to be presented in print editions of the texts so that each concordance example follows printed-text conventions such as line divisions. When run through AlphaX, the system of line divisions in the play-texts functions most like Open Source Shakespeare Through-Line Numbering system.11 Because each RegExp search opens in a new window, the researcher can move between these contexts with ease, and identify the full passage containing a match within the linear plot of a literary text. Though other concordancing programs – including WordHoard and WordSmith – offer similar features of contextualizing lines, AlphaX allows a researcher to adapt their concordance data into an external database. Appendix A presents an outline of how to compile a simple concordance using AlphaX.

Upon compiling an external database of concordance data found using gender-specific

---

11 Read more about TLN at [http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/info/technicaldetails.php](http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/info/technicaldetails.php)
RegExps in AlphaX and annotated with relevant information (the line number containing the example, the play-text character saying the line, their gender and the part of speech the RegExp fulfils), an analysis of specific linguistic structures can be conducted within a literary text. Frequencies derived from this aggregated data can then be checked in a distributional concordance plot using AntConc, which will highlight specific parts of the play-texts where a specific lexical item is most or least frequent, contextualizing and allowing for visualizations of each RegExp search result within the linear plot structure of the play-text.

2.2.4 Further thoughts

Although a number of corpus tools are available and are useful for analysis of large textual objects such as plays or literature, these programs are not always ideal for a close study of stylistic features in a strictly literary environment, as they present only immediate collocations in a specified space—many which cannot go beyond five words in either direction using KWIC concordancing. KWIC concordancing is useful for identifying regular patterns of regular usage in a corpus. However, a stylistic study is also looks for irregular or otherwise specific usages of a search term.

By presenting a specific space based on an established pattern (in this case, after a full line of iambic pentameter as said by one character; this could be modified to match the lineation of a printed text edition of a literary text which is not a play), AlphaX’s approach to concordancing is useful in that it will show search terms in a variety of contexts. The two-window approach to a play-text allows the researcher to see a concordance of the search term within the context of an immediate collocation, a line, a character’s soliloquy, a rapid exchange between two or more characters to determine comedic effect using puns, within a scene, an act, or within the whole dramatic structure of the play-text.

However, a compilation of several available tools— including those not explicitly designed for linguistic research— will uncover linguistic patterns which may not be readily found using
just one corpus tool. This project uses WordHoard, AlphaX, and AntConc to identify different aspects of relevant stylistic features for analysis. After all, “corpus approaches to literature and literary style are only in an early stage of development,” recognizes Mahlberg. “The full potential of corpus linguistic methodology for literary stylistics is yet to be exploited” (2007: 2). My project starts to explore the potential of stylistics and corpus studies in a study of literary-linguistic features as identified by adapting several corpus methodologies: statistical, concordancing, and distributional visualization. In Chapter 3 I take these computer-isolated examples and conduct a close linguistic and literary analysis of grammatical possession.
Chapter 3: Results and Analysis

In this chapter I present how male and female are represented in *Macbeth* and *Wives*, beginning with our expectations and the realities of the play-texts. I then move into a distributional analysis of two gender-specific pronouns – *his* and *her* - to illustrate how grammatical possession using a determiner + noun (*his/her + noun*) construction is presented in *Macbeth* and *Wives*, and how this is presented in contrast to our expectations of gender representation in these two texts. I begin my analysis of possession as it is ascribed to male characters in *Macbeth* and *Wives*, and then conduct a similar analysis of possession as ascribed to female characters in *Macbeth* and *Wives*. The results I present are adapted from a corpus-based study of gender-specific lexical representation. This chapter focuses exclusively on results that construct a contrast between the expectations of male and female characters and how they are linguistically represented in the play-texts through the analysis of immediate collocations.

Part I. Gender representation in the play-texts

3.1.1 Expectations

Briefly shifting away from computer “reading” or counting, in this section I briefly return to linear reading; then I will return to quantitative aspects of this study. The human reader - specifically a modern, non-objective reader of the play-texts - may assume that male characters will have certain social roles, and that these male characters will present them within the social world of the play-texts. It seems reasonable to assume that male characters might be more likely to appear in these two Early Modern play-texts with significantly larger speaking roles. Women are commonly understood as being socially disadvantaged in the Early Modern period, based on twenty years of pervasive feminist literary criticism (Lenz et al. 1983, Callaghan 2000), so they should be saying and doing much less than male characters say and do in the play-texts. Yet if a play-text is meant to be representative of social realities of a period - as Eric Dunnam argues in his 2009 dissertation - 51% of the play’s population should be female, and these female characters should be speaking 51% of the time. Based on the actual number of male and female characters in the play-texts and the frequencies at which they speak, it is dangerous consider the play-texts as an accurate reflection of a specific subset of society: clearly, the figures shown below do not match a 51% female, 49% male division found in society.
Table 2. Breakdown of characters by gender in *Macbeth* and *Wives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters by gender in <em>Macbeth</em></th>
<th>Characters by gender in <em>Wives</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/39 characters (74%)</td>
<td>22/26 Characters (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/39 characters (18%)</td>
<td>4/26 characters (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT SPECIFIED</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOT SPECIFIED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/39 characters (8%)</td>
<td>0/26 characters (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical representations of men and women in *Macbeth* and *Wives* appear in ways which are different than our social expectations of their artistic representations.

If the play-texts were to present an accurate numerical representation of gender and sex then we would have 51 female and 49 male characters – but we do not. According our intuitions about proportions, we might expect that given the populations of these two play-texts men would speak 49% of the time and women would be speaking 51% of the time. This would make the division of lines to characters in the play-texts exactly the same as the percentages of male and female characters.

But as I have illustrated, the play-texts do not show either of these features. In *Macbeth*, male characters should speak about 74% of the time. The remaining 26% of *Macbeth* should be spoken by female characters. Similarly, male characters in *Wives* should speak about 85% of the time, and female characters should be speaking the remaining 15% of the play. Table 3 shows that the percentage of lines said by gender do not correlate perfectly with the number of male and female characters. Investigating the number of lines ascribed to male and female characters will show a feature of female and male representation in the play-texts.

Women are not entirely unrepresented in *Macbeth*: the witches’ prophecy is the rising action of the play-text (“All hail Macbeth, thou shalt be king hereafter!” 1.iii.151), and Lady Macbeth is commonly understood as one of Shakespeare’s strongest female characters. The power she so desperately desires is, to a certain extent, already available to her:

```
And, to be more than what you were, you would
Be so much more the man. Nor time nor place
Did then adhere, and yet you would make both:
They have made themselves, and that their fitness now
Does unmake you. I have given suck, and know
How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me:
```
I would, while it was smiling in my face,  
Have pluck’d my nipple from his boneless gums,  
And dash’d the brains out, had I so sworn as you  
Have done to this. (Lady Macbeth, I.vii. 529-538)

Lady Macbeth’s perception of herself within the social space of the play-text is one of dominance, and she is consistent in her occupation of such a space. By calling her husband’s masculinity into question - “you would be so much more the man” (I.vii.530) - she has put herself in a position of power; the violent imagery later in this speech (“have pluck’d my nipple from his boneless gums, / and dash’d the brains out”) further constructs Lady Macbeth’s position of power rather than subordination. Though as a female character she should be subordinate, having “given suck” and “love[d] the babe that milks [her]” (533-534), Lady Macbeth occupies a much more masculine identity through her projection of power and dominance. “Lady Macbeth consciously attempts to reject her feminine sensibility and adopt a male mentality” (Asp 1981: 153). Men clearly control Macbeth’s Scotland: their “society equates feminine qualities with weakness” (Asp 1981: 153). Similarly, Waith notes that “To be courageous is to be ‘manly’” (Waith 1950: 265) and later on the same page decrees, “not to be a man is to be effeminate” (1950: 265). In Macbeth, masculinity is considered a very positive trait, and female characters strive to inhabit a masculine identity wherever possible. Harding addresses these issues of masculinity and femininity in Macbeth in his aptly titled article Women’s Fantasy of Manhood: “The nature of manliness is a question running all through the play, manliness as lived by the man and manliness seen in the distorting fantasy of the woman. […..] To the wife, who has largely to secure her worldly ends indirectly through her husband’s effort’s, his opportunities seem vastly greater than hers” (Harding 1969: 245-7). In this passage, Harding is specifically discussing the relationship female characters have to male characters. If women occupied the same social status of men, the “fantasy of the woman” to inhabit such a masculine space would not be a necessary plot device. Lady Macbeth would not have her “unsex me here” speech, because she would have the agency to kill Duncan herself, rather than making her husband do so.
Asp puts it quite simply: “women are subordinate to men” (1981: 158). As a result, Asp argues, female characters must rely upon male characters, because they are not ascribed the agency necessary to complete their actions. We see that the expectation of feminine lexical items appearing only under certain circumstances is not an unfounded assumption by a feminist scholar. Based on this knowledge, we might assume that female characters will not want to be reminded of their feminine identities in such a context. This would lower the number of references to women and feminine-specific lexical items. However, female characters can appear as objects in ways other than pronominal forms which I have highlighted here.

We might have expected *Wives* to follow the same pattern of lexical representation and gender roles that *Macbeth* presents, based on the fact that it is also an Early Modern play written by the same author, under similar circumstances. It is possible, as derived from the title of the play-text, it might be expected that male characters will be more likely to be speaking to each other about women (who we would assume are the Merry Wives). The Merry Wives could represent a very high number of female characters in the play-text, though perhaps these women will not say very much to each other. But this is not the reality of the play. Although *Wives* is a play with proportionally few female characters, the action centers around the social roles of women, but without ignoring the male characters.

However, we see that the numbers of lines ascribed to male and female characters also is not consistent with the divisions of the play by gender. Table 3 presents a breakdown of the number of lines by gender in *Macbeth* and *Wives*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. A comparison of lines spoken by each gender in each play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines by gender in <em>Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT SPECIFIED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only are the play-texts inaccurately portraying the division of male and female in the real world, but male and female language is not presented in proportion to the number of characters,
either. The actual proportion of lines ascribed to female characters in both *Macbeth* and *Wives* is more than the proportion of female characters in each play, and female characters in *Wives* say significantly more than we would expect. It is surprising to find that *Wives* has fewer female characters than *Macbeth*, yet the female characters of *Wives* say more than the female characters of *Macbeth*. In fact, “*Wives* is argued as giving the most authentic portrayal of social life out of all the plays” (Demmen: 2009: 113 citing Boyce 1990: 424-425). Women in this play talk about each other (and to each other) much more than women of *Macbeth* will – women in *Macbeth* barely interact with each other. Where this does not occur in *Macbeth*, we see that female characters in *Wives* frequently have very quick back-and-forth discussions, such as the following, as found in III.i.1566-1585:

Mistress Page. Is there not a double excellency in this?

Mistress Ford. I know not which pleases me better, that my husband is deceived, or Sir John.

Mistress Page. What a taking was he in when your husband asked who was in the basket!

Mistress Ford. I am half afraid he will have need of washing; so throwing him into the water will do him a benefit.

Mistress Page. Hang him, dishonest rascal! I would all of the same strain were in the same distress.

Mistress Ford. I think my husband hath some special suspicion of Falstaff's being here; for I never saw him so gross in his jealousy till now.

Mistress Page. I will lay a plot to try that; and we will yet have more tricks with Falstaff: his dissolute disease will scarce obey this medicine.

Mistress Ford. Shall we send that foolish carrion, Mistress Quickly, to him, and excuse his throwing into the water; and give him another hope, to betray him to another punishment?

Mistress Page. We will do it: let him be sent for to-morrow, eight o'clock, to have amends.
Such a conversation between two female characters, wherein they discuss a plan which invokes the participation of the other female character, would not appear in *Macbeth*. Female characters in *Macbeth*, as we have outlined above, rarely speak, and it would be difficult to find a passage in *Macbeth* where two women speak to each other. The percentages of lines ascribed to female characters is much higher than the percentage of female characters in the play-text. Because of this marked difference in social representation based on frequency alone, the construction and presentation of social roles, I argue that the representation of men and women in these two play-texts are quite different.

This study opens with a quantitative investigation of lines by gender and how they do not correspond to an idealized social reality. I also illustrate that the disproportionate representation of lines ascribed to male characters and lines ascribed to female characters in the two play-texts are remarkably inconsistent with our expectations. I now continue my analysis with a quantitative study of subject and object positions using gender-specific third person pronouns to investigate how male and female characters are represented in the plays.

### 3.1.2. Subjects and objects

A typical English sentence follows Subject/Verb/Object structure, but permutations of this structure are common in verse; regardless of grammatical organization of a sentence, subjects are obligatory in English, whereas predicates are not. As we have established in 2.1.3, third-person pronouns are organized by case and conceptualized gender. Deviation from grammatically assigned case is not allowed, retaining specific lexical properties: nominatives are subjects, whereas accusatives, datives, and genitives are objects. Syntactic relationships can change within poetic language, as the rules of syntax can be broken in poetic verse. Feminist

---

12 Although The Witches speak in quick succession to each other, the gender identity of the witches is not perfectly clear – an issue I address in Section 2, part II of this chapter.

13 For example: “I swam” is a grammatical sentence, whereas “Swam the ocean” is not. Subjects can be null but implied, as seen in imperative sentences, such as “Go home”.
literary critics often assume female characters will always appear as objects rather than subjects. Such a presupposition will ultimately color their critical reading of the play-texts. In this section I investigate whether the feminist literary critics are correctly assuming these grammatical roles.

I begin my analysis by comparing the nominative third-person pronouns *he* and *she* in *Macbeth* and *Wives*.

Table 4. Nominative pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th><em>Macbeth</em></th>
<th><em>Wives</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>He</em></td>
<td>f = 108 (86%)</td>
<td>f = 184 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>She</em></td>
<td>f = 17 (14%)</td>
<td>f = 64 (26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where f = relative frequency of search term *X* in each text, and percentage has been calculated out of total nominative pronouns in the play-texts.

The total number of nominative pronouns in *Macbeth* is 125; *Wives* has 248 nominative pronouns. Upon calculating the statistical probability of *he* and *she* appearing in *Macbeth* and *Wives*, we see that this chart appears to support feminist theory. Male characters will appear much more frequently as nominatives than female characters will. Furthermore, the proportions presented in this chart correlate nicely to the number of male characters in *Macbeth*. However, this is not true of *Wives*: the ratio of female characters to examples of *she* in the play-text, feminine nominatives appear with a much higher frequency than in *Macbeth*. From a strictly quantitative viewpoint, *he* is much more likely to appear in both play-texts. Though it is apparent that female nominative pronouns do appear in the subject position, they are much less likely to appear as subjects when compared to male nominative pronouns.

I continue this analysis with an investigation of the non-nominative pronouns *his*, *him*, *her* and *hers* in the two play-texts.

Table 5. Non-nominative pronouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th><em>Macbeth</em></th>
<th><em>Wives</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>His</em></td>
<td>f = 141 (54%)</td>
<td>f = 117 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Him</em></td>
<td>f = 85 (33%)</td>
<td>f = 134 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Her</em></td>
<td>f = 35 (13%)</td>
<td>f = 146 (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where f = relative frequency of search term *X* in each text, and percentage has been calculated out of total non-nominative pronouns in the play-texts.
Non-nominative pronouns occur a total of 261 times in *Macbeth* and 397 times in *Wives*. Based on the proportions of text ascribed male and female characters, as illustrated in Table 2 and Table 3 above, this is not very surprising. More male characters in the dramatis personae, who have more lines ascribed to them, must use a nominative pronoun more frequently than female characters who have proportionally fewer lines. If there are more male characters in the play-text, they are more likely to be talked about compared to than female characters. This is very clear from our quantitative analysis of *Macbeth*. Female characters in *Macbeth* are not more likely to appear as objects than subjects; instead, we see that references to male and female characters in both subject and object positions appear in proportion to the dramatis personae outlined in Tables 2 and 3. However, *Wives* does not present such a proportional usage of male and female pronouns. Despite evidence implying that *him* and *his* would have higher frequencies, we see instead that *her* is the most likely pronoun out of our list of non-nominatives to appear. What is happening here?

Although there are only four female characters in *Wives*, they speak substantially more than the women of *Macbeth*, as seen in Table 3. But this does not account for the fact that *her* has a very high frequency in *Wives* – higher than both *his* and *him*. Presumably, because female characters in *Wives* do have more lines, there is more of an opportunity for other characters to talk about them. Because it is awkward – in both writing and spoken language - to constantly refer to another being using their name or otherwise avoiding pronouns (Livia 2001: 38), we use pronouns to make our language less clumsy. Perhaps it is not that female characters appear more often as objects in *Wives*, but that they have already appeared as nominatives or through the use of proper nouns and now for cohesive purposes, the characters of the play-text use *her* more frequently. Indeed, although female pronouns are more proportionally more likely to appear in the object position, female pronouns in *Wives* were also proportionally are more likely to appear in the subject position, too. The numbers presented in *Wives* show that female characters are not entirely insignificant in plays written during the Early Modern period: the disproportionate
representation of her to the number of women does not account for this skewing. The use of third person gender pronouns should proportionally match the number of lines spoken by gender and based upon the quantity of male and female characters, as they do in Macbeth. In Macbeth, it is overwhelmingly clear that male pronouns are more likely to appear than female pronouns, but this proves to be reflective of male and female character proportions, and not indicative of a preference. We have seen that male characters might be more likely to appear in Early Modern plays as characters and have significantly larger speaking roles. As a result, the total number of male lexical items will be higher in the play-texts overall than the total number of female lexical items, and I do not find male and female pronouns appearing exclusively either as subjects or as objects.

Keeping this in mind, I conduct a second analysis to explore the use of grammatical possession as constructed through use of his and her as it is immediately collocated to a noun in the two play-texts. This analysis will serve two purposes: first, it will present a close reading of the play-texts; second, it will investigate a specific linguistic feature as it appears contextually within Macbeth and Wives. Grammatical possession is a salient linguistic feature which can be easily identified, and serve as a study of gender-specific agency towards other objects as it is presented in the play-texts. Because the two play-texts occupy different genres, with different themes, I will be able to draw several comparisons between them. I will be able to identify how an aspect of gender relationships in the Early Modern Period is constructed and represented in a sociohistorical context, and how these features of grammatical possession compare to a feminist criticism of gendered possession in the play-texts. To conduct this analysis, I investigate whether or not linguistic constructions of possession is different as it is ascribed to male and female characters, or if grammatical features of possession are consistent across these two play-texts.

3.1.3 Ownership and the Early Modern Period
I now shift my analysis to investigate patterns of possession and ownership as it has been encoded in the play-texts. However, grammatical possession does not always implicate legal ownership. Legally speaking, “a married woman in Renaissance England forfeited both agency and identity: […] according to the law, in sum, the married woman did not exist” (Rose 1991: 293). Indeed, “the bride’s portion was exchanged for her maintenance during marriage, for the groom’s responsibility for her [the wife’s] contracts (since without property she could not contract) […] a woman had no legal remedy” (Erickson 1993: 100). While this addresses the legal status of married women (Mistress Quickly, Mistress Page, Mistress Ford, Lady Macbeth, and Lady Macduff), unmarried women (such as The Witches and female characters of marriage age, such as Anne Page) had a different legal status and sometimes would be grouped with widows, as their social circumstances are similar (Erickson 1993: 48). While single women and widows in the Renaissance retained some legal rights, as long as a male figure such as a father or husband would be able to preside, their rights would be nullified: “as the wife was subject to her husband, children and servants were subject to the couple that headed the household” (Amussen 1988: 95). However, an object can be ascribed to a volitional being without their legal ownership of the object. This is a strictly conceptual, rather than legal, type of ownership (Murphy 2002), and can be extended from volitional beings in the real-world to characters within a play-text.

There are some grammatical constructs that present aspects of ownership using grammatical structures of possession, regardless of the legal status of men and women in the Early Modern Period and whether or not the play-texts are accurate representations of legal and social realities of the period. One such example can be found in a reference to one’s own body and body parts. A person, regardless of gender or real-world legal status, inherently owns one’s own body and body parts. If a social group divided according to gender – a “community of practice” according to Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1992: 462) – shows variation in ownership of external-to-the-body objects, differences between male and female possession within the play-texts can be identified and examined.
Part II. Distributional frequencies in *Macbeth* and *Wives*.

### 3.2.1 Distributional frequencies as a way to identify patterns of lexical representation.

I present these examples of ownership and possession through the use of a phrase consisting of a determiner and a noun, which I abbreviate as D+N. *His/her* can function as determiners and will appear in a noun phrase as such. Additionally, *his* has a second role of denoting possession in the sense of ‘it is his’. *Her* has a separate sense ‘the noun of her’, the equivalent construction would be ‘it is hers’. For the purposes of this study, I focus exclusively on these D+N clusters which create a phrase which represents a single semantic unit of possession.

Before addressing the linguistic detail of the play-texts below, I first illustrate the linguistic distributions of *his* and *her* in *Macbeth* and *Wives*, using AntConc. Rather than presenting simple frequencies, a distribution allows us to visualize the location of these lexical items in the text. While not all of these hits are representative of D+N constructions, this will show an aspect of possession as it appears throughout the play-texts. The distributional analysis I show is a broader view of *his* and *her* than simply looking at D+N possession, but it includes every result found in a RegExp search. These examples are reproduced in full in Appendix B and C.

There are 141 examples of *his* in *Macbeth*, and they appear in the text with the following distribution, as illustrated below in Figure 2.1a.
The distribution for her in Macbeth looks drastically different. There are a total of 35 examples of her in Macbeth, and a majority of these examples are visible in very small clumps as illustrated in Fig. 2.1b, below:
There is a distinct difference visible between *his* and *her* as they appear in the text of *Macbeth*. *His* is much more widespread than *her*. Given the frequencies of *his* and *her* in *Macbeth*, as described above, this is to be expected. We can identify the darkest clump for *her* as representative of Act 5, Scene 1, where the Doctor and the Gentlewoman discuss Lady Macbeth’s sudden, strange illness. In doing so, they refer to Lady Macbeth using third-person feminine pronouns with a sudden, consistent frequency in comparison to the rest of the play-text. I will discuss this scene in greater detail in my analysis of *her*-N below; almost all the examples I cite are taken from this scene. Act 5, Scene I is especially important, as it presents an instance wherein a female character is truly the focal point of the other characters, and I discuss the representation of *her*-N below in 3.3.2 of this chapter. The distribution in Figure 1.1b shows one specific point where characters suddenly use *her* with an extremely high frequency compared to the rest of the play. What is happening in this scene that makes it so different from all the other scenes?

Lady Macbeth’s role as a tragic character is cemented in this scene while the Doctor and the Gentlewoman observe and comment upon her strange behavior. Lines 2126-2205 are full of
examples of *her* (the feminine object form) and *she* (the feminine subject form) as said by the Doctor and the Gentlewoman - these examples are reproduced in full in Appendix B and discussed in 3.3.2, in this chapter. Based merely on the rapid-fire mentions of *her* in these lines, we see that a female character is the focus of others’ attention. This is contrasted with many rapid exchanges of *his* throughout the entire play-text of *Macbeth*, as identified by the dark distributional clusters found throughout Figure 1.1a. *His* appears almost uniformly in *Macbeth*; *her* barely appears by contrast.

Act 5 Scene 1 presents a paradigm which is unavoidable: women in *Macbeth* are as not insignificant or entirely ignored as one might assume. Here is a scene which is entirely about a female character, where two external characters – one male, one female - discuss a second female character in depth, with lots of repetition of gender-specific third person pronouns. Despite the number of female characters in *Macbeth*, such a scene does not happen anywhere else in this play.

*Macbeth* is in direct contrast to distributional patterns found in *Wives*. Compared to *Macbeth*, *Wives* presents entirely opposing distributions. *His* appears with a raw frequency of 117 times, and is fairly consistently spread throughout the play, as illustrated in Figure 2.2a, below:
Unlike the frequency and distribution of *her* in *Macbeth*, where I have illustrated that *her* appears very rarely, and only in a few specific parts of the play, the opposite pattern is true of *Wives*. *Her* appears much more frequently in *Wives*, with a raw frequency of 146 times, as illustrated in the distribution shown in Figure 2.2b, below.
Referring back to our simple frequencies, we can expect such a distribution. *Her* is much more frequent compared to *his* in *Wives*. It is perhaps easier to see where women are not mentioned in the play-text rather than where they are. This is very much in opposition to our expectations of gender representations in an Early Modern play-text, and in direct contrast to the lexical representation of *his* and *hers* in *Macbeth*. *Her* is used much more frequently (178 hits) compared to *his* (148 hits) in *Wives*, and certainly *her* appears much more often in *Wives* than in *Macbeth* - *her* appears much less frequently in *Macbeth* (44 hits) compared to *his* (148 hits).

There are 23 scenes in *Wives*; *his* and *her* appear in 20 and 19 scenes each, respectively. However, there is only one scene where *his* and *hers* both do not appear; this in Act IV, scene 3: this is a remarkably short scene of 20 lines, where Bardolph and Host talk to each other about meeting a duke to talk about Germans who are stealing horses (and use *him*). Again in Act V, scenes 3 and 4, *his* is conspicuously absent again. These are both very short scenes: Act V Scene 3 is 27 lines long, and Act V Scene 4 is four lines long. In Act V Scene 4, there are no third-person pronouns, but in Act V Scene 3 there are examples of *him* and *he* – but no examples of *his*. Thus it comes as no surprise that *her* does not appear in Act IV scene 3 and Act V Scene 4.
either. But curiously, _her_ also does not appear in Act III Scenes 1 and 3. Only male characters (Evans, Simple, Shallow, Page, Doctor Caius, Slender and Host) appear Act III Scene 1, and they discuss each other. Though Doctor Caius briefly mentions Anne Page, he names her directly rather than using pronouns. Yet Act III Scene 3 is mixed: male and female characters do talk to each other about each other – but do not use _her_. However, they do use _she_ in this scene. Based on this information, we can safely assume the typical scene of _Wives_ is likely to have both male and female gender-specific pronouns; and as we have seen, _her_ is more likely to appear than _his_. Unlike _Macbeth_, where women are rarely the focus of conversation between characters, we see that female characters are very frequently discussed, and under a variety of different circumstances.

These visualizations show that two gender-specific pronouns have entirely different distributional frequencies which represent the broad usage of _his_ and _her_ in these two opposing play-texts. I now take these distributional frequencies and focus my analysis on examples of possessive D+N constructions as they appear in the play-texts. These examples have been identified in the concordancing aspect of my study (2.2.3) and are reproduced in full in Appendix B and C. I highlight a pattern I have found in the concordance data, and conduct a literary-linguistic analysis of these D+N constructions encompassing both a literary, close reading of the examples and a linguistic analysis of these D+N constructions.

I have already discussed the broad distributions of _his_ and _her_ as they appear in _Macbeth_ and _Wives_. I now shift from broad distributional frequencies of these two search terms into a close analysis of patterns of possession using D+N clusters. The remainder of this chapter will discuss relevant D+N constructions from the play-texts and conduct a close-reading analysis of them. I begin my analysis with the representations of _his+_noun in _Macbeth_ and _Wives_ for the purpose of contrasting their results with patterns of _her+_noun constructions as found in the two play-texts.
Part III. Grammatical Possession in the Play-texts

3.3.1 His+N constructions in Macbeth and Wives.

I begin with constructions featuring his+N. A noun in the D+N constructions presented below will be syntactically ascribed to his through complement structures. I begin with examples of male possession in Macbeth:

(1) “And fix’d his head upon our battlements” (Sargeant, 1.ii.42)

(2) “To his home before us” (Duncan, 1.vi.461)

(3) “Those of his chamber, as it seem’d, had done’t” (Lennox, II.iii.887)

(4) “Lays blame upon his promise” (Ross, III.iv.1328)

(5) “Whether it was his wisdom or his fear” (Ross, IV.i.1745)

(6) “The devil to his fellow and delight” (Macduff, IV.iii.1988)

(7) “Nothing in love now does he feel his title” (Angus, V.ii.2229)

(8) “That struts and frets his hour upon the stage” (Macbeth, V.v. 2383)

(9) “His secret murderers sticking on his hands” (Angus, V.ii.2226)

What do men own? Male characters in Macbeth retain possession of conceptual, external, and corporeal objects. Similarly, his home and his chamber are his property which he lives in and presumably retains ownership of. His hour is his conceptual property – the time belonging to him. His secret murderers are a group of people that he (a male character) is in charge of. His wisdom, his promise and his fear are both conceptual, non-tangible qualities that he has ascribed to him. And, men retain ownership of their own body parts, such as in his hands, his head, his eyes, and his heart. Male characters do have possession of conceptual and physical objects external to their bodies as well as their body parts.

Much like the male characters of Macbeth, male characters of Wives also retain ownership of conceptual, physical and corporeal objects, as shown in examples (10) through (20):

(10) “It is a shallenge: I will cut his troat [throat] in de park” (Caius I.iv.510)

(11) “Cut all his two stones, by gar he shall not have a stone” (Caius, I.iv.513-514)
An important man such as Falstaff in *Wives* will have a servant or two (Pistol and Nym), while looking for a wife (which, by the Renaissance legal system, he will also be in possession of). This collocation should be unavailable to women in the same way, as women in *Wives* would be unable to retain ownership of another human being. Judith Butler notes that legal identity of a single individual as the “property holder […] is a figure of disembodiment, but one which is nevertheless a figure of a body, a body forth of a masculinized rationality, the figure of a male body”, in contrast with the “way that the feminine is ‘always’ the outside, and the outside is ‘always’ the feminine” (Butler 1993: 48-9). A female character in these play-texts would not retain the proprietary ownership of another person in the same way that a male character in these play-texts would.

All men are not equal, however. Male characters embody a gradient system of masculinity: while men do retain features of specific kinds of power which is inherently unavailable to female characters, some men (such as Falstaff and Lennox) are considered by critics to be more masculine than others (Bardolph, Rugby, the Servant, Donalbain), creating a hierarchy of maleness based on a series of features:
concepts of manhood coincided with patriarchal principles that both privileged males over females, and favoured particular men above others. Patriarchial manhood endorsed a gender hierarchy that exalted maleness as a cultural category by ranking men generally above women. This was patriarchy in a feminist sense. In its early modern sense, however, it most frequently served the interests of middle-aged, householding men [...]. Strength, thrift, industry, self-sufficiency, honesty, authority, autonomy, self-government, moderation, reason, wisdom, and wit were all claimed for patriarchical manhood, either as the duties expected of men occupying patriarchal positions or as the justification for their associated privileges. (Shepard 2003: 247)

Self-sufficiency, autonomy, and self-government are all features of corporeal ownership - body parts in the Renaissance “have individuated functions, locations and differentiations to the body as a whole, they can become concentrated sites where meaning is invested” (Hillman & Mazzio 1997: xii) Hillman and Mazzio go on to describe how the “influential natural philosophers […] went so far as to argue that parts were individuated not only lexically and physiologically but also ontologically: to the isolated organs belonged what were termed ideae sigularum partium […] imparting integrity and spiritual significance to each part of the body.” (1997: xviii). Body parts are often ascribed symbolic status in literary studies; for this reason it is unsurprising that Caius refers to his stones as symbolic of another male character’s masculine identity. The possession of one’s own body parts would therefore construct a specific kind of autonomous, inherent power: these are your personal objects which you control, and function differently than conceptual or external-to-the body objects.

I now address what female characters are ascribed. If male characters are ascribed ownership of physical, conceptual, and corporeal nouns in D+N constructions, what are female characters ascribed in the same constructions?

3.3.2 Her+N Constructions in Macbeth and Wives.

I repeat my analysis using his+noun using examples of D+Ns which contain her as the determiner. As before, noun in the D+N constructions presented will be syntactically ascribed to her through complement structures. Example (21), from Macbeth, illustrates the difference between D+N clustering and pronominal D perfectly:
“Rise from her bed throw her nightgown upon her” (Gentlewoman, V.i.2131)

In this example, her bed and her nightgown are objects that are ascribed to her, referring to Lady Macbeth: these are Lady Macbeth’s objects. The nouns in the D+N constructions presented, “bed” and “nightgown”, are syntactically ascribed to her through complement structures; these are objects that are syntactically possessed by a woman. Her appears as a pronominal at the end of this line, as well, to further illustrate the semantic and syntactic differences between a pronominal and a D+N construction. The following pattern of a woman’s body parts as the noun of a D+N construction begins to emerge:

(22) “A sailor’s wife had chestnuts in her lap” (1st Witch, 1.iii.101)
(23) “By each at once her choppy finger laying” (Banquo, I.iii.144)
(24) “What is it that she does now? Look how she rubs her hands” (Doctor, V.i.2152)
(25) “Upon her skinny lips: you should be women” (Banquo, 1.iii.145)
(26) “Remains in danger of her former tooth” (Macbeth, 1312)
(27) “You see, her eyes are open” (Doctor, V.i.2150)
(28) “Oftener upon her knees than on her feet” (Macduff, IV.iii.1968)

Example (21) is actually a rare occurrence of a woman retaining ownership of something external to her own body, as seen in contrast to examples (22) though (28). Similarly, the example provided in (21) is a rare example of an external object belonging to her; many of the other examples found are collocates to a body part (tooth, feet, eyes, hands). Women in Macbeth do not generally possess – or own – anything outside of their own body. Following Butler’s analysis of property ownership as a masculine feature, as described above – namely “a figure in a crisis”, whereas “the feminine, strictly speaking, has no morphe, no morphology, no contour […] it is itself undifferentiated without boundary” (1993: 48-9). Furthermore, using Butler’s earlier (1990) framework for gender, “if sex does not limit gender, then perhaps there are genders, ways of culturally interpreting the sexed body that are in no way restricted by the apparent duality of sex […] if gender is something that one becomes – but can never be – then gender is itself a kind
of becoming or activity” (1990: 153). Merely being ascribed a masculine character-role is not enough to be inherently masculine – one must enact maleness in order to fully inhabit a male identity. We begin to construct feminine possession in *Macbeth* as a masculine feature, as ownership of clearly corporeal boundaries is ascribed to female characters adheres to the masculine construction of ownership.

Recalling that there are only 35 total instances of *her* in *Macbeth*, there are also very few examples of *her*+N to be found within the play-text. Figure 1.1b illustrated that the distribution of *her* is already very limited, and most of the examples of *her*+noun are cited above in examples (22)-(28). Of these examples, almost all of the relevant constructions cited above are in reference to Lady Macbeth, most often occurring in Act 5, Scene 1. While there are other female characters in *Macbeth*, including the three Weird Sisters and Lady Macduff, they are not discussed with much frequency in the play-text. While these characters are present on stage and have lines, other characters do not refer to them very often using pronouns. The Weird Sisters are a supernatural phenomenon representing the Three Fates – and they may not be considered female. Banquo identifies this confusion for us: “Upon your skinny lips you should be women, and yet your beards forbid me to interpret so” (I.3.145). While the title ‘witches’ is socially feminine in connotation, “the link between bearded women and witchcraft seems to be firmly embedded into the cultural consciousness of Early Modern England” (Hirsch 2008: 94). A bearded woman is not inherently feminine – nor is such a figure inherently masculine. As Will Fisher’s study of beards in the Renaissance concludes, “the beard (or lack thereof) did not absolutely determine gendered identity” (2001: 190). Thus it is arguable - and as I will argue here – that the witches of *Macbeth* are supernatural beings and therefore not exactly female, though they count as non-masculine entities\(^\text{14}\). This claim is furthered by the reluctance of other

\(^{14}\) The witches, or Weird Sisters, are in some way both feminine and masculine: As “sisters” and “[bearded] women” they are in some way feminine, but as “bearded women” they would also exist somewhere along the masculine spectrum.
characters to ascribe pronouns to the Witches, yet other characters refer to Lady Macbeth and Lady Macduff as she and her. To see the results in full, please see Appendix B.

In contrast, male characters of these play-texts remain masculine, even when their masculinity is called into question (as is the case with Macbeth). Male characters are not occupying such a gender-flexible space. Masculine identity is “constructed and constrained by a patriarchal culture – infused with patriarchal assumptions about power, privilege, sexual desire, the body” – there is a “broad and powerful discourse that assumed a divinely ordained basis for authority based on gender and status” (Breitenberg 1996: 1). But despite this, a female character such as Lady Macbeth can be ascribed a masculine identity in this way, thus moving “up” the social hierarchy, referring to “female’s failed maleness, not in terms of male’s originary femaleness” (Adelman 1999: 40). Male characters, it seems, cannot move down the social hierarchy – though they may be referred to as effeminate or appear otherwise emasculated, they are not ascribed the category of womanhood in the same way that Lady Macbeth can be ascribed masculinity. In order for women to have this social mobility afforded to them, female characters need to dress and act as men (like Viola in Twelfth Night and Portia in Merchant of Venice) but male characters do not have the same need to present as female – they only do so for strictly comedic purposes. Contrast this with Francis Flute in A Midsummer Night’s Dream, whose feminine identity is comical on the basis that he could not possibly be a (biological) woman - he is forced to shave his beard and raise his voice to play the part.

Yet social gender-bending does occur in Wives: Falstaff disguises himself as a woman, albeit a “a woman [who] has a great beard” (IV.ii.2149). While Falstaff is – however temporarily – portrayed as female, he will continue to be referenced using male pronouns. Thus Falstaff will still be ascribed corporeal objects using D+N construction – a form of possession which is available to characters who are somehow categorized as masculine, regardless of their gender presentation. When dressed as a woman, Falstaff has the noun woman applied to him but still retains male pronouns – he, his, him, as illustrated in this exchange (IV.ii.21245-2169):
Mistress Page. Are you not ashamed? I think you have killed the poor woman.

Mistress Ford. Nay, he will do it. 'Tis a goodly credit for you.

Ford. Hang her, witch!

Evans. By the yea and no, I think the ‘oman is a witch indeed: I like not when a ‘oman has a great peard; I spy a great peard under his muffler.

Ford. Will you follow, gentlemen? I beseech you, follow; see but the issue of my jealousy: if I cry out thus upon no trail, never trust me when I open again.

Page. Let's obey his humour a little further: come, gentlemen.

[Exeunt FORD, PAGE, SHALLOW, DOCTOR CAIUS, and SIR HUGH EVANS]

Mistress Page. Trust me, he beat him most pitifully.

Mistress Ford. Nay, by the mass, that he did not; he beat him most unpitifully, methought.

Mistress Page. I'll have the cudgel hallowed and hung o'er the altar; it hath done meritorious service.

Mistress Ford. What think you? may we, with the warrant of womanhood and the witness of a good conscience, pursue him with any further revenge?

Mistress Page. The spirit of wantonness is, sure, scared out of him: if the devil have him not in fee-simple, with fine and recovery, he will never, I think, in the way of waste, attempt us again.

Mistress Ford. Shall we tell our husbands how we have served him?

Falstaff, who is dressed as a woman, is described as a “poor woman” by Mistress Page, but only Ford uses a female pronoun to describe the effeminized Falstaff. Mistress Ford, Evans, and Page all continue to ascribe male-specific pronouns to Falstaff, and even Mistress Page returns to using male lexical items by line 2166. Evans’ line (2150) has a curious note in Melchiori’s Arden Shakespeare edition of Wives. Melchiori makes a note about his muffler: the Folio edition of Wives reads his, but the Quarto edition read “her muffler”. This line would have ascribed a
feminine identity to Falstaff at one point, but it is no longer read this way. What has happened in this passage?

If we are to assume that *her* is the correct pronoun here, we see that there are two possibilities. This “may be Evans’ confusion, but more likely Shakespeare’s slip or a printer’s misreading of ‘hir’, an alternative spelling of *her*” (2000: 253). Halliwell’s edition (1854, reprinted 1970) reads “her muffler”, but attaches the following note: “earlier editions read, by mistake, *his muffler*” (1970: 434). But turning to other critical editions of the text, including Wells, Taylor & Salmon 1986’s Original Spelling edition (1986:565), based upon the Folio edition, and Kokeritz’s facsimile edition of the First Folio (1954:55) both read *his muffler*. It seems less likely that *his muffler* is the mistake, but rather that *her muffler* is the error.

We have identified an editorial decision upon which my entire argument can hang: If it is indeed *her muffler*, as Halliwell and the Quartos state, Falstaff has successfully constructed himself, albeit temporarily, as a female character. Furthermore, Evans is so convinced by this disguise, he can only refer to Falstaff as a woman. But Falstaff could not possibly be ascribed a feminine identity here, and Evans himself is unconvinced of this, calling Falstaff “a witch”. As we have already established in *Macbeth*, the gender of witches in the Early Modern period is questionable, but we can be certain from this passage that “a witch” and “a woman” are different social identities: “I think the woman is a witch” (line 2148). A witch is perhaps more likely to have masculine features (such as a beard, cf. Fisher 2001), but we will not mistake a witch for a man, either. A beard is certainly a feature of masculinity; if Falstaff is to be perceived as a woman, his beard cannot be visible. But his beard is visible, Falstaff is considered a witch rather than a ‘true’ woman, *her* is effectively removed as a conceivable pronoun option in this scene. Furthermore, the repeated references to third-person male pronouns used to describe Falstaff in this passage (his honor, he beat *him*, pursue *him*, if the devil have *him*, *he* will never) continue refute the use of *her* as the appropriate pronoun under these circumstances.
Dressing Falstaff as a woman effectively should strip him of his patriarchal privileges, yet he retains a male identity through other characters’ application of male pronouns towards him. It is clear that the Folio emendation from *her* to *his* was necessary, and that *his* is in fact the correct pronoun to be using in this circumstance. Textual emendations such as these are not frequently issues in digital texts, because the editorial decisions have already been made and applied prior to digitization. Because the emended Folio edition of the text is widely used as the basis for publications of *Wives*, most – if not all – digital editions will allow Falstaff to retain his male identity. These digitalized texts will also continue to uphold the conceptualization of gender identity in this scene as I have presented here.

We see that biological, rather than social, constructions of sex are much more prevalent for the male characters of *Wives*. I now turn my investigation away from issues of masculinity to address issues of feminine representation using D+N structures of possession. We have seen that male representation of possession is consistent across *Macbeth* and *Wives*. Assuming that *Macbeth* is representative of feminine possession in the same way that it was for patterns of masculine possession, similar patterns of feminine ownership should be found in *Wives* – that is, women should have possession of their bodies and not much else.

This is not the result. A different kind of possession is identified in examples (29) through (35):

(29) “Did *her grandsire* leave her seven hundred pound” (Shallow, I.i.54)

(30) “*Her father* will be angry” (Mrs Page, III.iv.1725)

(31) “*Her husband* goes this morning a-birding” (Mrs Quickly, III.v.1786-7)

(32) “The jealous fool to *her husband* I suspect without cause” (Mrs Ford IV.ii.2090)

(33) “*Her husband* has a marvelous infection to the little page” (Mrs Quickly, II.ii.905)

(34) “*Her father* hath commanded her to slip” (Fenton, IV.vi.2445)

(35) “Poor old woman. That same knave Ford, *her husband*, hath” (Falstaff, V.i.2495)
Instead of body parts, the recurring pattern of D+N constructions containing *her* in *Wives* is one of familial relationships: women in this play seem to be constantly referred to using their relationship to other (often male) characters.

Of the 146 examples of *her* in *Wives*, we have a much larger sample size to draw *her+N* constructions from. While the full results for *her* in *Wives* can be found in Appendix C, the examples I cite here are representative of the immediately recognizable pattern in the examples of *her+N* constructions in *Wives*. Female characters in this play are correlated directly to a patrilineal system of husbands, fathers and grandfathers. Based on our understanding of Early Modern culture, we are to understand that women in *Wives* are the property of the men in their lives – their husbands, their fathers, and their grandfathers. This constructs a hierarchy of patriarchal possession of women within the social realm of the play-text. As Stallybrass notes, “‘woman’, unlike man, is produced as a property category. The conceptualization of woman as land or possession has, of course, a long history […] In early modern England ‘woman’ was articulated as property not only in legal discourse but in economic and political discourse” (Stallybrass 1986: 127). Within examples (29)-(35), a second pattern of collocation is visible in the responses of Mrs Page, Mrs Quickly, and Mrs Ford: one of jealousy and anger. The response to feminine identity within this framework is concerned with how other male characters who are immediately connected to those being discussed, will respond to their actions. Words such as “jealous” and “angry” imply that the male characters will be displeased with an errant female character that does not follow the patrilineal expectations set forward by Early Modern Society.

Furthermore, *wife* and *woman* are synonymous in the Early Modern period. It is not entirely surprising that the social relationships ascribed to women are accurate within the historical context of woman-as-property, as they are semantically constructed as the object of another person. A wife is the woman who belongs to a man; thus a male character would retain

---

See wife, n. 1a in the OED and HTOED under the category of the external world > the living world > people > person > woman.
power over his wife and daughters; similarly, grandfathers would also retain power over their
granddaughters. However, it is important to note that these D+N constructions in *Wives* using
*her* do not exclusively refer to men as the N. There are three examples of *her mother* in the play-
text, all said by Fenton and found in the same speech in Act IV, scene 6:

(36) “*Her mother*, even strong against that match” (Fenton, IV.vi.2448)

(37) “Straight marry her. To this *her mother’s* plot” (Fenton, IV.vi.2453)

(38) “She shall go with him *her mother* hath intended” (Fenton, IV.vi.2459)

In this scene, Fenton is explaining Anne Page and Slender’s plan to elope to the Host. Mistress
Page disapproves of this match, preferring Doctor Caius as a husband over Slender. Anne’s
mother, Mistress Page is elevated, but only slightly, in the social hierarchy; Anne and Slender’s
elopement is an act of rebellion against this familial decree. As Fenton’s speech illustrates,
mothers in *Wives* retain a form of social mobility. While female characters are limited in their
social identities, women retain power over their children that would be unavailable to single or
unmarried women according to Stallybrass and other scholars of social order in the Renaissance.
This feature is especially prevalent in *Macbeth* as well, though the use the phrase *wife and babes*
(See Appendix B). As children are physical extensions of a woman’s body, mothers retain a
certain amount of power over them.

Female characters of *Wives* are ascribed a specific kind of ownership which appears to be
unavailable to female characters of *Macbeth*. Most notably, there is a reversal of the pattern of
gender presentation as first patterned in *Macbeth*: in *Wives*, it is the men – not the women, as
found in *Macbeth* - who are described in these D+N patterns as having possession of body parts.
Examples such as *her husband* appears to denote the same sort of direct possession of another
human being – yet the women are the possessed, not the possessor in such examples. Based on
social histories, women would still be constituents of their husbands – it is their husbands, not
them, who retains the power in this construction.\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Wives} presents some interesting patterns of ownership which were not present in \textit{Macbeth}. While other people are collocated to \textit{her} in a D+N construction in \textit{Wives}, \textit{his}+N collocates appear to function in a different way.

Indeed, it is apparent that there is a notable difference between the relationships constructed using \textit{his}+N and \textit{her}+N in these two play-texts. The masculine construction implies ownership of the N, whereas the feminine construction implies that the N owns the D.

(39) “Worship that \textit{her husband} is seldom from home” (Mistress Quickly II.ii.893-895)

(40) “Even as you came into me, \textit{her assistant}” (Falstaff II.ii.1047)

(41) “Took off \textit{her life}; this, and what needful else” (Malcolm V.viii.2561)

(42) “Remains in danger of \textit{her former tooth}” (Macbeth, III.i.1186)

(43) “Those of \textit{his chamber}, as it seem’d had done’t” (Lennox II.iii.887)

(44) “\textit{His wife}, \textit{his babes}, and all unfortunate souls” (Macbeth IV.i.1732)

(45) “Be beholding to \textit{his friend} for a man” (Slender I.i.253-254)

(46) “There is either liquor in \textit{his pate} or money in \textit{his purse}” (Page II.ii.746)

In these examples, the feminine \textit{her}+N are parsed as ‘N belonging to D’ – ‘the husband of her’ (39), ‘the assistant of her’ (40), ‘the life of her’ (41) and the ‘the tooth which was formerly hers’ (42). However, in examples (43) through (46), a different parsing is required: Instead of being read ‘the N of D’, the masculine construction is read as ‘D of the N’. Example (43) should be read as ‘the chamber which is his’; (44) should be parsed as ‘the wife and babes which are his’, and (46) should be read as ‘the pate that is his’ and ‘the purse which is his’. The feminine examples present a passive construction, whereas the masculine constructions present a more active voice.

Returning to the examples of social ownership outlined above in *Wives*, this presents a form of constituency within the D+N grouping. Syntactically, the N is attributed as the object of the D within this unit, but semantically the N belongs to the D. But, in these examples, it is the other way around: the N is the head word, not the D. For example, in *her husband*, the *husband* is the head of the attributive phrase which refers to *her*. We understand *her husband* to mean ‘the husband of her’ or ‘the husband who belongs to her’. In both understandings of this phrase we see that the husband-relationship is attributed to her. But following Halliday’s Functional Grammar (1985: 173) “the Thing, however, is not the measure word but the thing being measured”. In our example of *her husband*, *husband* is the Thing being measured by *her*. Thus we see that a woman, in these examples, is still grammatically governed by the Thing (*husband, father, grandsire* etc), and thus makes the second interpretation (‘the husband who belongs to her’) not applicable. If the example had been *his wife* (‘the wife of him’, ‘the wife who belongs to him’), *his* would be the headword of the phrase, modifying *wife*. This is a linguistic feature which reflects the patriarchal nature of Early Modern society. Halliday’s approach to measurability shows that in examples featuring *her*+patrilinial discourse marker, the patrilineal discourse marker is the focus of the phrase, whereas in examples of *his*+feminine discourse marker, the male pronoun will be the focus of the phrase rather than the feminine discourse marker.

The familial possessions presented by the semantic constructions of *her husband* and *her father* are not uncharacteristic of the social realities of the period: Men (and by extension, male characters) would be the head of the family. A sufficient metaphor for familial relationships in the Early Modern period would be as follows: the patriarch of a family would be analogous to a king; the rest of the family could be considered his subjects, but with some agency: “Wives and children had different rights and responsibilities within the family. Their independence was limited, but they were not slaves” (Amussen 1988: 60). This rhetoric of family-as-kingdom, man-as-king is not impossible in the early modern period: “James I regularly described his
relationship to his kingdom in familiar terms. His 1597 treatise on kingship […] is characterized by patriarchal arguments […] If James’s subjects were his children, his kingdom was his wife.” (Goldberg 1986: 1). Despite this metaphor, wives and children would retain some rights against their husbands and fathers; women and children in higher-class families would retain more rights than those in lower-class families. Therefore, to understand daughters and wives as a form of conceptual property of their fathers and husbands is not a stretch. Goldberg describes familial relationships as a microcosm of society, saying that “society is an extended family” (1986: 2). A woman is in some way bound to others; she does not exist autonomously. Social relationships are meant to be reflective of familial realities, so it is not a stretch to make “the claim […] that the wives, being embodiments precisely of the sex-gender system that regulates female desire to marital propriety, seek to protect their reputations against Falstaff’s unwanted approaches and do so by exercising their domestic powers” (Goldberg 2009: 369). In other words, the female characters of Wives - who are in some way representative of women in the real-world of the early modern period - are following the sociocultural ideology of the Renaissance. The female characters of Wives therefore use their familial relationships to their advantage, employing these relationships as a linguistic method of rejecting suitors without having to do so outright. When Mistress Page and Mistress Ford refer to their husbands, they are linguistically and socially rejecting Falstaff’s advances. The effect here constructs a form of social possession which is impenetrable to Falstaff, an outsider to this familial structure.

Social courtship (or the avoidance thereof) is not an issue in Macbeth, as the characters are in established relationships, or their familial relationships are generally unimportant to the plot of the text, and thus do not bear repeating as a reminder of social strata. Linguistic patterns of grammatical possession of women by men to avoid (or encourage) marriage in Wives would be authentic to the Early Modern period and are considered a feature of the comedic genre. This linguistic feature would not be available to the characters of Macbeth: because weddings are not the driving force in tragedies, the reference to familial relationships for the purpose of
perpetuating or avoiding a courtship would not be an issue to be addressed in *Macbeth*. I argue that female characters described through corporeal relationships are features of male language, and that this feature is much likely to appear in a tragedy than in a comedy. This sets up a distinct linguistic difference between the play-text genres of tragedy and comedy and the representation of gender within each genre.

We do not see the same pattern of corporeal ownership for women in *Wives* but rather a pattern of familial relationships. It is through the familial relationships which I describe as a feature of feminine ownership, where female characters are governed by male characters, that are unavailable to women in *Macbeth*. The relationship between women and other (male) family members found in *Wives* shows that women are referenced according to a patriarchal hierarchy of husbands, fathers and grandfathers. I argue that possessives in the Early Modern period containing a body part can construct a form of masculine identity, and such a masculine identity appears unavailable to a traditionally feminine female character such as Lady Macduff, Mistress Quickly, Mistress Ford, Mistress Page, and other women in *Wives*. But this masculine identity is apparently available to Lady Macbeth, the ‘unsexed woman’ and male characters in *Wives*.

This is a form of social masculinity and femininity is a social construction of gender, as presented in the linguistic features of the play-texts. Women in *Macbeth* and *Wives* are reduced to bodies and familial relationships, respectively. Interestingly, this feature is not exclusive to Early Modern texts: Anna Livia finds this pattern of women-as-bodies retained in 20th century French fiction, and notes that “the assertion that women are bodies is a little puzzling. Are women […] more corporeal than men?” (Livia 2003: 147). While Livia’s analysis remains true for *Macbeth*, it is the male characters who are more corporeal than female characters in *Wives*. Where has this reversal come from? Rather than claiming that women are more corporeal than men, as Livia wants to, I suggest that corporeality is a linguistic feature of masculinity, which happens to be manifested in these texts. I suggest that perhaps female characters in tragedy are more masculine than feminine – despite their gender identity, their social identity within the
realm of this genre is more flexible, and furthermore, the distinct communities of practice based around binary gender distinctions suggested by Eckert and McConnell-Ginet functioning as the underlying framework of my study of gender in the Early Modern Period is much more fluid than originally anticipated.
Chapter 4. Conclusions.

4.1.1 Summary.

This is a study of gender in the early modern period, looking at the representations of men and women using a combination of corpus linguistic tools. This dissertation serves as a pilot study, proving that such a methodology is a valuable and relevant way to approach the lexical representation of gender in two complimentary yet contrastive plays using aspects of corpus linguistics for a strictly stylistic purpose, and in this dissertation I argue for the benefits of a corpus-based approach to stylistics as a multi-faceted approach to the lexical representation of third-person gender-specific pronouns in Shakespeare. Briefly recapping the aims of this study, I was initially interested in the actual linguistic representation of male and female characters, and how their actual lexical representation in the play-texts compares to what feminist scholars believe to be true. I then wanted to see how a study of social identities, a very subjective field of study with regards to historical data, could be made more objective. The representation of gender in a play-text, which I address in Chapter 2.1.1, is quantifiable in ways which other aspects of social identity is not, and is therefore well-suited to the analysis I conduct. In order to conduct such an analysis, however, I would need to compile tools to ensure that my study would retain a careful balance of qualitative and quantitative data and analysis.

I have identified a feature of social identity which is both countable and interpreted in a number of ways. This is a particularly effective approach to sociohistorical stylistic features of literary texts, as it presents the following features:

i) how a specific group of characters will apply an aspect of language to themselves and each other

ii) what makes these literary characters different than real people

iii) and the dangers of assuming that gender representation as presented in a play-text represents gender representation in the real-world.
I began my analysis by addressing reasons why a play-text is not representative of gender representation in the real-world: The number of male and female characters in each play is not reflective of the number of male and female people in the Early Modern Period, nor is the number of lines said by each gender consistent with the likely percentages of speech produced by men and women in the early modern period (Chapter 3.1.1). While other studies of gender representation in Shakespeare’s play-texts (and other literary texts) certainly do exist, they do not take this issue into account, presuming that a literary text is in some way reflective of the social realities of the period (Chapter 1.1.2).

My results showed several four major aspects of gender representation in Macbeth and Wives. The way that male and female possession using a third-person D+N construction is presented in the play-texts is exclusively limited to the assignment of gender identities to characters in the play-texts (Chapter 2.1.2). Based on speculations of grammatical gender representation provided by feminist critics, I investigate whether gender-specific pronouns appear with a preference towards subject/object grammatical structures. I find in Chapter 3.1.2 that gendered pronouns do not prefer one grammatical position over another - that is, I do not find that male pronouns only occur as subjects and female pronouns only appear as objects. Secondly, while features of female possession are different across the two play-texts, male possession is consistent for the two play-texts. This suggests that feminine possession is presented differently in different genres, whereas male possession will remain consistent across genre (Chapter 3.2.1). Thirdly, I find that corporeality is a feature of male ownership rather than feminine ownership, and female characters who are consistently described in the context of possessing their body parts – such as Lady Macbeth – are linguistically ascribed a more masculine, rather than feminine, social identity within the realm of these play-texts (Chapter 3.3.2). Additionally, I show that the female identity in Wives is presented within the context of a familial infrastructure (Chapter 3.3.2). As my results have shown, it is possible to use a corpus methodology and apply it to stylistic and discourse features of play-texts and that such a
methodology is an incredibly productive way to identify and isolate these features of literary texts in context. Building on several previous corpus stylistic studies of Shakespeare, my research fills a void in lexical markers of gender, a feature which combines both quantifiable and qualifiable data. Such an analysis could not be conducted without making a subjective analysis more objective, as I have successfully done (Chapter 2.2.2-3 and Appendix A).

4.1.2 Looking ahead.

This project is not without its flaws. My study would have benefited greatly from natural language processing and annotation of the play-texts for features such as gender and part-of-speech tagging; such annotations would have been useful in the compilation of many more gender-specific lexical items beyond just the use of pronouns in the two play-texts. My study ultimately became limited to the lexical representation of gender-specific pronouns, where it could have possibly included a complete analysis of gender-specific nouns and pronouns, compiled using a concordance search based on gender-markers in XML annotation. The use of XML annotation and metadata in corpus linguistics would allow for a much larger sample size, and I would have been able to make larger claims about gender representation in a larger subset of play-texts.

Rather than using the Project Gutenberg The Complete Works of William Shakespeare text, I could have used a different set of fully parsed play-texts, such as The Nameless Shakespeare (Muller 2009), or I could have tagged the texts myself using a part-of-speech tagger and marked the text manually for features of gender, but I would have been able to identity the same features as I do in this study, just perhaps on a larger scale.

But as it stands, this study is a successful pilot study for corpus stylistic investigation of two specific features of gender representation as it appears in two play-texts using syntactic and grammatical structures of third-person pronouns in the Early Modern Period. This dissertation argues convincingly for a corpus stylistic approach to investigating salient features of discourse
markers using a trio of corpus stylistic tools for a multi-faceted analysis of gender representation, and proves that patterns of gender representation in *Macbeth* and *Wives* do not always match the expectations set forth by feminist scholars and literary critics of Shakespeare and the early modern period.

The representation of gender-specific possession in these two play-texts certainly primes for further study. This approach to coded markers of gender is not limited to play-texts; indeed, this approach to lexically-coded features of gender-specific possession in texts is applicable to other literary (and non-literary – an idea I will return to in a moment) texts. Several unresolved questions arose in my study: How would gender representation in Shakespeare’s corpus compare to a corpus of other printed Early Modern texts, such as a corpus derived from Early English Books On-line? The two texts I examined represented different genres: are these patterns consistent across our common genre divisions? Can we use the representation of gender-specific possession as presented in D+N clusters as a new criteria by which we determine genre divisions – do all tragedies, for example, present their female characters as linguistically male? Do all comedies present female characters as the constituents of a predominantly male family member? Do gender-specific titles (*mistress, master, lord, lady*, etc) present similar patterns? Other questions arise: How are these D+N clusters represented in *Hamlet* compared to Beckett’s *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*? Is there a shift in gender-specific possession from the early plays to the later plays? These questions and more can be answered with further corpus stylistic studies of Early Modern English.

Stepping outside of Shakespeare and the Early Modern period, similar questions could be raised using equivalently large corpora of literary language, by applying the corpus stylistic methodology I outline in Chapter 2. Lexical representation of gender and gender-specific possession is applicable elsewhere in literary studies, and would ultimately present new interpretations of familiar texts. How are constructions of possession involving female characters and male characters represented in the Romantic or Victorian eras? Is 20th century women’s
writing different from 20\textsuperscript{th} century men’s writing in its representations of pronouns? How do African-American writers use pronouns in contrast to their white American contemporaries? Are British writers using gendered pronouns in a different way than American or Australian writers?

My secondary investigation of whether or not the use of different corpus tools in combination with each other – rather than limiting myself to just one software program - would be beneficial to the study of stylistic and discourse features as a form of a social identity was clearly a productive one. This dissertation highlights the strengths of WordHoard, AlphaX and AntConc and combines them into an effective methodology to highlight several aspects of one discourse marker for stylistic investigation. The investigation of one discourse marker under several different methodologies presents a multi-dimensional view of this feature in the play-texts, which tells us much more about its usage than just one of these methodologies would have.

Reviewing the benefits of these three programs in combination with each other, we find that while a statistical analysis is a good starting point for identifying relevant features of a play-text, it does not say everything about the representation of coded social features as they appear in the text. A log likelihood test represents a good starting point for analysis by presenting conceptual and function words which appear more or less frequently. With this information, a list of semantically related search terms can be identified (as shown in Chapter 2.2.3) for further investigation. Is the significant absence of a specific lexical item a paradigm of the text, or is it just a coincidence? Are similarly coded lexical items represented in similar ways? To investigate this further, I compiled a list of relevant terms for investigation (Chapter 2.1.3 and Chapter 2.2.3), and used a text editor to create a simple concordance to isolate immediate collocations of each search term within the context of a line of a play-text. Thus far I have used two tools: one is a statistical test which is widely common in corpus linguistics, and the other is a simplified approach to a common corpus linguistic technique. I then isolated a single grammatical item and used a third tool, AntConc, to produce a distribution of where these lexical items appeared in the
texts, to align the clusters of results with the act and scene divisions (Chapter 3.2.1), thus making the results easier to interpret.

While this approach was clearly successful, there are ways to speed up this process, addressed above. The use of three separate programs ultimately makes my claims stronger, as each is perfectly suited for the analysis it conducts. While AlphaX presented an efficient, easy way to compile the concordance data, this project ultimately was limited to a two-play comparison, as the compilation of each concordance was all done manually and had to be checked repeatedly for errors. Due to time constraints on this project, I was only able to complete this process on two texts. However, through the use of natural language processing and XML markup, every relevant discourse marker – for example, every gender-specific pronoun – could be automatically annotated as a “gender marker” with the distinction of “male” or “female” using a parser. While a human will still have to double-check the work of a computerized part-of-speech tagger, it would be less time consuming than manually isolating every example from a text like I have done here. Because a part of speech tagger will label grammatical parts of speech, isolating all pronouns and then identifying and annotating them as gender-specific or not would not be an arduous process. A fully-tagged text could thus be marked for every instance of a lexical item - either pronoun or noun - which is coded as being gender-specific and could be searched by mark-up tag rather than specific keywords. This would provide a more complete view of gender representation in the play-texts than my study has. While my study investigates third-person pronouns only (Appendix B and C), and limits its analysis to third person possession using D+N clusters (Chapter 3.3.1-2), other constructions such as Noun’s (i.e. women’s, men’s, lord’s, lady’s, husband’s, etc) might illustrate more features of male- and female- specific possession. Providing a computer with word-lists which denote male- and female- gender-specific lexical items, a simple code can be written to annotate the texts for such features using secondary tags. As a result, a concordance similar to the one outlined in Chapter
2.1.3 and Appendix B and C could be compiled using the tags to identify lexical items which have been explicitly marked for gender.

While some time would be devoted to ensuring that the tagger would be able to address spelling variants and non-standard Modern English found in Shakespeare’s Early Modern English writing, the use of pre-parser tools designed explicitly to deal with variants in Early Modern English such as VARD 2 (Baron and Rayson, 2008) could be used to prepare the texts for a part of speech tagger. Most available taggers are designed for Modern English. Issues of natural language processing, especially when dealing with Early Modern texts, present questions for programmers and computational linguists alike: Computers only understand what we tell them. Can computers determine semantic relationships in variant linguistic environments? Would it be possible to develop a tagger designed exclusively which will correctly (up to 90% accuracy) parse Early Modern English texts? Fully tagged texts of Shakespeare, such as the Nameless Shakespeare (Mueller 2009) exist – how can we test the accuracy of these tagged texts, and how can we replicate this with other non-variant historical language data such as Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales? A majority of work in natural language processing is exclusive to Modern English. Could linguistic change be identified through the use of historical parsers? What other, similar linguistic features can be identified using XML markup and annotation in a concordance technique as it is applied to Shakespearean play-texts?

These questions are not explicitly relevant to literary and non-literary texts as run through computers. Sociolinguists working with natural language could conduct further studies informed by this research. While this dissertation addressed how fictional characters from the past retain and present their social identities, how does this compare to actual people inhabiting the same social identities - in what ways do men and women use pronouns naturally? What makes play-text language different than natural spoken language? Are the examples produced by this study still common constructions and patterns in Modern English? How do different communities of
practice, use gender-specific lexical items? These are just a sampling of questions this dissertation has introduced.

4.1.3 Final thoughts.

Corpus stylistic studies of power as it is manifested in pronoun usage through a sociolinguistic discourse marker are becoming more popular. As the digital humanities movement progresses through more text-coding initiatives and more written works become available as e-texts, much more can be discovered about the stylistic and literary-linguistic features of a specific text or a group of texts from a specific period using a variety of statistical, concordancing, and other corpus linguistic approaches. As more software, computational tools, and texts become available, the possibilities of a corpus stylistic study of gender and other (socio)linguistic features become more apparent.

As I finished this dissertation, Pennebaker’s 2011 monograph The Secret Lives of Pronouns: What Our Words Say About Us was published. Pennebaker’s book begins to explore pronoun usage in contemporary modern culture, addressing pronoun usage in everything from an e-mail corpus to public speeches such as Guiliani’s speeches in spring 2000, making his studies inclusive of both literary and non-literary language, and covering many of the same issues of linguistic representation in discourse that my study has. Much remains to be said about the use of pronouns in written and spoken language using corpora, but Pennebaker’s book begins to address some of questions about pronoun usage in modern culture which I have identified above, using many of the approaches and methodologies I have outlined here.

My study serves to only illuminate a small feature of linguistic representation as it appears in literary language. I have successfully shown that computer technology is an interesting and otherwise relevant approach to investigating aspects of several major disciplines, including but certainly not limited literary studies, gender studies, sociohistorical studies, linguistic studies, and digital approaches to the humanities. As a pilot study, this dissertation
shows that the combination of critical discourse analysis, literary studies and sociohistorical linguistics with corpus studies will present interesting patterns of language use, but there is room for much improvement, and there is much more to be said about the lexical representation of gender in the Early Modern Period beyond the scope of this study.
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Appendices.
Appendix A. Building a concordance with AlphaX.

AlphaX is an open-source text editor designed for computer programming which runs on Mac OSX 10.4 or later. It searches for strings of typographical characters in a specific order, using a Regular Expression (RegExp) search and a Matching Lines function to produce a concordance of these typographical characters in the specified order. A RegExp “describes strings of characters. It's a pattern that matches certain strings and doesn't match others” (Sinclair 1991: 41). In other words, it finds every example of that exact search string – including spaces: according to a computer, “a ‘word’ is any string of characters with a word space on either side” (Sinclair 1991: 41). Thus a RegExp can be used to identify a specific lexical item.

For example, the lexical item *he*, when entered into a computer, is represented as [space]he[space] keystrokes. The character strings of in a RegExp search must match the keystrokes used to make the characters appear on-screen. This will find every example of the word *he*, but no examples of the letters *h* and *e* which happen to be next to each other (cf. *they*, *when*, *mother*, *orchestra*, etc). Each keystroke representing white space (the space bar) must be included on both sides of a single lexical item, as computers identify individual words in terms of white spaces between alphabetical keystrokes (Adolphs 2006: 47). To avoid issues of punctuation which may appear, all punctuation has been edited out of the play-texts.

A RegExp search in AlphaX is conducted through a Matching Lines search. Matching Lines will find all examples of lines in the play-texts. This creates a concordance of all examples of the search term found in the text, labeled chronologically, as shown below. An [enter] keystroke produces a new line of text, and each new string of typographical characters until the next [enter] keystroke is assigned a chronological number. The Matching Lines function will produce all examples containing the search term and their AlphaX-assigned linear number. In Figures 3.1 and 3.2 I show how a RegExp and Matching Lines search can be used to build a simple concordance.
Figure 3.1 Conducting a Matching Lines Search using RegExp to build a simple concordance

Figure 3.2 Conducting a Matching Lines Search using RegExp to build a simple concordance
This process produces a list of examples from the play-text in a new Matching Lines window. In this new Matching Lines window, the chronological AlphaX-assigned line number is produced, along with the full string of typographical characters which contain the specified RegExp.

A second Matching Lines and RegExp search will identify the exact location of a specific line of text within the play-text (or any other literary text). Using a second RegExp search, a full line of characters (as found by our original RegExp search in 3.2 above) can then be used as a second search term to be identified within a larger context, such as its location in a specific scene, act, chapter, section or other literary division in the text. This feature allows for a larger contextualization of a line within the dramatic story arc than software designed as a concordance program.

In Figures 3.3-3.5 below I show how this process works.

Figure 3.3 Finding a line in context using a second RegExp

![Image of Matching Lines window showing line search results]
This identifies the line as it appears in the context of the play-text, as illustrated in Figure 3.5 below:
A second RegExp Matching Lines search is extremely useful for locating the line within the larger literary context of the play. This allows us to see features of the play-text, such as who is saying the line, under what circumstances, to whom, and who (or what) the referents refer to. This ability to search with ease within the sample population is especially useful.

The information compiled through AlphaX’s simple concordances can be organized into a database using Excel. The databases used in this study have been replicated in full as Appendix B (Macbeth) and Appendix C (Wives) and inventory the following information: the example number, the line number as assigned by AlphaX, the character who is saying the line, the line itself, and the grammatical role the search term has within the clause. This information creates an annotated, yet simple concordance of each individual search term within the context of a line.
Appendix B. Concordance Database for Macbeth

In Appendix B I present the full concordance database for *Macbeth*.

Line numbers cited in this database are derived from the AlphaX line numeration, as described in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HE</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>POS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>What bloody man is that? He can report</td>
<td>S, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SARGEANT</td>
<td>For brave Macbeth -well he deserves that name</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SARGEANT</td>
<td>Till he faced the slave</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SARGEANT</td>
<td>Till he unseam'd him from the nave to the chaps,</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>What a haste looks through his eyes! So should he look</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>Till he disbursed, at Saint Colme's Inch</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>What he hath lost, noble Macbeth hath won.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1ST WITCH</td>
<td>He shall live a man forbid</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1ST WITCH</td>
<td>Shall he dwindle, peak, and pine;</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1ST WITCH</td>
<td>Wreck'd as homeward he did come.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>That he seems rapt withal. To me you speak not.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>The news of thy success; and when he reads</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>He finds thee in the stout Norweyan ranks</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>He bade me, from him, call thee Thane of Cawdor.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ANGUS</td>
<td>Which he deserves to lose. Whether he was combined</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ANGUS</td>
<td>He labor'd in his country's wreck, I know not;</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>That very frankly he confess'd his treasons,</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>Became him like the leaving it; he died</td>
<td>S, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>To throw away the dearest thing he owed</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>He was a gentleman on whom I built</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>True, worthy Banquo! He is full so valiant</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>He brings great news</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Tomorrow, as he purposes.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>But be the serpent under it. He that's coming</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>To be his purveyor; but he rides well,</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>He has almost supp'd. Why have you left the chamber?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Hath he ask'd for me?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>Know you not he has?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>He hath honor'd me of late, and I have bought</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>He hath been in unusual pleasure and</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>This diamond he greets your wife withal</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which now suits with it. While I threaten, he lives.

Which gives the sternest good night. He is about it:

He could not miss 'em. Had he not resembled,

My father as he slept, I had done't.

He could not miss 'em. Had he not resembled,

My father as he slept, I had done't.

That fears a painted devil. If he do bleed,

He is about it:

He is already named, and gone to Scone

If he had been forgotten,

Reigns that which would be fear'd. 'Tis much he dares,

He hath a wisdom that doth guide his valor

Mark Antony's was by Caesar. He chid the sisters

That it was he in the times past which held you

Hath in him closed, whereby he does receive

So is he mine, and in such bloody distance

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well

He needs not our mistrust, since he delivers

Then 'tis he the rest

Almost a mile, but he does usually-

Then 'tis he

'Tis better thee without than he within.

Is he dispatch'd?

Ay, my good lord. Safe in a ditch he bides,

He will again be well. If much you note him,

Would he were here! To all and him we thirst,

I pray you, speak not; he grows worse and worse

He shall spurn fate, scorn death, and bear

Was pitied of Macbeth; marry, he was dead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>How it did grieve Macbeth! Did he not straight,</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>He has borne all things well; and I do think</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>That, had he Duncan's sons under his key-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>As, an't please heaven, he shall not -they should find</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>But, peace! For from broad words, and 'cause he fail'd</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Where he bestows himself?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Sent he to Macduff?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>LORD</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>He did, and with an absolute &quot;Sir, not I,&quot;</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>His message ere he come, that a swift blessing</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1ST WITCH</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>He knows thy thought</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1ST WITCH</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>He will not be commanded. Here's another</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>What had he done, to make him fly the land?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>He had none;</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>From whence himself does fly? He loves us not;</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>He wants the natural touch; for the poor wren</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>He is noble, wise, Judicious, and best knows</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Father'd he is, and yet he's fatherless</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Yes, he is dead. How wilt thou do for father?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Ay, that he was</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>SON</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>If he were dead, you'd weep for him; if you would not, it</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>SON</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>He has kill'd me, Mother.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>He hath not touch'd you yet. I am young, but something</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>MACDUFF</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>What should he be?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>MACDUFF</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>What's the disease he means?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2206</td>
<td>I have seen him do. How he solicits heaven,</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2209</td>
<td>The mere despair of surgery, he cures</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>To the succeeding royalty he leaves</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>He hath a heavenly gift of prophecy,</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>MACDUFF</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2295</td>
<td>He has no children. All my pretty ones?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>MACDUFF</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2295</td>
<td>Within my sword's length set him; if he 'scape,</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>pale. I tell you yet again, Banquo's buried; he cannot come out</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>For certain, sir, he is not; I have a file</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>CAITHNESS</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>Great Dunsinane he strongly fortifies.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He cannot buckle his distemper'd cause

Now does he feel

Those he commands move only in command

Nothing in love. Now does he feel his title

Was he not born of woman? The spirits that know

If this which he avouches does appear,

He only lived but till he was a man,

In the unshrinking station where he fought,

But like a man he died.

Then he is dead?

Had he his hurts before?

Why then God's soldier be he

They say he parted well and paid his score

And she goes down at twelve

She strike upon the bell Get thee to bed

Died every day she lived Fare thee well

truth in your report When was it she last walked

Lo you here she comes This is her very guise and upon my

How came she by that light

Why it stood by her She has light by her

What is it she does now Look how she rubs her hands
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIM Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SARGEANT</td>
<td>Do swarm upon him - from the Western Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SARGEANT</td>
<td>Which ne'er shook hands nor bade farewell to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SARGEANT</td>
<td>Till he unseam'd him from the nave to the chaps,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>They smack of honor both. Go get him surgeons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>Confronted him with self-comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>Nor would we deign him burial of his men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1st WITCH</td>
<td>I will drain him dry as hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>And pour'd them down before him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>He bade me from him call thee Thane of Cawdor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ANGUS</td>
<td>Have overthrown him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>New honors come upon him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>With one that saw him die, who did report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>Became him like the leaving it; he died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>Not unaccompanied invest him only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>Give him tending;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>It is a banquet to me Let's after him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>Is not thy master with him who were't so</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of my fellows had the speed of him
We coursed him at the heels and had a purpose
And his great love sharp as his spur hath holp him
Conduct me to mine host. We love him highly
And shall continue our graces towards him
Soundly invite him his two chamberlains
equivocator with lechery it makes him and it mars him it sets him on, and it takes him off; it persuade him and
disheartens
him; makes him stand to and not stand to; in conclusion, equivocates him in a sleep, and giving him the lie, leaves him.
him for his lie, and, I think, being too strong for him, though
he took up my legs sometime yet I made shift to cast him
Our knocking has awaked him here he comes
He did command me to call timely on him
I'll bring you to him
Whose being I do fear and under him
And bade them speak to him then prophet like
They hail'd him father to a line of kings.
Hath in him closed, whereby he does receive
With barefaced power sweep him from my sight
That I require a clearness) and with him
Fleance his son, that keeps him company,
Can touch him further.
Present him eminence, both with eye and tongue:
My lord his throat is cut that I did for him
He will again be well If much you note him
1485  L. MACBETH  f  You shall offend **him** and extend his passion.  
1486  L. MACBETH  f  Feed, and regard **him** not—Are you a man?  
1504  MACBETH  m  If I stand here I saw **him**  
1524  MACBETH  m  Would he were here To all and **him** we thirst  
1559  L. MACBETH  f  Question enrages **him** At once good night  
1574  L. MACBETH  f  Did you send to **him** sir  
1524  MACBETH  m  Would he were here! To all and **him** we thirst,  
1679  LORD  m  That by the help of these, with **Him** above  
1693  LENNOX  m  Advise **him** to a caution, to hold what distance  
1699  LORD  m  I'll send my prayers with **him**  
1841  APPARITION  m  Shall come against **him**  
1916  MACBETH  m  That trace **him** in his line. No boasting like a fool;  
1929  L. MACDUFF  f  What had he done, to make **him** fly the land?  
1992  SON  m  If he were dead you'd weep for **him** if you would not it  
2019  L. MACDUFF  f  Where such as thou mayst find **him**  
2052  MALCOLM  m  Was once thought honest. You have loved **him** well;  
2054  MALCOLM  m  You may deserve of **him** through me, and wisdom  
2092  MALCOLM  m  By **him** that shall succeed.  
2098  MALCOLM  m  Esteem **him** as a lamb, being compared  
2103  MALCOLM  m  I grant **him** bloody,  
2206  MALCOLM  m  I have seen **him** do. How he solicits heaven  
2216  MALCOLM  m  That speak **him** full of grace.  
2221  MALCOLM  m  My countryman, but yet I know **him** not.  
2223  MALCOLM  m  I know **him** now. Good God, betimes remove  
2314  MACDUFF  m  Within my sword's length set **him** if he 'scape  
2315  MACDUFF  m  Heaven forgive **him** too!  
2378  L. MACBETH  f  had so much blood in **him**
74  2440  CAITHNESS  m  Some say he's mad others that lesser hate **him**  DO
75  2449  ANGUS  m  Hang loose about **him** like a giant's robe  PP
76  2353  MENTEITH  m  When all that is within **him** does condemn  PP
77  2458  CAITHNESS  m  And with **him** pour we, in our country's purge,  PP
78  2564  MALCOLM  m  Let every soldier hew **him** down a bough,  DO
79  2565  MALCOLM  m  And bear't before **him** thereby shall we shadow  PP
80  2574  MALCOLM  m  Both more and less have given **him** the revolt  DO
81  2575  MALCOLM  m  And none serve with **him** but constrained things  PP
82  2722  MACDUFF  m  Seems bruited Let me find **him** Fortune  DO
83  2702  MACBETH  m  And damn'd be **him** that first cries, "Hold, enough!"  DO
84  2817  MALCOLM  m  And that I'll spend for **him**  PP
85  2820  SIWARD  m  And so God be with **him** Here comes newer comfort  PP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HER</th>
<th>line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1st WITCH</td>
<td>A sailor's wife had chestnuts in her lap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1st WITCH</td>
<td>Her husband's to Aleppo gone master the Tiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>By each at once her choppy finger laying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>Upon her skinny lips You should be women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>OLD MAN</td>
<td>A falcon towering in her pride of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Remains in danger of her former tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Our hostess keeps her state but in best time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>We will require her welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>Authorized by her grandam Shame itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1st WITCH</td>
<td>Her nine farrow grease that's sweaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>(Stage directions)</td>
<td>Enter Lady Macduff her Son and Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>Her young ones in her nest against the owl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>(Stage directions)</td>
<td>Exeunt Murtherers following her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2084</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>Is added to her wounds I think withal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 2161 MACDUFF GENTLEWOM m Oftener upon her knees than on her feet PP, PP
16 2345 AN f rise from her bed throw her nightgown upon her unlock her PP, DO, PP
17 2351 DOCTOR m agitation besides her walking and other actual performances PP
18 2352 DOCTOR GENTLEWOM m what at any time have you heard her say DO
19 2353 AN GENTLEWOM f That sir which I will not report after her PP
20 2360 AN GENTLEWOM f Lo you here she comes This is her very guise and upon my DO
21 2361 AN GENTLEWOM f life fast asleep Observe her stand close DO
22 2363 AN GENTLEWOM f Why it stood by her She has light by her PP, PP
23 2364 AN f continually 'tis her command DO
24 2365 DOCTOR m You see her eyes are open DO
25 2367 DOCTOR m What is it she does now Look how she rubs her hands DO
26 2368 AN GENTLEWOM f It is an accustomed action with her to seem thus PP
27 2369 AN GENTLEWOM f washing her hands I have known her continue in this a quarter of DO, DO
28 2372 DOCTOR m Hark she speaks I will set down what comes from her to PP
29 2410 DOCTOR m God God forgive us all Look after her PP
30 2411 DOCTOR m Remove from her the means of all annoyance PP
31 2412 DOCTOR m And still keep eyes upon her So good night PP
32 2522 DOCTOR m That keep her from her rest DO, PP
33 2523 MACBETH m Cure her of that DO
34 2536 MACBETH m The water of my land find her disease DO
35 2842 MALCOM m Took off her life; this, and what needful else PP
Like Valor’s minion carved out his passage
And fix’d his head upon our battlements
As whence the sun ’gins his reflection
Our bosom interest Go pronounce his present death
And with his former title greet Macbeth
Nor would we deign him burial of his men
Our bosom interest Go pronounce his present death
And with his former title greet Macbeth
As one that had been studied in his death,
Than would make up his message.
By his loved mansionry that the heaven's breath
Hath made his pendant bed and procreant cradle
To be his purveyor; but he rides well,
And his great love, sharp as his spur, hath holp him
To his home before us. Fair and noble hostess,
With his surcease, success; that but this blow
First, as I am his kinsman and his subject,
Strong both against the deed; then, as his host,
Who should against his murtherer shut the door,
Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office, that his virtues
The deep damnation of his taking-off,

Have pluck'd my nipple from his boneless gums

Where to rather shall his day's hard journey

Soundly invite him- his two chamberlains

His spongy officers, who shall bear the guilt

Of his own chamber and used their very daggers,

Upon his death?

Alarum'd by his sentinel, the wolf,

Whose howl's his watch, thus with his stealthy pace,

With Tarquin's ravishing strides, towards his design

Confusion now hath made his masterpiece.

Mean you his Majesty?

Those of his chamber, as it seem'd, had done't.

His silver skin laced with his golden blood,

And his gash'd stabs look'd like a breach in nature

Threaten his bloody stage. By the clock 'tis day,

The sacred storehouse of his predecessors

Let every man be master of his time

Stick deep, and in his royalty of nature

And, to that dauntless temper of his mind,

He hath a wisdom that doth guide his valor

To pray for his good man and for his issue,

Who wear our health but sickly in his life,

Which in his death were perfect

That every minute of his being thrusts

For certain friends that are both his and mine

Whose loves I may not drop, but wail his fall

Fleance his son, that keeps him company,

Than is his father's, must embrace the fate

Say to the King I would attend his leisure
69  1319  MACBETH  m  In restless ecstasy. Duncan is in his grave;  

70  1321  MACBETH  m  Treason has done his worst; nor steel, nor poison,  

71  1336  MACBETH  m  Thou know'st that Banquo and his Fleance lives.  

72  1340  MACBETH  m  His cloister'd flight, ere to black Hecate's summons  

73  1341  MACBETH  m  The shard-borne beetle with his drowsy hums  

74  1381  MURTHERER  m  His horses go about.  

75  1432  MURTHERER  m  My lord, his throat is cut; that I did for him.  

76  1444  MURTHERER  m  With twenty trenched gashes on his head  

77  1459  ROSS  m  His absence, sir  

78  1470  ROSS  m  Lays blame upon his promise. Please't your Highness  

79  1480  ROSS  m  Gentlemen, rise; his Highness is well  

80  1482  L. MACBETH  f  And hath been from his youth. Pray you, keep seat.  

81  1485  L. MACBETH  f  You shall offend him and extend his passion.  

82  1563  LENNOX  m  Attend his Majesty!  

83  1576  MACBETH  m  How say'st thou, that Macduff denies his person  

84  1642  MACBETH  m  There's not a one of them but in his house  

85  1611  HECATE  f  Loves for his own ends, not for you  

86  1615  HECATE  f  Will come to know his destiny.  

87  1627  HECATE  f  Shall draw him on to his confusion.  

88  1629  HECATE  f  His hopes 'bove wisdom, grace, and fear.  

89  1664  LENNOX  m  That, had he Duncan's sons under his key-  

90  1668  LENNOX  m  His presence at the tyrant's feast, I hear,  

91  1676  LORD  m  Takes from his high respect. Thither Macduff  

92  1677  LORD  m  Is gone to pray the holy King, upon his aid  

93  1689  LORD  m  The cloudy messenger turns me his back,  

94  1694  LENNOX  m  His wisdom can provide. Some holy angel  

95  1762  LENNOX  m  His message ere he come, that a swift blessing  

96  1807  1st WITCH  f  Hear his speech, but say thou nought.  

97  1830  1st WITCH (stage direction)  n/a with a tree in his hand.
And wears upon his baby brow the round

Unfix his earth-bound root? Sweet bodements, good!

Shall live the lease of nature, pay his breath

Show his eyes, and grieve his heart;

A show of eight Kings, the last with a glass in his hand

And points at them for his What is this so

Come, sisters, cheer us up his sprites,

Our duties did his welcome pay.

His wife, his babes, and all unfortunate souls

That trace him in his line. No boasting like a fool;

His flight was madness. When our actions do not,

Whether it was his wisdom or his fear.

Wisdom? To leave his wife, to leave his babes,

His mansion, and his titles, in a place

Desire his jewels and this other's house,

By his own interdiction stands accursed

And does blaspheme his breed? Thy royal father

Into his power, and modest wisdom plucks me

The devil to his fellow, and delight
That stay his cure. Their malady convinces

The great assay of art, but at his touch,

Such sanctity hath heaven given his hand,

And sundry blessings hang about his throne

Since his Majesty went into the field, have seen her

His uncle Siward, and the good Macduff.

Who knows if Donalbain be with his brother?

He cannot buckle his distemper'd cause

His secret murthers sticking on his hands,

Now minutely revolts upbraid his faith-breach;

Nothing in love. Now does he feel his title

His pester'd senses to recoil and start

Enter Malcolm, old Seward and his Son, Macduff, Menteith, Caithness,

Tis his main hope;

That struts and frets his hour upon the stage

Tell thee, Macduff was from his mother's womb

The which no sooner had his prowess confirm'd

Must not be measured by his worth, for then

Had he his hurts before?
**NO EXAMPLES OF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIWARD</td>
<td>2815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIWARD</td>
<td>2819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>2840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE #</th>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>She'll close and be herself whilst our poor malice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE #</th>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>Norway himself with terrible numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>The raven himself is hoarse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>a farmer that hanged himself on th' expectation of plenty Come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>LENNOX</td>
<td>Where he bestows himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>L. MACDUFF</td>
<td>From whence himself does fly He loves us not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>Himself best knows but strangely visited people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2531</td>
<td>DOCTOR</td>
<td>Must minister to himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2702</td>
<td>SIWARD</td>
<td>The devil himself could not pronounce a title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUNCAN</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ST WITCH</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANQUO</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MACBETH</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>593 L. MACBETH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1020 MALCOLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1236 MACBETH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1821 APPARITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2377 L. MACBETH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35 2477 MACBETH m Fear not Macbeth no man that's born of woman
INDIRECT OBJ, PP
36 2710 MACBETH m Brandish'd by man that's of a woman born. PP
37 2769 MACBETH m For it hath cow'd my better part of man! PP
38 2802 ROSS m He only lived but till he was a man, DO
39 2805 ROSS m But like a man he died. DO

*MAN'S LINE # CHARACTER LINE
1 141 1st WITCH f I' the shipman's card PP
2 440 L. MACBETH f The effect and it Come to my woman's breasts DO
3 774 MACBETH m As they had seen me with these hangman's hands PP
4 942 MACDUFF m The repetition in a woman's ear PP
5 976 LENNOX m They stared and were distracted no man's life DO
6 1046 ROSS m Thou seest the heavens as troubled with man's act PP
7 1494 L. MACBETH f A woman's story at a winter's fire S
8 2001 MESSENGER m If you will take a homely man's advice DO
9 2233 ROSS m A modern ecstasy The dead man's knell S

MEN+ LINE # CHARACTER LINE
1 67 SARGEANT m With furbish'd arms and new supplies of men PP
2 107 ROSS m Nor would we deign him burial of his men PP
3 462 L. MACBETH f Your face my Thane is as a book where men AdvP
4 617 MACBETH m Bring forth men children only PP
5 1023 NOMAD m There's daggers in men's smiles the near in blood PP
6 1170 MACBETH 1ST m Sirrah a word with you Attend those men S
7 1224 MURTHERER m We are men my liege DO
8 1225 MACBETH m Ay in the catalogue ye go for men PP
133

9 1234 MACBETH m That writes them all alike and so of men PP
10 1383 MURThEreR m So all men do from hence to the palace gate S
11 1653 LENNOX m For Fleance fled Men must not walk too late S
12 1662 LENNOX m To hear the men deny’t So that I say DO
13 1987 L. MACDUFF f Why the honest men S
14 1989 SON m swears enow to beat the honest men and hang up them DO
15 2041 MACDUFF m Hold fast the mortal sword and like good men DO

16 2184 MALCOLM m Old Siward with ten thousand warlike men PP
17 2234 ROss m Is there scarce ask’d for who and good men’s lives S
18 2259 MALCOLM m Lent us good Siward and ten thousand men DO
19 2752 MACBETH m Of all men else I have avoided thee PP

MAN AND
LINE # CHARACTER LINE
1 1221 MACBETH m To pray for this good man and for his issue PP

OF MAN, OF MEN CHARACT ER LINE
LINE # CHARACTER LINE
1 67 SARGEANT m With furbish’d arms and new supplies of men PP
2 280 MACBETH m Shakes so my single state of man that function PP
3 1195 MACBETH m Given to the common enemy of man PP
4 1234 MACBETH 2ND APPARITIO m That writes them all alike and so of men PP
5 1821 N ? The power of man for none of woman born PP
6 2769 MACBETH m For it hath cow’d my better part of man PP
## WIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE #</th>
<th>CHARACT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>A sailor's <em>wife</em> had chestnuts in her lap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>The hearing of my <em>wife</em> with your approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>This diamond he greets your <em>wife</em> withal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>O full of scorpions is my mind dear <em>wife</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>His <em>wife</em> his babes and all unfortunate souls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Wisdom To leave his <em>wife</em> to leave his babes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>Why in that rawness left you <em>wife</em> and child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>How does my <em>wife</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>Your castle is surprised your <em>wife</em> and babes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td><em>Wife</em> children servants all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>My <em>wife</em> kill'd too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>My <em>wife</em> and children's ghosts will haunt me still</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WOMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE #</th>
<th>CHARACT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>The power of man for none of <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>Unknown to <em>woman</em> never was forsworn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>O I could play the <em>woman</em> with mine eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>Was he not born of <em>woman</em> The spirits that know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2692</td>
<td>That was not born of <em>woman</em> Such a one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>Thou wast born of <em>woman</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>Brandish'd by man that's of a <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2763</td>
<td>To one of <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2783</td>
<td>And thou opposed being of no <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OF WOMAN | OF WOMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>CHARACT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The power of man for none of <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MALCOLM</td>
<td>Unknown to <em>woman</em> never was forsworn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MACDUFF</td>
<td>O I could play the <em>woman</em> with mine eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Was he not born of <em>woman</em> The spirits that know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>That was not born of <em>woman</em> Such a one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Thou wast born of <em>woman</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>Brandish'd by man that's of a <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>To one of <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MACBETH</td>
<td>And thou opposed being of no <em>woman</em> born</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LINE # | CHARACTER | LINE
---|---|---
1 | APPARITION | The power of man for none of woman born PP
2 | MACBETH | Was he not born of woman The spirits that know PP
3 | MACBETH | Fear not Macbeth no man that’s born of woman PP
4 | (Stage Direction) | A cry of women within PP
5 | SEYTON | It is the cry of women my good lord PP
6 | MACBETH | That was not born of woman Such a one PP
7 | MACBETH | Thou wast born of woman PP
8 | MACBETH | To one of woman born PP

### WOMEN

#### LINE # | CHARACTER | LINE
---|---|---
1 | BANQUO | Upon her skinny lips You should be women DO
2 | BANQUO | As the weird women promised and I fear S
3 | ROSS | Would create soldiers make our women fight DO
4 | Direction | A cry of women within PP
5 | SEYTON | It is the cry of women my good lord DO

### WOMAN’S | WOMEN’S

#### LINE # | CHARACTER | LINE
---|---|---
1 | L. MACBETH | The effect and it Come to my woman’s breasts PP
2 | MACDUFF | The repetition in a woman’s ear PP
3 | L. MACBETH | A woman’s story at a winter’s fire S

### WIFE AND CHILD

#### LINE # | CHARACTER | LINE
---|---|---
1 | MALCOLM | Why in that rawness left you wife and child DO
2 | MACDUFF | My wife and children’s ghosts will haunt me still S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE #</th>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>DO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MACBETH m</td>
<td>And pity like a naked new born babe</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L. MACBETH f</td>
<td>How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd WITCH f</td>
<td>Finger of birth strangled babe</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MACBETH m</td>
<td>His wife his babes and all unfortunate souls</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L. MACBETH f</td>
<td>Wisdom To leave his wife to leave his babes</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ROSS m</td>
<td>Your castle is surprised your wife and babes</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE #</th>
<th>CHARACTER</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MACDUFF m</td>
<td>O gentle lady</td>
<td>VOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MACDUFF m</td>
<td>Look to the lady</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BANQUO m</td>
<td>Look to the lady</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C.

In Appendix C I present the full concordance database for *Wives*.

Line numbers cited in this database are derived from the AlphaX line numeration, as described in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>POS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chamber matter of it if he were twenty Sir John Falstaffs</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>he shall not abuse Robert Shallow esquire</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>It is marring indeed if he quarter it</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes py'r lady If he has a quarter of your coat there</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>he was outrun on Cotsall</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>That he will not 'Tis your fault 'tis your fault</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>more said He is good and fair Is Sir John Falstaff here</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sir he is within and I would I could do a good office</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>He hath wrong'd me Master Page</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sir he doth in some sort confess it</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master Page He hath wrong'd me indeed he hath at a word he hath</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>believe me Robert Shallow esquire saith</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>he is wronged</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PISTOL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>He hears with ears</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>By these gloves then 'twas he</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>By this hat then he in the red face had it for</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>and I with my ward defending my head he hot my shin</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>will entertain Bardolph he shall draw he shall tap said I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NYM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>He was gotten in drink Is not the humour conceited</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PISTOL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I ken the wight he is of substance good</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PISTOL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>He hath studied her well and translated her will out</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>husband's purse he hath a legion of angels</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caius coming If he do i' faith and find anybody in the</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>breed-bate his worst fault is that he is given to prayer he is</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SIMPLE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Does he not wear a great round beard like a</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No forsooth he hath but a little whey face with a</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRS QUICKLY F A softly-sprighted man is he not
27 SIMPLE M Ay forsooth but he is as tall a man of his hands as
28 SIMPLE M any is between this and his head he hath fought with a
29 QUICKLY F he not hold up his head as it were and strut in his gait
30 SIMPLE M Yes indeed does he man go into this closet [Shuts SIMPLE in the closet]
31 QUICKLY F He I say Go John go inquire for my master I doubt he be
32 QUICKLY F not well that he comes not home [Singing]
33 QUICKLY F he went not in himself if he had found the young man
34 QUICKLY F he would have been horn-mad
35 QUICKLY F truth of it He came of an errand to me from Parson Hugh
36 QUICKLY F [Aside to SIMPLE] I am glad he is so quiet if he dares in this manner
37 QUICKLY F he speaks but for his friend
cut all his two stones by gar he shall not have a stone
38 CAIUS M Reason for his precisian he admits him not for his counsellor
39 QUICKLY F out of my conversation that he dares in this manner
40 MRS PAGE F assay me Why he hath not been thrice in my company
41 MRS PAGE F liking And yet he would not swear prais'd women's edition He will print them out of doubt for he cares not
42 MRS PAGE F what he puts into the press when he would put us two I
43 MRS PAGE F very words What doth he think of us
44 MRS PAGE F know some strain in me that I know not myself he would
45 MRS PAGE F So will I if he come under my hatches I'll never
46 MRS PAGE F him on with a fine-baited delay till he hath pawn'd his
Why look where he comes and my good man
He woos both high and low both rich and poor
He loves the gallimaufry Ford perpend
Like Sir Actaeon he with Ringwood at thy heels
Believe it Page he speaks sense Exit PISTOL
He loves the gallimaufry Ford perpend
Like Sir Actaeon he with Ringwood at thy heels
Believe it Page he speaks sense Exit PISTOL
He hath wronged me in some humours I should
And it shall bite upon my necessity
He loves your wife
Believe it Page he speaks sense Exit PISTOL
He gets more of her than sharp words let it lie on my head
Nay but do so then and look you he may come
Hath not such a name Page is an ass a secure ass he will trust
His wife he will not be jealous I will rather trust a Fleming
By gar he has save his soul dat he is no come he has
Pray his Pible well dat he is no come by gar Jack Rugby
He is dead already if he be come
He is wise sir he knew your worship would kill
Him if he came
Is he dead my Ethiopian Is he dead my Francisco Ha
Of elder Ha is he dead bully stale Is he dead
By gar he is de coward Jack priest of de world he is
Seven two tree hours for him and he is no come
He is the wiser man Master Doctor: he is a curer
He will clapper-claw thee tightly bully
That is he will make thee amends
By gar me do look he shall clapper-de-claw me for
Sir Hugh is there is he
He is there See what humour he is in and
By gar me will kill de priest for he speak for a jack-
of mind I shall be glad if he have deceived me How
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Yonder he is coming this way Sir Hugh

Heaven prosper the right What weapons is he

Simple M Yonder he is coming this way Sir Hugh

Galant and he is a knave besides a cowardly knave as you S

Evan M doctor No he gives me the potions and the motions Shall I S

Evan M lose my parson my priest my Sir Hugh No he gives me S

This is well he has made us his vlouting-stog I S

By gar with all my heart He promise to bring me S

where is Anne Page by gar he deceive me too S

a league between my good man and he Is your wife at PP

Has Page any brains Hath he any eyes Hath he any S

thinking Sure they sleep he hath no use of them Why S

will shoot pointblank twelve score He pieces out his wife's S

inclination he gives her folly motion and advantage and S

What say you to young Master Fenton He capers S

he dances he has eyes of youth he writes verses he speaks S, S, S, S

holiday he smells April and May he will carry 't he will S, S, S

carry 't 'tis in his buttons he will carry 't PP, S

of no having he kept company with the wild Prince and S

Poins he is of too high a region he knows too much No S

he shall not knit a knot in his fortunes with the finger of S

my substance if he take her let him take her simply the S

liberty if I tell you of it for he swears he'll turn me away S

I had rather than a thousand pound he were out of the S

how have you deceiv'd me Look here is a basket if he be S

of any reasonable stature he may creep in here and throw S

What a taking was he in when your husband DO

I am half afraid he will have need of washing so S

he could not compass S

He doth object I am too great of birth S

Besides these other bars he lays before me S

May be he tells you true S
He will maintain you like a gentlewoman
He will make you a hundred and fifty pounds
your father here he comes
FENTON] A kind heart he hath a woman would run through
I marvel I hear not of Master Brook he sent me
And did he search for you and could not find you
search'd it but Fate ordaining he should be a cuckold
held his hand Well on went he for a search and away
proclaim myself what I am I will now take the lecher he
is at my house He cannot scape me 'tis impossible he
should he cannot creep into a halfpenny purse nor into
Is he at Master Ford's already think'st thou
Sure he is by this or will be presently but truly
he is very courageous mad about his throwing into the
That is a good William What is he William that
He is a better scholar than I thought he was
He is a good sprag memory Farewell Mistress Page
again He so takes on yonder with my husband so rails
to this his distemper he is in now I am glad the fat knight
Why does he talk of him
Of none but him and swears he was carried out
the last time he search'd for him in a basket protests to
my husband he is now here and hath drawn him and the
here now he shall see his own foolery
How near is he Mistress Page
Hard by at street end he will be here anon
Which way should he go How should I bestow
out ere he come
might slip away ere he came But what make you here
He will seek there on my word Neither press
coffer chest trunk well vault but he hath an abstract for

gown big enough for him otherwise he might put on a

shape he cannot abide the old woman of Brainford he

Ay in good sadness is he and talks of the basket

too howsoever he hath had intelligence

your master is hard at door if he did you set it down obey

he be there again In my house I am sure he is my

If you find a man there he shall die a flea's

Trust me he beat him most pitifully

recovery he will never I think in the way of waste

he not be publicly sham'd

And did he send you both these letters at an instant

You say he has been thrown in the rivers and has

should be terrors in him that he should not come

methinks his flesh is punish'd he shall have no desires

Devise but how you'll use him when he comes

And there he blasts the tree and takes the cattle

In their so sacred paths he dares to tread

And till he tell the truth

I'll to the Doctor he hath my good will

And none but he to marry with Nan Page

And he my husband best of all affects

Potent at court he none but he shall have her S S

That he shall likewise shuffle her away

will not rejoice so much at the abuse of Falstaff as he will S S

If he be not amaz'd he will be mock'd if he be S S S

amaz'd he will every way be mock'd

now is Cupid a child of conscience he makes restitution S

oil that's in me should set hell on fire he would never else

They are fairies he that speaks to them shall die

If he be chaste the flame will back descend
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHE Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mistress Anne Page She has brown hair and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>deliver to a joyful resurrections -give when she is able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I know the young gentlewoman she has good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>spy entertainment in her she discourses she carves she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Now the report goes she has all the rule of her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O she did so course o'er my exteriors with such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>her She bears the purse too she is a region in Guiana all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>QUICKLY MRS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>In truth sir and she is pretty and honest and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>QUICKLY MRS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>she loves you Have not your worship a wart above your eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>QUICKLY MRS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>laugh but in that maid's company But indeed she is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>[Aside to MRS FORD] Look who comes yonder she shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>easily She was in his company at Page's house and what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>honest I lose not my labour if she be otherwise 'tis labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>But what says she to me Be brief my good she-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>QUICKLY MRS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Marry she hath receiv'd your letter for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>QUICKLY MRS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>which she thanks you a thousand times and she gives you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>QUICKLY MRS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>the picture she says that you wot of Master Ford her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAIRY QUEEN
And turn him to no pain but if **he** start

[They put the tapers to his fingers and **he** starts]

Master Brook and Master Brook **he** hath enjoyed nothing of

**he** was in woman's apparel I would not have had him

For **he** to-night shall lie with Mistress Ford

**Ford**

Master Brook and Master Brook he hath enjoyed nothing of th' church I would have swing'd him or **he** should have he was in woman's apparel I would not have had him

**Ford**

For he to-night shall lie with Mistress Ford
MRS QUICKLY

F

18

an ill life with him. He's a very jealousy man. she leads a

S

Windsor. Whoe'er be the other, and she bade me tell your

S

MRS QUICKLY

F

20

Windsor leads a better life than she does. do what she will

S, DO

MRS QUICKLY

F

21

say what she will. take all, pay all, go to bed when she

DO

MRS QUICKLY

F

22

list. rise when she list. all is as she will. and truly she

S, S, S

MRS QUICKLY

F

23

deserves it. for if there be a kind woman in Windsor. she

S

PISTOL

M

24

Give fire. she is my prize. or ocean whelm them all. Exit

S

FORD

M

25

largely to many to know what she would have given

S

FORD

M

26

say that though she appear honest to me. yet in other

S

FORD

M

27

places she enlargeth her mirth so far that there is shrewd

S

FORD

M

28

O understand my drift. She dwells so securely on the

S

FORD

M

29

not present itself. she is too bright to be look'd against

S

FORD

M

30

she plots. then she ruminates. then she devises. and what

S, S, S

MRS PAGE

F

31

Truly sir to see your wife. Is she at home

S

FORD

M

32

Ay and as idle as she may hang together. for want of

S

FORD

M

33

Indeed she is

S

FALSTAFF

M

34

She shall not see me. I will ensconce me behind

S

SLENDER

M

35

No she shall not dismay me. I care not for that

S

SHALLOW

M

36

good comfort. She calls you. coz I'll leave you

S

PAGE

M

37

She is no match for you

S

MRS PAGE

F

38

My daughter will I question how she loves you

S

MRS PAGE

F

39

Till then farewell sir. she must needs go in

S

QUICKLY

F

40

She does so take on with her men. they mistook their

S

QUICKLY

F

41

Well she laments sir for it. that it would yearn

S

QUICKLY

F

42

a-birding she desires you once more to come to her between

S
house the hour she appointed me

How so sir did she change her determination

name her child if she be a whore

forbid her my house She comes of errands does she We

under the profession of fortune-telling She works by

As Falstaff she and I are newly met

his chamber I'll be so bold as stay sir till she come down

And what says she I pray sir

Marry she says that the very same man that

Immediately to marry she hath consented

She seemingly obedient likewise hath

Her father means she shall be all in white

She shall go with him her mother hath intend

That quaint in green she shall be loose enrob'

Which means she to deceive father or mo

white and cry 'mum' she cries 'budget' and

That ere she sleep has thrice her prayers

Sleep she as sound as careless infancy

my daughter she is by this Doctor Caius'

The truth is she and I long since contract

Th' offence is holy that she hath committed

Since therein she doth evitate and shun
with poison I will possess him with yellowness for the

How say you O I should remember him Does

an honest gentleman but Anne loves him not for I know

Reason for his precisian he admits him not for his counsellor

What should I say to him I was then frugal of my mirth

reveng'd on him for reveng'd I will be as sure as his guts

ashore at Windsor How shall I be revenged on him I

think the best way were to entertain him with hope till

the wicked fire of lust have melted him in his own grease

to sea again Let's be reveng'd on him let's appoint him a

meeting give him a show of comfort in his suit and lead

him on with a fine-baited delay till he hath pawn'd his

(against) him that may not sully the chariness of our honesty

O

too he's as far from jealousy as I am from giving him

th' town commended him for a true man

but these that accuse him in his intent towards our

toward my wife I would turn her loose to him and what

Tell him Cavaleiro Justice tell him bully rook

sack to give me recourse to him and tell him my name is

an ill life with him He's a very jealousy man she leads a

very frampold life with him good heart

Call him in [Exit BARDOLPH] Such Brooks are

Hang him poor cuckoldly knave I know him

not yet I wrong him to call him poor they say the

if you saw him

Hang him mechanical salt-butter rogue I will

stare him out of his wits I will awe him with my cudgel

Master Brook shalt know him for knave and cuckold

jealousy My wife hath sent to him the hour is fix'd

adoption of abominable terms and by him that does me
him if he came

By gar de herring is no dead so as I vill kill him. Take

your rapier Jack I vill tell you how I vill kill him

seven two tree hours for him and he is no come

And I will provoke him to't or let him wag

Let him die. Sheathe thy impatience throw cold water

I warrant you he's the man should fight with him

not stay for him to kill him Have I not at de place I did

cold linen upon him as if it were going to bucking or-it is

Nay follow him like a dwarf

husband had him of What do you call your knight's

wives share damnation together Well I will take him

my substance if he take her let him take her simply the

Falstaff and drink canary with him Exit HOST

I'll make him dance Will you go gentle

humidity this gross wat'ry pumpion we'll teach him to

man to your husband to give him such cause of suspicion

convey him out Be not amaz'd call all your senses to you

some conveyance in the house you cannot hide him O

foul linen upon him as if it were going to bucking or-it is

whiting-time-send him by your two men to Datchet

[Gets into the basket they cover him with foul linen]

throwing him into the water will do him a benefit

Hang him dishonest rascal I would all of the

of Falstaff's being here for I never saw him so gross in his

(Mrs) Quickly to him and excuse his throwing into the water

and give him another hope to betray him to another

We will do it let him be sent for to-morrow

I cannot find him may be the knave bragg'd of that

Let's go in gentlemen but trust me we'll mock him

Therefore no more turn me to him sweet Nan

I come to him [Aside] This is my father's choice

you good jests of him Pray you uncle tell Mistress Anne
Good Master Shallow let him woo for himself

Now Master Slender Love him daughter Anne-

a pepper box But lest the devil that guides him should aid

him I will search impossible places Though what I am I

nothing in the world at his book I pray you ask him some

teaches him to hick and to hack which they'll do fast

Why does he talk of him

Of none but him and swears he was carried out

the last time he search'd for him in a basket protests to

my husband he is now here and hath drawn him and the

a dead man What a woman are you Away with him

away with him better shame than murder

Shall I put him into the basket again

How might we disguise him

gown big enough for him otherwise he might put on a

On my word it will serve him she's as big as he

I would my husband would meet him in this

Heaven guide him to thy husband's cudgel and

the basket again to meet him at the door with it as they

(dress) him like the witch of Brentford

the basket Go up I'll bring linen for him straight Exit

Hang him dishonest varlet we cannot misuse

him enough

(obey) him quickly dispatch tch

(let) him not strike the old woman

Trust me he beat him most pitifully

him with any further revenge

(out of) him if the devil have him not in fee-simple with fine

and

I'll warrant they'll have him publicly sham'd

they are going to meet him
not of him in the court. Let me speak with the gentlemen.

In him that was of late an heretic.

Where we may take him and disgrace him for it.

How to send him word they'll meet him in the Park.

should be terrors in him that he should not come.

Devise but how you'll use him when he comes.

And let us two devise to bring him thither.

And in this shape When you have brought him thither.

What shall be done with him What is your plot.

Then let them all encircle him about.

And ask him why that hour of fairy revel.

Let the supposed fairies pinch him sound.

And burn him with their tapers.

And mock him home to Windsor.

Nay I'll to him again in name of Brook.

Nym sir that beguil'd him of a chain had the chain or no.

beguil'd Master Slender of his chain cozen'd him of it.

from him.

Away with Slender and with him at Eton.

She shall go with him her mother hath intended.

The maid hath given consent to go with him.

the finest mad devil of jealousy in him Master Brook that.

devil and we shall know him by his horns Let's away.

That cannot choose but amaze him.

We'll betray him finely.

And turn him to no pain but if he start.

And as you trip still pinch him to your time.

Pinch him fairies mutually.

Pinch him for his villainy.
Pinch him and burn him and turn him about

th' church I would have swing'd him or he should have

took a boy for a girl If I had been married to him for all

he was in woman's apparel I would not have had him
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Speech Text</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FENTON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>her before me commend me</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>NYM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>have borne the humour'd letter to her but I have a sword</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(on) her she'll fit it</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>toward my wife I would turn her loose to him and what</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>he gets more of her than sharp words let it lie on my head</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>and when Mistress Bridget lost the handle of her fan</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Let her approach</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Well Mistress Ford what of her</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>have brought her into such a canaries as 'tis wonderful</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>could never have brought her to such a canary Yet</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>warrant you they could never get an eye-wink of her</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>her so much as sip on a cup with the proudest of them all</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>pensioners but I warrant you all is one with her</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>to notify that her husband will be absence from his house</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ten and eleven Woman commend me to her I will not fail her</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>to your worship Mistress Page hath her hearty commendations</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>worship that her husband is seldom from home but she</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>would desire you to send her your little page of all loves</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Her husband has a marvellous infection to the little page</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>is one You must send her your page no remedy</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>to your worship Mistress Page hath her hearty commendations</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>There is a gentlewoman in this town her husband's</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I have long lov'd her and I protest to you bestowed</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>much on her followed her with a doting observance engross'd opportunities to meet her fee'd every slight occasion</td>
<td>PP, DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that could but niggardly give me sight of \textit{her} and not \textit{PP}.

only bought many presents to give \textit{her} but have given \textit{PP}.

briefly I have pursu'd \textit{her} as love hath pursued me which \textit{DO}.

(at) \textit{her} hands \textit{PP}.

Have you importun'd \textit{her} to such a purpose \textit{DO}.

places she enlargeth \textit{her} mirth so far that there is shrewd \textit{DO}.

\textit{her} excellence of \textit{her} honour that the folly of my soul dares \textit{PP}.

Now could I come to \textit{her} with any detection in my hand \textit{PP}.

\textit{her} reputation \textit{her} marriage vow and a thousand other \textit{her} \textit{PP, PP, PP*}.

want none I shall be with \textit{her} I may tell you by \textit{her} own \textit{PP}.

appointment even as you came in to me \textit{her} assistant or \textit{DO}.

go-between parted from me I say I shall be with \textit{her} between \textit{PP}.

\textit{her} husband will be forth Come you to me at \textit{S}.

his wife seems to me well-favour'd I will use \textit{her} as the \textit{DO}.

farm-house a-feasting and thou shalt woo \textit{her} \textit{Cried} \textit{DO}.

By your leave sire I am sick till I see \textit{her} \textit{DO}.

inclination he gives \textit{her} folly motion and advantage and \textit{DO}.

now she's going to my wife and Falstaff's boy with \textit{her} \textit{A} \textit{PP}.

boy with \textit{her} Good plots They are laid and our revolted \textit{PP}.

Mistress Anne and I would not break with \textit{her} for more \textit{PP}.

my substance if he take \textit{her} let him take \textit{her} simply the \textit{DO, DO?}.

She's coming to \textit{her} coz O boy thou hadst a \textit{PP}.

And as I find \textit{her} so am I affected \textit{DO}.

\textit{Her} father will be angry \textit{S}.

\textit{her} or in sooth I would Master Fenton had \textit{her} I will \textit{DO}.

snowballs for pills to cool the reins Call \textit{her} in \textit{DO}.

Alas the day good heart that was not \textit{her} fault \textit{DO}.

She does so take on with \textit{her} men they mistook their \textit{PP}.
your heart to see it. Her husband goes this morning.

eight and nine. I must carry her word quickly. She'll make.

Well. I will visit her. Tell her so and bid her.

think what a man is. Let her consider his frailty and then.

I will tell her.

Well. Be gone. I will not miss her.

How so, sir. Did she change her determination?

and in her invention and Ford's wife's distraction they.

you'll undertake her no more.

have been into Thames. ere I will leave her thus. Her (from) her another embassy of meeting 'twixt eight and nine is.

with your enjoying her. Adieu. You shall have her. Master.

I'll be with her by and by. I'll but bring my.

Vengeance of Jenny's case. fie on her. Never.

name her child if she be a whore.

is and there's her thrumm'd hat and her muffler too. Run.

swears she's a witch forbade her my house and hath.

threat'ned to beat her.

the jealous fool to her husband. I suspect without cause.

forbid her my house. She comes of errands does she. We.

I'll prat her. [Beating him] Out of my door. you.

Hang her. witch.

And marry her at Eton. -Go. send to Falstaff straight.

Potent at court. he none but he shall have her.

Though twenty thousand worthier come to crave her. Exit.

I come to speak with her indeed.

thy fat woman. Let her descend bully let her descend.
with her

My master sir my Master Slender sent to her

seeing her go thorough the streets to know sir whether one

herself I had other things to have spoken with her too

have her or no

To have her or no Go say the woman told me

black and blue that you cannot see a white spot about her

So far forth as herself might be her chooser

Her father hath commanded her to slip

Her mother even strong against that match

That he shall likewise shuffle her away

Straight marry her To this her mother's plot

Her father means she shall be all in white

To take her by the hand and bid her go

She shall go with him her mother hath intended

The better to denote her to the doctor-

With ribands pendent flaring 'bout her head

To pinch her by the hand and on that token

Went you not to her yesterday sir as you told me

I went to her Master Brook as you see like a

poor old man but I came from her Master Brook like a

poor old woman That same knave Ford her husband hath

Ay forsooth I have spoke with her and we have

a nay-word how to know one another I come to her in

or her budget The white will decipher her well enough

you see your time take her by the hand away with her to

Where is Nan now and her troop of fairies and

That ere she sleep has thrice her prayers said

Raise up the organs of her fantasy

to woo her in good English

wife that now laughs at thee Tell her Master Slender hath
139 2911 PAGE M married her daughter
140 2932 PAGE M you should know my daughter by her garments
141 2933 SLENDER M I went to her in white and cried 'mum' and she
142 2945 MRS PAGE F Why did you take her in green
143 2958 FENTON M You do amaze her. Hear the truth of it
144 2959 FENTON M You would have married her most shamefully
145 2968 FENTON M Which forced marriage would have brought upon her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIS</th>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>All his successors gone before him hath done't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>and all his ancestors that come after him may: they may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>gold and silver is her grandsire upon his death's-bed-Got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>The tevil and his tam. What phrase is this 'He hears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>BARDOLPH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>drunk himself out of his five sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>It is his five senses fie what the ignorance is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Give ear to his motions: Master Slender I will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>you pardon me he's a justice of peace in his country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nay Got's lords and his ladies you must speak possitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'resolutely' his meaning is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>be beholding to his friend for a man I keep but three men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>is in the manner of his nurse or his dry nurse or his cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>or his laundry his washer and his wringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>his thefts were too open his filching was like an unskilful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>PISTOL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>His dove will prove his gold will hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>PISTOL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>And his soft couch defile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>breed-bate his worst fault is that he is given to prayer he is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>something peevish that way but nobody but has his fault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ay forsooth but he is as tall a man of his hands as any is between this and his head he hath fought with a PP

he not hold up his head as it were and strut in his gait PP, PP

my master look you for I keep his house and I wash PP

it is a challenge I will cut his troat in de park and I will DO

cut all his two stones by gar he shall not have a stone PP

to throw at his dog PP

Alas he speaks but for his friend PP

Troth sir all is in His hands above but PP

Reason for his precision he admits him not for his counsellor PP

With all his might PP

reveng’d on him for reveng’d I will be as sure as his guts S

to all uncomeliness that I would have sworn his disposition DO

would have gone to the truth of his words but they do no PP

threw this whale with so many tuns of oil in his belly PP

the wicked fire of lust have melted him in his own grease PP

meeting give him a show of comfort in his suit and lead PP

to his jealousy PP

English out of his wits PP

but these that accuse him in his intent towards our PP

wives are a yoke of his discarded men very rogues now PP

Were they his men DO

There is either liquor in his pate or money in his purse PP, PP

(on) his wife's frailty yet I cannot put off my opinion so PP

easily She was in his company at Page's house and what PP

to notify that her husband will be absence from his house PP

Brook is his name DO

his wife seems to me well-favour'd I will use her as the S*

stare him out of his wits I will awe him with my cudgel PP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line Content</th>
<th>Pronoun Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>peasant and thou shalt lie with his wife. Come to me soon at night. Ford's a knave and I will aggravate his style. thou (he will trust) his wife. he will not be jealous. I will rather trust a Fleming.</td>
<td>PP, DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>By gar he has save his soul dat he is no com he has</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CAIUS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>By gar me vill cut his ears.</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>CAIUS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I will knock his urinals about his knave's</td>
<td>DO, PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>from his book and it is wonderful.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Pless you from his mercy sake all of you.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(with) his own gravity and patience that ever you saw.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>heard a man of his place gravity and learning so wide of</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>of his own respect.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Got's will and his passion of my heart. I had as lief</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>It appears so by his weapons. Keep them asunder.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>This is well he has made us his vlouting-stog I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Well I will smite his noddles. Pray you follow.</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I cannot tell what the dickens his name is my.</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>will shoot pointblank twelve score he pieces out his wife's</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>carry 't 'tis in his buttons he will carry 't.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>he shall not knat a knot in his fortunes with the finger of</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ill advantage of his absence. You are undone.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>with half Windsor at his heels to search for such a one.</td>
<td>PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>friend and I fear not mine own shame as much as his peril</td>
<td>DO*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>more tricks with Falstaff. His dissolute disease will scarce</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Quickly to him and excuse his throwing into the water.</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A lousy knave to have his gibes and his mockeries.</td>
<td>DO, DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>FENTON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I seek to heal it only by his wealth.</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>if it be my luck so if not happy man be his dole. They</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>think what a man is Let her consider his frailty and then</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>word to stay within I like his money well O here he</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>the prologue of our comedy and at his heels a rabble of his</td>
<td>PP, PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>distemper and forsooth to search his house for his wife's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>thus cramm'd in the basket a couple of Ford's knaves his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>held his hand Well on went he for a search and away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>he is very courageous mad about his throwing into the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>young man here to school Look where his master comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Blessing of his heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>nothing in the world at his book I pray you ask him some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>questions in his accidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2098</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Why woman your husband is in his old lunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2104</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>to this his distemper he is in now I am glad the fat knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>experiment of his suspicion But I am glad the knight is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>here now he shall see his own foolery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>the devil guide his cudgel afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ford that search'd a hollow walnut for his wife's leman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>under his muffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Let's obey his humour a little further Come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>methinks his flesh is punish'd he shall have no desires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2363</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Disguis'd like Heme with huge horns on his head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>He'll tell me all his purpose Sure he'll come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Send Quickly to Sir John to know his mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2413</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>The Doctor is well money'd and his friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2430</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>There's his chamber his house his castle his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>SIMPLE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>his chamber I'll be so bold as stay sir till she come down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>beguil'd Master Slender of his chain cozen'd him of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tis 'tis his fortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>The devil take one party and his dam the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>FENTON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>And in that habit when Slender sees his time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>FENTON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>And when the doctor spies his vantage ripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>2651</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>and I will deliver his wife into your hand Follow Strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>devil and we shall know him by his horns Let's away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>2778</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[Lies down upon his face]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO RESULTS FOR HERS

### HIMSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MRS QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>he went not in himself if he had found the young man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>shall speak for himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ANNE PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Good Master Shallow let him woo for himself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERSELF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>walk my ambling gelding than my wife with herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SIMPLE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(with the woman) herself I had other things to have spoken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAN+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it agrees well passant it is a familiar beast to man and
Where's Simple my man Can you tell cousin
sirrah for all you are my man go wait upon my cousin
be beholding to his friend for a man I keep but three men
it as any man in England You are afraid if you see the
A softly-sprighted man is he not
Ay forsooth but he is as tall a man of his hands as
man go into this closet [Shuts SIMPLE in the closet] He
he went not in himself if he had found the young man
Ay me he'll find the young man there and be
The young man is an honest man
What shall de honest man do in my closet Dere is
no honest man dat shall come in my closet
so loud and so melancholy But notwithstanding man I'll
man (CF. I will find you twenty lascivious turtles ere one chaste)
th' town commended him for a true man
turn them together A man may be too confident I would
I do relent what would thou more of man
an ill life with him He's a very jealousy man she leads a
and truly Master Page is an honest man Never a wife in
and you have been a man long known to me though I
wooing win her to consent to you if any man may you
the match is made Would any man have thought this See
He is the wiser man Master Doctor: he is a curer
though now a man of peace
heard a man of his place gravity and learning so wide of
I warrant you he's the man should fight with him
I had rather forsooth go before you like a man than
a league between my good man and he. Is your wife at
man may hear this show'r sing in the wind. And Falstaff's
man here but 'tis most certain your husband's coming
if it be my luck, so if not, happy man be his dole. They
swells a man and what a thing should I have been when
think what a man is. Let her consider his frailty and then
a man of my kidney. Think of that-
heat as butter a man of continual dissolution and thaw. It
young man here to school. Look where his master comes
dead man. What a woman are you. Away with him
Why man why
Here's no man
Marry she says that the very same man that
poor old man but I came from her Master Brook like a
in the shape of a woman for in the shape of man Master
Heaven prosper our sport. No man means evil but the
beast a man in some other a man a beast. You were also
I'll wink and couch no man their works must eye
But stay I smell a man of middle earth
A puff'd man

WOMAN+  APPOSITIVES = parenthetical statements
Line   Character  gender Line
 1  51  SLENDER  M  speaks small like a woman  DO
 2  580  FENTON  M  How now good woman how dost thou  S
 3  658  MRS PAGE  F  What's the matter woman  VOC
 4  659  MRS FORD  F  O woman if it were not for one trifl  S
 5  661  MRS PAGE  F  Hang the trifle woman take the honour What  VOC
 6  714  MRS FORD  F  You are the happier woman  DO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line#</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Two thousand fair woman and I'll vouchsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ten and eleven Woman commend me to her I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(go along with) this woman [Exeunt QUICKLY and ROBIN] This news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>the hell of having a false woman My bed shall be abus'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Pray you do so she's a very tattling woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Your husband's coming hither woman with all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CAIUS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>By gar I see 'tis an honest woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BARDOLPH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Come in woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Why woman your husband is in his old lunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>woman the modest wife the virtuous creature that hath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Old woman what old woman's that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(let) him not strike the old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>(I think you have killed) the poor woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SIMPLE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>There's an old woman a fat woman gone up into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ha a fat woman The knight may be robb'd I'll call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(of) thy fat woman Let her descend bully let her descend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>action of an old woman deliver'd me the knave constable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>poor old woman That same knave Ford her husband hath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>in the shape of a woman for in the shape of man Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MAN'S* (* is not a command in AlphaX; wildcard search was "man's " rather than " man's ")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line#</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MRS QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>fairest that would have won any woman's heart and I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Like a fair house built on another man's ground so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FORD STAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Old woman what old woman's that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Re-enter FALSTAFF in woman's clothes and MISTRESS PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(of) man's disposition is able to bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>he was in woman's apparel I would not have had him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN+</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Knight you have beaten my men kill'd my deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>be beholding to his friend for a man I keep but three men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>for the putting down of men How shall I be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>men as long as I have an eye to make difference of men's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>wives are a yoke of his discarded men very rogues now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Were they his men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>laughing-stocks to other men's humours I desire you in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Give your men the charge we must be brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>lisping hawthorn-buds that come like women in men's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>whiting-time-send him by your two men to Datchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Help to cover your master boy Call your men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>She does so take on with her men they mistook their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>We'll try that for I'll appoint my men to carry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I'll first direct my men what they shall do with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>are simple men we do not know what's brought to pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>say they be fled Germans are honest men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>what shall poor men do For me I am here a Windsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN+</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>chain but I warrant you the women have so cried and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SLENDER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>shriek'd at it that it pass'd but women indeed cannot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>liking And yet he would not swear prais'd women's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHALLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>the sons of women Master Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FALFSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>lisping hawthorn-buds that come like women in men's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAN AND

Line #  Character  gender  Line
1  1403  MRS PAGE  F  a league between my good man and he  Is your wife at  PP

WOMAN AND

Line #  Character  gender  Line
NO RESULTS

WOMEN AND

Line #  Character  gender  Line
NO RESULTS

MEN AND

Line #  Character  gender  Line
NO RESULTS

OF MAN | OF MEN

Line #  Character  gender  Line
1  643  MRS PAGE  F  for the putting down of men  How shall I be  PP
2  882  PISTOL  F  I do relent  what would thou more of man  PP
3  2644  FALSTAFF  M  in the shape of a woman  for in the shape of man  Master  PP

OF WOMAN | OF WOMEN

Line #  Character  gender  Line
1  1202  SHALLOW  M  the sons of women  Master Page  PP

WIFE

Line #  Character  gender  Line
1  192  PAGE  M  Wife  bid these gentlemen welcome  Come  we have a  S
thrift. Briefly, I do mean to make love to Ford's wife. I
another to Page's wife, who even now gave me good eyes
Sir John affects thy wife
Why, sir, my wife is not young
Love my wife
Another to Page's wife, who even now gave me good eyes
Sir John affects thy wife
Why, sir, my wife is not young
Love my wife
And it shall bite upon my necessity. He loves your wife
'Tis true. My name is Nym, and Falstaff loves your wife
Toward my wife, I would turn her loose to him, and what
I do not misdoubt my wife, but I would be loath to
Good morrow, good wife
fartuous a civil modest wife and one. I tell you that will
But I pray thee, tell me this: has Ford's wife and
Page's wife acquainted each other how they love me
and truly Master Page is an honest man. Never a wife in
Sieg to the honesty of this Ford's wife. Use your art of
you shall, if you will, enjoy Ford's wife
his wife seems to me well-favour'd. I will use her as the
peasant and thou shalt lie with his wife. Come to me soon at
jealousy. My wife hath sent to him. The hour is fix'd
his wife. He will not be jealous. I will rather trust a Fleming
walk my ambling gelding than my wife with herself. Then
my wife be reveng'd on Falstaff and laugh at Page
Truly, sir, to see your wife. Is she at home
a league between my good man and he. Is your wife at
now she's going to my wife, and Falstaff's boy with her. A
then torture my wife. Pluck the borrowed veil of modesty
my wife. Master Doctor is for you altogether
You suffer for a pad conscience. Your wife is as
known to you why I have done this. Come wife. Come
hath pass'd between me and Ford's wife
Somebody call my wife. Youth in a basket. O you panderly
against me. Now shall the devil be sham'd. What wife I
woman  the modest *wife*  the virtuous creature  that hath
Pardon me  *wife*  Henceforth  do what thou wilt
and I will deliver his *wife* into your hand  Follow  Strange
I will never mistrust my *wife* again  till thou art able
And as wicked as his *wife*
Pardon me  *wife*
Henceforth  do what thou wilt
a  and I will deliver his *wife* into your hand  Follow  Strange
I will never mistrust my *wife* again  till thou art able
And as wicked as his *wife*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>that my husband saw this letter  It would give eternal food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>to notify that her husband will be absence from his house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>husband will be from home  Alas  the sweet woman leads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>worship that her husband is seldom from home  but she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Her husband has a marvellous infection to the little page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>knave  her husband will be forth  Come you to me at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>husband were dead  I'll speak it before the best lord  I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>man to your husband to give him such cause of suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>husband is deceived  or Sir John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I think my husband hath some special suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I mean it not  I seek you a better husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>QUICKLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>your heart to see it  Her husband goes this morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>husband  Master Brook  dwelling in a continual 'larum of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>husband is this morning gone a-birding  I have received from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sir Hugh  my husband says my son profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>(you are sure of your) husband now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Why  woman  your husband is in his old lunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>again  He so takes on yonder with my husband  so rails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>my husband he is now here  and hath drawn him and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>FORD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>MRS FORD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td>FALSTAFF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2851</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2979</td>
<td>MRS PAGE</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>