THE STANDARDIZATION OF LANGUAGE IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS

Marija Liudvika Drazdauskienė

This study goes back to an investigation of the phatic[*] use of English in Shakespeare's plays (cf.: Drazdauskienė, 1986). It is also related to literary studies which in some way deal with the scenic composition of Shakespeare's plays. As a linguistic study it focusses on situational and lexicogrammatical patterns and therefore on the standardization of Shakespeare's language. It has a bearing on literary studies by virtue of a scholarly argument stating ideas contrary to those known from published works. Since linguistic studies in the field are virtually non-existant, reference is made to literary works on related problems. It has been known, for example, that scenic composition in Shakespeare is harmonious and effective (Jones, 1971, p. 3, 28—40), that models of concrete scenes are perfected through several plays (Ribner, 1960; Jones, 1971) and that there exists a significant correlation between the opening and closing scenes in Shakespeare's plays (Jones, 1971; Wilson, 1977). Nevertheless some scholars (cf.: Wils„n, 1977, p. 6) found it difficult to state anything general about the method of composition of at least opening scenes in Shakespeare. The author of the present paper finds this assumption erroneous and will make an attempt to show why. This attempt is invigorated by the ideas of those scholars who point out Shakespeare's interest in his own language

---

[*] The phatic use of English is the use of this language for the purpose of establishment, maintenance and termination of verbal contact at the beginnig and the end of speech acts in such situations in which the direct exchange of information is not sought, whilst speech is required as a confirmation of attention or as an expression of civil attitude.

and a distinct role of lexical patterns in the texts of the great dramatist (Quirk, 1974, p. 61). In this connection it is assumed that it might be purposeful to investigate grammatical and lexical patterns in Shakespeare's language (Quirk, 1974, p. 64). Thus the idea of this paper as stated above appears to have a perspective and to be motivated.

The material of the present paper has been drawn from nine plays by Shakespeare. They include "Macbeth", "King Lear", „Antony and Cleopatra", „King Henry VIII", „King John", „King Richard III", „The Tempest", „Two Gentlemen of Verona" and „Merry Wives of Windsor". The scenic composition of the plays has been investigated employing contextual method, i. e. analysing the opening and closure of all the scenes and acts.The guiding criterion was the author's remarks, not the act and scene division in the above mentioned plays. In addition to this we also investigated the use of absolutely all items of address in the same plays. Thus, though we have investigated only one fifth of Shakespeare's plays, we have ample material at our disposal for generalizations and conclusions.

It might be stated at the beginning that Shakespeare employs the phatic use of English in accord with the realistic conditions of its functioning. The phatic use of English occurs essentially at the opening and closure of the scenes. This appears to be so regular that scenic composition even of the less successful plays such as „King John" appears to be perfect. The phatic use of English is so regular in Shakespeare's plays that it is possible to consider its typical patterns. As the material investigated has it, there are two major patterns of the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays — the situational and the lexicophraseological. The situational patterns embrace the phatic use of English at the opening and closure of the scenes together with instances of the prolonged use of phatic communion. The lexicophraseological patterns include: 1) regular patterns of address having unrestricted use

throughout the text of the plays, 2) typical recurrent formulas of verbal etiquette marked by high frequency, 3) requests for permission to speak and oral management of verbal contact, 4) praiseworthy evaluation of speech and 5) separate stereotyped units of verbal routine. These patterns of the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays will be considered here.

The discovery of the situational patterns of the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays confirms the dramatist's employment of this use of language in accord with its realistic functioning, as well as the presence of the three situational patterns in all plays by Shakespeare. What is of significance here is that some situational patterns of the phatic use of English are not only typical but also have literal identity in Shakespeare's plays. Bearing in mind but temporarily ignoring the metasemiotic significance of the phatic use of English in drama, we shall descriptively review all the situational patterns of this use of language in Shakespeare's plays.

The most frequent pattern of the phatic use of English at the opening of the scenes is the pattern including the conventional question "How now?" together with the thematic pattern "The state of things and welfare". The greatest literal identity is testified for the pattern with the conventional question *"How now?"*. Although the phatic use of English does not always follow this question, the minimum establishment of verbal contact is very frequent in this pattern.

For example:

(1) *Enter Oswald*
    C o r n w a l l. **How now? Where's the King?**
    O s w a l d. My Lord of Gloucester hath conveyed him
                hence. (K. Lear, III. 7)
(2) *Entern Knight*
    L e a r. **How now? Where's that mongrel?** (K. Lear, I. 4)
(3) *Enter Enobarbus*
    A n t o n y. **How now, Enobarbus?**
    E n o b. What is your pleasure, sir?

A n t o n y. I must with haste from hence.

<div align="right">(Ant & Cleop, I.2)</div>

(4) *Enter Varius*
    P o m p e y. How now, Varius?
    V a r i u s. This is most certain that I shall deliver: Mark
    Antony is every hour is Rome expected.

<div align="right">(Ant & Cleop, II.1)</div>

(5) *The others wake*
    A l o n s o. Why, **how now?** — Ha, awake! Why are you
    drawn? (Temp., II.2)

(6) *Enter Thurio and musicians*
    T h u r i o. **How now**, Sir Proteus? Are you crept before
    us? (Two Gent., IV.2)

The regularity of similar verbal expression in these scenes testifies to the presence of the pattern. The presence of the pattern is also confirmed by the syntactical regularity of two types: How now? ± address + a question/a comment; How now? + address + a response. The phatic use of English may follow this conventional question (cf. 4, above). This question itself represents the phatic use of English, what is confirmed by the fact that it in no way contributes to the metasemiotic significance of the following question. Moreover, in those instances when at least one contact establishing utterance follows the question „How now?", its function approximates that of a filler. But it cannot be denied that in contexts of high tension (cf.: 7, 8, 9, below) the question „How now?" seems to reflect the contextual atmosphere. For example:

(7) M a c b e t h /.../
        Enter Lady Macbeth
                    How now? What news?
    L a d y He has almost supped. Why have you left the
            chamber?
    M a c b e t h Hath he asked for me?
    L a d y Know you not he has? (Macb., I.7)

(8) C h a m b e r l a i n /.../
        Enter Sir Thomas Lowell
    How now? What news, Sir Thomas Lowell?
    L o w e l l 'Faith, my lord, I hear of none, but the new
            proclamation that's clapp'd upon the court-ga-
            te. (Hen VIII, I.7)

(9) *Exeunt Lowell* and *Denny*
    C r a n m e r I am fearful: — /.../
    K i n g H n e r y How now, my lord? you do desire to
                        know Wherefore I sent for you.
    C r a n m e r It is my duty
                        To attend your highness′ pleasure.
                                        (Hen VIII, V.1)

(10) *Enter Speed*
    S p e e d **How now, Signior Launce? What news with
                your mastership?**
    L a u n c e With my master′s ship? why, it is at sea.
    S p e e d Well, your old vice still; mistake the word. What
                news, then, in your paper?
    L a u n c e **The blackest news that ever thou
                    heard′st.** (Two Gent., III.1)

We are inclined to believe that the material introduced
here testifies to the fact that the question „*How now?*"
serves in principle the function of the means of holding
attention. Besides, the frequency of this question in scene
openings in Shakespeare′s plays reflects in all probability
the realistic conditions of its use rather than its special
employment for dramatic purposes.

The thematic pattern „The state of things and welfare"
in the scenic composition in Shakespeare′s plays is limited
to a few stereotyped questions in scene openings. The
question of this kind usually includes the following: *How
goes... How does... How is... How fares...* For example:

(11) *Enter Macduff*
    R o s s **How goes the world,** sir now?
    M a c d u f f Why, see you not? (Macb., II.2)

(12) *Enter Dolabella*
    D o l a b e l l a. **How goes it here?**
    S e c o n d G u a r d s m a n. All dead.
                                        (Ant & Cleop., V. 2)

(13) *Enter Banquo and Fleance*
    B a n q u o **How goes the night,** boy?
    F l e a n c e The moon is down. I have not heard the
                    clock. (Macb., II.1)

(14) *Alarums. Enter...*
    K. J o h n. **How goes the day with us?** O, tell me,
                    Hubert.
    H u b e r t Badly, I fear. **How fares your Majesty?**

K. J o h n   This fever, that hath troubled me so long, Lies heavy on me; —

(K. John, V. 3)

The same degree of identity is registered in those scene openings in which Shakespeare uses other questions of the same thematic pattern. For example, in „Macbeth", IV. 3, V. 3, in „King Lear", III. 2, III. 4, in „King Henry VIII", V. 1, in „The Tempest, IV. 1, V. 1 and so on. The material introduced allows us to conclude that this thematic pattern seems to be the closest to the realistic phatic use of English. It contains an exchange of stereotyped questions on the state of things and welfare (cf.: 14, above). In the respective contexts of Shakespeare´s plays these questions reduce tension and simultaneously reflect definite aspects of dramatic atmosphere.

The material introduced above does not exhaust the situational pattern of scene opening in Shakespeare´s plays. This situational pattern also includes less frequent scene openings in which the phatic use of English occurs. They contain questions concerning the news, the whereabouts of the personage and blessing. These scene openings also form regular patterns. Among them, the pattern of greetings, which is extended by regards, deserves a special mentioning.

Questions concerning the news perform the function of the introductory phatic use of English. They usually precede narrative speech, the function of which was noted by scholars long ago. It is interesting to notice that Shakespeare resorts to the phatic use of English to introduce the narrative which informs of events behind the scenes. For example:

(15) K i n g   J o h n   /.../
           Enter Hubert
        Hubert, what news with you?
     P e m b r o k e   This is the man should do the bloody de-
                ed;   (K John, IV. 2)

(16) *Enter a Messenger*
     A n t o n y   **From Sicyon how the news? Speak there!**

35

F i r s t   M e s s e n g e r   The man from Sicyon — Is
there such an one?
(Ant & Cleop., I. 2)

(17) L a d y   /.../
Enter a Messenger
What is your tidings?
M e s s e n g e r   The King comes here tonight.
(Macb., I. 5)

(18) V a l e n t i n e   ... Hath she forsworn me?
P r o t e u s   No, Valentine.
V a l e n t i n e   No Valentine, if Silvia have forsworn
me! — **What is you news?**
L a u n c e   Sir, there's a proclamation that you are
vanish'd.
P r o t e u s   That thou art banished; O, that's the news;
(Two Gent., III. 1)

Questions concerning the news occur in their stereoty-
ped form in a number of scene openings. They never
reduce dramatic effectiveness of the scenes. On the contra-
ry, this short question arrests attention and keeps it on
what is going on in linguistic, as well as in the extralin-
guistic context. This permits to assume that even the mini-
mum phatic use of English is employed by Shakespeare in
accord with its communicative effectiveness.

Though questions concerning the whereabouts of the
personage may require information, their occurrence in scene
openings is closer to the phatic use of English proper than
to its communicative use. For example:

(19) *Thunder. Enter the three Witches*
F i r s t   W i t c h   **Where hast thou been, sister?**
S e c o n d   W i t c h   Killing swine.
(Macb., I. 3)

(20) *Enter Simple*
S l e n d e r   How now, Simple! **Where have you been?**
I must wait on myself, must I?   (Mer-
ry W., I. 1)

(21) *Enter Cleopatra, Charmian, Alexas and Iras*
C l e o p a t r a   **Where is he?**
C h a r m i a n   I did not see him since.
C l e o p a t r a   See where he is, who's with him, what
he does.
(Ant & Cleop., III. 13)

36

(22) *Enter Diomedes*
    D i o m e d e s **Where's Antony?**
    D e c r e t e s There, Diomed, there.
                                    (Ant & Cleop., IV. 14)
(23) *Enter Cleopatra, Charmian, Iras and Alexas*
    C l e o p a t r a **Where is the fellow?**
    A l e x a s Half afeard to come.
                                    (Ant & Cleop., III. 3)
(24) Caesar /.../
            Enter Gallus
                    Where's Dolabella,
            To second Proculeius?
    A l l Dolabella!
    C a e s a r Let him alone, for I remember now How he is
            employed. He shall in time be ready.
                                    (And & Cleop., V. 1)
(25) *Enter Dolabella*
    D o l a b e l l a **Where's the queen?**
    C h a r m i a n Behold, sir. Exit
                                    (Ant & Cleop., V. 2)

The occurrence of these questions in scene openings
together with the contents of the responses confirm their
phatic character. Their contact establishing function is
especially obvious in the extralinguistic context of the
reader.

Blessing at the opening of the scenes in Shakespeare's
plays may also have literal identity and significance which
depends on address and the respective contexts of si-
tuations. For example:

(26) *Enter a Massenger*
    M e s s e n g e r **Bless you, fair dame!** I am not to
                    you known, Though in you state of ho-
                    nour I am perfect. (Macb., IV. 2)
(27) *Enter Ford*
    F o r d **Bless you, sir!**
    F a l s t a f f Now, Master Brook? you come to know what
                    Hath passed between me and Ford's wife.
                                    (Merry W., III. 5)
(28) *Enter Host, Shallow, Slender, and Page*
    H o s t **Bless thee, bully doctor.**
    S h·a l l o w Save you, Master Doctor Caius.
    P a g e Now, good master Doctor!
    S l e n d e r Give you good morrow, sir.   .
                                    (Merry W., II. 3)

37

(29) *Enter Gloster*
G l o s t e r Good-morrow to my sovereign king and queen;
And, princely peers, a happy time of day!
K i n g E d w a r d Happy, indeed, as we have spent the
day. (Rich III, II. 1)

(30) *Enter Hastings*
H a s t i n g s Good time of day unto my gracious lord!
G l o s t e r As much unto my good lord chamberlain!
Well are you welcome to this open air.
How hath your lordship brook´d
imprisonment? (Rich III, I. 2)

(31) *Trumpets sound. Enter Antony and Eros*
S o l d i e r The gods make this a happy day to Antony!
A n t o n y Would thou and those thy scars had once pre-
vailed
To make me fight at land!
(Ant & Cleop., IV. 5)

Blessing represents exceptional phatic means which replace or accompany greetings. Irrespective of its significance in concrete situations, blessing is marked by especially good tone and subtlety of the expression of emotions at the opening of the scenes. This is especially obvious when tenderness is expressed (cf. 26, above). Since blessing is so effective dramatically, it must be treated as phatic means, specially employed by the dramatist in scene openings.

Thus, in discussing the situational pattern of the opening of the scenes we have discovered the realistic and the special dramatic employment of the phatic use of English by Shakespeare. In both cases this use of language increases either artistic or communicative effectiveness of the plays or both. Even literally identical patterns of the phatic use of English retain different significance and effectivenees in different plays.

The situational pattern of the closure of the scenes is less rich than that of the opening of the scenes. Scene closures are limited to minimum forms of the phatic use of English which include requirement to introduce oneself or an introduction of the personage, and formulas of parting, gratitude and regards. The requirement to introduce oneself

or an introduction of the personage is an especially frequent pattern at the change of the scenes. It finds expression in stereotyped questions „Who´s/What´s here?", „Who/What are you?", which are sometimes shifted to the opening of the scene, and in identifying formulas *„Here he comes"*, *„Here comes..."* or *„See who comes..."*. For example:

(32) B a n q u o ... Give me my sword! **Who´s here?**
         Enter Macbeth
       M a c b e t h *A friend. (Macb., II. 2)*
(33) *Enter the Bastard and Hubert...*
       H u b e r t Who´s here? Speak, ho! speak quickly or I shoot.
       B a s t a r d A friend. − Who art thou?
       H u b e r t Of the part of England.
                                         (K John, V. 6)
(34) M a c d u f f
         Our knocking has awaked him; **here he comes.**
               Enter Macbeth   (Macb., II. 1)
(35) F a l s t a f f I marvel I hear not of Master Brook; he sent me word to stay within: I like his money well. O, Here he comes. Enter Ford
                                   (Merry W., III. 5)

It deserves noticing that the requirement to introduce oneself or an introduction of the personage have literal identity at the change of scenes in Shakespeare´s plays. This is partly conditioned by analogies of the contexts, but the pattern of the low tone of introduction is obvious.

In the scenes of the court, formulas of introduction differ from those mentioned above. This is best reflected in the tragedy „Antony and Cleopatra" which is treated as a tragedy in a high key by almost all scholars. In such contexts the formula of introduction *„This is ..."* is used. But the majority of cases registered in our material reflect a much lower tone of introduction.

The material considered draws attention to the clarity of the development of action achieved by Shakespeare with the permanent use of the pattern of the introduction of the personage. First, this pattern introduces not only the personage but also respective alterations at the change of scenes. Second, the pattern of introduction arrests the attention of

the reader and directs in to the appearance of the new
personage thus establishing contact in the extralinguistic
context of situation. Moreover, this pattern also serves in
creating dramatic effects (cf.: 32, 33 and 34, above). Thus
it may be concluded that the literally identical pattern of
introduction at the change of scenes does not handicap exp-
ressiveness. On the contrary, it strengthens the dramatic
and the contact establishing effectiveness of the play.

Among other forms of the phatic use of English at the
closure of the scenes are formulas of parting, gratitude and
regards. For example;

(36) E d m u n d I hear my father coming. Pardon me,
<div style="text-align:center">...</div>
Yield! Come before my father. Light, ho, he-
re! – Flay, brother. – Torches, torches! So;
farewell.
<div style="text-align:right">Exit Edgar (K Lear, II. 1)</div>

(37) C o r n w a l l Leave him to my displeasure. Edmund,
keep you our sister company. The revenges we are
bound to take upon your traitorous father are not
fit to ypur beholding. ...
Farewell, dear sister; farewell, my Lord of
Gloucester.
<div style="text-align:center">*Enter Oswald*   (K Lear, III. 7)</div>

(38) O s w a l d Would I could meet him, madam! I
should show What party I do follow.
R e g a n **Fare thee well.** *Exeunt* (K Lear, IV. 5)

(39) C l e o p a t r a Well, het thee gone. **Farewell.**
C l o w n Yes, forsooth, **I wish you joy o´th´ worm.**
<div style="text-align:center">*Exit*   (Ant & Cleop., V. 2)</div>

(40) C a e s a r Bid her have good heart.

For Caesar cannot live
To be ungentle.
E g y p t i a n So the gods preserve thee! *Exit*
<div style="text-align:right">(Ant & Cleop, V. 1)</div>

(41) A g r i p p a Let us go.
Good Enobarbus, make yourself my guest
Whilst you abide here.
E n o b a r b u s Humbly, sir, **I thank you.** *Exeunt*
<div style="text-align:right">(Ant & Cleop., II. 2)</div>

(42) W o l s e y Say, lord chamberlain, They have done my poor
house grace; for which I pray ´em

A thousand thanks, and pray ´em take their pleasures.
Ladies chosen for the dance... (Hen VIII, I. 4)

In this case we speak of the pattern of the closure of the secenes, not any other verbal pattern. In these contexts we do not discover literally · identical verbal patterns since it is only formulas of parting and gratitude that are identical, and these consist of only one or two words. It is important to notice how significant and expressive, for instance, the formulas of parting are. Cf. the abrupt „Farewell" of a deceiver in (36) above and as short „Farewell" from the queen when she releases a servant in (39) above. Cf. also the parting of Regan which is extended to regards (38) and the repeated „Farewell" from Cornwall (37). This reveals how identical formulas at the end of the scenes acquire individual significance which depends on the conrete context. Similarly expressive are formulas of gratitude and regards. This, then, concludes a consideration of the situational pattern of the closure of the scenes, which revealed the employment of different forms of the phatic use of English. It also showed communicative realism of some of the formulas. and their individual significance in concrete contexts of concrete plays.

The situational pattern of the **prolonged use of phatic communion** has different forms in Shakespeare´s plays. Here belong conversations on the weather, nature and environment, an announcement or an introduction of a personage, self introduction, the requirement of subtle verbal etiquette and conversations on other conventional topics. In this connection we shall also mention briefly the pattern of the extermination of verbal contact.

In Shakespeare´s plays, in the company of royal personages, the introduction or self-introduction of the person is typical and required. · This includes the announcement of newcomers. The queen, for instance, does not begin a conversation until she knows the name of the person and the name of his guardian. It is only before her very death

Cleopatra ignores the self-introduction of the newcomer. Here also belongs communication through servants. It is interesting to notice that the verbal service of the courtier is required only once in „Macbeth", while in „Antony and Cleopatra" this is regular service. This is how the court of the king-murderer differs from the court of the noble monarch.

Subtle verbal etiquette in Shakespeare´s plays is in particular required from women. For instance, Caesar reproaches Octavia for coming anannounced, while Lady Falconbridge surprises her bastard son when she appears without her husband and without an announcement.

Refined conversations on conventional topics are typical only of the communication of the nobility. One of the best instances of such conversation is the pleasant talk about Macbeth´s castle when King Duncan visits it (Macb., I. 6). Similar conversations are found in „King Henry VIII". Here belong conversations at the table when ladies are invited to enjoy themselves (Hen VIII, I. 4). We would also include here the talk on health with Katherine which reflects the loneliness of the old Queen (Hen VIII, IV. 2). To this pattern we would also ascrible the long and refined speech of Cranmer from „King Henry VIII", in which he predicts a brilliant future for Elizabeth I (Hen VIII, V. 4). His speech was meant to please King Henry VIII in the context of the play and it must have pleased Queen Elizabeth I in Shakespeare´s time.

It remains to say a few words about **the extermination of verbal contact**. This is a very significant pattern wherever it occurs in Shakespeare´s plays and has typical sociolinguistic features. It is only monarchs who are permitted to exterminate verbal contact by Shakespeare, which they do with much confidence and self-esteem. For example:

(43) *Enter a Messenger*
M a c b e t h   Thou com´st to use thy tongue; thy story quickly. (Macb., V. 5)

(44) *Enter a Messenger*
       M e s s e n g e r   News, my good lord, from Rome.
       A n t o n y   Grates me, the sum.
       C l e o p a t r a   Nay, hear them, Antony.
                                        (Ant & Cleop., I. 1)
(45) *Enter a messenger*
       C l e o p a t r a   O, from Italy —
                       Ram thou thy fruitful tidings in mine ears,
                       That long time been barren.
       M e s s e n g e r   Madam, madam — ...
                                        (Ant & Cleop., II. 5)

As is evident from the material introduced, the ex-
:ermination of verbal contact has a certain pattern in Shakes-
peare´s plays. Most frequently it is only the phatic use of
English that is exterminated. It is very significant that in
:very instance of such communication it is possible to
predict the tone of voice in the text: cf. the hysterical
voice of the dying murderer in (43), the state of mind of a
:ired but noble monarch in (44) and rough directness of
.he Queen in (45). Moreover, the extermination of verbal
:ontact may mean a threat and have dramatic effects as in
King Henry´s speech to Gardiner in „King Henry VIII",
V. 2. It is possible to conclude that direct extermination of
verbal contact not only creates dramatic effects but also
.estifies to the significance of the phatic use of English and
.o the variety of its forms in Shakespeare´s plays.

Having reviewed the situational patterns of the phatic
ise of English in Shakespeare´s plays, we are in a position
.o consider the lexico-phraseological patterns of this use of
anguage. As has been mentioned, the pattern of address
:tands out among other lexico-phraseological patterns.
Address has typical sociolinguistic features and fixed
)atterns of usage. Depending on its potential meaning,
address is a very expressive unit of speech.

As the material analysed has it, address occurs regular-
y at the opening and closure of the scenes and at any
noment in the speech of one personage when the addressee
:hanges. The use of address at the moment of the change

of the addressee is absolutely regular in the plays of the great dramatist.

For example:

(46) K e n t Thou whoreson zed! thou unnecessary letter!
— **My lord**, if you will give me leave, I will tread this unbolted villain into mortar, and daub the wall of a jakes with him. ... (K Lear, II. 2)

(47) K i n g J o h n Mine eye hath well examined his parts And finds them perfect Richard. — **Sirrah**, speak. What doth move you to claim your brother´s land?
(K John, I. 1)

(48) P r o s p e r o I´ll deliver all;
And promise you calm seas, suspicious gales, And sail so expeditious that shall catch Your royal fleet far off. — **My Ariel**, chick, That is thy charge. (Temp., V. 1)

These instances of address testify to the contact establishing significance of address in accord with its realistic use.

Syntactically address forms several patterns. The syntactically free form of address is rarer, whereas its syntactically bound form is more frequent. The syntactically bound from of address has not got a permanent place in the sentence. But it is absolutely regular in short responses and in positive and negative response utterances. We have not discovered a more direct response utterance that „Not mine" in the material analysed. Response utterances in Shakespeare´s plays contain at least „Sir" as a form of address or an interjection as an emotive sign. This testifies to limited directness and courteous character of oral English in general. It is not excluded that limited directness which is a feature of late modern English, too, owes much to Shakespeare´s language.

As our material has it, a limited number of syntactical patterns of address is used in Shakespeare´s plays. It is possible to present them in the following inventory:

1) a name/a family name ± qualifying words;
2) Sir ± a name/a qualifying word;
3) My Lord(s) ± qualifying words;

4) Lord(s);

5) Lady(ies) ± qualifying words;

6) Gentleman(men) ± qualifying words;

7) Madam;

8) Mistress ± qualifying words;

9) common names (man, woman, boy, girl, people, wench, etc) ± qualifying words;

10) kinship terms (father, son, daughter, husband, brother, sister, etc) ± qualifying words;

11) titles (Thane, etc) ± qualifying words;

12) words denoting social position (friend, fellow, master, host, servant, king, sovereign, etc) ± qualifying words;

13) common names of abstract beings (love, God, angels, heavens, wind, heavenly bow, shadow, spirit, etc) ± qualifying words;

14) forms of indirect address (Your Highness, Your Lordship, Your Grace, His Majesty, etc);

15) swear words (slave, dog, cat, thou fool, monkey, villain, rascal, kite, tyrant, etc) ± qualifying words.

All the above mentioned forms of address conform to typical sociolinguistic rules of usage in Shakespeare´s plays. Items 1—8 and 14 belong to standard forms of address. They are used in accord with the sociocultural tradition of English speaking society. That is why standard forms of address may be guiding clues in the texts of the plays. For instance, if the inattentive reader happens to overlook a change of the scenes, the mere form of address „Your Highness" makes it necessary to clarify the situation and find out when the king appeared. Qualifying words in address depend to a certain extent on the sex of the speaker. This, however, does not mean gentleness toward and among women only or coarseness toward and among men. In Shakespeare´s plays address of gallant men is especially subtle. Even swear words are unsual among them (cf.: *Thou whoreson zed! thou unnecessary letter!* from Kent).

Sources of the expressiveness of address are many and various, and Shakespeare makes use of all of them. Sources of the expressiveness of address include the following:

1) the potential meaning of . address, i. e. an indirect reflection of conventional sociocultural relations which determine its use; the use of address contrary to such relations may express humiliation and contempt (cf. the form of address from Henry VIII to the bishop in scene 2 of act V);

2) qualifying words which increase its emotive—evaluative expressiveness (cf.: „noble sir" to Macbeth, „noble Banquo" to Banquo and „gentle lady" to Lady Macbeth);

3) the use of address preceding a response, which expresses esteem (cf.: Kent. Sir, I do know you, and... /K Lear, III.1/);

4) a high frequency of address that expresses inequal relations among close relatives (cf.: the frequency of address between King Lear and his daughters at the beginning of the tragedy); 5) repeated address as a means of emphasis, and 6) the absence of address as a means of expression of familiar relations or of high tension. The frequency of address and Shakespeare,s use of its all expressive potential significantly enriches the metacontents of Shakespeare´s plays owing to this single unit of speech. Communicative effectiveness of address is none the less significant in the extra-linguistic context of the reader.

It will not be an exaggeration to say that Shakespeare´s plays abound in **formulas of verbal etiquette.** Apart form the formulas which have already been mentioned, request is a markedly frequent and pleasant unit. That is why numerous respective formulas are used by Shakespeare. „I pray you/pray thee", „Prithee...", „I Beseech you/thee/your lordship´ and others are absolutely typical. Formulas of the confirmation of attention or of a response to a request have similar frequency. For example: What´s your grace´s will? What´s your gracious pleasure? What

would my master? Will't please you/your Highness walk/go? etc. Though these formulas are most common from the inferior to the superior, their frequency gives an impression of especially correct and attentive relations among the personages.

A significant testimony to the present investigation is permanent attention to speech and, especially, a request for permission to speak in Shakespeare's plays. This is reflected in stereotyped elliptical **phrases requesting permission to speak** which are amply used by Shakespeare. For example: *A word, good sir. A word with you. But one word. One word more!Let me ask you one word in private. Let me have audience; I am sent to speak...* The recurrence of such units of verbal etiquette signifies courteous communication. But still more important in this context are stereotyped units expressing **oral management of verbal contact**. For example: *Dost thou attend? Dost hear? Do you hear, master? I charge thee that you attend me.* High frequency of these units of speech,which is testified by their unmarked contexts, are expressive of the refined culture of society represented by Shakespeare. This is a motivated generalization because Shakespeare's plays reveal one more means of verbal courtesy. This is **praiseworthy evaluation of speech** expressed by fixed units. For example: *This tune goes manly* (Macb., IV. 3). *Sir, you speak nobly* (K Lear, I. 4). „*Tis nobly spoken* (Ant & Cleop., II. 2; Hen VIII, III. 2). *You have said well.* „*Tis well said again* (Hen VIII, III. 2). *Well said* (Ant & Cleop., II.5). „*Tis spoken well* (Ant & Cleop., III. 2). *Worthily spoken* (Ant & Cleop., II. 2)

The material adduced above confirms the fact that concern for speech and verbal contact is Shakespeare's plays does not only mean the skill of an expert author. In all probability Shakespeare represented society of refined verbal culture in which concern for speech and verbal routine had have had a tradition (cf.: Wyld, 1936, p. 101). It is quite

probable that the artistic reality of Shakespeare's plays reflected the social environment of a certain part of English society of Shakespeare's time. Most of Shakespeare's plays represent the nobility, and nobility of Shakespeare's time had a refined tradition of the phatic use of English (cf.: Castiglione).

Our permanent attention to fixed global units of meaning (i. e. forms of address, formulas, stereotypes and response utterances) which manifest the phatic use of English in Shakespeare's plays does not mean that have tried to reveal the stereotyped character of the language of the great dramatist. On the contrary, the idea was to show how skillfully the great author uses the stereotyped speech of conventional routine. But literally identical, stereotyped and otherwise standardized speech in the phatic use of English is absolutely regular in the scenic composition of Shakespeare's plays. This confirms the idea that there is a key to generalizations regarding the design of the composition of Shakespeare's plays. There is also a key to measure the expressiveness of the language of conventional routine, which is the potential meaning of the fixed global units of speech. Moreover, since verbal routine of late modern English has numerous analogies with Shakespeare's usage, a question arises if the language of Shakespeare could have contributed to the formation of standard English.

With the phatic use of English so permanent, various and standardized in Shakespeare's plays, it is possible to assume that Shakespeare's language might have been basic in the formation of standard English at the time when the standard was only in the process of development (cf.: Gordon). The material of the present paper may have been sufficient to illustrate the presence of standardized language in Shakespeare's plays. What is more and deserves mentioning is that the standard of Shakespeare's language is that of the best society, has a realistic character and shapes the scenic composition of the plays.

Since Shakespeare's plays represent the period when standard English was in the process of formation, it is not excluded that the language of the great dramatist had an influence on this formation (cf.: Wyld, 1936; Ярцева, 1969). The genre of the play may also have had its influence: the public performance of the plays could have contributed to the spread of the standard of Shakespeare's language in the widest circles of society. If our assumption is correct, it may be concluded that the English language has inherited a standardized form from Shakespeare's plays. If it is not correct, the English language is nevertheless an inheritor of the standardized usage of Shakespeare in a colossal volume.

СТАНДАРТИЗАЦИЯ ЯЗЫКА В ПЬЕСАХ ШЕКСПИРА

Мария Людвика Драздаускене

Р е з ю м е

В статье рассматривается речь контактоустанавливающей функции в пьесах Шекспира, которая представляет стандартизованное употребление английского языка. Речь в данной функции является абсолютно регулярной в сценической композиции пьес Шекспира и может быть ключем к обобщениям относительно закономерностей в искусстве великого драматурга. Стандартизованная речь в контактоустанавливающей функции в пьесах Шекспира также могла быть возможным источником стандартизации английского языка вообще.

REFERENCES

Castiglione B., 1975 — C a s t i g l i o n e B. The Book of the Courtier. London: Dent, 1975. 324 p.

Drazdauskiene M. L., 1986 — D r a z d a u s k i e n e M. L. The Phatic Function in the Scenic Composition of „Macbeth" // Transactions of the Higher Schools of the Lithuanian SSR:Kalbotyra. 1986. 36(3). P. 29—39.

Gordon G., 1928 — G o r d o n G. Shakespeare's English // S. P. E. Tract No XXIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. P. 255—276.

Jones E., 1971 — J o n e s E. Scenis Form in Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971. 269 p.

Quirk R., 1974 — Q u i r k R. The Linguist and the English language. London: Arnold, 1974. 181 p.

Ribner I., 1960 — R i b n e r I. Patterns in Shakespearean Tragedy. London: Methuen, 1960. 295 p.

Wilson R. F., 1977 — W i l l s o n R. F.Shakespeare's Opening Scenes. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1977. 217 p.

Wyld H. C., 1936 — W y l d H. C. A History of Modern Colloquial English. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. 433 p.

Ярцева В. Н., 1969 — Я р ц е в а В. Н. Развитие национального литературного английского языка. М.: Наука, 1969. 385 с.

Vilniaus universiteto   Įteikta
Anglų filologijos katedra   1990 m. lapkričio mėn.