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Socio-pragmatic factors in the rise and fall of address terms

1 Introduction

In chapter 2, we saw that there are multiple sources of syncretism in the inflectional paradigm. One potential source for inflectional homophony is politeness. In this chapter, we approach the role of politeness in deflection in Dutch in a roundabout way. We will discuss politeness-related changes in the address term system of Dutch, and we will evaluate the effect of these changes on the verbal paradigm.

The focus on address terms is motivated by evidence for the role of politeness in inflectional homophony that we formulated in chapter 2. In chapter 2, we observed that one piece of independent evidence for the role of pragmatic factors in changes in the inflectional paradigm, is that this change frequently co-occurs with change in the pronominal system. In contrast, morphology-internally motivated change only affects the verbal paradigm. In this chapter, we only discuss changes that comply with the first type of independent empirical evidence that we discussed: all changes co-occur with a change in the pronominal paradigm.

A second piece of independent evidence has to do with socio-pragmatic conditioning. As we saw in chapter 2, we expect changes which are triggered by politeness to arise first in the higher classes and in formal speech. On the other hand, morphology-internally motivated change is expected to arise in informal circumstances first. There is a wide range of literature dealing with the socio-pragmatic factors that influence the choice of address terms in Dutch (Kern 1911, Lulofs 1967, cf. Meert 1890, Muller 1926a, b, Verdenius 1924a, b, Verdenius 1946, Vermaas 2002, 2004, Vor der Hake 1908, 1911, 1915) whereas diachronic information on the effect of socio-pragmatic factors on inflectional markers is at best indirect. Thus, looking at address terms also provides a second type of evidence in support of the notion that politeness strategies induce change within the inflectional paradigm.

In section 2, we present an overview of changes in the pronominal address term system in Dutch. Additionally, we look into the relation between these changes and the changes in the verbal paradigm. On the basis of the data presented in section 2, we conclude that there is one politeness-triggered change that has a profound effect on the verbal paradigm of Dutch, namely the loss of second person singular.
In sections 3 and 4, we evaluate to what extent socio-pragmatic factors can explain the creation of new address forms and the loss of old address forms. Section 3 discusses the role of socio-pragmatic factors from a comparative angle. We formulate the hypothesis that developments in the Dutch address term system which are socio-pragmatically motivated bear resemblance with developments in other languages that developed under similar circumstances.

In section 4, I evaluate the role of socio-pragmatic factors in the rise and fall of address terms by relating changes in the address term system to socio-pragmatic variables that influence the choice for an address marker. The hypothesis is that if a change in the address term system is socio-pragmatically motivated, we should be able to relate the change to socio-pragmatic factors.

In section 5, the results of section 2 are combined with the results from sections 3 and 4. The conclusion of section 5 is that it is the change that has the most profound effect on the verbal paradigm, namely the loss of second person singular, that is unlikely to be motivated solely by socio-pragmatic factors. The loss of second person singular is rare. Additionally, the change is difficult to understand purely on the basis of socio-pragmatic factors. This conclusion forms the impetus for chapter 4, where we discuss formal factors in the loss of second person singular marking.

2 Developments in the Dutch address term system

In this section, we describe changes in the address term system of Dutch. We look into the socio-pragmatic conditioning of the changes and evaluate effects of the changes in the pronominal system on the verbal paradigm. In 2.1 through 2.5, we present an overview of the changes within the address term system. We begin each subsection with a brief schematic overview of the address term system in that particular time period, which is followed by an explanation. The second part of each subsection discusses how changes in the address term system affect the verbal paradigm. In 2.6, we summarize the results of this section.

2.1 Stage I

(1) **Address terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Politeness level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of address terms

In the first stage of the address term system that we will look at, there is one singular form and one plural form of address. Du marks the singular and gi marks the plural. Differences in politeness level are not expressed in the pronoun. It is difficult to
accurately date the first stage since texts written in Dutch before 1250 are scarce and the oldest texts available already depart from the stage described in I (Vor der Hake 1908: 224). We hypothesize that this stage did indeed exist in Dutch because it also existed in all other Germanic (and Romance) languages.

In short, in stage I, politeness does not play a role in the choice of an address form. There are two second person pronouns and the use of these two pronouns is clear: *du* marks the singular and *gi* marks the plural. The verbal inflectional marking of stage I is presented in the paradigm in (2). The verb *kloppen* is selected as an example because this verb plays a central role in chapter 6 on Dutch dialects.

**Paradigm**

(2) The verbal paradigm of *kloppen* (*to knock*); Stage I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>(ic) kloppe</td>
<td>(wi) kloppen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressee</td>
<td>(du) klops</td>
<td>(gi) klopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(hi) klopt</td>
<td>(si) kloppen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inflection**

In the first stage, four inflectional markers mark six functions: -*e* marks first person singular, -*s* marks second person singular, -*n* marks first and third person plural and -*t* marks second person plural and third person singular.\(^1\)

2.2 Stage II

(3) **Address terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Politeness level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td><em>du</em></td>
<td><em>gi</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of address terms**

\(^1\) The form *klopt* and *kloppet* alternate and the form *klops* and *kloppes* alternate (Franck 1910: 113). In a much smaller number of cases, schwa is also deleted in first person, so *klopp* can alternate with *klop* (Franck 1910: 114, Van Bree 2007: 202, 225). The paradigm in (2) reflects the most frequently chosen form variant in the corpus of Middle Dutch texts that I describe in detail in chapter 4. The -*e* for first person singular was originally part of the stem. After -*e* was lost before -*t* and -*s* this part of the stem was most likely reanalyzed as a suffix in first person singular. The suffix -*s* also alternates with the forms -*st* , -*ts* and -*ste*. This form variation does not yield changes in the abstract paradigm: second person singular remains distinctively marked.
In stage II, politeness begins to play a role in the address term system of Dutch: The second person plural pronoun can now also be used as a formal singular form of address (Meert 1890, Vor der Hake 1908). The arrow used in the paradigm in (3) reflects the fact that the use of *gi* as a singular formal pronoun can be interpreted as a metaphorical extension of the plural form to the singular in this stage. As introduced in chapter 2 (page 40), I follow Brown & Gilman (1960) in their use of the letter T which derived from Latin *tu* to refer to informal address forms. The letter V was derived from Latin *vos*, and refers to polite address forms.

The socio-pragmatic conditioning of the use of second person plural forms towards one addressee is in line with politeness-triggered change. The use of second person plural towards singular addressees is first used in literature associated with a more elevated formal style. Substitutions triggered by morphology-internal factors arise in informal contexts first (Vor der Hake 1908).

Since the time period for stage I is obscure, it is also difficult to accurately date the beginning of stage II. We do, however, know the time when polite address forms arose in two other West-Germanic languages. In German, the first use of a plural address form with a singular reference occurred in the third quarter of the ninth century (Simon 2003b: 94). In English, this first occurred in the thirteenth century (Lass 1999: 148, Mustanoja 1960: 126, Wales 1983: 108). We also know polite address forms are already in existence in the thirteenth century in Dutch (Vor der Hake 1908: 224).

**Paradigm**

(4) Verbal paradigm of *kloppen* (‘to knock’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td>(ic) klopp</td>
<td>(wi) kloppen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressee</strong></td>
<td>(du) klops (T)</td>
<td>(gi) klopt (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>(hi) klopt</td>
<td>(si) kloppen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inflection**

In stage II, we still have four inflectional markers, but in polite/formal contexts, the number distinction is neutralized. In polite speech both second person singular and second person plural combine with the inflectional marker –*t*. Not only does the inflectional marker –*t* mark second person, but also third person singular. In formal settings, there is now an overlap in form between the inflectional markers of second and third person singular and of second person plural. In terms of morphology, the verbal paradigms in stage I and stage II are much the same. The only difference
between stage I and II has to do with the extended use of *gi*, whereby speakers use a plural form to refer to singular addressees in formal situations.

2.3 Stage III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Politeness level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gi</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of address terms**

In the third stage, the pronoun *du* is lost. There is only one address form that can be used in both formal and informal contexts and with singular and plural reference. This resembles *you* in present day English. Stage III can be dated back to the sixteenth century, when the use of the pronoun *du* becomes obsolete (Kloekke 1926: 4, Vor der Hake 1915: 241). Vor der Hake (1915: 247) refers to 1618 as ‘the year of death’ for the pronoun *du* because, as Vor der Hake points out, this is the first year where translations of the bible no longer included *du* in the text.
Paradigm

Verbal paradigm of *kloppen* ('to knock'): Stage III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td>(ic) klopp</td>
<td>(wij) kloppen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressee</strong></td>
<td>(gij) klopt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>(hij) klopt</td>
<td>(sij) kloppen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflection

There is a fundamental difference between the verbal paradigms in stage II and stage III: If we compare the verbal paradigm of stage II (as shown in (4)) with the paradigm of stage III (shown in (6)), we see that the inflectional marker –*s* is lost. Instead of four inflectional markers, there are now only three. First person singular is marked with –*e*, first and third person plural are marked with –*en* and second and third person singular and second person plural are marked with –*t*. The inflectional marker –*t* for second person singular can no longer be attributed to a pragmatic rule. It has become part of grammar. There is no context where second person singular and second person plural are differentiated. The inflectional marker of second person and third person singular are homophonous except with some irregular verbs such as *hebben* ('to have') and *zijn* ('to be') and with modal verbs. Accordingly, we see *gij sijt* ('you are') versus *hij is* ('he is') and *gij kunt* ('you can') versus *hij kan* ('he can').

We also see a change in the phonology of pronouns: The [i] is gradually replaced by the diphthong [εi] which is reflected in orthography: *ij*. The rise of the diphthong begins around the fourteenth century in Brabant. The earliest known attestation of the spelling *ij* for [εi] was in 1540 in Antwerp (Van Bree 2007: 121, Van Loey 1970: 92-93).
2.4 Stage IV

Address terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Politeness level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>jij</td>
<td>jelui</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gij</td>
<td>gij lieden</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uwe Edelheid (UE)</td>
<td>UEE</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uwer Liefde (UL)</td>
<td>jouwer Liefde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of address terms

If we compare stage III with stage IV, we see the rise of the new address forms: *Uwe Edelheid* (‘Your Nobility’), *Uwer Liefde* (‘Your Love’), *jij* (‘you’), *jelui* (‘you people’) and *u* (‘you’). We will now look into the origin of each of these new address forms. Let us begin by looking at new polite terms of address. These new polite forms of address can take two forms: (i) they can consist of a possessive pronoun and a metonymic reference to the addressee such as *Uwer Liefde* (‘Your Love’) or *Uwe Edelheid* (‘Your Nobility’) or (ii) they can take the form of an expression using metaphors of size for power such as *Uwe Hoogheid* (‘Your Highness’) and *Uwe Majesteit* (‘Your Majesty’). The address term *Uwer Liefde* (‘Your Love’) rises in Eastern Dutch in the middle ages and enters the Western variant in the seventeenth century. In writing, *Uwer Liefde* (‘Your Love’) is frequently abbreviated to ‘UL’ (De Vooys 1970: 80, Koelmans 1978: 18, Van Loey 1970: 114). The title *Uwe Edelheid* (abbreviated UE) (‘Your Nobility’) is used more frequently than *Uwer Liefde* (‘Your Love’) and is used in Western texts. The form UE is considered more polite than UL (Van Loey 1970: 114). The written abbreviation UE enters the spoken language as uwé, a form that is later associated with the lower classes (De Vooys 1970: 79, Kern 1911: 129, 133).

The rise of address abstractions in Western Dutch can be dated around the seventeenth century (Koelmans 1978, Van Loey 1970). The socio-pragmatic distribution of abstractions is in line with politeness-triggered change. We find abstractions in formal polite contexts (Kern 1911: 128-129). Because address abstractions are the most polite forms of address, and because they are only used in polite contexts, I consider them V.

New polite pronouns are not the only pronouns which are added to the address term inventory in the seventeenth century. In written texts, we also see the
rise of the pronoun *jij*. The pronoun *jij* can be used in polite and non-polite contexts and does not yet seem specified as T or V (Muller 1926b, Vermaas 2002). Because the pronoun *jij* seems underspecified for politeness, we have left empty the quadrant in table (7), which would usually indicate the politeness specification of *jij*. In present day Dutch, *jij* is the T-form. In general, new second person pronouns tend to first have a polite connotation (Braun 1988). I would like to take a brief detour with respect to the origin of the pronoun in order to show why *jij* could be used in informal contexts right away.

There is debate about the precise origin of the pronoun *jij*. *Jij* is the informal singular pronoun of present day Standard Dutch. Standard Dutch has a strong affiliation with Dutch spoken in the province of Holland. The form *jij* resembles the proto-form of the pronoun *gi* (*<ji*). The question is: How should we interpret the absence of *ji/jij* in written texts before 1600? And how can we account for the quick and abrupt rise of *ji/jij* in the following period?

Muller (1926b) claims that *ji/jij* remained part of the spoken language of the province of Holland. He relates the absence of *ji/jij* in written texts with spelling conventions. In Middle Dutch, written *g* was pronounced as *j* if it appeared before *-i* or *-e*. The spelling *gh* was used to reflect *g* before *-e* and *-i*. The *g*- before *-a* and *-u* is pronounced as *g*/. This spelling convention explains why we do find instances of the second person pronoun beginning with *j*- in the non-nominative case. The possessive form and object-form *ju/jou* are not followed by *-e* or *-i* but instead by *-u* or *-ou*. If *g*- precedes *-ou* or *-u*, it yields the pronunciation *g*/. For the pronunciation *j/-, j*- is required and is in fact (rarely) attested in texts.

Muller (1926b: 94 fn1) cites the grammarian Lambert ten Kate, who claims that around 1700, *gij* is used in written texts, while *jij* is used in speech. Moreover, Muller (1926b: 101) cites the grammarian Lambrecht who, in 1550, also claims that some people pronounced *gij* as *jij*.

If the rise of *jij* in texts is merely a spelling-issue, we can understand the quick rise of the pronoun in written texts and the lack of a polite connotation when it appears in these texts. Once the new spelling *jij* is introduced, we see frequent occurrences of the form *jij* in written texts, a form that was already frequently present in the spoken language.

Van der Sijis (2004: 470-472) questions Muller’s hypothesis. She cites two grammarians who deny the replacement of the pronunciation *jij* for *gij* is related to spelling. The first author she cites is De Heuiter (1581). According to De Heuiter, words that are spelled with a *g*- and which precede *-i* and *-e* (such as *gij* (*you*), *geve* (*give*), *gegeven* (*given*) and *gelijk* (*equal*)) are always pronounced as *g*/ and never as *j*/. By denying that *g*- is pronounced as *j*/ in *gij* de Heuiter denies
that the absence of the form *jij* in written texts is merely an effect of spelling conventions. The second grammarian that Van der Sijs (2004) quotes is Van de Schuere, who also denies the claim that the pronunciation of ‘*g*’ depends on the vowel it precedes. In 1612, Van de Schuere observed that the *g*- in *gij* is pronounced exactly like the *g* in the word *God* (‘God’) and *gunst* (‘favour’). He thus claims that the pronunciation of *g* is always /g/ and is independent of the following vowel.

Van der Sijs (2004) follows Verdenius (1924b), who claims that *jij* and *je* came into existence via the inverted word order whereby the verb stem and the clitic –*di* (< *gi* ‘you’) combined such as in *hebdi* (‘have you’). The form –*di* palatalizes into –*je* or –*ji* in the following steps: *hebdi* > *hebdjie* > *hebdzie* > *hebje* and *hebdli* > *hebdji* > *hebdzi* > *hebzi* > *hebji*. The observation that almost all of the oldest attested forms of *je* and *jij* appear in the inverted word order (Verdenius 1924b: 87) corroborates the hypothesis that *jij* came into existence via the inverted word order.

For Muller (1926b), one drawback of the inverted word-order hypothesis is that there is no sufficient explanation for the existence of the object-form *jou* and the possessive form *jouw*. In present day Dutch, the subject-form *jij* is associated with the object-form *jou* and the possessive form *jouw*. All *j*‐forms: *jij*, *jou* and *jouw* are thus related. If we assume that *j*‐forms are relatively new, we can explain the existence of *jij* as the result of a clitic form that became independent. If we accept this, however, we need an additional explanation for the existence of *jou* and *jouw*. Muller (1926b) claims that it is more elegant to have one explanation for the existence of all *j*‐forms. His claim that all *j*‐forms already existed in Hollandic dialects provides one explanation for the existence of *j*‐forms in present day Dutch.

Van der Sijs (2004: 472-473) addresses Muller’s questions who relates the rise of *j*‐forms *jou(w)* to the influence of German immigrants, who spoke Lower German. Lower German includes the second person forms: subject *ji* and object *ju*. Van der Sijs (2004) assumes that Lower German *ji* is associated with the Dutch form *jij* that arose from the inverted order. This connection between *jij* and *ji* also facilitates the adoption of Lower German *ju* in the pronunciation *jou*.

From the perspective of Van der Sijs, the rise of the *jij* and *jou* under question are separate innovations. *Jij* arose via the inverted order and *jou* via language contact with Lower German immigrants. An observation that supports this hypothesis is the observation that until the nineteenth century, the pronouns *jij* and *je* combine with the non‐nominative form *u*, the non‐nominative form that is now associated with the pronoun *gij* (Buitenrust Hettema 1891: 149)

Van der Sijs (2004) assumes that early descriptions of the pronunciation *jij* for *gij* as described by Muller (1926a) can be related to the pronunciation of *gij* from
immigrants from Germany and from the Eastern part of the Netherlands. They pronounced gij as jij.  

In short, there are two explanations for the rise of the pronoun jij. The first hypothesis is that the form already existed in the spoken language and that the appearance of jij in written texts can be related to changes in spelling conventions. The second hypothesis is that jij came into existence in the inverted word order as part of the spoken language. The extension of the j-forms to non-subjects and the non-inverted word order is related to language contact with Lower German. Lower German did not have overt prestige.

More quantitative information on the use of jij and je in the inverted and the non-inverted order, and more quantitative information on the pronoun jou in combination with more information on spelling conventions in the seventeenth century texts should help in distinguishing between the two hypotheses. For now it is sufficient to know that the pronoun jij is related to the pronoun gij and that the pronoun jij is associated with the spoken language.

It is common for new address forms to have a polite association (cf. Braun 1988). The relation between jij and gij, either as a local variant, or as a reanalyzed variant of gij, in the inverted word order, shows that jij was not actually a new polite form. This would explain why jij never had a special polite connotation in texts. The relation of jij with the spoken language, either as the indigenous form or as the form that came into existence in the inverted word order, explains why jij is used in informal registers.

Now that we have concluded our detour on the origin of jij, let us continue describing the difference between stage III and stage IV by looking into a change in address forms which is indirectly related to politeness strategies. The loss of second person singular pronoun du implied number neutralization in the plural. In the seventeenth century, we see the rise of plural marking on pronouns in the form lieden/lui (‘people’) in jelui (‘you people’) and gijlieden (‘you people’). This restores the number distinction in second person marking (Verdenius 1938: 206). In the second half of the nineteenth century, the form jelui is slowly replaced by the pronoun jullie (Verdenius 1938: 206-207).

A final change between stage III and stage IV concerns the pronoun u. In Middle Dutch, the form u was traditionally used as the non-nominative form of gij. In present-day Standard Dutch, the form u has a polite connotation, and can be used in subject and non-subject position. The origin of subject u with a polite association is not clear. Likewise, we would like to discuss possible origins in the following.

---

2 Listen (1999: 32) shows that in Lower German we find the subject-pronoun gij combining with the object-form yu/ju. The absence of a j- subject is related to spelling conventions in Lower German.
Some authors claim that subject \textit{u} is a grammaticized form of the address abstraction \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’) or of \textit{uwé} (the abbreviated form of \textit{Uwe Edelheid}) (Van der Wal & Van Bree 1992). This claim helps explain why \textit{u} has regained a polite association and why \textit{u} appears in subject position. Others (Vor der Hake 1911) claim that the \textit{u} arose when speakers overgeneralized the object and possessive form of \textit{u} to subject position.

Paardekoper (1948, 1950, 1987, 1988) has a very specific interpretation of the overgeneralization hypothesis. First, Paardekoper argues that Hollandic Dutch originally had \textit{j}-forms as second person markers. One of these \textit{j}-forms (\textit{je}) can be used in subject and non-subject positions. Paardekoper (1988: 64) claims that overgeneralization of the possessive/object form \textit{u} to the subject position received an extra impulse from the lack of formal case distinction in the pronoun \textit{je}. Since it is not clear when \textit{je} became part of Hollandic Dutch, the validity of Paardekoper’s hypothesis remains undetermined.

Vor der Hake’s (1911) hypothesis fits in with a more general trend of form reduction in pronouns. The problem with this hypothesis, however, is that it does not fit in with the observation that polite forms tend to be conservative and retain form distinctions (cf. Posner 1997: 306). Paardekoper deals with this problem by relating the lack of case distinction in \textit{u} to the lack of case distinction in the pronoun \textit{je}. Kern (1911: 123), however, claims that there is another problem with the overgeneralization hypothesis. Kern claims that the pronoun \textit{u} in the nineteenth century is attested primarily in higher classes in formal situations. If the use of \textit{u} is an internally motivated overgeneralization of the object and possessive form, we would expect to find the pronoun, primarily in informal situations.

The advantage of the hypothesis that \textit{u} is a grammaticized form of \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’) is that we can understand the socio-pragmatic distribution of the pronoun in formal situations and in the higher classes. A disadvantage of the grammaticization hypothesis is that the reduction of the form \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’) or \textit{uwé} to \textit{u} is unlikely. If \textit{u} originates from the full title \textit{Uwe Edelheid} we expect to find evidence for a piecemeal phonological reduction for this title. In Spanish, for example, we find evidence for the piecemeal phonological reduction of the title \textit{Vuestra Merced} (‘Your Grace’) to the pronoun \textit{usted}: \textit{Vuestra Merced} > \textit{vuesa merced} > \textit{vuessarced} > \textit{vuessansted} > \textit{vuessasted} > \textit{voarced} > \textit{vuested} > \textit{usted} (Penny 1991: 125). There is no evidence for such piecemeal reduction from \textit{Uwe Edelheid} to \textit{u} in Dutch. A second possibility is that \textit{u} is derived from the abbreviation \textit{uwé}. The problem is that \textit{uwé} carries stress on the second syllable -\textit{wé}. In phonological reduction, we expect retention of the stressed syllable -\textit{wé} rather than of the unstressed syllable \textit{u} (Kern 1911:131).
A second disadvantage of this hypothesis is that the title is not frequently used until the seventeenth century. Paardekoper (1996: 70) finds evidence for the use of subject-\textit{u} in the sixteenth century. In contrast to what Kern (1911) observes, the early uses of \textit{u} appear in non-polite contexts in the nineteenth century. These two pieces of evidence make it unlikely that \textit{u} arose from \textit{Uwe Edelheid}

The third explanation for the rise of \textit{u} combines the merits of both hypotheses. Muller (1926a) and Kern (1911) argue that the use of \textit{u} in subject position in polite contexts is the combined effect of overgeneralization of the object and possessive form and the use of titles such as \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’). Overgeneralization yielded use of \textit{u} in subject position. The use of \textit{u} in subject position in polite contexts is sanctioned by phonological similarity between \textit{u} on the one hand and \textit{uwé} and \textit{Uwe Edelheid} on the other.

On the basis of results from Paardekoper (1996), we can be more explicit than Muller and Kern about the timing of overgeneralization and the association between polite titles and the pronoun \textit{u}. \textit{U} was initially the result of morphologically motivated overgeneralization in the pronoun \textit{gij}. At the end of the sixteenth century, there is still no difference in terms of politeness between the forms \textit{gij}, \textit{jij} and \textit{u} (Muller 1926a: 121). Deflection (in this case, the replacement of the subject-form by an object and possessive form) in an address form that is not specified for politeness is likely.

The second step in the rise of subject-\textit{u} does not begin until the nineteenth century. It is not until the nineteenth century, that \textit{u}-subject is frequently attested in printed text (Van der Sijs 2004). Kern (1911) bases his observations on the socio-pragmatic distribution of subject-\textit{u} on printed texts from the nineteenth century. Paardekoper (1996) uses letters and other handwritten texts from the sixteenth century. In these texts, subject-\textit{u} is not yet used as a polite form of address. Paardekoper (1996) claims that it is not accidental that he finds subject-\textit{u} only in handwritten texts. He claims that publishers likely filtered out the use of subject-\textit{u} even though it was still part of the spoken language.

In the nineteenth century, subject-\textit{u} gained a polite connotation, perhaps via the association with the title \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’) and the abbreviated form \textit{uwé}. The spread of this polite \textit{u} begins in the higher classes in formal settings. \textit{U} is thus an overgeneralized object/possessive form. Because of its formal similarity with the titles \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’) and \textit{uwé}, it becomes associated with politeness (Kern 1911, Vor der Hake 1911: 132-133).

The difference between the two non-nominative object and possessive forms \textit{u(w)} and \textit{jou(w)} is not related to politeness in the nineteenth century, but instead to style. The form \textit{jou} is considered informal and sometimes even vulgar.
Both the pronoun *u* and the pronoun *jou* co-occur with the subject-pronoun *jij*. In present-day Dutch, the non-nominative form *u* is only used in polite contexts, whereas *jou* is the non-nominative form of the informal term of address. The rise of polite subject-*u* might have facilitated the polite association of non-nominative *u*.

To conclude our detour on subject-*u*, we now know that there were early appearances of subject-*u* at the end of the sixteenth century, but in the sixteenth century subject-*u* was not yet considered a polite form. Because of its early appearance and because of its early occurrence in non-polite contexts, subject-*u* cannot be directly linked to the title *Uwe Edelheid* (‘Your Nobility’). The pronoun *u* gains polite connotations in the nineteenth century, perhaps via association with the abbreviated form of *Uwe Edelheid* (‘Your Nobility’), namely *uwé*.

Let us recapitulate the changes from stage III to stage IV. Apart from the rise of abstractions as polite forms of address, we have also seen the rise of the pronoun *jij* and the creation of second person plural pronouns such as *jelui* (‘you people’) and *gijieden* (‘you people’). In non-printed texts, we find the first attested uses of subject-*u*. At this point, subject-*u* does not yet seem to have a polite connotation. Because the pronouns *jij*, *gij* and *u* can be used in polite and non-polite contexts, they have no specification for T or V in table (7) and table (8). Abstractions are only used in polite contexts and are therefore specified as V in table (7) and table (8).

### Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(8) Verbal paradigm of <em>kloppen</em> (‘to knock’): Stage IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ic) <em>klop</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(wij) <em>kloppen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hij) <em>klopt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inflection

Although many changes occurred in the address term system, the impact in verbal inflection is minimal. Inflectional marking in combination with jelui (‘you people’) equals inflectional marking in combination with the pronoun jij/je and therefore does not change the verbal paradigm. The number distinction in combination with the formal pronoun gij can be made explicit on the pronoun by the addition of: liedend (‘people’), but the number distinction remains neutralized on the verb.

Abstractions such as Uwe Edelheid (‘Your Nobility’) and Uwer Liefde (‘Your Love’) are nouns. We expect nouns to combine with third person agreement. But for regular verbs, both second and third person combine with the inflectional marker –t. Consequently, we cannot distinguish second and third person. However, some verbs act differently. For modal verbs, and in the verbs zijn (‘to be’) and hebben (‘to have’), second and third person are formally distinguished. In these verbs, we see that abstractions like Uwe Edelheid (‘Your Nobility’) do indeed combine with third person inflection.

Whereas full titles combine with third person inflection, abbreviated forms like UE/uwe appear both with second and third person inflection (Koelmans 1978: 17-18, Van Loey 1970: 114). Regular verbs which are not inverted do not differentiate between second and third person. Consequently, introducing abbreviated titles to the address term system has little effect on the inflectional paradigm.

In present day Dutch, subject -u combines with third person inflection. The few instances of subject-u in stage IV (as described in Paardekoper (1996: 70) and Kloeke (1948: 286)) suggest that the first occurrences of u-subject actually combined with second person inflection. Paardekoper (1996) and Kloeke (1948) offer three examples which illustrate that it is possible to distinguish second and third person marking. The combination ’u hebt’ (‘you have’) appears once and the combination ’u zult’ (‘you shall’) appears twice. These combinations are explicitly marked for second person.

The pronoun jij combines with -t in the non-inverted word order just like the pronoun gij. In the inverted word order, the inflectional marker –t is lost (Buitenrust Hettema 1891, Verdenius 1924a, b). The absence of the suffix –t in the inverted word order is frequently used as support for the hypothesis that jij originates from the inverted word order. The reanalysis of hebdi (‘have you’) to hebji (‘have you’) (hebdi> hebdji> hebdzi> hebzi> hebji) implied a loss of the dental. Loss of the inflectional marker in the inverted word order, however, also occurs in other languages and in most cases, is independent of changes in the pronominal system (Ackema & Neeleman 2004: 183-232, Van Gelderen 2000: 188-
Since the use of the pronoun *jij* and loss of the suffix –*t* is attested early in informal contexts, we cannot associate the use of *jij* or the absence of the suffix –*t* with politeness.

### 2.5 Stage V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Politeness level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td><em>jij</em></td>
<td><em>jullie</em></td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>jullie</em></td>
<td><em>-</em></td>
<td>T/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>u</em></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of address terms**

In stage V, we only see a number distinction with the informal pronouns: *jij* marks the singular and *jullie* (*< jij lui 'you people'*) marks the plural. Verdenius (1938: 207) dates the appearance of *jullie* to texts in the nineteenth century. In the nineteenth century, the pronoun *gij* becomes obsolete. In his description of Dutch address forms, Buitenrust Hettema (1891: 149) notes that, at the end of the nineteenth century, *gij* is only used in the church and in formal written language. The choice to omit *gij* from Dutch bible translations was made in 2003 (NBG/KBS 2003: 258, 259). Not only is the pronoun *gij* lost in the second half of the twentieth century, but the use of abstractions as address forms is also reduced. Subject-*u* became a polite pronoun in the nineteenth century and can be used in the singular and in the plural.

Although we see a reduction of polite address forms, i.e. the reduction of the use of abstractions such as *Uwe Edelheid* (‘Your Nobility’) and the loss of *gij*, we also observe an increase in the use of intermediate address forms that are indirect but less formal than *u*. These intermediate forms are indicated as T or V in (10). The first example is the phonologically reduced variant of *jij*: *je* (Vermaas 2002: 79). Weerman (2006) shows that *je* can fulfill a function that *jij* cannot: only *je* can function as a generic pronoun (See 10a). Example (10b) is ungrammatical if a generic reading is intended.

(10)  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>Je leeft maar één keer.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>Jij leeft maar één keer.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You live but one time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘You live only once’ / ‘One lives only once’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The possibility to interpret *je* as a generic pronoun facilitates its use in more formal contexts (Aalberse 2004a: 61-65). In table (9), we refer to pronouns that are intermediates between polite and non-polite address forms (such as *je*) as ‘T/V’.

The second address form that is less polite than *u* but more indirect than *jij* is the use of the plural pronoun *jullie* towards one addressee (Vermaas 2004: 64-66). The use of the plural pronoun *jullie* (‘you people’) is a metaphorical extension of the plural form to the singular and is marked with an arrow in (9). The oldest documented example of the use of *jullie* with a singular referent dates back to 1954 (Vermaas 2004: 65). In cases where *jullie* is used to refer to a single addressee, the hearer is addressed as a representative of a group, rather than as an individual. A more recent example of the use of *jullie* towards a single addressee is given in (11) (from Vermaas 2004: 65).

(11)  
*Jullie moeten zorgen dat ze nu wordt opgenomen*  
You must ensure that she now gets hospitalized  
‘You (pl) have to make sure that she gets hospitalized now’

In sentence (11), a woman tries to persuade a doctor to hospitalize her mother. Although she addresses only one physician, she uses the plural form *jullie*. The doctor is addressed as a representative of the group of doctors rather than as an individual. The use of a plural pronoun towards one doctor makes the request less direct than if *jij* had been used, and, at the same time, more informal and solidary than if *u* had been chosen. Because the pronoun *jullie* can be used in solidary and polite contexts, I have categorized the pronoun *jullie* as T/V in (9).

In summary, we have seen two tendencies emerge in the comparison of stage IV and stage V. First of all, the number of polite forms has decreased. The only polite pronoun left is *u* and this address form can be used in the singular and in the plural. The second tendency is the rise of intermediate address forms (*je* and *jullie*) in the singular, which are more indirect than *jij* and less formal than *u*. These intermediate address forms arise in contexts that require both formality and solidarity (Aalberse 2004a, Vermaas 2002, 2004). The socio-pragmatic distribution of the intermediate address forms supports the role of politeness in the substitution pattern.
Paradigm
(12) Verbal paradigm of kloppen (‘to knock’): Stage 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td>(ic) klop</td>
<td>(wij) kloppen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressee</strong></td>
<td>(jij) klopt (T)</td>
<td>(jullie) kloppen (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(je) klopt (T/V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(jullie) kloppen (T/V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>(hij) klopt</td>
<td>(zij) kloppen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inflection

The effect of the changes in the address term system on the inflectional paradigm is negligible. All address terms except the pronoun jullie combine with an inflectional marker -t in the non-inverted word order. The pronoun je is a phonologically reduced form of jij, and therefore combines with the same inflectional marker. The use of the plural pronoun jullie (‘you people’) is a metaphorical extension of the plural form to the singular. If we compare stage IV with stage V, we see one profound change in the inflectional paradigm of regular verbs; the pronoun jullie combines with the general plural inflection marker -en. -En as a marker for second person plural begins to appear at the end of the nineteenth century (Verdenius 1938: 211). Buitenrust Hettema (1891) shows that the inflectional marker -en occurs first in informal situations and, according to him, has a vulgar association. This distribution suggests that the appearance of the suffix -en is not motivated by politeness, but instead by feature structure. Because this change in inflection marking is not related to politeness, it will not be discussed in detail until chapter 6.

Subject- u can combine with second and third person inflection. What is interesting is that in formal language, the preferred form of inflection in combination with the pronoun u depends on the category of the verb. For modal verbs, the most appropriate form of inflection is specifically marked for second person. So the forms u kunt (‘you can’) and u zult (‘you shall’) (which have second person inflection) are considered more formal than the combinations u kan (‘you can’) and u zal (‘you shall’), where u combines with third person agreement. In contrast, third person agreement is considered somewhat more formal in combination with the verb hebben (‘to have’) and extremely formal and archaic in combination with the verb zijn (‘to be’). So, u heeft (with third person agreement), is slightly more formal than u hebt (with second person agreement) and the form u is (‘you are’) (with third person agreement) is very formal. The most common form is u bent (‘you are’).

The observation that third person agreement is possible in combination with \textit{u}, is sometimes used as an argument to support the hypothesis that \textit{u} is an abbreviated form of \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’). The third person origin of this pronoun would explain third person agreement (cf. Van der Wal & Van Bree 1992).

The first uses of the pronoun \textit{u}, however, do not show third person agreement and as we saw, third person agreement is not the preferred form of agreement for all verbs.

For modal verbs, in polite speech, second person finite verbs are more appropriate than third person forms.

One possible explanation for the observation that we sometimes find second and third person inflection in combination with the pronoun \textit{u} is that the choice for a finite verb in combination with \textit{u} is the result of a politeness strategy.

According to this explanation, speakers refrain from using the finite verb, which is unmarked and informal in non-polite speech. In modal verbs, we find that person marking is absent in informal speech. The use of a modal verb that is specified for second person is more marked. This marked form is the preferred form in polite speech. In the verbs \textit{hebben} (‘to have’) and \textit{zijn} (‘to be’), the second person singular form is unmarked in non-polite speech. To refrain from using the unmarked second person singular form, we sometimes observe the use of third person singular forms in combination with \textit{u} with the verbs \textit{hebben} and \textit{zijn}. A similar strategy is also described by Simon (2003a), who looked at case marking in Bavarian German. (Simon 2003a: 107-108).

2.6 Summary

We have seen seven changes in the development of address pronouns in Dutch: (i) the introduction of the plural pronoun \textit{gi} as a reference marker to a singular addressee; (ii) the loss of the original second person singular marker \textit{du}; (iii) the rise and loss of titles and abstraction such as \textit{Uwe Edelheid} (‘Your Nobility’); (iv) the introduction of \textit{jij}; (v) the introduction of subject – \textit{u}; (vi) the introduction of a new plural form \textit{jelui} (‘you people’) and related to that, the rise of the form \textit{jullie} (< \textit{jij lui} ‘you people’) and finally; (vii) the rise of the intermediate address forms \textit{je} and \textit{jullie}.

A schematic diachronic overview of the pronominal system is given in (13). A pronoun between brackets indicates that the pronoun is rarely used in that particular time period. It should also be kept in mind that \textit{gi} is not new to the pronominal paradigm. Rather, its function as a polite pronoun is new. For this reason, its
functions are separately marked in the first periods. The label ‘plural’ indicates the use of gi as a second person plural pronoun, while the label ‘V’ indicates the use of gi as a formal singular form of address. Once the pronoun du becomes obsolete, gi(j) becomes a multi purpose pronoun and its functions are no longer separately marked in table (13).

(13) Diachronic overview of Dutch address pronouns (subjects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;1200</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>1400</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jullie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gi</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>gj</td>
<td>gj</td>
<td>gj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur</td>
<td>plur</td>
<td>plur</td>
<td>plur</td>
<td>plur</td>
<td>gij</td>
<td>gij</td>
<td>gij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(gij)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>(du)</td>
<td>(du)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the number of changes in the address term system is relatively large, the effects of changes in the address term system on the inflectional paradigm are marginal. First of all, almost all polite address forms combine with the inflectional marker –t. This is true for gi(j), jij, Uwe Edelheid (‘Your Nobility’) and u-subject. Since most of the address terms combined with the same suffix –t, the fact that Dutch had multiple polite address forms resulted in few changes within the inflectional paradigm.

There are a few changes with regard to second person which had a more profound effect on the verbal paradigm. The first change is the loss of second person plural –t, in favour of a general plural marker –en. This change, however, occurred independent of the changes in the pronominal paradigm.

There is another change involving second person plural that does concern a combined substitution of the pronoun and inflection. The plural pronoun jullie in combination with plural inflection can be used in the singular as an intermediate address form. This combined substitution is optional, however, and it has not yet grammaticized. The use of plural jullie and plural inflection in the singular is nothing more than a metaphorical extension of the plural to the singular.
The only change in the verbal paradigm that is connected to a pronoun and that has grammaticized is the loss of the second person singular pronoun *du* in combination with the suffix *-s*. The loss of the original second person singular marker does not only imply number neutralization, but at the same time, neutralization of the distinction between second and third person singular in the regular verbs. Both second and third person singular now combine with the suffix *-t*.

We observed that the rise of second person plural forms as a singular form of address is connected to politeness. The role of politeness is evidenced by the observation that the use of plural inflection co-occurs with the use of a plural pronoun. The role of politeness in the use of second person plural marking is also confirmed by the socio-pragmatic distribution of the substitution. We find substitution first in formal settings. Politeness-triggered change occurs first in formal settings. The observation that the first attested uses of second person plural forms towards a singular addressee are triggered by politeness does not yet reveal the cause of the loss of second person singular forms. In section 3 and 4 I evaluate to what extent socio-pragmatic factors can explain the creation of new address forms and the loss of old address forms that we observed in this section.

3 Cross-linguistic comparison of changes in address terms

In this section, I will compare developments in the Dutch address term system with developments in the address term system in other European languages. The hypothesis is that developments in the Dutch address term system which are socio-pragmatically motivated bear resemblance to developments in other languages that developed under similar circumstances. Of course, no language developed under the exact same socio-pragmatic circumstance as Dutch, but the evolution in address terms in European languages is similar enough (Brown & Gilman 1960: 175, Yli-Vakkuri 2003: 189) to make a fruitful comparison.

In table (14), a schematic overview of address terms in a number of languages spoken in Europe is presented. 3

---

In table (14), pronouns which are still used today are indicated in bold. The address forms printed in italics have ceased to be used. The fifth column in table (14): ‘origin of V’ deserves some more detailed clarification. The label 2p is used for
polite singular pronouns that derive from the second person plural. Table (14) shows that almost all languages listed have, at some point, used a second person plural form as a singular polite form. In some languages, such as French (vous), Turkish (siz) and Finnish (te), the second person plural pronoun is still used as a polite singular form of address.

Following Jucker & Taavitsainen (2003: 4) pronouns that derive from titles or from ‘abstractions of address’ are marked with the label ‘respectful title’ in the column titled ‘origin of V’ in table (14). Examples of respectful titles are My Lord, My Lady, Master and Mistress. Examples of abstractions of address are the use of metonymic forms of address such as Your Grace, Your Honour and Your Well-learnedness (examples taken from Simon 2006) and metaphoric forms of address such as Your Highness and Your Majesty. The labels ‘3s’ and ‘3p’ refer to the use of a third person singular and third person plural pronoun as polite singular forms of address.

A striking conclusion that can be drawn from table (14) is that variation in the V-pronouns is larger than in the T-pronouns. In Spanish, Italian, Dutch, German, Polish, Portuguese, Czech, Norwegian, and Hungarian, there is evidence for the use of more than one polite pronoun. In German, we even see the use of four different polite pronouns. It is likely that more detailed diachronic evidence would reveal that some languages had more polite pronouns. Additionally, table (14) only takes pronouns into consideration. It does not show that most languages also used titles and abstractions as polite forms of address. The absence of full titles and abstractions in (14) increases the readability of the table but reduces the visibility of the large number of V-forms in most European languages. All languages from our selection that belong to Indo-European languages, apart from English and Dutch, have a cognate of the pronoun tu as a T-form. The fact that all languages have the same T-form shows that the T-form is very stable.

Intermediate address forms such as jullie and je (as described in section 2.4) are only scarcely attested in the literature, and are therefore not included in table (14). There is an example of the use of German address forms that resembles intermediate address forms in Dutch: Hickey (2003: 416) shows that –te, (the phonetically reduced form of the German T-pronoun du) can be interpreted as a generic pronoun, just like je in Dutch. Hickey (2003) claims that the phonetically reduced form is more acceptable in V-contexts than the full pronoun du. A likely cause for the lack of information regarding intermediate address terms is that the use of intermediate address forms is inconspicuous. The reason for the absence of information on T/V-forms is thus superficial. In contrast, the explanation for the scarcity of descriptions of T-loss must be deeper. The fact that almost all T-
Socio-pragmatic factors in the rise and fall of address terms

pronouns are similar with the form *tu* suggests that the absence of T-loss is more than just a lacuna in the address term literature. Most languages have just kept their original T-form.

In sum, we see that all languages in table (14) (except for Hungarian) did, at least at some point in their history, use a second person plural pronoun towards one addressee in polite contexts. Most languages used a variety of V-forms and many have since lost them. New V-pronouns derive from grammaticized titles and third person pronouns. Apart from English and Dutch, no language shows loss of the T-pronoun.

Our hypothesis stated that: socio-pragmatically motivated developments in the Dutch address term system bear resemblance to developments in other languages which developed under similar circumstances. Through cross-linguistic comparison, it is clear that the introduction of new polite pronouns is quite common and the loss of the original second person singular is rare. The relative rareness of the loss of a T-pronoun suggests that the loss is not only socio-pragmatically motivated. In section 4, we will discuss the role of socio-pragmatic factors in the rise and fall of address forms by relating changes in the address term system with socio-pragmatic variables that influence the choice for an address marker.

4 Socio-pragmatic variables in address term choice

In section 3, we saw that, cross-linguistically, the rise and fall of new polite address forms is common, whereas the loss and rise of new T-forms is rare. We interpreted the rareness of T-loss as an indicator that changes might not be solely motivated by socio-pragmatic factors. In this section, we will investigate what kinds of socio-pragmatic variables influence a speaker’s choice between T and V. There are various socio-pragmatic variables that influence the choice between T and V (Braun 1988, Brown & Gilman 1960, 1989, Clyne, Kretzenbacher, Norrby & Schupbach 2006a, Mühlhauser & Harré 1990, Vermaas 2002, Wales 1983, 1996, Walker 2003, 2005). I grouped these variables under the heading: ‘interpersonal relations’ and ‘identity marking’. Section 4.1 evaluates to what extent changes in the address term system are motivated by interpersonal factors such as status differences between the speaker and the addressee. Section 4.2 describes how changes in the address term system are related to identity marking.

4.1 Interpersonal relations: status and solidarity

the term *status* instead of power, but the general idea remains the same: the higher the social status, the more power, and consequently, the more likely a V-form will be used. In this subsection, I focus on the variable ‘status’ on the interpersonal level, i.e. how differences in social status between the speaker and hearer influence the choice of address terms. A speaker with higher status than the addressee is likely to use a T form, and a speaker with a lower status than the addressee is likely to use a V form. Vor der Hake (1908: 98), for example, shows that, in the epic *Esopet*, the small and powerless animals address the large and powerful animals with V, whereas the large and powerful animals address the small and powerless animals with T. So the mouse addresses the lion with V but the lion addresses the mouse with T. Similarly, the lamb addresses the wolf with V but the wolf addresses the lamb with T. The use of V in non-reciprocal relations is motivated by the wish to express deference to the addressee and to be indirect.

Research on second person pronouns in early modern English by Walker (2005: 79, 115, 192) corroborates the idea that power differences affect one’s pronoun choice. In all three genres investigated (trials, depositions and dramas), Walker (2005) finds a significant effect of class in the choice for an address term. Walker reports that those with lower social ranking are more frequently referred to with *thou* and those with higher social ranking are more likely to be referred to as *you*. The lower the rank of the addressee, the more *thou* is received and the higher the rank, the more *you* is given. No one is addressed as *thou* by a lower rank. *Thou* is only used to address power-equals or to people with a lower status.

The second interpersonal factor that defines the relationship between the speaker and addressee is solidarity or intimacy. The pronoun choice may either reflect (i) the level of intimacy/solidarity in a given speech situation, or (ii) the duration and the intensity of the relation between the speech act participants over a greater time span. Brown & Gilman (1989: 159) refer to the former type of solidarity marking as ‘affect’ and to the latter type as ‘interactive closeness’. In interactive closeness languages, T is more likely to occur when the speaker and the addressee know each other for a longer period of time and/or when the contact between the speaker and the hearer is intense. In some present day European languages, it is possible to address colleagues with T. This T-form does not necessarily express intimacy between the colleagues. The choice for the pronoun is unrelated to discourse topics. The use of T is merely a linguistic expression of frequent contact and/or common vocational ground. Once the decision is made to address each other with T, a switch to V is only possible in very exceptional occasions.
Brown & Gilman (1989) claim that, in contrast to present day European languages, Early Middle English had an affect address system. It is likely that all European languages started out as affect languages and grew into interactive closeness languages (cf. Brown & Gilman 1960: 254, Ehrismann 1902, Ganter 1905: 23-26, Simon 2003a: 89, Vor der Hake 1908: 27). In languages that express affect via the pronoun, strong feelings between the speaker and the addressee increase the likelihood of T. Simon (2003a: 90) uses an excerpt from *Nibelungenlied* where Gunther, the Burgundian king, talks with his friend and confidant Siegfried. In the beginning of the conversation, both Gunther and Siegfried address each other with V, but once Gunther begins to talk about his embarrassing wedding night, both speech act participants switch to T.

A famous example where T-use is motivated by affect in Middle Dutch comes from one of the Dutch versions of *Reynard the Fox*. The bear Bruun only departs from the standard courtly V-form when Reynard talks about honey. He asks Reynard:

(15) *Wat aetstu?* (Lulofs 1967: 242)

   What ate thou?

   ‘What did you (=T) eat?’

Lulofs (1967: 252) interprets Bruun’s T-form usage as a strategy to create solidarity between Reynard and the bear in order to move Reynard to obtain some honey. A different version of *Reynard the Fox* supports the hypothesis that, in this case, T-use is a positive politeness strategy. In manuscript P, the bear asks:

(16) *Lief Reynaer wat aet ghi?*

   Kind Reynard what ate you?

   Kind Reynard what did you (=V) eat?’

(Lulofs 1967: 242)

Instead of using a T addressee form, the bear adds the adjective *lief* (‘kind’) to Reynard’s name. The use of the adjective *lief* is, indisputably, a type of a positive politeness strategy. One might argue that one positive politeness strategy replaced another: the use of an expression which exaggerated sympathy via the adjective *lief* (‘kind’) replaced the use of T (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987: 106). The strategies used by Gunther and Bruun are typical uses of affect influencing speakers’ address term selections. There is one important difference between affect-motivated and
interactive closeness systems. In the prior, it is completely acceptable to switch back and forth between T and V. In the latter, the choice is, for the most part, irreversible.

In sum, we have seen two main factors which influence a speaker’s choice between T and V: status and solidarity. High status of the addressee increases the likelihood of V-use; solidarity between addressees increases the likelihood of T-use. Solidarity is determined either by interactive closeness or by affect. A prototypical V situation is characterized as [+power] and [-solidary], which means that the addressee is more powerful than the speaker and that the speaker and the addressee are not solidary. An example of a prototypical V-situation is a servant who addresses an unfamiliar powerful visitor with V. The prototypical T situation can be characterized as [-power] and [+solidary], which means that the addressee is less powerful than the speaker and that the speaker and the addressee are solidary with each other. An example of a prototypical T-situation is a parent who addresses his/her child with T.

The question now is: What happens if the power and the solidarity parameters clash? Brown & Gilman (1960) show that societies differ in their rankings of the power and solidarity parameters. They claim that European societies ranked the power parameter higher than the solidarity parameter until the midst of the twentieth century and that in present day European languages, the solidarity parameter is ranked higher. The reversal of the ranking of these two parameters is relevant in non-prototypical address form situations. Addressing a waiter in a restaurant would be characterized as [-power] and [-solidary]. In the nineteenth century, a waiter would be addressed with T because of the [-power] parameter. In the twenty-first century, V-form is used because of the [-solidarity] parameter. In the former situation, the T-form expressed that the waiter is lower in rank than the customer. In the latter situation, using the V-form creates distance.

Thus far, we have seen that interpersonal factors can be grouped around two main themes: power and solidarity. There are two types of solidarity that can be expressed linguistically: affect or interactive closeness. Languages differ with respect to the way they rank the power and solidarity parameters. Medieval European languages were most likely all affect-oriented and they ranked power over solidarity. The question now is: How do the functions of address terms impact change in the address term system? In subsection 4.1.1, I discuss the effects of interpersonal variables on developments in the V-pronoun. In subsection 4.1.2 I discuss the effects of interpersonal variables on developments in the T-pronoun.
4.1.1 Interpersonal factors and the rise and fall of V-forms

To understand the effect of interpersonal variables on changes in the address term system, let us begin by looking at the interpersonal motivation for V-use. The most important function of a polite address term in non-reciprocal power relations is to express deference and to formulate indirectly. The greater the power of the addressee over the speaker, the more important indirectness is and, generally speaking, the more important negative politeness becomes (cf. Brown & Levinson 1987, Brown & Gilman 1989). Brown & Gilman (1960: 157-158) illustrate that polite V (Maley 1972) entered European speech as a form to address the principal power in the state. It was eventually generalized to the powers within the microcosm of the nuclear family. There is not only an increase in the amount of people who receive V, but the number of situations where V is used as an address form also increases. Eventually, V-use increases so much that T-use becomes rare. This trend was documented in a number of languages including Early Modern English (Walker 2005), Middle Dutch (Vor der Hake 1908), and seventeenth century French (Maley 1972: 1000-1001).

The change from V as an exclusive pronoun in special circumstances towards people with high prestige towards a more general pronoun implies loss of exclusivity and deferential power for the V-form. Moreover, once the frequency with which a politeness form is used increases, the address form becomes automatized and loses much of its indirect qualities (cf. Braun 1988: 59-60, Dik & Hengeveld 1997: 46, Listen 1999). Both loss of exclusiveness and loss of indirect qualities of the V-pronoun motivate the need for a new polite pronoun. Abstractions such as *Uwe Edelheid* (‘Your Nobility’) fill in this gap. The function of V as an indicator of indirectness and deference thus explains the rise of new polite address forms. With the rise of new polite pronouns, we can also understand the fall of old polite pronouns; the old V-forms no longer fulfill the deferential and indirect qualities necessary for a V-form and are therefore also lost from the language (cf. Listen 1999).

4.1.2 Interpersonal factors and the rise and fall of T-forms

The question now is if the observation that the choice of an address term is partly motivated by a power dimension between the speaker and the hearer can also be related to the loss of T. One could interpret the fact that V-forms lose politeness qualities and exclusivity as a sign that the V-pronoun has become a T-pronoun. If the two address forms are interchangeable, it is only natural that one of the two is

The hypothesis that T and V became interchangeable address forms is advocated by Berteloot (2001), who uses excerpts from *Legenda Aurea* by Jacobus de Voragine to illustrate his claim. This particular writing includes the original text as well as all adjustments made to the original text. The original text shows considerable alternation between T and V use. The only context where pronoun alternation does not occur is when addressing children and personified abstractions. In these cases, addressees always receive T. Exchanges between church officials always use V. In some cases the adjusted version varies in pronoun use more than the original text.

Berteloot first observes that if the choice between T and V was motivated by politeness, we would find consistent use of either T or V. Berteloot (2001) interprets the quick alternation between T and V as evidence for the hypothesis that the choice between T and V is motivated by style (Berteloot 2001: 53) and not by politeness.

To further substantiate his claim that T and V are interchangeable pronouns, Berteloot reports the use of a metalinguistic comment on pronoun use in Jacobus de Voragine. The holy man, Nazarius, is caught by Emperor Nero’s soldiers, who yell to Nazarius:

(17) De grote Nero ontbiedt u
    The great Nero summons you

Nazarius responds to the soldiers that he finds the formulation of their request impolite and suggests the following reformulation:

(18) Nero roept di
    Nero calls thee

According to Berteloot (2001), the author’s reformulation of Nazarius’ request shows that the author does not understand the politeness distinction between T and V, because the V-form *u* is considered as inappropriate and the T-pronoun *di* as appropriate. Note, however, that the reformulation in (18) makes use of a simpler register in the full utterance. The adjective *groot* (‘great’) in front of Nero’s name is lost and the formal word choice *ontbiedt* (‘summons’) is replaced by the simple *roept* (‘calls’). It is possible that Nazarius challenges the bombastic choice of words by the soldiers. Burnley (2003) shows that T is the preferred form of address in
many religious and philosophical contexts. The preference for T in these contexts is motivated by two factors. First, the bible and the classic texts that humanists based themselves on do not have a V-form and second, because V-forms are associated with dishonesty and flattery. The example thus does not imply that the author is confused about the polite association of T and V. It is more likely that the reformulation with T in (18) fits with more common preferences in religious contexts.

The frequent variation between T and V that Berteloot (2001) describes does not imply confusion or interchangeability between the two pronouns or a lack of politeness. Busse (2002: 99-186) shows that in Shakespearean English, it is not the choice between T or V, but rather, the ratio between T and V-forms that correlates with politeness. Busse (2002: 99-186) discusses the co-occurrence patterns of second person pronouns and nominal forms of address. A term of endearment, like love, is associated with intimacy; a term of courtesy, like Lady, is associated with respect. Intimacy is associated with a T pronoun and the expression of respect is related to V. We see, however, that both the term love and the term Lady combine with T as well as with V.

In the Berteloot’s (2001) perspective, the observation that both T and V combine with the intimate address form love and with the polite address form Lady indicates confusion on behalf of the writer. Busse (2002), however, shows that the proportion of co-occurrence with T and V differs. The term of endearment love combines with T 23 times. It combines with V 11 times (Busse 2002: 163, 166). The courteous term Lady combines with T 29 times and with V 109 times. The T-ratio in combination with love is thus much higher than the T-ratio in combination with Lady. This implies that politeness is relevant in the choice between T and V. The results of Busse (2002) agree with the results of Mazzon (2003) and Stein (2003) who find that, although the use of T and V is possible in many different relations, the ratio between T- and V-forms correlates with politeness.

It is likely that if the data by Berteloot (2001) were reconsidered on the basis of the T and V ratio, the effects of politeness would be more evident. One indication that politeness is relevant in Jacobus de Voragine’s text is that although most addressees receive both T and V-forms, there are two groups who receive only one form of address. Children receive only the T-form and cardinals receive only V-forms. As we just saw, the type of politeness that is used towards an addressee depends on the parameters of power and solidarity (Brown & Gilman 1960, Vermaas 2002). The prototypical use of V-forms is associated with [+power] and [-solidarity]. The prototypical use of T-forms is associated with [-power], [+solidarity]. In most cases, the two politeness parameters are in conflict. This
conflict can lead to pronoun mixing (Aalberse 2004a). Addressing children is a prototypical T-situation. Children usually have low status and a high level of intimacy. This explains why pronoun mixing does not occur when addressing children. On the other hand, church officials have a high status and appear in formal contexts where intimacy is not expressed. It is therefore not surprising that only V-forms are used to address church officials.

The observation that pronouns are mixed does not imply that politeness is irrelevant in the choice between T and V. Moreover, pronoun mixing is not unique for Middle Dutch. Mixing of pronouns is reported for all medieval variants of European languages (Brown & Gilman 1960: 254, Ehrismann 1902, Ganter 1905: 23-26, Simon 2003a: 89, Vor der Hake 1908: 27). If pronoun mixing signals interchangeability of T and V, we would expect loss of the T-form in more European languages.

The hypothesis that V can become interchangeable with T is also problematic because it defines a T-form negatively, that is, as a form that is not indirect or deferential. We have seen in example (15) that the use of T (by the bear who asks for honey) is motivated by positive politeness. The same goes for the switch from V to T when Siegfried and Gunther discuss Gunther’s wedding night. The loss of deferential and indirect qualities of V does not make V suitable to express such forms of positive politeness and therefore T and V are never interchangeable in all situations. Since it is unlikely that T and V were interchangeable forms, interchangeability cannot explain T-loss.

There is, however, another explanation for T-loss that links the loss of T to interpersonal factors, which is termed the markedness reversal hypothesis. Markedness reversal describes the observation that the association of T changes in a time period when V-use strongly increases. When only a small group of people receive the V-form in a limited number of settings, receiving the T-form is the neutral, unmarked situation. Once the group of V-receivers becomes larger, more people expect to receive the form in more situations and the use of T becomes marked. When this happens, T is no longer a neutral form. Instead, T-use implies a degree of disrespect for the addressee (Wales 1983: 116, 1996: 75, Braun 1988: 59, Dik 1997: 46). In public situations, a T-form was only used if the addressee was clearly inferior to the speaker, or if the speaker was hit by strong emotions such as anger. Once T-form is associated with negative emotions (i.e. anger and contempt), the form is quickly lost.

As predicted by the markedness reversal hypothesis, we can find numerous examples of T used in derogatory contexts. Examples include: *thou arte a whore witche* (‘you are a whore witch’), *thow art a whoremonger knave* (‘you are a
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fornicating scoundrel’) and *thow art an owld bawyd whore* (‘you are an old obscene whore’) which were all taken from depositions from the period between 1560-1599 (Walker 2005: 261). In public situations, the increased use of *you* yields the marked and negative association of the pronoun *thou*, however, this is not true in every situation. In the three plays that Walker (2005: 231-215) describes from the period 1560-1599, *thou* is primarily used by male characters to express positive emotions or social closeness to female characters. In the total number of 46 attestations of *thou* in the three plays, 38 *thou*-forms express positive emotions. Some of the positive expressions include: *O Delya are we happy to see thee here* and *Thou fairest flower*.

Quirk (1971) claims that it is an oversimplification to always perceive *thou* as the marked pronoun and *you* as the unmarked pronoun. In a relationship where *thou* is expected *you* can also have a negative association. A situation where *thou* was expected and where *you* has a negative connotation is described by Walker (2005: 216). In a play by William Warner entitled *Menaecmi*, published in 1595, a servant expects to be addressed with *thou*. The servant is sarcastically addressed with *you* when he ‘forgets his place.’

The fact that *you* can have a sarcastic association and the fact that the association of the T-pronoun depends on the situation makes it difficult to relate the loss of T to markedness reversal. Markedness reversal can explain how the increased use of V in the public domain led to the avoidance of T in public situations, but it cannot explain loss of T in all situations.

4.1.3 Summary

In sum, we have seen that two interpersonal factors play a role in the choice for an address term, namely: solidarity and power. Power differences require that the speaker is indirect and deferential to the addressee with more power. A high level of intimacy is associated with the use of a T-form. We have seen that an increased use of V-forms results in loss of deferential and indirect qualities in the V-pronoun. The loss of deferential and indirect qualities of the old polite pronoun explains the need for a new pronoun that expresses indirectness and deference. Loss of deferential and indirect qualities also explains why some V-forms go out of use.

Some authors have claimed that the loss of indirect and deferential qualities made the V-pronoun like a T-pronoun and that T and V became interchangeable. If the two pronouns were interchangeable, it is not expected that one form fades. T and V are, however, not fully interchangeable. Old V-forms are not suitable to express
intimacy. Moreover, the mixing of T and V, which is sometimes claimed to signal interchangeability of T, is, in fact, still conditioned by politeness.

Another theory that relates the loss of T to interpersonal factors is markedness reversal. The increased use of V yielded negative associations for the T-form and therefore, it became problematic to give T to an addressee. The negative association is, however, context specific and again, there is no explanation for loss of T from all situations.

In short, we can understand the rise and fall of V from the perspective of interpersonal variables, whereas the loss of T cannot be fully related to interpersonal factors. The observation that the rise and loss of V is cross-linguistically common and the rise and fall of T is cross-linguistically rare is in line with this conclusion.

4.2 Social characteristics of the speaker

The choice of an address form is not only determined by interpersonal relations, but also by social characteristics of the speaker. Social class, sex, age, political views, regional background and religious views can all affect the choice of an address term (Brown & Gilman 1960, Vermaas 2002, Walker 2005). If language users recognize deviant address term use in certain groups, address terms become identity markers. The fact that address terms are identity markers creates yet another possible source of change in the use of address terms.

Vermaas (2002) describes an interesting observation on the effect of social characteristics of the speaker on the choice of address term use in present day Dutch. Vermaas (2002: 109-110) interviewed three generations of Dutch speakers regarding their reported address term use. She shows that in the youngest generation, the religious background of the speaker has a strong effect on the terms children use to address parents. The oldest generation, however, does not yet show a significant effect of religion in term choice. Older Catholics used V towards their parents in almost 90% of the cases versus 70% for the Protestants. The youngest generation of Catholics use V as an address term for their parents 6% of the time. This compares with the youngest generation of orthodox protestant youngsters who address their parents with V 75% of the time. It is apparent that V-use towards parents has strongly decreased in the catholic group but increased slightly in the orthodox protestant group.

Vermaas (2002) interprets the two opposing trends as an effect of identity marking. In the older generation, the majority was likely to use V as an address term towards their parents. V-use was a general default form which did not correlate (strongly) with the religious background of the speaker. In the 1960’s, social and
power dimensions where redefined. This affected people’s associations with authorities, which, in turn, affected their pronoun use. More people, including parents, received T-use towards parents became associated with looser morals. The shift in the association of the T-pronoun resulted in more Protestants who began using the V-pronoun towards their parents in order to linguistically convey their respect for authority and devotion to older moral values. The socially motivated increased use of T changed the association of the T-pronoun. The use of V towards parents was used to mark membership of a group who appreciates traditional values.

In the remainder of this subsection, we will look at how identity marking functions of address forms affect the development of the address term system. In subsection 4.2.1 we describe the effect of identity marking functions of address terms in the rise and fall of V-forms. Subsection 4.2.2 concerns the rise and fall of T-forms as the result of identity marking functions of address terms.

4.2.1 Social characteristics of the speaker and the rise and fall of V

Brown & Gilman (1960) report that polite address terms originate in the higher classes and that the use of polite address terms is associated with ‘good breeding’. By using polite address terms, speakers linguistically mark their affiliation with higher classes. Once more speakers begin to use polite address terms, V no longer functions as an identity marker for a select group of people. A new V-pronoun can emerge which fulfils the role of the lost form (Listen 1999: 11-12). This new address form can also spread downwards and, will likely result in the rise of yet another polite pronoun.

In the overview in (14), we observe that at least nine languages (Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, German, Czech, Polish, Slovenian, Slovakian and Hungarian) developed more than one polite address form. Some of the information in table (14) only includes synchronic information. It is likely that a more in depth study of all languages would reveal the use of more polite forms. If a polite address form is no longer associated with social elitism, it loses its function as a social marker and can be lost.

4.2.2 Social characteristics of the speaker and the rise and fall of T-forms

We know the use of polite forms begins in cities (Wales 1983: 117) and with the higher class (Brown & Gilman 1960: 159, Braun 1988: 59). A speaker who frequently uses T-forms is likely to be from a rural background and/or have affiliation with the lower classes. Wales (1983) considers the rise of a standard
language an important factor in the loss of the T-pronoun in English. Around 1600, a standard language developed. Wales (1983, 1996) claims that speakers became more aware of the differences between dialects. Consequently, speakers avoided the use of T in order to avoid undesired connotations (i.e. being associated with a rural area or with the lower classes).

Muller (1926a: 95-96) reports that in some Dutch texts, the T-form du is used to characterize speakers from the Eastern provinces. The earliest example that Muller describes is taken from the work Boere-klucht van Teeuwis de boer (‘Country Burlesque of Teeuwis the farmer’) which was written by the Dutch author Samuel Coster in 1624. In this work, a boorish character called Joncker van Grevelinckhuysen uses the T-pronoun du whereas the other speakers use the V-pronoun gi. Keep in mind that this text was written in 1624 and that in 1618, bible translators had already described the pronoun du as obsolete. The fact that the use of du could function as an identity marker of the Eastern dialects seems to be a result of the loss of this pronoun in the Western dialects rather than the motivation for the change in the Western dialects.

Walker (2005) offers further insight on the effect of social rank in the choice for an address term. As Walker explains, the group who is most in need of preventing association with the lower classes is the group of social climbers. Whereas higher classes are content with their social status, middle classes are less secure. Consequently, middle classes tend to use linguistic means to express superiority over lower classes. In her study of address terms used in drama from 1560-1599, Walker (2005) shows that thou is lost fastest in the middle ranking professionals. Whereas the higher-ranking gentry address each other with thou in 43% of the cases (in drama comedies) from 1560-1599, the middle ranking professionals address each other with thou in only 14% of the cases. The behaviour of the lower commoners resembles the address behaviour of the higher-ranking gentry; the lower commoners address each other with thou in 46% of the cases. The deviant behaviour of the middle classes as opposed to the higher and the lower classes supports the hypothesis that the increased use of V is a strategy adopted by social climbers.

The reported deviant behaviour of the middle classes, however, concerns the reciprocal use of address terms, that is, the choice of address terms within two members of the same social status. If we look at non-reciprocal address term usage, (the choice of address terms between two speakers that do not have equal status) the use of address terms does not deviate from the middle classes. They address the lower classes with thou in 85% of the cases, although they always address the higher classes with you. All social classes tend to address lower classes with thou and
higher classes with you. In non-reciprocal relations, the use of *thou* does not reflect characteristics of the speaker. Rather, non-reciprocal use of *T* reflects social distance. The loss of *thou* in non-reciprocal relations is therefore not be related to the social characteristics of speakers because it is not a social marker.

We might hypothesize that loss of non-reciprocal use of *T* results from social mobility. It is possible that social mobility leads to a more egalitarian society where reciprocal use of address forms was preferred. Wales (1983: 118) shows that this hypothesis is incorrect. Social mobility led to a heightened social awareness and the marking of class distinctions became more important rather than less important. Thus, we still have no explanation for the loss of non-reciprocal *T*.

In sum, the conclusion seems justified that the *T*-pronoun could be associated with the lower classes and with a rural background. But the relationship between loss of *T* and the stigmatized use of *T* seems a chicken and egg problem. The association between *T* and low status dialects did not motivate the loss of *T*. Rather the association between *T* and lower classes seems to result from the loss of *T* in the status dialect and in the higher classes. When *T* remains in the speech of the higher classes, the use of *T* can only be stigmatized in certain contexts, since a stigmatized connotation is not a static association. Associations depend on the context. For example, a speaker who uses a *T*-form in a public setting to an official is considered uneducated or rude. It is also less likely that the use of a *T*-form towards a child in a family setting is stigmatized when *T* is still part of the language. Moreover, in non-reciprocal use of the *T*-pronoun, the use of *T* by a social superior to someone with a lower social status does not stigmatize the speaker. It only reflects social distance (cf. Brown & Gilman 1960, Gilman & Brown 1958). Addressing God with a *T*-form still occurs in English (Wales 2004). This use was never stigmatized. It remains unclear why *T* was lost in non-reciprocal uses and in other contexts where its use was not stigmatized and did not reveal social characteristics of the speaker.

4.2.3 Summary

 Speakers’ choice of which address term to use in which circumstances reveals information about the social background of the speaker. Inevitably, speakers’ choices induce change within the address term system. Polite pronouns mark exclusive group membership. Once V-forms spread, new polite address forms are needed to replace the original form. The increase in the number of V-forms implies the loss of some of these V-forms.
It has been argued that the use of T was stigmatized because of the association of this pronoun with the lower classes and with people with a rural background. Before this occurs, however, this association is context-dependent. It is not until the T-pronoun is lost from the language that T-pronouns become identity markers independent of the context. It remains unclear why T was lost in non-reciprocal uses and in other contexts where its use was not stigmatized and did not reveal social characteristics of the speaker.

One conclusion from this section is that the loss of T cannot be fully related to socio-pragmatic factors. We can explain why T was used in fewer situations, however, we cannot understand full loss of T. The lack of a socio-pragmatic explanation for loss of T is in line with the observation that this loss is cross-linguistically rare. The rise of V is related to two factors: identity marking and interpersonal factors. The observation that two factors push changes in V-usage is in line with the observation that changes in polite pronouns are common among the world’s languages.

5 Conclusion

In this chapter, we looked at changes in the address term system of Dutch. We evaluated to what extent, we could understand changes in the address system in terms of socio-pragmatic factors. Additionally, we looked at the effects of changes in the address term system on verbal inflection. In section 2, we observed that only one change within the Dutch pronominal paradigm had a profound effect on the verbal inflectional paradigm: namely, the loss of the original second person singular suffix. The observation that loss of second person singular inflection co-occurs with a change in the pronominal paradigm is one piece of independent evidence that politeness influences the loss. The second piece of evidence for the role of politeness in inflection is the socio-pragmatic distribution of the first substitution patterns.

In section 3 and 4, we examined how changes in the address term system were influenced by socio-pragmatic factors. In section 3, we discussed the role of socio-pragmatic factors from a comparative angle. The hypothesis is that developments in the address term system of Dutch that are socio-pragmatically motivated bear resemblance with developments in other languages that developed under similar circumstances.

The conclusion from section 3 is that all changes in the Dutch address term system fit into a more general trend except the loss of second person singular. Whereas the rise and loss of V-pronouns is observed in many languages, Dutch and English are the only two known languages where T is lost. In most languages, the T-
pronoun is very stable. Apart from English and Dutch, all Indo-European languages in our set have a T-form that is cognate with *tu*. In contrast, there is a good deal of variation in the inventory of polite address forms in these languages.

In section 4, we evaluated the role of socio-pragmatic factors in the rise and fall of address terms. We related changes in the address term system to socio-pragmatic variables that influence the choice for an address marker. The hypothesis is that if a change in the address term system is socio-pragmatically motivated, we should be able to relate the change to socio-pragmatic factors. As expected, the rise and fall of polite address forms is related to socio-pragmatic factors. Although there are many socio-pragmatic factors that explain loss of the V-pronoun, there are no socio-pragmatic factors which can explain the loss of second person singular. The observation that there are many explanations for changes in polite address forms is in line with the observation that this type of change is frequently observed. The observation that loss of T is not understandable from a socio-pragmatic angle is in line with the observation that loss of T is rare.

The loss of the original second person singular pronoun and inflection is in need of explanation. The observation that we are dealing with a substitution in the verbal paradigm that always co-occurs with a substitution in the pronominal paradigm indicates that morphology-external factors play a role in the substitution. The role of morphology-external factors is also evidenced by the socio-pragmatic conditioning of the competition between second person singular and second person plural. However, cross-linguistically, the loss of second person singular is rare and the change is difficult to understand purely on the basis of socio-pragmatic factors. We still need an explanation for the loss of second person singular in Dutch. In chapter 4, we will evaluate whether formal factors can explain loss of second person singular.