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CHAPTER ONE

DEFINITION OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Moroni exhorts those who read the Book of Mormon:

Behold, I would exhort you that when ye shall read these things, if it be wisdom in God that ye should read them, that ye would remember how merciful the Lord hath been unto the children of men, from the creation of Adam even down until the time that ye shall receive these things, and ponder it in your hearts. (Moro. 10:3; all Book of Mormon citations are from the 1981 edition unless otherwise noted)

One purpose of the Book of Mormon is "to show unto the remnant of the House of Israel how great things the Lord hath done for their fathers; and that they may know the covenants of the Lord" (Title Page, 1830 ed.; emphasis added). This is one way in which "the promises made to the fathers" can be planted "in the hearts of the children" (D&C 2:2; JS-H 1:39). The "great things the Lord hath done" (1 Ne. 7:11; Alma 62:50; Ether 6:30, 7:27, 10:2) are another evidence that "the eternal purposes of the Lord shall roll on" (Morm. 8:22) and that his covenant with Abraham is sure (1 Ne. 15:18; 2 Ne. 29:14; 3 Ne. 20:25-27). Of the Book of
Mormon it can truly be said: "And behold, it is the hand of
the Lord which hath done it" (Morm. 8:8). The Magnalia
Christi Americana, or "the great works of Christ in
America," is not only the title of Cotton Mather's history
of colonial America, it could also be another title for the
Book of Mormon. "This is the LORD's doing; it is marvellous
in our eyes" (Ps. 118:23).

The Book of Mormon itself is "a marvelous work and a
wonder" (2 Ne. 25:17-18, 27:26; see also 1 Ne. 14:7). Speaking of the Book of Mormon, Joseph Smith testified that
he "translated the record by the gift and power of God"
(History of the Church 6:74, 4:537; Comprehensive History of
the Church 1:127). Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, and
Martin Harris testified: "And we also know that they [i.e.,
the gold plates which they saw] have been translated by the
gift and power of God, for his voice hath declared it unto
us; wherefore we know of a surety that the work is true"
(The Testimony of Three Witnesses). The Lord himself
declared: "And [Joseph Smith] has translated the book [of
Mormon], even that part which I have commanded him, and as
your Lord and your God liveth it is true" (D&C 17:6), and we
are accountable for these testimonies (D&C 5:5-20). Moroni
tells us that "by the power of the Holy Ghost [we] may know
the truth of all things" (Moro. 10:5). Therefore, "what
greater witness can [we] have than from God?" (D&C 6:23).

The "vision of all" things (Isa. 29:11), as Isaiah
prophesied, has been "delivered unto a man" (2 Ne. 27:9). "And behold the book shall be sealed; and in the book shall be a revelation from God, from the beginning of the world to the ending thereof" (2 Ne. 27:7). The words in this book "reveal all things from the foundation of the world unto the end thereof" (2 Ne. 27:10), but "the things which are sealed shall not be delivered in the day of the wickedness and abominations of the people" (2 Ne. 27:8), "for the book shall be sealed by the power of God, and the revelation which was sealed shall be kept in the book until the own due time of the Lord" (2 Ne. 27:10).

Mormon, the compiler of this record, tells us that only a "lesser part" of Christ’s words have been translated and sent forth unto this generation to "try their faith" (3 Ne. 26:8-11). However, the learned and wise will not receive even this lesser portion of God’s words. As the Lord said, "therefore, I will proceed to do a marvelous work and a wonder, for the wisdom of their wise and learned shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent shall be hid" (2 Ne. 27:26). In this day when men "make a man an offender for a word," the Lord says concerning "the book [of Mormon] and the words thereof," "the learned shall not read them, for they have rejected them, and I am able to do mine own work" (2 Ne. 27:19-29, 32). Thus, "the wise, and the learned, and they that are rich, who are puffed up because of their learning, and their wisdom, and their riches--yea,
they are they whom he despiseth; and save they shall cast
these things away, and consider themselves fools before God,
and come down in the depths of humility, he will not open
unto them" (2 Ne. 9:42).

Truly the Lord has worked through his weak, simple, and
unlearned servant Joseph Smith, Jr., to accomplish his
"great and marvelous work" (1 Cor. 1:25-27; 2 Ne. 27:14-20;
D&C 1:19, 23, 6:1). He also has worked through many other
prophets such as Moroni and Nephi who acknowledge their
"weakness in writing" (2 Ne. 33:1-4, 11; Ether 12:23-37).
The things the Lord has "reserved" to come forth in this
generation were "entrusted" to Joseph Smith, and the Lord
said to him, "this generation shall have my word through
you" (D&C 5:10).

Thus the Lord is willing to give men commandments to
his "servants in their weakness, after the manner of their
language, that they might come to understanding" (D&C 1:24;
see also 2 Ne. 31:3; Alma 29:8; D&C 90:11). The Book of
Mormon may not be a literary masterpiece according to the
world's standards, but it is the word of God couched in the
language of Joseph Smith. "Fools mock, but they shall
mourn" (Morm. 8:20), for, as Isaiah says:

Wo unto the wise in their own eyes and prudent in
their own sight! . . . Therefore, as the fire
devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the
chaff, their root shall be rottenness, and their
blossoms shall go up as dust; because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel. (2 Ne. 15:21, 24)

Though the word of God which has come through Joseph Smith is, perhaps, not without its inconsistencies in terms of spelling, punctuation, and grammar, these are not the important things. These are merely conventions of language which change from time to time. Moroni cautions us, "Condemn me not because of mine imperfection . . . but rather give thanks unto God that he hath made manifest unto you our imperfections, that ye may learn to be more wise than we have been" (Morm. 9:31). The lesson to be learned from this is that the Lord can work his "marvelous work and a wonder" even through the weak, the simple, and the unlearned. Though human weakness and error are evident in the Book of Mormon, the title page itself proclaims: "And now if there be fault, it be the mistake of men; wherefore condemn not the things of GOD, that ye may be found spotless at the judgment seat of CHRIST" (1830 ed.; see also Morm. 8:17).

Since the Book of Mormon proclaims to the world that it is the word of God, his hand should be evident therein. To the unbelieving his hand will be imperceptible, but to those who have eyes to see it will be evident everywhere. Cotton Mather tells us that
To regard the illustrious displays of the PROVIDENCE wherewith our Lord Christ governs the world, is a work, than which there is none more needful or useful for a Christian . . . and perhaps the Great Governour of the world will ordinarily do the most notable things for those who are most ready to take a wise notice of what he does. (2:341 [sixth book, paragraph 1]; italics in original)

In fact, to "confess" and acknowledge the Lord's "hand in all things" is the especial duty of his Saints (D&C 59:21).

The miracles Mather mentions are promised to the believers (Mk. 16:17; D&C 63:9-10). As Nephi states:

And if ye shall believe in Christ ye will believe in these words, for they are the words of Christ, and he hath given them unto me. . . . And if they are not the words of Christ, judge ye—for Christ will show unto you, with power and great glory, that they are his words, at the last day. . . . And you that will not partake of the goodness of God, and respect the words of the Jews, and also my words, and the words which shall proceed forth out of the mouth of the Lamb of God, behold, I bid you an everlasting farewell, for these words shall condemn you at the last day. (2 Ne. 33:10-11, 14; emphasis added; see also Ether 4-5)
The Lord's hand can also be seen in the life of Joseph Smith (2 Ne. 3). Even though he was "an unlearned youth" (History of the Church 6:74), he was able to use English with greater facility than he otherwise would have because of his religious upbringing and the Lord's influence in his life from an early age. According to his mother, Lucy Mack Smith, he was not an avid reader of the Bible in his youth compared with his siblings (92), and this can be seen when his brother Samuel was able to quote Isaiah 56:9-11 to some would-be destroyers of the Book of Mormon manuscript (176). However, Joseph Smith was familiar with various sects of the day and "attended their several meetings as often as occasion would permit" (JS-H 1:8), and thus he also became more familiar with religious language by singing the hymns and hearing various sermons of his day.

But we can also see the Lord's hand in the countless ages of preparatory work before the Book of Mormon was translated. As Brigham Young declared:

There is not another nation under heaven but this, in whose midst the Book of Mormon could have been brought forth. The Lord has been operating for centuries to prepare the way for the coming forth of the contents of that Book from the bowels of the earth, to be published to the world, to show to the inhabitants thereof that he still lives, and that he will, in the latter days, gather his
elect from the four corners of the earth. It was the Lord who directed the discovery of this land to the nations of the old world, and its settlement, and the war for independence, and the final victory of the colonies, and the unprecedented prosperity of the American nation, up to the calling of Joseph the Prophet. The Lord has dictated and directed the whole of this, for the bringing forth, and establishing of his Kingdom in the last days. (Journal of Discourses 11:17)

The Lord’s hand can also be seen in the history of the English language as it survived the Scandinavians, the Normans, the learned men of the Renaissance, and its many other trials before it flourished worldwide with the rise of the British Empire. In America, English has survived a movement for linguistic independence after the Revolutionary War and has since become the universal language of the world.

The Lord’s hand can also be seen in something as seemingly insignificant as the history of the pronouns of address in English. Though English has borrowed heavily from French, the many problems associated with the subtle distinctions of *tu* and *vous* in French and similar problems in other languages are absent in English (Finkenstaedt 1-27). The subtle distinctions of *tu* and *vous* (and their
English counterparts *thou* and *ye*) that were based upon the ever-changing mood and status of the speaker in reference to his audience have been eliminated over time. With only a few rare exceptions, all men are now addressed as equals in English with *you*.

Another evidence of the Lord's hand in the history of pronouns of address in English is the influence of the King James Bible. The style of the King James version is universally acknowledged as among the best in English, if not the best, even though it, like the Book of Mormon, is a translated work. This version of the Bible has preserved many of the more archaic features of English (such as *ye* and the th-forms of the second person pronoun) so they have become associated with religious or elevated language (Curme 2:17). However, as we shall see, even in the King James Version of the Bible there are both variations in language (e.g., "thy hand" versus "thine hand") and pronominal shiftings (or variations in usage with regard to singular and plural forms). This does not mean that the revelations contained therein are imperfect, but rather that the Lord "speaketh unto men according to their language, unto their understanding" (2 Ne. 31:3). The revelations of God will always be couched in imperfect language in this sphere where "we see through a glass, darkly" and "know [only] in part" (1 Cor. 13:12).

However, perhaps the greatest evidence of the Lord's
hand in the history of pronouns of address in English is that thou, thy, thine, thee, and thyself are now used almost exclusively in prayer. The implications of this are numerous, yet it just may be that English is the only language in the world in which the Lord is addressed with pronouns reserved almost solely for him. "This is the LORD’s doing; it is marvellous in our eyes" (Ps. 118:23).

Thus it can be seen that the Lord has had his hand in the history of the English language, but it should not be thought that English is inherently better than any other language or that one dialect of a language is better than another. The Lord will speak to whomever he will in language which is understandable to that person, and the gift of tongues may even become necessary so each can understand God’s words individually (Acts 2:1-13). Since the language of each prophet is somewhat different, when speaking to each prophet the Lord will use language according to the understanding of each prophet. Since second person pronouns are such a common part of language, the second person pronoun usage in the revelations given to man from the Lord will generally be similar to the pronoun usage of the prophet to whom it is given. However, if the prophet is translating something from another language, perhaps the pronoun usage of the other language could alter somewhat the normal patterns of the prophet’s pronoun usage.
II. DISCUSSION

The basic research problem to be discussed in this thesis is how pronouns of address are used in the Book of Mormon. In this thesis the pronouns of address to be studied include the following second person pronouns and reflexives: *thou, thee, thy, thine, thyself, ye, you, your, yours, yourself, and yourselves*. All of these pronouns occur in the Book of Mormon, but quite often singular forms and plural forms are used interchangeably. In other words, the text shifts from using the first five forms listed (the singular or *th*-forms) to the latter six forms (the plural or *y*-forms) and vice versa. A good example of this shifting is found in Alma 37:37 where Alma says to his son Helaman:

Counsel with the Lord in all *thy* doings, and he will direct *thee* for good; yea, when *thou* liest down at night lie down unto the Lord, that he may watch over *you* in *your* sleep; and when *thou* risest in the morning let *thy* heart be full of thanks unto God; and if *ye* do these things, *ve* shall be lifted up at the last day.

(Italics have been added to pronouns in excerpts of language herein to facilitate analysis.)

You will notice that this verse begins by using singular pronouns of address (*thy, thee, and thou*), then shifts to plural forms (*you and your*), then shifts back
again to singular forms (thou and thy), and finally shifts again to a plural form (ye--used twice). Since this kind of shifting is not uncommon in the Book of Mormon, the question presents itself, "Why does such shifting take place?" This thesis addresses itself to this basic question. In this case one possible explanation is that Alma is speaking first to one son, then shifts and speaks to more or all of his sons. However, this is an unsatisfactory explanation simply because Alma always refers to his audience as "my son," and not "my sons." Therefore, since there is no textual evidence to the contrary, it should be safe to assume that throughout Alma 36-42 Alma is speaking only to one of his sons at a time.

Some of the more general explanations for these pronominal shiftings include: shiftings or variations in Joseph Smith's own language, the influence of biblical language on Joseph Smith's language, shifts in the mood of the speaker, the attention of the speaker shifting to a different audience, and, of course, textual revisions. However, each of these possibilities alone may not fully explain why these shiftings occur. Therefore, each of the possible explanations must be examined sufficiently to properly understand the pronoun usage in each case.

Many readers of the Book of Mormon will recognize that pronouns of address are not always used consistently therein. Traditionally singular pronouns are often used in
a plural sense and traditionally plural pronouns are often used in a singular sense. For example, *thy* and *thee* are both used when Nephi is addressing his brothers (1 Ne. 17:55), and *ye* and *you* are both used as nominatives in a singular sense in when Alma is addressing his son Helaman (Alma 37:16). Nibley inquires, "How can we tell whether it is just a blunder here or the faithful--too faithful--rendering of the original?" (169).

Obviously this question cannot be answered fully since Joseph Smith returned the gold plates to Moroni as he was commanded (JS-H 1:60; 2 Ne. 27:21-22), and even if we did have them, we would not be able to interpret them without the Lord’s aid (Morm. 9:34). Another reason this question cannot be answered fully is that Joseph Smith felt that "it was not expedient" that "all the particulars of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon" should be revealed to the world (History of the Church 1:220). Since the available facts concerning the coming forth of the Book of Mormon are somewhat limited, it is imperative that each fact be interpreted as accurately as possible so that one does not arrive at faulty conclusions.

How faithful was Joseph Smith’s rendering of the original? To answer this question one would have to know exactly how Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon, which, however, can be known with certainty only through revelation. We should focus our attention initially, then,
on that which is known about the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and then we can proceed to investigate what else can be known about it.

For example, there is not "only one answer to explain the word-for-word similarities between the verses of Isaiah in the Bible and the same verses in the Book of Mormon" as Ludlow maintains (141-42). The evidence clearly indicates that Oliver Cowdery did not simply copy from the Bible the King James translation because he writes "lead" for "led" (1 Ne. 20:21), "vane" for "vain" (1 Ne. 21:4), "exceptable" for "acceptable" (1 Ne. 21:8), "cloath" for "clothe" (1 Ne. 21:18), and other homophones or different spellings for the words found in the Bible.

Also, the evidence is not conclusive that Joseph Smith used the Bible at all in translating the Book of Mormon. Since only two of the over seventeen chapters of Isaiah included in the Book of Mormon are extant in the original manuscript, the scanty evidence in these chapters must not be interpreted wrongly. In these chapters there is no evidence which can conclusively substantiate that Joseph Smith used the Bible while translating the Book of Mormon. Also, Emma Smith indicates that he never had any books with him during the translation process:

During no part of it [the work of translation] did Joseph Smith have any mss. or book of any kind from which to read or dictate except the metallic
plates which I knew he had. (Backman 127)

In 1 Nephi 20:11 the phrase "how should I" is crossed out in the original manuscript before the phrase "I will not" is written in its stead. Larson cites this phrase as possible evidence ("it seems") that Joseph Smith used the King James Bible in his translation of the Book of Mormon (246-47). However, the phrase in the Bible is not exact here, for "how should my name" and not simply "how should I" occurs in Isaiah 48:11. Since there are over forty discrepancies between 1 Nephi 20-21 in the original manuscript and Isaiah 48-49 in the King James translation, and since there are numerous corrections and emendations in other places in the original manuscript, the evidence is not conclusive that Joseph Smith used the Bible while translating the biblical passages found in the Book of Mormon. Also, since the biblical passages account for only a small portion of the Book of Mormon, the process of translation cannot be explained wholly in terms of how biblical passages were translated.

When speaking of the "interpreters," Ammon said, "Thus God has provided a means that man, through faith, might work mighty miracles; therefore he becometh a great benefit to his fellow beings" (Mosiah 8:18; emphasis added). The gifts of the Spirit are given to those who have faith, "for it is by faith that miracles are wrought" (Moro. 7:37). The "gift of interpreting languages" and "divers kinds of tongues" is
a gift of the Spirit and "comes from the Lord" (Omni 1:25; Moro. 10:16; D&C 46:25-26). "When a man works by faith he works by mental exertion. . . . It is by words, instead of exerting his physical powers, with which every being works when he works by faith" (Lectures on Faith 7:3; D&C 9).

A man must work by faith if he is to have the gift of translation. As David Whitmer stated:

At times when brother Joseph would attempt to translate . . . he found he was spiritually blind and could not translate. He told us that his mind dwelt too much on earthly things, and various causes would make him incapable of proceeding with the translation. When in this condition he would go out and pray, and when he became sufficiently humble before God, he could then proceed with the translation. Now we see how very strict the Lord is, and how he requires the heart of man to be just right in his sight before he can receive revelation from him. (qtd. in Comprehensive History of the Church 1:130-31)

David Whitmer also had this to say concerning Joseph Smith:

He was a religious and straightforward man. He had to be; for he was illiterate and he could do nothing himself. He had to trust in God. He could not translate unless he was humble and possessed the right feelings towards everyone. To
illustrate so you can see: One morning when he was getting ready to continue the translation, something went wrong about the house and he was put out about it. Something that Emma, his wife, had done. Oliver and I went upstairs and Joseph came up soon after to continue the translation but he could not do anything. He could not translate a single syllable. He went downstairs, out into the orchard, and made supplication to the Lord; was gone about an hour—came back to the house, and asked Emma's forgiveness and then came upstairs where we were and then the translation went on all right. He could do nothing save he was humble and faithful. (qtd. in Comprehensive History of the Church 1:131)

Truly the Lord is no respecter of persons—even Joseph Smith had to follow the revelations he was given. Joseph Knight, Sr., had given Joseph Smith some provisions and paper so he could continue translating (Hartley 34-37). Joseph Smith inquired of the Lord in behalf of Joseph Knight, Sr., and received the following:

Behold, I speak unto you, and also to all those who have desires to bring forth and establish this work; And no one can assist in this work except he shall be humble and full of love, having faith, hope, and charity, being temperate in all things,
whatsoever shall be entrusted to his care. (D&C 12:7-8; emphasis added)

The Book of Mormon is the word of God translated into the English of Joseph Smith. Joseph Smith's English is a dialect all his own. His language has some peculiarities, as does everyone's, which are found in no other person's language in exactly the same way. His language, or style of language, therefore, should be studied to see how he used it, rather than in terms of someone else's language. For example, if the language of the learned is compared to Joseph Smith's, a distorted picture of Joseph Smith's language results because the comparisons are usually negative. If the Lord saw fit to have the Book of Mormon translated into Joseph Smith's language and also saw fit to give us many other revelations in the same prophet's language, it seems foolhardy to find fault--especially since the Lord proclaimed that the translation is "true" (D&C 17:6). This does not mean that the Book of Mormon has been translated into the best possible language (Ether 12:24-25), rather it means that the translation is "correct" in terms of saving truths and doctrine: "And all Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine" (2 Tim. 3:16, JST).

Joseph Smith's language, then, must be understood on its own terms and in context to be understood rightly. For example, the Oxford English Dictionary is often used to find
the meanings of some of the words Joseph Smith used. This is often a misleading method because the usage found in the Oxford English Dictionary is that of the literary and learned. Schafer has studied various aspects of the Oxford English Dictionary and states:

One of the most obvious tendencies of the O.E.D. is its literary bias. In his preface to volume I of the N.E.D. (1888) Murray listed 'all the great English writers of all ages' as the most important sources. That the number of non-literary works is so small has been increasingly criticized. . . . It is perhaps less well known that this literary bias also extends to individual authors and results in a remarkable difference in treatment. . . . There is a marked tendency to grant the great names in English literature preferential treatment . . . : words of marginal importance used by these preferred authors are rarely omitted, and their vocabulary is usually assigned main lemma status. The O.E.D. was clearly conceived as an aid in reading great literature, a fact which has proved a boon for the literary scholar; for the linguist, however, this policy leads to distortion and makes it necessary for him to approach the O.E.D. with caution. (13) Joseph Smith was neither learned nor literary. He used
obscure words which do not even appear (e.g., *hinderment*) or are considered "rare" (e.g., *loading* as a noun or *woundedness*) in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which is one indication that his vocabulary was not that of an educated youth, and sometimes more like that of "an obscure boy," even a plowboy. Since such obscure words as *hinderment* do appear in the *English Dialect Dictionary*, this dictionary (and many others) should also be consulted when one examines Joseph Smith's language.

The language of Joseph Smith, then, should be understood in its own context, but when dealing with the revelations, the influence of the Spirit on Joseph Smith's language should not be ignored, since all scripture must be understood by revelation (1 Cor. 2:11, 14). It cannot be doubted that Joseph Smith had divine assistance as he translated the Book of Mormon since the Lord states that he gave Joseph Smith "power to translate through the mercy of God, by the power of God, the Book of Mormon" (D&C 1:29). However, if Joseph Smith's own language in general varies and at times is inconsistent, then perhaps these same characteristics of language would carry over into his translation of the Book of Mormon. In other words, "How much precision or variation was there in Joseph Smith's own language?" The language of the Book of Mormon obviously does not represent simply a verbatim translation of a different language because it is very readable English, but
since at times some of the features of the language of the Book of Mormon are not part of English historically, or even of Joseph Smith's language use outside the Book of Mormon, perhaps the translation is more literal at some times than at others. This would mean that the language features of the translated language would show through rather than Joseph Smith's native language patterns. By eliminating all language patterns which are not characteristic of "standard English" from the Book of Mormon, one may also unwittingly be eliminating language patterns which are similar to those found in Semitic languages. Since not all of these parallel language patterns are found in the Bible, they are but one more witness of the divinity of the Book of Mormon and of Joseph Smith's calling as a prophet.

Since Joseph Smith speaks of "a literal translation" when referring to the Book of Mormon, it is examined here in its context:

I wish to mention here that the title-page of the Book of Mormon is a literal translation, taken from the very last leaf, on the left hand side of the collection or book of plates, which contained the record which has been translated, the language of the whole running the same as all Hebrew writing in general; and that said title page is not by any means a modern composition, either of mine or of any other man who has lived or does
live in this generation. Therefore, in order to correct an error, which generally exists concerning it, I give below that part of the title-page of the English version of the Book of Mormon, which is a genuine and literal translation of the title-page of the original Book of Mormon as recorded on the plates. (History of the Church 1:71; emphasis added)

Though to some it may seem that "a literal translation" and "a genuine and literal translation" are somewhat different in Joseph Smith's mind from the record's being simply "translated," too much should not be read into these words since his point is that the title page is a genuine translation rather than one of his own composition. Also, it should be noted that Joseph Smith often used the word interpretation when describing what we might call translation or transmission and used the word translation for something we might call revelation (e.g., the Joseph Smith translation).

Roberts has discussed some of these issues at length (Comprehensive History of the Church 1:116-133; New Witnesses for God 2:91-146, 3:407-60; Defense of the Faith and the Saints 1:255-311). A summary of his comments is as follows:

There can be no doubt . . . that the interpretation thus obtained was expressed in such
language as the Prophet could command, in such phraseology as he was master of and common to the time and locality where he lived; modified, of course, by the application of that phraseology to facts and ideas new to him in many respects, and above the ordinary level of the Prophet's thoughts and language, because of the inspiration of God that was upon him. (Comprehensive History of the Church 1:133)

Although Joseph Smith stated plainly that he translated the Book of Mormon by "the gift and power of God" (Jessee The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith 215), the exact nature of the process of the translation has not been revealed. This thesis is not a study in how Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon; rather it is a study in the language variation of Joseph Smith with regard to pronouns of address. Since variation occurs in everyone's language, not only in the language of the unlearned, the possibility for variation exists in the language of Joseph Smith, and thus in the Book of Mormon as well.

For Joseph Smith to differentiate regularly between singular and plural pronouns of address when this was not part of his everyday language probably would have been difficult. Since he did use both the th-forms and the y-forms, the question considered here is whether he used them consistently (i.e., with regularity) or not. Many
translators today do not even differentiate between singular and plural second person pronouns in their translations and simply use you and the other y-forms. As a consequence, much is lost from those works in which such differentiation is an important stylistic feature of the original language. Even if the pronouns of address in the Book of Mormon are not "the faithful--too faithful--rendering of the original" (Nibley 169), the style of the language of the Book of Mormon is still considerably enhanced because both th-forms and y-forms are employed.

One of the purposes of this thesis is to discuss the general use of pronouns of address in English to understand the specific pronoun usage in the Book of Mormon and compare it with the historical pronoun usage in English. Since there is a correlation between the pronoun usage of some of Joseph Smith's contemporaries and that of Joseph Smith, some of the shiftings in the Book of Mormon can be explained simply as a feature of his own language. However, there also is a correlation between Hebrew (or Egyptian) usage and Joseph Smith's usage which means that perhaps the shiftings are the result of a more literal rendering of the original.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Since there is no satisfactory comprehensive history of pronouns of address in English, part of the first section of
this thesis (the third and fourth chapters) is an attempt to provide a general history of the use of pronouns of address which will be adequate for the purposes of this thesis. Finkenstaedt does give a history of the use of pronouns of address in English from the beginnings of English to shortly past the end of the seventeenth century, but his work is written in German and is therefore not as accessible to the student of the history of the English language as those works which are written in English.

Some of the major purposes, therefore, for including this historical examination of pronouns of address in English are: (1) to show that at any given time a single standard of usage would not apply to all speakers of the many dialects of English; (2) to show that pronominal shiftings and similar variations have occurred in every period of English since the thirteenth century; and (3) to give a general background of the history of pronouns of address to compare with Joseph Smith's usage.

This historical examination or diachronic study of pronouns of address will be divided into four chapters. Chapter 2 will examine language use and variation with regard to the history of the English language. Chapter 3 will examine second person pronoun usage in English until the end of the fifteenth century, and then chapter 4 will continue the same examination up until the present day. After the general overview of second person pronoun usage in
English is presented, chapter 5 will discuss the second person pronoun usage in the Bible and will conclude the first section of the diachronic study.

The second section of this thesis will be a more specific analysis or synchronic study of pronoun usage in the language of Joseph Smith and his contemporaries with specific focus on the usage in the Book of Mormon. Since the Book of Mormon and other revelations of Joseph Smith are considered as scripture, and since pronouns of address are quite prevalent in language, knowing how Joseph Smith usually used pronouns can be quite important when the interpretation of a scriptural passage depends on knowing whether the antecedent of a pronoun is singular or plural.

This second section also contains four chapters. Chapter 6 will discuss pronoun usage of some of Joseph Smith’s contemporaries, as well as the pronoun usage in the Doctrine and Covenants, the Pearl of Great Price, the Joseph Smith Translation, and in other writings of Joseph Smith. Chapter 7 will examine relevant information concerning Book of Mormon textual variants and revisions. The pronouns of address in the Book of Mormon will then be examined in chapter 8, with a focus on shiftings between singular and plural pronouns of address and variations in usage. Chapter 8 will also contain a basic summary of the findings of the thesis and the conclusions which can be drawn from this study. Following this last chapter, a list of the works
cited herein will be found, then an appendix containing some verses in the Book of Mormon in which pronominal shiftings occur will conclude the thesis.

One conclusion of this study is that Joseph Smith's pronoun usage is not peculiar to him, and that there are similarities between his usage and that of many of the literary giants of his day. Joseph Smith's shifting pronoun usage is simply a part of his linguistic heritage—a heritage which has been a part of English since the thirteenth century. Joseph Smith was an unlearned man and did not follow the prescriptions of the grammarians, and his language often shows this fact. However, others who were learned in Joseph Smith's day did not follow these prescriptions either, and variations in usage, including pronominal shiftings, also occur frequently in their writings. Joseph Smith's pronoun usage, therefore, cannot be faulted without also faulting all others who have not maintained a strict consistency with regard to second person pronouns in English. As we shall see, however, pronominal shiftings have been a part of English since the thirteenth century and are still a part of our language today in some cases, notably that of prayer.
CHAPTER TWO
LANGUAGE USE AND VARIATION

I. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we will discuss some aspects of language use and variations in language use, especially as they pertain to the history of the English language. In order to better understand language use and variation, it is important first of all to recognize that the uses of language are many and that each individual varies his language according to the context and his intended audience.

In the following chapters it may seem that there is an inordinate focus on what appear to be exceptions to normal or "standard" pronoun usage in English. One reason for this is that historically there have been many ways to pronounce, write, and use each word, and this, of course, includes pronouns. The idea that there is only one way to pronounce, write, and use each word, or even a pronoun for that matter, is a notion which cannot be supported historically. In fact, just the opposite is true.

II. DISCUSSION

Throughout the history of English there have been many varieties of pronouns and of pronoun usage. One of these
varieties is the shifting from singular forms of the second person pronoun (the th-forms) to plural forms (the y-forms) or vice versa. The concepts relating to language use and variation in this chapter are applicable to pronominal shifting and other types of variations in pronoun usage that will be discussed in the following chapters.

There are many varieties of English today, just as there have been many varieties of English in ages past. G. L. Brook mentions that "many criticisms of linguistic habits arise from a failure to realise that there are many varieties of English and to recognise the characteristics of each variety" (Varieties of English 11) He further comments on the various usages of language:

It is natural that there should be varieties of language, since language is a form of human social behaviour, and communities tend to split up into groups, each displaying differences of behaviour. Language reflects these differences. The primary function of language is to convey ideas from one person to another, but these ideas may be information, command or entreaty. (Varieties of English 12)

The main purpose of using language, then, is to communicate. Since communication is the basic purpose of language, then creating a barrier to communication by being overly concerned with "correctness" frustrates this purpose.
One's understanding of a work (or the language) of another is lessened by the degree one allows supposed faults to distract one's attention from the message itself. These errors can become magnified to the point that the reader simply cannot perceive the message or meaning of what he is reading. If one does not allow for human error or even variation in language, this intolerance will render one unable to really understand or appreciate the language of past ages.

Therefore, when studying language use historically, one must simply let the sources speak for themselves. The notion of "correct" spelling, grammar, or pronunciation is a recent one, historically speaking (G. L. Brook Varieties of English 159-60). One can imagine the absurdity of trying to "correct" the spelling in the works of Chaucer, Shakespeare, or even Mark Twain according to our modern notion of words having only one "correct" spelling. As G. L. Brook states, "The term 'correct' is not a good one to use in describing language. It is very rarely true to say that one word is right and that all others are wrong" (Varieties of English 143).

There are a multitude of factors which affect how language is used in each attempt to communicate. Wyld states that the spoken language of each person varies according to the age, class, education, and habits of the speaker. His social experience,
traditions and general background, his ordinary tastes and pursuits, his intellectual and moral cultivation are all reflected in each man's conversation. These factors determine and modify a man's mode of speech in innumerable ways. They may affect his pronunciation, the speed of his utterance, his choice of vocabulary, the shade of meaning he attaches to particular words, or turns of phrase, the character of such similes and metaphors as occur in his speech, his word order and the structure of his sentences.

But the individual speaker is also affected by the character of those to whom he speaks. He adjusts himself in a hundred subtle ways to the age, status, and mental attitude of the company in which he finds himself. His own state of mind, and the mode of its expression are unconsciously modified by and attuned to the varying degree of intimacy, agreement, and community of experience in which he may stand with his companions of the moment. (A History 359)

Blake also tells us that "sociolinguistics has shown us that we each possess a multitude of languages which we use in the different social situations which we meet daily" (14).

One factor which creates variation in language is the idiosyncracies of the different speakers of each language.
G. L. Brook also tells us that "different speakers of English vary greatly in the extent of their vocabulary and in their skill in using it" (*Varieties of English* 13). Thus all language use is somewhat idiosyncratic, but this tendency to idiosyncracy is usually tempered by the speaker's understanding of various linguistic conventions which he assumes are also used by the person(s) being spoken or written to.

Often discussions of language use become complicated by the many situations in which individuals use language. It can be said that each individual speaks his own idiolect--an individual dialect of sorts--but does so according to the linguistic conventions recognized as appropriate to each situation. Each individual shares various linguistic conventions with those around him, and each social group (any group of two or more speakers) can be said to have its own dialect. However, since it is difficult to define exactly what constitutes a dialect, or even a language, subcategories of these terms are sometimes discussed. The variety of linguistic conventions which each person uses can be grouped under the subcategories of a dialect known as idiolect, register or level, and style (G. L. Brook *Varieties of English* 12-15), but grouping varieties of language use or linguistic conventions into these categories tells little about the language use itself.

Since individuals use language according to their
individual purposes and the changing contexts in which they find themselves, a study of language use should take into account these purposes and contexts. Thus a study of language use becomes a study of the message of a work, as well as a study of how and why the language was used in that specific context. Some methods for doing this are better than others, of course, since word counts and prolix generalizations often do not help one understand what is meant by a certain author in a specific context. Since nearly all language is purposeful, a study of language use should also be purposeful—-the main purpose being to understand the language use of a specific individual in a specific context. As G. L. Brook states:

There are some varieties of language which can be associated neither with groups nor individuals but with the occasions when they are used. . . . Their study may be regarded as the examination of language in the context within which it is used.

(Variedes of English 81)

If the dimension of time is added to a study of language use, this further complicates the analysis of language use because language changes considerably from age to age (G. L. Brook Variedes of English 15). The study of the history of the English language can become a complicated endeavor indeed. Any analysis of written records is complicated by the changes in the language since those
records have been written, as well as by the differences which always exist between the original writer and his audience and between the original writer and the language historian or analyst. The analysis is further complicated when different scribes or editors alter a manuscript because of their differing linguistic backgrounds occasioned by time, individual dispositions, or whatever. Language is often used by different individuals in the same context in dissimilar ways, especially when enough time has passed to allow for significant changes in the language itself.

Also, since language is used by individuals in so many different ways, and since it changes quite readily, dividing language into periods yields no better conclusions than those that can be arrived at from analyzing the texts themselves. As G. L. Brook states, "Since language is constantly changing, it is not always easy or profitable to divide the history of a language into periods" (A History 41). However, many histories of the English language attempt to show general trends and developments over time and therefore tend not to discuss how individuals have used the language.

More recently, however, a few books have been written on the language use of various individuals, although the individuals focused on are usually the literary giants in their day (e.g., Jane Austen, Geoffrey Chaucer, and Sir Walter Scott). In order to appreciate the language use of
an individual, one must be intimately acquainted with the language of that individual, as well as with the language of the time in which he lived. It is also helpful to understand how this individual's language use fits into the overall historical use of that particular language. As Stella Brook states:

The language of a particular century and, still more, the language of a particular book, cannot be discussed in isolation. Linguistic history, like any other kind of history, is continuous and each period must be related to its past as well as to its future. (36)

Likewise, since every language is a combination of many dialects, it is neither easy, profitable, or wise to expect uniform use of language by all users of that language at any given time. As one Old English reader states:

In its earliest phase one cannot even properly speak of the language as "English"; it was a collection of dialects brought over to Britain from the continent by Germanic invaders (the familiar Angles, Saxons, and Jutes) (Cassidy and Ringler 1; see also Laird 116-31).

The English language today is likewise "a collection of dialects"--a worldwide collection, as it were. Thus, even though certain generalizations can be made about language use in a period, these generalizations will not cover all
uses of language in each given period of time.

In the following two chapters we will examine pronoun usage by centuries to provide a general background for the pronoun usage of individuals who lived and wrote in each century. Obviously the language did not change drastically at the end or beginning of each century, and often the lifespan of an individual straddles a century. This approach is used simply for the sake of convenience, and it should be kept in mind that time is not the only factor one should be concerned with when examining language use.

As we have seen, the purpose of language is to communicate. If one wishes to communicate an archaic flavor with his message, he will usually use more archaic forms or words in his work (e.g., Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*). If one wishes to elevate the style of his language, then those forms which are used in formal situations in the language will tend to be used (e.g., the language of legal proceedings). However, if one wishes to communicate reverence for God in one’s language, one will use those words and forms of words which are associated with such reverence in the language. However, often some of the archaic forms of English are associated with religious feeling and elevated style simply because of they are found also in such revered works as the King James Bible. Whatever the intent of the message is, the language itself should reflect this intent in the words and forms of words.
chosen.

One thing to remember, however, is that most analyses of language are made of literary works, rather than of the writings of the common folk. Bolton even calls his brief summary of the history of the English language *A Short History of Literary English*. One reason the common folk did not write is simply that in earlier ages most of them did not even know how to write. If the task of understanding the history of the English language as used by the learned is a complicated endeavor, to understand the language of the unlearned can be a task even more complicated due to the paucity of sources.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* suffers from this literary bias, as we mentioned in chapter 1, since it was compiled mainly from published works of literature rather than from the letters and scrapbooks of the less learned. *The English Dialect Dictionary* and other specialized dictionaries complement the *Oxford English Dictionary* in this regard because they consider many of the variations of language use found in English.

Blake has written on how the language of the unlearned has been represented in literature and makes this comment:

> Since the standard language is an educated language, non-standard language has almost always been regarded as uneducated and unsophisticated.

... Because literature has until the recent
present been written by the educated, it is not unnatural that non-standard language has been widely looked down on as being the appropriate language for the lowly born, the foolish and the ignorant. (13)

Though the language of the unlearned is sometimes difficult to analyze because few have written on the subject and because few sources have survived which can be analyzed, it usually is common or simple language that is easy to understand, barring a few words which may be unfamiliar.

However, language variation occurs in the language of the learned as well as in the language of the unlearned. In each period of the history of the English language there has been a multitude of variations due to dialectal differences stemming from differences in idiolect, register (or level), or style. These variations have also occurred simply because there was no "standard" to base one's usage on which all people using the language understood or agreed upon.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

If only consistency is expected in language use, then one largely eliminates the possibility of differences in human personality and thinking expressed through language. People are not automatons and cannot always be expected to conform strictly to linguistic rules or conventions, many of
which they may know nothing about. One must be tolerant of the language use of others, especially that of earlier ages, in order to not create a bigger barrier between the past and the present than there already is.

It should be obvious by now that each person actually speaks his own dialect (which changes over time) and that each person uses language in an individual fashion. Each individual uses many varieties of language for many different purposes. Each use of language must be understood in its context. Therefore it should not be expected that the infinite varieties of language use can be delineated completely in any historical outline, especially one drawn from sources, many of which are summaries and generalizations of language use themselves.

In order to eliminate some of the inherent limitations of the historical examination in the following chapters, some excerpts of texts will be analyzed in their contexts, but obviously these passages cannot be discussed fully herein. So as not to distort the secondary sources cited herein by quoting them out of context, many secondary sources will be quoted at length. This will provide the reader with an abundance of evidence that throughout the history of the English language variation in second person pronoun usage has been the norm and will also give the reader a feel for the various authors who have written about the history of pronouns of address in English. Since
variation has been the norm in second person pronoun usage in English by both the learned and the unlearned since the thirteenth century, the reader will come to expect this variation and perhaps understand some of the complexity of pronouns of address in English. The reader will also come to understand that Joseph Smith's use of pronouns is not altogether an anomaly in the history of the English language, since many others of his day used pronouns in a similar way.
CHAPTER THREE
SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN
ENGLISH THROUGH THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

I. INTRODUCTION

The following historical examination will trace some of the changes in the second person pronouns of English, often referred to herein as pronouns of address, with special reference to shiftings between two forms and other seemingly inconsistent or irregular uses of pronouns of address. The pronouns of address which will be considered herein include the singular forms thou, thy, thine, and thee; the plural forms ye, your, yours, and you; and the related reflexive forms thyself, yourself, and yourselves.

Since pronominal shiftings did not occur in English until after the Norman Conquest, the discussion in this chapter is mainly limited to that period between the Norman Conquest and the end of the fifteenth century (for the use of pronouns of address in Old English see Finkenstaedt 28-47). The printing press arrived in England near the end of the fifteenth century and brought with it the need for a standard written English. The language use prior to the arrival of the printing press had varied considerably from place to place, as well as from age to age, and this continued to be the case with those who did not know how to
read. However, though the need for a standard written language was felt at this time, three centuries passed before the prescriptive grammarians were writing their works and influencing those who were linguistically insecure or unstable to adopt their prescriptions as the standard.

It is true, of course, that many of the literate were aware of what was happening to their language during this early time. William of Malmesbury comments in Latin (c. 1125) that those of one part of the country are not able to understand the English of those in another (209; qtd. in Elliott 390, n. 11) Two centuries later (after 1327), Ranulph Higden wrote a world history in Latin and John Trevisa added his comments (c. 1385) to those of Higden (in his translation of Higden's work) on the diversity of tongues in England and their near mutual intelligibility (Higden 2:157-63; Mosse 285-89).

In the middle of the fifteenth century Reginald Pecock writes:

Langagis, whos reulis ben not writen, as ben English, Freensch, and manye othere, ben chaungid withynne 3eeris and cuntrees [countries], that oon man of the oon cuntre, and of the oon tyme, my3te not, or schulde not kunne [be able to] undirstonde a man of the othere kuntre, and of the othere tyme; and al for this, that the seid langagis ben not, stabili and foundamentali writen. (Patrouch
Though the language of both the learned and the unlearned was changing considerably during these centuries, people generally understood each other and generally were not hampered by these changes. Once the printing press came on the scene, however, printers such as Caxton were often at a loss to know who to please when translating a word or what variation of a word to print (Baugh 235-37). Concerning these language changes Caxton states, "And certaynly our langage now used varyeth ferre from that whiche was used and spoken whan I was borne" (Baugh 236).

In this chapter we will discuss the second person pronoun usage from the Norman Conquest to the end of the fifteenth century with a special focus on the variations in pronoun usage, especially pronominal shiftings. The lengthy quotes are included to provide the reader with sufficient evidence that pronominal shiftings have occurred in all periods of English since the thirteenth century and also to allow the reader to become somewhat familiar with the levels of generality and expertise with which each language historian writes. As in chapter 1, the pronouns of address in passages being analyzed will be underlined without note.
II. DISCUSSION

A. GENERAL LOSS OF INFLECTIONS

In the earliest forms of the English language there were fewer grammatical inflections than are found in languages such as Greek or Latin, but there were more grammatical inflections in the language than in present-day English. However, many grammatical inflections were already disappearing in the earliest written forms of English. The personal pronouns, including the second person pronouns, suffered as well, but compared with other parts of speech these "losses were not so great" (Baugh 193; see also Bryant 67). The reason for this, as Baugh explains, is that "from the frequency of its use and the necessity for specific reference when used, the personal pronoun in all languages is likely to preserve a fairly complete system of inflections" (67). Pyles and Algeo tell us, however, that "the system of the pronouns has undergone several major and a number of minor alterations" (189).

Although the personal pronouns did survive the general loss of inflections rather well, perhaps better than most or all other grammatical systems in the language (Bambas 66; Bloomfield and Newmark 163; Emerson 319), the second person pronouns suffered worse than the first and third person pronouns. In the earliest forms of English there were twelve general forms used as second person pronouns in any
given dialect (one in each of the four cases for the singular, dual, and plural numbers), but today only two of these forms are in general use (you and your from eow and eower, respectively). The Oxford English Dictionary gives us this brief historical overview of the pronouns of address in English:

Thou and its cases thee, thine, thy, were in OE. used in ordinary speech; in ME. they were gradually superseded by the plural ye, you, your, yours, in addressing a superior and (later) an equal, but were long retained in addressing an inferior. Long retained by Quakers in addressing a single person, though now less general; still in various dialects used by parents to children, and familiarly between equals, esp. intimates; in other cases considered as rude. In general English used in addressing God or Christ, also in homiletic language, and in poetry, apostrophe, and elevated prose. ("thou")

The paradigms of the second person pronoun are also given in the Oxford English Dictionary for Old English, Middle English, and Modern English, but these are merely generalizations rather than pronouncements as to how they were used during a certain time period in some specific location ("thou"; see also Cassidy and Ringler 23; Emerson 319-20; and Lounsbury History 263).
Kennedy discusses some of the variations in second person pronouns found in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Kennedy's study, in fact, mentions "seventy forms" in use for the genitive (or possessive) plural alone (26) and numerous forms for each of the other pronouns of address (26-53). His "summary of all the numbers and cases of the pronoun of address for the [major documents] covering a period of approximately two hundred years shows the rather amazing total of 320 different forms" (53). Kennedy also discusses the varieties of syntax each form appears in (54-79). Kellner (168-97) and Curme (2:14-19, 52-54) both give a short historical overview of syntax of pronouns, while Visser's work is a more exhaustive treatment of the historical developments of English syntax.

One of the first losses of inflection is the loss of the separate forms of the pronoun for the accusative case in English. The dative forms took the place of the accusative quite early on in the history of English (Bryant 67). The Oxford English Dictionary states that

the original OE. acc[usative] *thec* still remained in Mercian in the 9th c. and in North Anglian (*thec, theh, thech*) late in the 10th; in W[est]Sax[on] it ran together early with the dative *the* [with eth or thorn as the initial letter], and thenceforth (as in L[ow]G[erman] and Scand[inavian]) the two cases have had the same
form, so that the direct and indirect object are only distinguishable by position or by context. ("thee")

Since the dative forms were used for the accusative quite early on, many historians of English do not even list the separate accusative forms for the personal pronouns of Old English in their paradigms. Thus three of the original twelve second person pronoun forms were nearly lost in English at its earliest recorded state (Emerson 321; Kennedy 26, 37-39, 49-52, 66-72).

Another example of this general loss of inflections is the loss of the dual pronouns. Strictly speaking, the dual pronouns were used to mean "you two," and no mention is made of its being used for addressing one person. "The dual is especially effective for showing close association between two people--as two men fighting side by side, or husband and wife, or lovers" (Cassidy and Ringler 23). The dual number was used early on in English, but even in the earliest documents we have in what we call English it "was disappearing" (Baugh 68). Lounsbury tells us that even in the ninth and tenth centuries it was not unusual to strengthen the dual forms by one of the words meaning 'both' or 'two'. . . . [I]nstances also occur in which buu, 'both,' and twaa or tuu, are together added to the form of the dual. As the number was by no means essential to
expression, its fate was sealed as soon as the force originally belonging to it was felt to be going. (History 265)

Traugott explains the dual and also adds that "for first and second person pronouns, then, plural strictly means 'more than two'; . . . ge [is], however, often extended in meaning to cover 'two or more'" (88). The three existing second person dual forms (as well as those of the first person) were simply dropped at some point in time, so only six second person pronoun forms were left.

However, when the dual finally disappeared in English is a matter of question, but it seems the last traces of it are found somewhere late in the thirteenth century (Baugh 67-68, 193; Bryant 67; Emerson 320; Kington-Oliphant 8; Lounsbury History 265; Robertson 124; "thou" Oxford English Dictionary). The last citation in the Oxford English Dictionary for a second person dual pronoun is "c.1250" ("inc"), although the last citation for a first person dual pronoun is "a.1300" ("unker"). Kennedy gives many examples and variants of the dual's being used in the thirteenth century (42-43, 77-79).

These six remaining pronouns of address were used quite consistently with regard to number and case early on (Baugh 292; Bryant 385; Traugott 88). However, after the Norman Conquest and the subsequent French influence in Great Britain, many changes in English followed which affected the
pronoun system in general (e.g., grammatical gender being replaced by natural gender [Cassidy and Ringler 90; Emerson 289-90]). Of these many changes (many of which do not affect the second person pronouns), only the genitive's coming to be used in a possessive sense and the rise of the reflexive will be dealt with in this section. Since the use of plural pronouns in a singular sense is one of the major points of focus in this thesis, the rise of the polite plural will be discussed in the next section.

Emerson mentions that "the genitive of the personal pronoun came to be used almost exclusively in a possessive sense, the older genitival idea having been lost except in a few phrases" (320). This change gave rise to the distinctions between thy and thine and between your and yours. Lounsbury discusses the development of these distinctions in some detail:

In the first part of the Early English period the genitives of the first and second personal pronouns often dropped their final -n, and accordingly exhibited the double forms min and mi, thin and thi. . . . The contracted forms mi and thi, for min and thin, made their appearance at the end of the twelfth century, and were at first used indifferently. As early certainly as the fourteenth century, however, a practice sprang up of using min and thin before words beginning with
a vowel or silent h, and mi and thi before consonants. (History 269, 277; see also E. A. Abbott 160; Barber 207-08; Jespersen A Modern English Grammar 2:399-403; Kellner 190-97; Kennedy 26, 31-37, 45-49, 59-66; Lounsbury 278-79; Mosse 58-59; Pyles and Algeo 189; Sweet A Short Historical English Grammar 107-09; "thine" Oxford English Dictionary; Wyld A Short History 236)

Another change is the creation and adoption of separate forms for the reflexive rather than using pronouns themselves as reflexives (E. A. Abbott 141; Franz 100, 129-33; Jespersen A Modern English Grammar 2:46; Kellner 184-89; Kennedy 22, 26, 39-42, 52-53, 72-77; Kington-Oliphant 49; Mosse 95-96). Lounsbury presents us with this historical overview of the rise of the reflexive:

In Anglo-Saxon the simple personal pronouns were constantly employed also as reflexives. This use of them has lasted down through all periods of the language to this day, though it is far less common now than formerly. From its very nature it led frequently to ambiguity. If there were no other reflexives than the simple personal pronouns, such an expression as "he killed him" would have, beside the sense it now has, the possible signification of "he killed himself."

Consequently a disposition began to be manifested
in the earliest speech, to make the reflexive sense more clear and emphatic. This was accomplished by the addition of the forms of the adjective self to the corresponding forms of the personal pronouns; thus the dative himself would be in Anglo-Saxon him selfum; the accusative, hine selfne. This tendency has gone on increasing to the present time, so that outside of the language of poetry, the simple personal pronouns are rarely used any longer in a reflexive sense. When this does occur, it is usually in phrases where the context would dispel any doubt as to the meaning.

During the Old English period, self, like other adjectives, gradually lost its inflection. In consequence it was often looked upon, both then and later, merely as a substantive, forming by its combination with the personal pronoun an independent word. This tendency was even seen in the Anglo-Saxon. This seems to be the reason why self, when stripped of its inflections, was joined to the genitive of the pronouns of the first and second person, or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say, it was treated as a substantive, with which agreed the possessive adjective pronouns corresponding to the genitive of these
personal pronouns. (History 283-86)

Eventually the reflexive forms came to be used even in a nominative sense (Burnham 264-67), and they are sometimes used as such even today.

B. THE RISE OF THE PLURAL OF POLITENESS

One of the more striking changes in the second person pronoun was the use of the plural forms of the second person pronoun in a singular sense as is done in French and many other European languages. This will be the major focus of the remainder of this historical examination. Lounsbury gives us this brief historical outline to introduce this development in the second person pronoun in English:

The Anglo-Saxon . . . never used, in addressing an individual, anything but the second person of the singular; and this continued to be the case, in our tongue also, for nearly two centuries after the Conquest. . . . [I]n the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the use of the plural steadily increased, and in the sixteenth century it became the standard form of polite conversation. (History 286-87)

The rise of this "plural of reverence," "plural of politeness," "plural of majesty," or "formal singular" in European languages has been a subject of interest to many scholars. Evans, citing Nyrop, states that "the desire to show respect to a superior was the primary factor in the
earliest known use, about the year 300, of the second-person plural pronoun as a singular in Latin" ("Dramatic Use" 38). Muller also recites some of the various explanations for the rise of this plural of reverence and then comments that "the plural thus became associated with the idea of majesty, and was extended to persons of high standing to express the reverence felt for their rank" (68-69). Muller also states:

How the use of the 'plural of reverence' developed from the time it originated down to the first works of Romance literature has never been fully described. As a matter of fact, its origin is still obscure. . . . There is no satisfactory account of one of the stages of this development, viz., the alternate use of tu and vos with the same person in the same speech or letter, and even in the same sentence, a usage which is still to be found in the early chansons de geste. (68-69)

He further notes that "it was a common practise in classical Latin to address one person of a group in the plural, having reference to the group, rather than to the individual member" (68; see Brookbank 13:119 for a biblical parallel).

Byrne tells us that

early literature adhered rigidly to the singular form of address. When the plural form for a singular subject made its appearance in the thirteenth century, it represented respect from
subject to King, from son to father, from inferior to superior, and so grew up as a courtly form. As it spread out from the court it retained its implication of respect, so the children of the nobility used you to their parents who continued to use thou to them; and inferiors generally granted you to their superiors; thus servants used it to master, lovers to each other, strangers to strangers, youth to age. This released thou for familiar interchange, so that intimacy and affection found verbal outlet through the natural pronoun which did further duty as the pronoun of contempt in contradistinction to the you of respectful address. (xix)

The rise and subsequent use of the plural of politeness is examined in detail by Kennedy in his *The Pronoun of Address in English Literature of the Thirteenth Century*, and Stidston analyzes fourteenth-century uses of the pronoun of address in his *The Use of Ye in the Function of Thou*. Byrne also traces the plural of politeness from its foreign origin to Shakespeare's time in the introduction to her *Shakespeare's Use of the Pronoun of Address: Its Significance in Characterization and Motivation*, and then she analyzes the second person pronoun usage in Shakespeare's works. Lounsbury's discussions of pronouns of address are insightful (*History* 263-89; "Pronouns of
Address" 200-06), and Finkenstaedt discusses the rise of the plural of politeness in Europe (15-27), as well as its use in Middle English (48-90).

Generally the credit for the introduction of the plural of politeness into England is given to the French influence brought in by the Normans after the Norman Conquest (e.g., Armour 143; Bradley 62-63; Emerson 322; Jespersen A Modern English Grammar 2:44; Robertson 125; Stidston 19; Traugott 136-37). As Curme states, "This new usage arose in English in the thirteenth century under the influence of French, which here followed the continental Latin usage" (2:16). Pyles and Algeo state:

As early as the late thirteenth century, the second person plural forms (ye, you, your) began to be used with singular meaning in circumstances of politeness or formality. In imitation of the French use of tu and vous, the English historical plural forms were used in addressing a superior, whether by virtue of social status or age, and in upper-class circles among equals, though highborn lovers might slip into the th-forms in situations of intimacy. The distinction is retained in other languages, which may even have a verb meaning 'to use the singular form'—for example, French tutoyer, Spanish tutear, Italian tuizzare, German dutzen. Late Middle English had thoute, with the
same meaning. (190)

Kennedy gives his opinion concerning the arrival of the plural of politeness in English in these words:

The question of the cause of causes of the introduction of the formal singular into English can be answered at best with conjectures only.

We know that a formal pronoun of address was very common in Old French literature as far back as the time of the writing of the version of the Roland now extant and if the O. F. romances of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are at all faithful in their portrayal of social intercourse, the formal singular was quite generally used. We also know that the English monasteries were full of French monks for some time after the Conquest and there was a constant intercourse between English and continental religious institutions.

... It cannot be questioned that the writers of much of our thirteenth century literature knew well the use of the formal pronoun in French.

... Rather it would seem probable that it was first an imitation at court of Anglo-Norman and Anglo-French usage which gradually appeared in the more serious literature of the times. ... As it is, it is only possible to conjecture that the English court which was so strongly French in the
days of Marie de France knew the new formal address and practiced it, but that being a courtly usage at first, it smacked too strongly of worldliness to be allowed to slip into the homiletic and religious-historical works of this early time.

The same argument which speaks for a French influence in introducing the formal singular into English usage opposes the idea that it could have come exclusively out of Latin usage. For Latin was not a popular tongue however widely it may have been used by scholars and it was not a living, growing language as the French was, hence could hardly have exerted the influence in this matter that the French could. (90-91)

Kennedy also comments (concerning the works he studied) that "in at least 75% of the monuments studied, which comprise much more than that percentage of literature, the poet was unquestionably in religious life a monk or priest" (81).

In his section on semasiology, Kennedy puts the various uses of the pronoun of address in the thirteenth century into three categories: "pronoun of confessional and pulpit" (80-81), "ambiguous usage" (82-85), and "formal singular" (85-89), the latter being the conclusive uses of the plural forms in a singular sense. He also cites two examples of the formal singular used in prayer (89) and summarizes his
findings in these words:

In very few instances, however, is formal address consistently maintained, but either the writer soon lapses into the use of the common sing[ular] or else the formal sing[ular] represents an isolated occurrence. . . .

On the whole, the use of the formal singular in English literature of the second half of the thirteenth century is sporadic and seems rather the occasional reflection of a practice familiar in some other tongue or at least in some other class of society than that represented by most of the English literature of the century. (89-90; see also Baugh 292-93; Bryant 385; Curme 2:14-16; Kellner 175-76)

Mosse gives us this sketch on how the plural of politeness was used in many works of this period:

There does not seem to have been any social or prestige connotations attached to the use of thou 'thou' and gee 'ye, you' in OE or EME. A distinction called a "plural of politeness" tended to develop, however, from the end of the 13th century. Superiors were addressed by you-forms and adolescents so addressed an adult: thus [in Chaucer's Pardoners Tale, lines 671ff] the young boy uses you to the patrons of the inn. In upper
class society you was used among equals; in the lower ranks thou was used as in OE [see Chaucer’s Pardoner’s Tale, lines 944-50]. But this use of you-forms was still quite irregular. It was not unusual to go from "thou" to "you" and from "you" to "thou" when speaking to the same person and in the same sentence, thus [in Havelok the Dane, lines 485-86] Al Denemark I wile you yeve To that forward thu late me live ‘all Denmark will I give you in return for the agreement (that) thou lettest me live’. In the Second Shepherds’ Play, sometimes the other shepherds use "thou" to Mak (lines 199, 222, 224, 235, etc.) and sometimes "you" (lines 208, 209, 217, 218, 220, etc.). In the extremely refined and courtly atmosphere of Gawaine and the Green Knight "you" is regularly used in conversations involving Gawain, the Lady and the Lord of the castle. But the Lady uses "thou" to Gawaine when the situation suggests that her tone has become more intimate. On the other hand, Gawain uses thou when addressing God, and in the Pardoner’s Tale the "old man" uses "you" in speaking to his mother, Earth (line 734). (94)

Kennedy gives this necessary caveat in his preface to Stidston’s work:

It is hardly necessary to suggest that the
material with which we work is not to be taken too seriously as one can never be absolutely sure that the author—or the scribe—is making his characters speak in a manner that is true to life. If in the succeeding pages the speeches are studied as tho [sic] they proceeded from living people the excuse must be that literary artists, or even near-artists, make their characters speak the language with which they themselves are familiar. . . . But after all, the fact that we are studying art and not real life, and at that art which has passed thru unknown vicissitudes of scribal manipulation, must not be lost sight of altogether. (4)

C. PRONOUN USAGE IN SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT

The second person pronominal forms used by the Green Knight (in his various disguises) and the Lady of the castle in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (c. 1370) will now be examined in order to show some of the pronominal confusion that existed during the end of the fourteenth century. The comments made here on pronoun usage in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight can be compared with those of Evans ("Dramatic Use" 138-45), Metcalf (165-78), and Stidston (94 and elsewhere). There is some disagreement with regard to how to interpret these pronominal shiftings, since this is one of the first English works in which such pronominal
shiftings are encountered. The plural of politeness was familiar to those who had read French literature, but it was not generally used in English literature of this period. As Evans states, "the pronoun thou is practically always the normal singular in the contemporary Northwest Midland alliterative poems, exclusive of Sir Gawain" ("Dramatic Use" 39).

In Fitt I ("fitt" is a term which means "book," "division," or "chapter") the Green Knight addresses Arthur and Gawain with second person singular forms. The usage is consistent in this fitt—all persons are addressed with the second person singular forms except when Gawain addresses Arthur and when Arthur addresses the Queen. There is one exception, however, on the part of the Green Knight when he is addressing Arthur but uses a plural form. This, however, can be explained by a simple shift in audience (i.e., addressing the court momentarily).

In Fitt II the Green Knight, disguised now as the Lord of the castle, addresses Gawain in these words:

Thenne lagande quoth the lorde, 'Now leng the byhoues,
For I schal teche yow to that terme bi the tyme
ende,
The grene chapayle vpon grounde greue yow no more;
Bot ge schal be in yowre bed, burne, at thyn ese'.

(1068-71)
Clearly, there is some pronominal confusion here on the part of the Lord of the castle. The confusion is cleared up, however, since Gawain and the Lord of the castle address each other with the plural forms thereafter in the fitt. Metcalf comments on this passage:

The situation is one in which both you and thou are appropriate, and in which the two combined are probably more effective than the use of either one alone would be. . . . Exclusive use of thou would be forward on the host's part; exclusive use of you would be too distant. The lord strikes the right note, and Gawain remains. (170)

Metcalf's explanation for the pronominal shiftings in this passage may not be completely satisfactory, but however one explains it, the pronominal confusion continues.

In Fitt III the Lord of the castle maintains his consistent use of plural forms with one major exception:

The lorde hym letted of that, to lenge hym resteyed,
And sayde, 'As I am trwe segge, I siker my trawthe Thou schal cheue to the grene chapel thy charres to make,
Leude, on Nw Gerez lygt, longe bifiefore pryme.
Forthy thou lye in thy loft and lach thyn ese,
And I schal hunt in this holt, and halde the towchez,
Chaunge wyth the cheuisaunce, bi that I charre hider;
For I haf fraysted the twys, and faythful I fynde the. (1672-79)

In this case the Lord of the castle consistently uses singular forms rather than the usual plural forms. Evans quotes both of these passages cited and explains that "these instances of thou by Bercilak [the Lord of the castle] may be regarded simply as evidence of an especially friendly fellow-feeling toward an amiable knight" ("Dramatic Use" 43), but he indicates that they may have a deeper significance than otherwise would be supposed ("Dramatic Use" 43-45).

The final fitt is where the real pronominal confusion appears. The Green Knight and Gawain address each other initially with singular forms, but as the Green Knight reveals his identity, both become confused as to which pronoun forms to use. Gawain shifts from singular to plural forms in the same discourse, and the Green Knight follows suit (see lines 2322-30, 2338-68). Then Gawain’s next response starts with plural forms, changes to singular forms, then shifts back to plural forms (see lines 2374-88). The Green Knight then follows with similar pronominal confusion:

Thou art confessed so clene, beknownen of thy mysses,
And hatz the penaunce apert of the poyn of myn egge,
I halde the polyzed of that plygt, and pured as clene
As thou hadez neuer forfeted sythen thou watz fyrst borne;
And I gif the, sir, the gurdel that is golde-hemmed,
For hit is grene as my goun. Sir Gawayn, ge maye Thenk vpon this ilke threpe, ther thou forth thryngez
Among prynces of prys, and this a pure token
Of the chaunce of the grene chapel at cheualrrous knygtez.
And ge schal in this Nwe Ger agayn to my wonez,
And we schyn reuel the remnaunt of this ryche fest ful bene. (2391-402)

The confusion is abated for a short while, but the final words of the Green Knight exhibit no real resolution. He starts out with a shift again to the singular form ("That schal I telle the trwly," line 2444), shifts to plural forms for the next fourteen lines of this fitt, then once again lapses into singular forms:

Therfore I ethe the, hathel, to com to thy naunt,
Make myry in my hous; my meny the louies,
And I wol the as wel, wyge, bi my faythe,
As any gome vnder God for thy grete trauthe.

(2467-70)

However, Gawain also shifts pronominal forms in his encounters with the Lady of the castle. Gawain consistently uses the plural forms, but the Lady shifts to singular forms off and on (lines 1248-58, 1272-75, 1481-86). Plural forms are used from that point on until the Lady shifts alternately when speaking to Gawain from singular to plural to singular and back to plural again. It is at this point, just before the Lady shifts back to plural, that Gawain uses the singular forms, then shifts to plural ones (1801-12). These two consistently use plural forms throughout the rest of the fitt.

It should be clear by now that there is a great deal of confusion with regard to pronouns in Gawain. Although both Evans ("Dramatic Use" 38-45) and Metcalf (165-87) supply some explanations for these shiftings, the fact that this was an early use of a form of speech in an area of England in which it had not become widely accepted makes it difficult to interpret these shiftings accurately.

Were these simply attempts to reflect the language of the day or attempts to imitate French linguistic customs? This is also difficult to determine exactly, since we know so little about the spoken language of that day. That there was the option of using either the singular or plural second person pronouns is one of the primary causes of the
confusion. Another possible cause of confusion to modern readers is that fanciful literature only vaguely reflects real life, and thus this early use of the plural of politeness makes it possible for an interpretation of the work to hinge almost entirely on the use of pronouns of address. To add to these problems, relatively little, if anything, is known about the author and scribe(s) which produced the only manuscript of this work that exists.

D. PRONOUN USAGE IN CHAUCER’S WORKS

Here we will examine the second person pronoun usage in some of Chaucer’s writings. First of all, since Chaucer was notably influenced by the French literary tradition and even translated some (e.g., Roman de la Rose; see Benson 685-767), it seems only reasonable to expect the plural of politeness (and pronominal shiftings) in his works as well. Indeed, this is what we find.

However, in contrast to Sir Gawaine, although we have many manuscripts of Chaucer’s writings, none of these are in his own hand. Textual problems multiply with each additional manuscript, so reconstructing exactly what Chaucer wrote is next to impossible. Nathan mentions a few of the textual problems inherent in Chaucer studies, and these textual problems also include such things as second person pronouns. Concerning line 1399 (Robinson edition) of the Friar’s Tale Nathan states, "of the fifty-five manuscripts containing the line, thirteen have you, one has
yee, ten have the, and thirty-one have thou" (41). Kerkhof writes concerning a similar problem:

The alternation of ye and thou no doubt reflects varying usage in Middle English, but it may also be due to the fact that in later times scribes of lower rank (we have no contemporary MSS of the Canterbury Tales) were not familiar with the forms of address in higher circles in Chaucer's time. (228)

Thus, even if there is sufficient evidence to conclude that Chaucer used pronouns of address in some consistent fashion, it would seem that one could not logically assume from this that the general populace in the fourteenth century were able to use them consistently. If some consistent use was maintained during this age of considerable linguistic change, it would seem that Chaucer would be the one to do it. Instead, we find a number of pronominal shiftings in Chaucer for which there is little or no explanation.

In his preface to William of Palerne, a French romance which was translated into English about 1350, Skeat states:

The distinction between the use of thou and ye (with their accompanying singular and plural verbs) is so well kept up throughout these poems that it would not be well to lose so good an opportunity of pointing it out. It was one of
those niceties of speech which it was the poet's especial business to observe. . . . [The examples given are] sufficient to show that thou is the language of a lord to a servant, of an equal to an equal, and expresses also companionship, love, permission, defiance, scorn, threatening; whilst ye is the language of a servant to a lord, and of compliment, and further expresses honour, submission, entreaty. Thou is used with singular verbs, and the possessive pronoun thine; but ye requires plural verbs, and the possessive you.

. . . Besides the insight we thus get into our forefathers' ways of speech, this investigation may serve to remind us . . . that the frequent interchange of the forms is the result, not of confusion, but of design and orderly use. (xli-xliii)

This summary as to how pronouns of address were used in Chaucer's day is often cited (Evans "'You' and 'Thou'" 96, 101; Kerkhof 227; Nathan 39; Skeat Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer 5:175; Stidston 8). It should be remembered, however, that the work Skeat speaks of is simply a translation of a French work into English, which in all probability presented many problems to the translator--including how to render the second person pronouns (Stidston 3-4, 68-70, 80). The argument that the English used their
pronouns without confusion because the French may have done so seems unsound, and the evidence seems to be to the contrary. As Stidston points out concerning translations from French into English, and William of Palerne is included in his study, "in no case does the English version use the plural as generally as the French does" (80).

Some of Chaucer's writings will now be examined to see if he, in fact, used the pronouns of address consistently. Evans states that "the relationship between Chaucer's usage and reality constitutes a dilemma precisely because of his skill," but also writes, "that Chaucer clearly recognized the possibilities of the two pronouns has been amply demonstrated" by both Walcutt and Nathan ("Dramatic Use" 39). This same Nathan states that

at first glance the characters in the 'Friar's Tale' may appear to speak their ye's and thou's haphazardly. Careful examination shows, however, that in all but one of ninety instances (the prologue is not considered here) usage is in accord with the pattern given by Skeat. (39)

Although Nathan admits that there is "one instance that seems to be a slip of Chaucer's pen" (42), he also affirms:

Thus it appears after a detailed analysis of the 'Friar's Tale' that Chaucer is remarkably consistent in his use of the pronoun of address, that correct usage becomes an effective dramatic
tool, and that apparent exceptions often disappear upon closer investigation. (42)

Then Nathan asks:

Is Chaucer, in his other tales, as consistent in his use of the pronouns of address as he is in the "Friar's Tale"? Generally, yes. The vast majority show approximately one lapse per hundred usages. However, the prose tales, those of the Canon Yeoman and the Knight, and the "Wife of Bath's Prologue," have a much larger proportion of errors. (42)

The "errors" in Chaucer's use of pronouns of address can be found in the works Nathan mentions, although some of these so-called errors may have been intentional on Chaucer's part due to the exigencies of rhyme or meter. The second person pronouns in the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale will be examined here in detail (using the Benson ed.) to see if Chaucer was either consistent or inconsistent in his use of them, but the possible "errors" introduced by scribes will not be dealt with in this examination.

In line 235 of the Wife of Bath's Prologue, the Wife of Bath begins by addressing one of her first three husbands with second person singular forms, but in line 241 shifts momentarily to a plural form, which seems to be necessary to keep the appropriate number of syllables in the line. But she later says:
By this proverbe thou shalt understande,
Have thou ynogh, what thar thee recche or care
How myrily that othere folkes fare?
For, certeyn, olde dotard, by youre leve, . . .
Have thou ynogh, thee thar nat pleyne thee.
(328-36)

She continues with singular forms from this point on until line 369, where she uses two plural forms, but shifts back to singular forms until line 378, which ends her discourse.

One possible explanation for these pronominal shiftings is the shift of reference on the part of the speaker. The Wife of Bath speaks of her first three husbands collectively, but shifts back and forth between plural and singular forms when referring to "them." Starting in line 379 she refers to them in a plural sense, but shifts in line 395 to singular forms until line 407, wherein she shifts back to plural forms. She continues with these plural forms until line 410, where she shifts to singular forms until line 419, then shifts back to plural forms until lines 429 and 430.

At this point the Wife of Bath says to one of her husbands:

Com neer, my spouse, lat me ba thy cheke!
Ye sholde been al pacient and meke,
And han a sweete spiced conscience,
Sith ye so preche of Jobes pacience. (433-36)
As we have seen, the Wife of Bath usually uses singular forms to address her husbands, but here she uses only one singular form and then uses only plural forms for the remainder of the passage (until line 450).

However, to her fifth husband she doesn’t use the plural forms at all (with the possible exception of line 580). Likewise, the Wife of Bath’s fifth husband only uses singular or th-forms when he addresses her (lines 803-21). Elliott also mentions her "topsy-turvy use of thee" when she says to the other pilgrims in line 711, "But now to purpos, why I tolde thee" (186).

These pronominal shiftings in the Wife of Bath’s prologue parallel those found in the tale she gives. The Knight only uses pronouns of address on three occasions to the Old Wife. He initially uses the plural forms (1005-08), then after they are married he exclaims, "Thou art so loothly" (1100), and finally ends with plural forms (1228-35). The Old Wife also shifts back and forth between singular and plural forms when addressing the Knight. Her constant shifting is evident by her using plural forms (1001-1004), singular forms and one plural form (1009-12), then continuing to use singular forms thereafter before her marriage (1014-20, 1054-57, 1062-66). Then after her marriage, she uses plural forms (1087-96, 1104), plural forms along with two singular forms in lines 1160 and 1161 (1106-1227), then finally plural forms (1236-37, 1239-49).
Both the Knight and the Old Wife shift occasionally, but perhaps more shiftings would have occurred if Chaucer had had the Knight use more second person pronouns.

It seems doubtful that any certain conclusions can be drawn from these pronominal shiftings. However, Kerkhof discusses some of these pronominal shiftings in the "Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale" and suggests some explanations and also gives some examples of inconsistent or variant pronoun usage (228-32). One of these examples is found in the Franklin's Tale where Dorigen prays to God and shifts from singular pronominal forms to plural, back to singular, and ends on plural, with no apparent reason for these shifts:

Eterne God, that thurgh thy purveiaunce
Ledest the world by certein governaunce,
In ydel, as men seyn, ye no thyng make. . . .
Why han ye wroght this werk unresonable? . . .
Se ye nat, Lord, how mankynde it destroyeth? . . .
Which mankynde is so fair part of thy werk
That thou it madest lyk to thyw owene merk.
Thanne semed it ye hadde a greet chiertee
Toward mankynde; but how thanne may it bee
That ye swiche meenes make it to destroyen. . . .

(865-93)

Stidston cites a number of examples of the use of the plural pronoun of address to Deity and then notes:

The interesting thing about the small but
insistent minority of plurals addressed both to the members of the Trinity and to the Holy Virgin is that they seem to represent an abortive tendency to carry the form of respect in the direction of worship. . . . The few instances of the plur[al] addressed to God or Christ are probably due largely to a feeling on the part of the author that there is an almost human relationship between the speaker and the one addressed. (47-48; see also Lounsbury "Pronouns of Address" 203-04)

It should now be obvious that variations of pronoun usage occur in Chaucer’s works (Elliott 50-51, 139, 186, 228, 230-31, 382, 412-13). Even though "he seems to have taken exceptional care in choosing between ye and thou" (Kerkhof 228), at times Chaucer’s usage is not what is expected (Emerson 322; Kerkhof 229; Traugott 136-37).

E. GENERAL PRONOUN USAGE IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The pronoun usage which has been analyzed thus far has been mainly that of the highly literate who also were those more susceptible to the French literary traditions and courtly influences. At this time English was again coming into its own and many used pronouns of address as the French did, but the usage of the general populace is still a matter of question. Schlauch states that "though some tendencies toward [expressing social distinctions grammatically] may be
detected in the late medieval distribution of thou and ye for the singular, the distinction never became a rigid one" (53).

Stidston has examined "practically all the contents of the most important MSS. copied between approximately 1325 and 1375" (3) and summarizes the use of pronouns of address by inferiors to superiors during this period:

At its best the use of the more formal pronoun can only be said to be in its experimental stage. Persons of all ranks naturally use the singular still and it is only when a speaker—usually one of the higher classes who knows the fashions of the day, linguistic as well as otherwise—desires to make a good impression upon some superior than he employs the plural. The common people do not show any very strong tendency to use the plural. In some instances the presumption is strong that they are not familiar with the practice. . . . The very fact that it is addressed to God and used in other places which seem, to say the least, uncalled for, would imply that the new practice of formal address was either not very well understood or else was not regarded as of much importance. It is a fashion for the fashionable, a sort of tool in the hands of those who have the desire and skill to use it, for shaping certain personal ends
such as the appeasement of an angry superior or the gaining of some coveted favor. (49-50)

Since it is the common folk who usually retain the older forms of any given language (see Byrne xxxii; Curme 2:16; Pyles and Algeo 191), some attention must be paid to them as well. Emerson comments in this regard:

During the Middle English period, the plural ye, you, began to be used in ceremonious address in place of the singular. . . . The first instances of such use . . . occur in the thirteenth century, and by Chaucer's time it was evidently common. . . . During all this time the older singular remained among the common people, and was probably used to some extent among the upper classes, by superiors to inferiors, and in the older language of poetry. . . . How long the older singular remained in use among familiars it is difficult to ascertain. (322)

Kington-Oliphant gives us this picture of the period:

In Pronouns, we are struck by the sharp distinction now first drawn between thou and ye; the thou is used by a husband to his wife, (alas for the age of chivalry!) as to a person beneath him; the ye is used by a wife to her husband, who is above her. . . . More than a hundred years before this time [c. 1180], Nigel Wireker had
complained of the English students at Paris, who drank too much and were far too familiar in speech:

Wesseil et drinchail, necnon persona secunda;
Haec tria sunt vitia quae comitantur eos.
[i.e., using the "familiar" second person pronoun was another one of their vices; see Longchamp 50-51, 137; Wireker 1:63]

That is, the English would not lay aside their national and straightforward thou, thou, for the polite French vous. The change was at length effected by 1303, and the distinction now made lasted for three hundred years. (456)

The English did not employ the plural of politeness generally until after the French influence had been in England hundreds of years. Kennedy says of this:

Nor is it to be wondered at that after two centuries the usage was not entirely fixed, for it is not just a question of instituting a new linguistic custom or practice, but the introduction of this phase of formal address into England brings with it an entirely new attitude toward social intercourse and the relations of the various strata of society. For the Anglo-Saxon bluntness and sincerity of speech it would substitute a new French culture characterized by
greater polish and an artificiality which covers in many instances, we must admit, a very great lack of sincerity. (Stidston 4)

Stidston summarizes the pronoun usage in the fourteenth century and concludes:

There is evidence of an increase in this practice of formal address, tho [sic] it is not easy to measure the growth because of the heterogenous nature of the literature from which it has been necessary to draw conclusions. In Sir Gawayn and William of Palerne the plur[al] in the mouths of the characters seems due at times to mere force of habit. But if these two monuments be set aside we may say that the sing[ular] is . . . the accepted form and the use of the plur[al] should call for some special explanation. That the use of the plur[al] is increasing seems to be evidenced by the very confusion and shifting which we have been unable to explain in many cases except as the proof of a divided usage in fourteenth-century England.

This new phase of polite usage which is invading England is, as one would expect, confined largely to members of the upper classes of society. . . . 

The lowest classes still cling to the old
forms of address even in their speech to kings and queens. They are, of course, slow to adopt a custom which represents a phase of courtly life entirely foreign to their usual course of life. So, while in the French the sing[ular] may be accounted for at times as a direct insult, it is rarely, perhaps never, that in the English of our period. Rather it shows the speech of the plain man who speaks sincerely and directly. (81; emphasis added)

During this time the distinction between ye as a nominative form and you as an objective form began to break down. Lounsbury traces this development between Chaucer’s day and Shakespeare’s day:

In Chaucer’s writings ye and you . . . are never confounded. The former is invariably the case of the subject; the latter, the case of the object. Occasional instances of confusion between the two cases have been discovered in writings of the fourteenth century; but they are so few in number, that it is more reasonable to attribute the great majority of them to blunders by the copyists rather than to intention on the part of the author. Undoubtedly the resemblance in writing . . . between the letters y and the Rune [the thorn] contributed largely to the confusion of the
two forms, so that thou [i.e., the thorn + ou] was frequently indistinguishable from you; at any rate, it was not distinguished from it. As a result, you was supposed to be meant when thou was intended. As is inevitable in such cases, what was originally a blunder came soon to be accepted as an authorized form. Besides this, there were other agencies at work to break down the distinction between the nominative ye and the objective you. In the fifteenth century this result had come to pass to a considerable extent. Still it was not till after the middle of the sixteenth century that the confusion between the two forms showed itself on any large scale. (History 271-72)

Stidston gives some examples of you used as a nominative in the place of thou in the fourteenth century (69).

J. PRONOUN USAGE IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

In general, this century was a period of tremendous language change, and pronouns of address were used somewhat unsystematically in this century as well. It is difficult to ascertain what the pronoun usage of the common folk was in this century due to the scarcity of documents. This century is often ignored since few real significant literary figures appear between Chaucer (d. 1400) and Caxton. Therefore the citations for this age of transition are
sparse and represent mainly the pronoun usage of the literary.

Jespersen cites examples of pronoun usage from Malory and later authors and states:

The distinction between the two forms of addressing one person corresponded pretty nearly to that of the French tu and vous; but it was looser, as very frequently one person addressed the same other person now with thou and now with you (ye), according as the mood or the tone of the conversation changed ever so little. (A Modern English Grammar 2:44-45)

Another example of pronoun usage in this century is Caxton’s Blanchardyn and Eglantine published about 1489. Kellner, who edited this work, comments on the use of pronouns in this work (xxix-xxxvi) and states that "in many cases thou and ye are used in the same speech" and gives examples of pronouns used in this way in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (xxx). Curme mentions that "in Pecock’s Donet (about A.D. 1449) the father, throughout the book addresses his son by thou and thee, while the son out of deference uses ye and you" (2:16).

Norman Davis’s comments on the Paston letters (c. 1422-91) can give us an indication as to how pronouns of address were used by some during this era:

A point of social as well as linguistic
interest, well illustrated by the letters of the entire family, is the use of the pronouns and verbs of the second person. The singular 'thou' and its oblique cases are never used in normal correspondence, however intimate the writers: husband to wife, mother to son, one brother to another, even master to servant, all use 'ye' and 'you' invariably. In this they differ from the practice of some of the Celys about the same time. Richard Cely the elder uses 'thee' and 'thy' (beside 'ye', 'you', 'your') in several letters of 1477 and 1478 to his son George, and Richard the younger uses I pray thee to his servant in 1481. Where the singular occurs in the Paston letters it always implies anger, contempt, or hostility. The following extract, from an account by Margaret in 1448 of an attack by a certain Wymondham and his men on her chaplain James Gloyes, exemplifies the tone:

And Jamys Gloyes come wyth his hatte on his hede betwen bothe his men as he was wont of custome to do. And whanne Gloyes was a yenst Wymondham, he seid thus: 'Couere thy heed.' And Gloyes seid ageyn, 'So I shall for the.' And whanne Gloyes was forther passed by the space of iiij or iiiij strede Wymondham
drew owt his dagger and seid, 'Shalt thow so, knave?'
The youngest John, in 1472, writes of a quarrel he had with the same Gloyes: 'We fyll owtbhe for my modyr wyth "thow prowd prest" and "thow prowd sqwyer".' And in 1469 he reports Edward IV as rebuking Sir William Brandon in these words: 'Brandon, thow thou can begyll the dwk of Norffolk and bryng hym abow[t] the thombe as thow lyst, I let the wet thow shalt not do me so; for I vnderstand thy fals delyng well j now.' (131-32)

Norman Davis concludes that "in roughly the third quarter of the fifteenth century men of some education, of similar background and interests, could choose among so many 'permitted variations' that no two of them wrote exactly alike" (130). He also observes that clearly one man might in his time use many [grammatical or spelling] forms, sometimes changing them quite suddenly; and each so regularly that his writings could be placed in roughly chronological order on their evidence alone. (131)
III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Pronouns of address were used quite consistently with regard to number before the Norman Conquest and for a few hundred years thereafter. The English slowly adopted the French linguistic fashion of addressing a single person with a pronoun which was plural in form. Once the plural of politeness had been introduced generally among the upper classes, the upper classes then demanded it from those of the lower classes. It seems that these changes were due to various social forces, but what the real causes were will remain a question.

The writings we have examined thus far have been mainly those of the highly literate. Since the educated were able to write and the uneducated were not, there is less information on how the general populace spoke during these times, since all reading materials were handwritten until the printing press was introduced in England. This is one reason why there are so many discrepancies between various manuscripts of Chaucer and other writers during these centuries. Even after the Bible was translated into the English vernacular, the general movement for literacy (by the Lollards and Wycliffites in the fourteenth century) did not succeed until after the printing press made reading matter available to the common folk.
CHAPTER FOUR
SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN ENGLISH
AFTER THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

I. INTRODUCTION

The English language as a whole was starting to become fairly standardized after the arrival of the printing press in England in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. William Caxton and other printers had their share of worries as to how to "turn" Latin or French into English because each part of the country had a different dialect. While the plain folk wanted books that were "Englished" in a simple way, the scholarly demanded sophisticated translations full of foreign phrases.

Often historical events change both the lives and language of many people in a dramatic way. As Baugh states regarding this period to be discussed:

In the development of languages particular events often have recognizable and at times far-reaching effects. [Some of the] new factors [which caused] English to develop along somewhat different lines from [conditions] that had characterized its history in the Middle Ages [are] the printing press, the rapid spread of popular education, the
increased communication and means of communication, and the growth of what may be called social consciousness. (240)

II. DISCUSSION

A. PRONOUN USAGE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

The second person pronoun usage of some writers of the sixteenth century will now be examined. Some writers differentiated between ye as a nominative form, while others used you as a nominative form (Lounsbury "Pronouns of Address 201). Lord Berners, in his translation of Froissart's Chronicles (1523-25), "always distinguishes" between the nominative ye and the dative. He also uses yours for the second person possessive (e.g., "the noble and gentyl kyng of yours" [Wyld A History 119]). Sir Thomas Elyot, in his Boke Called the Governour (1531), nominative ye and accusative and dative you "are distinguished" (Wyld A History 121). In George Cavendish's Life of Cardinal Wolsey (1557), "ye and you are used indifferently" for the nominative, "especially in addressing one person" (Wyld A History 123). Hugh Latimer (1485?-1555) uses ye and you "indifferently" in the nominative plural (Wyld A History 126). Roger Ascham (1515-68) uses you and ye "indifferently" in the nominative, "both in addressing one or several persons. On one occasion ye is used as if for
variety in a sentence in which *you* has already occurred three times" (Wyld *A History* 129). John Lyly (1554?-1606) uses *you* "for all cases," whether singular or plural, "but *thou, thee, [and] thy* (thine before vowels) are used in affectionate address" in a singular sense. "*Ye* also occurs" in the nominative plural (Wyld *A History* 135). Queen Elizabeth (1533-1603) "never uses *thou*" or other singular forms, "always *you(e)*" (Wyld *A History* 139). Henry Machyn (1498?-1563?), a diarist writing in the middle of the century (1550-63), uses only "*yowe*" in the second person plural nominative (Wyld *A History* 145).

Wyld summarizes his findings concerning the pronoun usage in this century as follows:

Down to the middle of the sixteenth century writers generally distinguish between Nom[inative] *ye* and Acc[usative] Dat[ive] *you*. The Pl[ural] forms already in M.E. are used in respectful address to a single person.

While, for instance, Sir Thos. More and Lord Berners distinguish between *ye* and *you*, B[isho]p Latimer, Ascham, Cavendish, and Euphues [John Lyly's work] use both forms indifferently for the Nom[inative]. Q[ueen] Elizabeth appears to employ *you* alone for Nom[inative] and oblique cases, Sing[ular] and Pl[ural]. On the whole, in the sixteenth century, while *you* is common as a
Nom[inative], **ye** is much rarer as an Acc[usative] or Dat[ive].

**Ye** is sometimes introduced merely for variety, cf. Ascham—"**you** that be shoters, I pray **you**, what mean **you** when **ye** take', &c. . . .

(Wyld *A History* 330; see also Curme 2:15-16; Pyles and Algeo 192)

Byrne traces the "prevailing distinction between **thou** and **you** in the sixteenth century" in these words:

Whereas in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the use of the plural form constantly multiplied, in the sixteenth century it became the pattern for polite conversation, whilst the use of the singular to individuals of the like rank, but bearing no particular connection of intimacy to one another, was designed to be rude and was so deemed.

. . . **You** was the tranquil form which appeared in habitual speech among the lettered classes, whereas **thou** could display manifold sentiments, such as anger, contempt, familiarity, superiority, or love. (xxviii)

Gordon states that "as the general use of **thou** declined, the polite use of the plural pronoun with singular reference became more widespread" (193). He also maintains that "eventually **ye*/you** rather than **thou*/thee** became
mandatory in polite address" (193). His explanation for this phenomenon is as follows:

The two cases probably began to fall together in the fourteenth century because their unstressed forms in weak sentence position were much alike, as illustrated by Chaucer's rhyme Troie/Joie/fro ye. . . . At any rate you in nominative positions became more frequent in the fifteenth century and was formally established in the sixteenth, although ye continued to be used into the seventeenth century. (193)

Baugh also discusses this same phenomenon and then affirms that "in the course of the seventeenth century you becomes the regular form for both cases" (293). Finkenstaedt also discusses the use of pronouns of address in the sixteenth century (91-173).

Stella Brook has written The Language of the Book of Common Prayer and discusses many versions, some of which are products of the sixteenth century and some of which are products of the seventeenth century. Some of her discussion follows:

For the most part, the Book of Common Prayer, in its original form and in its revisions, retains the distinction, thou and thee being used not only in addressing God but also in addressing the individual human being, ye and you being used in
addressing a congregation collectively. . . . However, even in the 1549 Book, there are signs of the extension of you to singular use. That part of the Catechism which goes back to 1549 employs both you and thou, and the fluctuation is too haphazard to be explained by the assumption that the children are sometimes addressed collectively, sometimes individually. (54)

She also states that "there seems to be an unstated but deep-rooted English belief that it is irreverent to address God as 'You'" (53-54).

Stella Brook also points out that

The real danger arising out of changing grammatical habits between the sixteenth and the twentieth centuries is that grammatical features of the language of the Book of Common Prayer may not be recognised as such, and may be mistaken for features of style. Such characteristics as the retention of the second singular personal pronoun . . . are liable to be regarded as the mannerisms of a deliberately 'poetic', high-flown style, whereas they are really simply the survivals of normal, everyday grammatical forms which have since been discarded. (53)

She also discusses a variety of other aspects of second person pronouns in the Book of Common Prayer (53-56).
As we near the end of the sixteenth century, frequent mention is made of Shakespeare and his age. Craik notes that "thou was still common in the English of Shakespeare's age" (qtd. in Byrne xxxii). However, Partridge states:

A comparison of the occurrences of thou and you in Shakespeare and Ben Jonson admirably reveals the complexity of a blunted social custom. Jonson, for instance, used thou more sparingly than Shakespeare; and this may show that you was gradually becoming the ordinary parlance of the day. Shakespeare's fondness for thou must have been archaic or the result of a Warwickshire dialect habit which he brought to London. . . .

By 1600, the distinctions seem to have become too subtle for the average person to observe, as are the uses of shall and will in modern English. A contributory cause of the breakdown may have been the rise in social position of the middle and lower classes. (25; emphasis added)

Platter comments in this regard, "neither Marlowe nor, for that matter, Ben Jonson nor any other of the Elizabethan writers appear to have been guided by anything like a principle" in their use of second person pronouns (131; see also 131-35).

Byrne also comments on the endurance of thou among the common folk:
At the end of the sixteenth century you, the old plural, was the ordinary form in the average speech of the higher and middle classes; but thou endured in the use of the lower classes with no claim to culture. The choice between the two forms continued, none the less, to avail in evincing differences in the attitude of speaker to listener, degrees of contrast which do not allow of strict specification. (xxxii)

B. SHAKESPEARE’S PRONOUN USAGE

Since Shakespeare’s works straddle the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and since his works are considered representative of the language of his day, his pronoun usage will be discussed here in a separate section.

The frequencies of the second person pronouns in Shakespeare’s works will be given here. These word counts are found in Spevack and the frequencies are based upon the total number of words (884,647; see Spevack v) in Shakespeare’s works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRONOUN USAGE IN SHAKESPEARE’S WORKS</th>
<th>FREQ.</th>
<th>% TOTAL PRONOUNS</th>
<th>FREQ./TOTAL WORDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thee</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>.0927%</td>
<td>.3825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thine</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>.0135%</td>
<td>.0558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>.1588%</td>
<td>.6556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thy</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td>.1175%</td>
<td>.4851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thyself</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>.0065%</td>
<td>.0267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTALS</td>
<td>14,205</td>
<td>.3890%</td>
<td>1.6057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>.0094%</td>
<td>.0386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>14,326</td>
<td>.3923%</td>
<td>1.6194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>.1918%</td>
<td>.7916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yours</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.0073%</td>
<td>.0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>.0082%</td>
<td>.0338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourselves</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.0020%</td>
<td>.0085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTALS</td>
<td>22,310</td>
<td>.6110%</td>
<td>2.5219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36,515</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus a second person pronoun occurs every twenty-five words in Shakespeare's works. One interesting thing is that **you** occurs more times than all the **th**-forms added together. These frequencies do not include contractions or combined forms which include these pronouns. Also, these frequencies exclude the editorial additions which account for about 350 additional second person pronouns.

The question here is whether or not Shakespeare was consistent in his use of pronouns. The pronoun usage of the Elizabethan era is somewhat different than that of today:

The Elizabethan writer had at his command certain means for heightening the emotional character of a passage and for increasing the vividness of presentment. Thus, the discriminating use of "thou" and "you" could depict a variety of feeling in a way, and with a subtlety, no longer possible. "You" was the unimpassioned form which prevailed
in ordinary speech among the educated classes, whereas "thou" could express numerous emotions such as anger, contempt, familiarity, superiority, or love. (Ward and Waller 3:527)

It is obvious that Shakespeare was able to use pronouns of address to dramatic advantage, but whether he used them consistently is another question. Some defend his use of pronouns adamantly and argue that in every case there is an underlying emotion or subtle motivation to prompt the change in pronouns (Byrne xxxvi). However, we shall see that Tulloch's view more nearly accords with the evidence:

Franz and Abbott attempt to reduce Shakespeare's use of these pronouns [i.e., thou and you] to rule, but a residue of examples remain, for which none of these rules provides adequate explanation. One is at a loss to provide any reasoned explanation for sentences like: 'If thou beest not immortal look about you' (JC II iii 7). (135)

By far the most comprehensive analysis of pronouns of address in Shakespeare is the work done by Geraldine Byrne (Shakespeare's Use of the Pronoun of Address: Its Significance in Characterization and Motivation). However, her work is not as authoritative as those of E. A. Abbott (A Shakespearian Grammar [sic]) and Wilhelm Franz (Shakespeare-Grammatik [in German]). The main body of Byrne's work is simply an analysis of Shakespeare's use of the pronouns of
address in each of his plays, but her introduction is also a helpful historical overview of sources on pronouns of address. She believes that Shakespeare was able to use thou "easily and sincerely," even though "you had secured the mastery" (xxxii) in his day.

According to Byrne, E. A. Abbott's discussion of Shakespeare's use of pronouns of address "point[s] to the general interpretation that thou answers as the pronoun of the heart; you the pronoun of the head" (xxxix-xxxiii). E. A. Abbott himself maintains that nearly all pronominal shiftings stem from some real motivating cause in the speaker:

In almost all cases where thou and you appear at first sight indiscriminately used, further considerations show some change of thought, or some influence of euphony sufficient to account for the change of pronoun. (158)

However, E. A. Abbott also concedes that in Shakespeare the inflections of Personal Pronouns are frequently neglected or misused. It is perhaps impossible to trace a law in these irregularities. Sometimes, however, euphony and emphasis may have successfully contended against grammar.... For reasons of euphony also the ponderous thou is often ungrammatically replaced by thee, or inconsistently by you. This is particularly the
case in questions and requests, where, the pronoun being especially unemphatic, **thou** is especially objectionable. (139)

E. A. Abbott also explains how second person pronouns in Shakespeare’s day were used:

**Thou** in Shakespeare’s time was, very much like "du" now among the Germans, the pronoun of (1) affection towards friends (2) good-humoured superiority to servants, and (3) contempt or anger to strangers. It had, however, already fallen somewhat into disuse, and, being regarded as archaic, was naturally adopted (4) in the higher poetic style and in the language of solemn prayer. (153-54)

Abbott then discusses the pronoun usage of Valentine and Proteus in **Two Gentlemen of Verona** (1.1.1-62, 2.5.120) and then adds this comment:

Fathers almost always address their sons with **thou**; sons their fathers with **you**. . . . A wife may vary between **thou** and **you** when addressing her husband. . . . **Thou** is generally used by a master to a servant, but not always. Being the appropriate address to a servant, it is used in confidential and good-humoured utterances, but a master finding fault often resorts to the unfamiliar **you**. (154-55)
He then tells us that "thou towards strangers who were not inferiors was an insult" (157) and also explains:

Thou is often used in statements and requests, while you is used in conditional and other sentences where there is no direct appeal to the person addressed. Similarly the somewhat archaic ye is distinguished by Shakespeare from you by being used in rhetorical appeals. ... In the original form of the language ye is nominative, you accusative. This distinction, however, though observed in our version of the Bible, was disregarded by Elizabethan authors, and ye seems to be generally used in questions, entreaties, and rhetorical appeals. Ben Jonson says: "The second person plural is for reverence sake to some singular thing." (158-59; see Jonson 73)

Byrne summarizes Franz's studies on Shakespeare's use of pronouns of address:

He holds the general opinion that thou is the pronoun of emotion, passion, affection; you is the pronoun of indifference, calm, measure. In a further study, he regards you as the prevailing form of dispassionate address among the upper and middle classes by the close of the sixteenth century, while thou remains popular on the lips of those who are lacking in good breeding, or
indifferent to niceties of form, though it is sometimes clung to privately for use in affectionate and good-humoured expressions, especially by the uneducated whose communication is more informal. . . .

His observations point to the fact that Shakespeare's use [of pronouns] is that of the general usage of his time. Accordingly, you is expressive of superiority and of indifferent equality; thou is the index of inferiority and of emotional response. With mutations of situation or of whim you and thou relieve and replace each other. (xxxiii; see Franz 104-17)

From the following citation from Byrne it can readily be seen why she could explain Shakespeare's use of pronouns of address so well—to her it had wide latitude:

Universally in Shakespeare thou is the pronoun which betrays all emotional responses, except where it is so customarily used that a change of feeling or an excess of feeling can be conveyed only by a reversion to the less familiar you as is the case in the French usage, in which if tu is impolite where vous is becoming, so vous where tu is "de rigueur." Thou as the pronoun of feeling is used between lovers under the influence of their emotion. It reveals companionship, love,
familiar tenderness, joy, delight, pathos, earnest appeal, defiance, scorn, threatening, excitement, anger, contempt. Employed by equals of the lower classes, it is also used to a servant by a master who favors and approves him, as also by a father to his son. It serves for a contemptuous aside, and as a frequent form of reference to one absent. As a rhetorical pronoun, it is used euphonically, or in the poetic style, in a spirit of reverence, and in solemn prayer. You, in the singular, is regarded as the ordinary conversational pronoun, used in the unimpassioned speech of the educated. It is employed in calm discussion between equals of the upper classes. Moreover, it is the pronoun of compliment and courtesy, and as such, used by a servant to his lord, by a son to his father, and with the appellative "sir." Finally, thou is generally reserved for fluctuations of attitude and feeling, you for quiet courtesy; thou is intimate and responsive, warm, and indicative of fancy and feeling, you is expressive of fact and form. . . . It is important to realize, moreover, that the basis of distinction between thou and you being one of attitude partly, it is entirely proper to apply both pronouns to the same person, providing that the change go with a corresponding
change in attitude. (167-68; see also Partridge 24-28)

Pyles and Algeo also discuss Shakespeare's "artistic discrimination" in his use of pronouns of address in Hamlet 3.4.9-21 and then state:

Elsewhere also Shakespeare chooses the y-forms and the th-forms with artistic care, though it is sometimes difficult for a present-day reader, unaccustomed to the niceties offered by a choice of forms, to figure him out. (191; Barber 210)

The above statements of Shakespeare's consistency of pronoun usage leave latitude for allowing inconsistencies, since they either do not deal with all of the passages in Shakespeare's works, or they frankly admit that there are exceptions which cannot be explained. For example, Pyles and Algeo maintain that

there is frequently no apparent reason for their [i.e., the pronouns'] interchange, as in the dialogue between two servants in The Taming of the Shrew 4.1.101-104:

**Cur[tis]**  Doe you heare ho? you must meete my maister to countenance my mistris.

**Gru[mio]**  Why she hath a face of her owne.

**Cur[tis]**  Who knowes not that?

**Gru[mio]**  Thou it seemes. . . . (190)

This passage is not specifically discussed by Byrne (48).
Lounsbury comments in this regard that
the distinction between thou, thee and ye, you,
was never thorough-going in English. The rigid
rules that have been authoritatively laid down for
their exact employment will not stand the test of
careful examination. The same character
addressing another in the same conversation will
frequently pass from the singular pronoun to the
plural, and from the plural pronoun to the
singular, without any conceivable reason. The
transition will sometimes even occur in the same
sentence. In particular, it is often the case
that the nominative or objective of the singular
will be found immediately joined with the
possessive pronoun representing the plural.

(Emerson 288)

Whether Shakespeare always used pronouns of address
intentionally in such fashion as he did, or whether he
reflects the confusion with regard to pronouns found
generally in his day is still a matter of question, but he
did use them sufficiently inconsistently that all examples
cannot be explained according to the rules offered. At any
rate, the evidence is that in Shakespeare's day
the distinction between nominative and objective
was showing everywhere symptoms of breaking down.
In fact, if the language of the Elizabethan drama
represents fairly the language of society,—and we
can hardly take any other view,—great license in
this respect had begun to prevail. *Me, thee, us,
you, him, her, and them* were frequently treated as
nominatives; while the corresponding nominative
forms were treated as objectives. . . . But, with
the exception of *ve* and *you*, this confusion of
case did not become universally accepted.
(Lounsbury *History* 273)

Another interesting insight comes from Berry, who
discusses the second pronoun use in Shakespeare's sonnets.
He finds in the sonnets that

'you' is, then, more intimate, 'thou' more formal
--the opposite of what might expected according to
some imaginary Elizabethan Fowler of Correct
Usage. But the plural form has another poetic
effect. . . . Through the plural form a sense of
duality is broached in the poetry. (42; see also
36-47, 72, 81)

Berry also discusses some interesting aspects of second
person pronoun usage in Donne's poetry (86-92), in *The
Revenger's Tragedy* (80-86), in Beaumont and Fletcher's plays
Partridge is another author who discusses second person pronouns in Renaissance poetry (The Language of Renaissance Poetry 89, 106, 114, 169, 179, 209, 214, 238-40, 246, 263).

C. PRONOUN USAGE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

At this point the use of pronouns of address in the seventeenth century will be discussed. In terms of pronouns of address, this century could be called the century of confusion. It was in this century that the singular forms were generally lost, that the plural forms prevailed, and that you as a nominative became firmly established (Barber 208-12). Finkenstaedt also discusses the use of pronouns of address in the seventeenth century (91-173), as well as the disappearance of the th-forms (215-31).

Though Shakespeare’s language is considered to be representative of his day, perhaps this is not wholly accurate since one man’s language is not always everyone’s language. His language is not that of the King James Bible, which will be discussed in the next chapter, nor that of the Quakers, though both belong to this century. The language of the King James Bible is quite archaic even for its day, and the pronoun usage of the Quakers was and is uncharacteristic of English in general (see Finkenstaedt 174-214).

The Pilgrims brought English to the New World in this century, though at the outset the English used in America
differed little from that used in England. Even though fine
distinctions between the two can be made later on, an
authoritative history of pronouns of address in America has
never been written. It will be assumed, therefore, that the
pronoun usage in both British and American English is
roughly parallel. Curme writes:

Between 1620 and 1800 important changes took place
in the grammatical structure of English, both in
Great Britain and America, but instead of drifting
apart in this period of marked changes these two
branches of English, at all important points, developed harmoniously together. This was the
result of the universal tendency in colonial days
among Americans of culture to follow in speech the
usage of the mother country. The colonies had
little literature of their own and were largely
dependent in matters of culture upon the Old
World. If it had not been for this general
tendency of American culture, the language of the
New World might have drifted away from that of
England, for, as can be seen by American popular
speech, there is a very strong tendency for
English on American soil to cling to the older
forms of the language. About 1800 the structure
of literary English had virtually attained its
present form in both territories and was in both
essentially the same. (2:ix)

Laird also discusses some of the linguistic influences on English in the New World (182-99).

Wyld has this to say about pronoun usage in this century:

In the seventeenth century you is far commoner than ye in Nom[inative], though the latter is not infrequent. Sir Edmund Verney, in 1642, uses ye after a preposition. . . .

A distinction was formerly made between thou, thee, and you, in the sense that the former was used by superiors, or seniors in addressing their inferiors or juniors, and in the familiar and affectionate speech of parents addressing their children.

Sir Thos. More's son-in-law, Roper, in his Life of that famous man, represents him as addressing the writer--'Sonne Roper'--as thou, thee, but himself as using you in speaking to Sir Thomas More. (Wyld A History 330; see also Curme 2:15-16)

Lounsbury discusses the "attitude of contempt" in which thou and thee were often employed in this century, citing the illustrations given by Theobald to explain a passage in Shakespeare's Twelfth Night:

[One instance] occurs in "Twelfth Night," in the
scene where Sir Toby Belch is urging Sir Andrew Aguecheek to send a challenge to the disguised Viola. "Taunt him with the license of ink," says the former; "if thou thou’st him some thrice, it shall not be amiss.’ The other is contained in the attacks which were made on the accused by the attorney-general on the occasion of the trial in 1603 of Sir Walter Raleigh. "All that he did," says Sir Edward Coke, "was at thy instigation, thou viper; for I thou thee, thou traitor." This was far from being the only instance in which Coke belabored the prisoner by the use of the singular number of this pronoun. "Thou hast a Spanish heart and thyself art a viper of hell," was another one of the flowers of rhetoric which he bestowed upon Raleigh. Theobald’s bringing forward this illustration to make clear the meaning of the text is fairly presumptive proof that little sense of the force of this usage remained in the fourth decade of the eighteenth century, in which his edition of Shakespeare appeared. ("Pronouns of Address" 202)

It appears that Milton in the seventeenth century was one writer who did not always make the distinction between ye and you. Robertson cites Milton’s use in Areopagitica of "you for nominative and occasionally ye for accusative" and
gives this example: "... you must then first become that which ye cannot be. ... And who shall then stick closest to ye ...?" (126). The reason for "this interchange of forms," writes Robertson,

is surely not due wholly to a disregard for grammatical distinctions; part of the cause was phonetic—the fact that these pronouns, usually coming in unstressed positions, would have their vowels neutralized or centered, until the [u] of you and the [i] of ye became virtually identical. (126)

Skeat also mentions that "phonetic similarity was responsible for this confusion" of ye with you (qtd. in Mencken 552-53).

Leith gives us this social history of pronoun usage during this era:

At first, you, as a marker of special esteem, was rare, an emblem of courtly custom; but gradually, relationships such as parent/child, lord/servant, husband/wife were power-coded, in that the former in each pair demanded you, and returned thou. By about 1500 it seems that this practice had been copied by the middle class, and thou was becoming the 'marked' form. It could be used for special effects; moreover, it was the reciprocal pronoun of the lower class.
In that *you* was emblematic of upper-class manners, as *thou* was of working people, the widespread adoption of *you* in the course of the seventeenth century may be said to represent the triumph of middle-class values.

We do not know . . . who initiated the rejection of power-coding. . . . It has been suggested that this was motivated by an egalitarian ethic. More likely was it a reflex of middle-class insecurity. In sixteenth-century urban society, particularly that of London, social relationships were not fixed, which perhaps explains the Elizabethan obsession with them. With power and influence increasingly identified with the entrepreneur, there was no means of knowing who was entitled to *you*, and who to *thou*. The best solution was to stick to *you*, which would not offend, and rely on the more open-ended set of address terms [such as *man*, *woman*, *gentleman*, and even *neighbour*]. (82-83, 108-109; see also Marckwardt 19; Partridge 24-28)

Anne Johnson's study of the plays and novels of this century in order to determine "the social usage of the era" is revealing (263). She outlines pronoun usage in English up until the seventeenth century and then states:

Bock, stressing the fact that after 1600 the *you-*
singular, as well as the grammatical form you in both numbers, is predominant, [also] comments, although not in great detail, upon the circumstances in which you and thou may be found in 14 comedies of the sixteenth century, in 10 of the seventeenth, and in 11 of the eighteenth. (262)

Then she tells of her study of "33 comedies" and "14 works of popular fiction of the period" (263). Some of her findings are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600-1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In percent.

This maintenance of the distinction between the two pronouns by the better educated (as, nowadays, those with more schooling differentiate between certain forms, like shall and will, and was and were in the subjunctive) would also seem to imply that you and thou are employed in free variation.
The historical uses of the you-singular, as in respect or irony, and of the thou-singular, as in emotion or intimacy, to an inferior, or in the exchange of the members of the lower class, are exemplified in the various texts throughout the era. However, further demonstrating the meaningless of the distinction between them, you may frequently be found in circumstances where thou might be expected to occur, and, at times, thou where we should expect to find you. . . .

Although every shade of emotion is time and again expressed during the entire era by the you-singular, the use of thou in moments of feeling persists in the dialogue of men and women of every station. . . .

Certain other uses of the thou-singular, less frequent than those noted above, may be mentioned. . . . In every one of these uses, however, the employment of the you-singular, in one text or another, also may be noted.

In conclusion, we may well ask why the you-singular continued, throughout the seventeenth century, to dispossess the thou-singular. Were the lower orders expressing a new freedom? Was the nation, after the Restoration, reacting
against the *thou* of the sects? Or was the *you*-singular preferred because of the dictates of the fashionable world? To questions such as these, the evidence of the texts, as I interpret it, gives no definite answer. (265-66, 269; see also Barber 211-12)

Barber tells us of some of the social implications of pronoun usage in this century:

In the course of the 17th century, *you* steadily displaces *thou* in educated usage. Even in the middle of the century, however, people were sufficiently sensitive to the implications of *thou* to be shocked by its use in inappropriate situations. This can be seen in reactions to the Quakers, who insisted on using *thou* as the second-person singular pronoun, whoever they were addressing. (210-11)

Richard Farnworth, a Quaker, published a short tract entitled *The Pure Language of the Spirit of Truth set forth for the confounding false languages; . . . or, thee and thou in its place is the proper language to any single person whatsoever: proved by several examples, etc.* in 1655. Shortly thereafter George Fox and two other Quakers (John Stubs and Benjamin Furly) put out a book entitled *A Battle-Door for Teachers & Professors to Learn Singular & Plural* in 1660. This book gives "battledoors," or examples, showing
how various languages and the Bible use "\textit{thou} to one, and \textit{you} to many." Leonard's states that this work is one of the few instances "of a grammatical correction of usage previous to the eighteenth century" (10). (Since the work is variously paginated and the signatures are not completely consistent, the references in brackets are to help the reader find the passage cited more readily.) Here follows a sampling of \textit{A Battle-Door}:

\begin{quote}
The Teachers of the world, and Schollars have been either very Ignorant of Tongues, or else wilfull, that they would have you spoken to one, which is thou; and this may give all people to see, in saying that it was you in other Tongues to one, that they are them which corrupts the Languges [sic], and are exalted, taking glory to themselves, and have the Plural put upon them, for the singular, which is vulgar. (A2v [part of the introduction])
\end{quote}

They also inquire:

\begin{quote}
Who was the first that brought up this evill custome, to put you for thou, or to say we when you should say I; and they, when you should say \textit{he}; our, when you should say \textit{min}; us, when you should say \textit{me}; your, when you should say \textit{thy}?

Answer ye learned men; who hath brought this evill custome to put \textit{Plural} for \textit{Singular}? . . .
\end{quote}
Answer me you School-masters, Schoolmasters, Professors, and Teachers, and Magistrates, . . .

[w]hether it be proper to speak Plural, when we should Singular? (Cr-v [pp. 5-6 of first paginated section])

Later on in the book, when castigating some of the published grammars of the day, they ask such searching questions as, "art thou fit to be a Teacher, or Translator either here, who makes no distinction at all in the English betwixt you and thou?" (no signature [p. 1 of penultimate paginated section]).

They continue to rail on those who do not speak "thou to one, and you to many":

Now if ye say they were wise men that translated the Bible, and not fools, and Idiots, and Novices, and that the Bible is translated true, and that it is the words of God: then ye must acknowledge your selves to be fools, and Idiots, and Novices, and through your pride and ambition, have degenerated from your own Mother tongue English, and cannot speak proper Language plural, and singular, thou to one, and you to many, but you would have you to one. So England hath degenerated from their Mother tongue English, and speakes not proper English, if that be proper English which be in the Bible; which is thou to one, and you to many.
. . . so ye may see how England, and other Nations, in their own Bibles have degenerated from their Mother tongue; and from the Latine, Greek and Hebrew, which is taught in their Schooles, which is plural, and singular; and now it is a great crime to speak thou to a single man, and you to many, that they may learn the Languages, the pure Language, singular that is,, [sic] thou to one man, King, or Lord, or Judge, or Father, or Mother. . . . Not thou to many as the degenerates speaks. . . . (D2r [p. 15 of penultimate paginated section--labeled as p. 9])

Also included is "Part of James Howells Epistle" concerning the origin of the use of the plural in a singular sense:

And indeed it was the Stile of France at first, as well as any other Countries Tutoyer to thou any person one spoke unto; But when the Common-wealth of Rome turned to an Empire, and so much Power came unto one mans hand, then in regard he was able to Conferr Honor and Offices, the Countries began to magnifie him, and to speak to him in the Plural Number by You, and to deify him with Transcending Titles, as we read in Symmachus his Epistles to the Emperour Theodosius, and to Valentinian, wherein his Stile unto them is vestra aeternitas, vestrum numen, vestra perennitas.
vestra_ Clementia, so that you in the Plural Number, with other Titles and Complements, seems to have its first rise with Monarchy, which descended afterwards by degrees upon particular men. (no signature [the page after D2v or p. 17 of penultimate paginated section]; also qtd. in Stidston 20-21)

George Fox makes this final comment in the last paragraph of the book:

The Pope set up [you] to one in his pride, and it is the pride which cannot bear thou and thee to one but must have, and would have [you] from the Author their Father in their pride, which must not but have the word thou, which was before their Father the Pope was, which was Gods language, and will stand when the Pope is ended. (G2v [p. 28 of last paginated section])

George Fox’s journal of 1665 includes this:

The priest asked me, "Why we said Thou and Thee to people? for he counted us but fools and idiots for speaking so." I asked him "Whether those that translated the scriptures, and made the grammar and accidence, were fools and idiots, seeing they translated the scriptures so, and made the grammar so, Thou to one, and You to more than one, and left it so to us?" (qtd. in "thou", Century
Dictionary and Cyclopaedia)

Lounsbury also mentions A Battle-Door and quotes George Fox as writing:

Thou and thee was a sore cut to proud flesh, and them that sought self-honor; who, though they would say it to God and Christ, could not endure to have it said to themselves. So that we were often beset and abused, and sometimes in danger of our lives for using these words to some proud men, who would say, 'What! you ill-bred clown, do you thou me?' as though there lay Christian breeding in saying you to one, which is contrary to their grammar and teaching-books. ("Pronouns of Address 202)

Barber makes these comments about the pronoun usage in the latter part of the seventeenth century:

Generally speaking, thou is no longer used to mark social distinctions [in drama], and occurs among polite speakers only as an occasional indicator of emotional attitude--anger, male camaraderie, wheedling.

In literary prose, thou is rare in the later part of the century. One situation in which it continues to be found is in addresses to the reader. Locke uses it in this way in his Essay; he has a dedication to the Earl of Pembroke, whom
he addresses as you; and then has a long 'Epistle to the Reader', in which he consistently addresses the reader as thou. This usage, which perhaps gave a tone of button-holing intimacy, continued in the 18th century. In poetry, thou continued to be used with great regularity, but was clearly a literary archaism. It also continued to be used in lower-class and regional speech. . . . But in the standard literary language thou existed only marginally by 1700, and the system of personal pronouns was in effect the same as it is today.

(212)

D. PRONOUN USAGE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Jespersen tells us that "thou and thee went out of use in standard speech in the 18th c[entury]," but survived in some dialects and in the speech of the Quakers (A Modern English Grammar 2:45). However, he also notes that both Scott (1771-1832) and Carlyle (1795-1881) used plural and singular pronoun forms in the same line (A Modern English Grammar 2:45). Obviously even the best of writers in this era were not free from pronominal shifting or variation.

One of the major sources for what the language of this century was like are the grammarians, rhetoricians, and lexicographers, and the influence of many of these carried into the nineteenth century as well. Laird mentions the influence of these so-called purists and various
characteristics of English in America in the eighteenth century (195-99, 257-62). Lounsbury introduces this onslaught of prescriptivism by poking fun at those who profess to believe that propriety of expression depends not on the practice of the best speakers and writers, but upon some abstract principle which they call reason. Unless founded upon that assumed solid rock, no usage in their opinion can be deemed correct. If it contradict reason, or at least what they consider reason, it must necessarily be wrong. In order to conform to reason, therefore, some other manner of speech must be substituted for the unclean thing. There is a certain convenience about this view for its holders. It furnishes a short and easy method of deciding what is proper or improper in expression. It obviates all necessity of studying the development of the language. To reach their conclusions, men are not obliged to know anything of the history of the idiom under consideration or to learn anything of the exact nature of its component parts. If their limited knowledge does not enable them to parse it, that is enough for them to condemn it as opposed to reason, and therefore wrong.

Persons who have faith in usage only as it is
based upon what they term reason must find themselves in a state of painful perplexity when they come to consider the shocking misuse of pronouns of address. Every one of us, when he speaks to another, uses a plural pronoun with a plural verb. He does not say, "thou art" or "thou wast," but "you are" or "you were." A single person is spoken to as if he were two or more. Looked at from the point of view of reason, there cannot well be a much grosser corruption. ("Pronouns of Address" 200)

Leonard provides a good overview of the influence of prescriptive grammarians in the eighteenth century and on into the nineteenth and holds that "the grammarians and rhetoricians," in a "very earnest way," "hold hard to dying forms of speech":

Especially is the care with which Lowth and Baker and Murray insist on the -st forms of verbs agreeing with thou, and censure most of the poets for their immemorial and constant neglect of this shibboleth and for mixing thou and you. . . .

Of the forms effectually banned, a number, already long dead, were exhumed in the eighteenth century solely for critical obloquy. Such cases are clearly the confusion of ye and you and the mixture of thou and you, and probably the use of
which referring to persons. . . .

If this had been the end of the grammatical furore—if grammarians had passed with the emenders—the result upon the practice of writing and particularly the practice of schools today would not be so unfortunate as it is. But the work of the grammarians had only begun. The nineteenth century was to see a yet completer inundation. . . . [W]hole heaps of the prejudices, taboos, and prescriptions of eighteenth-century writers were carried entire into the books of writers who followed them, so that a majority of their ideas . . . may nevertheless be found today earnestly and convincedly taught in schools. (129, 237-38)

Some of these grammars and dictionaries will be examined nearly chronologically to show that they are, in fact, more prescriptive than descriptive. Leonard includes a fairly exhaustive bibliography of those grammars published in the eighteenth century (309-26), and Dekeyser discusses the major grammars of the nineteenth century (333-37 and passim). Anne Johnson also briefly discusses a few who mention specifically using you for thou (261-62).

Richard Browne asks, "How is Thou declined?" in The English School Reformed published in 1700. He then answers:

Before it's actually declined observe that You in
civil speaking is now used in each Case, and also in both Numbers thus,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. thou, or you.</td>
<td>Nom. ye, or you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. of thee, or you.</td>
<td>Gen. of you, or your selves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. to thee, or you.</td>
<td>Dat. to you, or your selves, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(96-97)

James Greenwood, in 1711, informs us:

It is customary among us, (as likewise among the French, and others) tho' we speak but to one particular Person, to use the Plural Number: But then we say You, and not Ye. And if any one speaks to another in the Singular Number, as, Thou Thomas, it is reckon'd a Sign of Contempt or Familiarity. (103-04)

Michael Maittaire writes in 1712 that "Instead of the singualrs thou, thy, thine, common speech and civility in modern languages uses the plurals, you, your, yours" (50).

Ann Fisher asks in 1750:

Q. Why do we say you when we speak only to a single Person, since it is really of the Plural Number?

A. It is customary among us (as likewise among the French and others) to express ourselves so: But then we say you, and not ye; and the Verb that is put to it is always of the Plural Number; for
we say, **you love**, which is **Plural**; and not **you lovest**, which is **Singular**. So likewise, out of Complaisance, as we say **you** for **thou** and **thee**, so we frequently say **your** for **thy**, and **yours** for **thine**. (67-68)

A person styling himself Aristarchus writes in the **Gentleman’s Magazine** of 1750:

I am so displeased with an impropriety of expression, which some of our best writers have unwarily fallen into; that 'tis high time to caution them against it. I mean the quick transition from **thou** and **thee**, to **ye**, and **you**; and back again: which wound even an ungrammatical ear. (274)

Samuel Johnson comments in his dictionary put out in 1755 that **thou** "is used only in very familiar or very solemn language. When we speak to equals or superiors we say **you**; but in solemn language, and in addresses of worship, we say **thou**" ("thou"). The verb **thou** is defined by Johnson "to treat with familiarity" ("thou"). He also states that **you** "is used in the nominative; and though first introduced by corruption, is now established," "is the ceremonial word for the second persons singular, and is always used, except in solemn language," and "is used indefinitably, as the French on"—the impersonal **you** used even by Addison ("you"). **Your**, says Samuel Johnson, "is used properly when we speak to more
than one, and ceremoniously and customarily when to only one," as well as "in an indeterminate sense" ("your"). He also states that "yours is used when the substantive goes before or is understood; as this is your book, this book is yours" ("your").

Joseph Priestley comments in 1761, "We usually, in this case, say [you] when, by the complaisance of the present times, we apply it to a single person; as you [not ye] are reading" (9).

Bishop Robert Lowth in his A Short Introduction to English Grammar of 1762 tells us that "Some writers have used Ye as the objective case Plural of the Pronoun of the Second Person; very improbably and ungrammatically" (33). He also states:

Thou, in the Polite, and even in the Familiar Style, is disused, and the Plural You is employed instead of it: we say You have, not Thou hast. Tho' in this case we apply You to a single Person, yet the Verb too must agree with it in the Plural Number: it must necessarily be You have, not You hast. You was, the Second Person Plural of the Pronoun placed in agreement with the First or Third Person Singular of the Verb, is an enormous Solecism: and yet Authors of the first rank have inadvertently fallen into it. (48)

He then cites Addison, Lord Bolingbroke, Swift, and Pope as
exemplars of "great impropriety" (48-50).

Daniel Fenning queries in 1771:

Q. Is not the pronoun you sometimes used in the singular number?
A. Yes; but it is only by way of ceremony or complaisance; and, in order to shew what number it is of, it is always joined, or ought to be joined, to a plural verb; as, you are, you were; though some authors write you was. (30)

Anselm Bayly, in his A Plain and Complete Grammar with the English Accidence of 1772, gives the second person singular nominative pronoun as "thou" and the plural nominative of the same person as "ye, you" (22).

George Campbell, in his The Philosophy of Rhetoric of 1776, prefers "ye as the nominative plural of thou, for it may be remarked that this distinction is very regularly observed in our translation of the Bible, as well as in all our best ancient authors" (1:386; qtd. in Leonard 131). As we shall see in the next chapter, various editors of the King James Bible (especially those of the 1762 and 1769 editions) created this oft-cited consistency, perhaps as a reaction to the grammarians of the day. Leonard remarks:

He particularly commends Milton as attentive to this, a remark that ill agrees with the findings of the grammarians who have a choice collection of examples of the "manifest Solecism" of employing
ye as the accusative, especially by Shakespeare and Milton. (131)

George Neville Ussher tells us in 1785 that "By the complaisance of modern times, we use the plural you, instead of the singular thou, when we speak to a single person" (15).

Leonard states that Lindley Murray’s *English Grammar* (first published in 1795) was "the grammar which by its combination of the elements of conservative and authoritarian liking held the field for years" (322). Dekeyser agrees that "Murray’s work may be regarded as the receptacle of 18th century prescriptive grammar; in point of influence and circulation . . . they are both massive" (10). Dekeyser also notes that Murray’s "Grammar, together with the numerous abridgements produced by his followers, ran through no fewer than 200 editions before 1850, totalling between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 copies" (11). In this grammar Murray gives thou as the singular form and ye or you for the plural form of the second person pronoun in all his paradigms (30, 45-66), but says little else on second person pronouns. That Murray’s grammar was popular during the nineteenth century is significant since he retains the distinction between thou and you, a distinction that had largely been abandoned a century before Murray’s grammar. As Barber states:

In 1600, there are still two different pronouns of
the second person, thou and you; but in the course of the 17th century the thou forms fall into disuse, and by 1700 have disappeared from the standard language except as literary archaisms and in the special language used for liturgical purposes. (208)

Many modern researchers conclude that usage in general did not follow the various prescriptions of the grammarians. Dekeyser summarizes these findings:

This makes it unmistakably certain that a whole century or even two centuries of laborious criticism and purism have produced no effect worth mentioning, if any at all. These findings run counter to Peters, who speaks of changes in usage (c. 1750-1825) "that stemmed from the rise in authority of the prescriptive grammarians", and who would make these changes a differentiating feature between Early Modern and Late Modern English. It is worthy of note that Knorrek arrives at the same negative assessment of the influence of the grammarians as regards the 17th and 18th centuries. And Leonard asserts that the 18th century grammarians' accomplishment was "rather diffusion of a standard already clear among literary men than that rectification of the best practice which obviously they purposed to
accomplish". Though we must not rule out the possibility that grammar has operated as a kind of check or brake in particular fields, it is obvious that grammatical doctrine has failed to thwart the development of usage, which is primarily a self-determining process, a matter of innate linguistic intuition. . . . (276-77)

For some time one of the points of contention of the grammarians was you was. Lounsbury notes that in 1755 one writer remonstrates "against this scandalous defiance of propriety of usage" ("Pronouns of Address" 206). Here is what J. Robertson wrote in the Gentleman's Magazine:

You was there, you was here, you was pleased, etc., are expressions which occur in a hundred writers; but you was is certainly false grammar, because you as well as ye is the second person plural; for tho' we speak in one person only, we unanimously say you are, or you had, you shall, and if a man should use the verb in the singular number, and say you art, you hast, you hadst, you shalt, he would be deemed ignorant of the common rules of grammar. (125-26)

Leonard writes on you was as a major point of contention by some grammarians:

Lowth was apparently the first to attack you was an [sic] "an enormous Solecism: and yet
Authors of the first rank have inadvertently fallen into it." He does not explain why it is wrong, but Priestley and Withers base the conventional form on the analogy with you are, citing errors by Blair among others. Only Webster holds out, giving you was in his paradigms—though admitting you have and you are "to be construed as singular verbs when we address one person." In defending this position he is, as often, slightly inconsistent: In the 1789 Dissertations he notes that in conversation you was is generally used, and adds, "Notwithstanding the criticisms of grammarians, the antiquity and universality of this practice must give it the sanction of propriety; for what but practice forms a language? This practice is not merely vulgar; it is general among men of erudition who do not affect to be fettered by the rules of grammarians, and some late writers have indulged it in their publications." In the 1798 letter he simply remarks, "In the substantive verb the word has taken you was, which practice is getting the better of old rules, and probably will be established." That Webster was wrong as to the trend of this form, but at least partly right as to the fact of its usage in his own day, is
supported by Wyld's statement on you was: "This
habit was apparently passing into disrepute at the
beginning of the nineteenth century." (223-24)
Pyles and Algeo also comment on the use of you was in
the eighteenth century:

From the later seventeenth century and
throughout the eighteenth, many speakers made a
distinction between singular you was and plural
you were. James Boswell used singular you was
throughout his London Journal (1762-63) and even
reported it as coming from the lips of Dr. Johnson. . . . Bishop Robert Lowth, in his very
influential Short Introduction to English Grammar
(1762), had condemned you was in no uncertain
terms as "an enormous Solecism," but George
Campbell testified in his Philosophy of Rhetoric
(1776) that "it is ten times oftener heard." You
was at one time was very common in cultivated
American usage also. . . . The construction became
unfashionable in the early nineteenth century, but
Noah Webster continued to defend it. (193)

Noah Webster comments in his grammar of 1784 that
thou is used only in the sacred or solemn style,
as in the scriptures, in addresses to the Deity,
and in some of the graver kinds of profane
writings. The same is to be observed of ye in the
plural. But in familiar discourse and writings we now use *you*, which is always plural and ought always to be joined to a plural verb, tho' it be applied to an individual. Thus, *you was*, is as improper as, *you art, you hast*. We ought to say, *you were*. (15)

In this same regard Hook states:

The frequency of *you was* in personal letters suggests that it was probably quite common in conversation. (Several early Presidents of the United States used *you was* in familiar correspondence.) Interestingly enough, the comparable present tense *you is* has rarely been observed in print and apparently has been spoken by relatively few people. (200-01)

It should now be clear that the use of *you was* was quite widespread, notwithstanding the efforts of the grammarians to abolish it. Lounsbury discusses the use of *you was* at length:

For more than a century and a half [you was] was steadily and consciously employed by cultivated speakers and writers. The frequency of its appearance shows that it represented fairly a current usage of polite conversation. The practice, however, never extended to the present tense. Unlike *you was, you is* was never heard
from the lips of an educated person. . . .

It was not till about the middle of the seventeenth century that you was passed from dialectic into general use and was adopted as an authorized mode of speech in address. No observant reader of the literature of the hundred and fifty years following the Restoration can fail to be struck with the frequency with which it occurs. Especially is this the case in the representation of colloquial speech. To colloquial speech, in fact, the usage mainly belongs, rather than to the purely literary. Even in the former, it never displaced you were in addressing a single person; but it took its place alongside of it as a fully authorized locution.

. . .

During the latter part of the seventeenth century the employment of you was prevailed to a considerable extent, but by no means to the extent it did during the century following. In both periods, however, it occurs more or less frequently in the writings of men who held then and still continue to hold a high rank in our literature. ("Pronouns of Address" 204-05)

Lounsbury mentions some of the many writers who have employed you was during a period lasting about 150 years:
Atterbury (in a letter of 1690), Dryden, Swift, "the great scholar Bentley," Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (in a letter of 1710), Pope (in a letter to Swift in 1728), Dr. Young (in his tragedy produced in 1753), Walpole, Beattie, Goldsmith, Cowper, Lamb (in a letter to Hazlitt in 1805), Byron (in a letter to Murray in 1815), Dugald Stewart, William IV (in 1830), Mrs. Radcliffe, and even by Jane Austen who used it "intentionally . . . in the mouth of a somewhat illiterate character" ("Pronouns of Address 205-06). Phillipps also discusses Jane Austen's second person pronoun usage briefly (Jane Austen's English 167-68). Jespersen cites Bunyan as the first to use you was, then notes various authors who have employed it (A Modern English Grammar 2:48).

E. PRONOUN USAGE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Walter Scott (1771-1832) straddles the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but most of his work was done in the nineteenth century and his influence was especially felt throughout the nineteenth century. Tulloch discusses the pronoun usage in Sir Walter Scott's works in this manner:

Thou and other pronouns and adjectives associated with it . . . are extremely frequent in the dialogue of our novels. This is the most frequent archaism in Scott's work and in fact its occurrence outnumbers that of the modern equivalent use with you. . . . Scott's works show
alternations of pronoun equally inexplicable [as some in Shakespeare's works]; inexplicable, that is, if one tries to make Scott's usage follow rules. . . . Any attempt to explain the wavering between thou and you forms in Scott according to rules will break down after, at the most, a page. (135)

Tulloch also mentions that while Scott's use of thou forms very often becomes tedious, at other times it is saved from annoying us by the intermixing of you forms. . . . Certainly, too, many examples of inconsistency are mere carelessness—meticulousness in such a matter would have been unlike Scott. . . . It is surprising how little we notice the inconsistency until we look for it. (136)

Tulloch also discusses Scott's use of ye in a singular sense (137-38).

The English Dialect Dictionary has excellent citations on how the second person pronouns have been used during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Only a few of the more lengthy ones will be quoted here. One from a publication dated 1788 speaks concerning pronoun usage in Yorkshire states:

Farmers in general 'thou' their servants; the inferior class (and the lower class of men in
general) frequently their wives, and always their children; and the children as invariably 'thou' each other. Superiors in general 'thou' their inferiors; while inferiors 'you' their betters. Equals and intimates of the lower class generally 'thou' one another. These distinctions are sometimes the cause of awkwardness [sic]: to 'you' a man may be making too familiar with him; while to 'thou' him might affront him. ("thou")

A citation from Yorkshire in 1876 states:

'Thou,' though naturally the expression of familiar feeling, is yet associated with contemptuous treatment on the part of a speaker. . . . Towards superiors, the objective case of the second person plural is as a matter of course employed, but under circumstances of strong feeling it is apt to be changed for 'thou,' and without that sense of unpardonable vulgarity which would attach to the form if used in a like manner in ordinary conversation. ("thou")

A citation about Lancashire in 1877 states:

In the district about Goosnargh, near Preston, prior to 1850, 'the husband and father "thou'd" his wife and children, but the wife always addressed the husband in the second person plural; children did the same to both parents and all
seniors. Persons equal in years and circumstances, and on familiar terms, always "thou'd" each other. For a young man to "thou" an old one was an unpardonable offence. A young man "thouing" his sweetheart served in some sense the part of the "engaged" ring.' ("thou")

An author in 1877 states that in west Somersetshire *thee* was used most generally by seniors to their juniors, by boys to each other, and by farmers to their servants or labourers. It is used to express anger, contempt, and also endearment, but it usually implies much familiarity, and would never except for intentional impertinence be used by an inferior; but its form is always 'dhee'. 'Thou' is never heard. ("thee")

A citation of 1887 on the pronoun usage of people in south Cheshire states:

As generally used implies familiarity, or at least absence of constraint. It is thus employed by parents to their children [less frequently used to the daughters than to the sons], and *a fortiori* by grandparents to their grandchildren; by a husband to his wife and vice versa; by the children among themselves, by schoolboys, less commonly by schoolgirls to one another; by a master to his
labourers, though scarcely ever to his foreman or bailiff; by the labourers to one another; by a master or mistress to the maidservants, but this not so frequently; by sweethearts to each other, &c., &c. Outside this general use, the 2nd person singular is also adopted to express anger, contempt, or strong emotion; in each of these cases it may be used by persons other than those mentioned. Towards superiors the 2nd person plural is by rule employed, and in fact could not, except with intentional impertinence, be exchanged for the 2nd person singular. ("thou")

One from a Gloucestershire publication in 1890 states:
The laws that govern the use of 'thee' and 'thou' amongst agricultural workers are not to be violated. . . . A co-mate or inferior is to be so addressed, but when they quarrel the 'thou' and 'thee' should not be dropped since that would be an admission of the adversary's superiority. ("thee")

This last citation from the English Dialect Dictionary concerns Yorkshire before 1892:
Still extensively used, but it is not so general now as it was twenty years ago. When I was a lad the following was the rule: 'thaa' was used in every case except the 'jii' was used (1) in
addressing strangers, especially grown-up people, or as a mark of respect to masters and old people; (2) children in addressing their parents; (3) people who had made each other’s acquaintance after they had grown up usually employed ‘jii’ in speaking to each other. (”thou”)

William Cobbett, in his *A Grammar of the English Language, in a Series of Letters* published in 1826, states in Letter VI:

> Thou is here given as the second person singular; but, common custom has set aside the rules of Grammar in this case; and though we, in particular cases, still make use of Thou and Thee, we generally make use of You instead of either of them. According to ancient rule and custom this is not correct; but, what a whole people adopts and universally practises, must, in such cases, be deemed correct, and to be a superseding of ancient rule and custom.

> Instead of you the ancient practice was to put ye, in the nominative case of the second person plural: but, this practice is now laid aside, except in cases, which very seldom occur; but, whenever ye is made use of, it must be in the nominative, and never in the objective, case. (C8v paragraphs 57-58)
In 1833 a writer for the *Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* states:

It is a curious fact, that in the languages of modern Europe the pronoun of the second person singular—'thou'—is almost banished from polite conversation, and in many instances the use of this natural and innocent word would subject the speaker to the imputation of gross ignorance, or intentional rudeness. Nay more; in some languages the word which corresponds to our 'you' is also uncourtly; and a foreigner might be thought absurdly familiar, who was merely misled by his dictionary and grammar, into a literal translation of the most polite pronoun of his native tongue.

... In English the pronoun 'thou' may be considered as nearly obsolete in colloquial language, being confined to the rustics of the remoter counties, and the Society of Friends; it cannot therefore with us be considered as a mark of tenderness or familiarity, but rather a solemn word, appropriated to the highest style of composition. Some centuries since, however, it was still a mark of familiarity, and as such was deeply resented by those who supposed that their station in society merited the superior pronoun:—
"Avaunt caitiff, dost thou thou me?
I am come of good kin,"
says a character in the old morality of Hicke-
Scorner. ("On the Pronouns Used" 277-78)

A little later in the century Julius Hare gives
examples of the use of the polite plural in many works
dating from the fourteenth century onward (114-35) and
comments that "it is perhaps a singular phenomenon in a
cultivated language, that scarcely a writer seems to know
when he ought to use such words as thou, you, and ye" (130-
31).

One of the more ambitious works of this century was
Tennyson's The Idyls of the King, which he labored on for
over fifty years (1833-88). Carruth's study of the pronoun
usage of this work is revealing. For some passages he
"found absolutely no ground for the [pronominal] shifts,"
which show "that these forms shift indifferently within the
same speech and even the same sentence, in addressing one
and the same person" (160). He then gives "Tennyson's
pronoun scheme" for the second person for this work:

Sing.                    Pl.
Nom:  thou, thyself, you, you, yourselves, ye.
yourself, ye.
Poss:  thy, thine, your, yours. your, yours.
Obj:  thee, you.         you. (160)

In contrast, we now examine the second person pronouns
in *Moby-Dick* (1851) written by Herman Melville, an American writer from New York. Clubb, writing in 1960, uses Wellek's suggestion to examine the "deviations and distortions from normal usage" to attempt "to discover their aesthetic purpose" (252). Clubb states:

A cursory reading of *Moby-Dick* will make one conscious of the many archaisms of language and especially of *thou* and *ye* forms of the second personal pronoun, apparently in contrast with *you* forms. . . . The use of singular *thou* forms contrasts not only with singular *you* forms in the novel but also with the customary usage of the day and of Melville himself.

As a matter of historical record, it is true that *thou* forms and *ye* (both singular and plural) have survived down to the present, as Curme says [in 1935], 'in the higher forms of poetry and elevated diction where the thoughts soar' and that *thee* (often with a verb ending with -s) is still current, used both as the nominative and the objective singular, among some Quakers; nevertheless, by the eighteenth century, *you* had become the standard singular form in speech and the usual forms of writing. (252-53)

Clubb analyzes how various character use pronouns of address and then concludes:
At this point, although one might hesitate to make too much of the evidence and although Melville himself is not completely systematic in his manipulation of you, thou, and ye forms, a significant pattern of usage does seem to develop. First thou and ye are used realistically to reproduce Quaker and sailor speech respectively. You is used by Ishmael as narrator of the ordinary events of the story. On the other hand, he generally uses thou forms in his capacity as interpreter of the action. Thus, on the one hand thou forms are used realistically and on the other metaphorically. Naturally, the thou forms as used by Ishmael tend to give the effect of 'elevated diction where the thoughts soar,' but, more specifically, one can almost say that where thou forms occur in Ishmael's speech we can expect some symbolic or metaphysical significance.

The general conclusions to be drawn from this analysis of the second personal pronoun usage in Moby-Dick cannot be laid down as hard-and-fast rules; nevertheless, there is something that is significant, certainly from a literary point of view. Melville needed for his great novel a highly elaborate style, a 'grand style,' and, as F. O. Matthiessen has pointed out, he achieved
this in part by adapting or transforming the Elizabethan styles of Shakespeare and the King James Bible into the style of *Moby-Dick*. But we may now add that the old Elizabethan *thou* forms and Ishmael’s metaphorical use are bridged by Ahab’s use, which is both realistic and metaphorical. In effect *you*, as it is used for straight narration and realistic description, becomes symbolic of the common-sense view of the world, and *thou* becomes symbolic of the philosophical view. (257-59)

The paradigm for the second person pronoun in *Moby-Dick* as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>thou, ye, you, thee</td>
<td>ye, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>thy, thine, your</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>thee, ye, you</td>
<td>ye, you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Clubb 252-60)

You will notice that no *th*-forms are used in a plural sense.

This comment on pronoun usage during this century comes from Alice Meynell (1847-1922):

Certain of our own poets . . . seem to find a difficulty in carrying the second person singular safely through a stanza. If one verb agrees in order, ten to one there is another, a little more out of sight, that does not. As Shelley wrote--
Thou lovest, but ne'er knew love's sad satiety.

Nevertheless, it is not excusable. It was not done in other centuries. Must we needs, as we go on, grow so lax, and do these unhandsome things? (138)

Finally, in various places in the United States the pronoun usage in the United States also seemed behind the times. McAtee mentions the use of ve in an "Indiana dialect of Grant County in the 1890s" (159).

F. PECULIARITIES OF PRONOUN USAGE

At various periods of English there were also some pronominal oddities, some of which are now obsolete. All of these anomalies cannot be enumerated, but a few will be given here. The second person singular pronouns were sometimes combined with verbs—both Chaucer and Shakespeare use some of these forms ("thou" Oxford English Dictionary). Mosse mentions a few of these found in Chaucer's day:

Alongside thou, thou there was an enclitic form tuu, toow (and even te) often attached to the verb, for example artoow 'art thou', hastoow 'hast thou', wiltoow, woltoow 'wilt thou' wenest tuu 'thinnest thou', wilte 'wilt thou'. In the same way, though rarer, the object case thee yielded after a final -t a form tee: went te awei 'wend thee away'. (55; see also E. A. Abbott 139)
Some other peculiarities include such contractions as these used by Shakespeare: *thou’dst, thou’lt, thou’rt, thou’ldst, thou’st, thou’t, ye’ll, you’d, you’ld, you’ll, you’re*, and *you’st*. Even an oddity such as *yourself’s* appears once (see Spevack for each word).

Other peculiarities include various attempts to recreate a distinction between "singular" *you*, and a "plural" form of *you*, such as *you all, you guys*, and so forth (Curme 2:16-17; Jespersen *A Modern English Grammar* 2:45-48). Bambas remarks:

> English speakers are spared the delicate problem of determining when they may safely address someone with the familiar singular, but that they are no longer able to distinguish singular from plural presents a problem of another kind. The solution lay in the invention of a distinctive plural form, and several inventions exist: *you all, vous, and you uns*. But none of these forms has won general favor. (69)

Bambas also mentions James Joyce’s use of *vous* in *Dubliners* as an example (69).

Mencken gives the various forms of the second person pronoun in his book, *The American Language* (543), as well as some of the forms which are characteristic of American speech. His discussion of some of these forms follows:

> The addition of *s* to *you* in the nominative
and objective of the second-person plural exhibits no more than an effort to give clarity to the logical difference between the pure plural and the merely polite plural. Another device to the same end is the familiar dual, you-two. . . . Others are the Southern you-all or y'all, the South Midland you-uns and the Delmarva mongst-ye, all of which simply mean you jointly as opposed to the you that means thou. . . . In our own time, with thou passed out entirely, the confusion between you in the plural and you in the singular presents plain difficulties. The vulgate speaker sets up a distinction well supported by logic and analogy: "I seen vous" is differentiated from "I seen you." And in the conjoint position "vous guys" is separated from "you liar." (546-57)

Mencken then discusses you-all (547-48), although only a portion of his discussion is excerpted here:

The Southern you-all seems to be indigenous: there is no mention of it in Wright's "English Dialect Dictionary" or "English Dialect Grammar." What is more, it seems to be relatively recent. You-all struck a Northerner visiting Texas as "something fresh" so late as 1869, though he had apparently been in the South during the Civil War and was familiar with you-uns. It was not listed
by any of the early writers on Americanisms, and it is missing even from Bartlett's fourth and last edition of 1877. On the question of its origin there has never been agreement. In 1907, C. Alphonso Smith, then head of the English Department at the University of North Carolina, sought to show, by quotations from Shakespeare and the King James Bible, that you-all went back to England to Elizabethan times, but his quotations offered him very dubious support, for those that were metrical showed the accent falling on all, not on you. (547)

Mencken also discusses you-uns and similar forms (548-49), you and I (555), and yourn and similar pronominal forms (543-44).

Pyles and Algeo also discuss some of these forms briefly:

Present-day nonstandard speech distinguishes singular and plural you in a number of ways; examples include the analogical youse of the "underprivileged" city dweller (also current in Irish English) and the you-uns (that is, you ones), which probably stems from Scots English. You-all (or y'all) is in educated colloquial use in the Southern states, and it is the only new second person plural to have acquired
respectability in Modern English. (192)

With regard to *yourn* and similar less popular possessives, Anselm Bayly comments in his work published in 1772 that

in the Western Counties they say, *ourn, yourn, hern, theirn*, for ours, theirs, yours; which though held as vulgarisms are yet analogous to mine, thine, and more intelligible than ours, yours, whose plural terminations are seemingly inexplicable. (24)

Lounsbury mentions that these same forms existed, which have left traces of themselves, in the language of the uneducated, to this day. The old *n*-declension, both the noun and adjective, still survived in the fourteenth century in certain parts of the country. It was then, as we have seen, applied to words which had no right to it in Anglo-Saxon. Various dialects, consequently, especially of the South of England, instead of forming, in these cases, a double genitive in −*s*, formed one in −*n*. The result was, that, in place of *oures, youres, hires*, and *heres*, they had the forms *ouren, youren, hiren, heren* (i.e., their‘n). To this analogy of *mine* and *thine* unquestionably contributed. The forms in −*n* are not infrequent in the Wycliffite version of
the Bible, made about 1380. In consequence, during the latter half of the fourteenth century, the genitive of the personal pronoun, when used in the predicate, can be found in three forms,—without any ending, with the ending -g, or with the ending -n. . . . The forms in -n, however, speedily disappeared from the language of literature, though they have exhibited a marked vitality in the language of low life. (*History* 279-80; see also Bryant 385; Evans "The Survival" 185-86)

Further peculiarities, especially the multitude of variations which have existed for each pronoun and its related forms, can be found in *The English Dialect Dictionary* edited by Joseph Wright. For *thee* we find such forms as dey, die, ta, te, tee, teh, tey, tha, theh, they, thi, thie, tho, and thur ("thee" [notice they can sometimes mean "thee"]). For *thou* we find a, aw, doo, dou, du, ta, taa, tae, tau, taw, tay, te, tea, teau, teaw, teh, ter, teu, tha, thaa, thaaw, thae, thah, thai, thau, thaw, thaww, thea, theau, theaw, theow, they, tho, thoo, thow, thu, to, too, tou, tow, tu and some others! ("thou"; notice they, too, and to can each mean "thou"). For *you* the dialectal forms include a, eh, ey, jau, jeu, jiu, jo, ju, jue, o, ow, y, ya, yah, yar, yau, yaw, yav, yeaw, yew, yeow, yew, yo, yoa, yoo, yow, yowe ("you"), while ye has only about half a
dozen variant dialectal forms ("ye").

Further confusion in different periods of English has resulted from various words which appear the same as some second person pronouns, thus making any superficial word counts somewhat skewed. The following is a partial list of the more common ones which can be found in the Oxford English Dictionary and elsewhere:

the meaning "the," thee meaning "thigh," thee meaning "thrive," thou meaning "thousand," thou meaning "to use thou," ye meaning "eye," ye meaning "the" (e.g., "Ye Olde Shoppe" [see Creswell 115-19; Mencken 309; Wyld _A History_ 126]), and ye meaning "yea."

G. QUAKERS

Baugh states that "by the sixteenth century the singular forms had all but disappeared from polite speech and are in ordinary use today only among the Quakers" (293). The Quakers are often pointed out as the last vestiges of the th-forms of the pronoun of address, but, as we shall see, today they use them rarely, if at all. Finkenstaedt discusses the Quakers' use of thou and thee at length (174-214).

Regarding the general loss of thou and its related forms, Jespersen comments:

English is the only language that has got rid of this useless distinction. The Quakers . . .
objected to the habit as obscuring the equality of all human beings; they therefore thou'd (or rather thee'd) everybody. But the same democratic levelling that they wanted to effect in this way, was achieved a century and a half later in society at large, though in a roundabout manner, when the pronoun you was gradually extended to lower classes and thus lost more and more of its previous character of deference. Thou then for some time was reserved for religious and literary use as well as for foul abuse, until finally the latter use was discontinued also and you became the only form used in ordinary conversation.

Apart from the not very significant survival of thou, English has thus attained the only manner of address worthy of a nation that respects the elementary rights of each individual. People who express regret at not having a pronoun of endearment and who insist how pretty it is in other languages when, for instance, two lovers pass from vous to the more familiar tu, should consider that no foreign language has really a pronoun exclusively for the most intimate relations. Where the two forms of address do survive, thou is very often, most often perhaps, used without real affection, nay very frequently
in contempt or frank abuse. Besides, it is often painful to have to choose between the two forms, as people may be offended, sometimes by the too familiar, and sometimes by the too distant mode. (Growth and Structure 240-41; see also Hare 126-32)

Marckwardt also comments on the Quaker influence on the leveling of the pronoun of address:

Actually, at one point slightly later than Shakespeare's time, this matter of the second personal pronoun became a politico-religious issue. The Quakers, committed to a belief in the innate equality of all men, interpreted the duality of the pronoun of address as a negation of that equality and argued, quite intemperately at times, for a return to an older state of the language where the two forms were differentiated solely on the basis of number. It is worth noting that the English language did eventually go along with Quaker leader George Fox's democratic prescriptions by giving up the pronoun differentiation based upon social status. . . . (19)

He also notes that society in general chose you instead of thou to denote this equality (19).

It was the Quakers who continued to use all of the th-
forms to address others, but eventually used only thee in all grammatical cases (Hench 361-63; see also E. A. Abbott 139; Baugh 385-86; Bryant 385-86; Curme 2:17-18, 54; Jespersen Growth and Structure 240-41; Kington-Oliphant 456; Maxfield "Quaker 'Thou' and 'Thee'" 359-61; Meynell 137-38; Partridge 24; Pyles and Algeo 191; "thee" and "thou" in the Century Dictionary; "thou" in the Oxford English Dictionary; Wyld A Short History 228-29). Mencken states that "the origin of this use of thee has been debated at length, but inconclusively" (549; Maxfield "Quaker Thee and Its History" 638-44; Maxfield "Quaker Thee and Thou" 359-63; Tibbals 193-209). It seems that the motive behind using the singular forms was that of humility, as well as equality among men. Maxfield tells us that "the Society of Friends ... persisted in the use of the old forms of address through a religious conviction that you was undemocratic and should be reserved for the Deity" ("Quaker Thee and Its History" 640), although the Quakers also used the y-forms for the plural. Both George Fox and William Penn used you and ye as second person plural nominative forms in their letters, a not uncommon practice in their day.

Mencken tells us that "the more old-fashioned American Quakers still use the objective thee for the nominative thou, and the third-person singular verb with it, e.g., Thee is and Is thee?" (549). The use of thee by the Quakers continued into the twentieth century, but seems to have
disappeared entirely. For various examples of the use of 
thee by the Quakers, the Oxford English Dictionary has a few 
("thee"). The most recent four-volume supplement to this 
same dictionary says that thee is now "rare" and gives the 
following citation: "1980 B. Strachey Remarkable Relations 
xxi. 314 Alys [Russell (1867-1951) had been the last of the 
older ones; the last to say Thee and Thy" ("thee").

H. PRONOUN USAGE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

In various parts of England, especially the Northern 
part, the second person singular pronoun forms are still 
used. As Pyles and Algeo state:
The th-forms of the second person singular, which 
had become quite rare in upper-class speech by the 
sixteenth century, were completely lost in 
standard English in the eighteenth, though they 
have lingered on in the dialects. (191; see also 
G. L. Brook Varieties of English 104-09; Lounsbury 
History 289)

Evans has written some articles on how second person 
singular pronoun forms continue to be used in some dialects 
in parts of England. He states that "despite the 
distinctive situation in the Northumberland area though, we 
can still say that . . . the old historical thou maintains a 
very vigorous existence in most of the northern region" 
("'You' and 'Thou'" 96). He also writes that "in general, 
the old distinctions that we might expect still exist
between *thou* and *you*" ("'You' and 'Thou'" 96) and cites Skeat's formula in his preface to *William of Palerne* (xli-xliii). He then explains:

Traditionally the choice between the two pronouns depended on the relative rank of the people concerned, or—in cases of approximately equal rank—on the relative distance or closeness of two people. A speaker said *you* to some of greater consequence—in age, or in social or political power—but *thou* to someone of lesser consequence. And to someone of approximately equal consequence, the speaker varied his pronoun typically from *you*—in the case of a comparative stranger—to *thou*—in the case of a close friend of a member of the family. ("'You' and 'Thou'" 96-97)

Evans also mentions "one sidelight" from the survey taken:

In a few localities in Yorkshire *thou* can apparently be used, quite untraditionally, to older people—sometimes with reservations, sometimes, presumably, without. . . . [In York] though *thou* could be used to anybody, it was considered "rough" in some cases. [In three other locales in Yorkshire] *thou* can be used to anybody. And this is interesting, not just because it is
rather untraditional, but because it seems to represent an expansion of a form which has, in general, been contracting—even in the North. It is interesting also in view of a tendency that Roger Brown and Albert Gilman have recently observed in regard to the second-person pronoun in other modern languages—a tendency they have called an "extension of the solidarity ethic." They conclude that pronoun distinctions in French, German, and Italian are being made more often nowadays on the basis of closeness or lack of it, and less often with regard to power or rank; and they contend, further, that the pronoun of closeness or "solidarity"—the pronoun corresponding to English thou—is being extended more widely than ever before. The dialect use of thou to anybody by some informants in Yorkshire seems to reflect such a tendency, on a fairly small scale. ("'You' and 'Thou'" 97)

Evans also mentions the use of "he, instead of you, as a pronoun of address . . . with varying implications, one of them being a particularly respectful attitude" ("'You' and 'Thou'" 98; Wright English Dialect Grammar 274).

Evans ends his article with these comments:

We can draw a few conclusions about the extent and usage of the historical thou singular. It is an
integral part of the speech of most of the localities surveyed throughout the northern region, with the exception of the Isle of Man and the greater part of Northumberland. Among the oldest dialect speakers in the North, you still prevails in address to those who are superior in rank or age—with perhaps some weakening of the traditional prohibition against thou in some parts of Yorkshire. And you forms still outnumber thou forms in speech to comparative strangers. On the other hand, where a woman is involved as speaker or listener, thou—though still occurring much of the time—seems to be losing ground noticeably. But in speech from man to boy and in speech between men who are friends—particularly old friends—thou seems to have its staunchest strongholds. The traditional singular would seem to persist in these relationships almost as strongly as it does, on another plane, in the language of prayer. In other words, for the informants studied, the persistence of the traditional thou in Northern dialect speech from man to boy and from friend to friend is presumably exceeded only by its persistence, in both dialect and standard language, in address to God. ("'You' and 'Thou'" 99-100)
Evans also discusses the lingering use of singular forms in southern England:

The historical second-person singular pronoun, then does survive in the southern counties of England, but in the Southwest rather than in the Southeast. Its apparent disappearance in the southeastern counties of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey has created an additional dialect distinction—a modern one—helping to set off the old Kentish dialect area from the rest of the South. The historical singular and the historical plural together form a singular paradigm not unlike that in standard Middle English, but marked by the expansion of the historical objective thee, the virtual disappearance of the historical nominative thou, the curtailment of the historical nominative ye, and the diffusion of the pronominal genitive yourn, known but non-standard in Middle English. Finally, in the southwestern counties where the historical singular still survives, it appears to function more often as a way of emphasizing closeness or likeness between two people, rather than as a means for stressing difference—either of rank or of opinion. ("The Survival" 186)

The Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia of 1902, an American publication, has this comment on the usage of thou
and its related forms:

In ordinary English use the place of thou has been taken by you, which is properly plural, and takes a plural verb. Thou is now little used except archaically, in poetry, provincially, in addressing the Deity, and by the Friends, who usually say not thou but thee, putting a verb in the third person singular with it: as, thee is or is thee?

... Formerly it was used in general address, and often bore special significance, according to circumstances, as noting—(a) equality, familiarity, or intimacy; (b) superiority on the part of the speaker; (c) contempt or scorn for the person addressed. ("thou")

This dictionary also explains that thine, like thou, is now used only in poetry, in solemn discourse, always in prayer, provincially in England, and in the common language of the Friends. In familiar and common language your and yours are always used in the singular number as well as the plural. ("thine")

Also, the Century dictionary states that to thou a person implies "(except when referring to the usage of the Friends) familiarity, wrath, scorn, contempt, etc." ("thou," verb), and thy is "used in solemn and grave style" ("thy").
Ye, however, is "used also instead of sing[ular]" and "still survives in religious and poetical use, while in ordinary colloquial and literary use you has superseded it" ("ye" Century). The Century Dictionary also adds this explanation of ye:

The personal pronoun of the second person, in the plural number: now commonly applied also (originally with some notion of distinction or compliment, as in the case of the royal we) to a single individual, in place of the singular forms thee and thou—a use resulting in the partial degradation of thou to a term of familiarity or of contempt. Ye is archaic, and little used except in exalted address and poetry. ("ye")

Thus in twentieth-century English, as Traugott states, you is semantically ambiguous as a surface form between singular and plural, but is grammatically plural as a surface form insofar as it requires the plural, never the singular, form of the verb in standard English. (88)

Today only you and your survive from the "original" twelve second person pronouns. We have added the possessive yours and the reflexives yourself and yourselves. The distinctions between singular and plural pronouns of address can still be made since they are used in prayer and poetry (as well as in some dialects), but often the verb forms
accompanying these singular forms are not those used historically (e.g., thou shall for thou shalt). Some writers have noted the "increasing tendency to replace thou by you" in addressing God in prayer (G. L. Brook Varieties of English 119; Stella Brook 53-54)

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Bryant summarizes the development of the pronoun of address thus far:

In the early Modern English period, that is, in the time of Shakespeare, and even as late as the early eighteenth century, thou and you both were employed, thou for more formal conversation. You was originally the accusative form, but early in the fourteenth century it began to replace the nominative ye. In the next century ye came to be used in the accusative case, resulting in an interchange of the two forms ye and you, until finally ye disappeared, leaving the one form you. Occasionally, however, we find ye used poetically, as in Wordsworth's "And O, ye Fountains, Meadows, Hills" from his Ode on Intimations of Immortality. . . . In prayer and poetry, the other two places where these old forms are found, language tends to be conservative and traditional and thus preserve
the old historical forms. *You* and *your* were formerly not used in addressing *God*, perhaps in the beginning because it did not seem proper to use a courtly custom for this purpose, and now that *you* has replaced the other forms, to some it may seem too familiar. (385-86)

As Curme states, speaking of the *th*-forms, the old poetic forms, long used to elevate thought and feeling, are in our own time breaking down; it may be because the poetic elevation of thought and feeling that once gave them meaning is no longer present. (2:17)

Evans gives this summary of the development of the pronoun of address:

In the Middle English of the thirteenth century a paradigm for the second-person singular pronoun could be comparatively simple:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A paradigm for the second-person plural could also be comparatively simple and, for the most part, still quite distinct from the singular paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective you
Genitive your, yours

But as the historical plural pronoun began to function as a singular, the historical case forms became more and more flexible. During the three centuries--the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries--when Y [i.e., the y-forms] was increasingly appearing in writing as a singular, the objective forms were beginning to replace nominatives in subject function and nominative forms were starting to occur as objects. The two processes--number shifting and case shifting--are difficult to separate and together provide a striking example of a language change in progress.

By the beginning of the fourteenth century, the historical nominative plural ye had begun to occur as a singular subject, and the historical genitive plurals your and yours had begun to replace the singular genitives thy and thine. By the end of the fourteenth century, the historical objective plural you--the ultimate victor over all the other nominative and objective forms in the standard language--had begun to occur as a singular object, and the historical objective singular thee had also begun to appear as a
singular subject. By the late fifteenth century, the historical nominative plural *we* was occurring as a singular object, and the historical objective plural *you* had broken both the number and case barriers and was appearing as a singular subject. All of this shifting results in a relatively complex singular paradigm in the standard English of the late fifteenth century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>thou, thee, ye, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>thee, you, ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>thy, thine, your, yours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed that the one nominative-objective shift that apparently did not occur at all in the standard language in Middle English times was the use of the historical nominative singular *thou* as an object.

Five centuries later . . . a paradigm for the second-person singular pronoun in the southern dialects of modern England would roughly resemble the paradigm in the standard Middle English of the fifteenth century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>thee, you, ye ('ee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>thee, you, ye ('ee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>thy, thine, your, yours,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distinction between th-forms and y-form in English before the thirteenth century was simply that of number. After this period this simple distinction has broken down and a variety of pronominal forms have been available for use in each succeeding age. Even if one ignores the many subtle variations in pronunciation for each form today, there still exists the possibility of using the th-forms in singular sense and the y-forms in a plural sense.

Since this distinction in number has not been maintained with consistency for hundreds of years, one should not be critical of one (such as Joseph Smith) who has not been able to maintain this consistency. Though the prescriptive grammarians have thundered "consistency!" for a number of years, the basic purpose of language is still to communicate. The grammarians and purists have created a false expectation in the minds of men concerning the use of language--one should not expect pristine consistency from humankind, especially in matters having to do with language. Each individual chooses his own words, but he does so from a reservoir of linguistic conventions not of his own creating.

Those who are linguistically hypercritical are those who also have no cloak for their own errors--a double standard cannot exist if there is one "correct" way to phrase an idea. Though the learned often assume that there
is only one "correct" form for each grammatical function, the truth is that a variety of forms have been and are vying for each function. Variation has been the theme in language, and, as we have seen, this variation continues to this day.

If the literary giants of Joseph Smith's day were not able to maintain consistency in their use of pronouns, should we expect that Joseph Smith could maintain a consistency which has never been characteristic of English except in its earliest age? Surely one would have to be severely intolerant, linguistically speaking, to find fault with Joseph Smith's use of pronouns, especially since he was not a learned man as were Scott (1771-1832), Carlyle (1795-1881), Tennyson (1809-92), and Melville (1819-91). All of these men were contemporaries of Joseph Smith, and all had pronominal shiftings in their writings and varied in other ways in their use of second person pronouns.
CHAPTER FIVE
SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE

I. INTRODUCTION

The King James Version of the Bible is a miracle in many ways. Even though it is a translation, the Authorized Version is often lauded for its exquisite use of the English language. However, much of the credit for the wording of the King James Version is due not to the translators of 1611 but to William Tyndale. Tyndale was the first to translate the whole New Testament into English from Greek in 1525 (Lewis 17-34, 367-72). As Lewis states:

The English Bible is indebted in some sections of the Old Testament and in all of the New Testament to Tyndale more than to any other single individual. It has been estimated that 92 percent of the New Testament as left by Tyndale is carried over into the KJV. (22)

Therefore, since most of the wording of the King James New Testament, as well as the forepart of the Old Testament, is actually Tyndale's and not the result of the translating committees, the language of the King James translation is actually older than the 1611 date would lead one to suppose. The language of the King James translation is also more conservative (i.e., more archaic) than the everyday language
of 1611, even with regard to second person pronouns (Partridge *English Biblical Translation* 118, 120, 189).

However, the debt is not only due Tyndale, since there were "more than fifty" translations made prior to 1611 (G. L. Brook *Words in Everyday Life* 137). As Bernard Groom states, "The Authorized Version is the work not of an age but of many centuries; and its authority as an English classic is due largely to its preservation of the traditions of our language" (qtd. in G. L. Brook *Words in Everyday Life* 137) Sir Frederic Kenyon summarizes this tradition:

The translation which still holds the field and which to all except a small minority is the Bible, is that which we know as the Authorised Version, produced in 1611 by a committee appointed by James I. This was based on the translation of Tyndale (New Testament 1525, Pentateuch 1530, historical books posthumously in 1537), completed by Coverdale (1535, revised in Great Bible, 1539-41), and revised by King James's revisers with the help of the Geneva Bible (1560) and the Roman Catholic Rheims and Douai Bible (N.T. 1582, O.T. 1609). Its main character was indelibly imprinted on it by Tyndale and Coverdale, and it is a pre-eminent example of the dignified and expressive prose which is the special characteristic of Tudor translations. (qtd. in G. L. Brook *Words in*
Because of its wonderful way with words, the King James Version of the Bible has wielded a great influence on the later development of English (G. L. Brook Words in Everyday Life 138-40), as well as on other religious writings such as the language of the Book of Mormon. The Old Testament has been translated from Hebrew (and a little Aramaic), which, it is generally assumed, is more similar to the language the Book of Mormon has been translated from than Greek, the language the New Testament has been translated from. At any rate, the writings of the Old Testament were familiar to the Nephites. It would seem, then, that many of the underlying grammatical patterns of Old Testament Hebrew which are evident in the King James translation (and other English translations) may have influenced how people have used the English language. This is especially evident with regard to idiomatic expressions, but it may also be evident with regard to how pronouns of address are used. However, it would be hard to separate the influence of the language of the Old Testament from that of the New Testament on English as a whole, especially with regard to something as basic to language as second person pronouns.

Barber discusses the interrelationship of the language of prayer and that of the King James translation:

In prayers, God is always addressed as thou. In Christian thought, God is both our king and our
father; and in either capacity he ought to be addressed as you. Perhaps this is just an example of liturgical conservatism, for it is normal for the language of worship to resist change and so become archaic. In that case, we could say that the use of thou in prayer is a relic of the time in [early Middle English] when thou was the only possible pronoun of address in the singular, and ye was used only in the plural. There may have been another influence at work, however, namely that of biblical translation. The translators of the Bible had an enormous respect for their text, and tried to keep their translations very close to it. But whether they were translating from the Latin Vulgate (like Wyclif and his followers) or from the Hebrew and the Greek (like the 16th century translators), they were translating from languages that distinguished between singular and plural in the second-person pronouns (e.g. Latin tu and vos). Since, in the original languages, the distinction was one of number, not of social rank, God was naturally addressed by the singular pronoun (e.g. Latin tu). And the English translators, equally naturally, rendered this pronoun as thou. So in English translations of the Bible, we regularly find that the pronoun of
address used to God is thou; and this likewise determined liturgical usage. (209-10)

Thus, the King James Version of the Bible has had a great influence on English, and it also has had a great influence upon the language of Joseph Smith, especially in his later writings and addresses.

II. DISCUSSION

Here we will examine briefly how pronouns of address are used in the Bible using the King James Version as the major source. One thing which needs to be pointed out initially is that many Bibles which claim to be the King James Version are actually different in many respects. Actually, this variation in editions began in 1611. In this year two major printings of the King James Bible appeared—the "he" edition and the "she" edition. The discrepancy between these two editions in Ruth 3:15 ("and he [or she] went into the city") was only the beginning of a multitude of variations. Many are simply the result of printer's errors (e.g., Luke 7:39 of the 1979 LDS ed. has sinnner instead of sinner; see also "Bible, The English"), but many are the result of deliberate editing. Scrivener mentions a typical collation of various editions available in 1873:

Between the five recent Bibles that were collated the differences would be slight and superficial,
but when the standard of 1611 came to be taken into account, it is very credible that the recorded variations, solely in the text and punctuation, amounted to 24,000. (39)

This is an exorbitant amount, but a collation between an edition today and the 1611 edition ("he" or "she" edition) would yield tens of thousands more discrepancies.

Lewis queries:

The King James Bible, then, as a currently circulating book, becomes a phantom, a figment of an imagination clinging to the past. Which of all these revisions is to be considered the real King James? If we are to use only the KJV and read the other versions for comparison, which King James shall we use? (40)

How this continuous editing has affected pronouns of address is only one item of interest here. Scrivener is of the opinion that the original translation should be left in its original state as much as possible:

The apparent solecisms also and unusual grammatical constructions of our standard of 1611 should be scrupulously retained, without any attempt to amend them. Such as they are, they comprise an integral part of the Translation, and preserve phrases once legitimate enough, which have since grown obsolete. (109)
Yet Lewis asks, "If revision has been tolerated and even encouraged in the past, why should it be terminated now?" (40).

A. THY AND THINE

In the history of English, as we have seen in chapter 3, *thy* and *thine* have never been differentiated with exactness in principle or practice. Scrivener tells how the King James Version has been edited capriciously in this regard:

The changes introduced in more recent books [i.e., editions of the King James Version] are apparently capricious or accidental, being as often wrong as right. Thus if *my* of 1611 is turned into *mine* before *integrity* Job xxvii. 5 in 1762, and *mine* correctly changed into *my* before *head* by the same, Luke vii. 46; the opposite alterations of *my* for *mine* before *eyelids* Job xvi. 16 in 1617, of *thy* for *thine* before *eyes* Job xv. 12 in 1769, and of *thine* for *thy* before *hands* I Macc. xv. 7 in 1629, prove clearly that they had no principle to guide them [the original translators and later editors] in the matter. (109)

B. YE AND YOU

Another feature which is often pointed out about the King James Bible is that *ye* and *you* are consistently used in their nominative and objective cases, respectively (e.g.,
Lounsbury "Pronouns of Address" 201; Pyles and Algeo 192; Wyld A History 330; "ye" Century Dictionary). The consistent use of ye and you is actually a language feature much older than the 1611 translation. As Lounsbury states:

Our version of the Bible, for instance, has regularly ye in the nominative and you in the accusative: but in this particular it is more archaic than is the language of the period to which it nominally belongs. (History 272)

This is, perhaps surprisingly, a consistency that is a feature only of edited versions of the King James translation since the 1611 editions (Curme 2:15). Scrivener comments concerning this textual emendation:

Amidst all this unmeaning tampering with the text, the several editors, especially those of 1762 and 1769, carried out to the full at least [one thing] on which they had set their minds: ... in 364 places (e.g. I Cor. xiv. 18) they have altered the nominative plural you into ye, besides that Blayney makes the opposite change in Build you Num. xxxii. 24; Wash you Isai. i. 16; Get you Zech. vi. 7; Turn you Zech. ix. 12. (104)

Dr. Paris edited an edition in 1762 for the Cambridge press, and Dr. Blayney edited an edition in 1769 for Oxford press. As we shall see, however, all these pronoun changes, as well as others, are not the work of these two editors alone.
An interesting sidelight is that in the preface of the 1611 edition, "The Translators to the Reader," the translators quote Numbers 32:14 as, "You are risen up in your fathers stead," but in the text itself you is ye in this passage. Such seemingly inconsistent use of ye and you in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has already been pointed out.

Kenyon quotes various writers who mention the alleged consistency in the King James Version and then states:

I find in the whole Bible about 3830 nominative ye's and 300 nominative you's, or over 7 per cent. of you's. The ratio of you's to ye's is in the Old Testament about 6 per cent., Apocrypha 35 per cent., and New Testament 5 per cent.

I have seen no full discussion of the disappearance of these nominative you's from modern Bibles. (454-55)

He then cites Scrivener's finding 364 places in which you has been altered to ye, but notes, "I am unable to find so many" (455). Kenyon also lists the instances of nominative you in the 1611 Bible (454-55) and notes that "287 or more" are in the text itself, while the remaining thirteen are in the margin (460).

Kenyon's discussion is quite informative and reliable in this regard. He examines the various alterations in
various editions of the Bible between 1611 and 1762 and concludes that both Paris and Blayney were not solely responsible for the changes from you to ye (455-61). He then gives this excellent treatment as to how pronouns of address are used in the Bible and how some of them have been changed:

We have to deal in the Authorized Version with another apparent confusion between nominative and objective in the second person plural of the pronoun, the use of the unstressed form ye as an objective. This form occurs as early as Chaucer in unstressed positions. [Kenyon footnotes a discussion on the first instance of objective ye and the following: Almost all of the examples in Shakespeare are unstressed, and none have full stress. In the Bible they are invariably without stress.] It is frequent in the Bible of 1611, but Blayney and his predecessors have substituted you for it throughout. The following are examples:

Gen. 19. 14 Vp, get yee out of this place.
Deut. 1. 40 turne ye, and take your journey into the wilderness.
Josh. 3. 12 Now therefore take yee twelue men.
Num. 32. 24 Build ye cities for your little ones.
Isa. 32.11 strip ye and make ye bare.

In such instances we have to be on our guard, owing to the fact that in seventeenth-century English many verbs, transitive and intransitive, could take after them either a nominative or objective pronoun, such as stay thou or stay thee, go thou or go thee (Ezek. 21. 16). [Kenyon footnotes: These verbs with pronouns well illustrate Tyndale’s remark about the very great similarity in style between Hebrew and English. Go thee, and lay thee hold and take thee (2 Sam. 2. 21) all have reflexive forms in Hebrew, and are rendered literally in English by equally idiomatic forms.] Since ye and you were each either nominative or objective, it is difficult in many instances to know which case the translators felt, if any. Get ye (you) appears to be always objective. Get thee is frequent and get thou does not occur. Get you is much more frequent than get ye in the 1611 version, so that Blayney and his predecessors are consistent in changing all to get you. . . .

These facts raise the question whether it would not have been better, while modernizing the A. V. in some other respects, to have left ye and you as they were in 1611.
Ye and you invariably represent the plural when used as the second personal pronoun. Many instances appear at first sight to contradict this; for example:

Josh. 4. 1 ff. the LORD spake vn to Joshua,
saying, Take you twelue men out of the people, . . . And command you them . . .

Deut. 12. 7 and yee shall rejoyce in all that you put your hand vn to, ye and your households, wherein the LORD thy God hath blessed thee.

Deut. 13. 5 to turne you away from the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, to thrust thee out of the way which the LORD thy God commanded thee to walke in.

Such instances abound, but so far as English is concerned ye and you are always plural; for the pronouns invariably correspond in number with the original.

Many of these examples illustrate a very effective trait of biblical style. In addressing a group, the speaker appears suddenly to address himself to one person singled out from the rest. For example:
Deut. 29. 10 ff. Ye stand this day all of you before the LORD your God: your captaines of your tribes, your Elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, Your little ones, your wiues, and thy stranger that is in thy campe, from the hewer of thy wood, vnto the drawer of thy water; That thou shouldest enter into Couenant with the LORD thy God, and into his othe [i.e., oath] which the LORD thy God maketh with thee this day:

This is seen to advantage in the Sermon on the Mount:

Matth. 6. 1 ff. Take heed that yee doe not your almes before men, to be seene of them: otherwise ye haue no reward of your father which is in heauen. Therefore, when thou doest thine almes, doe not sound a trumpet before thee, . . . . . But when thou doest almes, let not thy left hand know, what thy right doeth:

Matth. 6. 16 f. Moreouer, when yee fast, be not as the Hypocrites, . . . . . But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head,
and wash thy face:

There are four instances in Judith (1. 10, 12; 2. 24) in which you is the singular indefinite pronoun:

Jud. 1. 12  all Iudea, and all that were in Egypt, till you come to the borders of the two Seas. . . .

Blayney is, so far as I know, the first editor to change these you’s to ye’s. (461-66)

Kenyon has thus pointed out that pronominal shifting--shifting from plural second person forms to singular forms--occurs in the Bible as "a very effective trait of biblical style." By shifting from plural forms to singular forms of the pronoun, each member of the audience is able to feel as if the message is directed to him individually. Kenyon continues his discussion of pronouns of address in the Bible by commenting on the use of you as a nominative form:

The use of you as a nominative in English appears to date from the middle of the fourteenth century. According to Spies, you begins to predominate over ye about 1550. In the first half of the sixteenth century you and ye are found used indiscriminately. As is to be expected, nominative you is more frequent in the spoken than in the literary dialect. The great frequency of you in Shakespeare well represents the situation
at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In spite of its 300 nominative *you's*, therefore, the Bible is very conservative in the use of this popular form.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century we find that this conservatism is characteristic of the Bible translations. In Tyndale's New Testament I find no nominative *you's*. The same is true of Coverdale's and the Great Bible of 1549. There is one in Matthew's Bible (1538), a few in the Geneva of 1557, and they become frequent, though still relatively few, in the Bishop's Bible of 1568. On the other hand, the Rheims Bible of 1582 has relatively few *ye's*.

In the sixteenth century there appears a tendency to associate *ye* with Biblical and other dignified language. Perhaps this is as much a result as a cause of the conservative use in Bible versions, a desire to translate accurately doubtless being at the bottom of the matter in Tyndale and his immediate successors. For Tyndale and other men intimately associated with early Bible translations employed nominative *you* in their writings. This difference in style is perhaps most noticeable in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549). In the scriptural parts *ye*
and you are carefully distinguished, but in the other parts nominative you is frequent. There is also a difference to be seen in the more and less formal passages of the non-scriptural parts. For example, the formal passage following the Creed in the Communion has ye, but the more personal and intimate exhortation following has you.

To the question of the source of the nominative you's in the Authorized Version, one answer at least is definite. Of the rules laid down for the translators, the first was, "The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the Truth of the original will permit." The fourteenth was, "These translations to be used when they agree better with the Text than the Bishops Bible: Tindoll's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's, Geneva." An examination of the passages shows that none of the you's go back to Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, or Whitchurch (Great Bible) . . . .

About 200 of the you's in the Authorized Version are in passages substantially identical in phrasing with either the Bishops' Bible or the Geneva. About 87 of these you's are taken directly from the Bishops', and 40 from the Geneva
version. That the remainder are easily accounted for by the tendency of the contemporary language is indicated by the situation in the Bishops’ and Geneva versions. In the Bishops’ Bible of 1602 a number of you’s occur which were ye’s in the first edition (1568), and the same is true of Geneva. The influence on the Authorized Version from the Bishops’ Bible is most evident in the Pentateuch. From Job to the end of the Apocrypha the Geneva version is most prominent. Neither furnished many you’s in the New Testament, the greater number coming from the Bishops’. It is perhaps significant of the translators’ sense of the closer connection of the New Testament with the life of the people that here the great majority of the nominative you’s are not derived from a definite source, and may therefore be attributed to a feeling for a slightly more familiar and popular style.

That the normalizing of ye and you has to some extent affected the style of the original version of 1611 there can be little doubt. Though perhaps it would be difficult to offer proof from particular passages, the euphony has undoubtedly been affected in places by the changes. This will not seem too slight a matter to those who
appreciate the remarkable qualities of the version in this respect.

Again, the translators' use of you is of interest as an indication among many others of their attitude toward the popular idiom. Recent scholars have pointed out definite traits of popular style in the Bible, and this takes its place among them. We have seen a progressive tendency in the translations to approximate the popular idiom, a tendency that accounts either immediately or through previous translations for the nominative you's in the 1611 version. The later correctors have therefore deprived us of this element, so scattered through the Bible as to assist in keeping that nice balance between formal dignity and popular simplicity that is universally recognized in the version in other respects.

Finally, the normalization has removed an element of variety in style that is not inconsiderable. Not only in euphony, but in the avoidance of rigidity, and in the slight variations in formality, the occasional use of the more popular form plays a part. Compare, for example, in the light of contemporary usage, the tone of Ps. 24. 7 Lift vp your heads, O yee gates, with that of Gen. 24. 49 And now if you wil deale
kindly and truely with my master, tell me. [Kenyon footnotes: It seems significant that nominative you is most frequent in the narrative parts of the Old Testament and of the Apocrypha, and the narrative and epistolary parts of the New Testament, and rare in the Prophets and Psalms, and the book of Revelation.] The translators themselves did not intend that their style should be mechanically uniform even in matters that did not affect the sense. (466-71)

Thus in the 1611 King James translation of the Bible there was considerable variation in usage between ye and you, as well as the remaining pronominal shiftings occasioned by the speaker's addressing his audience as if he were addressing an individual rather than a group. That some of this variation in usage has been edited out in later years shows that the Bible did not escape the intolerance of the prescriptive grammarians and others for variation in usage.

C. PRONOMINAL SHIFTINGS

As Kenyon mentions, one stylistic feature of the Bible is the shiftings from singular to plural second person pronoun forms. Brookbank explains that enallage "is a convenient term to express the substitution of one gender, person, number, case, mode, tense, etc., of the same word for another; and learned commentators inform us that it was
frequently applied by the ancient Hebrews" (13:118-19). Moses, Isaiah, and others address Israel with singular and plural second person pronouns, sometimes shifting in midsentence, and many times in middiscourse. Deuteronomy 4:25 is only one of many examples:

When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, and shall do evil in the sight of the LORD thy God, to provoke him to anger.

You will notice the first pronoun of address is a singular second person pronoun, thou, and then plural forms occur (ye and yourselves), and finally a singular form (thy) occurs again. Even though it cannot be determined with certainty that these words are direct quotations of Moses' words, they should be representative of how pronouns of address were used in general.

Also in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus shifts between singular and plural pronouns many times (Matt. 5-7), although it cannot be determined with certainty that the words found even in the earliest Greek manuscript are direct quotations. They should, however, reflect general usage of the language of the time, but some Greek manuscripts even differ for some pronouns of address in the Sermon on the Mount (e.g., Matt. 6:21).
This same shifting also occurs in speeches to individuals, such as when Jesus talks with Nicodemus:

Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? (John 3:10-12)

Another example is in Matthew 23:37:

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens, under her wings, and ye would not!

This same kind of shifting which occurs in the Sermon on the Mount and in Moses' addresses to Israel also occurs in the Book of Mormon, but in many cases the text has been altered so that this is not reflected in the printed editions. Nibley mentions such shiftings in Abinadi's language which have been altered and states, "The occasional change of person or number in the middle of a sentence or speech in the Book of Mormon is bad English grammar, but quite characteristic of ancient composition," although the article on Personenwechsel that he mentions discusses
changes in grammatical number, not changes in grammatical person (169-70).

Brookbank also has mentioned pronominal shifting and indicates that it is a Hebraism:

Dr. Angus in the Bible Hand Book, paragraph 277, speaking of Hebraisms, says that plural forms are sometimes put by the Jews for the singular to imply that there are more than one person or thing held in view, though it may be to only one that the direct address or reference is made. In other words, when more than one was to share in a thought, or sentiment, the plural was sometimes used to show that the single individual chiefly in mind was not the only one to whom it was applicable, and, conversely, when more than one was to be included, the singular could be substituted for the plural to show, among other things, that those to whom the thought or command, etc., was directed, were not viewed collectively only, but as individuals also, who separately composed the mass. An example of the substitution of the singular for the plural occurs in the terms used by Moses in giving the ten commandments to the Israelites (Ex. 20).

Just previous to the announcement of these, God had instructed his servant to speak to the
people, saying, "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenants, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine" (Ex. 19:4,5). This is a preface to the ten commandments, and plural forms are used exclusively when reference is made to the whole body of the Israelites; but there occurs a remarkable and uniform substitution of the singular for the plural, when the obligation of the law is being laid upon these same people. By the use of thou and thy instead of ye and your, however, every individual is searched out and made to feel his personal accountability before the law almost as sensibly as if he had been commanded by name to observe it. None could deceive himself with the vain plea that all must be well with Israel individually in the sight of God, because collectively the people were acknowledged by him. It is thus manifest that this idiom placed in the power of the Jews a wonderfully effective mode of address. (13:119)

Brookbank also cites Deuteronomy 6:1, 2, 16-19; Exodus 23:9, 31; Numbers 28:3, 4 (17:191) and Exodus 22:22, 23;

Brookbank then concludes:

These Hebraisms are thus demonstrated to be fully as characteristic of the language of the Book of Mormon as they are of that of the Bible, and some of the grammatical errors in the former, to which our attention is sometimes called by our opponents, are also found in the Bible, which is a model of correct English [or perhaps popularly considered as such]; and they should not be regarded by any one as fit matters for ridicule, but be viewed in their true light, as peculiarities necessarily associated with the use of a Hebrew idiom, and hence as affording unimpeachable evidence that the Book of Mormon was not written by Joseph Smith, nor by any other man who was not thoroughly familiar with some peculiar principles of the Jewish language.

If those who peruse these remarks will turn to Christ's sermon on the mount, and read especially Matt. 5: 39; 6: 1, 2 and 6, 7, and 16, 17, and 7: 1-5, they will find that, if there is
any ground for charging illiteracy against the Book of Mormon writers because of the peculiarities in the use of language just passed upon, an identical charge of illiteracy can be sustained against the writers of the Bible.

(13:235)

With regard to whether the grammar of the Bible is "correct" or not, Sperber mentions a few editions of the Hebrew text that have been edited based on various grammars rather than by basing the grammar on the Hebrew text of the Bible itself. He states, "Thus, Bible editors till now made the fundamental error to approach their task as grammarians, anxious to eliminate and correct what in their eyes plainly were 'errors'" (555). He further maintains that it is high time that Bible scholars outgrow this attitude of superiority, and approach the Bible not as schoolmasters teaching the prophets how Hebrew sentences should be formed and Hebrew words spelled; but as humble students of these great masters of Hebrew, anxious to learn from them.

(104)

He also states:

I shall cheerfully deny ("verleugnen") any grammatical rule, if the Biblical text denies it. It is the Bible, upon which the authority for all Hebrew grammar rests. And whenever and wherever
the facts in the Bible do not uphold a grammatical law, this law has no leg to stand on and becomes immediately null and void. (53-54; see also 566)

In his study Sperber also mentions some places in the Hebrew text (e.g., Ex. 23:31) where the second person pronouns (actually the pronominal suffixes) shift between singular and plural (93 and elsewhere).

Th-forms occur 13,168 times in the Old Testament and 1,886 times in the New Testament, while y-forms occur 5,233 times in the Old Testament and 3,343 times in the New Testament (1979 LDS ed.). Here follows a reference list of pronominal shiftings (some seem more apparent than real) which occur within the context of a single verse:

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Similar pronominal shiftings occur both in the Bible and in the Book of Mormon. In the Bible these shiftings occur mainly in the Old Testament, but a few also occur in Matthew and John (which both contain other Hebraisms). It seems that these shiftings were done purposely in the Bible (e.g., for rhetorical effect). Since the Bible is a
translated work, it would be expected that some grammatical features of the original languages would show up in the translation itself. This is precisely what we find in the Bible. The pronominal shiftings in the Bible are due to the literal translation of the original, but these variations in pronoun use also were allowable in English at the time the Bible was translated. Pronoun usage in English was not fixed at this date, and some of the variations in usage in the King James translation (e.g., ye or you as nominative) simply reflect the variation in usage that was a part of English.

The pronominal shiftings and variations in pronoun usage found in the Book of Mormon closely parallel these variations in pronoun usage in the Bible. Some are the result of variation in Joseph Smith’s own language, but others seem parallel to this biblical or Hebraic usage and may reflect an underlying language feature similar to the biblical usage of pronouns of address just discussed.
CHAPTER SIX
SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN JOSEPH SMITH'S DAY

I. INTRODUCTION

"In the United States," Mencken states, thou "dropped out of use at a very early date, and no writer on American speech so much as mentions it" (549). However, we have discussed briefly how Melville used pronouns of address, as well as some other contemporaries of Joseph Smith. As we have seen, thou and related second person singular forms are still used in prayer, poetry, and by some people in England who retain these forms in their dialects. However, even though these pronouns of address have not been used much except for addressing Deity in prayer, anyone can use them even today who is familiar with them.

Some early uses of the th-forms in America are recorded, but these are sparse. O. L. Abbott mentions sixty occurrences of the verbal suffix -st in a corpus of American works written in the seventeenth century, but indicates that this corpus was not appropriate for an analysis of second person forms (185-94). He also indicates that "in nine instances [all from Anne Bradstreet] the second person singular ends in -s" instead of -est (185-86).

Cotton Mather quotes a few dialogues in his Magnalia Christi Americana in which the th-forms are used, but the
majority of the conversations reported in this work written at the end of the seventeenth have only y-forms. One of the few examples in which th-forms occur interchangeably with y-forms is in a section entitled "The Discourse of the Minister with James Morgan, on the Way to His Execution":

Min[ister]: And what shall I now say? These are among the last words that I can have liberty to leave with you. Poor man! thou art now going to knock at the door of heaven, and to beg and cry, "Lord, Lord, open to me!" The only way for thee to speed [i.e., succeed], is to open the door of thy own soul now unto the Lord Jesus Christ. Do this, and thou shalt undoubtedly be admitted into the glories of his heavenly kingdom: you shall fare as well as Manasseh did before you; leave this undone, and there is nothing remains for you but the "worm which dieth not and the fire which never shall be quench'd." (2:412; see also 2:416)

Thomson translated a harmony of the Gospels in 1815 and uses pronouns with biblical consistency, however he did err on occasion and used you as a nominative plural (25; e.g., "This day there is an accomplishment of this scripture which you have just heard" [Luke 4:21] and "You will doubtless apply to me this proverb [Luke 4:25]).

One possible source as to how pronouns of address were used by some in America around this time is the twenty-
volume series edited by Barrett H. Clark entitled America's *Lost Plays*, a collection of obscure plays from various periods of American history. Since plays are written by the more literate, it would seem that if they did use th-forms, it would be more for effect than to represent actual usage of the day. A brief perusal of a few volumes will show that y-forms were the norm, although a few plays consciously employ the th-forms (e.g., Charles Kean's "Louis XI" 1:49-106).

Exactly how and when thou "dropped out of use" in America has not been examined carefully, but clearly by Joseph Smith's day the general use of thou was found rarely except in prayer, poetry, religious writings, and various translations of religious works. Since the King James Bible and many other works have been translated using these forms, these forms are still in use and have not disappeared entirely. The many prayers offered each day in which these forms are used are rarely written down for future generations to examine, but it should be obvious that the use of second person singular forms continues to this day.

Since the Book of Mormon is a religious work, it is only proper to examine other religious works of the day to see how pronouns are used in them. This is a difficult task because, as Mencken has mentioned, few writers mention the use of thou in the United States except in reference to the Quakers.
II. DISCUSSION

We shall now examine some writings of Joseph Smith's day. Since the language used by different members of a family is usually somewhat similar, the pronoun usage of some of Joseph Smith's progenitors and family will be briefly examined here, followed by a short discussion of pronoun usage in hymns. Pronoun usage in the Doctrine and Covenants, the Pearl of Great Price, the Joseph Smith translation, and in some of Joseph Smith's other writings will be discussed. These discussions will better enable us to determine whether the use of these pronouns in the Book of Mormon is due to Joseph Smith's own variations in language or to something in the nature of the language he translated.

A. SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN JOSEPH SMITH'S DAY

Lucy Mack Smith's work entitled Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith the Prophet and His Progenitors for Many Generations reports the speech of a number of individuals in Joseph Smith's day. Since this work was dictated many years after some of the events, it may not represent the exact words of individuals. However, this dialogue between Joseph Smith, Sr., and a Quaker that Lucy Mack Smith includes in her work shows that she was at least somewhat sensitive to pronoun usage of the day:
Quaker: "Friend Smith, I have a note against thee of fourteen dollars, which I have lately bought, and I have come to see if thou hast the money for me."

Mr. Smith: "Why, sir, did you purchase that note? You certainly was in no want of the money?"

Quaker: "That is business of my own; I want the money, and must have it."

Mr. Smith: "I can pay you six dollars now,—the rest you will have to wait for, as I can not get it for you."

Quaker: "No, I will not wait one hour; and if thou dost not pay me immediately, thou shalt go forthwith to the jail, unless (running to the fireplace, and making violent gestures with his hands towards the fire) thou wilt burn up those Books of Mormon; but if thou wilt burn them up, then I will forgive thee the whole debt."

Mr. Smith (decidedly): "That I shall not do."

Quaker: "Then, thou shalt go to jail."

"Sir," I [Lucy Mack Smith] interrupted (taking my gold beads from my neck, and holding them towards him), "these beads are the full value of the remainder of the debt. I beseech you to take them, and give up the
note."

**Quaker:** "No, I will not. **Thou** must pay the money, or **thy** husband shall go straightway to jail." (192-93)

Thus it would seem that Mother Smith is attempting to represent the speech of those in her work as accurately as possible.

Lovina, Lucy Mack Smith’s sister, uses **you** exclusively as both a nominative and an objective form in singular and plural senses in her speech (Lucy Mack Smith 13, 16-17), except in poetry:

"Lord, may my thoughts be turned to **thee**;
Lift **thou** my heavy soul on high;
Wilt **thou**, O, Lord, return to me
In mercy, Father, ere I die!
My soaring thoughts now rise above--
O, fill my soul with heavenly love.
"Father and mother, now farewell;
And husband, partner of my life,
Go to my father’s children, tell
That lives no more on earth **thy** wife;
That while she dwelt in cumbrous clay,
For them she prayed both night and day.
"My friends, I bid you all adieu; [see Jacob 7:27]
The Lord hath called, and I must go--
And all the joys of this vain earth,
Are now to me of little worth;
'Twill be the same with you as me,
When brought as near eternity."

(Lucy Mack Smith 20)

Some other contemporaries also are reported to have used you in the same manner as Lovina, the same normal pronoun of today. A man to Daniel Mack, Lucy Mack Smith's brother (Lucy Mack Smith 27); John Mudget to Stephen Mack (Lucy Mack Smith 38); Major Mack, or Stephen, to a Mr. Stevens (Lucy Mack Smith 45), angelic messengers to Lucy Mack Smith (Lucy Mack Smith 41) and to her husband (Lucy Mack Smith 54, 57, 72, 76); Jason Mack to Solomon Mack (Lucy Mack Smith 48-49); townspeople to Lucy Mack Smith (Lucy Mack Smith 59) or to the Smith family in general (Lucy Mack Smith 69); Lucy's mother to Lucy (Lucy Mack Smith 70); and many others are all represented as using you as Lovina does.

Joseph Smith, Sr., is also represented as using you in both nominative and objective cases and in both plural and singular numbers for the second person pronoun (e.g., Lucy Mack Smith 40-41, 94). Alvin (e.g., Lucy Mack Smith 91, 98-99) and his mother, Lucy Mack (e.g., Lucy Mack Smith 60, 63, 71), use you likewise. It would seem, then, that you is the normal, everyday second person pronoun and th-forms are used rarely except by Quakers and in poetry (and, of course, in prayer). Some mobbers are characterized as using ye as both a nominative and an objective pronoun in a singular sense
and also as a nominative plural (Lucy Mack Smith 235-36; History of the Church 1:261-63).

Another good source for contemporary second person pronoun usage is patriarchal blessings. Because access to these blessings is usually restricted to those who are direct descendants of the recipient of the blessing, this valuable source for determining usage of pronouns of address has not been examined fully. Patriarchal (or other blessings which were taken down verbatim) given by those in Joseph Smith’s family would probably be the best "control" sample of pronoun usage to compare with Joseph Smith’s pronoun usage outside of his own.

Both Joseph Smith, Sr., and Hyrum Smith gave patriarchal blessings to many Saints. Because these blessings are usually transcribed verbatim, this makes them an even better source for pronoun usage than reported speech recorded many years afterward. In the few blessings examined that are not in Lucy Mack Smith’s work, Joseph Smith, Sr., seems to use th-forms exclusively. However, Lucy Mack Smith reports that he used y-forms (excluding ye) in blessings he gave to Arthur (his daughter Catherine’s husband), Hyrum, Joseph, Don Carlos, and to his wife Lucy (Lucy Mack Smith 337-42). In the blessings he gave to William, Sophronia, and to his daughter Lucy, he used th-forms exclusively, while in his blessing to Samuel he varies his usage. This shifting is easily explained because he is
relating the Lord's words to Samuel:

When the Lord called you, he said, "Samuel, I have seen thy sufferings, have heard thy cries, and beheld thy faithfulness; thy skirts are clear from the blood of this generation." Because of these things, I seal upon your head all the blessings which I have hitherto pronounced upon you; and this is my dying blessing, I now seal upon you. (Lucy Mack Smith 338-39)

Hyrum Smith, on the other hand, uses y-forms almost exclusively in the blessings he gives (a few biblical phrases such as "thou shalt not covet" or "thou art Abrahams [sic] seed" are the rare exceptions). Since only a few patriarchal blessings have been examined, these generalizations may not hold true for all the blessings they have given. The patriarchal blessings examined were some of those listed in the index of Mormon Manuscripts to 1846 (Andrus and Bennett 225).

B. SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN HYMNS

Hymns often retain archaic forms and features of language, but they also can give an indication of some of the writer's attitudes towards different types of phrases and expressions. As Monson states, "Hymns are a great treasure house of linguistic history" (22). We will examine some hymns in the first Latter-day Saint hymnbook, as well as some in a more recent edition.
The first Latter-day Saint hymnal was published in 1835 and included ninety hymns. Because these hymns are mainly those written by contemporaries of Joseph Smith, they can be a valuable source of some of the attitudes and feelings of the writers of Joseph Smith's day towards various forms and features of language, including use of pronouns. The majority of the hymns included in this hymnal use pronouns of address consistently, that is, th-forms for singular and y-forms for plural in their proper cases, but a few use them inconsistently. Since these hymns are not referred to in the hymnal by name, they will be referred to by number here.

The most frequent inconsistency is the use of both ye and you as nominative plural forms, and only these uses will be underlined in the following examples. Part of hymn number 2 reads, "Ho! ye that pant for living streams" and "Here you may quench your raging thirst" (7). Hymn number 74 has, "Waft, waft, ye winds, his story,/ And you, ye waters roll" (100), and in hymn number 81 we find, "You are built upon this Rock" and "Look to me and be ye holy" (110). Hymn 87 has "Ye living men, come view the ground/ Where you must shortly lie" (118).

Some hymns with more examples include the following. In hymn number 55 we read:

Wonder, ye heavens! . . .

Ye men behold . . .

The sacred record, while you read,
Calls you to imitate the deed. (72)

Hymn number 63 queries:

O stop and tell me, Red Man,
Who are ye? why you roam?
And how you get your living?
Have you no God:—no home? (83)

In hymn number 65 ye and you are used indifferently:

Come all ye sons of Zion . . .
Come, ye dispers'd of Judah . . .
The voice of God shall reach you,
Wherever you are found;
And call you back from bondage,
That you may sing his praise . . .
Ye saints, throughout the land, . . .
Has said you shall obtain. (85-86)

In other hymns the only nominative plural form found is you. Hymn number 78 has, "Come, brethren, you that love the Lord" (105). Hymn number 25 states:

"I am Joseph, your brother," he said,
"And still to my heart you are dear;
You sold me, and thought I was dead,
But God, for your sakes, sent me here." (32)

The chorus of hymn number 16 reads:

O Israel! O Israel!

In all your abidings,
Prepare for your Lord
When you hear these glad tidings. (22-23)

It should be obvious that ye as a poetic form was being used inconsistently or simply abandoned in favor of you long before the compilation of these hymns. This may be perhaps because ye was not associated with religious language or feelings. It also shows that you was in use quite generally.

Singular th-forms are used in many of these hymns, but sometimes the verbs which follow them do not have the more archaic -est or -st endings. Hymn number 40 has, "Thou spread'st the curtain of the night" and "And thou awakens all my pow'rs" (54). Hymn number 58 reads in part, "Till thou return, and we shall eat" (78). Assuming it is the more literate who write these hymns, it would seem strange for someone as unlearned as Joseph Smith to use them with "correctness" when the more literate are not able to.

Monson gives some examples of a variety of linguistic features in the hymns of the 1948 Latter-day Saint hymnal (13-22), including second person pronouns (14-16). In hymn number 4, "All Creatures of Our God and King," the inconsistent pronoun use ("ve light of evening") is perhaps due to a misprint, since "ve lights of evening" is found in hymnbooks used by other denominations (e.g., Inspiring Hymns no. 232).

The pronoun shifting from "ye Saints" to "As thy days may demand" in hymn number 66, "How Firm a Foundation," can
be explained by the verses after the first one being quotes or paraphrases of scripture. In the 1835 hymnbook the third and later verses are in quotation marks (111-13), but in another the second and later verses are in quotation marks (Inspiring Hymns no. 325).

In hymn 75, "It May Not Be on a Mountain Height," we sing, "I'll go where you want me to go," but this could be changed to "I'll go where thou wilt have me go" (or even a less euphonic "I'll go where thou wouldst have me go"). The other phrases in which you is used in reference to the Lord in this same hymn could be changed in like manner, although doing so would radically alter the tone of this hymn. The pronouns of Hymn 206, "Put Your Shoulder to the Wheel," could easily be changed to be consistent (i.e., changed to "With all your might and zeal").

Hymn number 81, "Israel, Israel, God is Calling," was written by Richard Smyth, an Irish Latter-day Saint born on Christmas day in 1838 (Cornwall 97). This hymn reads in part:

Israel, Israel, God is calling,
Calling thee from lands of woe: . . .
Israel, Israel, God is speaking;
Hear your great Deliverer's voice! . . .
Come to Zion, come to Zion,
For your coming Lord is nigh. . . .
Israel! Israel! canst thou linger
Still in error's gloomy ways?

In some hymns not mentioned by Monson but in the same hymnal we find you used as a nominative form. In hymn 170 we find, "If you strive to do what's right" and "If you put your trust in him," as well as "Day by day you'll then rejoice." Also, in hymn 22, "Come unto Jesus," we find, "Ye heavy laden," "Though in the darkness you've gone astray," "If you in meekness plead for his love," and "Oh, know you not that angels are near you." Contractions are not generally used in the Bible or in the other standard works.

C. SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN THE DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS

The Doctrine and Covenants, like the Book of Mormon and the other scriptures, has also had editorial revisions over the years. The Book of Commandments and the first edition of the Doctrine and Covenants is included in the second volume of Wood's Joseph Smith Begins His Work. A detailed analysis of most of the changes in the Doctrine and Covenants before the 1981 edition can be found in Woodford's lengthy doctoral dissertation.

Mark Davis has written a short paper on the second person pronouns in the Doctrine and Covenants given at the 1980 Deseret Language and Linguistics Society Symposium. He states:

The modern English you for both singular and plural, nominative and objective, is used in several sections, nine where it is used in a
plural context and eleven where it is singular. In addition, there are eleven sections where you is used only in the objective case and it is impossible to determine whether ye or you would have been used in the nominative. But since these objective you's often refer to singular antecedents, they cannot be said to follow the King James rules. They are used consistently though, and that in itself is significant.

There is only one other section where the same second person pronoun is used consistently for one antecedent. In section 60, vv. 13-15, thou/thee is used to refer to a plural antecedent: "I give unto them a commandment, thus: thou shalt not idle away thy time . . ." Interestingly, in this same section, another plural antecedent is referred to as you.

The above consistent sections, plus fourteen irrelevant sections in which there is no second person used at all, account for seventy-one of the sections--slightly more than half of the total. The rest are a collection of virtually every possible combination of plural and singular pronouns imaginable. I have classified these "mixed" sections in eight categories of mixed usage. . . .
It is important to note here that while the *ye* and *thou* pronouns are used in these "mixed" sections with various singular and plural meanings, the words themselves are used "gramatically" [sic] correctly. That is, there occurs no objective *ye* or nominative *thee*. Further, the verbs used with these pronouns apparently agree as they should. It is always "thou hast," "ye shall" and so on. (60-61)

The categories Mark Davis gives are:

1. "Mixed *Ye, You* Nominative--Plural" (e.g., D&C 17:5, 88:76-78, 84).
   "This is by far the most common variety of mixed usage. . . . Typically *ye* appears for a few verses, then *you*, then *ye* again" (62).

2. "Mixed *Ye, You* Nominative--Singular" (e.g. D&C 80:1-2).
   "There is no section in which a single person is consistently addressed by *ye*, but the alternating *ye/*you occurs in three sections in which the recipient of the revelation is clearly designated by name" (62).

3. "Mixed *Ye, Thou* Nominative--Plural" (e.g., D&C 21:4-5, 42:30-31, 45, 58).
   "In addressing the Church the revelations often will first use *thou* and then change to
ye, and back again" (62-63).

4. "Mixed Ye, Thou Nominative--Singular" (e.g., D&C 112:16-19).

   "This form does not exist. Whenever a plural subject is referred to as thou in mixed sections, it alternates with the pronoun ye" (63).

6. "Mixed You, Thou Nominative--Singular" (e.g., D&C 19:13, 25, 32, 90:3).
   "This is the second most common mixed pronoun category. It is very common in commandments given to specific persons" (63).

7. "Mixed You, Ye, Thou Nominative--Plural" (e.g., D&C 98:3, 8, 39).
   "There is only one example with a plural antecedent" (63).

8. "Mixed You, Ye, Thou Nominative--Singular" (e.g., D&C 6:20, 23, 30, 132:40, 46).
   "This occurs in five sections, and is often the cause of ambiguity" (64).

Mark Davis gives these comments on his findings:

These categories account for all the second person pronoun usage in the Doctrine and Covenants. There appears to be no pattern or consistency in the mixed usage. Revelations addressed to Joseph
Smith and those given through him to others are all written with the same usage quirks. Further, Brigham Young's Section 136 [see verses 17, 20, 29, and 34] follows the example of the others, so it is not just Joseph Smith's personal style. Nor is it the style of the times, since contemporary edited writing does not reflect the same abandon.

(64)

The revelations included in the Doctrine and Covenants were not representative of the "style of the times," but perhaps Joseph Smith's pronoun usage was infectious to his close associates. For example, the ordination of Asael Smith, presumably with Brigham Young as mouth, follows this same style of pronominal shifting (History of the Church 7:302-03). In a letter to Joseph Smith, Orson Hyde writes: "P.S.--Will you please send word to Marinda, that I want her to write to me at Cincinnati, Ohio. Please bear it in mind and oblige thy friend" (History of the Church 4:125). In another more lengthy letter to Joseph Smith, Orson Hyde shifts numerous times between th-forms and y-forms (History of the Church 4:386-87).

Mark Davis also provides a list of those sections in which pronoun usage is consistent and those in which it is not (66-67). His recommends a revision of the Doctrine and Covenants which uses second person pronouns consistently, but does not advocate the adoption of you for all numbers
Th-forms occur 881 times in the 1981 edition of the Doctrine and Covenants, while y-forms occur 3,029 times (ye accounting for 608 of these). Here follow some examples of pronominal shiftings in the Doctrine and Covenants (or "mixed usage," as Mark Davis calls it). These examples are only of shiftings which occur in the context of a single verse:

D&C 3:10:
But remember, God is merciful; therefore, repent of that which thou hast done which is contrary to the commandment which I gave you, and thou art still chosen, and art again called to the work.

D&C 7:1:
And the Lord said unto me: John, my beloved, what desirest thou? For if you shall ask what you will, it shall be granted unto you.

D&C 8:4:
Therefore this is thy gift; apply unto it, and blessed art thou, for it shall deliver you out of the hands of your enemies, when, if it were not so, they would slay you and bring your soul to destruction.

D&C 8:6:
Now this is not all thy gift; for you have another gift, which is the gift of Aaron; behold, it has
told you many things.

D&C 11:12:
And now, verily, verily, I say unto thee, put your trust in that Spirit which leadeth to do good--yea, to do justly, to walk humbly, to judge righteously; and this is my Spirit.

D&C 14:11:
And behold, thou art David, and thou art called to assist; which thing if ye do, and are faithful, ye shall be blessed both spiritually and temporally, and great shall be your reward. Amen.

D&C 15:3:
And I will tell you that which no man knoweth save me and thee alone.

D&C 16:3:
And I will tell you that which no man knoweth save me and thee alone.

D&C 19:32:
Behold, this is a great and the last commandment which I shall give unto you concerning this matter; for this shall suffice for thy daily walk, even unto the end of thy life.

D&C 21:4:
Wherefore, meaning the church, thou shalt give heed unto all his words and commandments which he shall give unto you as he receiveth them, walking
in all holiness before me.

D&C 23:1:
Behold, I speak unto you, Oliver, a few words. Behold, thou art blessed, and art under no condemnation. But beware of pride, lest thou shouldst enter into temptation.

D&C 23:3:
Behold, I speak unto you, Hyrum, a few words; for thou also art under no condemnation, and thy heart is opened, and thy tongue loosed; and thy calling is to exhortation, and to strengthen the church continually. Wherefore thy duty is unto the church forever, and this because of thy family. Amen.

D&C 23:4:
Behold, I speak a few words unto you, Samuel; for thou also art under no condemnation, and thy calling is to exhortation, and to strengthen the church; and thou art not as yet called to preach before the world. Amen.

D&C 23:5:
Behold, I speak a few words unto you, Joseph; for thou also art under no condemnation, and thy calling also is to exhortation, and to strengthen the church; and this is thy duty from henceforth and forever. Amen.
D&C 25:2:
A revelation I give unto you concerning my will; and if thou art faithful and walk in the paths of virtue before me, I will preserve thy life, and thou shalt receive an inheritance in Zion.

D&C 25:15:
Keep my commandments continually, and a crown of righteousness thou shalt receive. And except thou do this, where I am you cannot come.

D&C 28:8:
And now, behold, I say unto you that you shall go unto the Lamanites and preach my gospel unto them; and inasmuch as they receive thy teachings thou shalt cause my church to be established among them; and thou shalt have revelations, but write them not by way of commandment.

D&C 30:9:
Behold, I say unto you, my servant John, that thou shalt commence from this time forth to proclaim my gospel, as with the voice of a trump.

D&C 35:23:
And inasmuch as ye do not write, behold, it shall be given unto him to prophesy; and thou shalt preach my gospel and call on the holy prophets to prove his words, as they shall be given him.

D&C 39:7:
And now, behold, I say unto you, my servant James, I have looked upon thy works and I know thee.

D&C 39:10:
But, behold, the days of thy deliverance are come, if thou wilt hearken to my voice, which saith unto thee: Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on my name, and you shall receive my Spirit, and a blessing so great as you never have known.

D&C 42:57:
And it is expedient that thou shouldst hold thy peace concerning them, and not teach them until ye have received them in full.

D&C 42:62:
Thou shalt ask, and it shall be revealed unto you in mine own due time where the New Jerusalem shall be built.

D&C 42:65:
Behold, thou shalt observe all these things, and great shall be thy reward; for unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but unto the world it is not given to know them.

D&C 55:1:
Behold, thus saith the Lord unto you, my servant William, yea, even the Lord of the whole earth, thou art called and chosen; and after thou hast
been baptized by water, which if you do with an eye single to my glory, you shall have a remission of your sins and a reception of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands.

D&C 59:10:
For verily this is a day appointed unto you to rest from your labors, and to pay thy devotions unto the Most High.

D&C 66:6:
Tarry not many days in this place; go not up unto the land of Zion as yet; but inasmuch as you can send, send; otherwise, think not of thy property.

D&C 66:8:
Let my servant Samuel H. Smith go with you, and forsake him not, and give him thine instructions; and he that is faithful shall be made strong in every place; and I, the Lord, will go with you.

D&C 81:3:
Therefore, verily I acknowledge him and will bless him, and also thee, inasmuch as thou art faithful in counsel, in the office which I have appointed unto you, in prayer always, vocally and in thy heart, in public and in private, also in thy ministry in proclaiming the gospel in the land of the living, and among thy brethren.

D&C 81:4:
And in doing these things thou wilt do the greatest good unto thy fellow beings, and wilt promote the glory of him who is your Lord.

D&C 88:124:
Cease to be idle; cease to be unclean; cease to find fault one with another; cease to sleep longer than is needful; retire to thy bed early, that ye may not be weary; arise early, that your bodies and your minds may be invigorated.

D&C 90:1:
Thus saith the Lord, verily, verily I say unto you my son, thy sins are forgiven thee, according to thy petition, for thy prayers and the prayers of thy brethren have come up into my ears.

D&C 90:2:
Therefore, thou art blessed from henceforth that bear the keys of the kingdom given unto you; which kingdom is coming forth for the last time.

D&C 90:3:
Verily I say unto you, the keys of this kingdom shall never be taken from you, while thou art in the world, neither in the world to come.

D&C 90:19:
Now, verily I say unto you, let there be a place provided, as soon as it is possible, for the family of thy counselor and scribe, even Frederick
G. Williams.

D&C 98:29:
And then, if he shall come upon you or your children, or your children's children unto the third and fourth generation, I have delivered thine enemy into thine hands.

D&C 98:39:
And again, verily I say unto you, if after thine enemy has come upon thee the first time, he repent and come unto thee praying thy forgiveness, thou shalt forgive him, and shalt hold it no more as a testimony against thine enemy.

D&C 112:1:
Verily thus saith the Lord unto you my servant Thomas: I have heard thy prayers; and thine alms have come up as a memorial before me, in behalf of those, thy brethren, who were chosen to bear testimony of my name and to send it abroad among all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people, and ordained through the instrumentality of my servants.

D&C 112:2:
Verily I say unto you, there have been some few things in thine heart and with thee with which I, the Lord, was not well pleased.

D&C 112:12:
And pray for thy brethren of the Twelve. Admonish them sharply for my name's sake, and let them be admonished for all their sins, and be ye faithful before me unto my name.

D&C 112:16:
Verily I say unto you, my servant Thomas, thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the keys of my kingdom, as pertaining to the Twelve, abroad among all nations.

D&C 122:9:
Therefore, hold on thy way, and the priesthood shall remain with thee; for their bounds are set, they cannot pass. Thy days are known, and thy years shall not be numbered less; therefore, fear not what man can do, for God shall be with you forever and ever.

D&C 132:3:
Therefore, prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same.

D&C 132:12:
I am the Lord thy God; and I give unto you this commandment—that no man shall come unto the Father but by me or by my word, which is my law, saith the Lord.
D&C 132:40:
I am the Lord thy God, and I gave unto thee, my servant Joseph, an appointment, and restore all things. Ask what ye will, and it shall be given unto you according to my word.

D&C 132:47:
And again, verily I say, whomsoever you bless I will bless, and whomsoever you curse I will curse, saith the Lord; for I, the Lord, am thy God.

D&C 132:49:
For I am the Lord thy God, and will be with thee even unto the end of the world, and through all eternity; for verily I seal upon you your exaltation, and prepare a throne for you in the kingdom of my Father, with Abraham your father.

D&C 132:53:
For I am the Lord thy God, and ye shall obey my voice; and I give unto my servant Joseph that he shall be made ruler over many things; for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

D. SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE AND THE JOSEPH SMITH TRANSLATION
Since the Pearl of Great Price contains excerpts of the Joseph Smith Translation, they will be examined here together. In the Pearl of Great Price th-forms occur 293
times, while ḳ-forms occur only 98 times.

The following are some verses in which variation in pronoun usage is found in the Pearl of Great Price:

Moses 2:1:
And it came to pass that the Lord spake unto Moses, saying: Behold, I reveal unto you concerning this heaven, and this earth; write the words which I speak. I am the Beginning and the End, the Almighty God; by mine Only Begotten I created these things; yea, in the beginning I created the heaven, and the earth upon which thou standest.

Moses 4:32:
(And these are the words which I spake unto my servant Moses, and they are true even as I will; and I have spoken them unto you. See thou show them unto no man, until I command you, except to them that believe. Amen.)

Moses 6:34:
Behold my Spirit is upon you, wherefore all thy words will I justify; and the mountains shall flee before you, and the rivers shall turn from their course; and thou shalt abide in me, and I in you; therefore walk with me.

Moses 6:52:
And he also said unto him: If thou wilt turn unto
me, and hearken unto my voice, and believe, and repent of all thy transgressions, and be baptized, even in water, in the name of mine Only Begotten Son, who is full of grace and truth, which is Jesus Christ, the only name which shall be given under heaven, whereby salvation shall come unto the children of men, ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, asking all things in his name, and whatsoever ye shall ask, it shall be given you.

Abraham 3:15:
And the Lord said unto me: Abraham, I show these things unto thee before ye go into Egypt, that ye may declare all these words.

Variations exist in longer contexts, of course, but the above passages are only those in which there are variations in the context of one verse. For further variations and shiftings, see Moses chapters 1, 6, and 7, as well as Abraham chapters 2 and 3.

Some of the differences between the King James Version of the Bible and the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible are differences in pronouns of address. In Joseph Smith--Matthew you appears as a nominative form—a form not found in editions of the King James Bible since the major editings of the 1760s. A few examples are included here:

JS-M 1:12:
When you, therefore, shall see the abomination of
desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, then you shall stand in the holy place; whose readeth let him understand.

JS-M 1:38:
Now learn a parable of the fig-tree—When its branches are yet tender, and it begins to put forth leaves, you know that summer is nigh at hand.

JS-M 1:46:
And what I say unto one, I say unto all men; watch, therefore, for you know not at what hour your Lord doth come.

In some passages of the Joseph Smith Translation ye and you are used in a singular sense:

Matt. 9:18, JST:
Then said the Pharisees unto him, Why will ye not receive us with our baptism, seeing we keep the whole law?

Matt. 12:37, JST:
Then came some of the Scribes and said unto him, Master, it is written that, Every sin shall be forgiven; but ye say, Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven. And they asked him, saying, How can these things be?

In some passages both ye and you are used as a
nominatives in a plural sense. One example is Luke 16:21, JST:

O fools! for you have said in your hearts, There is no God. And you pervert the right way; and the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence of you; and you persecute the meek; and in your violence you seek to destroy the kingdom; and ye take the children of the kingdom by force. Woe unto you, ye adulterers!

In some passages thou is used in a plural sense, as in the following examples:

Matthew 7:6-7, JST:

And Jesus said unto his disciples, Beholdest thou the Scribes, and the Pharisees, and the Priests, and the Levites? ... Go thou and say unto them, Why teach ye men the law and the commandments and ye yourselves are the children of corruption?

Luke 3:19, JST:

For it is well known unto you, Theophilus, that after the manner of the Jews, and according to the custom of their law in receiving money into the treasury, that out of the abundance which was received, was appointed unto the poor, every man his portion.

In still other passages, th-forms and y-forms are used interchangeably:
Mark 3:21, JST:
And then came certain men unto him, accusing him, saying, Why do ye receive sinners, seeing thou makest thyself the Son of God.

Luke 6:30, JST:
For it is better that thou suffer thine enemy to take these things, than to contend with him. Verily I say unto you, your heavenly Father who seeth in secret, shall bring that wicked one into judgment.

James 2:18, JST:
Therefore wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead and cannot save you?

In some verses of the Joseph Smith Translation where Joseph Smith made many additions th-forms are used exclusively except in one of the verses which has no parallel in the King James Bible. The following is from Mark 9:43-46, JST:

It is better for thee, to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell; into the fire that never shall be quenched. Therefore, let every man stand or fall, by himself, and not for another; or not trusting another. Seek unto my Father, and it shall be done in that very moment what ye shall ask, if ye ask in faith, believing that ye shall receive. And if thine eye
which seeth for thee, him that is appointed to watch over thee to show thee light, become a transgressor and offend thee, pluck him out.

E. SECOND PERSON PRONOUNS IN JOSEPH SMITH’S WRITINGS

At an early date Joseph Smith, Jr., is represented as using you in everyday discourse (e.g., Lucy Mack Smith 64-65, 94, 101-02). In a letter by Joseph Smith and John Whitmer to the Knight family in late August 1830 we find: "may you all realize," "ye shall receive," "ye are placed," "prayers of you few," and "you need not suppose" (Hartley 56). Since the letter was probably dictated by Joseph Smith or written by John Whitmer himself with some collaboration on Joseph Smith’s part, it is difficult to actually determine whose use of pronouns this is.

The boldfaced words found in Dean C. Jesse’s The Personal Writings of Joseph Smith are those words found in Joseph Smith’s own handwriting (xiii-xix, xxiii-xxvi). These words (approximately 13,537) show how he personally used the language, rather than how a scribe would put his language into writing. Since these words were written mainly in the early 1830s, they represent his language before he studied grammar in Kirtland. In these words there are about forty-two occurrences of th-forms of the pronoun of address and about 274 occurrences of y-forms (ye appearing only once). Nearly all of these represent Joseph Smith’s pleadings to the Lord or the Lord’s speech to him
personally.

In the rest of Jesse's collection of Joseph Smith's writings, that which is dictated, the Prophet uses y-forms almost without fail. A few of the exceptions will be noted here. Joseph Smith represents the angel Moroni as saying:

you have not kept the commandments of the Lord which I gave unto you therefore you cannot now obtain them for the time is not yet fulfilled therefore thou wast left unto temptation that thou mightest be made acquainted with the power of the advisory therefore repent and call on the Lord thou shalt be forgiven and in his own due time thou shalt obtain them. (Jesse Personal Writings 7)

In a letter to various brethren dated 10 and 18 August 1833 Joseph Smith writes, "yea never did the hart pant for the cooling streem as doth the heart of thy Brothe[r] Oliver for thy salvation" (Jesse Personal Writings 285). In a letter to Vienna Jacques dated 4 September 1833 Joseph Smith uses both th-forms and y-forms, though the th-forms seem to be Joseph Smith's representing what the Lord would say to him and vice versa (Jesse Personal Writings 294-95). While dictating some reflections in 1842 Joseph Smith said:

Oh, may the eternal Jehovah crown eternal blessings upon your head, as a reward for the care you have had for my soul. . . . Hyrum, thy name
shall be written in the Book of the Law of the Lord, for those who come after thee to look upon, that they may pattern after thy works. (Jessee Personal Writings 531)

In Jessee's book there are about 202,560 words. In this work th-forms occur 540 times and ye-forms occur 1,773 times (ye accounting for only 28 of these occurrences).

Some examples of Joseph Smith's pronominal shiftings can also be found in the History of the Church (e.g., 5:276-77). Since this history is a compilation of the writings of many people, superficial word counts will not reveal the usage of Joseph Smith alone. Word counts are also skewed because the History of the Church contains the sections of the Doctrine and Covenants. However, in the 1,648,949 (or so) words of the History of the Church ye-forms occur approximately 17,113 times (ye occurs only 987 times--less the 608 or so occurrences in passages from the Doctrine and Covenants that are included therein). In contrast, th-forms only occur approximately 1,942 times in the History of the Church--less the 881 occurrences in the Doctrine and Covenants.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It should be obvious that you was the normal pronoun of address in Joseph Smith's day. It was used, as it is today,
for both singular and plural in both subjective and objective cases. The th-forms seem to be used only in elevated language, in religious writings, in prayers, and in hymns, as well as by the Quakers.

The pronoun usage in the Doctrine and Covenants would seem to be a fair representation of Joseph Smith's language. However, when comparing his usage in the Doctrine and Covenants with his other writings, there is a distinct difference in pronoun usage. In the Doctrine and Covenants it seems he uses pronouns almost willy-nilly, but in his other writings (many of them dictated in similar fashion to those in the Doctrine and Covenants) he seems to use them quite consistently—with only a few pronominal shiftings.

Since language is used as the language user deems appropriate to the situation, it seems likely that even in Joseph Smith's case his pronoun usage would reflect his specific outlook in each specific situation. It should be obvious that Joseph Smith was a different man from day to day and that his language use would somehow reflect these changes.

Thus since each situation seems to carry with it a slightly different use of language, it seems appropriate that each of Joseph Smith's works be studied on its own terms rather than using his other works (or anyone else's) as standards for comparison. This does not mean that each should be discussed in isolation, but rather it means that
each of Joseph Smith’s works should be understood in its context.

Though the circumstances of each of Joseph Smith’s writings is quite different, the element of the Spirit is one factor which is always present. This is one element which important to remember, especially since Joseph Smith was a prophet and the instrument in the Lord’s hand to reveal His word to this generation (D&C 5:10). Also, since the Book of Mormon was translated with the aid of the Almighty, it can only be understood rightly with the same assistance (Moro. 10:5; 1 Cor. 2:10, 14).

Each reader, likewise, will read different meanings into the words given to us through Joseph Smith, depending upon his individual temperament and circumstances, along with his spiritual impressions. Of course, whether one’s writings are understood or not depends mainly on the reader, but when interpreting the word of God, it is often as Nephi states:

When a man speaketh by the power of the Holy Ghost the power of the Holy Ghost carrieth it unto the hearts of the children of men. But behold, there are many that harden their hearts against the Holy Spirit, that it hath no place in them; wherefore, they cast many things away which are written and esteem them as things of naught. (2 Ne. 33:1-2; emphasis added)
Since language itself is often an imperfect medium with which to convey thoughts and ideas, one should be all the more cautious when attempting to interpret the word of God, especially without the aid of the Holy Ghost. Joseph Smith, himself, realized that in this life language is only a hint of hereafter. In a letter to William W. Phelps he prays:

Oh Lord God deliver us in thy due time from the little narrow prison almost as it were total darkness of paper pen and ink and a crooked broken scattered and imperfect language (Jessee Personal Writings 261; qtd. here as in Jessee)

Nephi also states in this regard:

I, Nephi, have written what I have written, and I esteem it as of great worth. . . . And the words which I have written in weakness will be made strong unto them. (2 Ne. 33:3, 10; emphasis added)

Thus the Lord promises to make the "weak things" (or words) of the Book of Mormon "become strong" unto the meek and humble, even unto salvation (Ether 12:23-41; 2 Ne. 3:20-21). To those who reject his word, the Lord says plainly:

And he that will contend against the word of the Lord, let him be accursed; and he that shall deny these things, let him be accursed; for unto them will I show no greater things, saith Jesus Christ; for I am he who speaketh. (Ether 4:8)
CHAPTER SEVEN

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF MORMON
WITH REGARD TO TEXTS AND EDITIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

On 28 November 1841 Joseph Smith "told the brethren that the Book of Mormon was the most correct of any book on earth, and the keystone of our religion, and a man would get nearer to God by abiding by its precepts, than by any other book" (History of the Church 4:461; emphasis added). A week later, on 5 December 1841, Joseph Smith writes, "I commenced to proof read the Book of Mormon, previous to its being stereotyped; read sixty pages" (History of the Church 4:468). This helps us understand that he was referring to the doctrine in the Book of Mormon as "the most correct" and was not suggesting that the Book of Mormon itself was without printing errors or other possible errors in its transmission. Since there were many ears and eyes, as well as many hands and minds, of mortals involved from Joseph Smith’s initial inspired dictation of the Book of Mormon to the indelible ink of the 1830 edition, human error is bound to occur. However, this in no way diminishes the divine origin of the book itself.

Joseph Smith’s purpose for proofreading the Book of Mormon is explained by his entry of 15 January 1842:
I commenced reading the Book of Mormon, at page 54, American stereotype edition (the previous pages having been corrected), for the purpose of correcting the stereotype plates of some errors which escaped notice in the first edition. (History of the Church 4:494)

The Book of Mormon is not a book without "errors," be they typographical, grammatical (so-called), or whatever, and even Joseph Smith was well aware of this fact. However, the doctrine is sound and "true" (D&C 17:6), "the most correct of any book on earth" (History of the Church 4:461; emphasis added).

Those who "mock" at the language of the Book of Mormon will "mourn" (Ether 12:26) because their "soul hath appetite" (Isa. 29:8-10) and "they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the LORD, and shall not find it" (Amos 8:11-12). McConkie mentions some readers of the Book of Mormon who understood the word of God with the power of the Holy Ghost, but also acknowledges that sadly there are others--and they are many--who

... wear out their lives counting the misspelled words, the commas that are out of place, the textual changes that bring the account into full conformity with the original manuscript and the intent of the inspired authors, and such like--all with a view to crying: "Delusion! Falsehood! Flee
this imposture!" (A New Witness 414)

Our design here is not to count jots or tittles, but rather to set forth in plainness some things relating to the textual changes in the Book of Mormon insofar as they are relevant to pronouns of address. "Wherefore, condemn not the things of God, that ye may be found spotless at the judgment-seat of Christ" (Title Page of the Book of Mormon).

The Prophet made further entries concerning his proofreading project, but other affairs crowded out this work so that it was never completed. As a result, these corrections were not incorporated into the next printed edition or even later editions and have never been found, as far as we know. At this time, Joseph Smith did not have access to either the original or printer's manuscripts while doing this proofreading, so he probably was concentrating his energies on typographical or other similar errors rather than making significant changes to the text itself.

The history of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon is contained in the History of the Church (1:9-59), in the Comprehensive History of the Church (1:69-176), in Lucy Mack Smith's Biographical Sketches (83-180), in Porter (64-96), and in countless other places. It is our purpose here to provide only a very brief history of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon as it relates to the various manuscripts and early editions. Larson gives a fuller discussion of textual variants in the original and printer's manuscripts and in
the three first editions (26-294), but a definitive history of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon is yet to be written, and a reliable critical text is yet to be compiled.

II. DISCUSSION

For a full examination of the revisions in the text of the Book of Mormon one cannot rely on only one manuscript or one printed edition. Each of the manuscripts must be examined and some of the printed editions must be examined to understand most textual variants. However, each of the manuscripts has its peculiarities, and each of the scribes who wrote for Joseph Smith as he translated has his own peculiarities as well--each has his own language background, and each spells words differently. For example, sometimes a scribe would write down a homonym of the word he heard rather than the word which was meant (e.g., maid instead of made). These and many other peculiarities of the text make it difficult to ascertain exactly what was meant in some cases. Therefore, all available information must be taken into consideration for any possible variant.

A. THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT OF THE BOOK OF MORMON

The original manuscript, sometimes called the "dictated manuscript," is the manuscript written as Joseph Smith dictated his translation to various scribes. With regard to pronouns of address, the phonetic similarity between ye and
you is an important matter to consider in terms of a dictated text. This could explain why some instances of ye are used in the objective case, or why some instances of you appear in the nominative case, but it does not explain the shifting between singular and plural forms since they are quite dissimilar. For example, it would be difficult to hear thou in the place of ye or even thee in the place of you.

According to Jessee, the handwriting of Oliver Cowdery appears on all extant pages and fragments of this manuscript from about 1 Nephi 16 forward ("The Original Book of Mormon Manuscript" 273). The few other scribes wrote varying portions of the first twenty-five or so pages. The handwriting of Oliver Cowdery is much smaller (as well as lighter) than that of the other scribes, so the twenty-five or so pages correspond to actually less than twenty-five pages of text as written by Oliver Cowdery. Usually the photographs and copies of the original manuscript in published material are of these first twenty-five or so pages. For example, Jessee includes three partial pages in his article, and all three pages are from these early scribes ("The Original Book of Mormon Manuscript" 263, 271, 275). Another reason for including these first pages is that they are also better preserved than some of the later ones.

The original manuscript was put in the cornerstone of
the Nauvoo House on 2 October 1841 (Jessee "The Original Book of Mormon Manuscript" 264). It suffered a great deal of water damage, and many pages have crumbled into small fragments over the years or have been lost. Most of the extant portions of the original manuscript are in the LDS church archives. Nearly all of 1 Nephi is extant and in fairly good condition. About two-thirds of Alma is also extant, but about a fourth of each page is missing. Very little, if any, of the other books is extant. In all there are about "144 pages or part pages" of the original manuscript extant (Larson 7).

The original manuscript should be the primary source in all Book of Mormon textual studies simply because all other copies or editions derive therefrom. However, it has never been used as the primary source to print any edition of the Book of Mormon, although it was used a little in preparing the 1840 edition (Howard 49-50; Larson 25) and also was used for some minor changes in the 1981 edition. Also, compared with the printer's manuscript, the original manuscript has few alterations, and, consequently, the discrepancies (intentional or otherwise) between the original manuscript and any printed edition are numerous. Howard reports that in preparation for the second edition [i.e., the 1837 edition] well over two thousand alterations were written into the pages of the [printer's manuscript]. In addition over one thousand more
revisions appeared in the published work of 1837 which were not recorded in the manuscript. That most of these were grammatical and stylistic in nature is readily seen with examples as follows:

1. The impersonal "which" to "who" 707 times
2. "Was" to "were," "is" to "are," "are" to "is," and "were" to "was" 137 times
3. "Saith" (sayeth) to "said" 229 times.

Since there have been many changes made to the printer's manuscript, this also means that the original manuscript and the printer's manuscript will differ in many places. Some of the textual variants will never be known because the original manuscript does not exist for all portions of the Book of Mormon. Thus it occasionally becomes necessary to rely on the printer's manuscript as the primary source in textual studies.

B. THE PRINTER'S MANUSCRIPT OF THE BOOK OF MORMON

The printer's manuscript, sometimes called the "emended manuscript," was copied from the original manuscript. It was the major source in preparing the 1830 and 1837 editions. Since Oliver Cowdery took the printer's manuscript with him when he left the Church in 1838, it was not used in preparing subsequent editions except for a few minor changes in the 1981 edition. Later David Whitmer had the printer's manuscript, and now this fully extant
manuscript is in the possession of the RLDS church.

Even though the printer's manuscript was used to prepare the 1830 edition, the printer's manuscript and the 1830 edition will differ in many places for a variety of reasons. First, the printers made a few errors here and there when printing the 1830 edition and thus introduced a few discrepancies. Secondly, many alterations in the text were made in the 1837 edition, and not all of these were written onto the printer's manuscript. Also, it is difficult to ascertain whether a change was made at the time Oliver Cowdery copied the original manuscript or at some later date. Thus, using the printer's manuscript as the primary source brings with it a variety of problems (for a short discussion of some of these textual considerations see Howard 26-52).

C. THE 1830 EDITION OF THE BOOK OF MORMON

John H. Gilbert, the major compositor of the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon, wrote a "memorandum" (8 Sep. 1892) about the printing of the Book of Mormon. At this time he was ninety years old, but stated that his memory was still clear about the particulars concerning the printing of the Book of Mormon. In this memorandum he states:

On the second day--[Martin] Harris and [Hyrum] Smith being in the office--I called their attention to a grammatical error, and asked whether I should correct it? Harris consulted
with Smith a short time, and turned to me and said: "The Old Testament is ungrammatical, set it as it is written." (included in the front matter of Wood, vol. 1)

To Gilbert's credit he set the Book of Mormon essentially as he found it in the printer's manuscript. Gilbert was twenty-seven at the time he assisted in the printing of the Book of Mormon and obviously had had some education, but he still revealed his rural upbringing in his nineties with his statement in this same memorandum, "Cowdery taught school winters--so it was said--but what he done summers, I do not know." Gilbert performed a good service for the Church, but would it have been a better service if Martin Harris and Hyrum Smith had allowed him to alter the ungrammatical parts according to his understanding of grammar? Some would like to think so.

Without Gilbert (or someone else to do it) the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon would not have had any paragraphs, sentences (since punctuation was almost nonexistent in the printer's manuscript), punctuation, and would have had a great deal less capitalization. Gilbert's paragraphing was essentially eliminated in later editions after Orson Pratt's versification in 1879, and a significant amount of his punctuation and capitalization have also been changed. Would Gilbert's grammar also have been altered as readily? We will never know, but from reviewing the 1830
edition it seems that his grammar at twenty-seven probably would have been little different from Joseph Smith’s of twenty-four, since he was only two and a half years younger than Gilbert at the time (John Gilbert was born on 13 Apr. 1802 and Joseph Smith was born on 23 Dec. 1805).

The 1830 edition was printed in such a way as to make nearly every copy slightly different from every other copy (Jenson 214-22). A comparison between the Wilford Wood reprint and the Deseret Book reprint will reveal many discrepancies, but the majority are matters of punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. However, of any printed edition, the 1830 edition is still closest to the prepublication manuscripts, even though such words as "trans-/gransgressions" and "Lamanitas" appear therein.

Gilbert and those who worked with him on the 1830 edition, however, did not follow the printer’s manuscript with exactness. One example is in Mosiah 3:3 where the angel of God speaks to King Benjamin: "And he said unto me, Awake, and hear the words which I shall tell thee: for behold, I am come to declare unto you the glad tidings of great joy" (1830 edition). Thee appears in place of you in the printer’s manuscript, but all of the printed editions have you here. This is one instance of pronominal shifting in the Book which cannot be attributed to Joseph Smith.

The following are some of the errors relating to pronouns of address that were made in printing the 1830
edition which have not been subsequently corrected.

Jacob 6:11: ye was deleted from "repent ye, and enter [ye]"

Mosiah 3:3: thee was changed to you in "to declare unto you"

Alma 7:9: "repent ye" was deleted from "Repent ye, [repent ye] and prepare the way of the Lord"

Alma 8:15: thee was changed to you in "I am he that delivered it unto you"

Alma 9:25: "repent ye" was deleted from "Repent ye, [repent ye] for the kingdom of heaven is nigh at hand"

D. SUBSEQUENT EDITIONS OF THE BOOK OF MORMON

In general, all subsequent editions of the Book of Mormon have departed further from these two manuscripts. This departure is usually a matter of readability or grammatical consistency, but occasional errors have persisted from edition to edition. Joseph Smith did use the original manuscript when preparing the 1840 edition, but a full examination of all of the possible textual changes made in the 1840 edition with reference to the original manuscript has not been done.

The 1981 edition contains some "corrections that seem appropriate to bring the material into conformity with prepublication manuscripts and early editions edited by the
Prophet Joseph Smith" (front matter of the 1981 edition of the Book of Mormon). However, it also has many changes which depart from these same manuscripts—many that’s were deleted, which’s were changed to who’s, and many exceeding’s were changed to exceedingly’s (the same kinds of changes made when preparing the 1837 edition).

With regard to pronouns of address, most revisions in the texts have tended to consistency and modernization in usage of pronouns rather than to inconsistent and archaic usage. An example of this is found in 1 Nephi 7:8. Nephi addresses Laman and Lemuel by saying:

Behold ye are mine elder brethren, and how is it that ye are so hard in your hearts, and so blind in your minds, that ye have need that I, your younger brother, should speak unto you, yea, and set an example for you?

The first ye are shows up as thou art in both manuscripts and in the first two editions (1830 and 1837), but has been changed to ye are in all subsequent ones. However, examples of changes which result in inconsistent pronoun usage can also be cited.

The following are examples of the printing errors in the 1830 edition which have subsequently been corrected.

Alma 20:4: my has been corrected to thy in "Who told thee that my brethren were in prison?"

Helaman 15:8: yourselves has been corrected to
yourselves in "ye know of yourselves are firm and steadfast in the faith"

The following are examples of some of the changes made in editions since the 1830 edition involving pronouns of address:

Alma 5:37: ye (which appears in the 1830 edition) has been deleted from "nevertheless [ye] have gone astray"

Alma 7:17: you (which appears in the 1830 edition) has been changed to ye in "I know that ye believe them"

Alma 33:2: your (which appears in the 1830 edition) has been deleted from "if ye suppose that ye cannot worship [your] God"

Alma 34:30: ye (which does not appear in the 1830 edition) has been added to "ye come forth and bring fruit unto repentance"

Alma 42:7: we (which appears in the 1830 edition) has been changed to ye in "ye see by this that our first parents were cut off"

The following is a list of some of the discrepancies between second person pronouns in the 1830 edition and those in the 1981 edition. The notation 2X will be used to denote that the feature being considered occurs twice in the same verse. "PMS" refers to the printer's manuscript.
SOME SECOND PERSON PRONOUNS WHICH ARE DIFFERENT
IN THE 1830 AND THE 1981 EDITIONS

ye changed to you = 5 (Alma 14:19, 32:30, 41:14, 61:9; Hel. 7:16)

you changed to ye = 1 (Alma 7:17)

you added = 3 (Mosiah 12:26, 15:11; Alma 26:27
[the in 1830 ed. and thee in PMS])

ye deleted = 5 (Alma 5:37; Hel. 13:25 [2X], 27;
3 Ne. 10:4)

thee changed to you = 2 (Mos. 2:11, 24:16)

thine changed to your = 1 (Mos. 12:31)

thy added = 3 (2 Ne. 3:12; 3 Ne. 12:36, 22:4)

thy deleted = 1 (2 Ne. 3:14)

ye added = 3 (Alma 34:30, 42:7; 3 Ne. 3:15)

your added = 1 (2 Ne. 31:13)

your deleted = 1 (Morm. 9:3)

thou changed to ye = 11 (1 Ne. 3:29, 7:8; 2 Ne.
9:4; Mos. 2:25 [2X], 26, 12:27, 30 [2X], 31
[2X])

It can be seen from the above changes and from the
summary to follow that the tendency is for th-forms to be
changed to y-forms.

A SUMMARY OF THE ABOVE SECOND PERSON PRONOUN CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADDED</th>
<th>DELETED</th>
<th>NET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thou  0  11  -11
thy  3  1  +2
thyself  0  0  0
ye  15  10  +5
you  10  1  +9
your  2  1  +1
yours  0  0  0
yourself  0  0  0
yourselves  1  0  +1 (changed from
yourselfe Hel. 15:8)

TOTALS  30  27  +3

(This summary may not be fully complete for various
reasons, e.g., 1830 editions vary)

E. SECONDARY SOURCES FOR BOOK OF MORMON TEXTUAL STUDIES

Pronouns have generally not been considered in the work
which has been done on the textual variations in the Book of
Mormon. Holland discusses some of the textual variations in
the printed editions of the Book of Mormon, but he basically
ignores pronouns except perhaps in a very few instances.

Larson compares the original and printer’s manuscripts
along with the first three printed editions of the Book of
Mormon in his study of textual variations in the Book of
Mormon. Since his study compares excerpts from the whole
Book of Mormon, he generally ignores pronouns in favor of
textual variations of greater significance. Thus he does
not include all significant variants in his thesis. For
example, his thesis only includes 1,376 words (or about 6 percent) of 1 Nephi. He also includes some photocopies of various pages of the original and printer's manuscripts but doesn't provide a complete transcription of them (297-341).

Larson did suggest, however, that an examination of the Book of Mormon excerpts found in the *Evening and Morning Star* be made to find textual variants which may be considered editorial revisions by Joseph Smith. The present author has carefully compared the excerpts from 1 Nephi found in the *Evening and Morning Star* with the same excerpts in the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon. The textual variants that were found could all be simply explained as typographical or similar unintentional errors.

A source which gives many textual variants is the *Book of Mormon Critical Text: A Tool for Scholarly Reference* put out by the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (commonly known by the acronym FARMS). This is an ambitious work but not wholly reliable or adequate. What has been included is mostly correct, but it is still a preliminary work and not the end in textual studies of the Book of Mormon. It is in no way comparable in quality to the reliable critical texts done of the Greek New Testament. It can be helpful for gaining a general picture of textual variants in the Book of Mormon but should not be relied on for technical textual studies. Until both the original and printer's manuscripts are transcribed fully, a critical text
simply cannot be done adequately.

The errors in the *Book of Mormon Critical Text* abound, but two examples will suffice here. The first one relates to pronouns of address, but the second one does not. In Alma 54:12 the 1981 edition reads, "And behold, if ye do not this," and the 1830 edition reads the same. The printer's manuscript reads "& behold if ye do not this" and the original manuscript reads the same. Yet the *Book of Mormon Critical Text* reads "AND BEHOLD IF YOU DO NOT THIS." There is no note to justify this reading, so it is assumed that ye has appeared in every edition of the Book of Mormon except the *Book of Mormon Critical Text* produced by FARMS.

The second example better illustrates some of the problems involved in creating a critical text. In 1 Nephi 8:31 the 1981 edition reads: "And he also saw other multitudes feeling their way towards that great and spacious building." The word *pressing* [sic] occurs in the place of the word *feeling* in the original manuscript, but in the printer's manuscript and in every printed edition of the *Book of Mormon* *feeling* appears.

How could such a simple error escape detection? The explanation is simple—scribal error and scholarly oversight. First, an explanation of the scribal error will be provided. One of the scribes writing for Joseph Smith often used the elongated s (similar to a handwritten f) when writing a double s. Thus this scribe would write "and it
came to pass" in such a manner that it would appear like "and it came to pafs." This same scribe often omitted the vowel (e.g., pfs) or even inserted a different vowel (e.g., pefs) when writing pass. When Oliver Cowdery copied this verse which had been written by this particular scribe, he wrote feeling in the printer's manuscript instead of pressing (which looks like prfsing). If Oliver Cowdery was copying fairly fast, he may have seen only the shape of the word as he read instead of individual letters. An additional justification for this word being pressing instead of feeling is that all the other "multitudes" in Lehi's vision in 1 Nephi 8 are "pressing" their way forward.

As for scholarly oversight, Larson doesn't mention pressing as a variant in this thesis even though he includes a readable photocopy of the page of the original manuscript containing this verse (307). This variant also did not appear in the Book of Mormon Critical Text done by FARMS until after they were apprised of it by the present author. In fact, after the recent edition of the Book of Mormon Critical Text was finished, Robert F. Smith, the major compiler of this critical text, gave the present author a transcription of a portion of the original manuscript (the first dozen or so chapters of 1 Nephi) which he had had in his possession but which he had not used in compiling the critical text itself.

The comments made here are not intended to be
disparaging of these scholars. Holland, Larson, and Smith all did foundational studies, but Book of Mormon textual studies are far from being finished. Although perfection cannot be expected from any human endeavor, it should be obvious that more careful studies of textual variants in the Book of Mormon are needed. Only from such careful studies can accurate conclusions be arrived at.

F. EXAMPLES OF TEXTUAL VARIANTS IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

These passages of the Book of Mormon were selected for inclusion here because they have many pronouns of address which have been altered over the years. The fact that they have been altered should be deemphasized, since our focus here is on pronouns of address and what we can gain from analyzing them in earlier manuscripts or editions of the Book of Mormon.

The following is the text of Mosiah 12:25-31 as found in the 1981 edition (including capitalization and punctuation) with textual variants found in the 1830 edition enclosed in square brackets (i.e., [ ]). Notice the pronominal shiftings and the various textual variants.

And now Abinadi said [replace "said" with "saith"] unto them: Are you priests, and pretend to teach this people, and to understand the spirit of prophesying, and yet desire [replace "desire" with "desireth"] to know of me what these things mean? I say unto you, [delete "you"] wo be unto you for
perverting the ways of the Lord! For if ye understand these things ye have not taught them; therefore, ye have perverted the ways of the Lord. Ye have not applied your hearts to understanding; therefore, ye have not been wise. Therefore, what teach ye [replace "teach ye" with "teachest thou"] this people? And they said: We teach the law of Moses. And again he said [replace "said" with "saith"] unto them: If ye teach the law of Moses why do ye not keep it? Why do ye set your hearts upon riches? Why do ye commit whoredoms and spend your strength with harlots, yea, and cause this people to commit sin, that the Lord has [replace "has" with "hath"] cause to send me to prophesy against this people, yea, even a great evil against this people? Know ye [replace "Know ye" with "Knowest thou"] not that I speak the truth? Yea, ye know [replace "ye know" with "thou knowest"] that I speak the truth; and you [insert "had" here] ought to tremble before God. And it shall come to pass that ye shall be smitten for your [replace "your" with "thine"] iniquities, for ye have said that ye teach the law of Moses. And what know ye [replace "know ye" with "knowest thou"] concerning the law of Moses? Doth salvation come by the law of Moses? What say ye?
[replace "say ye" with "sayest thou"]

The following is the text of Mosiah 2:9-3:4 as found in the 1981 edition (including capitalization and punctuation) with textual variants found in the 1830 edition enclosed in square brackets (i.e., [ ]). One of the many textual variants (most are spelling variants) found in the printer’s manuscript will also be included and is enclosed in wavy brackets (i.e., { }). This lengthy text has been included to illustrate the types of textual changes found in the Book of Mormon and to show the pronominal shiftings which occur in these verses. Note especially the textual variants relating to pronouns of address in Mosiah 2:11, 25, 26 and also the discrepancy between the printer’s manuscript and the 1830 and 1981 editions in Mosiah 3:3.

ch2 v9 And these are the words which he spake and caused to be written, saying: My brethren, all ye that have assembled yourselves together, you that can hear my words which I shall speak unto you this day; for I have not commanded you to come up hither to trifle with the words which I shall speak, but that you should hearken unto me, and open your ears that ye may hear, and your hearts that ye may understand, and your minds that the mysteries of God may be unfolded to your view. v10 I have not commanded you to come up hither that ye should fear me, or that ye should think
that I of myself am more than a mortal man. But I am like as yourselves, subject to all manner of infirmities in body and mind; yet [insert "as" here] I have been chosen by this people, and [insert "was" here] consecrated by my father, and was suffered by the hand of the Lord that I should be a ruler and a king over this people; and have been kept and preserved by his matchless power, to serve you [replace "you" with "thee"] with all the might, mind and strength which the Lord hath granted unto me. v12 I say unto you that as I have been suffered to spend my days in your service, even up to this time, and have not sought gold nor silver nor any [replace "any" with "no"] manner of riches of you; v13 Neither have I suffered that ye should be confined in dungeons, nor that ye should make slaves one of another, nor [replace "nor" with "or"] that ye should murder, or plunder, or steal, or commit adultery; nor [replace "nor" with "or"] even have I [replace "have I" with "I have not"] suffered that ye should commit any manner of wickedness, and have taught you that ye should keep the commandments of the Lord, in all things which he hath commanded you— v14 And even I, myself, have labored with mine own hands that I might serve you, and that ye
should not be laden with taxes, and that there should nothing come upon you which was grievous to be borne—and of all these things which I have spoken, ye yourselves are witnesses this day. v15 Yet, my brethren, I have not done these things that I might boast, neither do I tell these things that thereby I might accuse you; but I tell you these things that ye may know that I can answer a clear conscience before God this day. v16 Behold, I say unto you that because I said unto you that I had spent my days in your service, I do not desire to boast, for I have only been in the service of God. v17 And behold, I tell you these things that ye may learn wisdom; that ye may learn that when ye are in the service of your fellow beings ye are only in the service of your God. v18 Behold, ye have called me your king; and if I, whom ye call your king, do labor to serve you, then ought not ye [replace "ought not ye" with "had not ye ought"] to labor to serve one another? v19 And behold also, if I, whom [replace "whom" with "who"] ye call your king, who has spent his days in your service, and yet has [replace "has" with "hath"] been in the service of God, do [replace "do" with "doth"] merit any thanks from you, O how [insert "had" here] you ought to thank your
heavenly King! v20 I say unto you, my brethren, that if you should render all the thanks and praise which your whole soul has [replace "soul has" with "souls hath"] power to possess, to that God who has [replace "has" with "hath"] created you, and has [replace "has" with "hath"] kept and preserved you, and has [replace "has" with "hath"] caused that ye should rejoice, and has [replace "has" with "hath"] granted that ye should live in peace one with another-- v21 I say unto you that if ye should serve him who has [replace "has" with "hath"] created you from the beginning, and is [replace "is" with "art"] preserving you from day to day, by lending you breath, that ye may live and move and do according to your own will, and even supporting you from one moment to another--I say, if ye should serve him with all your whole souls [replace "souls" with "soul and"] yet ye would be unprofitable servants. v22 And behold, all that he requires of you is to keep his commandments; and he has [replace "has" with "hath"] promised you that if ye would keep his commandments ye should prosper in the land; and he never doth vary from that which he hath said; therefore, if ye do keep his commandments he doth bless you and prosper you. v23 And now, in the
first place, he hath created you, and granted unto you your lives, for which ye are indebted unto him. v24 And secondly, he doth require that ye should do as he hath commanded you; for which if ye do, he doth immediately bless you; and therefore he hath paid you. And ye are still indebted unto him, and are, and will be, forever and ever; therefore, of what have ye to boast? v25 And now I ask, can ye say aught of yourselves? I answer you, Nay. Ye cannot say that ye are [replace "ye are" with "thou art"] even as much as the dust of the earth; yet ye were [replace "ye were" with "thou wast"] created of the dust of the earth; but behold, it belongeth to him who created you. v26 And I, even I, whom ye call your king, am no better than ye yourselves are; for I am also of the dust. And ye behold [replace "ye behold" with "thou beholdest"] that I am old, and am about to yield up this mortal frame to its mother earth. v27 Therefore, as I said unto you that I had served you, walking with a clear conscience before God, even so I at this time have caused that ye should assemble yourselves together, that I might be found blameless, and that your blood should not come upon me, when I shall stand to be judged of God of the things whereof he hath commanded me
concerning you. v28 I say unto you that I have caused that ye should assemble yourselves together that I might rid my garments of your blood, at this period of time when I am about to go down to my grave, that I might go down in peace, and my immortal spirit may join the choirs above in singing the praises of a just God. v29 And moreover, I say unto you that I have caused that ye should assemble yourselves together, that I might declare unto you that I can no longer be your teacher, nor your king; v30 For even at this time, my whole frame doth tremble exceedingly while attempting to speak unto you; but the Lord God doth support me, and hath suffered me that I should speak unto you, and hath commanded me that I should declare unto you this day, that my son Mosiah is a king and a ruler over you. v31 And now, my brethren, I would that ye should do as ye have [replace "have" with "hath"] hitherto done. As ye have kept my commandments, and also the commandments of my father, and have prospered, and have been kept from falling into the hands of your enemies, even so if ye shall keep the commandments of my son, or the commandments of God which shall be delivered unto you by him, ye shall prosper in the land, and your enemies shall have no power
over you. v32 But, O my people, beware lest there shall arise contentions among you, and ye list to obey the evil spirit, which was spoken of by my father Mosiah. v33 For behold, there is a wo pronounced upon him who listeth to obey that spirit; for if he listeth to obey him, and remaineth and dieth in his sins, the same drinketh damnation to his own soul; for he receiveth for his wages an everlasting punishment, having transgressed the law of God contrary to his own knowledge. v34 I say unto you, that there are not any [replace "any" with "one"] among you, except it be your little children that have not been taught concerning these things, but what knoweth that ye are eternally indebted to your heavenly Father, to render to him all that you have and are; and also have been taught concerning the records which contain the prophecies which have [replace "have" with "hath"] been spoken by the holy prophets, even down to the time our father, Lehi, left Jerusalem; v35 And also, all that has [replace "has" with "hath"] been spoken by our fathers until now. And behold, also, they spake that which was commanded them of the Lord; therefore, they are just and true. v36 And now, I say unto you, my brethren, that after ye have
known and have been taught all these things, if ye should transgress and go contrary to that which has [replace "has" with "hath"] been spoken, that ye do withdraw yourselves from the Spirit of the Lord, that it may have no place in you to guide you in wisdom's paths that ye may be blessed, prospered, and preserved—v37 I say unto you, that the man that doeth this, the same cometh out in open rebellion against God; therefore he listeth to obey the evil spirit, and becometh an enemy to all righteousness; therefore, the Lord has [replace "has" with "hath"] no place in him, for he dwelleth not in unholy temples. v38 Therefore if that man repenteth not, and remaineth and dieth an enemy to God, the demands of divine justice do [replace "do" with "doth"] awaken his immortal soul to a lively sense of his own guilt, which doth cause him to shrink from the presence of the Lord, and doth fill his breast with guilt, and pain, and anguish, which is like an unquenchable fire, whose flame [replace "flame" with "flames"] ascendeth up forever and ever. v39 And now I say unto you, that mercy hath no claim on that man; therefore his final doom is to endure a never-ending torment. v40 O, all ye old men, and also ye young men, and you little children who
[replace "who" with "which"] can understand my words, for I have spoken plainly [replace "plainly" with "plain"] unto you that ye might understand, I pray that ye should awake to a remembrance of the awful situation of those that have fallen into transgression. v41 And moreover, I would desire that ye should consider on the blessed and happy state of those that keep the commandments of God. For behold, they are blessed in all things, both temporal and spiritual; and if they hold out faithful to the end they are received into heaven, that thereby they may dwell with God in a state of never-ending happiness. O remember, remember that these things are true; for the Lord God hath spoken it. ch3 v1 And again my brethren, I would call your attention, for I have somewhat more to speak unto you; for behold, I have things to tell you concerning that which is to come. v2 And the things which I shall tell you are made known unto me by an angel from God. And he said unto me: Awake; and I awoke, and behold he stood before me. v3 And he said unto me: Awake, and hear the words which I shall tell thee; for behold, I am come to declare unto you (replace "you" with "thee") the glad tidings of great joy. v4 For the Lord hath heard thy prayers, and hath
judged of thy righteousness, and hath sent me to declare unto thee that thou mayest rejoice; and that thou mayest declare unto thy people, that they may also be filled with joy.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It should be obvious that one should rely primarily on the texts themselves (printed editions or even the two manuscripts, if readily accessible) rather than on any secondary sources for textual studies. In general the 1830 edition represents how the pronouns appear in the original and printer's manuscripts, but some recourse must be made to the manuscripts for any technical textual analysis. Since there are quite a few second person pronouns used in the Book of Mormon, analyzing only the pronoun usage in the 1830 edition will still yield valid conclusions. Although the focus of this chapter has been on textual variants and revisions in the Book of Mormon, the textual variants for pronouns of address are too few to invalidate any of the general conclusions presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER EIGHT
SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

I. INTRODUCTION

The Book of Mormon was translated by Joseph Smith in 1829. At this time he was only twenty-four years old. He had had little schooling and had spent the majority of his life thus far "obtaining a scanty maintenance by his daily labor" (JS-H 1:23). For one who had little "book learning," he accomplished a miracle. He translated into English a record which testifies that "there shall be no other name given nor any other way nor means whereby salvation can come unto the children of men, only in and through the name of Christ, the Lord Omnipotent" (Mosiah 3:17; emphasis added).

As the title pages proclaims, the record itself was "written by way of commandment," which means that Jesus Christ himself commanded it be written. It was also written "by the spirit of prophecy and of revelation" (Title Page of the Book of Mormon). The record was "sealed up, and hid up unto the Lord . . . to come forth by the gift and power of God unto the interpretation thereof" (Title Page of the Book of Mormon). It is written, as stated therein, "to the convincing of the Jew and Gentile that JESUS is the CHRIST, the ETERNAL GOD, manifesting himself unto all nations" (Title Page of the Book of Mormon).
Later in the Book of Mormon Alma writes:

For behold, the Lord doth grant unto all nations, of their own nation and tongue, to teach his word, yea, in wisdom, all that he seeth fit that they should have; therefore we see that the Lord doth counsel in wisdom, according to that which is just and true. (Alma 29:8; emphasis added)

Nephi comments similarly:

For my soul delighteth in plainness; for after this manner doth the Lord God work among the children of men. For the Lord God giveth light unto the understanding; for he speaketh unto men according to their language, unto their understanding. (2 Ne. 31:3; emphasis added)

The Book of Mormon, thus, is the word of God translated into the language of Joseph Smith.

Joseph Smith brought "forth out of darkness unto light" the "secret works" and "abominations" of those who had lived on the American continent in earlier ages (Alma 37:25). This same record is a wonderful witness for Jesus Christ and contains his words. If one is humble, these words become a more powerful witness for Jesus Christ, but they also can become a powerful witness against the wicked and will condemn them at the last day.

Jesus Christ himself said:

Therefore it shall come to pass that whosoever
will not believe in my words, who am Jesus Christ, which the Father shall cause him [i.e., Joseph Smith] to bring forth unto the Gentiles, and shall give unto him power that he shall bring them forth unto the Gentiles, (it shall be done even as Moses said) they shall be cut off from among my people who are of the covenant. (3 Ne. 21:11; emphasis added)

He also quoted Malachi’s words to the Nephites:

For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up. (3 Ne. 25:1; emphasis added)

The witness Joseph Smith bore of the power of the Book of Mormon will only be meaningful to those who come to know of its veracity by experience:

I told the brethren that the Book of Mormon was the most correct of any book on earth, and the keystone of our religion, and a man will get nearer to God by abiding by its precepts, than by any other book. (History of the Church 4:461; emphasis added)

Likewise, the exhortation Moroni gives will only have real meaning to those who heed it. He exhorts those who read the Book of Mormon to
I ask God, the Eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost. And by the power of the Holy Ghost ye may know the truth of all things. (Moro. 10:4-5)

Though the pronouns of address in this passage are clearly plural in form, few readers will not take this passage personally. "The Lord is merciful unto all who will, in the sincerity of their hearts, call upon his holy name" (Hel. 3:27). The promise is unto all, even though the witness of the Holy Ghost will come to humble, sincere individuals one at a time.

II. DISCUSSION

In this thesis so far we have examined how English (specifically the pronoun of address) has been used by various people at various times. A language changes as the people who speak it change. It is a volatile, highly mutable medium, and each individual will use language in many different ways according to his circumstances and feelings. Since Joseph Smith had never translated anything into English, it would obviously be a new experience for him. Likewise, the same would be true for the scribes who
wrote what he dictated to them. Thus many varieties of language usage are found in both the manuscripts, as well as in the printed editions of the Book of Mormon, and thus the 1981 edition of the Book of Mormon is a composite of many varieties of language, not just Joseph Smith's.

In a variety of ways Joseph Smith seems to not always have clearly differentiated between plural and singular in his language. This is also true at times with regard to pronouns of address. As we have seen with regard to the language of the Doctrine and Covenants, often when we would expect a singular pronoun form (i.e., a th-form), Joseph Smith uses a plural form (i.e., a y-form). This same phenomenon occurs in the Book of Mormon. Although the language varies somewhat from what many consider to be standard English (if there ever were such a thing), this variation is entirely understandable and should actually be expected in Joseph Smith's language. Since pronominal shiftings and variation occur also in the writings of others of Joseph Smith's day (e.g. Tennyson, Melville, and Scott, to name a few), it would be surprising, in fact, if Joseph Smith were able to differentiate accurately according to some prevailing notion of correctness, especially if he was unaware of such a notion.

It should be remembered, therefore, that though language variation occurs in the language of the Book of Mormon, this in no way impinges on the veracity of the work
itself. Variation in language use has been the theme in the history of the English language, as we have seen. Therefore, though the language does not conform to our individual or collective standards of language, it is still holy writ and cannot be understood rightly without the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

A. PRONOUN USAGE IN GENERAL IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

At the outset a general overview of pronouns of address in the Book of Mormon is in order. This will be done initially with some tables showing the frequencies of pronouns of address in the Book of Mormon. However, it should be remembered that comparisons of either word counts or frequency of occurrence percentages are often misleading, especially since the forms of words do not always correspond strictly with their functions. For example, the pronoun you is used in English for both singular and plural numbers, and also for nominative and objective cases. Thus if the second person pronoun usage in the Book of Mormon is compared with that of Shakespeare, one can see clearly that Shakespeare used you in his works (39%) a great deal more than Joseph Smith did (22%) in translating the Book of Mormon. However, since there are at least four possible functions of you in both Shakespeare’s works and in the Book of Mormon, this simple word count comparison yields very little.
Table 1 is a list of the second person pronouns in the Book of Mormon and their frequencies of occurrence in the 1981 edition.

### TABLE 1

SECOND PERSON PRONOUN FREQUENCY AND PRONOUN FREQUENCY PERCENTAGE IN THE BOOK OF MORMON (1981 EDITION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEE</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>.0538%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THINE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.0076%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOU</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>.1114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THY</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>.0871%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THYSELF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.0026%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>.2625%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YE</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>.3733%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOU</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>.2189%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>.1286%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOURS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0002%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOURSELF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0009%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOURSELVES</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.0156%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>3973</td>
<td>.7375%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 is the second person pronoun frequency in the 1981 edition of the Book of Mormon. The numbers correspond with the pronouns as they are numbered in Table 1.

**TABLE 2**

SECOND PERSON PRONOUN FREQUENCY IN THE 1981 EDITION OF THE BOOK OF MORMON ARRANGED BY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#10</th>
<th>#11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nephi</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nephi</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. of M.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helaman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nephi</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nephi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ether</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

290  41  600  469  14  2011  1179  693  1  5  84
Table 3 is a general paradigm of pronouns of address in the Book of Mormon. It should be observed that this paradigm is similar to second person pronoun paradigms for major works of some contemporaries of Joseph Smith. Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* and Melville's *Moby-Dick*, as well as other works during the century, have similar paradigms for pronouns of address with one major exception: *th*-forms are used in a plural sense in the Book of Mormon and not in these other works. This seems to be the major difference between the general historical second person pronoun usage in English and that found in the Book of Mormon. As Barber states, in English "it has never been possible to use *thou* as a plural" (208). In this regard the Book of Mormon seems to parallel the biblical use of singular pronominal forms for addressing each individual in an audience more effectively. This same usage has been discussed in some detail in chapter 5 herein.

Generally pronouns which function as genitives or possessive adjectives are considered in the possessive case today. Also pronouns which function as datives (indirect objects or objects of a preposition) or accusatives (direct objects) are usually considered in the objective case. However, these two cases (the objective and the possessive) have been separated in the following paradigm to show the distinct functions of these pronouns rather than to show any distinctness of forms.
TABLE 3
PARADIGM OF PRONOUNS OF ADDRESS IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>thou, ye, you</td>
<td>thou, ye, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
<td>thy, thine, your</td>
<td>thy, your, yours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS. ADJ.</td>
<td>thy, thine, your</td>
<td>thy, thine, your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>thee, you</td>
<td>thee, you, ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>thee, you</td>
<td>thee, you, ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFLEXIVE</td>
<td>thyself, yourself</td>
<td>thyself, yourself, yourselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are various examples illustrating the above general paradigm. It should be noted that yours appears only once in the Book of Mormon, and it is used in a plural sense. Also, the abbreviations OMS (for the original manuscript) and PMS (for the printer’s manuscript) will be used throughout the rest of this chapter. When more than one example occurs in a single verse, the notations 2X (for two times), 3X (for three times), etc. will be used.

EXAMPLES FOR PARADIGM OF PRONOUNS OF ADDRESS

SINGULAR

thou as nominative: 1 Nephi 2:9 ("O that thou mightest be like unto this valley"

ye as nominative: Alma 38:5 ("And now my son, Shiblon, I would that ye should remember"

you as nominative: Mosiah 18:13 ("ye have entered into a covenant to serve him until you are dead")
thy as genitive: 2 Nephi 2:3 ("because of the righteousness of thy Redeemer")
thine as genitive: Alma 12:5 ("now this was a plan of thine adversary")
your as genitive: Alma 30:46 ("grieved because of the hardness of your heart")
thy as possessive adjective: 1 Nephi 1:14 ("Great and marvelous are thy works, O Lord God Almighty!")
thine as possessive adjective: 1 Nephi 17:53 ("Stretch forth thine hand")
your as possessive adjective: Alma 38:2 ("because of your steadiness and your faithfulness")
thee as accusative: 1 Nephi 2:1 ("declared unto this people the things which I commanded thee")
you as accusative: Alma 37:15 ("that he may sift you as chaff")
thee as dative: Mosiah 22:4 ("they have been of service to thee")
you as dative: Alma 38:2 ("I trust that I shall have great joy in you")
thyself as reflexive: Alma 22:18 ("if thou art God, wilt thou make thyself known unto me")
yourself as reflexive: Alma 39:9 ("cross yourself in all these things")
PLURAL

thou as nominative: Mosiah 4:22 ("yet ye put up no petition, nor repent of the thing which thou hast done")

ye as nominative: 1 Nephi 15:8 ("And I said unto them: Have ye inquired of the Lord?")

you as nominative: 2 Nephi 33:14 ("And you that will not partake of the goodness of God")

thy as genitive: 2 Nephi 32:9 ("for the welfare of thy soul") [addressed to plural audience]

your as genitive: Helaman 13:38 ("ye have procrastinated the day of your salvation")

yours as genitive: Jacob 3:8 ("their skins will be whiter than yours")

thy as possessive adjective: 1 Nephi 17:55 ("I would not suffer them, saying: I am thy brother, yea, even thy younger brother")

thine as possessive adjective: Alma 26:27 ("bear with patience thine afflictions")

your as possessive adjective: 1 Nephi 3:29 ("Why do ye smite your younger brother with a rod?")

thee as accusative: Mosiah 2:11 ("to serve thee with all the might" in PMS)

you as accusative: Jacob 2:9 ("to admonish you according to your crimes")

ye as accusative: Alma 14:19 ("to deliver ye" in PMS)
thee as dative: 1 Nephi 17:55 ("in the land which the Lord thy God shall give thee")

ye as dative: Alma 54:9 ("pull down the wrath of that God whom you have rejected upon yea even to your utter destruction" in OMS) [PMS="upon you, then ye, then you"

you as dative: Mosiah 4:22 ("which doth not belong to you but to God")

thysel itself as reflexive: Mosiah 13:13 ("Thou shalt not bow thyself unto them") [addressed to plural audience]

yourselves as reflexive: 1 Nephi 19:24 ("liken them unto yourselves"

B. PRONOUN USAGE IN 1 NEPHI IN DETAIL

In this section we will examine the pronoun usage of 1 Nephi in some detail to exemplify the second person pronoun usage in general in the Book of Mormon. Some of the reasons for using 1 Nephi to illustrate the pronoun usage in the Book of Mormon are that it was not edited by Mormon, the original manuscript is extant for the majority of 1 Nephi, and it also contains a fair amount of dialogue--which is where many second person pronouns are found.

THOU IN 1 NEPHI

Thou occurs eighty-eight times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition and all are in the nominative case. Thou occurs two other times in 1 Nephi in the original manuscript, but these two occurrences do not appear in the 1981 edition (1 Ne.
3:30, 7:8). Twenty-three are plural in sense (1 Ne. 3:29, 7:8, 10:20, and those in chapters 20-21).

1:14 because thou art merciful [the Lord]
1:14 thou wilt not suffer [the Lord]
2:1 Blessed art thou Lehi [Lehi]
2:1 the things which thou hast done [Lehi]
2:1 because thou hast been faithful [Lehi]
2:9 O that thou mightest be like unto this river [Laman]
2:10 O that thou mightest be like [Lemuel]
2:19 Blessed art thou, Nephi [Nephi]
2:19 for thou hast sought me diligently [the Lord]
2:22 inasmuch as thou shalt keep my commandments [Nephi]
2:22 thou shalt be made a ruler [Nephi]
3:2 thou and thy brethren shall return [Nephi]
3:4 thou and thy brothers should go [Nephi]
3:6 thou shalt be favored of the Lord [Nephi]
3:6 because thou hast not murmured [Nephi]
3:13 Behold thou art a robber [Laman]
3:29 thou shalt go up [Nephi and his brethren] (OMS)
4:34 if thou wilt go down [Zoram]
4:34 thou shalt have place with us [Zoram]
5:2 Behold thou hast led us forth [Lehi]
7:8 thou art mine elder brethren [Laman and Lemuel] (OMS)
7:17 wilt thou deliver me [Nephi]
10:20 thou shalt be brought into judgment [readers]
11:2 Behold, what desirest thou? [Nephi]
11:4 Believest thou that thy father saw the tree [Nephi]
11:5 Yea, thou knowest that I believe [the Spirit]
11:6 And blessed art thou, Nephi [Nephi]
11:6 because thou believest in the Son [Nephi]
11:6 thou shalt behold the things which [Nephi]
11:6 thou hast desired [Nephi]
11:7 after thou hast beheld the tree [Nephi]
11:7 thou shalt also behold a man [Nephi]
11:9 I behold thou hast shown unto me [Nephi]
11:10 And he said unto me: What desirest thou? [Nephi]
11:14 Nephi, what beholdest thou? [Nephi]
11:16 Knowest thou the condescension of God? [Nephi]
11:18 Behold, the virgin whom thou seest [Nephi]
11:21 Knowest thou the meaning of the tree [Nephi]
12:9 thou rememberest the twelve apostles [Nephi]
12:10 these twelve ministers whom thou beholdest [Nephi]
13:2 the angel said unto me: What beholdest thou? [Nephi]
13:21 Knowest thou the meaning of the book? [Nephi]
13:23 The book that thou beholdest is a record [Nephi]
13:24 thou hast beheld that the book [Nephi]
13:26 thou seest the formation [Nephi]
13:28 thou seest that after the book hath gone [Nephi]
13:29 the many waters which thou hast seen [Nephi]
13:29 thou seest--because of the many [Nephi]
13:30 thou beholdest that the Gentiles [Nephi]
13:13 thou seest that the Lord God will not suffer [Nephi]
13:32 which thou beholdest they are in [Nephi]
13:32 whose formation thou hast seen [Nephi]
13:40 These last records, which thou hast seen [Nephi]
14:5 thou hast beheld that if the Gentiles repent [Nephi]
14:5 thou also knowest concerning the covenants [Nephi]
14:5 thou also hast heard that whoso repenteth [Nephi]
14:8 Rememberest thou the covenants of the Father [Nephi]
14:16 behold, thou seest all these things [Nephi]
14:23 which thou beheld proceeding out of the mouth [Nephi]
14:24 many things which thou hast seen [Nephi]
14:24 and behold, the remainder shalt thou see [Nephi]
14:25 which thou shalt see hereafter [Nephi]
14:25 thou shalt not write [Nephi]
16:1 thou hast declared unto us hard things [Nephi]
16:3 thou speakest hard things against us [Nephi]
17:8 thou shalt construct a ship [Nephi]
17:9 the manner which thou hast shown unto me [Nephi]
17:19 thou canst not accomplish so great a work [Nephi]
17:20 And thou art like unto our father [Nephi]
17:50 I should say unto this water, be thou earth [water]
20:4 I knew that thou art obstinate [Israel]
20:5 lest thou shouldst say--mine idol hath done [Israel]
20:6 thou hast seen and heard all this [Israel]
20:6 and thou didst not know them [Israel]
20:7 before the day when thou hearest them not [Israel]
20:7 lest thou shouldst say--Behold I knew them [Israel]
20:8 Yea, and thou hearest not [Israel]
20:8 yea, thou knewest not [Israel]
20:8 I knew that thou wouldst deal [Israel]
20:17 who leadeth thee by the way thou shouldst go [Israel]
20:18 that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments [Israel]
21:3 thou art my servant, O Israel [Israel]
21:6 that thou shouldst be my servant [Israel]
21:6 that thou mayest be my salvation [Israel]
21:9 That thou mayest say to the prisoners [Israel]
21:18 thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all [Israel]
21:20 The children whom thou shalt have [Israel]
21:20 after thou hast lost the first [Israel]
21:21 Then shalt thou say in thine heart [Israel]
21:23 and thou shalt know that I am the Lord [Israel]

THEE IN 1 NEPHI

Thee occurs thirty-seven times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition. Although all occur in the objective case, twenty-one function as accusatives and sixteen function as datives. In the many quotations from Isaiah (chs. 20-21) thee construed as being plural in sense, but singular in form. All the rest are singular in sense except the second occurrence of thee in 1 Nephi 17:55.

1:14 those who come unto thee [the Lord]
2:1 which I commanded thee [Lehi]
2:21 thy brethren shall rebel against thee [Nephi]
3:13 thou art a robber, and I will slay thee [Laman]
7:17 according to my faith which is in thee [the Lord]
11:7 shall be given unto thee for a sign [Nephi]
17:7 Arise, and get thee into the mountain [Nephi]
17:8 after the manner which I shall show thee [Nephi]
17:53 they shall not wither before thee [Nephi]
17:55 the Lord is with thee [Nephi]
17:55 the Lord thy God shall give thee [Laman and Lemuel]
20:5 from the beginning declared to thee [Israel]
20:5 before it came to pass I showed them thee [Israel]
20:6 I have showed thee new things [Israel]
20:7 they were declared unto thee [Israel]
20:9 my praise will I refrain from thee [Israel]
20:9 that I cut thee not off [Israel]
20:10 For, behold, I have refined thee [Israel]
20:10 I have chosen thee in the furnace [Israel]
20:17 God who teacheth thee to profit [Israel]
20:17 who leadeth thee by the way [Israel]
21:6 I will also give thee for a light [Israel]
21:8 In an acceptable time have I heard thee [Israel]
21:8 in a day of salvation have I helped thee [Israel]
21:8 and I will preserve thee [Israel]
21:8 and give thee my servant for a covenant [Israel]
21:15 yet will I not forget thee [Israel]
21:16 I have graven thee upon the palms [Israel]
21:17 and they that made thee waste [Israel]
21:17 shall go forth of thee [Israel]
21:18 and they shall come to thee [Israel]
21:18 thou shalt surely clothe thee [Israel]
21:19 they that swallowed thee up shall be [Israel]
21:23 they shall bow down to thee [Israel]
21:25 with him that contendeth with thee [Israel]
21:26 I will feed them that oppress thee [Israel]
22:14 every nation which shall war against thee [Israel]

THINE IN 1 NEPHI

Thine occurs six times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition. All are plural in sense (although they appear to be used in a collective or figurative plural sense) except the single occurrence in 1 Nephi 17:53.

1:13 I have seen thine abominations [Jerusalem]
17:53 Stretch forth thine hand again [Nephi]
20:8 from that time thine ear was not opened [Israel]
21:18 Lift up thine eyes round about and behold [Israel]
21:20 shall again in thine ears say [Israel]
21:21 Then shalt thou say in thine heart [Israel]

THY IN 1 NEPHI

Thy occurs seventy times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition. Of these seventy, thirteen function as genitives and the other fifty-seven function as possessive adjectives. All are singular in sense except the occurrences found in 1 Nephi 10:20, 17:12, 17:55, and in the quotations from Isaiah in chapters 20-21.
1:14 Great and marvelous are thy works [the Lord]
1:14 Thy throne is high in the heavens [the Lord]
1:14 and thy power, and goodness [the Lord]
2:1 they seek to take away thy life [Lehi]
2:19 because of thy faith [Nephi]
2:21 inasmuch as thy brethren shall rebel [Nephi]
2:22 a ruler and a teacher over thy brethren [Nephi]
2:23 they shall have no power over thy seed [Nephi]
2:24 they shall be a scourge unto thy seed [Nephi]
3:2 thou and thy brethren shall return [Nephi]
3:4 thou and thy brothers should go [Nephi]
3:5 And now, behold thy brothers murmur [Nephi]
4:11 the Lord hath delivered him into thy hands [Nephi]
4:12 the Lord hath delivered him into thy hands [Nephi]
4:14 Inasmuch as thy seed shall keep [Nephi]
10:20 for all thy doings thou shalt be brought [readers]
11:4 Believeth thou that thy father saw the tree [Nephi]
11:7 which bore the fruit which thy father tasted [Nephi]
11:21 the meaning of the tree which thy father saw [Nephi]
12:1 Look, and behold thy seed [Nephi]
12:1 and also the seed of thy brethren [Nephi]
12:8 who are chosen to minister unto thy seed [Nephi]
12:9 ministers of thy seed shall be judged [Nephi]
12:10 whom thou beholdest shall judge thy seed [Nephi]
12:14 And the angel said unto me: Behold thy seed [Nephi]
12:14 and also the seed of thy brethren [Nephi]
12:16 filthy water which thy father saw [Nephi]
12:18 which thy father saw [Nephi]
13:11 upon the seed of thy brethren [Nephi]
13:30 the Lord God hath covenanted with thy father [Nephi]
13:30 destroy the mixture of thy seed [Nephi]
13:30 which are among thy brethren [Nephi]
13:31 shall destroy the seed of thy brethren [Nephi]
13:34 of whom I speak is the seed of thy father [Nephi]
13:35 I will manifest myself unto thy seed [Nephi]
13:35 and after thy seed shall be destroyed [Nephi]
13:35 and also the seed of thy brethren [Nephi]
13:41 made known in the records of thy seed [Nephi]
14:2 be numbered among the seed of thy father [Nephi]
15:18 In thy seed shall all the kindreds [Abraham]
17:8 I may carry thy people across these waters [Nephi]
17:12 I will make thy food become sweet [Lehi's colony]
17:53 thine hand again unto thy brethren [Nephi]
17:55 I am thy brother [Nephi's brethren]
17:55 yea, even thy younger brother [Nephi's brethren]
17:55 worship the Lord thy God [Nephi's brethren]
17:55 and honor thy father [Nephi's brethren]
17:55 and thy mother [Nephi's brethren]
17:55 that thy days may be long [Nephi's brethren]
17:55 the Lord thy God shall give thee [Nephi's brethren]
20:4 and thy neck is an iron sinew [Israel]
20:4 and thy brow brass [Israel]
20:17 And thus saith the Lord, *thy* Redeemer [Israel]
20:17 the Lord *thy* God who teacheth thee [Israel]
20:18 then had *thy* peace been as a river [Israel]
20:18 *thy* righteousness as the waves of the sea [Israel]
20:19 *Thy* seed also had been as the sand [Israel]
20:19 the offspring of *thy* bowels like the gravel [Israel]
21:16 *thy* walls are continually before me [Israel]
21:17 *Thy* children shall make haste [Israel]
21:17 against *thy* destroyers [Israel]
21:19 For *thy* waste [Israel]
21:19 and *thy* desolate places [Israel]
21:19 and the land of *thy* destruction [Israel]
21:22 and they shall bring *thy* sons in their arms [Israel]
21:22 and *thy* daughters shall be carried [Israel]
21:23 And kings shall be *thy* nursing fathers [Israel]
21:23 and their queens *thy* nursing mothers [Israel]
21:23 and lick up the dust of *thy* feet [Israel]
21:25 and I will save *thy* children [Israel]
21:26 I, the Lord, am *thy* Savior [Israel]
21:26 and *thy* Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob [Israel]
22:9 In *thy* seed shall all the kindreds [Abraham]

**THYSELF IN 1 NEPHI**

*Thyself* does not appear in 1 Nephi.

**YE IN 1 NEPHI**

*Ye* occurs 103 times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition. All are used in the nominative case and all are plural in sense

In the original manuscript thou appears in the place of ye in 1 Nephi 3:29 and 1 Nephi 7:8 as noted.

1:18 I would that ye should know [readers]
2:20 And inasmuch as ye shall keep [Nephi]
2:20 ye shall prosper [Nephi]
3:29 ye smite your younger brother [Laman and Lemuel]
3:29 Know ye not that the Lord [Laman and Lemuel]
3:29 ye shall go up [Lehi's sons] (ye=thou in OMS)
4:3 ye know that this is true [Nephi's brethren]
4:3 ye also know that an angel [Nephi's brethren]
4:3 wherefore can ye doubt [Nephi's brethren]
7:1 And now I would that ye might know [readers]
7:8 Behold ye are mine elder brethren [Laman and Lemuel]

(ve=thou in OMS)
7:8 how is it that ye are so hard [Laman and Lemuel]
7:8 that ye have need that I [Laman and Lemuel]
7:9 How is it that ye have not [Laman and Lemuel]
7:10 How is it that ye have forgotten [Laman and Lemuel]
7:10 ye have seen an angel of the Lord [Laman and Lemuel]
7:11 how is it that ye have forgotten [Laman and Lemuel]
7:12 how is it that ye have forgotten [Laman and Lemuel]
7:13 ye shall know at some future [Laman and Lemuel]
7:15 if ye will return unto Jerusalem [Laman and Lemuel]
7:15 ye shall also perish with them [Laman and Lemuel]
7:15 And now, if ye have choice [Laman and Lemuel]
that if ye go ye will also perish [Laman and Lemuel]

Prepare ye the way of the Lord [Israel]

standeth one among you whom ye know not [Israel]

if ye have sought to do wickedly [readers]

then ye are found unclean [readers]

ye must be cast off forever [readers]

and him shall ye witness [Nephi]

and after ye have witnessed him [Nephi]

ye shall bear record that [Nephi]

ye are of the house of Israel [Nephi and his seed]

Have ye inquired of the Lord [Nephi’s brethren]

that ye do not keep [Nephi’s brethren]

How is it that ye will perish [Nephi’s brethren]

Do ye not remember the things [Nephi’s brethren]

If ye will not harden your hearts [Nephi’s brethren]

believing that ye shall receive [Nephi’s brethren]

if ye were righteous [Nephi’s brethren]

that ye might walk uprightly [Nephi’s brethren]

then ye would not murmur [Nephi’s brethren]

that ye cook it not [Lehi’s colony]

that ye shall keep my commandments [Lehi’s colony]

as ye shall keep my commandments [Lehi’s colony]

ye shall be led towards [Lehi’s colony]

and ye shall know [Lehi’s colony]

it is by me that ye are led [Lehi’s colony]

ye have arrived in the promised land [Lehi’s colony]
17:14 ye shall know [Lehi's colony]
17:19 We knew that ye could not construct a ship [Nephi]
17:19 for we knew that ye were lacking in judgment [Nephi]
17:23 Do ye believe that our fathers [Nephi's brethren]
17:24 do ye suppose that they would [Nephi's brethren]
17:25 ye know that the children [Nephi's brethren]
17:25 and ye know that they were laden [Nephi's brethren]
17:25 ye know that it must needs be [Nephi's brethren]
17:26 ye know that Moses was commanded [Nephi's brethren]
17:26 and ye know that by his word [Nephi's brethren]
17:27 ye know that the Egyptians [Nephi's brethren]
17:28 ye also know that they were fed [Nephi's brethren]
17:29 and ye also know that Moses [Nephi's brethren]
17:33 do ye suppose that the children [Nephi's brethren]
17:33 do ye suppose that they were [Nephi's brethren]
17:34 Do ye suppose that our fathers [Nephi's brethren]
17:41 their hearts, even as ye have [Nephi's brethren]
17:42 ye know that they were led forth [Nephi's brethren]
17:44 ye also have sought to take away [Nephi's brethren]
17:44 ye are murderers in your hearts [Nephi's brethren]
17:44 and ye are like unto them [Nephi's brethren]
17:45 Ye are swift to do iniquity [Nephi's brethren]
17:45 Ye have seen an angel [Nephi's brethren]
17:45 ye have heard his voice [Nephi's brethren]
17:45 but ye were past feeling [Nephi's brethren]
17:45 that ye could not feel his words [Nephi's brethren]
17:46 ye also know that by the power [Nephi’s brethren]
17:46 and ye know that by his word [Nephi’s brethren]
17:46 ye can be so hard in your hearts [Nephi’s brethren]
17:47 I fear lest ye shall be cast off [Nephi’s brethren]
17:48 command you that ye touch me not [Nephi’s brethren]
19:24 Hear ye the words of the prophet [Israel]
19:24 ye who are a remnant of the house of Israel [Israel]
19:24 hear ye the words of the prophet [Israel]
19:24 that ye may have hope as well [Israel]
19:24 from whom ye have been broken off [Israel]
20:6 and will ye not declare them [Israel]
20:14 All ye, assemble yourselves [Israel]
20:16 Come ye near unto me [Israel]
20:20 Go ye forth of Babylon [Israel]
20:20 flee ye from the Chaldeans [Israel]
20:20 with a voice of singing declare ye [Israel]
20:20 say ye: The Lord hath redeemed his servant [Israel]
21:1 Hearken, O ye house of Israel [Israel]
21:1 all ye that are broken off [Israel]
21:1 all ye that are broken off [Israel]
21:1 hearken ye people from far [Israel]
22:1 What meaneth these things which ye have read [Nephi]
22:10 my brethren, that ye should know [Nephi’s brethren]
22:20 him shall ye hear in all things [Israel]
22:30 I would that ye should consider [Nephi’s brethren]
22:31 ye need not suppose [Nephi’s brethren]
22:31 if ye shall be obedient [Nephi’s brethren]
22:31 ye shall be saved at the last day [Nephi’s brethren]

YOU IN 1 NEPHI

You occurs in 1 Nephi twenty-nine times. All instances function as datives except three (1 Ne. 17:14 [2X], 48) which function as accusatives. All are plural in sense.

1:20 will show unto you [readers]
2:20 prepared for you [Nephi and colony]
3:29 a ruler over you [Nephi’s brethren]
4:3 spoken unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
7:8 speak unto you [Laman and Lemuel]
7:8 an example for you [Laman and Lemuel]
7:15 I say unto you [Laman and Lemuel]
7:15 I speak unto you [Laman and Lemuel]
8:4 because of you [Laman and Lemuel]
10:8 there standeth one among you [Israel]
15:11 made known unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
15:12 I say unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
15:16 I say unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
15:34 I say unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
17:13 I will prepare the way before you [Lehi’s colony]
17:14 I, the Lord, did deliver you [Lehi’s colony]
17:14 I did bring you out of the land [Lehi’s colony]
17:33 I say unto you, Nay [Laman and Lemuel]
17:34 I say unto you, Nay [Laman and Lemuel]
17:45 he spake unto you [Laman and Lemuel]
17:45 he hath spoken unto you [Laman and Lemuel]
17:45 he has spoken unto you [Laman and Lemuel]
17:47 rent with anguish because of you [Laman and Lemuel]
17:48 I command you [Laman and Lemuel]
22:18 I say unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
22:20 raise up unto you [Israel]
22:20 he shall say unto you [Israel]
22:21 I, Nephi, declare unto you [Nephi’s brethren]
22:27 I, Nephi, say unto you [Nephi’s brethren]

**YOUR IN 1 NEPHI**

*Your* appears sixteen times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition. All are plural in sense. All function as possessive adjectives except those found in 1 Nephi 10:21 and 1 Nephi 15:10 which function as genitives.

3:29 ye smite your younger brother [Nephi’s brethren]
3:29 this because of your iniquities [Nephi’s brethren]
3:29 Laban into your hands [Nephi and his brethren]
7:8 ye are so hard in your hearts [Laman and Lemuel]
7:8 and so blind in your minds [Laman and Lemuel]
7:8 need that I, your younger brother [Laman and Lemuel]
8:14 I beheld your mother Sariah [Lehi’s children]
10:21 do wickedly in the days of your probation [readers]
15:10 the hardness of your hearts [Nephi’s brethren]
15:11 If ye will not harden your hearts [Nephi’s brethren]
17:13 I will also be your light [Lehi’s colony]
17:44 ye are murderers in your hearts [Laman and Lemuel]
17:45 remember the Lord your God [Laman and Lemuel]
17:46 ye can be so hard in your hearts [Laman and Lemuel]
19:24 hope as well as your brethren [Nephi’s brethren]
22:20 shall the Lord your God raise up [Israel]
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YEARS IN 1 NPHI

Yours does not appear in 1 Nephi.

YOURSELF IN 1 NPHI

Yourself does not appear in 1 Nephi.

YOURSELVES IN 1 NPHI

Yourselves occurs three times in 1 Nephi in the 1981 edition. All are plural in sense.

19:24 and liken them unto yourselves [Nephi’s brethren]
20:14 All ye, assemble yourselves, and hear [Israel]
21:9 in darkness: Show yourselves [Israel]

The remainder of the detailed analysis of the pronoun usage in 1 Nephi will consist of various examples of pronominal shifting found therein.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN 1 NPHI

1 Nephi 2:19-22:

And it came to pass that the Lord spake unto me, saying: Blessed art thou, Nephi, because of thy faith, for thou hast sought me diligently, with lowliness of heart. And inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments, ye shall prosper, and shall be led to a land of promise; yea, even a land which I have prepared for you; yea, a land which is choice above all other lands.
And inasmuch as thy brethren shall rebel against thee, they shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord. And inasmuch as thou shalt keep my commandments, thou shalt be made a ruler and a teacher over thy brethren.

1 Nephi 3:29-30 (OMS):

why do ye smite your younger Brother with a/ rod know ye not that the Lord hath chosen him to/ be a ruler over you & this because of your iniquities behold/ thou shalt go up to Jerusalem again & the Lord will/ Deliver Laban into your hands

1 Nephi 7:8 (OMS):

and now i nephi being/ grievd for the hardness of their harts [sic] therefore i spake/ unto them saying yea <even: inserted> unto lamen and unto lemual/ behold thou art mine elder brethren and how is it that/ ye are so hard in your hearts and so blind in your mi/nds that ye have need that i your younger brother should/ speak unto you yea & set an example for you

1 Nephi 10:20-21:

Therefore remember, O man, for all thy doings thou shalt be brought into judgment. Wherefore, if ye have sought to do wickedly in the days of your probation, then ye are found unclean before the judgment-seat of God; and no unclean thing can dwell with God; wherefore, ye must be cast off forever.

1 Nephi 11:7:
And behold this thing shall be given unto thee for a sign, that after thou hast beheld the tree which bore the fruit which thy father tasted, thou shalt also behold a man descending out of heaven, and him shall ye witness; and after ye have witnessed him ye shall bear record that it is the Son of God.

1 Nephi 12:9-10:
And he said unto me: thou rememberest the twelve apostles of the Lamb? Behold they are they who shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel; wherefore, the twelve ministers of thy seed shall be judged of them; for ye are of the house of Israel. And these twelve ministers whom thou beholdest shall judge thy seed.

1 Nephi 17:12:
For the Lord had not hitherto suffered that we should make much fire, as we journeyed in the wilderness; for he said: I will make thy food become sweet, that ye cook it not;

1 Nephi 17:19:
and now when they saw that I began to be sorrowful they were glad in their hearts, insomuch that they did rejoice over me, sayin: We knew that ye could not construct a ship, for we knew that ye were lacking in judgment; wherefore, thou canst not accomplish so great a work. And thou art like unto our father, led away by the foolish imaginations of his heart;
1 Nephi 20:6:

Thou hast seen and heard all this; and will ye not declare them? And that I have showed thee new things from this time, even hidden things, and thou didst not know them.

C. SPECIAL ANALYSES OF SECOND PERSON PRONOUN USAGE

In this section will be found some special analyses of second person pronoun usage. We will first examine you as a nominative form in the Book of Mormon and then examine the pronouns of address in a few selected passages which illustrate pronoun usage somewhat peculiar to the Book of Mormon.

You occurs 1,179 times in the 1981 edition of the Book of Mormon. Only about sixty of these (or so) function as nominatives, the rest, of course, occur in the objective case. Of those which occur in the nominative case, only about five are used in a singular sense. The following notations will be used in this analysis:

*=ye in earlier editions and/or manuscripts
**=ye in 1981 edition
***=singular in sense

It can be debated whether those which occur in Alma 54 (and in a few other instances) are singular or plural in sense, but it should be obvious that you is used as a nominative only infrequently in the Book of Mormon (compare D&C 9).
### You as a Nominative Form in the Book of Mormon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Ne. 33:11</td>
<td>you and I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ne. 33:14</td>
<td>you that will not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob 2:13</td>
<td>that you have obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob 3:7</td>
<td>are you than they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:9</td>
<td>you that can hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:9</td>
<td>but that you should hearken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:19</td>
<td>how [had] you ought to thank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:20</td>
<td>if you should render</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:34</td>
<td>all that you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 2:40</td>
<td>you little children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 4:10</td>
<td>if you believe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 4:21</td>
<td>on whom you are dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 4:24</td>
<td>I mean all you who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 5:8</td>
<td>all you that have entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 5:15</td>
<td>that you may be brought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 12:25</td>
<td>are you priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 12:30</td>
<td>you [had] ought to tremble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 18:10</td>
<td>what have you against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 18:13</td>
<td>until you are dead***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 23:12</td>
<td>as you have been*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 24:14</td>
<td>you cannot feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 24:14</td>
<td>while you are in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 29:13</td>
<td>that you could have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosiah 29:25</td>
<td>choose you by the voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alma 5:6   you that belong
Alma 5:6   have you sufficiently retained
Alma 5:6   have you sufficiently retained
Alma 5:16  can you imagine
Alma 5:19  can you look up
Alma 5:20  when you have yielded
Alma 5:55  will you persist
Alma 5:57  all you that are desirous
Alma 5:60  if you will hearken
Alma 7:6   that you do not worship
Alma 7:17  that you believe them**
Alma 7:27  all that you possess
Alma 9:18  when you know not
Alma 32:28 when you feel
Alma 32:30 then you must needs say*
Alma 32:34 because you know
Alma 34:27 when you do not cry
Alma 38:2  for as you have commenced***
Alma 38:2  that you will continue***
Alma 39:14 you cannot carry them***
Alma 39:17 you marvel why these things***
Alma 54:8  I may expect you will do it
Alma 54:9  behold you will pull down the wrath**
            (PMS=you, then altered to ye)
Alma 54:9  except you withdraw
Alma 54:9  whom you have rejected
(PMS=you, then ye, then you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alma 54:12</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>until you are destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma 55:12</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you may do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma 56:17</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you may well suppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma 60:7</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>can you think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma 60:32</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>can you suppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma 61:9</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you have censured*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 5:6</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>when you remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 5:41</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you must repent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 7:16</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>how could you have given away*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 7:18</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you have hardened your hearts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 7:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>how could you have forgotten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 8:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>will you dispute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 13:26</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you will say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ne. 7:24</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>I would have you to remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morm. 6:17</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>how could you have rejected*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morm. 8:32</td>
<td></td>
<td>you</td>
<td>you shall be forgiven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL = 65

PRONOUNS OF ADDRESS IN ALMA 36-42

In Alma 36-42 there are 251 second person pronouns. Since Alma is speaking to only one son at a time, it would seem that this would be an appropriate place for Joseph Smith to use the singular second person forms (or th-forms). However, Joseph Smith translated these chapters with a high preponderance of y-forms.
In these seven chapters all instances of second person pronouns are singular in sense, though there are ten instances which are possibly plural in sense. In these passages the Lord's words to Nephi are quoted (as they are throughout the Book of Mormon) in a formulaic manner: "inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God ye shall prosper in the land; and inasmuch as ye will not keep the commandments of God ye shall be cut off from his presence" (Alma 38:1; see also Alma 36:1, 30, 37:13).

Of the fifty-nine th-forms, two instances refer to Deity (Alma 36:18, 38:14), four occur in the angel's words to Alma (Alma 36:9, 11), and one occurs when Alma is quoting the Lord's words to him (Alma 39:12). Therefore, this means that only a little more than one-fifth (or fifty-two th-forms) of the total number of second person pronouns in these seven chapters are singular in form, although all are singular in sense.

The following, then, is the frequency of the second person pronouns in Alma 36-42:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thou</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.0797%</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.0916%</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thyself</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0080%</td>
<td>yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.0558%</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.2351%</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, in King Benjamin's sermon in Mosiah chapters 2 and 4-5 (chapter 3 is a recitation of the angel's
words to King Benjamin), there are three hundred second person pronouns. Ten of these are th-forms, but four of these are not found in the 1981 edition. Whether it was King Benjamin or Joseph Smith or both who use these th-forms, the effect of using them is the same as when Moses addressed Israel and also is the same as when Jesus gave the Sermon on the Mount.

Also, in Abinadi's words to the wicked priests of King Noah in Mosiah 12-17, excluding his quotations from the ten commandments and Isaiah 53, he uses 105 second person pronouns, nine of which are th-forms used in a plural sense. However, in the 1981 edition only three of these appear, and even two of these are citations of scripture (Mosiah 15:14, 29). It would seem that all should be y-forms, since Abinadi is speaking to many rather than to just one priest. (However, perhaps only one really heard him--Alma.)

Other instances of pronoun usage include Alma 30 and Jacob 7. In Alma 30:32-55 there sixty-two second person pronouns which are used in a singular sense, but thirty are y-forms, not th-forms. In Jacob 7:6-14 there are seventeen second person pronouns which are singular in sense, but only nine are th-forms.

In the 1981 edition of the Book of Mormon there are a total of 1,414 th-forms. Passages which are also in the Bible (e.g., Isaiah, the Sermon on the Mount, and similar passages) account for 409 of these (29 percent). Prayers or
praises to the Lord account for 211 (15 percent) of these pronouns, while passages in which Deity (the Lord, angels, or the Spirit) speaks to men account for 247 (17 percent) of these th-forms. The remaining 567 (39 percent) are mainly found in dialogues or prophetic passages (e.g., Jacob 7).

Of course, when the Book of Mormon is translated into other languages, the second person pronouns also have to be translated. Since most other languages differentiate between singular and plural second person pronouns, each translator faces the tedious task of translating over five thousand second person pronouns and deciding which are singular and which are plural. For those who can read the Book of Mormon in both English and another language, it may be worthwhile to compare some of the passages found in Appendix 1 with those translated into another language.

III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It should be obvious by now that variation in language use has been a pervasive feature of the history of the English language. It is still with us today, especially in the language of the prayers of many. Since the th-forms are rarely used today except in prayers, and since the th-forms have not been used generally with a high degree of consistency, perhaps this is why not all are able to use them consistently today. It may be thought that if one
reads the Book of Mormon quite often, one’s use of pronouns could be influenced so as to become less consistent, yet few use th-forms or ye in day-to-day conversation. However, even if the language of the Book of Mormon becomes a part of one’s own language, it should not affect the language of one’s prayers, except in a positive way—the prayers in the Book of Mormon have very consistent pronoun usage.

Pronominal shiftings do occur in the Book of Mormon. They also occur in the Bible. They occur in the writings of many people throughout the history of the English language. It would be surprising if they did not occur today in the language of those who use the th-forms occasionally. They do, in fact, occur in a recent work by an avid student of the scriptures, Bruce R. McConkie. Here Satan is tempting the Son of God:

"If thou be the Son of God," the tempter says, "then cast thyself down in the midst of the worshipping throng. If thou art the Messiah, surely thou wilt fulfill this Messianic prophecy; how else can it be fulfilled but by you on this occasion? And what a beginning for thy ministry! All men shall hear of the marvelous thing thou hast done! They will flock to hear your message, and you will be able to accomplish what you were sent to do! This is the very thing the Messiah must do to prove his divinity, and it must be done
to commence your ministry. If thou be the Son of
God, thou wilt surely cast thyself down. Now, do it
now; this is the time; this is your great hour!" (The Mortal Messiah 1:415)

The th-forms of the pronoun of address in the Book of Mormon are used occasionally in biblical fashion. That is, they are used when speaking to a plural audience or when referring to a collective group, but seemingly in a singular sense. This can account for some of the pronominal shiftings in the Book of Mormon. Some of the ways pronouns of address are used in the Book of Mormon which are characteristic of the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, have already been discussed (see chapter 5 herein).

This biblical usage of second person pronouns is uncharacteristic of the general usage of second person pronouns throughout the history of the English language. It can either be considered an imitation of biblical style, a quirk of Joseph Smith’s own language, or a literal translation of the second person pronouns on the gold plates, or a combination of any or all of the above. Since Joseph Smith does not seem to have been an avid reader of the Bible before he translated the Book of Mormon, it seems unlikely that he would have been able to imitate something he was not very familiar with, unless he had been given divine assistance. Joseph Smith may well have known the
Bible quite well, but this still does not explain how he translated the Book of Mormon, even though he incorporates King James English and phraseology in his translation. Whether he translated the language on the plates literally in some places and not in others is difficult, if not impossible, to determine, but the language of the Book of Mormon does have many parallels to Semitic languages, some of which are not found in the Bible.

Since there is insufficient evidence to conclusively determine whether Joseph Smith translated literally the second person pronouns in the Book of Mormon in some instances and not in others, each reader must decide this question for himself. Since every reader of the Book of Mormon encounters many second person pronouns therein, and since personal pronouns are so basic to English, it seems unlikely that very many readers would purposely consider how they determine the antecedent (or referent) for each pronoun as they read, even though the y-forms of the second person pronouns are sometimes used in a singular sense, and the th-forms likewise are sometimes used in a plural sense.

A more careful reading of the second person pronouns (as well as the other pronouns) of the Book of Mormon can help one focus more clearly on the message and intent of each passage one reads, and thus one will better understand each passage. Of course, it may not be easy to determine what each second person pronoun refers to at first. Some
are obviously more difficult to determine than others. Though some pronouns may be difficult to determine, each pronoun can be understood appropriately with the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

Thus it should be obvious that if even the learned can err with regard to pronouns of address (if this can be called erring), then the unlearned can also err. That Joseph Smith "erred" if judged by some arbitrary standard of English usage may well be true. But the fact is that the language of an unlearned translator cannot be accurately measured against or compared with the language of the learned of his day. How an individual uses his language is the best standard for any kind of comparison, and the best aid in understanding his language as well.

Therefore, each person's language must be understood and appreciated in its own context if one desires to understand and appreciate it properly. If one attempts to understand the language of one person in a specific context by comparing that language with that of another in a similar context, this may assist one in understanding both uses of language. However, Joseph Smith was in a situation unlike that of any other person in the history of the English language—an unlearned youth was given power from God to translate an ancient record into English. Where in the history of English do we have such a parallel? The language of the Book of Mormon, therefore, which includes the
language of Joseph Smith and his varied use of pronouns of address, must be understood in its own context and on its own terms, which means "by the power of the Holy Ghost" (Moroni 10:3-5), and not on the terms the world may seek to provide as a substitute.
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APPENDIX 1

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

EXCLUDING 1 NEPHI

This section includes various examples of pronominal shifting found in the Book of Mormon. This is only a partial listing and does not include passages in 1 Nephi (see chapter 7) or passages longer than a verse (except the first example) in which pronominal shiftings occur.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN 2 NEPHI

2 Nephi 1:30-32:

And now Zoram, I speak unto you: Behold, thou art the servant of Laban; nevertheless, thou hast been brought out of the land of Jerusalem, and I know that thou art a true friend unto my son, Nephi, forever. Wherefore, because thou hast been faithful thy seed shall be blessed with his seed, that they dwell in prosperity long upon the face of this land; and nothing, save it shall be iniquity among them, shall harm or disturb their prosperity upon the face of this land forever. Wherefore, if ye shall keep the commandments of the Lord, the Lord hath consecrated this land for the security of thy seed with the seed of my son.

2 Nephi 2:1:

And now, Jacob, I speak unto you: Thou art my first-born in the days of my tribulation in the
wilderness. And behold, in thy childhood thou hast suffered afflictions and much sorrow, because of the rudeness of thy brethren.

2 Nephi 3:1:
And now I speak unto you, Joseph, my last-born. Thou wast born in the wilderness of mine afflictions; yea, in the days of my greatest sorrow did thy mother bear thee.

2 Nephi 3:2:
And may the Lord consecrate also unto thee this land, which is a most precious land, for thine inheritance and the inheritance of thy seed with thy brethren, for thy security forever, if it so be that ye shall keep the commandments of the Holy One of Israel.

2 Nephi 4:9:
And he spake unto them, saying: Behold, my sons and my daughters, who are the sons and the daughters of my second son; behold I leave unto you the same blessing which I left unto the sons and daughters of Laman; wherefore, thou shalt not utterly be destroyed; but in the end thy seed shall be blessed.

2 Nephi 4:9:
And he spake unto them, saying: Behold, my sons and my daughters, who are the sons and the daughters of my second son; behold I leave unto you the same blessing which I left unto the sons and daughters of Laman;
wherefore, thou shalt not utterly be destroyed; but in the end thy seed shall be blessed.

2 Nephi 7:1:
Yea, for thus saith the Lord: Have I put thee away, or have I cast thee off forever? For thus saith the Lord: Where is the bill of your mother’s divorcement? To whom have I put thee away, or to which of my creditors have I sold you? Yea, to whom have I sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away.

2 Nephi 7:4:
The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season unto thee, O house of Israel. When ye are weary he waketh morning by morning. He waketh mine ear to hear as the learned.

2 Nephi 8:12:
I am he; yea, I am he that comforteth you. Behold, who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of man, who shall die, and of the son of man, who shall be made like unto grass?

2 Nephi 9:46:
Prepare your souls for that glorious day when justice shall be administered unto the righteous, even the day of judgment, that ye may not shrink with awful fear; that ye may not remember your awful guilt in
perfectness, and be constrained to exclaim: Holy, holy are thy judgments, O Lord God Almighty—but I know my guilt; I transgressed thy law, and my transgressions are mine; and the devil hath obtained me, that I am a prey to his awful misery.

2 Nephi 12:10:

O ye wicked ones, enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for the fear of the Lord and the glory of his majesty shall smite thee.

2 Nephi 29:2:

And also, that I may remember the promises which I have made unto thee, Nephi, and also unto thy father, that I would remember your seed; and that the words of your seed should proceed forth out of my mouth unto your seed; and my words shall hiss forth unto the ends of the earth, for a standard unto my people, which are of the house of Israel;

2 Nephi 29:6:

Thou fool, that shall say: A Bible, we have got a Bible, and we need no more Bible. Have ye obtained a Bible save it were by the Jews?

2 Nephi 32:9:

But behold, I say unto you that ye must pray always, and not faint; that ye must not perform any thing unto the Lord save in the first place ye shall pray unto the Father in the name of Christ, that he will consecrate
thy performance unto thee, that thy performance may be for the welfare of thy soul.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN JACOB

Jacob 5:75:
And it came to pass that when the Lord of the vineyard saw that his fruit was good, and that his vineyard was no more corrupt, he called up his servants, and said unto them: Behold, for this last time have we nourished my vineyard; and thou beholdest that I have done according to my will; and I have preserved the natural fruit, that it is good, even like as it was in the beginning. And blessed art thou; for because ye have been diligent in laboring with me in my vineyard, and have kept my commandments, and have brought unto me again the natural fruit, that my vineyard is no more corrupted, and the bad is cast away, behold ye shall have joy with me because of the fruit of my vineyard.

Jacob 7:6:
And it came to pass that he came unto me, and on this wise did he speak unto me, saying: Brother Jacob, I have sought much opportunity that I might speak unto you; for I have heard and also know that thou goest about much, preaching that which ye call the gospel, or the doctrine of Christ.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN MOSIAH

Mosiah 1:10:
Therefore, he had Mosiah brought before him; and these are the words which he spake unto him, saying: My son, I would that ye should make a proclamation throughout all this land among all this people, or the people of Zarahemla, and the people of Mosiah who dwell in the land, that thereby they may be gathered together; for on the morrow I shall proclaim unto this my people out of mine own mouth that thou art a king and a ruler over this people, whom the Lord our God hath given us.

Mosiah 3:3:
And he said unto me: Awake, and hear the words which I shall tell thee; for behold, I am come to declare unto you the glad tidings of great joy. [note: you is thee in PMS]

Mosiah 4:22:
And if ye judge the man who putteth up his petition to you for your substance that he perish not, and condemn him, how much more just will be your condemnation for withholding your substance, which doth not belong to you but to God, to whom also your life belongeth; and yet ye put up no petition, nor repent of the thing which thou hast done.

Mosiah 4:28:
And I would that ye should remember, that whosoever among you borroweth of his neighbor should return the thing that he borroweth, according as he doth agree, or
else thou shalt commit sin; and perhaps thou shalt cause thy neighbor to commit sin also.

Mosiah 12:14:
And now, 0 king, behold, we are guiltless, and thou, 0 king, hast not sinned; therefore, this man has lied concerning you, and he has prophesied in vain.

Mosiah 17:15:
Behold, even as ye have done unto me, so shall it come to pass that thy seed shall cause that many shall suffer the pains that I do suffer, even the pains of death by fire; and this because they believe in the salvation of the Lord their God.

Mosiah 18:13:
And when he had said these words, the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, and he said: Helam, I baptize thee, having authority from the Almighty God, as a testimony that ye have entered into a covenant to serve him until you are dead as to the mortal body; and may the Spirit of the Lord be poured out upon you; and may he grant unto you eternal life, through the redemption of Christ, whom he has prepared from the foundation of the world.

Mosiah 20:18:
For do ye not remember the priests of thy father, whom this people sought to destroy? And are they not in the wilderness? And are not they the ones who have stolen
the daughters of the Lamanites?

Mosiah 20:24:
And it came to pass that the king was pacified towards his people; and he said unto them: Let us go forth to meet my people, without arms; and I swear unto you with an oath that my people shall not slay thy people.

Mosiah 26:29:
Therefore I say unto you, Go; and whosoever transgresseth against me, him shall ye judge according to the sins which he has committed; and if he confess his sins before thee and me, and repenteth in the sincerity of his heart, him shall ye forgive, and I will forgive him also.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN ALMA

Alma 8:11:
Nevertheless, they hardened their hearts, saying unto him: Behold, we know that thou art Alma; and we know that thou art high priest over the church which thou hast established in many parts of the land, according to your tradition; and we are not of thy church, and we do not believe in such foolish traditions.

Alma 8:15:
Blessed art thou, Alma; therefore, lift up thy head and rejoice, for thou hast great cause to rejoice; for thou hast been faithful in keeping the commandments of God from the time which thou receivedst thy first message
from him. Behold, I am he that delivered it unto you.

Alma 9:2:
Who art thou? Suppose ye that we shall believe the testimony of one man, although he should preach unto us that the earth should pass away?

Alma 11:23:
Now Amulek said: O thou child of hell, why tempt ye me? Knowest thou that the righteous yieldeth to no such temptations?

Alma 11:24:
Believest thou that there is no God? I say unto you, Nay, thou knowest that there is a God, but thou lovest that lucre more than him.

Alma 12:5:
Now this was a plan of thine adversary, and he hath exercised his power in thee. Now I would that ye should remember that what I say unto thee I say unto all.

Alma 14:15:
Behold, ye see that ye had not power to save those who had been cast into the fire; neither has God saved them because they were of thy faith. And the judge smote them again upon their cheeks, and asked: What say ye for yourselves?

Alma 16:6:
And it came to pass that Alma inquired of the Lord
concerning the matter. And Alma returned and said unto them: Behold, the Lamanites will cross the river Sidon in the south wilderness, away up beyond the borders of the land of Manti. And behold there shall ye meet them, on the east of the river Sidon, and there the Lord will deliver unto thee thy brethren who have been taken captive by the Lamanites.

Alma 17:11:
And the Lord said unto them also: Go forth among the Lamanites, thy brethren, and establish my word; yet ye shall be patient in long-suffering and afflictions, that ye may show forth good examples unto them in me, and I will make an instrument of thee in my hands unto the salvation of many souls.

Alma 18:17:
I say unto you, what is it, that thy marvelings are so great? Behold, I am a man, and am thy servant; therefore, whatsoever thou desirest which is right, that will I do.

Alma 18:20:
And the king said: How knowest thou the thoughts of my heart? Thou mayest speak boldly, and tell me concerning these things; and also tell me by what power ye slew and smote off the arms of my brethren that scattered my flocks--
Now when Ammon saw that he had wrought upon the old king according to his desire, he said unto him: If thou wilt grant that my brethren may be cast out of prison, and also that Lamoni may retain his kingdom, and that ye be not displeased with him, but grant that he may do according to his own desires in whatsoever thing he thinketh, then will I spare thee; otherwise I will smite thee to the earth.

Alma 20:26:
And when he saw that Ammon had no desire to destroy him, and when he also saw the great love he had for his son Lamoni, he was astonished exceedingly, and said: Because this is all that thou hast desired, that I would release thy brethren, and suffer that my son Lamoni should retain his kingdom, behold, I will grant unto you that my son may retain his kingdom from this time and forever; and I will govern him no more—

Alma 22:3:
And now, O king, if thou wilt spare our lives, we will be thy servants. And the king said unto them: Arise, for I will grant unto you your lives, and I will not suffer that ye shall be my servants; but I will insist that ye shall administer unto me; for I have been somewhat troubled in mind because of the generosity and the greatness of the words of thy brother Ammon; and I desire to know the cause why he has not come up out of
Middoni with thee.

Alma 22:11:
And he said: Yea, I believe that the Great Spirit created all things, and I desire that ye should tell me concerning all these things, and I will believe thy words.

Alma 22:16:
But Aaron said unto him: If thou desirest this thing, if thou wilt bow down before God, yea, if thou wilt repent of all thy sins, and will bow down before God, and call on his name in faith, believing that ye shall receive, then shalt thou receive the hope which thou desirest.

Alma 26:27:
Now when our hearts were depressed, and we were about to turn back, behold, the Lord comforted us, and said: Go amongst thy brethren, the Lamanites, and bear with patience thine afflictions, and I will give unto you success. [note: "unto thee" in PMS, "unto you" in 1837 edition on]

Alma 30:23:
Now the high priest's name was Giddonah. And Korihor said unto him: Because I do not teach the foolish traditions of your fathers, and because I do not teach this people to bind themselves down under the foolish ordinances and performances which are laid down by
ancient priests, to usurp power and authority over them, to keep them in ignorance, that they may not lift up their heads, but be brought down according to thy words.

Alma 30:41:
But, behold, I have all things as a testimony that these things are true; and ye also have all things as a testimony unto you that they are true; and will ye deny them? Believest thou that these things are true?

Alma 30:42:
Behold, I know that thou believest, but thou art possessed with a lying spirit, and ye have put off the Spirit of God that it may have no place in you; but the devil has power over you, and he doth carry you about, working devices that he may destroy the children of God.

Alma 30:44:
But Alma said unto him: Thou hast had signs enough; will ye tempt your God? Will ye say, Show unto me a sign, when ye have the testimony of all these thy brethren, and also all the holy prophets? The scriptures are laid before thee, yea, and all things denote there is a God; yea, even the earth, and all things that are upon the face of it, yea, and its motion, yea, and also all the planets which move in their regular form do witness that there is a Supreme
Creator.

Alma 30:46:
And now it came to pass that Alma said unto him:
Behold, I am grieved because of the hardness of your heart, yea, that ye will still resist the spirit of the truth, that thy soul may be destroyed.

Alma 30:49:
Now Alma said unto him: This will I give unto thee for a sign, that thou shalt be struck dumb, according to my words; and I say, that in the name of God, ye shall be struck dumb, that ye shall no more have utterance.

Alma 30:51:
And now when the chief judge saw this, he put forth his hand and wrote unto Korihor, saying: Art thou convinced of the power of God? In whom did ye desire that Alma should show forth his sign? Would ye that he should afflict others, to show unto thee a sign? Behold, he has showed unto you a sign; and now will ye dispute more?

Alma 37:37:
Counsel with the Lord in all thy doings, and he will direct thee for good; yea, when thou liest down at night lie down unto the Lord, that he may watch over you in your sleep; and when thou risest in the morning let thy heart be full of thanks unto God; and if ye do these things, ye shall be lifted up at the last day.
Alma 38:3:
I say unto you, my son, that I have had great joy in thee already, because of thy faithfulness and thy diligence, and thy patience and thy long-suffering among the people of the Zoramites.

Alma 39:1:
And now, my son, I have somewhat more to say unto thee than what I said unto thy brother; for behold, have ye not observed the steadiness of thy brother, his faithfulness, and his diligence in keeping the commandments of God? Behold, has he not set a good example for thee?

Alma 39:10:
And I command you to take it upon you to counsel with your elder brothers in your undertakings; for behold, thou art in thy youth, and ye stand in need to be nourished by your brothers. And give heed to their counsel.

Alma 42:31:
And now, O my son, ye are called of God to preach the word unto this people. And now, my son, go thy way, declare the word with truth and soberness, that thou mayest bring souls unto repentance, that the great plan of mercy may have claim upon them. And may God grant unto you even according to my words. Amen.

Alma 45:9:
But behold, I have somewhat to prophesy unto thee; but what I prophesy unto thee ye shall not make known; yea, what I prophesy unto thee shall not be made known, even until the prophecy is fulfilled; therefore write the words which I shall say.

Alma 54:5:
Behold, Ammoron, I have written unto you somewhat concerning this war which ye have waged against my people, or rather which thy brother hath waged against them, and which ye are still determined to carry on after his death.

Alma 54:7:
Yea, I would tell you these things if ye were capable of hearkening unto them; yea, I would tell you concerning that awful hell that awaits to receive such murderers as thou and thy brother have been, except ye repent and withdraw your murderous purposes, and return with your armies to your own lands.

Alma 54:11:
But behold, it supposeth me that I talk to you concerning these things in vain; or it supposeth me that thou art a child of hell; therefore I will close my epistle by telling you that I will not exchange prisoners, save it be on conditions that ye will deliver up a man and his wife and his children, for one prisoner; if this be the case that ye will do it, I
will exchange.

Alma 56:4:
Now I need not rehearse unto you concerning their traditions or their unbelief, for thou knowest concerning all these things——

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN HELAMAN

Helaman 7:24:
For behold, they are more righteous than you, for they have not sinned against that great knowledge which ye have received; therefore the Lord will be merciful unto them; yea, he will lengthen out their days and increase their seed, even when thou shalt be utterly destroyed except thou shalt repent.

Helaman 9:27:
Has Nephi, the pretended prophet, who doth prophesy so much evil concerning this people, agreed with thee, in the which ye have murdered Seezoram, who is your brother?

Helaman 9:34:
And then shall ye say: Because of this fear and this paleness which has come upon your face, behold, we know that thou art guilty.

Helaman 10:6:
Behold, thou art Nephi, and I am God. Behold, I declare it unto thee in the presence of mine angels, that ye shall have power over this people, and shall
smite the earth with famine, and with pestilence, and
destruction, according to the wickedness of this
people.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN 3 NEPHI

3 Nephi 12:23:
Therefore, if ye shall come unto me, or shall desire to
come unto me, and rememberest that thy brother hath
ought against thee--

3 Nephi 12:24:
Go thy way unto thy brother, and first be reconciled to
thy brother, and then come unto me with full purpose of
heart, and I will receive you.

3 Nephi 12:26:
Verily, verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means
come out thence until thou hast paid the uttermost
senine. And while ye are in prison can ye pay even one
senine? Verily, verily, I say unto you, Nay.

3 Nephi 12:39:
But I say unto you, that ye shall not resist evil, but
whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to
him the other also;

3 Nephi 13:5:
And when thou prayest thou shalt not do as the
hypocrites, for they love to pray, standing in the
synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they
may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have
their reward.

3 Nephi 16:12:
And I will show unto thee, O house of Israel, that the Gentiles shall not have power over you; but I will remember my covenant unto you, O house of Israel, and ye shall come unto the knowledge of the fulness of my gospel.

EXAMPLES OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN ETHER

Ether 1:43:
And there will I bless thee and thy seed, and raise up unto me of thy seed, and of the seed of thy brother, and they who shall go with thee, a great nation. And there shall be none greater than the nation which I will raise up unto me of thy seed, upon all the face of the earth. And thus I will do unto thee because this long time ye have cried unto me.

Ether 2:15:
And the brother of Jared repented of the evil which he had done, and did call upon the name of the Lord for his brethren who were with him. And the Lord said unto him: I will forgive thee and thy brethren of their sins; but thou shalt not sin any more, for ye shall remember that my Spirit will not always strive with man; wherefore, if ye will sin until ye are fully ripe ye shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord. And these are my thoughts upon the land which I shall give
you for your inheritance; for it shall be a land choice above all other lands.

Ether 2:20:
And the Lord said unto the brother of Jared: Behold, thou shalt make a hole in the top, and also in the bottom; and when thou shalt suffer for air thou shalt unstop the hole and receive air. And if it be so that the water come in upon thee, behold, ye shall stop the hole, that ye may not perish in the flood.

Ether 3:9:
And the Lord said unto him: Because of thy faith thou hast seen that I shall take upon me flesh and blood; and never has man come before me with such exceeding faith as thou hast; for were it not so ye could not have seen my finger. Sawest thou more than this?

Ether 3:13:
And when he had said these words, behold, the Lord showed himself unto him, and said: Because thou knowest these things ye are redeemed from the fall; therefore ye are brought back into my presence; therefore I show myself unto you.

Ether 3:15:
And never have I showed myself unto man whom I have created, for never has man believed in me as thou hast. Seest thou that ye are created after mine own image? Yea, even all men were created in the beginning after
mine own image.

Ether 3:16:

Behold, this body, which ye now behold, is the body of my spirit; and man have I created after the body of my spirit; and even as I appear unto thee to be in the spirit will I appear unto my people in the flesh.

Ether 3:21:

And it came to pass that the Lord said unto the brother of Jared: Behold, thou shalt not suffer these things which ye have seen and heard to go forth unto the world, until the time cometh that I shall glorify my name in the flesh; wherefore, ye shall treasure up the things which ye have seen and heard, and show it to no man.

Ether 3:23:

And behold, these two stones will I give unto thee, and ye shall seal them up also with the things which ye shall write.

Ether 8:10:

And now, therefore, let my father send for Akish, the son of Kimnor; and behold, I am fair, and I will dance before him, and I will please him, that he will desire me to wife; wherefore if he shall desire of thee that ye shall give unto him me to wife, then shall ye say: I will give her if ye will bring unto me the head of my father, the king.
AN EXAMPLE OF PRONOMINAL SHIFTING IN MORONI

Moroni 9:25:
My son, be faithful in Christ; and may not the things which I have written grieve thee, to weigh thee down unto death; but may Christ lift thee up, and may his sufferings and death, and the showing his body unto our fathers, and his mercy and long-suffering, and the hope of his glory and of eternal life, rest in your mind forever.
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ABSTRACT

The first section of this thesis is a diachronic examination of second person pronouns in English with special focus on variations in usage such as pronominal shifting between thou (and related forms) and ye (and related forms), as well as an examination of the second person pronoun usage in the English Bible (especially the King James Version) with a similar focus. From the thirteenth century on variations in usage have been common.

The second section is a synchronic examination of second person pronouns as used by Joseph Smith and some of his contemporaries, followed by an analysis of these pronouns in the Book of Mormon. Also included is a brief discussion of Book of Mormon textual variants and revisions, especially as they pertain to pronouns of address. The second person pronoun usage and pronominal shiftings in the Book of Mormon are similar to that of other works of Joseph Smith's day except for the use of thou (and related forms) when addressing a group as individuals. This pronoun usage seems more characteristic of biblical or Hebraic usage than that of English historically.
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