

# Gender and Imperatives in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel<sup>1)</sup>

Ayumi NONOMIYA

## Abstract

本稿は、会話の男女差を 18 世紀英国小説における命令文の用法に着目して論じたものである。Lakoff(1975) 及び Trudgill (1983) の「女性の方がより保守的で丁寧な言い方を好む」との主張に基づき、2.1 節では命令文に添えて丁寧さを添加する語 *pray* の男女別使用頻度、2.2 節では丁寧さの異なる否定命令文の 3 つの形式（単純命令文 “V not”、非縮約 do 命令文 “do not V”、縮約 do 命令文 “don’t V”）の選択頻度について調査する。さらに、それぞれの節において話者と聞き手との関係を調査し、それらと性別との連関関係をも見ていく。結果として、女性は男性よりも丁寧な形式を選択することが多く、同じ関係（家族など）でも男性の方が丁寧さの低い形式を使用するという結果が得られた。

**Key Words:** contracted form, eighteenth-century English novel, gender, imperative, *pray*

## 1. Introduction

What is the difference between men’s way of talking and that of women? Lakoff (1975) argues that women speak more politely than men do because they are thought of as the preservers of morality and civility. Trudgill (1983) also points out that women tend to speak more conservatively and politely than men do. Assuming that their statements are correct, can they be applied to eighteenth-century English as well as to Present-day English? In this paper I examine the use of imperatives among male and female characters in eighteenth-century novels since different types of the constructions often convey different degrees of politeness<sup>2)</sup> and linguistic conservatism. The imperative constructions I will primarily deal with are imperatives with *pray* and second person negative imperatives, which are discussed in 2.1 and 2.2 respectively.

Before discussing imperatives, I would like to touch upon the relationship between imperatives, the act of command, and politeness. Obviously, imperatives are mainly used to give commands to the hearer. Since imperatives disregard the hearer’s will and show the command in the boldest, on-record way, they are often thought of as very rude; Brown and Levinson state that the imperative, the direct expression of one of the most intrinsically face-threatening speech acts, is “too rude to occur in most normal social situations” (1978, p. 196). To avoid such rudeness,

one might add “please”, “pray”, or a tag question to the imperative sentences.<sup>3)</sup> One can also adopt other less direct measures to give commands – declaratives and interrogatives. The use of these constructions as command is more polite because they do not impose on their hearer; for example, if one says “It’s cold in here.” instead of “Close the window.”, the declarative sounds more polite because it just hints at its speaker’s intention that he or she wants the hearer to close the window, while the interrogative “Could you close the window?” sounds as polite because it gives the hearer the choice. It is also important to note that the imperative can be used for purposes other than giving commands. Leech suggests that the imperative has a multitude of functions, such as good-wishes (e. g. “Have a good time!”), offer (e. g. “Help yourself.”), invitation (e. g. “Make yourself at home.”), faith-healing (e. g. “Be whole.”), curse (e. g. “Go to hell.”), threat (e. g. “Say that again, and I’ll hit you.”).<sup>4)</sup>

It is true that, as we have illustrated above, politeness in the act of command is achieved not only by choosing among different types of imperatives but also by resorting to other constructions. Yet, in what follows, I will focus upon the use of imperatives in eighteenth-century English where various types of imperative constructions seem to be available to convey different shades of politeness and linguistic conservatism. Furthermore, as far as I know, there are few studies of the imperative in eighteenth-century English so that it would be worth investigating the use of the constructions in their own right as an initial step towards the study of linguistic politeness and gender in earlier English.

The corpus used in this study consists of six novels written in the eighteenth century: *Moll Flanders* (1722), *Joseph Andrews* (1742), *Cecilia* (1782), *Romance of the Forest* (1791), *The Monk* (1796), and *Pride and Prejudice* (1796).<sup>5)</sup> Abbreviations and full bibliographical details are provided in the references. I chose these novels according to two criteria: the date of composition and the gender of the writers. Two novels were written in the first half of the century and the other four in the latter half.<sup>6)</sup> *Moll*, *Joseph*, and *Monk* were written by men while the authors of *Cecilia*, *Romance*, and *PP* were women. I also attempted to limit the length of the novels to between 100,000 and 200,000 words, although *Cecilia* amounts to over 330, 000 words.<sup>7)</sup> *PP* is excluded from the data in 2.2 because this novel does not have a suitable variety of types of second person negative imperatives; the most frequent type is the uncontracted *do*-imperative and the other types occur only on special occasions (Nonomiya, 2008). The imperatives were collected by reading through the texts because as far as I know there are no tagged corpora of eighteenth-century novels.

## 2. Gender and Imperatives

### 2.1 *Pray*

To investigate whether women tend to speak more politely than men in eighteenth-century novels, we will look at the use of *pray* in imperative sentences. The word *pray*, which would be an equivalent to *please* in Present-day English,<sup>8)</sup> was used to express deep respect or petition (Nakamura, 1996). If female characters speak more politely than male characters do, they are likely to utter *pray* more frequently to soften their imperatives. The table below shows the occurrences of the imperatives with *pray* classified according to the gender of the speaker and the hearer:<sup>9)</sup>

Table 1 The frequency of imperatives with *pray* in men's and women's conversation

		hearer		TOTAL
		male	female	
speaker	male	11 (10%)	20 (19%)	31
	female	36 (34%)	40 (37%)	76
TOTAL		47	60	107

The percentage indicates the proportion of the total number of imperatives with *pray* uttered by both genders.

As predicted, the female characters employ *pray* with imperatives more frequently than the male characters do. In addition, the total number of imperatives with or without *pray* uttered by the male characters is greater than is the case with the female characters (1185x; 960x), and *pray* occurs with imperatives less frequently in men's conversations than in women's (3%; 8%). A closer look at Table 1 also reveals that the female characters use *pray* both to men and women while the male characters employ *pray* more frequently to women. This inclination is especially salient in *Cecilia*; the male characters use *pray* with an imperative to the female characters nearly four times more frequently than they do to other male characters (4x; 17x). Lakoff points out that in contemporary English, women, in addition to speaking politely, are also spoken to in an especially polite way (1975, pp. 51-52); the patterns of use of *pray* in *Cecilia* may indicate that this was equally the case in the eighteenth century.

It may not always have been as simple as this, however, as an examination of the use of "do pray V", which would probably be a most polite form of command, reveals.<sup>10)</sup> There are seven occurrences of this form in *Cecilia*, six of which appear in the speech of female characters and one in that of a male character.<sup>11)</sup> One thing worth noting is that the only instance of its use

by a male character is directed to a female character:

(1) “Now do pray, Miss Beverly, guess who it was.” (*Cecilia*, 612, Mr. Morrice to Cecilia).

When looked at in context, the degree of politeness of this utterance is in fact rather ambiguous. The relevant background is that Miss Cecilia Beverly is a young lady with a large fortune while Mr. Morrice, a young lawyer, is acquainted with her because he serves Cecilia’s friend (i.e. his social rank is lower than that of Cecilia); Cecilia is on her way to London to marry her lover Mortimer secretly. She is joined by Mr. Morrice by chance, and he forces her to help the passengers in a coach which has been involved in an accident, which causes her much delay. A suspicious masked man approaches Cecilia, but soon runs away. It is Mortimer, who has become worried about Cecilia and has set out to search for her; he has disguised himself so that others will not notice that he and Cecilia are trying to see each other secretly. She recognizes him but says to her friends that she does not know him. Mr. Morrice runs after him and identifies who the suspicious man is, and he utters example (1) when he returns to Cecilia, knowing that the man is Cecilia’s lover.

Since example (1) is a part of a dialogue between a man and a woman, the use of *pray* may indicate that in eighteenth-century novels politeness is important in dialogues between men and women, regardless of the gender of the speaker—or at least this is true in *Cecilia*. We could thus conclude that in the eighteenth-century women were spoken to as well as speaking more politely than men. We need, however, to take heed of other possibilities since there are two other alternative explanations why Mr. Morrice uses *pray* to Cecilia. The first is that she is superior in rank to him; because he is described as “supple” (*Cecilia*, 11), it may be that he is cringing to her. The second is that he shows rudeness by being over-polite. Because he has found out that Cecilia has been trying to conceal who the masked man is, there may be sarcasm in his way of asking her who the man is.

There is another, clearer counterexample to the presupposition that the type “pray V” is one of the characteristics of women’s speech:

(2) “[P]ray do you do your Duty . . .” (*Moll*, 242)

The combination “pray do you do V” is employed only by a male character in *Moll* and is never seen in the other novels. It would, however, be better to differentiate this instance from other examples with *pray* for two reasons. First, the periphrastic *do* may be inserted so as to indicate that the pronoun *you* is not oblique but nominative; without *do* this example would be “pray do

you your duty” and *you* may look like an indirect object of the verb *do* (meaning “to perform something”).<sup>12)</sup> Second, the speaker clearly employs this form to show not respect to the addressee but sarcasm or irritation. The speaker is a mercer and the addressee is a constable. The mercer catches a woman whom he believes to be a shoplifter and calls a constable. Some of the witnesses of the event, however, claim that he has got the wrong person. The constable suggests that the mercer should release the woman as she is not a criminal. On hearing this, the mercer gets irritated and utters example (2), sarcastically comparing the constable to a justice of the peace. The adverb *pray* might be used to show some respect to the constable, but considering the fact that his manner is “surly” and the constable seems to be offended to hear what the mercer says, *pray* is probably used ironically. From these two examples, we may say that *pray* can be used in a rude way as well as in a polite way. These, however, are the only two rude or sarcastic uses of *pray* I have found in this corpus.

When we presume that women are associated with the use of *pray*, one question arises: are women in general related to *pray* or is there some other factor relevant, such as the relationship between the speaker and the hearer? Although it is generally thought that politeness is not so important among family members, Nonomiya shows that “pray V” is used mainly to a family member of the speaker in *PP* (2008, pp. 67-71). To investigate this point further, let us look at the table below, which shows the relationship between the speaker and the hearer:

Table 2 The frequency of imperatives with *pray* and the relationship between the speaker and the hearer

speaker	hearer	hearer’s relationship with the speaker					TOTAL
		family	servant	friend	couple <sup>13)</sup>	others	
male	male	2	0	1	0	8	11
	female	0	0	0	2	18	20
female	male	6	5	0	12	13	36
	female	2	2	21	0	15	40
TOTAL		10	7	22	14	54	107

Table 2 shows that the male characters never use “pray V” to the women in their family while the female characters sometimes use this form to the male members of their family. This discrepancy may result from the notion that men have much stronger power in a family and women are expected to obey the family member of the opposite gender, in particular the head of the family.

This can also account for the result that the female characters use “pray V” to their lover/spouse while the male characters seldom do. On the other hand, imperatives with *pray* occur in dialogues between female friends. This might indicate that women tend to use politeness strategies to their friends to keep their relationship better while men do not pay attention to politeness in speaking with their friends, which would be in some part true in present-day society.

When politeness is not given priority (as in the case of an emergency), both male characters and female characters tend not to use *pray*. For example, in *Cecilia*, although the heroine Cecilia often receives imperatives with *pray* (over one third of the occurrences of “pray V” are directed to her), the characters use only imperatives without *pray* to her when she becomes insane from fatigue and extremely ill while in return she uses only simple imperatives to her friends and husband. Brown and Levinson’s claim that “(i)n cases of great urgency or desperation, redress would actually decrease the communicated urgency” (1978, pp. 95-96) would support this assumption.

## 2.2 Negative Imperative

Next, we will turn to the use of second person negative imperatives by men and women. Broadly speaking, there are three types of second person negative imperative in eighteenth-century English: the negative simple imperative (V *not*), the negative uncontracted *do*-imperative (*do not* V), and the negative contracted *do*-imperative (*don’t* V). The use of *do* in second person negative imperatives was established by 1700 and took the place of the older “V not” over the course of the century (Görlach, 2001), though the earlier form still appeared frequently in the novels written in the last two decades of the eighteenth century (Nonomiya, 2008). The form “don’t V” appeared latest and was often related to colloquialism and vulgarism (Fuami, 1998, p.17). In the light of this, it can be surmised that women may prefer “conservative” forms, i.e. the negative uncontracted *do*-imperative and the negative simple imperative, which was a bit archaic and in the process of falling out of use in the eighteenth century. The table below shows the occurrences of “V not”, “do not V”, and “don’t V”:

Table 3 The types and occurrences of second person negative imperatives in men’s and women’s language

speaker	V <i>not</i>	<i>do not</i> V	<i>don’t</i> V	TOTAL
male	60 (52%)	27 (23%)	29 (25%)	116
female	63 (50%)	34 (27%)	29 (23%)	126
TOTAL	123	61	58	242

The percentage indicates the proportion of each type of imperative in each sex's total use of second person negative imperatives.

We can see from Table 3 that the negative simple imperative is used by both genders in almost the same ratio while the negative uncontracted imperative is only slightly more frequently used in women's speech than in that of men. When we look at the frequency in each novel, we find, contrary to our expectation, that in *Joseph* the female characters tend to use the contracted form "don't V" while the male characters use the uncontracted form "do not V":

Table 4 The types and occurrences of second person negative imperatives in men's and women's language in *Joseph*

speaker	V not	do not V	don't V	TOTAL
male	1	3	3	7
female	1	1	8	10
TOTAL	2	4	11	17

Why do the female characters in *Joseph* use the colloquial form "don't V" frequently? Is it one of the characteristics of women's language in *Joseph*? To answer these questions, we can focus on the disposition of the female characters. Most of the women who utter negative imperatives are described as foolish or comical. To take a few examples, Mrs. Slipslop is a malapropist and Mrs. Truilliber becomes comically agitated when she mistakes the hero for a burglar. It would be hasty, however, to consider that the author makes the female characters use the type "don't V" to show that women are foolish by nature, though in the eighteenth century women were still considered to be inferior to men in the point of intelligence and portrayed as making mistakes in speaking and writing (Görlach, 2001). It should be noted, on the other hand, that a noble good-natured lady named Harriet uses the negative uncontracted *do*-imperative only:

(3) "Do not," says she, . . . "Do not curse Fortune, . . ." (*Joseph*, 193, Harriet to her relative)

It would be better to assume that most of the female characters in *Joseph* who tend to use the negative contracted *do*-imperative do so not because they are women but because they are 'foolish' characters.<sup>14)</sup>

Next, we will look at the relationship between the type of negative imperatives and the hearer's gender, which is shown in the table below:

Table 5 The types and occurrences of second person negative imperatives and the gender of the speaker and the hearer

speaker	hearer	V not	do not V	don't V	TOTAL
male	male	14 (42%)	8 (24%)	11 (34%)	33
	female	46 (53%)	19 (23%)	21 (24%)	86
female	male	39 (56%)	23 (33%)	8 (11%)	70
	female	24 (45%)	11 (21%)	18 (34%)	53
TOTAL		61	123	58	242

The percentage indicates the proportion which each type of negative imperative accounts for in the total of utterances from men to men, from men to women, from women to men, and from women to women.

Table 5 shows that the use of the negative contracted *do*-imperative is frequent in dialogues between characters of the same gender. This result may indicate that politeness is less important in dialogues between people of the same gender than those including the opposite gender. But why do women, who are believed to speak more conservatively, use the contracted form frequently in the dialogues between women? One possible reason for this phenomenon is that the relationship between the speaker and the hearer affects the use of the type of the negative imperative. Iwasaki (2003), who studied the use of contracted forms in Jane Austen's novels, found out that the contracted forms are likely to appear when the speaker is intimate with the hearer. Is this use of the contracted form true to the characters in the eighteenth-century novels? To investigate this problem further, let us focus on the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, which is shown in the table below:

Table 6 The frequency of the negative contracted *do*-imperative and the relationship between the speaker and the hearer

speaker	hearer	family	servant	friend	couple	others	TOTAL
male	male	3	1	4	0	3	11
	female	12	0	0	4	5	21
female	male	2	3	0	1	2	8
	female	0	2	13	0	3	18
TOTAL		17	6	17	5	13	58



From Table 6 we can see that both the male characters and the female characters tend to use the contracted *do*-imperative when they talk to friends of the same gender. This accounts for the result that this type appears more frequently in dialogues between the characters of the same gender. On the other hand, the male characters tend to use “don’t V” to the women in their family while the female characters seldom use it to members of their family, regardless of their gender. This may suggest that in the eighteenth century men could speak freely in their family while women were required to speak politely even in their home.

Though couples are on intimate terms, the male and female characters tend to use the negative simple imperative to their lovers or spouses. It is true that “don’t V” does occur in such dialogues, but the number is scarce, as we see from Table 5. Accordingly, there should be a special rule for the use of the negative imperative in dialogues between couples. Fuami points out that “V not” is noticeable in the speech of male characters, in particular when they address their beloved and in that situation this form implies emotional heightening (1991, p.623). To examine whether her claim matches our result, let us investigate the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, as we did with “V not”:

Table 7 The frequency of the negative simple imperative and the relationship between the speaker and the hearer

speaker	hearer	family	servant	friend	couple	others	TOTAL
male	male	3	1	0	0	6	10
	female	2	0	0	30	18	50
female	male	2	1	3	24	9	39
	female	2	0	21	0	1	24
TOTAL		9	2	24	54	34	123

We can see from Table 7 that “V not” occurs most frequently in dialogues between couples. In particular, two male characters show an inclination to use this type when speaking to their beloved: in *Monk Ambrosio*, a once venerable monk who becomes intoxicated with sexual desire, uses “V not” only to Antonia, an innocent girl with whom he wants to make love; in *Cecilia Mortimer*, a young noble, always employs this form to his sweetheart Cecilia. Though it should be born in mind that the most frequent form in these novels is the negative simple imperative, considering that the two male characters rarely use this form to other characters, Fuami’s suggestion can explain the result. On the other hand, while not only the male characters but also the female characters resort to this form when they talk to their lovers (30x by the male

characters and 24x by the female characters), the female characters who utter negative imperatives to their lover, i.e. Matilda in *Monk*, who seduces Ambrosio and becomes his first lover, and Cecilia in *Cecilia*, employ both “do not V” and “V not”.<sup>15)</sup> Although the frequency of use of “V not” is similar in utterances from by male characters to their lovers or wives and in those by female characters to their lovers or husbands, there can be some differences in their use of imperatives. It is not possible to investigate this problem further on account of the lack of sufficient data; there are only two novels in the corpus which both men and women employ second person negative imperatives to their lovers, and in *Monk* most of the negative imperatives are of the type “V not”.

### 3. Conclusion

In this paper we have looked at the differences in speech between male and female characters in eighteenth-century English novels, focusing on the use of *pray* with imperatives and the various types of negative imperative. With respect to the use of *pray*, we found that the female characters use *pray* more frequently than the male characters do. Also, the female characters are likely to receive such imperatives more frequently. These results would probably be due to the idea that politeness is important in dialogues in which women participate. When we looked into the relationship between the speaker and the hearer, it was revealed that the female characters tend to use *pray* to their friends and lover/spouse while the male characters do not. From this result we can assume that in eighteenth-century England women were supposed to talk politely even to those who were intimate with them while in men’s speech politeness was less important and they did not need to show their respect to the female members of the family.

In 2.2 we saw that the frequency of each type of the second person negative imperative is more or less same in the language of the male characters and in that of the female characters. When we focused on the hearer’s gender in dialogues involving the negative contracted *do*-imperative, it turned out that this type occurs most frequently when the speaker and the hearer are of the same gender. As for the relationships between the interlocutors, “don’t V” is often used when (1) the speaker and the hearer are friends and (2) a male character is talking to his family. In contrast to the male use of “don’t V”, female characters seldom use this form when speaking to their family. On the other hand, “V not” is favoured in dialogues between lovers/spouses. While this form is used by both male characters and female characters, only male characters use it exclusively to their lovers.

There remain some problems which need further investigation. Firstly, the use of *pray* and the choice of the type of negative imperative is probably not only due to gender but also to other factors like social class. Secondly, though there are a few studies, the use of *do* with affirmative

imperatives is not yet fully clarified. It would be worth studying the use of *do* in terms of the relationship between the interlocutors. Thirdly, the use of the negative imperative could be also affected by the kinds of verbs involved, the intensity of command, and some other pragmatic factors. A larger-scale study remains to make clear the picture of the use of negative imperatives in the century as a whole.

## Notes

- 1) I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Jun Terasawa whose numerous comments and suggestions were invariably valuable throughout the course of my study. Special thanks also go to two anonymous referees who gave me invaluable comments and warm encouragement and Mr. Paul Rossiter, who checked the English in this paper. Of course, for the errors and weakness which remain I am to blame.
- 2) In this paper “politeness” refers to the speaker’s attitude of avoiding being rude to the hearer and showing respect to him or her. Discussion on the nature of politeness is shown in Leech (1983).
- 3) Although as far as I know there are few studies which prove that *pray* is in fact used to make imperatives polite, the fact that in the corpus imperatives with *pray* are rarely directed to enemies of the speaker (e. g. a rival in love) or a person whose rank is inferior to the speaker (e. g. servant) can suggest that *pray* may be used in situations in which politeness is needed. Also, most of the imperatives are entreaties rather than requests. The counterexamples to the assumption that “pray V” is not used to the inferiors are found in the speech of Lady Booby, a noblewoman in *Joseph*; she uses this type to her chambermaid twice:

“[T]hen pray pay her her Wages instantly.” (*Joseph*, p. 30)

“Pray don’t Mister such Fellows to me . . .” (*Joseph*, p. 246)

However, since these are the only counterexamples, Lady Booby’s use of “pray V” may be different from that of the other characters. On the other hand, she uses an imperative with *pray* and one without *pray* in her utterance:

“[B]ut pray, answer me this Question, Suppose a Lady should happen to like you, . . . if you had been born her equal, are you certain that no Vanity could tempt you to discover her? Answer me honestly, *Joseph*, . . .” (*Joseph*, pp. 24-25)

In this scene she tries to seduce her footboy Joseph. At the start of the utterance she seems to employ “pray V” so that the hearer (Joseph) will feel more comfortable answering the question which she is going to ask him or make him feel that he is equal to her (for “pray V” is not likely to be used to the inferior), and after telling him that she loves him she requests him to answer her question (seduction) by using the imperative without *pray* as she wants his (positive) answer because being confident in the charm of her wealth, position, and herself, her pride will be hurt severely if she is rejected or dismissed.

- 4) Although Leech’s suggestion about the functions of the imperative is probably concerned with the imperative in Present-day English, it can be applied to the use of imperatives in the eighteenth century. In the corpus imperatives carrying the function of impositive command occurs by far most frequently. Here I give examples of the above-mentioned functions from our corpus (the number next to functions show that how many examples are found in the corpus):

impositive command (1721x): “Tell him what a dreadful state I am in . . .” (*PP*, p. 218)

good-wishes (4x): “Take with you my blessing!” (*Cecilia*, p. 829)  
 offer (19x): “Take whatever you like . . .” (*PP*, p. 232)  
 invitation (6x): “Come as soon as you can on the receipt of this.” (*PP*, p. 22)  
 curse (1x): “Go to Devil . . .” (*Joseph*, p. 65)  
 threat (2x): “Detain me at your peril!” (*Cecilia*, p. 895)

It is true that all of the functions are equally important and need studying, we may well focus mainly on impositive command because over 98% of the imperatives in the corpus convey this function.

- 5) Though *PP* was published in 1813, this novel is believed to have been written by 1796 and consequently can be regarded as an eighteenth-century novel (Suematsu, 2004).
- 6) One may notice that the corpus does not include novels written in the middle of the century. The reason that novels from that period are missing is that the mid-century novels which I investigated, i.e. Tobias Smolett’s *Ferdinand Count Fathom* (1753), Samuel Johnson’s *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia* (1759), and Oliver Goldsmith’s *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), do not provide sufficient data for this study and accordingly were not included in the corpus (Nonomiya, 2008).
- 7) Although Fanny Burney, the author of *Cecilia*, wrote a novel of about 150,000 words named *Evelina*, it is an epistolary novel; I did not use it since the specific genre of the work might affect the use of imperatives.
- 8) Though Nakamura (1996) shows that “please V” occurred in eighteenth-century epistles, this form never appeared in our corpus (Nonomiya, 2008). This difference is best explained by Iyeiri’s assumption that the “English of literary works is more conservative” (2004, p.236). The form “please to V”, from which “please V” developed, is found once in *Cecilia* (“But now, ma’am, *please to* take notice what I argue upon the reply;” (p.448, emphasis added)), it can be surmised that “please to V” is about to appear in novels in the last part of the eighteenth century. Of course, *pray* is not an exact equivalent of *please* – *please* has functions which *pray* does not have; for instance, *please* can be used to show that the speaker has the authority to request an action by the listener. However, since “pray V” is almost extinct and “please V” is commonly seen in Present-day English and both “pray V” and “please V” have similar meaning (according to OED<sup>2</sup>, *please* as an adverb is “used in polite request or agreement, or to add a polite emphasis or urgency: kindly, if you please” while *pray* as an adverb is “used to add urgency, solicitation, or deference to a request: ‘I pray you’.”), it could be possible to assume that “please V” has taken of the place of “pray V” to some extent.
- 9) In this section “imperative” includes all kinds of imperatives, viz. second person affirmative imperatives, second person negative imperatives, affirmative *let*-imperatives, and negative *let*-imperatives.
- 10) Because as far as I know few studies mention the relationship between the use of *do* with affirmative imperatives and politeness, it might not be appropriate to regard “do pray V” as a more polite form than “pray V”; generally speaking, *do* is associated with speaker’s strong emotion (Nakamura, 1996, p.56). On the other hand, I have pointed out that both “pray V” and “do V” are used only for the people intimate with the speaker in *PP* (Nonomiya, 2008). Lakoff claims that “the more one compounds a request, the more characteristic it is of women’s speech, the less of men’s.” (1975, p.19).
- 11) A list of all of the occurrences of “do pray V” in our corpus is as follows:  
 “[D]o pray, brother, try to get rid of him for me . . .” (*Cecilia*, p.83, Mrs. Harrel to Mr. Arnott)  
 “Do pray now,” cried Miss Larolles, “observe Mr. Meadows!” (*Cecilia*, p. 132, Miss Larolles to Cecilia)

- “Do pray, Sir, be so good as to make room for one of us at your side.” (*Cecilia*, p.287, Mrs. Mears to Mr. Meadows)
- “[D]o pray stop . . .” (*Cecilia*, p.334, Miss Larolles to Cecilia)
- “But do pray come . . .” (*Cecilia*, p.489, Lady Honoria to Cecilia)
- “[N]ow do pray look in the glass . . .” (*Cecilia*, p.521, Lady Honoria to Cecilia)
- “Now do pray, Miss Beverly, guess who it was.” (*Cecilia*, p.612, Mr. Morrice to Cecilia)
- 12) In eighteenth-century English a pronoun follows, not precedes, the verb in imperatives. Nakamura (1996), who lists the types of affirmative imperatives in epistles between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, does not list the pattern “S V”, and Rissanen (1999) and Denison (1998), who study the syntax of English between 1476 and 1776 and between 1776 and 1996 respectively, claim that the type “S V” reappeared at the end of the eighteenth century. Though Visser (1963) shows the occurrence of this type at the end of the seventeenth century, Rissanen points out that “(t)he only example quoted by Visser from the seventeenth century (Congreve *Love for Love* I.i.7; *you go to breakfast*) seems faulty: the passage reads *go you* in the editions I have checked. The other Modern English instances in Visser are from the end of the eighteenth century or later” (1999, p.326). I investigated five versions of this play available in Early English Books Online, four of which were published in 1695 and one in 1697, and all of them show that the line is “go you to breakfast”.
  - 13) “Lover/spouse” includes one-sided love; for example, in *Cecilia* Mr. Monckton loves Cecilia and accordingly his utterances to her fall into this category while she thinks him as just a friend and her speech to him is included in the “friend” category.
  - 14) This method of characterization can be seen in Jane Austen’s novels. Iwasaki points out that “[a]mong those who are prone to use contracted forms, Mrs. Jennings and Miss Steele are explicitly described as vulgar; others are characterised as wanting in delicacy, elegance, intellect or integrity of mind” (2003, p. 18).
  - 15) There are no valid examples of the negative imperative spoken by Ambrosio to his lover Matilda. The only example of such an imperative is uttered before she becomes his lover: “Do not insist upon a reply, Matilda” (*Monk*, p. 82).

## References

### Primary Sources

- [*Cecilia*] Burney, Fanny. *Cecilia or Memoirs of an Heiress*. 1782. rpt. *Cecilia*. (Oxford World’s Classics) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [*Joseph*] Fielding, Henry. *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and of His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams*. 1742. rpt. *Joseph Andrews and Shamela*. (Oxford World’s Classics) Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [*Moll*] Defoe, Daniel. *The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders, &c.* 1722. rpt. *Moll Flanders*. (Oxford World’s Classics) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [*Monk*] Lewis, Matthew. *The Monk: A Romance*. 1796. rpt. *The Monk*. (Oxford World’s Classics) Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [*PP*] Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. 1813. rpt. (Oxford World’s Classics) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [*Romance*] Radcliffe, Ann. *The Romance of the Forest*. 1791. rpt. (Oxford World’s Classics) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

## Secondary Sources

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1978. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denison, David. 1998. "Syntax." in Suzanne Romaine (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume IV: 1776-1997*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuami, Kayoko. 1991. "Negation in Eighteenth-Century English –Its Use in Fictional Speech." in Michio Kawai (ed.) *Language and Style in English Literature: Essays in Honour of Michio Masui*. Tokyo: Eiho-sha, 619-633.
- . 1998. "Imperatives in Eighteenth-Century Fictional Speech." *Studies in Modern English* 14.
- Görlach, Manfred. 2001. *The Eighteenth-Century English*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Iwasaki, Haruo. 2003. "Jane Austen's Use of Contracted Forms." *Kyorin Daigaku Gaikokugo Gakubu Kiyo* 15.
- Iyeiri, Yoko. 2004. "The Use of the Auxiliary do in Negation in Tom Jones and Some Other Literary Works of the Contemporary Period." Moskowich-Spiegel Fandiño and Begoña Crespo García. (eds.) *New Trends in English Historical Linguistics: an Atlantic View*. Coruña: Universidade da Coruña, 223-240.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Nakamura, Fujio. 1996. "Kotei Meirei Bun ni okeru Jodoshi Do no Hattastu – 17-19 Seiki Shokan karano Kensho." [The Development of the Periphrastic *Do* in Affirmative Imperative Sentences: an Inspection of Epistles in the 17-19th Centuries]. *Mulberry* 45.
- Nonomiya, Ayumi. 2008. "Imperative Sentences in the Eighteenth-Century Novel." Unpublished M. A. Thesis. University of Tokyo.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1999. "Syntax." in Roger Lass (ed.) *The Cambridge History of the English Language Volume III: 1476-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suematsu, Nobuko. 2004. *Jane Austen no Eigo – sono Rekishi, Shakaigengogaku Teki Kenkyu—*. [Jane Austen's English – Its Historical and Sociolinguistic Study –] Tokyo: Kaibunsha.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1983. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. London: Penguin Books.
- Visser, F. H. 1963-73. *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. 3 parts. Leiden: Brill.

Early English Books Online

<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>

Oxford English Dictionary (2nd edition)

<http://www.oed.com/>